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Greg McKay: Okay.

Nikhil Narkhede: It's online.

Greg McKay: (Unintelligible) so something to (unintelligible).

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes Let me pull up my paper. Hey good morning everybody on the Google line. Can you hear Greg and myself?

Sue Baker: I can hear you. This is Sue. Good morning.

Greg McKay: Yes, I can.

Nikhil Narkhede: All right.

Greg McKay: Yes, I can hear you.

Nikhil Narkhede: Great.

Greg McKay: Shall we start?

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes Greg so I'll let you open it and call...

((Crosstalk))

Greg McKay: Okay good morning everybody. It's just 9:00 according to the clock here. This is the August 19, 2020 9:00 am meeting of the Commission on off-highway vehicles. I'll do a roll call of the commission members. Commissioner Baker?

Sue Baker: Here.

Greg McKay: Commissioner Malone?

Kevin Malone: Here.

Greg McKay: Commissioner Cox?

Charlie Cox: Here.

Greg McKay: Commissioner Hill?

Kevin Hill: Good morning

Greg McKay: Good morning. Commissioner Gerow? Commissioner Fell?

Phil Fell: Commissioner Fell here.

Greg McKay: Okay Commissioner Parks?

Brian Parks: Here.

Greg McKay: Commissioner Parks? Commissioner Booth?

Edmond Booth: Here.

Greg McKay: Commissioner McKay Everyone is here except for Michael. Okay. We'll go ahead and do the public comment here and can be limited to three minutes per person, any viewpoint restricted. No action will be taken on the matter raised during the public comment period that is not already on the agenda. And persons making comments will be asked to begin by stating and spelling the last name per the record. Is there any public comment?

(Robert): (Unintelligible)

Greg McKay: All right (Robert) go ahead.

(Robert): (Unintelligible) get an idea a permanent mark trail connection from to the public lands to the north. Another item of good news is we just about got the (unintelligible) on that. Another RTP application for (unintelligible). Something we're just running into - and just throwing this out (unintelligible) advice that some of you can get to me later on somehow would be the BLM promise we're doing is we're changing one software with another off the shelf (unintelligible) items. And it really shouldn't be a process, complicated process but it has turned into that. And (unintelligible) the conditioner (unintelligible) agenda (unintelligible).

Greg McKay: Okay if (Myles) can help or do you know...

(Myles): Yes, I'm here. I couldn't understand anything you said though.

Greg McKay: Okay do you want me to (unintelligible). Well, we can't take action anyway. We'll just talk when we finish the meeting and we can.

(Myles): Okay.

Greg McKay: Thanks (Bob). I appreciate that. Any other comments on the phone or video conference? Okay closed to public comment. The next item is review and approval of agenda. Are there any problems with the agenda (unintelligible)? Okay, then we'll consider the agenda approved. So go ahead.

Man: I think it's best to get two commissioners’ motions and then approve that agenda.

Greg McKay: Okay can I have a motion to approve that agenda?

Phil Fell: Commissioner Fell motion to approve.

Brian Parks: Commissioner Parks second.

Greg McKay: And Commissioner Parks second. Any further discussion questions? Okay, all those in favor say aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Greg McKay: Any opposed? Okay motion carried unanimously for the record. Item Number 5 is review and approval of the June 10, 2020. We're - they've been posted since ...

Man: Monday

Greg McKay: ...Monday. And I mean everybody had read in that link. Are there any questions or corrections to the minutes as they stand? And I will ask for a motion to approve the minutes?

Charlie Cox: Commissioner Cox will make a motion to approve the minutes.

Greg McKay: Okay Charlie makes the motion. Do we have a second?

Michael Gerow: Commissioner Gerow will second

Greg McKay: All right. Welcome aboard Michael. All right is has been - we've been seconded through our June 10, 2020 minutes. All those in favor say aye?

Man: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Sue Baker: Aye.

Man: Aye.

Greg McKay: Opposed? Okay so moved. All right. We get to Item Number 6. We have a program update from Nikhil our program manager. He'll update us on program activities, challenges and successes during quarter two of this year. Special topics include the OHV Summit in Winnemucca legislative progress future program positions, et cetera. So Nikhil I'll turn it over to you.

Nikhil Narkhede: Hey good morning everybody. Okay. Before we jump into the presentation let's - we should clarify a couple of housekeeping items. These minutes take some time to guess translate over but we're trying to make the audio available for the meeting within 24 hours. So while that's been posted these make meeting minutes went up on June 10 and it was really - oh sorry that went up on Monday when I had some time to transcribe those. And really the last meeting surrounded the...

Greg McKay: NAC?

Nikhil Narkhede: ...well yes, the NAC topics but also safety training courses. So I think that's a topic that's still kind of open to (unintelligible).

 All right. A quick program update for quarter two. I will just go over kind of what we've been working on towards these OHV program goals. So our goals pretty much are - remain the same, big picture is to administer the grant program, promote safe recreation vehicles and the quantity and quality of OHV req in Nevada and then increase our OHV registration compliance. So how are we meeting those goals?

 A quick reminder since we're talking about OHV grant priorities today just last year, we funded seven trail projects, four registration enforcement projects to different sheriff's offices, education and outreach projects and two projects in mapping and marketing. Those are continuing with NXT Media and the Mapping Collaborative. Total Award was just over $1 million. And as of today we have 34 active projects. So that'll span everything from 2019 and all of the projects in 2020.

 Over the past six months, we slowly but surely closed out all of those 2018 projects. So quarter one as a reminder we gave you a reminder on May 13 during that meeting and we discussed a few items. We were talking about the OHV grant agreements established the language surrounding those and getting all the signatures. So we've been - they're like 99% signed.

 The Cottonwood OHV Trail Agreement we're still kind of going back and forth on an indemnification clause with the Forest Service. Right now I don't foresee any delays on that project especially because the Ranger District of the Forest Service is like chomping at the bit to get started on it. We just need all the signatures.

 We did a presentation to Humboldt County Commission regarding the sand dunes, a Winnemucca Dunes project that has - that faced some delays in 2019. So we're trying to get it kick started in 2020. The sand dunes there's positive news there that BLM will be progressing like as we originally described. And I think there's a slide more specific details further down.

 And then we also gave the Legislative Committee on Public Lands a pretty lengthy presentation on where the grant funds or where these registration dollars are going. So recently we've also submitted a bill concepts to that same group in support of an annual registration detail and OHV detail.

 Okay so in quarter two specifically from April through June we hosted two grant workshops. The intent of the grant workshop is to improve the accuracy of some of the finance statements that we're getting. So in the past it was like taking me at least a full month to just go through all of the grant reimbursement, making sure that the report is there as well as all of the supporting documents. And we just wanted to bring some of the new grantees in line with all of these different - the two main forms that we require before grants are reimbursed. We did work on a few different mapping initiatives.

 So one of the members was trail mapping crew (Christie) has put together a kind of user-friendly OHV guide for the bullfrog mining district. And we'll use this (unintelligible) story map product as kind of a template for a few other projects we have going on. So as a reminder another 2020 OHV grant was to the Nevada Division of Natural Heritage. It was partially funded to create these off-road naturalist trails and create a video to show users how to like log rare and different species into the iNaturalist app.

 So we'll take a look at this Bullfrog Mining District project and kind of tie it in with this NDNH trails project. The link, fingers crossed that this works here.

 Everybody that's on Google Maps can - or on the Google meeting should be able to see my screen share here. If you're not on the Google meeting then all of these documents are provided on the Web site for this meeting. All right so this is how the story maps product looks. And so (Christie) has basically gone through a lot like in paper handout document and digitized it so that you can access this from anywhere in the country before you go driving around (unintelligible).

 It's got a nice picture of the different points of interests along the way. Looks like there's about 18 points on this map and it provides a short description of what point of interest is available. So basically as you're riding you can take this along with you. Once you stop at each point of interest you can have kind of a description of the different geology or what's going on in that area.

 So if you have some time. It's worth checking this out. We'll be making similar products like this for the division of Natural Heritage Grant Projects.

 We did work on the proposed amendment code changes as you guys are aware. As everyone here is aware, we held two workshops, one in May one in June. We submitted grant - we submitted our draft language to LTD to clarify the grant management scoring and audits and everybody's pretty familiar with that. We're awaiting questions from LCP right now so my understanding is ours is just further down the line. So we haven't got any questions from other government offices.

 And then we've submitted build concepts to the governor's office and Legislative Committee on Public Lands. Again still looking for somebody that can carry our proposal of an annual OHV youth sticker. And these my understanding here is I'm pretty new to this. But there are budget bill draft requests. We're trying to change the OHV budget and those again will be questioned a little further down in the legislative process. We haven't received any questions from the governor's office just yet.

 Again the build concept focuses on the OHV annual sticker and it also includes helmet law for riders under 16. I don't think that the commission reached a final decision on mandatory statements on that safety training so I think that's still in the works.

Greg McKay: Okay.

Edmond Booth: Some media update. So we've been working really closely with MXT Media and (Laura) to get some print ads going. I'm finding that really it helps to defer to (Laura) as the - that kind of social media and media professional to tell us where to publicize it. So let's see if these links work

 Okay we've got to endow ads. One is in the big game seasons and applications I believe it's on page 35, no 37. And today's registration dollars create tomorrow's off-road adventures. This is how the ad looks and it also on this online version to add links to our Web site in paper. Obviously, you have to type in the Web site yourself. There's links to our Web site.

 All right the second item is in the Nevada Big Game Hunting Guide. The advertisements is similar but it just exists in a different publication from the Department of Wildlife here. Let's see how this looks, just loading up.

 So while the first publication showcased registrations and trail maps the second publication is focused, I believe on law enforcement. Okay here it is. So again this one hunter focused, same header. And then there's a spotlight on the Nevada Outdoor School project and Humboldt County Sheriff's Office project. Again this exists in print and it links online to our Web site.

 The last item I saw that SOAR has joined on the Google meetings. We just submitted a quick interview to (Matthew) for his Nevada Off-Road podcast. Those links are found here. I think it's Nevadaoffroad.com. All right just kind of got sidetracked there. Okay something that I wanted to open up for a little bit of discussion are a few Web site changes to go through and then this picture.

 Our header has like a truck on it. We need to just work internally to change this this picture. I think it's quick. The mapping team is out there collecting different pictures while on tour. So we're going to like pick one of theirs either from Jarbige or somewhere around Nevada.

 Okay Web site changes let's see what's on here. Yes so when we went through some delays with processing OHV registrations number one like my voicemail inbox got full. And we - the DMV office also started getting tons of calls about registration. So we're going through and just adding a few - some color to our Web site and just publicizing the DMVs direct line for registration questions noting the title and registration backlog is 30 days and then what to have before you have the - before you call the DMV.

 The effort here is to knock down the backlog that arose from closures in early April through May of 2020. Any other Web site changes? Maybe if the commissioners could run through the Web site and (Laura) is actually doing the same thing, finding dead links, finding any just needs for updates and she's taking care of those updates. We just need to tell her what changes we need, we want to see in there. So you can send those changes to me. You can send them directly to (Laura). It's up to you.

 Okay again diving into the Winnemucca Dunes Trailheads development. So it's one of our larger projects at just under 150,000. We present it to the Humboldt County Board of Commissioners to get their support and pushing this project through. BLM's agreed to progress with our original agreement which says we'll do the environmental clearance and develop a trailhead on approximately like 5 acres right at the entrance to the park or to the recreation area.

 They've provided Chapters 1 and 2 of the Environmental Assessment to StanTech who is the contractor hired to complete the environmental assessment. StanTech sites about three months 90 days to complete the document at which point BLM will take 60 days to approve it.

 Okay high clearance trail maintenance. This is a project that we have with the US Forest Service at the state level. We also purchase the same team, the roads crew, this piece of equipment, the mini excavator. It was deployed to Hunter Creek. We had a chance to catch up with some of the operators out there see the type of work that they were doing.

 Majority of that work is clearing the culverts and improving how water runs off of the road. So that's in the form of just they're really putting in water bars. So when we look at how that equipment's being used in the future we should maybe - well we want it to be building more than water bars and we should look at how it's used to maintain trails from a trail's perspective as opposed to roads. But the project's going on in a forward manner. And then this machine is being used across a number of OHV projects on the Forest Service.

 So there was some discussion about can this equipment be used for non-motorized projects? So far it hasn't been and it looks like going into the future it's going to be pretty busy on the Green Mountain project, the Cottonwood OHV Trail and all of these right here -- Wheeler pass, Tiger Creek and (unintelligible) Creek area.

Michael Gerow: Hey Nikhil?

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes?

(Myles): Just to jump in really quick I just want to make sure everyone's aware that we did get confirmation it can be used on BLM projects as well. So if, you know, future projects come up just don't forget that. Make sure it gets used to its full capabilities.

Nikhil Narkhede: Awesome.

Greg McKay: Great, thank you.

Nikhil Narkhede: Thanks (Myles). Is there any other is there any other questions surrounding the US Forest Service statewide project or the equipment? I know that was kind of a new topic for the commission. Okay awesome.

 Okay so additional topics kind of nearing the end here. I just want to open the floor for discussion about OHV summit in Winnemucca during the first week of October. I think originally, we were throwing around the dates of October 8 and 9 and right now I'm having second thoughts of hosting the summit. So I wanted to hear the commissioner's input on this as well as a couple of other topics, additional program positions and then other projects that you might have questions on.

Greg McKay: So basically this is Greg McKay for the record. I'd like to ask other commissioners if we should just go ahead and do our summit or (unintelligible) and get other people's opinions. Myself personally I (unintelligible) much and I thought it'd be an opportunity to (unintelligible) out and make it pretty informal. But I wanted to hear what others thought if they wanted to do it or didn't want to do it so time to give us your opinions.

Phil Fell: This Commissioner Fell. I think with this year it might just be not so but they're not doing it with the hurdles we have to go through with the social distancing and not being able to do a lot of interactive stuff. You know, a lot of the (unintelligible) presentations I think the value there with this constraint that we're going to have to be under with the, you know, with all the COVID requirements that we have to meet.

Greg McKay: Okay. Anyone else?

Charlie Cox: This is Commissioner Cox. It was hard to hear what he said. Can you paraphrase it?

Greg McKay: Phillip basically thought with all the COVID restrictions and challenges that he was not in favor of doing a...

Charlie Cox: This is Commissioner Cox again.

Greg McKay: Yes go ahead.

Charlie Cox: Is there - I'm just trying to think, is there a way or even a facility we could hold within that - we could have social distancing and still have a, like you said an informal summit?

Greg McKay: Yes, I think kind of if we do it it's kind of got to be formal, I think if we notice it and all that type of stuff. We could do something, well heck even if we met, we'd still have problems.

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes, I think keeping it informal I feel like as a as a state program we are - we should be following the governor's orders of not having a big event in a specific area. I think that earlier this year I was really a proponent of like a group ride or some way to keep meetings held outdoors. But again those plans are kind of waning just because while it'd be awesome to get together it's not setting a good example for the rest of Nevada. I don't know if it sets a good example for the rest of Nevada.

Greg McKay: Okay other opinions other commissioners?

Edmond Booth: This is Booth.

((Crosstalk))

Edmond Booth: Go ahead.

Greg McKay: Go ahead Sue.

Sue Baker: Well I was just thinking that when I met with the Bureau of Reclamation folks down at Boulder City, they were very excited about meeting at the next event because they wanted to talk about how other agencies are following the laws and what they're supporting and not supporting. I do get that right now I think if we limited it to 50 people. Right, isn't that the directive right now I believe. So it could be a challenge because I think we get more than 50 that sign up.

 But I wonder if we should think about key topics that we would want and maybe have the virtual posting of it with a - with maybe putting a panel together that's in person. I don't know. I'm just thinking that if we lose a whole year there's a lot of people that were - that have interest in us now. And so I'd like to keep the momentum going so try and get creative with how we could put some key players together and do a virtual meeting with maybe some in person for some of the key topics. So that's just something to throw out and think about.

Greg McKay: Good point. All right thanks Sue. Anyone else?

Kevin Malone: Commissioner Malone.

Greg McKay: Go ahead Commissioner Malone. We can barely hear you. Can you hear her? I can't hear.

Nikhil Narkhede: Hey can - sorry Commissioner Malone...

Greg McKay: We just can't hear you. Can you talk in the mic closer or try something?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Greg McKay: Hang on one second everybody, Kevin's going to call in so you can hear his comment.

((Crosstalk))

Kevin Malone: All right good morning. This is Commissioner Malone again. Can you guys hear me better?

Greg McKay: Much better, thanks Kevin.

Kevin Malone: Okay sorry about that.

Greg McKay: Okay.

Kevin Malone: I'm trying out some new headphones and they're not working that great, I guess. So what I was saying is I could go either way on the summit. I love the idea of having it here. And, you know, I would just I would love the opportunity to show off, you know, our community in areas that we have to ride.

 However I think I got to agree with Phil a little bit. I think we'd be sending a wrong message to the rest of the state in hosting it here. Winnemucca in general or Humboldt County as a whole I guess is pretty divided right now on the governor's directives and mask wearing and social distancing and things like that. However, you know, in Sonoma cycle cannot keep an ATV or motorcycle in stock. They're flying off the shelves. So it might be a great opportunity for us to you know make some connections with new riders

Greg McKay: Okay. Well it looks like maybe we need to think a little bit more about what our options are whether virtual or in person and the date. We'll get a little more guidance from the state what they're comfortable with or how we could do it. So would the commission be comfortable that we could get back to you in a couple of weeks as far as if we can put something together...

Sue Baker: Well virtual we can do that.

Greg McKay: ...you know, virtual and perhaps informally ride a little bit. We can ride a little bit for a couple of days. I appreciate everyone's position. It's a difficult issue these days with this. And being a state agency also makes it a little more limiting. But so why don't we give Nikhil a couple of weeks and we'll see what we can put together as an as an option.

Nikhil Narkhede: Well it's end of August so I guess if we do want to pursue like virtual meetings then let's make that decision and run with it. Yes, I guess (unintelligible).

Greg McKay: Pick one of those days and have a virtual meeting and then we can perhaps socially distance ride for a day or two on our own. Does that...

((Crosstalk))

Greg McKay: ...please the commission or do some still think we shouldn't have anything at all?

Brian Parks: Commissioner Parks for the record. I like that idea. But it sounds complicated.

Greg McKay: What isn't these days?

Kevin Malone: Well This is Commissioner Malone. You know, if we hold a virtual event, I think we're probably going to have the same people involved that we have on this line right now. I just don't know too many of the public that are going to take time out of their day to you know, join a virtual event versus whether we were set up at the Convention Center, the indoor events center and they could come through and actually speak with us or join a ride or something like that.

Greg McKay: What do you think Nikhil?

Nikhil Narkhede: So my only concern with virtual events is it's going to be difficult to get up huge OHV community to tune in on the computer for really any period of time...

Greg McKay: Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: ...especially if we're trying to cater to OHV riders and trying to support the program.

(Myles): Hey this is (Myles) from the BLM. You know, I obviously don't get to vote on this but a lot of other events are postponing until the spring including a bunch of the other outdoor conferences. So maybe that'll be something you guys could consider.

Sue Baker: It's true yes.

Phil Fell: Commissioner Fell. Yes, I'd be more and more in favor of doing that.

Greg McKay: All right Does anyone have an objection that take a stronger look at it in the spring and hopefully some of the restrictions we have now will be eased?

Man: Commissioner (unintelligible).

Greg McKay: Anyone have a problem with that? All right, and I'm assuming unless anyone speaks up that (unintelligible) try and push it off to the spring and hopefully what we're dealing with now is much less of an issue. Any other comments on that?

Devon Blunden: Devon Blunden from Travel Nevada for the record. And I just want to suggest that if you guys do end up doing that in the spring or whenever it is you could also record and then we share itself even the public can jump on virtually in the seats at that moment they could still take a look at it at a later date.

Greg McKay: Great. Thanks Devon, good idea. Okay. So anything else on program updates?

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes. So there are I'm sure a few questions that we haven't touched on today like registration numbers for example. I'm still trying to tally up the registrations. So far there is a positive trend. We're trying to button up the quarter four numbers. But all the registration numbers will be reflected in the financial update that's also provided. So I think that's only update I have for everybody today.

Greg McKay: Greg McKay for the record. Do you like tell them a little bit about the RTP program this year and a delay?

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes well to my understanding right now about some projects that that rely on OHV funding as well as Rec Trails program funding is the RTP funds are being held up at some level of government where we can't be using them or grantees can't be using them for projects on the ground just yet. And while that's being held up things like our Las Vegas Valley Loop Trail it's being spearheaded by Western Trails Conservancy and Ross Williams is on hold because while we've provided some support costs for administration that real the NEPA legwork, the environmental clearances are being funded by the Rec Trails program.

 So until that gets sorted out in figuring out how the federal highways money can come back down to the state and then be used for recreation trails, we don't really have much progress on those shared accounts shared projects. Another example would be like the mapping collaborative that wants to host a statewide trails Web site that's - that won't be up and running until those funds are released.

Greg McKay: How about this Kokopelli road thing that the power company?

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes. So a few grants projects that we, well one grant project in specific that we awarded I believe it was around $35,000 to was (LatchTop) trail repair. The synopsis is that trail had washed out. It provided access to trails north of Mesquite Nevada and into Caliente. The access road was washed out and so we granted funds to repair it.

 Just last week we got some information about the local power company, Overton Power going in and repairing that road for...

Greg McKay: Maintenance (unintelligible).

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes for maintenance or a new power line that's going in. I guess my recommendation is leave the $35,000 obligated for the next five months through the end of the year and let's make sure that Overton pains the - maintains the road and keeps open for OHV access and then we'll take the (4D) obligating that money back to account.

Greg McKay: Any problems with that commissioners?

Charlie Cox: No. This is Commissioner Cox from. And that is exactly what the folks involved were thinking, sounds good.

Greg McKay: In that future program positions or (unintelligible).

Nikhil Narkhede: Future additional program positions. So this update is kind of it's - put together very recently right. We've got all of these changes that are occurring now in quarter three. We've been asked to put together a budget for our 2022 fiscal year so that's going to be after June 30 of 2021. And we're asking for a few items.

 So it's kind of difficult for me to prepare that budget assuming that COVID is clear and out of state travel is now authorized again where we can do some of that in-person research like going to see other OHV facilities and like I guess traveling out of state is one budget item that's up for discussion. So I'm putting in kind of what I estimate to be to be valid justifiable travel for different items.

 Another budget item that I've been considering is purchasing a - some kind of covered storage for this OHV that the program was - that the program received through partially through the Outdoor Access Initiative and partially through our own funding. We've got...

Greg McKay: Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: ...this OHV that's one of I'd say like a valuable resource. It's definitely an expensive resource but it's sitting uncovered at the Washoe County yard. So I was requesting or I am requesting in the budget a coverage trailer similar to what Humboldt County Sheriff's Office uses to hold their OHV which would hold our OHV as well as education and outreach materials.

 So the covered trailer is one option where we'd receive that equipment as the other option is keeping the OVH in storage at like a covered storage facility. I guess those are two costs that we're being asked to estimate in the future that that weren't part of the program in past years.

Greg McKay: When do we make a decision on those budget items?

Nikhil Narkhede: So...

((Crosstalk))

Nikhil Narkhede: ...I'll submit and ask for those items. I think that they're administrative expenses but they're...

Greg McKay: Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: ...I think another government agency will approve or deny those requests.

Greg McKay: Okay, okay.

Nikhil Narkhede: And then an additional program position. I know that that's been an item up for debate. Is there anybody that wants to have a discussion about those? Right now we haven't - have not requested additional positions through the - through other government offices.

Greg McKay: I think that (unintelligible) was like a volunteer coordinator and...

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes so right now the volunteer coordinator and kind of an equipment operator or somebody that can go out and actually spearhead building trails as well as somebody that can spearhead bridging the gap with user groups telling them of public events and generating like a hand crew workforce on days when we can go out and work on trails. Both of those are like desired positions. But right now we're using different grant projects to complete those tasks.

 So for example NXT Media is providing all of the media support, all of the marketing support. SOAR is providing a lot of this outreach support. And then the mapping collaborative is picking up the field crew support of not only creating the maps which is huge project in itself but they're also collecting pictures out when they're in the field interacting with users providing that education outreach, those important education outreach messages. So right now we're kind of spreading these funds out across Nevada businesses to help the program deliver that - those messages.

Greg McKay: And perhaps with all this COVID stuff and everything we just status quo for the time being?

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes that's the guidance that I'm getting is getting more difficult to request new in-state positions regardless of whether we're a general fund account or not.

Greg McKay: Okay any comments questions from the commissioners? Okay and anything else you'd like to add Nikhil?

Nikhil Narkhede: I think that's it.

Greg McKay: Okay. Then we'll go to Item 7 financial update for discussion. Kelly Williams will update the commission on the status of OHV fund. And on our Web site the current financial summary as of June 30, 2020 is posted. So Kelly you're on the line?

Kelly Williams: I am. Yes. Can everybody hear me okay?

Greg McKay: We can hear you just great.

Kelly Williams: Okay good. All right. So again this is Kelly Williams, the Chief Financial Officer for the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. So hopefully Nikhil has put up on the screen for the Google Meet the financial summary. If not, as Greg said it is available online. So just kind of go through it real quick.

 This is - you may or may not know, we are in the process of closing our fiscal year '20. Fiscal year '20 ended on June 30, 2020. We are just finalizing all the number of all the payments and everything and we'll officially close out the books at the end of next week. I'm getting some feedback from someone on the phone. Is there - you guys hear that or is it just me?

Man: It's not just you. If people could mute their lines, that'd be handy.

Kelly Williams: Okay sorry about that. So anyway we'll be closing our books officially for fiscal year '20 at the end of next week. We - the financial update that I have provided it's kind of a picture of where we're at the end of fiscal year '20.

Greg McKay: Yes.

Kelly Williams: That is June 30. As you can see here Column B there's - that's where we ended at the end of this time last year for fiscal year '19. And then Column C kind of got a little grayed out section. That was what we had budgeted for fiscal year '20. But the numbers I'm going to go over in more detail today are the last column there, Column D it just - which is where we are actual closing for fiscal year '20, our actual revenue and expenditures.

 So for the beginning cash that was the 3.29 million you see there. That was the beginning cash that came was leftover at the end of fiscal year '19. That became our beginning cash for the new fiscal year '20. We did receive so far to date a new revenue totaling 992,000 which I do believe is the most revenue we received for this program at least since it has been under the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. So I did break out that 993,000 total so far that we've received by quarter.

 And so the fourth quarter amount I have a little star there. You can see that we're still waiting on some final numbers from DMV. So far, they've transferred 287,000 to us. But I just received word this week that they're - they did receive some additional revenue that was to be credited to FY '20. So that number may increase just slightly.

 So with everything that we do know as of today, the total revenue, you know, with the cash that we brought over from last fiscal year plus new revenue collected is $4.2 million almost $4.3 million. We did have of course some expenditures to support the program and the OHV grants.

 The total program cost for fiscal year '20 were 136,463.83. And then that just breaks down into what type of expense down below there, 76,000 of that with personnel. You know, there were some in state travel, some operating, our statewide cost allocation plan which is the amount that we pay as a state agency to support the other agencies that assist us - like state purchasing and state sorry, like state purchasing and the budget division, et, cetera, those types of agencies that do provide support to us.

 And then as you can see, we actually did not have an attorney general cost allocation this year and that is because chances are very good that in previous years we overpaid. So we had a credit so they did not charge us for the services this year. We're kind of two years behind on the AG cost allocation.

 So as they, you know, provided services for us, you know, the last two years our next budget will include either an adjustment up or down based on what they provided to us. It's a little complicated but it's not that they're not charging us. It's just that we likely had a credit on hand. And then in fiscal year '20 we actually paid out 710,417.50 OHV grants. And then that makes a total expenditure of 846,882 between the grants and the admin program costs.

 So if you take the number up above in the blue revenue section of 4.28.2 minus the total expenditures that leaves us a cash balance at the end of this fiscal year of $3,435,469.13. Of that ending cash balance there are some, you know, of course additional grants that we have awarded. They just haven't come in for reimbursement yet because as you know our grants are kind of rolling through from one year to the next until they're, you know, either closed out or done.

 I did a quick calculation this morning just kind of for my own personal information. I thought it'd be helpful. I - if I'm looking at the records correctly, we have about $.3 in grants obligated still that could come in for reimbursement. So that $3.4 million ending cash balance there would also have to take into consideration the remaining obligated grants of $1.3 million. So we are still looking pretty good cash wise. So that money will of course become our beginning cash balance for fiscal year '21 which did start July 1 of this year and we'll just keep going as we can.

 As Nikhil touched on in his update just a little bit ago, we are in the process of building our fiscal year '22 and '23 budgets that will be presented. They are due what's called agency requests. It's a request that we put together as a program. Those are due on September 1. They then go to the governor's finance office for review and they take a couple months to go through look at it, make sure everything's reasonable.

 And then the end of December beginning of January the Governor's Finance Office proposes the governor recommend budget. That happens usually beginning of January. And he releases that during the state of the state address. And then that is what goes through the legislature. Legislature starts the beginning of February. They then go through their process of review and decide what they are going to approve budget-wise.

 And then hopefully by the end of May before the session closing for the legislature, we will have an idea of what our final approved budget is. So Nikhil did touch on a few what we would call enhancements that we are going to be asking. But as he also mentioned this is actually a really weird very unique budget building season as we call it because of all the COVID and the state budget shortfall even though this program doesn't have a shortfall because it's not general funds.

 You know, we still have to be mindful and, you know, keep things kind of status quo as possible and not ask for the moon at this point because the public doesn't see the funding as you know different. They see that the state has an overall shortfall.

 So to our best interest to just kind of keep things status quo right now. And hopefully, you know, by the time we're doing this process again two years from now things will be much better and we can consider additional acts at that time. So with that that concludes my financial update but I'm happy to answer any questions.

Greg McKay: Oh yes and thank you Kelly. Any other commissioners have any questions about the budget or Kelly's presentation and recommendations. Hearing that I'd have to say good job Kelly and I echo probably your '22, '23 budget should pretty much echo what we're doing now so we're not trying to ask for too much more in a period where everybody is financial straits.

Kelly Williams: Yes thank you.

Greg McKay: All right. Sure there's no other questions for Kelly on our financial update? All right hearing none I will go to the next item Number 8 which is the Nevada Division of Outdoor Recreation update for discussion. Colin Robertson the Division of Outdoor Recreation Administrator will update the commission on activities, partnership opportunities in the OHV tourism as a rural economic driver. So Colin are you up there?

Colin Robertson: I am sir.

Greg McKay: All right.

Colin Robertson: Can you hear me okay?

Greg McKay: Yes, I can hear you perfect.

Colin Robertson: Great.

Greg McKay: It's all yours.

Colin Robertson: All right. Thank you so much. Glad to see all of you sorry it's not possible to do so in person. This is the part of the new reality that's a little bit tricky these days. But I am very happy to be here. I recognize some of your voices. I listened to the podcast last week with (Janice Keeler) interviewed on the new podcast. Great job on that (Matthew). The typewriter sound effects were a good touch.

 And I have a letter that's been sitting here for a little while from Mr. Queen that tells me about the (unintelligible) state off-road (unintelligible) alliance which I'm excited exists and look forward to learning more about. I follow all the (unintelligible). I'm glad I put names and faces with voices that I have heard previously.

 So as you may know I am the new Administrator of the new Division of Outdoor Recreation which is sort of the new kid on the block in the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and alongside the state climate initiative. So Dr. Kristin Averty who runs the state climate initiative and I are the two newest members of the leadership team of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

 And the Division of Outdoor Recreation was created in 2019 after the legislation 80486 passed through the legislature and was created in Nevada as the 15th - actually it was the 15th state to become part - one of the states that have an Office of Outdoor Recreation. There are currently I believe 15 and 16 states on the way. Those are all states with small divisions of Outdoor Recreation. They're not large squads within the - as the Division of State Parks or other departmental categories are.

 Almost all of the Offices of Outdoor Recreation across the country are very small maybe one person to three people tops. So they're not meant to be large programmatic offices per se. About half of my counterparts in states across the country are in offices like the Governor's Office of Economic Development. About 1/4 are in offices tourism of one kind or another. And the last quarter are in offices like mine inside of the DCNRs or DNR departments principally.

 And I think it was a lot of - there's a lot of forethought put into that from the Nevada side for the Division of Outdoor Recreation to live inside of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. And I think it was a meaningful choice and a meaningful decision that will come back, it'll prove out to be a very wise choice ultimately because the states that have these Offices of Outdoor Recreation like Utah, Oregon and Colorado and so forth are states where the impacts of outdoor recreation are significant.

 And the first thought isn't necessarily to ideas about conservation of the natural resources which makes that outdoor recreation possible in the first place. So I think that's a really important consideration. As the state passed that legislation and which was signed into law then Governor deputized, Governor Dominque Echegoyhen and who's on the call later today. He's the Deputy Director of the Department Conservation of Natural Resources to sign Nevada on to what's called a confluence accord.

 And the accords are a set of kind of foundational principles by which the Offices of Outdoor Recreation that have been created thus far are stood up. And so Dominque and a small group of people gathered in Utah last fall and signed Nevada on to the consulate’s accords. And consulates in addition is a bit of a kind of informal alliance or association if you will of the states with Offices of Outdoor Recreation. The founding principles of those sort of values statements that the consulates is organized around are not law or statute or codes either. But they are kind of like how you value based principles and they function around four categories.

 One category, first category is conservation and stewardship. Second pillar if you will is economic development. Third pillar is education and workforce development and the fourth pillar is health and wellness, health and well-being. And so I say that up front because those are the kind of four pillars and sort of foundational principles by which I think in my tenure as the inaugural administrator of this new division all that I'll do will be tied into one or more of those pillars. And that's basically an easy way to say yes to certain kinds of things. And it might make it easy to - easier to say no to certain other kinds of things if they don't tie into one of those four pillars specifically.

 I am an agency of one for the time being and I would say that that's true until I'm not. There are plans for two hires for my division starting early next fiscal year. So I'm optimistic that those will...

[End of segment]

(Colin): remains possible but I've also been around long enough to know that I'm not going to hold my breath about that either. So I continue to just do the work that I have been starting to do and I thought I'd tell you a little bit about that. I had been very engaged in discussions about the great American Outdoors Act. I've not been involved in the policy advocacy work directly myself. However, I have following very closely and working closely with people who are or are involved in efficacy and the legislation about what that meant for the balance.

 I think that's really just since you last met (unintelligible) I think we should celebrate the fact that the great American Outdoors Act passed and it increased funding. But that will mean (unintelligible) the backlog of maintenance for infrastructure that is maintained by our federal agency partners which I think is relevant to you all as a commission in particular.

 The Land and Water Conservation Fund, at full funding means that there is $900 million allocated for land and water conservation funds. It has never exceeded $327 million since its inception in 1964. So that's a significant increase in that funding. Half of that funding goes to the federal side and half of that funding goes to the stateside.

 I don't share 70% of the federal for having $50 million to the federal side. It goes to the National Park Service and the remaining 30% of that $450 million goes - split up between a couple of different things, so when there's the Forest Service, the Bureau of Indian Education among them. I say that because I think I know that you like I am concerned about issues tied bureaucracy and access and getting things done with agencies like the Bureau of Land Management.

 And I think that it is important to see that on the federal side there are going to be dollars allocated for basically acquisitions. The federal dollars are primarily for land acquisition. The state tied dollars are primarily aimed at infrastructure. And that's like an important marriage, an important conversation to have, I think.

 And then the other part of great American Outdoors Act that's really important I think for - There's a $10-1/2 billion backlog. Well, it's actually a $20 billion backlog of deferred maintenance. And the great American Outdoors Act basically cuts that in half. It's about a $10-1/2 billion fund for federal agency deferred maintenance at the National Park Service and the BLM and the Forest Service, in particular. So that's great news. It's also to say that there's more work to do. So I think that's something that your commission and OHV Program can and should be involved with moving forward.

 Following the great American Outdoors Act, I want to just bring to your attention a couple of other pieces of legislation that might be interesting for you to be following if you're not already. One is called the Recreation Not Red Tape Case ACT House Resolution 3400 which does a couple of things. It's aimed at increasing the efficiency of permitting for guys and outfitters to include, I believe, trail tools that might be conducted by OHV. So I think that's relevant to your interests in particular.

 It also adds a recreation mission to other land management agencies that don't have one thus far. So for example, in Nevada, that's significant because the Bureau of Reclamation is a significant manager of public lands in Nevada especially in the southern part of the state. But the Bureau of Reclamation has never had a particular or specific recreation-oriented mission.

 So the Recreation Red Tape Act, of the Recreation Not Red Tape Act says specifically to change that. To give the Bureau of Reclamation among other land management agencies a recreational mission. And I think that is impactful in terms of your interests as of a commission. So I share that with you because of that.

 And then the second piece is Sectors 3 actually. I'm going to just make a note here to myself. The second piece is called a Sore Act which is a similar piece of legislation that aims to increase efficiency for permitting primarily, especially across jurisdictional needs.

 So I think that's relevant to you all because of the kinds of interagency permitting that you may require if you were trying to be involved with a very large OHV race, for example. The Sore Act is aimed at helping to reduce some of the difficulties of getting permits across multiple agencies for the same kinds of events. So I would encourage you to follow that as well.

 And then the third piece is a piece of legislation called the Map Land Act and the Map Land Act is aimed at increasing access and information basically. Information access as well as public lands access to public lands across, primarily across the west, but elsewhere in the country as well.

 How many public lands are basically not - the agencies that manage them have not kept up with making that the mapping resources about those public lands available for the public. So the Map Land Act does a great service about making it clear. It requires those agencies to publish data and maps both about the geography of that land. And so I think that's an important one for your interests as well.

 So those are three of the areas of kind of federal legislation that I wanted to draw your attention to that I'm tracking quite closely and working very much to try to encourage as where I can, people to be aware of and to support those efforts. But I want to just turn for a couple of minutes and talk a little bit about the administrative priorities for my division.

 Currently, I have an advisory board that unlike the OHV Commission has not yet been able to meet and work in - A primary administrative priority for me is to make the effort to get those final three - to get three final appointments down to the governor's office so that my advisory board on outdoor recreation can meet which we have not yet been able to do to this point. Another priority is just sort of basic interaction and relationship building with key partners and agencies. So I work quite closely with the Department of Tourism, Travel Nevada, which I think is meaningful to you and your interests.

 I work increasingly closely with the Department of Health and Human Services and particularly the Office of Minority Health. A lot of the public health indicators associated with outdoor recreation are very positive and those implications are significant for our communities of color and communities of lower socioeconomic status across the state. So that's an important partnership.

 I have been very proud and excited to be able to work closely with the governor's Office of Economic Development. And I'm very excited that they have agreed to do two things over the course of the next seven years with my help. Is to include outdoor recreation economy as a key thread of the Nevada State Recovery and Stabilization effort that comes out of the governor's Office of Economic Development this fall.

 And then subsequent to that the next five-year strategic plan will include the outdoor economy as the key thread of the Nevada Governor's Office of Economic Development strategic plan for the next five years after that. So that's exciting. I feel like an important win for the outdoor economy in Nevada generally.

 I've also been fortunate to develop some good relationships thus far with the Department of Transportation and then follow with the Bicycle - the Biking Pedestrian Commission, advisory board and also working on the active transportation plan that NDOT creates every handful of years. I think it's every five years.

 And then finally and probably most importantly for your interests on some level is the work that I've been fortunate to be involved with trying to build relationships across this federal agency partners So I met with all the federal agency partners in the state U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, BLM, Forest Service plus several offices at the state including state parks and the division of Outdoor Recreation.

 And that has been really meaningful and helpful work to do. It's been primarily aimed at this - to this place around the COVID sort of COVID-related impacts on outdoor recreation to the federal agency land managers. But it has opened up a whole slew of opportunities for the state to collaborate more closely with those federal agency partners. And I feel pretty proud of that work as well.

 I want to say that, those are all in the administrative priority list. I've also been able to join the Southern Nevada Agency Partnership a bit, and that I think is relevant to your interests particularly for southern Nevada trails and access throughout the southern part of the state.

 One final note on the administrative side that I belong - I find the division of outdoor recreation (unintelligible) member for the Outdoor Recreation Roundtable. And the Outdoor Recreation Roundtable is an industry trade alliance that's based in Washington D.C. It's run by a woman named (Jessica Turner). And (Jessica) is a powerhouse of a policy advocate and to some degree after recreation policy wonk. She's very good at what she does.

 The Outdoor Recreation Roundtable is an alliance of about 34 member organizations ranging from the RV industry of America to backcountry hunters and anglers. And I bring it to your attention because among the members of those 34 or so members are (unintelligible) recreational off Highway Vehicle Association, a motorcycle industry council and the International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association as well as the National Forests Recreation Association.

 And each of those organizations advocates for highway vehicle work as well as recreational opportunities and infrastructure spending and so forth. And I think it's really valuable and important to the Division of Outdoor Recreation as a formal member of that group, there are three offices like mine that are Montana and Maine are the other two.

 And they definitely, I think like I do, recognize the value and importance of having somebody advocating for outdoor industries across many different sectors in Washington as it relates to outdoor recreation opportunities.

 So I share that with you because I want you to know that I am paying attention to the kinds of issues that you all focus on and that is not something that's far from my thinking when I am out trying to figure out how can an agency as one, do the work that needs to be done in a new division of state government.

 So on the project side, I'll just say that there's a bunch of project priorities. And I am trying to basically kind of like triage. Trying to figure out or (unintelligible) setting maybe, which plate wobbly and it gets spun a little bit more. But right now, I've been spending a lot of time on something that I hope will be something that's of significant interest to you all which is that I have found an opportunity to help the community of (Eeley) apply for it an Economic Development Administration grant opportunity.

 And that grand would be at planning technical assistance grant to support the creation of a trail building institute at (unintelligible) College. This would be called (unintelligible) Trails Institute at GDP and it would be an opportunity to train people professionally in the creation and maintenance and planning and so forth associated with trail building across many different modes of transportation.

 So there would obviously be elements associated with mountain bike and hiking and non-motorized trail access trail building maintenance and planning. But also a really important opportunity to train people about OHV trail building and maintenance using heavier equipment for example. And then also some stuff about wilderness trail building which requires hand tools or non-mechanized modes of construction.

 So I feel very fortunate so far to have gotten almost universal excitement from people about this idea. And (Catherine Cortez Masto), (Jackie Mosen), Lt. Governor (Kate Marshall) and the governor are all writing letters of support. I have (unintelligible) of those in hand and are ready to upload them as soon as the rest of the pieces are in place.

 But I've got great support from the superintendent of Great (unintelligible) National Park in a variety of other really high-level political voices who are helping to make 0 healthy lean makes the case that this is a good opportunity for education and workforce development in Nevada.

 Got a couple other similar projects in (unintelligible) and Boulder City. I'll just mention the (unintelligible) one specifically right now for time. (Unintelligible) I think may be the next project on the list for potential PDA funding opportunity because of their interests and work with you all on the OHV trail systems surrounding (Caliente) as well as the mountain bike trail infrastructure that exists in that community.

 And through an idea to rehabilitate the (Caliente) train people in concert with (Caliente) building a tourism convention center potentially over the course of the next several years. There's a real opportunity to turn (Caliente) toward the outdoor economy that it seeks to build in its community and stabilize the economic future. So that's exciting.

 I have been helping with a collaborative mapping project that (unintelligible) mentioned earlier. Trying to get access to some particularly southern Nevada data sources for the non-motorized portion of the mapping exercise. And so that's been real interesting and engaging. And then I want to just to draw your attention to a couple of items that I could work on personally and very specifically here recently.

 The first is the trails of Outdoor Recreation Summit Tours, is an international summit of trail building and outdoor recreation (unintelligible) across the globe but especially obvious in the U.S. That meeting was going to be held in Reno, Nevada next year, the third week of September. And that is a real opportunity, I think, to highlight what you all as a commission are doing with OHV trialing building and for that matter the sort of economic impact of OHV in the state.

 So I'm on the planning committee for that summit which will happen as I say in the third week of September, kind of right between, when is it? I guess it's between the air races and the balloon festival, basically if you know what happens in the Reno schedule at all. But I just bring that to your attention because I think it's an opportunity to try to show a broader audience the impact and the opportunities available to people thinking about OHV. But basically, the OHV economy, but also the OHV trail opportunities in a state like Nevada.

 As I oftentimes say, Nevada - outside of Nevada, Nevada's generally known as an indoor recreation space not an outdoor recreation space, unfortunately. But my job is to try to help fix that a little bit. And I think your work to create the mapping catalog of 57,000 miles of OHV-accessible trails and gravel roads around the state is phenomenal and a very important resource for people to know about. And I think the (unintelligible) summit might be an opportunity to highlight that.

 Finally, I'm also working on a bill draft right now for a dark sky designation bill in the Nevada legislature for the next session, and that looks promising. I have good support for thus far for the idea. Basically, it is the bill that would designate and promote Nevada's dark side assets and resources as a natural resource rather the state working with the International Dark Sky Association.

 That dark sky bill draft, in addition to designating parks and communities as places for enjoying Nevada's prominent and well-known dark skies also identifies a partnership with the Department of Transportation, Nevada designated scenic byways, dark sky byways. So what it amounts to is that there would be a sign along several highways in Nevada that would identify those highways and roads as specifically dark skies designated byways.

 And I proposed it to you in part because I think the opportunity also exists to designate OHV Trail systems as specifically dark sky trail systems across the state. And I think that might be an interesting way for us to work together. In part that's because I think I could imagine Polaris is after all named after a star. So we should be approaching Polaris about potentially sponsoring Nevada designated off-highway vehicle dark sky trails system across the state and see if we couldn't get that in the works. So I think that's pretty exciting.

 And then I also want to just leave you with one other kind of idea about how we might work together. I have been working very closely with the Reno Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority lately and the Reno Sparks market is more appropriate to the size and scale of the outdoor recreation industry. But we're working to try to develop opportunities for meetings and conventions around a number of different recreational topics.

 And I think - and I've mentioned to them this already. (Unintelligible) of many different kinds (unintelligible. There are resources and park conventions and visitor’s authority that make that happen. Meaning (unintelligible) having an annual meeting in Reno. I'm talking about having (unintelligible) so that we could then show them some like Nevada promote what happens at the recreation Nevada.

 So I'll leave it there (unintelligible) if anybody would like to share. And (unintelligible).

Man: All right, commissioners, do you have any questions or comments about (unintelligible) presentation?

Comm. (Pell): Yes. This is Comm. (Pell). I just wanted to say thank you for your presentation. To echo Comm. (Malone)'s comment earlier, every (unintelligible) sports dealer I know, you know, ranging from side-by-side, dirt bikes, ATV, they're flying off the shelves right now.

 So I see our sector in OHV growing in the next couple of years which may lead us into a little bit of a logjam with trails of long-term trail development as we get more users out there. So, you know, I look forward to working with our Office of Outdoor Recreation on just keep going on the economic development in Nevada and to keep pushing trail development too. I think it's a great asset we have. Thank you for your work.

Man: Thanks (Phillip). Any other commissioners? (Colin), I'd like to thank you. That was a very thorough presentation. I was a little apprehensive when they were going to form this Nevada Outdoor Recreation Group, but after hearing your presentation, I think we have a lot of common goals and a lot of areas where we can improve the whole state. So I thank you for that and look forward the collaboration in the future.

(Colin): Thank you so much. Thorough can sometimes be a not good word.

man: No, actually for a person with a short attention span, you did a great job. I learned a lot. Anyone else, comment? Well, thank you very much, (Colin). And we'll go to our next topic. Item Number 9, the Reno Area Dirt Riders Project Update for discussion. (Lacy Barnett), Reno area Dirt Rider will provide an update on the grant project on the Pevine Mays Trail Maintenance. Thank you for being here, (Lacy).

(Lacy Barnett): Hi, thank you for having us. (Unintelligible) Director of Reno Area Dirt Riders, also here with my on the call is (Don Schmidt), (unintelligible) Director of RAD. so anyway, our project his year is our very first ever branch project where we got funding from the OHV Commission to clean up substantial illegal dumping, maintain about 7 miles of single track in the Pevine Mays area. And so, you know, replaced some damaged signage and add more signage. And this is all for Pevine on (unintelligible) National Forest Land.

 So far what they've done, in February we had this major cleanup day where we had about 100 volunteers come out and they cleaned out like a five-mile radius illegally dumped debris including trailers and abandoned cars. And that was an amazing project and we got a lot of good (unintelligible) feedback on that.

 And then this spring and summer we've had our professional trail builders, (Kevin) and (Joel) of trail works go out and - you can see our before and after (unintelligible) that (Nikilo) is putting up for me from our most recent (unintelligible) report where we just went in and clipped a lot of debris and (unintelligible). That picture doesn't do it justice, the before picture. The (unintelligible) are huge and now they're all flat and nice and easily ridable.

 So we actually went a little bit above and beyond. Not only were we able to repair about 7 miles of single track, but we also did about a mile, 1-3/4 of a mile of maintenance on an access road as well. (Kevin) and (Joel) personally donated about 170 hours of his time that he didn't bill us for in order to stay within budget to complete this project.

 So we really appreciated that. And the trails do not break. We get a lot of positive feedback from our (unintelligible) on about how they (unintelligible). So, you know, it's a really heavily trafficked area for dirt bikers and it really needed cleaning. So we're glad to be (unintelligible).

 And then just right after our trail build event, all of the equipment out of the Mays, RAD actually got a secondary grant. We got $9500 from the National Wilderness Stewardship Alliance to supplement this project. Again, we realize the significance of motorized recreation groups receiving grant funding from the Wilderness Organization which is normally pretty anti-motorized. So that was really neat.

 So what we're intending to do with that is use those additional funds to get the trail builder back in there to complete the (unintelligible) installation and then maybe go above and beyond to maintain even more trail in that area for maybe reallocate some unused portion of our grant funds that hasn't been used in other areas to support more trail work.

 So that's kind of where we're at with that, but otherwise, you know we are mostly complete our project already this year, and we're really happy about it and pleased with how it came out. That was a really cool update. And then (Donny), do you want to talk about how (unintelligible) built a lot of good relationships along the way?

(Donny): Yes, hey everybody. My name is (Donny Schmidt), one of the directors (unintelligible). The program that we did, the trail work that we did with the OHV funds was great in developing a relationship with the guys from (Humbolt) (unintelligible) Forest Office. They're kind of understaffed and underbudgeted and such and they're busy all the time. So they were really happy that we were coming into their land to fix it I up. There's a lot of things that I think they probably wanted to do. But just don't have the time or the budget to do it.

 So they were happy to see the funds from OHV going right back into the trails. We developed a great relationship with them. Subsequently, you know, we started talking about what we want to do moving forward, and they're just more than happy to let us do our thing, basically. They know it's for the benefit of all the local riders.

 We're also working on, you know, part of our next project is going to be tying into, you know, getting trails to the California border and tying into another organization that's working on trails in California called CR (unintelligible) trail stewardship. It's a connecting communities program. And they're certainly happy to have Reno, Nevada joining in on that program.

 In addition to, you know, developing relationships with the forest service and the service OHV community in general, we're really happy with the community outreach that we've been doing as well. So fixing up the trails and everything, that's awesome. The local riders are appreciative of it for sure. But part of the OHV grant was actually doing some community clean up like (unintelligible) convention.

 In addition to that, we did a cleanup basically with our own funding and with local businesses and organizations getting involved and donating their time and money. We did a cleanup in the Golden Valley area of Reno. That's on BLM land actually. We make a really good connection with the local BLM ranger. His name is (Garrett Sarcinoa). He's a topnotch dude. He's really dedicated to the cause of OHV and outdoor recreation in general. So he helped us out a lot.

 We got Keep (unintelligible) Meadows Beautiful, KTMB. They donated a dumpster. We had Reno Salvage donate a dumpster. So we had two full dumpsters and about 24-30 people show up a couple weeks ago there to start cleaning up that area. And unbeknownst to us, you know, when we were out there starting out on a Sunday morning getting everything cleaned up, local residents started showing up and asked us what's going on.

 And they jumped into help too. We had two or three guys show up, local residents with heavy equipment which made a huge effort for us or a huge advantage for us. We ended up pulling out three or four vehicles. Filling up those dumpsters. Those guys just put in pretty much, you know, a half-day effort with their equipment on their budget on their dime to help us clean up.

 A really cool aspect of this outreach was connecting with non-OHV users. So for example, we had a horse rider come up to us and was just blown away with what we were doing. He had this previous, you know, idea of what dirt bikers are. You know, thinking we're there tearing up the land. When in fact, we're actually stewards of the land.

 So we kind of changed her outlook on OHV users and she ended up making a donation to our club which was really cool. You know, hikers in the area were excited about what we're going. So the community outreach aspect of what we're doing is great. We're looking forward to doing more of it next year and doing more to help local dirt bike riders.

(Lacy Barnett): And to, you know, add on to what (Donny) said, you know, looking forward into 2021. He mentioned, you know, right now we are preparing to commit preapplication to the RTP program for planning a new trail to connect the trails that we just got done maintaining this year into the California border in the Dog Valley area to ultimately connect with the trail (unintelligible) that (unintelligible) trail stewardship is developing. Not sure what the status of that with the fire and everything right now, but hopefully that can still go forward.

 You know, with the ultimate goal of tying Reno in as OHV recreation destination for dirt bikers in particular, you know, to be part of that amazing, you know, (unintelligible) trail system that organization is developing. So right now we're working with CRB Trail Stewardship and (unintelligible) national forest to make that happen for next year.

 And then also next year, you know, RAD would like to come back to the OHV Commission to get more funding for more trail maintenance projects and then we would also like to start holding registration drives, coordinated with the law enforcement to help our dirt bike group (unintelligible) register, and help increase compliance in that regard just to get more funding to the (unintelligible).

 So that's what RAD is up to these days. And any questions?

Man: Any questions, comments from the commissioners?

Man: I think I'd just like to say I'm very encouraged with what you're doing and endorse you 100% of this. Look forward to your next project and I think there some ways we can get you some other resources to further both of our goals. Thank you very much.

Man: This is Commissioner (unintelligible), I just want to say thank you.

(Lacy Barnett) Thank you.

Man: Anyone else would like to comment, questions? Good job. You must have answered all our questions.

Man: Thank you.

Man: Thank you.

(Lacy Barnett): Thank you.

Man: Thank you (Lacy) and (Donny).

Man: Item Number 10, trail maintenance on BLM land for possible action. Commission (Phillip Feld) will open the discussion about volunteer organizations completing maintenance on routes and trails managed by the Bureau of Land Management.

 The commission will deliver on how to influence BLM to prioritize travel management plans. So OHVs can be OHV funds can be awarded toward trail maintenance projects. Outcomes of this deliberation will guide possible actions on the OHV commission. So (Phillip), I'll turn it over to you and see where this thing goes.

Comm. (Phillip Feld): Yes, hopefully, I'm not quite sure where it's going to go either. Like I said I hope it's more of a problem-solving type of thing, but in the last couple months as I've been trying to work a little bit with (Lacy) and (Donny) on some RTP projects, you know, they had such great results over in the (Toyavi) National Forest that they wanted to expand into other areas around Reno.

 You know that's heavily used by OHV, you know not only dirt bikers but side-by-side users, ATV, equestrian users. You know and it's mostly on the BLM land. And what we are learning is currently right now all the recreational management plans on BLM across the whole state, some of them date back to the 1980. And they don't even recognize recreation in a lot of aspects.

 So along Sierra Front, in particular, there isn't one mile of any trail that's legal for an organization to get BLM to sign off on a trail project to maintain which from a user perspective is kind of frustrating. We have open areas of OHV access. If you look at the Lands Bill Act that's coming up, there's sections earmarked for Hungry Valleys special recreation usage. But there's no mapping done. There's no RMPs done. So although we can take a trophy truck, you know, an 800-horsepower three-foot travel machine across the open desert, we're not legally allowed to maintain any of these trails.

 And as we get more usage like (Kevin Malone) said earlier with the amount of OHVs that are being sold at dealerships right - oh, actually what (Nikile) has up there. So this green area is Hungry Valley special recreation. So that should be - it's earmarked for OHV usage. But currently, there isn't any sort of recreation management plan that allows any sort of trail development or trail maintenance there. So it's really just a free for all. If you put up, (Nikile), l if you could go over and put up some of the maps that you showed - shared earlier. Yeah.

 So this is what (Holly) put together. The green roots are what's recognized kind of roads. They're recognized by the BLM, but we have this other user data that we've created of these are the trails that people are actually using that we're not able to maintain. They're not recognized by anybody. But it's an urban interface area. They get heavy usage all the time. So my goal here is just trying to figure out how we can help the BLM and prioritize. We can see some of these user-created trails. They're just sprawling.

 And right now it's legal to go out and ride all this stuff. But we can't maintain it. We can't fix it. We get erosion. We get trail damage that pops up over winter storm cycles and rain cycles. And then the trail just literally moves over a couple of feet and then they're just sprawling spiderwebs. So I see this as a long-term issue especially with the increasing usage we have across the state. And with our initiative to go to a youth sticker, we're really pushing to try to increase the revenue in our OHV fund to use for OHV projects.

 But if we don't have the land managers like the BLM update the recreational management plans, we're not able to use these funds on the trails that people are actually using. I don't know what the solution is. But I'm hoping that this discussion can kind of open up to the floor, the ideas to help our community and help all outdoor users.

(Miles): Hey so I'll jump in. This is (Miles) from the BLM out of the state office. You know, I think (Phil)'s synopsis isn't - is pretty spot on. So not only do we not have any kind of recreation management plans done for the majority of the state, but we don't even have our overarching resource management plan done. So we have two of our districts have them completed but that leaves something like 34 million acres in the state don't have resource management plans.

 And that may not sound like a - I mean it's a huge number but it may not sound like a big deal to not have those completed. But what it leaves us with is essentially no direction in how we intend to manage the public lands and no public input on how you guys would like us to manage those public lands.

 So offices around the state are basically just responding to, you know, to projects coming up like mining projects or power lines or solar farms or things like that instead of being able to - based on those resource management plans make proactive steps towards, you know, increasing public access or providing new trail opportunities or, you know, developing special recreation management areas. So it is a real problem I would say.

 And I've worked in several other states for the BLM and nowhere else that I've worked has been this far behind. And I do - I think just for a brief synopsis of what the issue is, I think it's- there's a three-fold problem with getting these plans completed. One, it's funding. And typically that funding comes out of our Washington office.

 So it's you know it has to be a priority for Washington for us to complete these plans because it's a long process. And they actually are quite expensive to complete. You know it's thousands of hours of work and you know thousands to tens of thousands of public comments. And it's just a big deal to complete. So funding is definitely a major issue.

 I would say also the politics of it is particularly difficult in Nevada. You know I think for especially travel plans. So designating trails on public lands, there's a perception from the public. And this may not be true for the commission and it's certainly not true for everyone. But from some portion of the public, there's the perception that if we go through travel management, it is going to mean the end of your favorite trail or closing the majority of trails. And I would argue that that is not the case.

 I think that, you know, there certainly is a chance that when you go through a travel plan or resource management plan, you'll discover that there are resource conflicts out there on public lands. Like for example, a trail going right through an archaeological site and things like that are hard to fix. So maybe that would mean a trail is closed, but the benefits far outweigh the small risk from that.

 I think what it would mean is it is exactly what you guys are trying to do with your mapping collaborative. That would mean that we would have official trails out on public land that could be mapped, that could be advertised to the public, that could be maintained and could be used by commercial operators easily to lead tours or do whatever to further their businesses.

 So you know the politics of kind of the second issue, and then I think also in Nevada, really scale of things has proven difficult over the years. So for example, the Battle Mountain District is 10-1/2 million acres. So completing plans for something that large has just been difficult. So that's why we're left (unintelligible). Can you guys hear me there?

Man: Yes, sounds like you're going for a job a little bit.

(Miles): Oh, no I'm sorry. So be open to any suggestions you guys have. How we can break the stalemate of getting these plans completed and I'm open to creative ideas. You know, of course, I'm not a decision-maker in the state. I definitely can give advice to our state director and to district leadership.

 But, you know, I think it is going to some public pressure to get some of this stuff moving because my advice only goes so far. So I also like what (Phil) was saying. If we can have this be an open discussion, I'm certainly open to any ideas and I'd be happy to answer any questions people have on exactly why things are difficult and why things haven't happened so far.

Man: Yes, (Miles), so. go on, if you want.

Man: I was going to say I'm glad (Colin) stayed on the line. Because maybe he can give some input with the Great American Outdoors Act that he mentioned earlier. Is there any way we can give pressure on to put this funding into some of these recreation management plannings? Because that was (unintelligible). steps he mentioned was

Man: I think (Colin) might, well I'm sure say the same thing. But the Great American Outdoors Act is restricted to that deferred maintenance. So that's things like if we have a, you know, a road that is eroding away or a trailhead that needs significant work, they aren't going to fund planning efforts with that money, unfortunately. Although there is a great need to fix all those other things as well.

Man: Yes, (Colin)'s right. I think that the Great American Outdoors Act doesn't really address this issue. A bigger (unintelligible) but bigger challenges is just figure out how does stuff get done at the BLM. And unfortunately just left up to (unintelligible) pulling a goal, (unintelligible), right? I think among other things, one of the areas to look at whether or not there is an appetite for legislative actions potentially that would, you know, compel and require the agencies an BLM among them, not only BLM.

 But compel or require to create these recreation management plans or travel management plants, et cetera. To complete them in a more timely way. I think (Miles) gave the statistical (unintelligible) site option here. But something like 80% of the recreation management plans for Nevada were created when I was in the fourth grade. I'm not that old, but it's been a while since a lot of them were updated.

 And I think it's also the case that something like 70 million acres of Nevada are being, you know, currently being managed without an updated plan. So I think personally that there's a lot of effort on this would be done trying to basically create pools that would lever and sort of compel the requirement of those plans to be updated on a regular basis.

(Donny): Guys, I might be able to comment on this. I think there's a few elements that all need to come together to make the registration for the sticker drive successful, the BLM successful. You know, we need to have the funding, of course, that's a big topic. We can create funding by making a more efficient registration or use sticker program which obviously we're talking about.

 But there needs to be a process when that money is generated. It has to be applied in the right place. So where organizations like RAD come into play, you know, we can - we're happy to go out and work on the BLM land and maintain those trails that are getting torn up. But we just don't have the opportunity to do it right now.

Man: Yes, thank you (Donny). (Miles), do you have an MOU on anybody that does any kind of stuff like that in the state?

(Miles): Well I guess I don't know what you mean by stuff like that. But...

Man: Trail maintenance, trail building. I mean you know I guess the standard answer is we can't do anything until we have the plan. And good luck with the plan being done any time in our lifetime.

(Donny): You know my goal is to have things done before your lifetime is over. But yes, - so we can. You know it's not exactly true that we can't complete trail maintenance. What we have to do is for trail maintenance to happen in an area that hasn't gone through a travel plan is they have to do an environmental assessment to, you know, to make sure that it's not going to conflict with other resources and that sort of thing. So you know a travel plan completes all of that and really streamlines the process. But there are areas in the state where we do have agreements with folks to do work.

 For example, a lot of the large events that we host, you know, part of the rules for the events is they have to complete trail maintenance after the event is complete. Like an example would be the Biggest Reno Race. They have to complete trail maintenance on the entire racecourse when they're finished with it.

 Also down in Las Vegas, there are agreements with a club that works on the Logan Dale Trail Network and they're also completing a travel plan on that Logan Dale Trail network this year. So there is some progress but it, you know, it's really happening at a glacial pace.

 And you know my gut feeling is probably the main reason why things aren't' moving forward is it's just not a priority out of Washington. So we're not getting the funding to complete these projects. I think statewide BLM managers really want to see this happen and they see that it would be a really great benefit to the public. But without that direction from Washington, that's just not happening.

Man: And there's not an opportunity for routine trail maintenance to be a (Catex) type project?

(Donny): No, that is not a (CX) for BLM. It's a (CX) for BLM if it's a designated trail that has gone through a travel plan. But without that, we're just legally not allowed to do that, unfortunately. I wish it were simpler.

Man: Yes, sounds to me like we need to change law.

(Donny): Yes, or change priorities, I would say yes.

Man: Both. And I appreciate the position you're in (Miles). You're trying to improve the situation not leave it status quo.

Comm. (Felligen): So Miles this is Commissioner (Felligen). You mentioned doing EAs to do trail maintenance. Is there maybe an opportunity we, the commission, could partner with an agency or a company that does environmental assessments and we can kind of target urban interface or heavy use areas and do kind of a broad EA. that allows maintenance for user groups to come in underneath an umbrella of an EPA and do maintenance that way?

(Miles): Absolutely. And I think, you know, I think that's one way it could be approached. You'd have to have the support from, you know, from the local office and wherever that project was going to happen.

 But certainly, that's something we could do. I know it be it's not going to be cheap, exactly. And that's why I really - my firm belief is that completing the travel plans and the resource management plans is the correct way to go forward. But in the meantime if we're looking for to complete some priority projects while those larger plans are getting completed, I think, yes, I think that's a great idea.

Comm. (Felligen): Yes, I just come from the line of thinking of if I don't have any control over it why bother putting the effort into it and put effort into things I have control over. So obviously, I don't have any control over Washington priorities over the BLM. You know, we can continue trying to influence that, but we have - We can take control over E.A. processes and try to help out with that at least in the short term in the next year to get some projects onto the trails and the BLM land that we use across the state.

(Miles): Absolutely. I think that's a smart way to look at it, (Phil).

Man: And historically there's been resistance from some commissioners to fund what a federal responsibility would be. But I think if we have priority projects or heavy use areas, it may be worth exploring sharing funding or you know to make these things happen. If enough people use them, otherwise we won't improve anything.

(Miles): Yes, you know that's certainly up to you guys. I think one additional point that I'll make though is that I have been talking with folks from GBI about trying to adjust the way that the mapping collaborative is working. So that BLM could better use that data inventory data for travel plans.

 So I don't know exactly when, but (Kevin Doce) I believe will be talking to the RTP commission about possibly trying to fund a much larger mapping crew to do more systematic mapping of routes on BLM lands. Rather than just mapping of, you know, priority OHV areas and that sort of thing.

 And I think, you know, there are three parts to a travel plan that all are pretty expensive. The first one is the mapping. So if, you know, if we could reduce the cost of mapping by funding it through RTP grants or if the commission solves the soft bit to fund that sort of thing as well, then it could release some of the small funding the BLM does get out of Washington to go from mapping to completing the travel plans, you know, rather than just compiling map data, you know, for eternity.

Man: So (Miles) we'd ask your opinion. So say our commission is leaning toward sharing the cost in some priority areas for this process. Would that make it a bigger priority in your organization?

(Miles): Absolutely. I think. And I think these things are on the local level. They really are a priority. You know the local staff are dealing - like for example let's look at moon rocks. Moon Rocks has been a popular area for a long time and is getting more and more popular. So the local staff and especially law enforcement are dealing with the problems that come along with that. So they want to complete this planning.

 It's just been a difficult uphill task to get the funding to complete that stuff. For the Sierra front field office, a large and complicated field office, they have one recreation planner. And his, you know, his attention is just really stretched thin. So yeah if there were a (unintelligible) for funding for a third-party contractor to complete the planning part of it, definitely that would move things to the top of the list.

Man: Okay, any other commissioners have any comments, questions?

Man: (Unintelligible), this is (unintelligible). I'm not a commissioner, but I could ask some.

Man: Please do.

Man: Something you may have heard that working with the US Forest Service and working kind of nationwide on a shared stewardship program, specifically in Nevada, you put that shared stewardship conflict and wanted to look at it more broadly.

 And we brought in a federal partner, Department of (unintelligible) to BLM and US Fish and Wildlife service being one of them. In 2009, (unintelligible) stewardship grant with our federal partners and other state agencies are engaged as well in (unintelligible) department of wildlife with the department of conservation and national resources.

 Now, bear with me for a second here, because primarily what we're looking at through this agreement is how to focus and work together across jurisdictions to achieve land (unintelligible) resistance and resiliency committed to (unintelligible).

[End of segment]

Man 1: But again because we're entering into this joint agreement, I know I've personally been frustrated that we have so many different small agreements. We wanted one big umbrella that would allow us to operate across these landscapes without having to enter into no agreements.

 So we did specifically conclude a (unintelligible) here on sustainable regulation and said that we would work together to provide a diverse array of safe and sustainable recreation opportunities. And to do that we would favor investments and (unintelligible) resources that span our capacity and their integration under a partnership.

 So immediately we are focusing on (unintelligible), because that has such a devastating impact on the state of Nevada. So in the short run, we're looking at identifying those large priority landscapes and then specifically two projects to be completed by 2021. And then how we can increase the work that we're doing on both the restoration, the rehabilitation of the landscapes, how we (unintelligible) 50%.

 But I want to use that agreement to address issues such as this one. When we do look at what we consider to be sustainable recreation, how can we as the state use our specific priorities to work with our federal partners and to leverage the resources that we have available?

 I think there will be opportunities (unintelligible) due to the outbreak under that agreement, but you've got to give us - sometimes we build it up, we've got a technical advisory committee that has been working very hard on identifying those landscapes very important for wildfire. And that's where (unintelligible) needed and those are the decisions that our executive committee could be making in the near term.

 But right after that, I would like to look at how we address these types of restoration issues and how we are sure that we as a state could invest on these federal lands and maintain these types of trail systems.

(Miles): Hey, do you have a link to that agreement somewhere or - I'm sure it's posted on the state website somewhere.

Man 1: I will provide that through (unintelligible) and he can blast that out to you.

(Miles): That would be - that would be great. That's exciting to hear. I didn't know about that.

Man 1: (Unintelligible) but that is the umbrella under which we can operate and it's really (unintelligible) kind of laying the groundwork for us to be able to achieve these opportunities.

(Phil Feld): This is Commissioner (Feld). It kind of hit a little bit on that just knowing the Loyalton fire in the layout of the fire. (Lacy) mentioned earlier that it is kind of moving into a lot of the trails that RAD worked on maintaining over the summer. And a lot of these forestry firefighting units use the OHV trails as access and as firebreaks. So it definitely does go hand in hand. One of the trails that they did help maintain was severely neglected.

 I would say about five years ago I could get through with, you know, maybe a slightly lifted truck. And now you need, you know, a modified jeep to get through. And they did a lot of repair to that access road to be able to get the equipment in. And that - that road I guarantee is now being used for firefighter access. So it's a win-win for all. So I'm glad to hear that recreation is going to be tied in with this because it really does help the access to these fire areas.

Man 1: That's a great point, (Phil), and that's something I will be sure to raise during out next executive committee meeting (unintelligible) a great (unintelligible) great asset when we're fighting fires, trying to get our resources in and out safely.

(Phil Feld): And then one thing -- to go back to what (Miles) mentioned earlier -- he mentioned some of the race permits in the race organizations going back and maintaining the areas that they've razed. How long is that agreement for? Is there any way that other organizations can find race routes on BLM land that have been razed in the past and just take on maintaining those trails?

 Because I understand for - to get a lot of permits that don't have the RMPs currently done, the BLM has to do a category exemption specifically for those races. So could we go back and maintain some of those trails that had the CX's to the race done as it was already part of the agreement for the event to go through?

(Miles): It's a good question. I don't know the answer to that, (Phil), but I can do some research and to see what the answer is. So for example, the Vegas to Reno - so you can only use a categorical exclusion if - for a special recreation permit -- which is what a race falls under -- if the disturbance from the - from the event is under three acres. So that includes the racecourse and camping, etc. So for the Vegas to Reno -- given that it's a, you know, 500-something miles long is - doesn't qualify for that.

 They have to do environmental assessment for that permit and they authorized the - the trail units under that environmental assessment. So I don't think that can work for us yet. But I - you know, I'm happy to look into creative ideas like that. So I'll shoot our guy who's an expert in that stuff an e-mail and ask him. But I guess, you know, the last question - oh go ahead. Sorry.

(Phil Feld): Oh, I was just going to say because I know between the Northern Morand Race organization and the Southern Morand Race organization, you know, they've done a lot of races around Reno, Pennock, Caliente, out in Winnemucca.

 You know, if we can find a loophole somewhere in here, you know, to at least get some maintenance going - that's really what I'm looking for is just trying to - we have an OHV fund. You know, we got - we got to get it to the actual trails and the end-user. And if we're blocked from maintaining trails on public lands like the BLM, where can we really spend the money on what the users are actually using?

(Miles): Right. That makes sense. Yes, I'll get an answer for you. I'll share it with - maybe I should send it to (Keo) and he can send it to the commission.

(Phil Feld): Yes, that'd be great. Thank you.

(Miles): And I guess, you know, the last question I would have for the commission. You know, I see - apart from the money that you guys dispense -- which is great -- I see you as a really important resource for kind of being a pulse of the OHP community around the state. So I'd be curious what you guys think in your local communities the attitude is towards travel management planning in general. And that's kind of a loaded question, but feel free to chime in if you feel so inclined.

(Phil Feld): This is Commissioner (Feld), I'll maybe take the first shot at this, just being involved as a user and with the race organizations. You kind of hit the nail on the head earlier when you hit the politics side of it, is a lot of fear of closures. But I think that comes from the fact that we haven't gone through this process since (Colin) was in the fourth grade. So nobody - it's nobody really knows the hard facts about what goes into this.

 We just hear the kind of conspiracy theory extremist viewpoints of everything's going to be closed and we're better off just keeping bandito pirates out in the desert doing their own thing. I think the public opinion is easily swayed when we look at other states like what Idaho's doing with their trail maintenance programs and their full-time trail crews that are out there.

 What Colorado's doing what their trail maintenance programs. We just got to use those as examples to educate our base about the benefits of the programs and what it can - what it can lead to long term. And that's part of what we can work on with the PR campaigns with MXT Media and stuff like that is getting that info out there.

(Lacy): This is (Lacy) from (unintelligible). You know, and I just kind of want to echo what (Phil) is saying and, you know, the user level -- like you said -- there is a lot of fear among our members about, you know, don't let them - don't let the BLM know about this trail, they'll just close it. You know, and we're working hard to kind of educate our people and to convince them that it's a good thing and go, "Listen, you know, if you (unintelligible) that can go back into the trail."

 And probably 80% of what our dirt bike people ride on is BLM land. And, you know, we have had our membership ask us, "Well, can we go knock down (unintelligible) on the trails at (unintelligible)?" And, you know, where most of our riding is. And right now we have to answer to them that we can't do that.

 And we should be able to take some ownership in the trails on BLM land to, you know - like I said, you know, even help some fire roads and stuff to, you know, get our trucks in there easier to the staging areas. And, you know, just generally have stewardship of it is what we would like to do. But our answer is sort of tied where we can't. So I just wanted to throw that out there.

(Mike): Yes, (Miles). I don't know what to tell you what the opinion is. I think there's a lot of fear, although you have done a half a dozen of them in the state. And my information was it resulted in single-digit reduction in all the trails in the affected area. And a lot of them were just duplicate trails going to the same place.

 But there's public perception and this is going to be no small project. I mean it's going to be a federal, state, and local effort to get anything done. I think we'll have to schedule this for another discussion when we get some more answers or at least be able to frame this better so our commission can move forward in an organized fashion. But, you know...

(Miles): Yes, that sounds - that sounds fair. I'm happy to participate in any conversations on this. And I'll - I'll do some more research. And I'm happy to update folks as we move forward with problem management. On one good note, I will say in the - in the Reno area we did get funding out of Washington in the tune of like $190,000 this year for completing contract or done professional inventories.

 And that will include stuff out of Moon Rocks and also in the Stillwater Field office. Some of the popular riding areas out there. So, you know, there is some progress. But - but I'm not happy with how things are going right now. I want - I really want to see things accelerate. So any - any way we can work together and make that happen, I'd love to do.

(Mike): All right. I'm sure this will be a topic for many years to come. And (Philip), thanks for bringing this to a boil I suppose. And allow us to all start thinking about how to get something done, whether - why we're not getting anything done. So any...

(Phil Feld): Yes, no...

(Mike): Comments from commissioners? Okay.

(Phil Feld): I would just say the - we wouldn't really have any possible action on this. But what we - what I got out and we can roll into the next grant priority funding is possibly taking a harder look at the environmental assessments on BLM high use areas and like some of the urban interface areas to hopefully speed up and make it easier for clubs to do some of these trail maintenance projects. We might want to parry that discussion into the OHP grant priorities.

(Mike): Well, would you like to prepare a crude analysis of that situation for our next commission meeting?

(Phil Feld): Yes, I can - I can take that on.

Man 1: I think also what Commissioner (Phil) wants to see is our discussion that we just had be reflected when we talk about grant priorities this afternoon to show some - some kind of effort towards the environmental planning or helping BLM with their - with their planning efforts.

(Mike): Make it a higher priority.

Man 1: Yes.

(Phil Feld): Correct. Yes, exactly.

(Mike): And if you want to - if you want to make a motion to that effect, we can ratify it that way.

(Phil Feld): Sure. Commissioner (Feld) makes the motion to add environmental assessments as an OHB grant priority to be discussed. And then next comment on the agenda.

(Mike): Okay.

(Charlie Cox): And this is Commissioner (Cox). I'd second that.

(Mike): Okay, moved and seconded. Any further discussion by the commission? And hearing none, all those in favor say Aye.

Group: Aye.

(Mike): Any opposition? Okay. Motion carries unanimously. And further, we have an understanding that next meeting we'll get an update that may give us a rough framework on the environmental assessment issue in priority areas and how we might move forward to alleviate that concern.

(Phil Feld): Yes. I see (Robert Adams) - he's still on the phone. (Robert), would you be able to help me out on identifying some areas in southern Nevada that could benefit from this initiative and, you know, work with me on getting ready for the next meeting?

(Robert Adams): Sure. (Unintelligible).

(Phil Feld): Yes, that be great. Because obviously you're well more versed in the terrain down there and where the riders are riding than I am in southern Nevada. So they'd be awesome. Thank you.

(Mike): Okay, any further questions, comments on this issue? All right. Thank you, (Miles). Thank you, (Phillip). Nice to Skype.

(Miles): Yes, thanks to both you and I have an open-door policy. If anyone has any questions, please don't hesitate and get in touch with me.

(Mike): Okay, you asked for it. We appreciate it. Thank you.

(Paul): (Unintelligible) we do have some additional information. We'll wait for the public comments to inform the latest in our efforts (unintelligible).

(Mike): Okay. Thank you, (Paul). All right. Well, let's go ahead and go to item number 11; 2021 OHB grant priorities for possible action. This is kind of an annual item to see if we want to reprioritize scoring criteria to reflect current needs or desires. So I'll open discussion to commissioners if they want to change last year's scoring criteria in any fashion.

Nikhil Narkhede: Actually, before we jump into the discussion, does anybody want a refresher or needs a refresher on how these grants were scored last year? We should discuss how they will be scored this year using the technical advisory committee and input from the non-voting members. And then obviously the big item up for discussion is changing where these priorities rank and then keeping the weight of each- of this priority the same. Does everybody has a good understanding of how we're scoring these grants?

(Phil Feld): Yes, can you maybe pull up on the screen the...

(Mike): Score sheet.

Nikhil Narkhede: Oh, I need to...

(Phil Feld): Yes. Just so everybody can have that.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay, so the screen being shared now should be the grant scoring criteria in the priority order that was listed for - that was used for 2020 grants. So we'll basically change the order of these ten criteria as the commission sees fit. Once those are changed, then the scorecard that will be provided to the Technical Advisory Committee to help guide where these grants rank out.

 Each grant will receive a score between 1 to 10 based on how well they hit all of these criteria. So if you've got like a law enforcement strategy or a project that addresses law enforcement plus enhancement and maintaining existing trails and they both receive 10, those are the two highest weighted priorities. So it would score theoretically pretty high.

 Similarly, if you can have a great project that addresses numerous of these priorities or these criteria then you gain more points because you're hitting multiple different subjects. So I guess with that, over you. And (Phil's) last - Commissioner (Phil's) comment of where items like planning and environmental studies and conservation will fall. That's really what's up for discussion today. At the end, as - hopefully, the outcome is 2021 OHP great scoring criteria where are these priority orders will be amended as you see fit.

(Phil Feld): This is Commissioner (Phil).

(Mike): Go ahead, (Phillip).

(Phil Feld): I think over the last multiple years the law enforcement has always been top priority. Do we have any sort of analysis on if that is actually - how much impact that had in compliance in the OHP program? I don't know if we - how to get that data to see if those efforts of putting funds into law enforcement has actually helped compliance or not.

Nikhil Narkhede: So I can - I can share like general trends with - with the commission today. And that says that where we have law enforcement grants there are higher registration numbers in that area. Now what I cannot tie together is the timing for when those grant monies went on the ground to the registration gains. So - or to the population of users in that area.

 So, for example, we'll take Fallon and - and the Sand Mountain area. Fallon exists in Churchill County and that sheriff's office has received an OHV grant. I cannot find a trend that says after a sheriff's office received an OHB grant there is a direct increase in OHB (unintelligible).

(Phil Feld): Okay. Commissioner (Malone), do you have any input on that or thoughts on that? If you think the law enforcement being a high - high priority is actually helping out in compliance or do you think maybe - I know a lot of your focus in Humboldt County is safety. And you've had a lot of success in showing decreased fatalities in OHB use.

Commissioner (Malone): We have. And I can only speak for Humboldt County. I can't speak for the others. But we'll say Lyons has been very proactive this year. The - can you guys all hear me ok?

Group: Yes.

Commissioner (Malone): Okay. I will say that I think probably 2020 since COVID hit is probably not a good way to judge OHB. Yes, I guess like Sand Mountain and things like that, you know, BLM (unintelligible) earlier. You know, the big weekend events where Churchill County area and BLM is going to be out there, you know, in the major holidays like Easter and things like that.

 I'm not really sure what the closure or reopening dates were, but I think the law enforcement interactions with the OHB community and enforcement actions regarding registrations were probably a lot (unintelligible) because of that. Hopefully, we can start seeing those - those numbers rise again.

 But I know for Humboldt County in general, we have not been out enforcing a lot - obviously due to the COVID. You know, our priority has kind of changed, too. And I think law enforcement in general across the nation our priorities have changed to (unintelligible) rather be reactive rather than proactive during this time just so we can keep our own people safe.

 That said, you know, as we've both been talking about OHB is motorcycles. Everything off-road related has been flying off the shelves. So I think that's going to be the biggest reason for registration spikes right now.

(Phil Feld): Do you think the success in your program is more attached to the law enforcement of - of your program or the training of your program? Just thinking of the OHB's flying off the shelves. Or should we maybe prioritize training a little bit higher and bring law enforcement down or what - what are your thoughts on that?

Commissioner (Malone): Well, you know, I think we're probably the only one that is doing the training program. You know, the only law enforcement agency that's also doing the training program, I should say. I know Lyon is developing their program as well. I can't tell you that our training program is the reason why people are getting more involved. If anything I would say it's as a result of our enforcement events. But I couldn't provide you any data to actually back that up right now.

(Phil Feld): Yes - no, maybe - I think I might have misphrased. I was thinking more - on that last question more the success you've had in decreasing OHB fatalities. Do you feel that's a result of the training or the law enforcement, especially with a lot of new people having OHBs and they're flying up the power sport shelf? You know, we want to - I just want to look into next year.

Commissioner (Malone): You know, our - our classes - while, you know, I wouldn't say they're successful. They haven't been acting the way I would see. And I think right now (Kevin Nos) and GBI has probably been our biggest attendance at our classes. So I wouldn't even say it's from our local level. We've had some, but not as many as I like. So I'd say definitely the success we've seen in reducing injuries and preventable injuries and death is 100% due to our enforcement actions.

(Phil Feld): Great, thanks.

(Mike): And if I - if I could, the reason in the past that we rated law enforcement so much higher than the others is typically that's the only category that they can apply for. If you have a good trail project, you know, you can do multiple categories for your score on a motorized project or a trail maintenance project or whatever. But law enforcement can only apply in that one category and that's why that was weighted so heavily. Just a historical point.

(Phil Feld): Got you, got you. I was kind of looking at the - the training - they can slip under a lot of the training stuff, too.

(Mike): And they can do training. But that's about - that's about it where they could hit where others could hit, you know, four or five if they're smart.

(Phil Feld): Yes, it's - it was good feedback hearing Commissioner (Malone's) opinion on the law enforcement keeping the fatalities down because, you know, me not being in that aspect I wasn't sure if it was the training or the law enforcement. So that was good info for me. Thank you.

(Mike): Does any commissioner want to make a specific recommendation to change the priority points that we give a certain category? Because this will affect our next - next round. Do we want to make the planning, environmental studies, conservation higher rated to make it available for possible future projects?

(Phil Feld): I for sure -- Commissioner (Feld) -- I for sure think we need to - to move that up to, you know, at least - man, I am conflicted. It's - I think it needs to be at this point a higher priority than maintenance of existing trails. Because right now if we don't have the planning to maintain existing trails. So we need to get the environmental studies done in order to maintain. So it really needs to be higher than maintenance, which is - for me fundamentally it's counterintuitive. But I guess that's the first step that has to happen before we maintain trails is get these environmental studies done.

(Mike): Well, if you want to make a suggestion or a motion to change the scoring on it, be my guest.

(Phil Feld): Yes, so Commissioner (Phil), I make a motion to move the planning and environmental studies up to a priority 10.

(Mike): Okay. Do we have a second for that?

Commissioner (Hill): Commissioner (Hill). Second.

(Mike): Okay. Moved in second. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say Aye.

Group: Aye.

(Mike): Any oppose? Okay, that's done. Is there any other commissioner that would like to make another suggestion on priorities?

(Phil Feld): Commissioner (Feld) here again. Just to - I think to make things balance out since we moved planning environmental studies up. We - we need to move something down. And I - I think looking - or taking the info we learned from the BLM and the mapping and getting things approved for maintenance, we might have to move the mapping down because if we don't have the environmental assessments done, we can't get the trails recognized.

 So there's really not much to map that's - that's legal until we get this planning environmental studies away. So I think the mapping we might have to move down to a six to offset moving the planning up to a 10. What's everybody's consensus on that?

(Mike): Any comments, concerns about that possible change from commissioners? Hearing none, you want to make a motion?

(Mike): Well, let me put in some input that change - if we're moving that thing down to priority 6, then we have to look at partnering and leverage. So if we do it all in one, would you - would the commission like to see more weight placed on projects that are bringing in outside funds or how should we rank or value the partnering and leverage aspect?

(Phil Feld): I think we can keep that the same because we have others that - like the connectivity loops and the planning and the trail mapping last year we're all viewed with the same priority.

Nikhil Narkhede: So weight - weight all of them at six?

(Phil Feld): Well, weight the mapping and the partner leveraging both at a six.

(Mike): Okay, other comments, concerns from other commissioners? You want to make that in the form of a motion, (Phillip)?

(Phil Feld): Commissioner (Feld) makes a motion to move the trail mapping and signage of existing trails and facilities from an eight down to a six on the priority list.

(Mike): Okay. Do we have a second?

Commissioner (Mullen): Commissioner (Mullen), I'll second.

(Mike): Okay, Commissioner (Mullen) seconds. Any further discussion? Hearing none...

(Charlie Cox): This is Commissioner (Cox) - (unintelligible) this Commissioner Cox.

(Mike): Go ahead, (Charlie).

(Charlie Cox): What - so what - in between there, you know, from an eight to a six. So what are we going to put in seven and eight? What are we going to put in between there? Because I feel signing of existing trails is important.

(Mike): Yes, and it didn't necessarily mean that that won't get funded either. A lot of it gets down to when we have a discussion as a group of a good project whether or not we want to fund it or not. (Unintelligible) these projects. But the commission still has the ability to - to change that rating and what they're going to fund or not fund, albeit with good reasons. As much as we want.

(Charlie Cox): All right. That clarifies it.

(Mike): So, let's see. We had a motion but we didn't have a second on the last one, right, Nikhil?

Nikhil Narkhede: Commissioner (Malone) seconded it, I believe.

(Mike): But - I'm sorry. Thank you for that correction. Any other comments, suggestions? Okay. Hearing none, All those in favor?

Group: Aye.

(Mike): And any opposed? Okay, motion carries. Are there any other suggested changes to this scoring criteria?

Commissioner (Hill): Commissioner (Hill) here. Nikhil, did you have any input with you and the technical advisory group last time you looked through this? Was there anything that came up that you feel needed to be changed or what was the feeling of all the members last night?

Nikhil Narkhede: So last time we provided all of the applications to the members as well as the scoring sheet. And then (unintelligible) that the technical advisory committee would see, like what makes the project beneficial for law enforcement, for maintaining trails and facilities, all these different categories. And then what challenges do those categories face?

 So that's how we made up all of the technical advisory notes and then those projects that didn't have any - had fewer challenges. So there were like 90% success rate potential. Then those would get ranked higher. When we see it - when we look at this year, I feel like each of these projects will be put on the commission's desk.

 Each of the applications will be put on the commissioners' desk with a numerical score on it. That numerical score will be derived from these - these categories. And then if the commission decides to fund a project with a score of 50 and not fund a project with a score of 90, then we need to provide a strong reason of why that 50-score project was funded but not the 90-score project. And that's how I see it playing out.

Commissioner (Hill): Thank you Nikhil. I do appreciate that. I was - I think the 50 more thinking about just the weighting - how the weighting went and if there is anything that came up with the group that we thought needed to be changed.

Nikhil Narkhede: I can't - I shouldn't comment on what I think should be changed, but I will reiterate that like the law enforcement projects were ranked the highest because you can't have a law - it's infrequent that you'll see a law enforcement project that also has some of the other categories.

Commissioner (Hill): Okay. Thanks for that. And a quick question for Commissioner (Feld). So do you think that the existing language in number six, planning environmental study conservation addresses the environmental assessment? I think it might be captured on the environmental studies but just wanted to be clear.

(Mike): They haven't. Yes, I've been on a teleconference meeting with...

(Phil Feld): Yes, that's a good point. I'm reading through that right now. Give me a sec here.

(Mike): Getting ready to do these grants. (Unintelligible) won't let us (unintelligible).

(Miles): Seems like environmental studies might be enough to capture it. But let me make sure we are capturing your intent.

(Phil Feld): Yes, thank you for that. Yes, we might want to add a sentence explaining how the environmental studies will allow future trail maintenance.

(Mike): And it's always been (unintelligible).

Commissioner (Hill): Future maintenance can occur.

Nikhil Narkhede: So I think on that one I just need to change the description of item number six, planning environmental studies and conservation to more of what Commissioner (Feld) just said, showing that environmental studies - show how your environmental special benefit trails. (Unintelligible).

Commissioner (Hill): Correct.

(Mike): Or can allow future maintenance to occur. You probably have to put that a motion, too, don't wee or can we (unintelligible) administrative?

Nikhil Narkhede: I don't think so. I think that I can define that.

(Mike): You got it understanding. Okay. Okay. And (Bob Adams), I'm - we didn't get back to you from earlier. You had a comment?

(Bob Adams): Yes, trying to make the computer (unintelligible). Yes, just some ground rules (unintelligible). And I know where I park an RV in southern Nevada. I - just an experience traveling in Arizona (unintelligible) I made up to (unintelligible) last year, I went across (unintelligible) to a conservationist meeting and the (unintelligible) was in northern Nevada. But I really had to talk with people to find out where I could park in the (unintelligible) areas. And that's just - there's probably resources out there that I could have looked at. I could have done that, but I didn't.

 So I guess it's - one is to put those resources in my face and the other is that we should be paying for parking (unintelligible) that a big problem in Clark County has been the restoration where they've taken old pit areas and restored them or rehabilitated them and areas where we used to ride you can't ride there anymore because there's really no place to park. (Unintelligible) just sharing my thoughts. Thank you.

(Mike): Thank you. Thank you. Okay. Any other comments on grant priority scoring from the commissioners? Pretty happy with those changes?

Nikhil Narkhede: Actually, while you guys are in discussion I'm going to try and redraft this page with the amended priorities at the end of meeting let's close by voting in the new set of priorities.

(Mike): Okay. Okay. So did you guys hear (Phillip's) comment there - not (Phillip's). Nikhil’s comments that he will change this grant scoring document here and at the end of the meaning we'll vote on the needed item? That work for everyone? Because we don't have too many...

(Miles): Yes, it does.

(Mike): All right, then I'll go to number12 agenda items and date for next meeting.

Nikhil Narkhede: Oh, well, (Mike), let's not move off this item just yet.

(Mike): Okay. All right.

Nikhil Narkhede: Are we going to continue to rank law enforcement as the highest priority and weight it at 20?

(Mike): Comments or suggestions? We keep them at 20?

(Phil Feld): Commissioner (Feld) here. I'm good with leaving it at 20, especially after listening to Commissioner (Malone's) comments about how his program is successful and how he feels the success has come from the law enforcement more than the training side of it. And taking (Greg's) historical perspective that law enforcement is limited in the amount of categories that they meet. So I'm - I'm good with leaving it as it is now.

Nikhil Narkhede: So then the priority that's ranked second at a weight of 10 is going to be the planning environmental studies and conservation. And we're going to amend this description of that item.

(Mike): To how future maintenance can occur on it.

Nikhil Narkhede: Right. No.

(Mike): And we're leaving number two the same?

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay, so the item that's ranked third -- which will carry a weight of nine -- is going to be enhancement and maintenance of existing trails and facilities.

(Phil Feld): That should stay at a 10.

(Mike): Keep that at 10.

Nikhil Narkhede: Keep that at 10? Okay.

(Mike): Yes. So you've got two 10s.

Nikhil Narkhede: Two 10s, Okay.

(Mike): And then you've got a nine and - for training and...

Nikhil Narkhede: Training goes to nine, Okay. And then trail mapping. Ok, the next item on our list is connectivity and loops. That was previously ranked at an eight. There was a three-way tie; planning and environmental studies, connectivity and loops, and then trail mapping. All of those were ranked eight. We've decreased trail mapping to a six. Connectivity and loops has stayed the same. And enhancements -- or sorry -- environmental assessments has increased.

(Phil Feld): Correct.

Nikhil Narkhede: Everybody's comfortable with that? Connectivity and loops stay at an eight.

(Phil Feld): Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. Next one down the line for everything. Yes. Trail access - describe how your project or program ensures the protection of access to that site. Explain what access or opportunities would be lost if the project does not occur. That was previously ranked as a priority level seven, and so we'll put trail mapping below that.

(Mike): Okay. And actually planning environmental serves in conservation and access that they wrote the grant. Right. They could use both those categories, which would be a pretty good help to them.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. Partnering and leverage will remain six. Economic integration remains at five. And demand for new facilities remains a four. Is that accurate?

(Phil Feld): Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. I'm going to have to do some quick changes here.

(Mike): Okay.

Nikhil Narkhede: Is there anything else that we need to (unintelligible) on today's meeting?

(Mike): Does the commissioner have any additional comments?

(Phil Feld): Commissioner (Feld), here. I'm good with the changes Nikhil made.

(Mike): Okay.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. Well, bear with me guys. If there's nothing else to be discussed I'm just trying to show you that - the changed version. But for that I've got to e-mail the document to myself and then put it on this screen share.

(Mike): Okay. (Unintelligible) just a couple minutes and I'll have the finished product.

(Phil Feld): Perfect. And just my - my kind of train of thought with moving mapping down is if a group's coming in and maintaining trails -- existing trails -- they're also going to be providing a map and initiative for those trails they're maintaining and the same with environmental assessments and studies. They're going to come out of that study with a map of the area and a map of what can be maintained and the resources that are there. So I think doing - moving a lot of these up in the priority will still keep the mapping initiative moving forward, just in a slightly different way to do it that maybe allows for better maintenance and a better user experience in the end than simply coming out with a map.

(Mike): Okay. So - all right. Mapping will be in the description of number two, number six, and number seven?

Nikhil Narkhede: I think so. But what - off of what (Phil) said, our largest mapping project right now is funded through - I believe it's June or July of next year. And my understanding is that that the mapping team is going back and forth between asking for OHB funds and rec trails funds.

 So right now we haven't started drawing down from the money that rec trails will be putting into the project and next year -- or sorry -- this December they'll be applying for rec trails program funding to keep that - keep that team rolling. So while we're decreasing the mapping initiative, we already have a huge project that's on the ground and rolling on that front.

(Phil Feld): Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. We've got 10 - 10 different categories. I think that the only item that we're considering that's not an actual criteria is the partnering leverage that is not defined in NRS. But if you look at the screen share on Google meeting, you'll see the old version on the left side and then the new rankings on the right side. I think if we - if we can get a motion to approve or just vote in these new grant priorities that will help.

(Mike): Okay. So do we have a motion to approve these new grants scoring priorities?

(Phil Feld): Commissioner (Feld), motion to approve the new grant scoring priority list.

(Mike): Okay. And do we have a second?

Commissioner (Hill): I'll second it. Commissioner (Hill).

(Mike): Okay. Commissioner (Hill), second. Okay. Any further comments or questions? Very well. Hearing none, all those in favor say Aye.

Group: Aye.

(Mike): Any opposed? Okay. Motion carries unanimously. Thank you. So now we get to agenda items and date for next meeting. What do you think in general terms there, timewise?

Nikhil Narkhede: Well, I guess agenda items we can - I feel comfortable adding them as commissioners reach out to me. And we don't have to decide those right now. I want to get a feel for how the commissioners think - what the commissioners think about our general communication over the past year. Are we - what are the challenges in the communication between the commissioners and the OHB office here? And what can be improved? I'd like to clear that up, that way in this in the midst of these virtual meetings, et cetera, we can still keep open lines of communication.

(Mike): Does any commissioner have any recommendations or concerns with a communication loop between Nikhil and yourself?

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay, good. Just trying to keep everything pretty transparent at this commission. Okay. Then I guess it's just call for agenda items and a timeline. I plan to open the grant rounds by August 31st. We have a few other deliverables like a few reporting deadlines by September 1st. But getting the applications live by August 31st shouldn't be an issue. I believe we need to leave them live for 60 days, per NRS. And that gives us through October 31st. Yes.

 So then our next commission meeting - let's say if we keep grant applications due on November 6 - that gets a one-week turnaround for the technical advisory committee and a grants commission meeting to award those - award 2021 grants would be late November or early December.

(Mike): When's Thanksgiving? 26th, probably?

Nikhil Narkhede: 26th. I think historically we've held the meeting in early December, right?

(Mike): First week of December, probably.

Nikhil Narkhede: And how do - any other - do any commissioners - what are your thoughts of the week of December 7 through December 11?

(Mike): I'm good. Anyone have particular days that aren't good for them that week?

Commissioner (Hill): Yes. This is Commissioner (Hill). I've got a conflict potential anyway. On December 9. I've got another commission - another board meeting that I'm a part of. I could not make it on the 9th that week.

(Mike): Wednesdays are kind of a big meeting day. How's the 8th? For everyone.

(Phil Feld): Commissioner (Feld). The eighth is good for me.

(Mike): How about everybody else?

(Miles): Good for me.

(Mike): Anyone have a problem with the 8th so far?

(Charlie Cox): This is Commissioner (Cox). I'm good with it.

(Mike): Okay. Well, let's shoot for the 8th, then.

Nikhil Narkhede: December 8th, Okay. One note, that's going to be that long - the long meeting.

(Mike): It'll be in all-dayer.

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes.

(Mike): Pretty much. Hopefully, we can meet in person. But I'm not holding my breath. Yes, we might be able to do it. If we get a legislative room or something like that. We could spread each other out. We might be able to pull that off.

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes. I think even since the last meeting all of the commissioners would prefer an in-person meeting. Should I try and push for that again for this - for the December event?

Commissioner (Mullen): Its Commissioner (Mullen). I personally would love that. I like being able to see the applicants and have a good conversation.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. So that's another item. Or that's kind of under agenda item how do we want to grant presentations to look. I think last year they could have been improved by requesting a formal presentation from each grantee. But that's going to - that's just going to mean it'll be a longer meeting. And the reason we didn't request a formal presentation was because we were trying to get all of our questions from the grantees answered before the meeting. Again, I know it could play out differently.

(Miles): What if we were to put a time limit on presentation? No longer than 5, 10 minutes.

(Mike): Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay.

(Mike): And they could do it in person or video conference, as long as we can ask them questions back and forth. They don't have to have that (unintelligible) if they don't want to or it's a long way.

Nikhil Narkhede: Yes, I think I think we'll get better support if the commissioners can meet in person but it's not open to - I guess public members have to call in.

(Mike): Probably.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. I'll have to ask some questions on that and then get back to the commission in a presentation from each applicant. Okay. What did the commissioners think about the technical advisory committee notes from last year? Were they helpful? Did it help guide the decision? What do you want to see differently from those minutes?

(Mike): They were helpful, I think. Did you have any thoughts with the problem or the opportunities were from their viewpoint?

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. Do we want to - now, since we're changing the way these grants have been scored historically where(unintelligible) advisory committee more official, do we want to require that that committee is present during this meeting?

(Phil Feld): This Commissioner (Feld). I think the notes were very helpful but I don't think we have to be present for the meeting. I think the notes were more than adequate.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay, awesome.

Commissioner (Malone): Its Commissioner (Malone). I would agree with that. And, you know, if we're going to have them do anything, maybe just have one of the members (unintelligible) on the phone in case we have any questions of them.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay understood. So I guess Commissioner (Malone) I've been serving is that kind of bridge to try and tell the commission what was discussed during the technical advisory committee meeting. And then that tech is typically the price of the four non-voting members, a member from rec trails program. And I think last year Chairman (McKay) also said on that committee.

(Mike): Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: I guess there's...

(Mike): Do we need (unintelligible) in there or do we (unintelligible)?

Nikhil Narkhede: We didn't. We did not engage DMV for advisory committee last year.

(Mike): I don't think they have too much advice that...

Nikhil Narkhede: Not this year.

(Mike): (unintelligible) projects. No offense meant to them, obviously. Yes.

Commissioner (Malone): I think last year went very smooth.

Nikhil Narkhede: It went smooth. Okay. Good to hear. Minus that two-hour break in the middle for scoring, which we're going to address this year.

(Mike): (Unintelligible). Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: Any other agenda items other than awarding OHB grants for 2021.

(Mike): That will be the big one. Probably be a couple small ones, but...

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. We have some time for that.

(Mike): Yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay. A couple of things that will be coming out to the commission maybe off-line just as a matter of like for your information would be those DMV registration numbers. Like I said, we've got them broken down by county on my desk, but we're also working on figuring out how much dirt bikes are registered or titled versus how many ATV is versus how many side by sides. Hopefully, I can put that information just on your desk via e-mail.

(Mike): Yes. And obviously probably an updated financial sheet. So we know it's available to be dispersed from (unintelligible). Wouldn't require her presence, just as a number that - what's available.

Nikhil Narkhede: Okay.

(Mike): Probably have to have that when you (unintelligible).

Nikhil Narkhede: Correct. So on that finance summary, (Kelly) talked about, you know, our account that holds a little over $4 million. And then we're at a $1.3 million that are obligated to current grants. What's the - what's the general trend? Do we want to stick with approximately a million dollars available? Do we want to tighten that budget? Or do we want to make more - more than a million dollars available? Noting that we already - we do have 34 active projects.

(Mike): I think everybody's just trying to keep it the same. I think with the uncertainty, or maybe just kick it a little more so we're showing positive, but - so I don't know. Make it 1.1 if it works with her. If not keep it the same as last year.

Nikhil Narkhede: Sure we can make that money available. And then that - award only to good projects (unintelligible).

(Mike): Sure, yes.

Nikhil Narkhede: I think that's all the questions I have.

(Mike): Any questions or the commissioners' concerns? Okay. Hearing none, I'll - our last agenda item is public comment. Anyone would like to make a public comment?

[End of segment]

Paul Quade: Hello, this is Paul Quade from (unintelligible) Off-Road.

Man 1: Hello, Paul.

Paul Quade: I just wanted to say this was a great meeting. A lot of information (unintelligible) Mr. (Robertson) provided us with a lot of information, (unintelligible) education, and certainly, some perspective on (unintelligible) and coordinating our efforts, which brings me to one of the main points that I wanted to move forward, and that is lack of communication between the (unintelligible) on the road -- excuse me -- on the ground like (Rav) and kind of the overarching policymakers in (unintelligible).

 And that's become (unintelligible) in our process of what we've been doing, is trying to make sure that (groups) like (Rav) that are a (good) group, a great project, of making sure that they're able to get their projects and do good work on the ground and that (could) happen in coordination with organizations (land managers), BLM, as well as the policymakers. One of the interesting bits of language that Mr. (Robertson) used in this regard was (unintelligible) and my view I think -- and I think is shared by a lot of the commissioners -- I believe they're talking about (unintelligible).

 And I'm hoping that he was enlightened (unintelligible) observation stewardship efforts that are being made by the OHV community and there'll be greater outreach related to that and other groups and efforts that they're making to coordinate with the (unintelligible) and we'll certainly be looking forward to working with Mr. (Robertson) in that regard.

 Some of the things there have been discussions about the state-wide (unintelligible) that would (fund) multi-year permits for racing organizations to address some of these issues and certainly, we'd like to see that in a collaborative. And we talked about trail OHV perspective, but as far as the fund (unintelligible) other user groups so they can participate in this process.

 Of course, if they seek undertaking several hundred thousand dollars (unintelligible) a lot of (unintelligible) will be required. That is not going to happen on an individual group level (unintelligible) that is a growth or business -- if you will -- (unintelligible) have the resources to throw at it (unintelligible) and have some interest on getting (unintelligible) permits in place. They're only one component of that and (unintelligible) many of these groups (unintelligible) OHV commission (unintelligible) as well as (statement) (unintelligible) and again, the land managers (unintelligible).

 So this is one of the things that we're focusing on. In particular, interest for (unintelligible) when you talk about the (story) criteria, you want to see some (unintelligible) and it's to the (ninth) element, nine areas that the OHV can (commit) to or are going to, and make sure we're focusing on these larger issues that we're all facing. I think that's going to require some legislative changes that we're working on and hopefully, they can get (unintelligible) sponsor to reorganize that a little bit with the (president) of the OHV Commission.

 We will have that to you by the next meeting as far as (unintelligible) changes there that would've had the (scoring) and priorities moving forward (unintelligible). But I wanted to thank some folks very much for working on that (scoring) criteria and can't wait to get moving forward when we're not stuck behind the (cameras).

(Matthew): This is (Matthew) also with (unintelligible). A couple things real quick. We have had some (clear) discussions with members of the state legislature to (unintelligible) sponsorship of the (unintelligible). They are in (unintelligible) but they are being done. Something (great) came up during the meeting, but (unintelligible) commentary about the trails, (working) on trails on federally managed (unintelligible).

 Currently, (unintelligible) is working on (going through) the OHV process for this next spin cycle in Lincoln County, Clark County, Nye County, Douglas, and Washoe. It is not impossible to work with the land managers (unintelligible) with what we have now.

 Just takes a certain amount of patience and effort to do that. One of those grants -- the (unintelligible) grant in particular -- we're going to be doing a (unintelligible) study as well. So that even folds into some of the stuff that we discussed or (Kirk) you discussed here a while ago as far as (including) the planning.

 On that, let's see. Just going through my notes here. Hey, thanks for the positive comments about the Nevada Off-Road podcast. I'm meeting with (Kevin) this afternoon. He's going to interview and all the other commissioners, you should expect me to start bugging you in the coming days to participate in this endeavor. The format is - starts out with a 10 to 20-minute interview with the stakeholders and my goal is to go through all the important key players that are stakeholders prior to the grants being submitted -- what do you say -- end of October?

 And then after that, we're going to start talking to (folks) that have done grants that are (unintelligible) and moving on in that direction. The idea being that over the next coming, you know, 12 to (unintelligible) 36, that we start building more of an audience that's going to participate both in the Nevada OHV grant process and the (unintelligible) program as well.

 Just a couple little notes here, but I don't think (anything's) really, you know, stressed. Most of it's been covered. Yeah, I think we'll stick with that.

Man 1: Thank you, (Matthew). Any other comments or questions?

(Lacy): This is (Lacy) (unintelligible) dirt bike rider. I'd also like to echo the (unintelligible) (Matthew), your (unintelligible) your fault. We think that's great of trying to share (unintelligible) and I learned something from it.

 So I think that's awesome. Relevant to some things that got brought up in that past commission meeting was the OHV (sticker) process, moving that away from the DMV and making that more equally accessible. I can definitely tell you from a (unintelligible) of the user population in the dirt bike community that a major source of non-compliance is that (file) is too difficult to deal with (unintelligible) form, so (I) was not going to do it.

 So (unintelligible) pretty much the (unintelligible) you know, feedback, is that the dirt bike community would be really supportive of converting to just an annual (unintelligible) sticker that they can pick up at a gas station or a photoshop or even online. So everyone's aware of that proposal and they all support it. (Unintelligible) to bring more funds back into, you know, the Nevada OHV fund, you know, (unintelligible) record.

 But another feedback that we did receive is that our membership isn't supportive of requiring these stickers for (plated) vehicles. So I just wanted to throw that out there (unintelligible) on that with the (unintelligible) process next year. And, you know, and again, (unintelligible) to participate with helping promote, you know, dirt biker (trips) starting to bring more money in. So we want to be part of that (unintelligible) to help improving compliance in that area. And I think that's all of my notes.

Man 1: Thank you very much.

(Lacy): Thank you for letting me be part of this meeting.

Man 1: Thank all of you. Any other further comments?

Paul Quade: This is Paul again. I'm sorry to interrupt. (Lacy), what's (the) compliance with actual dirt bikes on OHV registration. Do you know?

(Lacy): I don't know exactly. I don't have numbers on that either (unintelligible) well over 2,000 (unintelligible) and we've been slowly, you know, getting people to see the light that it's to their benefit to register their dirt bike, so we're trying to educate people on that. But I don't have a number, but I know just based on a lot of feedback I get from people, that compliance (unintelligible). And I got (unintelligible) up to me personally, like, "Hey, I don't even know how to register my dirt bike. How do I do that?"

 And I've been helping people on an individual level fill out forms and send it in to the DMV and I just think, like, even though it's simple for me. I don't think (unintelligible) but to the average (unintelligible) person, it seems to be an overly complicated process. And so I just have that comment based on, you know, (unintelligible) inflow of questions to me going (unintelligible).

Man 1: Alright, thank you. Any other further comments? Okay, hearing (that), meeting adjourned. Thank you for your input. Have a good day.

(Lacy): Thank you.

Paul Quade: Have a good day.

Man 1: Thank you.

Paul Quade: Matt, I'll see you at (unintelligible).

Man 1: (Unintelligible) than I thought today.

Man 2: (Unintelligible).

Operator: We're sorry, your conference is ending now. Please hang up.

END