**MINUTES -- MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLES**

**Date and Time: Tuesday April 5, 2022 at 09:00 AM**

**Meeting Location(s):**

**Primary:** Nevada Department of Conservation & Natural Resources, 901 S Stewart St. Carson City, 89701 *Tahoe Conference Room*

**Web Host:** https://call.lifesizecloud.com/6678206

**Phone (audio only):**

* United States: +1 (877) 422-8614
* Meeting extension: 6678206

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL OF THE COMMISSION MEMBERS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Commissioner** | **Appointed Representation** |
| Vacant | Off Highway Motorcycle Racing |
| Maurice White - **Present** | Nevada Association of Counties |
| Kevin Malone - **Present** | Law Enforcement |
| Ken Ravago - **Present** | ATV Riders |
| Vacant | Conservation Interests |
| John Glenn - **Present** | OHV Dealers |
| Scott Spero - **Absent** | Snowmobile Riders |
| Brian Parks - **Present** | Ranching Interests |
| Vacant | Sportsmen Interests |

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Public comment is limited to 3 minutes per person. The public may request that items be added to a future agenda.

*Forum restrictions and orderly business: The viewpoint of a speaker will not be restricted, but reasonable restrictions may be imposed upon the time, place and manner of speech. Irrelevant and unduly repetitious statements and personal attacks that antagonize or incite others are examples of public comment that may be reasonably limited.*

Bob Adams notifies the commission that the Pahrump OHV Park has broken ground and made significant progress. Additionally, the Amargosa Duners hosted a large cleanup at Big Dune where nearly one hundred volunteers showed up. The BLM present at the event announced a new roadway will be built to help access to Big Dune. Bob notifies the Commission that he will have to leave shortly for another meeting.

Rayette Martin states that it has been a pleasure working on the Pine Grove Cemetery project and though she is an Archaeologist and preservation expert, the NVFCP’s goal is to keep access to the areas she’s working on. She further states that preservation doesn’t mean keeping things exactly as they are but to make accommodations wherever possible.

1. **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

Comm. White moves to approve the Agenda. Comm. Glenn seconds. Motion passed, None opposed.

1. **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF December 22-23, 2021, MINUTES \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

Comm. White moves to approve the December 22-23, 2021 Minutes, Comm. Glenn seconds, Motion passed, None opposed.

1. **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF February 24, 2022, MINUTES \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\***

* <https://ohv.nv.gov/assets/etc/meetings/DRAFT_Minutes_Feb24_OHV_Comm.pdf>

Comm. White moves to approve the February 24, 2022 Minutes, Comm. Ravago seconds, Motion passed, None opposed.

1. **COMMISSIONER ROUNDTABLE \*FOR DISCUSSION\*** -- An opportunity for commissioners to introduce any OHV topics that they encounter between meetings.(15 Minutes)

Comm. Parks reintroduces the idea of changing the registration parameters. Comm. Malone agrees that the topic is one that should be discussed. Beyond that, Comm. Parks has nothing more to comment.

Comm. Ravago talks about the Tri-State Jamboree event and the work that was done representing the Nevada OHV program as well as educating the public on registration in Nevada. Comm. Ravago talks about the networking opportunities with the BLM of Arizona and Utah and the OHV community itself. Ravago is concerned that during the Tri-State Jamboree, there were no group rides that made it into Nevada. Comm. Ravago notifies the Commission of the cooperation between the Dunes and Trails Club and MXT Media are running a booth during the Clark County Fair to raise awareness of OHV Registration and the Grant Program.

Mathew Giltner notifies the Commission that NVORA has recommended that the Kokopeli ATV Club open up some of the staging areas in Mesquite for the Tri-State Jamboree so that some of the rides would be able to take place in Nevada.

Comm. Glenn mentions that a meeting with Mathew went very well recently and that work on the Elko Motocross track is built. He praises their efficiency and dedication to the work.

Comm. Malone informs the Commission that the Fernley City Council was unable to support the Fernley Sandbox Track. Unfortunately that means it will most likely be lost. Nikhil mentions that he spoke with Battleborn MX recently and it seems someone has interest in purchasing the track. Nikhil has not been further informed about this development. Comm. Malone states that it would be a great shame to lose this track and that he will attempt to get more information as the situation develops.

1. **ELECTION OF NEW CHAIR FOR NEVADA COMMISSION ON OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLES** **\*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\* --** The commission may choose to elect a new chairperson based on [NRS 490.068 (1) (A)](https://www.leg.state.nv.us/nrs/NRS-490.html#NRS490Sec068)

Comm. Ravago motions for Comm. White to be named the new Chairperson for the OHV Commission, Comm. Parks seconds, Motion passed, None opposed.

1. **SIERRA NEVADA JOURNEYS PRESENTATION \*FOR DISCUSSION\* --** Sean Hill will present an overview of Sierra Nevada Journeys mission statement and organization activities. The Nevada Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles will have an opportunity to ask questions about integrating OHV learning objectives to SNJ events. (15 Minutes)

Tabled for discussion later. The Commission moves onto subject ten. Subject nine is picked up again after the discussion on subject eleven.

Nikhil informs the Commission that there has been an additional comic from the previous discussion sent in via text message from Melanie the Program Manager of the Conservation District. Nikhil recites “In the past we’ve developed agreement language with Nevada Department of Wildlife that upon awarding a grant that any vehicles over three thousand dollars were held in title by Nevada Department of Wildlife and be utilized in the region for XYZ purposes outlined in the grant, the title holder (NDOW in this case) can remove the vehicle if its no longer needed in the region for those designated purposes. These agreements were specifically set up for weed scoring equipment, the maintenance is also paid for by the Nevada Division of Wildlife”. Anthony believes that aligns with the Commission’s ideals and sees nothing in the NRS that would otherwise prevent it. However, Anthony is worried that it could potentially be used as a workaround for agency purchases.

Sean introduces Sierra Nevada Journeys, a growing not for profit organization based in Nevada since 2006. Sean goes on to explain that the reason he is here right now is because seventy percent of elementary teachers spend three hours or less on science. Additionally, children are spending more time in front of computers as part of their education. Sierra Nevada Journeys aims to create innovative outdoor learning experiences that will potentially encourage children’s interest in natural resource stewardship. Sean goes on to explain that previous Chair Phil Fell approached Sean and said it would be a great opportunity to collaborate with the Commission to create programs that align with both organizations. Chair White comments that the Sierra Nevada Journeys group seems to focus efforts in Sacramento and asks what it is the Commission can do in Nevada specifically. Sean states that he’d like to speak with Chair White to work out why the online resources seem geared towards Sacramento because that isn’t their intent. Additionally, Sean ensures that if Sierra Nevada Journeys and the Commission do any work together, it will remain solely in Nevada and not within California territory. The SNJ’s current idea for cooperative work is to introduce the Commission’s ideals through the SNJ’s Family Science Night program. Other projects can be developed as time goes on. Comm. Glenn and Parks both believe it's a good opportunity. Comm. Malone looks forward to a grant application in July. Comm. Malone states that Nikhil will be the point of contact for the SNJ and Comm. Glenn asks if NVORA can work alongside with the SNJ as well. Mathew says he will speak with Phil Fell and will also work with the SNJ.

1. **NEVADA OFFROAD ASSOCIATION UPDATE** **\*FOR DISCUSSION \*** – Mathew Giltner, Executive Director NVORA, will provide an update about OHV clubs and communities in Nevada. (15 Minutes)

Mathew Gitlner states that Kim Murcia is listening in to the discussion but will be unable to contribute. Mathew informs the commission that the largest number of registrations per capita in Nevada are in Story county (closely followed by Humboldt county) rather than Clark county. Mathew goes into further detail about the specific numbers of registered OHV in Nevada and the discrepancies with their registration.

Mathew states that NVORA works hard to be a partner with every stake holder in recreation with a focus on mechanized recreation. Within the first quarter, NVORA has interacted with one hundred and eleven projects all associated with recreation to some degree. Mathew informs the Commission that the town of Beatty is attempting to limit access to racers in the area and NVORA was present to serve as a third party intermediary. The results of this meeting are that Beatty will designate specific racing routes for the OHV racing community to use that are out of the way enough to prevent any potential harm to the community of the town of Beatty. NVORA is working towards holding similar workshops in Tonopah and more northern communities but isn’t quite there yet.

NVORA is currently working in Tonopah to improve staging access for the offroad community. Mathew is working up a grant proposal for this project which will be prepared for the next round of funding. In Elko and Ely, NVORA has met with Comm. Glenn and a local group putting together a brick and mortar club. The Wildhorse Resort is currently developing an offroad recreation area for their guests to do more exciting ride activities in a more moderated location. Mathew met with the City Manager for Elko who intends to apply for the position of Chairperson. NVORA was able to acquire funding through the One Voice for Motorised Recreation Foundation to develop a map for all recreation in Elko. NVORA had some complications aquiring a permit from the BLM for VORRA but ultimately succeeded in protecting the rights of the community.

NVORA is organizing a poker run to raise funds for the Desert Veterans Racing Association. Mathew informs the Commission that NVORA has yet to receive explicit direction from the Commission to require NVORA to facilitate the purchasing of equipment and trailers. Mathew goes on to discuss the length of time it takes for grant agreements to be completed and returned to the clubs. NVORA suggests that the Commission get additional help with their administrative tasks. Furthermore, if the Commission intends to keep the grant cycle to twice a year then it is suggested that additional resources and manpower be acquired soon to keep up with the additional workload.

Comm. Malone wishes to give the Commission and Nikhil the chance to address the issue of the new grant cycle. Comm. Malone personally believes that Nikhil and his office have done an excellent job thus far and that Mathew’s comments are disrespectful and unnecessary.

Nikhil appreciates NVORA’s feedback and concerns. With respect to assigning tasks like issuing grant agreements, Nikhil believes that should be done in the DCNR office rather than the Recreation Technicians. Tasks regarding forwarding funds require more tact and care with considerations towards each unique application. As far as grants as a whole goes, Nikhil would like to get them on the ground faster and would like to brainstorm ways to make that achievable. Additionally, reimbursing clubs for the funds they’ve already spent towards their grant takes priority.

Comm. Glenn asks that once a grant is successfully accepted, what is the next step. Nikhil explains that he has to obligate funding from the reserve account for each accepted project and make sure that the program remains accountable and can pay off the grant applicant properly. After that, the agreement documentation must be completed in full. Comm. Glenn asks that the Grant Agreement has to go through multiple offices. Nikhil explains that the agreements generally only have to go through rigorous review whenever it has been edited. Nikhil goes on to discuss that reimbursing the applicants in a timely manner is a concern as the program wants to reimburse grant applicants within fifteen days but sometimes reimbursements require additional time and effort to complete. Comm. Glenn asks if there is someone Nikhil has to wait on in order to complete that reimbursement process. Nikhil explains that it's just a matter of making sure all receipts are taken into account and added up properly before they can be reimbursed. Comm. Glenn asks if there is anything the Commission can do to assist Nikhil. Nikhil explains that resources can be spent with a new budget agreement, a temporary hire, or the creation of a streamlined online grant application through the DCNR. The Commission has the authority to approve an annual legislative report that covers expenses, estimated future expenses, and summary of awarded grants.

Chair White comments that during the discussion of moving to a twice a year grant cycle that there was a question about what resources Nikhil would need to support such a change. Chair White asks if Nikhil is now aware of what is needed to do so. Nikhil recalls that the concern was balancing this change with the reimbursements. Comm. Mathew suggests changing the dates of the grant cycle to move it away from the end of the fiscal year. Nikhil comments that a twice a year grant cycle does increase workload but by optimizing how quickly grants get put out and perhaps hosting training on how to complete grant application packets the new grant cycle should be fine. Comm. Glenn asks for confirmation that the Commission has no say in Nikhil’s budget. Nikhil confirms this. Comm. Malone asks if the Commission pays Nikhil’s salary. Nikhil confirms this as well and mentions that the Commission pays the salary of three more individuals in the DMV. The Commission discusses the implications of the Commission funding three DMV employees, not having more of a say in the registration process, and the potential changes to the legislature to benefit everyone involved. Chair White asks if Nikhil believes that, at this time, the twice a year cycle is doable, if the time table should be adjusted, and if Nikhil requires help. Nikhil believes he will need assistance and that the time table is pretty straight forward. Comm. Malone comments that the Commission should move onto the next topic.

1. **OHV PROGRAM UPDATES \*FOR DISCUSSION\* --** Nikhil Narkhede will provide an update on program activities, opportunities, and challenges. Topics include but are not limited to: OHV grant timelines, regulation workshops, bill draft topics, additional support, and open commission seats.

* <https://ohv.nv.gov/assets/etc/meetings/OHV_AND_EMERGENCY_SERVICE_GRANT_APPLICATION_PROGRAMS.pdf>
* <https://ohv.nv.gov/assets/etc/meetings/R122-20P.PDF>

Nikhil notifies the Commission that six grants from the previous grant cycle have been completed and closed out. All 2022 grant agreements are out, are on the ground, and the funds have been allocated. The Program is participating in a request for proposals in a new vendor for new OHV decals and is focusing efforts on filling the three empty seats of the Commission. Nikhil notifies the Commission that there is a bill draft deadline coming up; the discussions over the past year have resulted in three bills to be submitted. One amends the OHV Registrations into an annual use decal that can be purchased through a third party contractor, the second is to diversify how OHV funds can be used, and the third is a financial BDR that will allow for the hiring of additional staff.

Nikhil notifies the Commission that a list of a variety of supplementary grants has been published for the benefit of the grant applicants who may not have been accepted. Nikhil continues to state that within the administrative code, there are a number of changes which will need public meeting workshops to approve previous regulations and adopt new regulations. Two more administrative changes have been added to the list of changes due to previously stated concerns. These are that applicants should be required to disclose any additional sources of funding they may receive for the use of a grant application and employees hired onto a grant project must be notified that grant projects have a limited duration of time.

Nikhil asks the Commission if they see any opportunities or challenges with the topics discussed. Comm. Malone asks what happens with equipment purchased for a grant project if the project suddenly shuts down and what can the Commission do about it to mitigate the loss. Nikhil mentions that the first question should be answered with the same discussion regarding the purchasing equipment through NVORA. Chair White asks if specific language needs to be included into the contracts that if a grantee fails to perform whatever purchased equipment comes back to the Commission and/or the Commission retains the right to retake the equipment. Anthony comments that he is not aware if the Commission itself can hold a title for specific property.

Comm. Ravago asks if there is a more effective means to keep track of the increasing number of grant projects rather than relying on being directly notified. Nikhil states that in the proposed administrative code changes, they should receive reports of the status of purchased equipment for a period of five years after the grant closes. Additionally, the program should be auditing these projects or at least have them available for auditing. Comm. Malone asks Anthony Walsh if the Commission does audit a particular grant and they discover that equipment has been converted into personal property, what jurisdiction does the state, DCNR, and/or Commission have to take action. Anthony believes that there needs to be more clarity is necessary in the NRS or NAC as to how equipment from projects either revert to or are retained title-wise by the state. Anthony adds that he is currently working on an answer for that.

Mathew reminds the Commission that NVORA has been tasked with holding titles of large equipment for the Commission as well as being a repository for said equipment. Additionally, should NVORA shut down, the titles would transfer to the Commission. That being said, NVORA extends the offer to alter their agreement to encompass small equipment as well. Comm. White states that he believes that expensive and specialized equipment should never become the personal property of an individual.

Comm. Glenn states that if the Commission takes possession of equipment and isn’t able to locate someone who could use the equipment, The Commission should have a way to recover at least some of the cost of that equipment. Comm. White explains there is a specific process for doing so. Nikhil informs the Commission that, based on a few other state programs, equipment is generally awarded on faith that said equipment will be used beyond the scope of the recipient’s grant project. Oftentimes, purchased equipment will fall under the ownership of the grantee and then can be used as collateral in future projects. Nikhil asks the Commission if they have a preference on who owns the title of purchased equipment.

Comm. Malone states that he doesn't have an issue titling equipment to the grantees. However, Comm, Malone doesn’t like the idea of a grant purchased equipment falling under the ownership of the grantee if the project fails or otherwise shuts down. Mathew informs the Commission that in this scenario, the organization would have to transfer that equipment to another non-profit organization.

Anthony comments that in his preliminary analysis of the NRS regarding state purchasing and holding titles, that titles can be transferred to the program in the event of a project failure. This would require specific use of language in future grant agreements. Comm. Ravago notifies the Commission that he must attend another meeting and will attempt to listen in through the phone call.

Nikhil states that with the last round of grants, as written, NVORA will hold the title to equipment over twenty five hundred dollars. The Commission however does not have a contract with NVORA that states what will happen with the equipment if NVORA shuts down. Comm. Glenn asks if Mathew has to take equipment from grantees, does the Commission have jurisdiction over where that equipment goes or NVORA get to decide where it’s allocated. Mathew explains that NVORA would move the equipment to another like-minded organization as directed by the Commission. Comm. Malone and Chair White ask Mathew if NVORA is prepared to maintain any and all equipment that they hold a title to. Mathew is confident that NVORA will be able to have all necessary maintenance completed within reasonable amounts of time. Kim agrees with Mathew.

1. **POLICY CHANGES AND SUGGESTIONS \*FOR DISCUSSION\* --** The Commission will continue discussion of changes to Nevada Revised Statute 490, regulation workshops and hearing dates.

Nikhil begins by stating for the record several dates. Under NRS 490 Nikhil is required to submit Bill drafts proposals to the office by the 15th of April which will be heard on the 18th of April. The topics of those bills will be on an annual OHV decal, increased diversity of grant recipients, and a financial budget that aligns with the increased list of duties. If there are any additional topics that the Commission needs to add they can do so later.

The next subject Nikhil introduces is the regulations the Commission must abide by and the proposed regulations the Commission might adopt. A series of public workshops and listening sessions was held in the second half of 2020 and early in 2021. This document was submitted to the Legislative Council Bureau on June 30th 2021. They were returned November 29th 2021 and now, through a public hearing, will be adopted. This public hearing must be completed and adopted by the agency by June 30th of 2022 and it requires a thirty day notice so that the public is made aware that these changes will be made to the Commission and its program. An example of these changes is that the program will be authorized to provide notice to proceed and carry out any procedural documents that occur after the Commission awards grants.

Nikhil continues that by June 30th, The Commission needs to restart the process to adopt any new regulations the Commision sees fit. Regulations like adding the funding sticker for any grants that receive OHV funding or discussing/describing how the Commission wants to deal with administrative fees. These additional regulations will need to go through a seperate public hearing and be completed by June 30th as well. Nikhil asks how much of the past regulations does the Commission want to hear about today.

Chair White asks about the regulation requiring a person that seeks to apply for a grant for a project on private land to have an interest in the real property on the private land sufficient to operate and maintain the project for a period of at least twenty five years or the normal life of the project. Chair White explains that this narrows down certain issues they’ve had in the past as specific grantees would take on projects without any real interest in the land they’re working on. But Chair White shows concern that requiring other grants to have leases lasting twenty five years may be problematic.

Chair White asks for clarification on the section that states that “the program shall not score or take further action with respect to an application that is not complete” but on the next page there is language that states “ incomplete or non-compliant grant applications that are turned into the Program may be returned to the applicant for correction. The Program shall not accept the corrected application submitted after the final deadlines.” Chair White understands the intent of these statements but finds them in conflict with each other. Anthony explains that while the Commission may not take action on an incomplete grant application, they may still allow the grantee to receive input, make necessary changes, and resubmit the application within the appropriate deadline. Comm. Parks asks about the reciprocity of the discussion. Nikhil explains that it is included in the bill draft.

Nikhil will be holding listening sessions and workshops for new policy adjustments to amend administrative codes that govern the OHV Grant. Nikhil explains if the Commission has anything they wish to add to those discussions and workshops, they will need to send a list to Nikhil. Finally, Nikhil introduces that the last subject for this discussion topic is for making changes to NRS 490. This includes reciprocity, the actual process of obtaining an annual OHV decal, budgets, and any additional law changes the Commission would like to see.

Comm. Parks explains that it's his understanding that currently, Nevada and California are the only states that share reciprocity. In Comm. Parks opinion, California uses Nevada OHV trails far more than the other way around. California has a sticker system already in place that is similar to what the Commission wants to create. Comm. Parks doesn’t want to miss out on potential funds from out of state for the OHV grant. Comm. Malone agrees. Mathew explains that the process to obtain an out of state sticker to use in Nevada is incredibly cumbersome and most individuals wouldn’t even think to look for it.

Comm. Glenn explains that there have been issues in the past with people trying to avoid state sales taxes by buying outside of the state. In order to register in Nevada, proof of sales tax must be provided and makes the process difficult so an agreement must be made with the division of sales tax. Nikhil asks Comm. Glenn, if it should be included in this revision, that going forward we should include proof of sales tax for machines registered in Nevada for Nevada residents. Comm. Glenn explains that if you're registering in Nevada that you pay tax on it unless you fill out an agricultural form. Nikhil corrects that in his experience, people from out of state will have their vehicle titled in their home state and then travel to Nevada to recreate. When these out of towners stay for longer than fifteen days, they are required to have a sticker. Nikhil asks if these people would be required to have sales tax in Nevada or be allowed to obtain a sticker without proof. Nikhil goes on to state that as a representative of all the dealerships in Nevada, Comm. Glenn will need to decide on whether or not they tie sales tax to the title of the machine and allow registration without Nevada sales tax or require the owner to pay Nevada sales tax in order to obtain a registration sticker.

Comm. Malone believes that the Commission should be strategic with the decision they make here as it will affect not only dealerships, but smaller businesses all over Nevada that rely on recreational OHV tourism. Comm. Glenn believes that regardless of what choice is made, the implementation of an out of state sticker will be necessary. Nikhil states that the grant fund isn’t supplied by title fees, only registration fees are used for the grant fund. Chair White states that it seems the discussion over sales tax and titling doesn’t support the Commission; it supports recreation. Chair White states that anyone riding in Nevada needs a Nevada sticker and the easier the Commission makes that happen the better it will be for everyone involved. Additionally, Chair White believes that this process should be made wholly online for ease of use.

Mathew is concerned about the possibility of someone abusing the chance to avoid sales tax by buying an OHV out of state which would be harmful to the businesses in Nevada. Mathew suggests that an out of state sticker should be very different to a regular registration sticker to ensure that the system remains balanced. Comm. Malone agrees with Comm. Glenn that the recreational OHVs and the dealers should both be protected in this decision but the issue in protecting the dealers is to somehow hold the populace accountable for going out of state. Businesses will lose money because people are going out of state to avoid sales tax.

Nikhil explains that the goal is to have this registration sticker function similarly to something like a fishing license. Dealers and the dealership community may react poorly if the Commission drops the need for proof of sales tax. Chair White asks if there is a Dealership association in Nevada, maybe they could provide a solution that will work for everyone.

Comm. Malone believes that it should be easier to move to a use sticker as the DMV already provides a sticker. The Commission considers using a vendor over the DMV for registration work.Nikhil explains that the start-up cost would be under one hundred thousand dollars and the vendor would take the two dollar registration fee. Nikhil brings up something that Comm. Malone said that numbers on a decal mean nothing and going forward should the numbers still not mean anything. As it stands, NDOW has a means to check licenses through an application, Nikhil asks if the Commission should adopt a similar service. Comm. Malone strongly agrees that this would be a good idea. Nikhil believes the Department of Conservation and the Department of Taxation will help to figure out how to prove sales tax and navigate the issues that will come from the change. Chair White asks what the cost of the decal is currently. Nikhil answers that it's twenty dollars.

Mathew asks if large ATVs are required to carry insurance under NRS 490 if they’re going to operate on pavement, how can this be accomplished with a use sticker. Comm. Malone believes the Commission should leave this particular scenario alone due to the confusion between large UTV and OHV. Nikhil asks if there is a citation from missing insurance. Comm. Malone states that any motorized vehicle on a public road can be cited for not having insurance. Comm. Glenn states that these issues should be helped in part by educating the public on what they need for their specific equipment. Mathew states that NRS 110 would need to be changed to match the discussion of the Commission. Comm. Malone believes that a caveat should be included in the NRS to meet this requirement. Mathew states that it would require a separate registration sticker acquired from the DMV if that's the case. Comm. Malone believes that would be the best course of action. Nikhil offers that the stickers be limited to out of state and in state stickers but in order to operate on public roads, proof of insurance needs to be available for inspection. Comm. Malone considers doing away with the Large ATV portion. The Commission agrees that the one sticker and proof of insurance idea is probably for the best.

Comm. Glenn states that an idea for registration is that it should be optional for the public to register multiple vehicles at a time. Comm. Malone states that currently each individual vehicle requires a separate verification check in order to be registered which bogs down registration. The Commission believes that it's a good idea to work towards this goal.

Nikhil asks if there are any other emergency medical services that should be opened up to be grant recipients. Mathew states that the biggest problem they’ve been hearing from the EMS side is not that they can't get grants to buy equipment, it's that they can’t get grants to pay their people. Comm. Malone believes that though it's needed, it's a difficult subject getting into paying wages for first responders. Mathew continues that the second criticism is that the people these emergency medical services are going after in the field are usually not a part of the OHV community. Nikhil states that in the past, salaries have been flexible and the Commission has been heavily considering which salaries to take on and leave off. In the past grantees have been asked to focus on specific problem areas, Nikhil suggests that grants asking for wage funding could be restricted like this as well. Mathew asks what the relationship is between an ambulance service and the sheriff's department. Comm. Malone states that it depends on the county, but in Humboldt there is an ambulance service that remains separate from other services. Chair White is concerned that volunteers are being paid in the first place. Comm. Malone adds that fire services should be included as well.

Nikhil speaks on engaging with NDOW, one of the reasons for including the unique identifier on the registration sticker is for the public who witnesses a crime on designated trails to report that activity to law enforcement officials. Regardless of if it's trampling sage brush or poaching, law enforcers would be able to track down the offenders. Comm. Parks states that the identification number isn’t visible. It's a great idea in theory but in order to see it in detail would require close proximity. Nikhil states the dimensions of a sticker and suggests that they can be made larger. Comm. Parks states that even then it still wouldn’t be a reliable way to report others. Nikhil asks the Commission if they wish to keep registration to an annual requirement or move it to once every two years. Comm. Parks considers extending it for even longer than that and asks how long trailers can be registered. Chair White answers that trailers are registered for up to three years if multiple are done at the same time. Comm. Glenn suggests that it remains once a year so as not to cause confusion.

Nikhil asks if there are any other projects that should be covered. Comm. Glenn asks if specific land studies or archaeological research should be included as well. Mathew explains that those are covered by NEPA already. Nikhil states that the Commission should be separating safety training and education in using an OHV. Nikhil states that the last budget request is for appliances by requesting one more position for the program. This will require defining the position title (like a program officer) and their duties (assisting with administrative tasks, advertisement, etc.). Chair White asks if this new person would be classified as a deputy or something else. Nikhil explains that the position would likely be called a program officer or a management analyst. Nikhil states that what he would want from the Commission would be to think about any tasks that could help achieve the Commission’s five year goals (increase registrations, expand network of recognised OHV trails, expand the diversity of who can receive grants, build a network of OHV clubs, local county governments, and land managers, maintain trail cleanliness and rideability, and provide resources that benefit riders’ experience. Comm. Malone states that though he has never been on a snowmobile, is the Commission missing anyone that Comm. Spero represents. Kim states that the Bridgeport Avalanche Center

serves a lot of Nevadans and Californians and is dealing with some issues in the growth of their scope. They are currently going through an OSV planning process and project revisions. Currently Comm. Sperro and Kim are working on getting the motorized community together and organized so that they may have a united voice to speak up for itself. The Commission has an opportunity to help with this organization.

Nikhil states that he will submit a concept that will include emergency medical services and public safety organizations that are Nevada based. Nikhil restates for the record that they discussed online vending stickers and the Finance BDR.

1. **JULY 2022 OHV GRANT UPDATES, PRIORITIES AND DISCUSSION \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\* –** The Commission will discuss and may amend grant priorities and due dates for the next round of OHV grants. Nikhil will introduce a new grant application with amendments gathered from the February 24, 2022 Commission meeting.

* <https://ohv.nv.gov/assets/etc/meetings/OHV_Goals_Discussion.pdf>
* <https://ohv.nv.gov/assets/etc/pdfs/2022_Scoring_Criteria_Form.pdf>

Nikhil states that his grant application is still in progress but the main takeaway touches on several items. With regards to the application side, not requiring the administrative changes to make sure the grant recipient knows that they must identify their project as a grant funded source and that they must disclose any other types of funding they may be receiving. The applicants will also be required to disclose to any employees that they intend to hire that they are grant funded employees and have a designated term that may or may not be up for renewal. Nikhil also states that there will be a change to how grant items are still in word format. There will be a checklist of items that need to be submitted

on the front page, if they aren’t all checked then the application doesn’t make it in front of the Commission.

Longer changes that aren’t relevant to this item are that our state office of grant procurement is moving towards a grant management system. Nikhil will be participating in developing requirements for the online system. Mathew asks if applications that are missing specific materials will be counted as incomplete. Nikhil answers yes and explains that if an application is sent in forty eight hours before the deadline it can be sent back informing the applicant what is missing or wrong and be allowed to change it before submitting it before the deadline arrives. If the application is sent in a few hours beforehand and there are issues then it will be sent back, with an explanation as to what was wrong or missing, and will not be accepted.

One action required for this item is the grant’s scoring priorities. The reasoning here is in the NRS and administrative code, a ranked list is required to gauge applications.

The decision needs to be made to either leave it as is or change it and the Commission needs to discuss the dates applications can be opened by, be left open for sixty days, and when those applications are due. Comm. Glenn asks if the dates can be changed for this grant cycle or if it's too late. Nikhil explains that he can move them but would prefer to move them back rather than forward. Chair White believes that it doesn’t necessarily matter when the grant timing is. Nikhil states that when they announce the grant openings in August they’d be able to hold the awards in September.

Comm. Malone asks what if the Commission returns to a once a year application but moves it to August. The commission discusses the benefits of doing so and the problems that would come with it. Nikhil states that keeping the grant cycle to twice a year is still better despite the additional workload. If Nikhil can open this grant round by May first, then the Commission could hold a meeting in July and have an open forum for applicants to ask questions and then have the grants due early August. Comm. Malone believes that sounds good. Nikhil explains that the Commission would meet in late August for the policy changes and in late August for the awards meeting. Nikhil asks the Commission if they want to change the scoring priorities. Comm. Glenn doesn’t believe it needs to be changed. Chair White asks what the difficulty was with the scoring in the last round. Nikhil explains that there was no discussion on how to judge or score the applications which lead to wildly different scores across the board. Nikhil suggests a brief training session to organize the Commissioners.

Nikhil states that if the scores aren’t being changed then no action needs to be taken. Nikhil continues that he has something for the Commissioner roundtable from Comm. Sperro. Nikhil will also make sure to select a date for the next meeting that will work with everyone’s schedule. Comm. Sperro has contacted a representative of the High Fives Foundation whose goal is to get injured extreme sports athletes back out on the snow and dirt regarding grant application. They hope to submit for the upcoming cycle to do a disabled moto and side by side riding event on NVOHV trails assuming that it pertains to NRS statutes.

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Public comment is limited to 3 minutes per person. The public may request that items be added to a future agenda. No action will be taken on any matter raised during the public comment period that is not already on the agenda. Persons making comment will be asked to begin by stating and spelling their name for the record.

*Forum restrictions and orderly business: The viewpoint of a speaker will not be restricted, but reasonable restrictions may be imposed upon the time, place and manner of speech. Irrelevant and unduly repetitious statements and personal attacks that antagonize or incite others are examples of public comment that may be reasonably limited.*

Kim thanks the Commission for their time and for Nikhil’s hard work thus far. Additionally, Kim mentions that hse is urging applicants to put their projects into phases to reduce the difficulty of large scale projects for getting a grant.

Nikhil comments that this agenda doesn’t have a call for agenda items for the next meeting. However a timeline should be drawn up while the Commission is available. The regulations workshop which will be posted in May, listening sessions for new regulation changes which will require fourteen days notice, and adopting regulation workshops for public hearings will require thirty days notice will take place between now and June 30th. The grant round will be opened on May First and be due in early August. Grants will be awarded in late August. Between now and late August, a Commission Meeting will be held in July. Several workshops will also be held within that time. Nikhil asks if that July meeting should be the next meeting or should there be one sooner and will the Commissioners be a part of those workshops. Chair White states that so long as Nikhil doesn’t schedule anything from June 17th-23rd and that meetings never land on Thursday, then everything will be good for him. Nikhil asks if there are any dates that don’t work after July 9th. Comm. Malone will be in North Carolina on August 18th-24th. Comm. Glenn states the best days for him are Mondays and Fridays are his worst days. Nikhil states he will hold the grant awards after August 24th. Nikhil asks if the July meeting can be held on the 18th or 25th. Malone believes he can call in on one of those days.

1. **ADJOURNMENT \*FOR POSSIBLE ACTION\*--** The Commissionmay adjourn the meeting.

The Commission adjourns.

**NOTICE: Items on this agenda may be taken in a different order than listed, combined for consideration, or removed from the agenda at the discretion of the Chair.**

Notice of this meeting was posted on the Nevada Commission on Off-Highway Vehicles Website at: <http://ohv.nv.gov/commission> and <https://notice.nv.gov/>

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities who wish to attend the meeting. To request special accommodations or assistance at the meeting, please notify our office by writing to the Off-Highway Vehicles Program, 901 S. Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89701; or by calling 775-684-2794 no later than two (2) working days prior to the scheduled meeting.

Please contact Nikhil Narkhede at: 901 South Stewart Street, Suite 1003, Carson City, Nevada 89701; [nnarkhede@ohv.nv.gov](mailto:nnarkhede@ohv.nv.gov); or 775-684-2794 to obtain support material for the agenda. Materials will also be posted on the <http://ohv.nv.gov/commission> website.