ATV FEASIBILITY STUDY CONNECTOR TRAIL JUNE 2017
INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

TRAIL SYSTEMS

Trail systems are vital in providing people the opportunity to enjoy outdoor recreation. Trail systems contribute to the safety of those who spend time outdoors by being well marked and of sustainable construction. They protect natural resources by keeping recreational users out of environmentally sensitive areas. Trails connect people with places, providing a local or regional brand to attract visitors to an activity or community. Trails may impact their surrounding environment, as well as the citizens in proximity to them.

In December of 2016, the Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) retained Larson Design Group (LDG) to independently examine the feasibility of constructing a sustainable, motorized trail that would connect the existing Bloody Skillet All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) Trail System in northeastern Centre County to the Whiskey Springs ATV Trail System in western Clinton County, passing through the town of Renovo. While DCNR staff provided support and guidance to LDG, ensuring LDG’s work be would efficient and adhere to Department management guidelines, LDG and its contractors were responsible for establishing the proposed trail corridor.
The State Forest Resource Management Plan, which details both overarching philosophy on allowable uses of state forest lands as well as specific guidance and mandates for their management. As with all other activities occurring on state forest land, trail corridor evaluation observes the various tenets of management related to protection of resources.

Like all state forests, there are communities, businesses, and private landowners within Sproul State Forest. For some, the proposed ATV connector promises expanded opportunities; for others, it represents detriment through trespass, property damages, and noise pollution. The proposed corridor needs to minimize impacts. There’s no route exclusively through the Sproul which can be carried without the cooperation of private landowners.

Accordingly, the initial component of the feasibility study consisted of meeting with local and statewide stakeholders and listening to inventory their concerns and aspirations about a potential connector. This report outlines that specific process, presents information gathered, and discusses recommendations relevant to the siting of the potential trail. It will help inform DCNR’s decision of whether it’s possible to build the connector, and if so, where is the best alignment to do so.
BACKGROUND
RECOGNITION

Motorized recreation is recognized on Pennsylvania state forest lands. DCNR maintains 273 miles of designated ATV trail, allocated among 11 separate trail systems on seven different state forests. Management of these trails has reinforced the intensive nature of motorized use upon the resource and the need for sustainable trail design. Poor trail experiences often lead to the rise of user-generated ATV trails in areas that can’t support them, resulting in environmental damage and negative effects on other state forest users.

Recent studies have underscored the relevance of ATV riding. In 2015, the Clinton County Commissioners authorized a study to review, among other things, the economic impact of ATV trails within the county and the activity’s potential to contribute to community and economic development. One conclusion of this study indicated that ATV users who travel to Clinton County spend approximately $1,700 annually within the county. (http://www.clintoncountypa.com/departments/county_departments/planning/pdfs/Clinton%20County%20ATV%20Recreational%20Analysis_January%202016.pdf)

A separate user survey and trail gap analysis conducted for DCNR in 2016 examined the broader wants and needs of the ATV riding community. That study revealed 169,015 Class 1 ATV registrations within the state as of May 2016. The 4,679 ATV riders who responded to the survey indicated “new trails” and “enhancement of trail systems” as being among the features most desired by users. Further, this survey illustrated that “long trails” (greater than 50 miles) should be of greatest consideration as a future trail design characteristic.

These user preferences are a result of changes occurring in the motorized community over the last decade. While the numbers of registered users has increased modestly over the past 10 years, ATVs themselves have changed considerably. ATV sales since 2008 have shown clear and consistent growth in the numbers of “side by side” Utility Task Vehicles (UTV).

Motorized recreational use has expanded from an individual experience to one which includes more socially-based, family, or group rides with the advent of larger machines that can carry multiple passengers farther distances and in greater comfort. Motorized users seek connected trail experiences, traversing forested landscapes, as do other recreational user groups.
MISSION STATEMENT
MISSION STATEMENT

CONNECTOR STUDY MISSION STATEMENT

To determine the feasibility of the most direct, environmentally sound, and sustainable connector trail possible between the Bloody Skillet and Whiskey Springs ATV Trail systems.

THE STUDY:

The goals of our feasibility study are to:

- Identify the best available route through the Sproul State Forest, incorporating the town of Renovo;
- Identify and inventory constraints to trail development;
- Identify and observe the expectations and concerns of stakeholders;
- Acknowledge the constraints which the Bureau of Forestry (BOF) observed to manage state forests in accordance with the State Forest Resource Management Plan.
MEETING THE OBJECTIVES

To meet these objectives, the project timeline is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTHS</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY – JUNE</td>
<td>Conduct stakeholder sessions and present findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY – SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>Conduct field view of the conceptual trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER – OCTOBER</td>
<td>Hold informational sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER – NOVEMBER</td>
<td>Prepare feasibility report and opinion of probable cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>Present findings to DCNR, Bureau of Forestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report culminates the first stage of the study by presenting and drawing conclusions from five stakeholder meetings which were conducted between February and April 2017. All meetings were conducted by LDG in Lock Haven University’s Durnwachter Center.

Comments were also solicited through a dedicated email address, ATVconnect@larsondesigngroup.com. Comments documented in Appendix B reflect the thoughts collected via this method until **June 30, 2017**. Understanding the interest shown by so many in the feasibility study, LDG will continue collecting study-related comments on this site through **October 30, 2017**.
MEETING DESIGN
LDG staff conducted five stakeholder meetings. Initial suggestions regarding stakeholders were provided by DCNR in January 2017. Attendees were grouped in general categories of common interest. Stakeholder groups organized around common interest are usually more open with their comments. While most invitees attended their designated meeting, it’s important to note that some organizations attended every meeting. They were invited to provide feedback every time. Groups and individuals also attended as news of the stakeholder meetings spread, and LDG received numerous inquiries regarding this. Anyone who attended spontaneously or contacted LDG with interest was welcomed. All attendees were offered the chance to participate.

The prospect of expanded motorized recreation on state forests incites strong feelings of both support and opposition, as examined in the results. It is noted with appreciation by LDG that no matter who attended or what their viewpoints were, conversation was productive, spirited, and respectful.
STAKEHOLDER GROUPS & MEETINGS

IDENTITY

With the understanding that the project has the ability to impact a variety of individuals, we identified the following stakeholder groups and meetings (for detailed list of attendees see Appendix A):

01
GOVERNMENT & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT :: 02.09.17
- Local Townships
- County Planning Offices
- County Commissioners
- Chambers of Commerce
- Tourism Officials
- Small Businesses

02
MOTORIZED :: 02.23.17
- Cameron County ATV/UTV Association, Inc.
- Central Mountain ATV Association, Inc.
- Central PA Sleds and Treads
- Lehigh Valley ATV Association, Inc.
- Pennsylvania Off-Highway Vehicle Association
- PA Ridge Runners
- PA State Snowmobile Association
- Snow Shoe Rails to Trails

03
NON-MOTORIZED :: 03.15.17
- Alpine Club of Williamsport
- Keystone Trails Association
- Mid State Trail Association
- Pennsylvania Environmental Council
- Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen’s Clubs Inc.
- Pennsylvania State Camp Lessee’s Association
- PA Trail Dogs
- Quality Deer Management Association
- Southern Clinton County Sportsmen’s Association
- The Kettle Creek-Tamarack Sportsmen’s Association
- Three Points Sportsmen Club
- Tiadaghton Sportsmen’s Association
- Twin Tiers Riding Club
- Western Clinton Sportsmen’s Association
- Williamsport Velo Club

04
CONSERVATION :: 03.21.17
- Babb Creek Watershed Association
- Beech Creek Watershed Association
- Bucktail Watershed Association
- Centre County Conservation District
- Clinton County Conservation District
- Keystone Elk County Alliance
- Lycoming Chapter of Audubon
- National Wild Turkey Federation Inc, Bald Eagle Longbeards PA
- PA North Central Region Chapter Trout Unlimited
- North Central Pennsylvania Conservancy
- Pennsylvania Environmental Defense Foundation
- Pennsylvania Game Commission
- Pine Creek Council of Governments
- Pine Creek Preservation Association
- Pine Creek Watershed
- Quality Deer Management Association North Central PA
- The Nature Conservatory
- Trout Unlimited God’s Country Chapter 327
- Trout Unlimited Lloyd Wilson Chapter 224

05
SCHEDULE CONFLICTS :: 04.13.17
This meeting was held for invitees who were unable to attend previous meetings.

Broad public feedback will be gathered once we have a plan to present. However, meetings weren’t the only method used to collect stakeholder feedback.

We created the email account ATVconnect@larsondesigngroup.com for stakeholders to submit written comments.

This report includes comments up to June 2017; additional comments may be received after this date that aren’t reflected in this report.
THE MESSAGE
CONFORMATION OF MESSAGE | PLANNING | BREAKOUT SESSIONS

The first objective was introducing the feasibility study concept. LDG developed a standard PowerPoint presentation to accomplish this. The same information was presented to each group. This PowerPoint is available at the following site: http://www.dcnr.state.pa.us/forestry/recreation/atv/atvplacstoride/.

The presentation focused on:

Team
Objectives
Planning

Emphasis was placed on the importance of careful, sustainable planning as a necessity to assess feasibility, as this has implications upon project cost and subsequent maintenance. The bulk of the feasibility study will be spent planning, through both field determination and mapping of the most sustainable route, as well as developing an opinion of associated costs.

Introduction | Project Approach | General Questions :: 45 minutes
Breakout Session :: 30 Minutes
Breakout Session Results :: 30 Minutes

The breakout session was an opportunity for individuals to express support, thoughts, and concerns about the project. Our plan was to have as many as three separate breakout session groups, depending on the number of attendees, with group members comprising of varying views.
BREAKOUT GROUPS
ATTENDEE PARTICIPATION

LDG staff facilitated breakout groups of 10-12 people. For most meetings, there were enough attendees for at least two breakout groups. In meetings where attendance was lighter, all attendees participated in a single group.

Each group was asked for feedback on the following questions:

- **What opportunities excite you about this project?**
- **What concerns do you have about the project?**
- **What areas do you think we should avoid as part of the project?**
- **What areas should we promote as part of the project?**

All responses to each question were recorded by a notetaker for each group. These notes are catalogued by keyword and user group in Appendix A.

Additionally, following a synopsis provided by the group facilitator explaining groups results, each member was given three votes for the most important thoughts the breakout had yielded to determine the group’s most important considerations.
Another objective of the stakeholder meetings was to introduce attendees to the LDG staff involved in coordinating the overall study. Most LDG staff involved, as well as Raudenbush Engineering staff, the principle subcontractor on the project, attended at least one of the meetings.

**THE TEAM**
LARSON DESIGN GROUP + RAUDENBUSH

**PROJECT MANAGER**
CHRIS KEISER

**PROJECT GUIDANCE**
JUSTIN KEISTER, P.E.

**LDG TEAM**
CHRIS IACHINI, PLS
ZACH ARMSTRONG, SIT
EMILY DIEHL

**RAUDENBUSH TEAM**
JACK RAUDENBUSH, P.E.
LYNN OTTAVIANI
MARGARET SCHUCKMAN
300+ EMPLOYEES

PROFESSIONAL
80 ENGINEERS
14 LICENSED SURVEYORS
2 WETLAND SCIENTISTS

REGISTERED
2 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

OFFICE LOCATIONS

NEW YORK
APALACHIN & CORNING

OHIO
COLUMBUS

PENNSYLVANIA
BEAVER, BETHEL,
PITTSBURGH,
LITITZ, SELINSGROVE,
WILLIAMSPORT

TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO

WEST VIRGINIA
MORGANTOWN

40+ EMPLOYEES

04 OFFICES

PROFESSIONAL
15 ENGINEERS
5 ENVIRONMENTAL

REGISTERED
2 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
Connecting - Economic growth / opportunity

Family together activity

Dozen small communities will

Downtown Revitalization

All-season use
MEETING RESULTS
The feedback we received was diverse, but common themes arose throughout the meetings. LDG utilizes three mechanisms to represent results in this report: (1) meeting synopses; (2) word diagramming; and (3) comment inventory by keyword and meeting groups.

An early distinction—breakouts are meant to capture thoughts, whether factually correct or not. Readers perusing data in the comment inventory may observe statements they do not agree with, or which they consider untrue. This may very well be the case. Groups were facilitated to be as conversational as possible; disrupting the conversation to correct or debate individuals works against this. The thoughts expressed by participants provide insight regardless.
OVERVIEW

In preparing summaries of individual meetings, LDG organized various feedback around overarching themes increasingly defined as the meeting process evolved, identified through keywords:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenities</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractions</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATV Culture</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate</td>
<td>Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td>Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The target of the stakeholder process was to harvest as many different thoughts about the proposed project and feasibility as possible. The following synopses are cumulative, using keywords as framework. Independent thoughts are listed only once, in the meeting they were initially expressed; only unique thoughts were added for subsequent meetings.

Stakeholder groups often expressed similar themes; through format of these synopses, groups earlier in the order of meetings appear to provide most of the feedback. This wasn’t necessarily the case. Examining the meeting-specific feedback in the comment inventory (Appendix A) shows differing thoughts on common themes expressed throughout the series of meetings.

The synopses reflect the numbers of attendees at each meeting. The first two meetings had significantly greater attendance (25 and 40 individuals, respectively) than the three later meetings (38 combined). Higher participation led to richer results.
MEETING ONE
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The first meeting was held on February 9, 2017. Invitations were sent to elected officials and municipal employees from local townships, county planning offices, county government, chambers of commerce, recreation and tourism boards, and area small business owners. The 25 attendees are listed in Appendix A.

Keyword synopsis of thoughts from this meeting:

ACCESS
- The trail corridor provides an exceptional access opportunity for the handicapped.
- Given the remote terrain & probable length of the corridor, emergency services access must be carefully planned & accounted for.
- Sufficient parking & access points need to be accounted for.

AMENITIES
- Greater access to state park camping opportunities should be considered in the feasibility.

ATTRACTIONS
- The trail should highlight downtown Renovo.
- The trail should consider connections to scenic vistas and opportunities, such as Hyner View and Fish Dam Scenic Overlook.
- The trail has potential to bring people closer to nature.
- The trail would bring a new group of people into the PA Wilds.

ATV CULTURE
- The proposed trail corridor provides the possibility of changing the culture of ATV users to demonstrate more safe and rule-compliant operation.
- Perception is that ATV community wants to dominate the forest.
- Local ATV groups and residents could help correct illegal use.
EDUCATE
- The trail project can educate motorized and non-motorized users alike about the positive aspects of ATV riding.
- The trail has opportunities to educate users about Civilian Conservation Corps history of the area.

ENFORCEMENT
- DCNR needs help with enforcement.
- Higher fees and fines should be considered as deterrents and to support trail maintenance.
- License plates on ATVs are too small and should be larger to assist rangers in apprehending violators.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
- State forest wild and natural areas should be avoided through design.
- Sproul contains some important birding areas which should be avoided.
- The trail design needs to account for noise management; siltation, run-off, and other pollution to numerous high-quality streams; discourage littering; and consider air pollution.
- Care should be taken that the trail doesn’t result in an additional fragmenting feature.
- The proposed trail corridor must have adequate provisions for storm water runoff planning.

FAMILY
- The proposed trail corridor provides expanded opportunities for family recreational activities.

MAINTENANCE
- DCNR needs to provide ATV-trail specific training to its employees and volunteer groups.
- With the amount of use this trail is likely to see, can it be built and maintained to properly support the activity?
OPPORTUNITY
- The trail corridor would provide economic opportunity for businesses and communities along the trail.
- The trail corridor would provide increased opportunity for family-based recreation.
- The trail corridor would provide a back-country experience to older or physically challenged citizens and tourists who presently can’t get to these areas.
- Many people who don’t currently interact would have the chance to meet and cooperate.
- Trail could result in employment opportunities for local citizens.
- The trail could invigorate downtown revitalization efforts and increase property values, particularly if it becomes a tourism destination.
- The proposed trail corridor represents a growth opportunity for many different support businesses – restaurants, hotels, campgrounds, convenience stores, etc.
- ATV riding has the potential to introduce outdoor recreation to people across all age groups.
- The proposed trail corridor represents potential growth for a dozen small towns.
- The proposed connector trail would be a catalyst for other economic development opportunities.
- The trail system would be a boost to Clinton County’s economy.
- A successful trail connector could draw outside investment to the County.

SAFETY
- Trail design should address features that can improve safety, such as frequent turns to limit speeds.
- The trail would need to be wide enough to allow for passing side by side, and feature safely constructed switchbacks.
- Cell service throughout the area is limited, so emergency notification would be difficult.
- Serious injuries to riders are expected; local emergency management would need helipads or rally points to reach injured riders.
- The trail needs to establish markers to guide dispatched emergency resources.
- The trail needs to be clearly designated to avoid accidents and injuries to riders who inadvertently travel off the system.
RESPECT
- Very important to respect private property.
- Need to respect the functions of areas churches near the trail.
- Need to clarify liability of neighboring landowners in event riders go off course and are hurt.
- This trail concept could create relationships among groups and businesses involved along the trail and other user groups.
- It will be important to consider the impacts of this trail upon other users of the forest.

TRAIL
- Examine opportunities for joint road use along the corridor.
- Communicate co-location on existing pipelines with companies.
- Revitalize old trail systems if possible.
- Be aware of and reduce the conflict with hiking trails, which also draw people to the area.
- A designated and professionally planned ATV trail has the potential to provide for positive usage.
- Take adequate time to prepare the plan for the trail; once in construction, be timely.
- Plank trail construction, similar to the Allegheny National Forest’s ATV trail system, could carry ATVs through wetland areas.
- Trail design for connector should acknowledge differing experience levels of riders and produce a trail that can be used by all.
- The connector trail should increase the use of Whiskey Springs, which is a popular ATV experience.
- The trail should be built for all-season use.
- The trail should have seasonal scheduling to accommodate other forest users.
MEETING TWO
MOTORIZED

The second meeting was held on February 23, 2017. Invitations targeted groups advocating for motorized recreation. The 40 attendees are listed in Appendix A.

Primary themes from this meeting included similar discussion as the first meeting. However, the group also provided these thoughts about the project:

ACCESS
- The trail corridor should provide riding access to new areas.
- The trail design should consider access to camps along its route.

AMENITIES
- Motorized recreationalists will need access to fuel, food, and restrooms along the route, either through small businesses along the way or state-provided facilities.
- ATV riders want additional camping opportunities for riders, either through re-opening camping at Whiskey Springs, ATV access to state parks, or privately-run campgrounds.

ATTRACTIONS
- The trail should incorporate vistas along its route.
- The Hogback Tunnel outside of Orviston should be included.
- ATV access to Kettle Creek State Park should be considered.
- The trail should be used to promote hunting and fishing in remote parts of the Sproul.
- The trail would provide a great wildlife viewing opportunity.

ATV CULTURE
- The motorized community has a perception-related challenge brought on by the conduct of a small percentage of users who engage in illegal activities.
- This minority of illegal users isn’t representative of the user group, which is becoming a group and family-based activity.
- The proposed trail corridor provides an opportunity for motorized users to demonstrate that ATV trails can exist in a forest without causing harm to the resources within it.
- The proposed trail corridor could motivate some who don’t presently register their ATVs to do so, increasing revenues and compliance.
EDUCATE
- Interpretive signs along the route could educate users about plants and animals in the Sproul.
- The trail could educate riders about historical sites along the route like the Hogback Tunnel in Orviston.
- This trail could provide family educational opportunities.
- Highlight other opportunities the Sproul offers.

ENFORCEMENT
- ATV user groups advocate responsible riding and suggest policing their own community in cooperation with law enforcement.
- Maintenance costs could be supplemented through enforcement.

MAINTENANCE
- Maintenance on existing DCNR ATV trail systems is generally lacking; how will DCNR address this and maintain a longer corridor?
- The cost of maintaining the proposed connector trail would be considerable; perhaps could be addressed through increased registration fee or trail-specific user fee?
- It's important to the success of the proposed trail that maintenance on this connector be performed to a higher standard than what's presently provided.

OPPORTUNITY
- The proposed trail could retain in-state revenue by preventing riders from leaving Pennsylvania for recreation in other states.
- Registration reciprocity with other states would make the proposed trail more attractive to out-of-state riders.
- The proposed trail will provide fundraising opportunities for non-profits and community causes.
- Proper design, maintenance, and promotion could make Pennsylvania a destination for motorized recreationalists from other states.
- Economic opportunity extends beyond riding; many would come here to camp and have multi-night stays, helping restaurants and stores.
- The trail could contribute greatly to economic survival of small communities.
- Connecting towns along trails in other areas has provided an economic boost to rural areas.
- More prosperous businesses would equate to a tax increase in supporting small communities.
RESPECT
- It’s important to be sensitive to neighboring landowners and avoid conflicts.

SAFETY
- Riding in numbers on a well-used corridor promotes safety.
- The terrain in many parts of the proposed corridor study area is challenging and unsafe.
The PennDOT bridge needs to be considered in planning – the whole trail could be shut down if PennDOT isn’t on board.

It’s important to guard against trail contamination through illegal riders creating their own trails to connect to the corridor.

The proposed trail corridor could give ATV riders a forest experience, like all other recreational users have access to, instead of trails in strip mines or along roads.

If DCNR doesn’t provide adequate length of designated, legal trails, users will create their own.

Current trail maps need to be available.

There should be mid-trail access points and/or multiple trail heads.

The proposed corridor should incorporate alternate routes help mitigate overuse of a single corridor.

DCNR wants to build the trail to too high of a standard – it doesn’t need to be perfect.

This trail corridor project should be viewed as an inaugural project; if it’s successful, other areas should be examined to build other connectors.

The trail should make use of state forest, state roads, and bridges through the proposed corridor.

Trail planners should take advantage of local knowledge for possible routes – many existing trail traces through the study area.

Should be open to law or regulation change to allow for things such as riding on state forest or PennDOT roads.

The trail should provide a variety of riding experiences while considering the safety of all users.

Conservation groups have had disproportionate influence over how DCNR allocates resources and develops trails. There’s no reason to think this will be any different with this trail.

DCNR has always expressed a bias against motorized recreation.

The trail will never be constructed and the feasibility study is simply window dressing.
The third meeting was held on March 15th, 2017. Invitations targeted groups advocating for non-motorized recreation. The 10 attendees are listed in Appendix A.

Primary themes from this meeting included similar discussion as documented in earlier meetings. However, this group also added these thoughts:

**ATTRACTIONS**
- The Elk Scenic Highway runs through the proposed trail study corridor.

**EDUCATE**
- The proposed trail corridor could be a platform to educate about other resources.
- Other historical educational opportunities involve native Americans, CCC, lumber, coal, and tannery industries.

**ENFORCEMENT**
- The cost of additional enforcement needs to be considered and is just as important as construction and maintenance.
- Funding for enforcement needs to be sustainable.

**ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**
- Much of the proposed trail corridor area is in headwaters areas of exceptional value streams. These areas should be protected to the greatest extent possible.
- The trail corridor requires crossing the West Branch of the Susquehanna River. This should be guarded.
- Conservation acquisitions through the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy shouldn’t be used in any prospective trail corridors.
- There are young conifer plantations within the proposed trail area.
- Sound pollution impacts on residents, camp owners, and other recreational groups needs to be accounted for; it impacts the character of the entire area.
- DCNR needs to demonstrate responsible stewardship of any resulting trail corridor in line with all other uses of state forest.
MAINTENANCE
- DCNR should investigate partnerships with other groups for proper maintenance.
- Maintenance standards and who’s responsible for them should be well-defined, as should sustainable funding sources for maintenance.

OPPORTUNITY
- Recognition should be considered for the various non-recreational opportunities Sproul State Forest provides to local communities.
- Western Clinton County could benefit by having the trail bring new people and business.

SAFETY
- The study area includes railroad crossings and right-of-ways, pipelines and pipeline crossings, gas wells and access roads, state forest roads and state highways, and power lines. These present safety hazards to ATV users.
- Incorporating a trail connector as described would increase serious accidents, causing a drain on local emergency resources. The trail must account for this in design and funding.

TRAIL
- Pipelines have historically excluded ATV users and should be consulted.
- Non-motorized recreation tends to be more healthful than motorized recreation; should this factor into DCNR’s assessment of the activity and management to meet needs?
MEETING FOUR
CONSERVATION

The fourth meeting was held on March 21st, 2017. Invitations targeted conservation organizations with interests in the local area. The 20 attendees are listed in Appendix A.

The primary themes from this meeting included similar discussion as documented in the earlier meetings. However, this group also added these thoughts:

EDUCATE
- Building this corridor could lead to a loss of historical features.
- Building an extensive ATV connector is contradictory to all that has been built over the past fifteen years in the Pennsylvania Wilds.
- This trail could be detrimental to tourists in the fall foliage season.

ENFORCEMENT
- More ATVs will end up on hiking trails and other restricted areas because of this corridor.
- Providing a corridor through parts of the Sproul which aren’t presently accessible will increase illegal ATV use and dumping, and increase trespassing on private lands.
- The PennDOT bridge over the river isn’t open to ATV use; the trail can’t legally cross the river.
- Private developments close to the connector will result in illegal trails between private lands and the connector.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
- Building the connector trail would impact the quality of life of camps and homes along the corridor.
- Building this trail would have a significant impact on non-fragmented areas of forest in this part of the Sproul, which is crisscrossed by roads, gas wells, and pipelines.
- There are unique areas of bird habitat which would be impacted in the feasibility study area.
- Constructing the connector proposed in this study contradicts the focus placed upon wild character in the recently-adopted State Forest Resource Management Plan.
Increasing the level of human presence and ease of access over such a wide area increases the Sproul's susceptibility to forest fires. Construction and illegal use activities could lead to degradation of DEP stream designations. The steep slopes throughout the proposed study area contain soils that are prone to erosion, and would be difficult to stabilize. This area of the Sproul has supported bear, elk, and fisher research; expanding ATV use will degrade its utility for these purposes. Construction and operation of the potential trail corridor increases the potential impacts of invasive species on the forest. This area of the Sproul is home to many rattlesnakes, a protected species, and conflicts during construction and trail operation will impact rattlesnake populations. The increased traffic in these areas conflicts with conservation measures for species listed in the Natural Heritage Inventory. Fragmentation of unbroken forested canopies through the corridor will cause problems for songbirds which need large blocks of mature forest. This project threatens the black bear population within the study area.
There should be a survey of other state forest users about the feasibility study.

Building this connector will result in decreased numbers of non-motorized recreational users in the area, such as bird watchers, hikers, and hunters.

Careful consideration needs to be given to how this trail could impact the commercial forest and the jobs it supports.

Too much emphasis is placed on the promise of economic opportunities—ATV trails have done little to help communities economically. Bloody Skillet hasn’t increased opportunities for people in Orviston or Monument.

Considering the amount of money being spent on this study and the money needed to build a connector of this length, is DCNR adequately supporting non-motorized recreation on state forest? The funding available for other forms of recreation is disproportionate.

There’s enthusiasm for more non-consumptive uses of state forests than motorized recreation, which should be considered.

Is the type of economic development this trail would bring truly desirable or significant for Clinton County?

The trail could hurt tourism related to hunting, fishing, and birdwatching.
RESPECT
- Eminent domain shouldn’t be considered for this project or impact landowners near the trail.

SAFETY
- Local emergency services aren’t equipped to handle the increased calls this trail will generate. The more time they spend responding to ATV wrecks, the more everyone else in the community is put at risk.
- Pipelines and well sites along the trail could pose safety threats to trail users, especially if they’re unfamiliar with them.

TRAIL
- Trail development should be limited to areas previously impacted by land uses, such as strip mines.
- Proposed trail segments must be located away from wetlands because ATVs prefer these areas to mud in.
- Jurisdictional right-of-ways of both PennDOT roads and railroads shouldn’t be considered for the trail.
- The connector trail should avoid populated areas.
MEETING FIVE
SCHEDULE CONFLICTS

Two of the meetings occurred on days with inclement weather. Additionally, some potential attendees were unable to make the meeting to which they had initially been invited. To give everyone the opportunity to attend, LDG offered an additional meeting on April 13th, 2017. Eight people attended (see Appendix A).

Primary themes from this meeting included similar discussion as documented in the earlier meetings. However, this group also added these thoughts:

**ATTRATIONS**
- Trail should be involved with the PA Wilds.

**EDUCATE**
- The trail could encourage registration and be an avenue to emphasize operator training.
- Archaeological sites could provide educational opportunities.

**ENFORCEMENT**
- Off-trail riding is a common problem with ATV trails, and would be hard to address in a trail this long.
- Trucks and Jeeps will also make use of this trail for four-wheeling.
- There’s a lack of funding for DCNR to address enforcement adequately, and building this trail connector won’t help.
- Adequate enforcement from the start is vital to provide structure and eliminate outlaw riding.
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
- This area of the Sproul is valuable for woodcock; the development of the trail would impact this value.
- Passive acid mine drainage systems in Huling Branch, Two Mile Run, and Middle Branch would be impacted by ATVs riding illegally.

OPPORTUNITIES
- The proposed connector trail would result in repair shops and other businesses specific to ATV users.
- It’s important to consider what attracts people to this part of the world, such as its quietness and lack of development, before changing these things with a trail.

TRAIL
- The cost of this project should be supported by the ATV Fund and not taxpayer funds.
- Examining the feasibility of such a trail violates DCNR’s long-held ATV trail policy. ATV trails should be clustered around areas of prior impact instead of traversing long trails.
- Additional ATV trails should be placed on private mine lands, such as Rock Run, and supported by DCNR through grants.
- The most important aspect of this trail project is that it not get built.

TRUST
- Does building a trail like this erode the public’s trust in DCNR’s conservation ethic?
These meetings illustrate that local businesses and the ATV community envision the trail as an economic and tourism driver, which would benefit small towns throughout the route. Most attendees at the first two meetings favored the project. While acknowledging issues related to environmental protection and enforcement, the greater part of the breakout sessions focused on community development, economic potential, and opportunities for ATV enthusiasts. Another theme discussed in these meetings was the increasingly family nature of ATV recreation and the need for greater access to Pennsylvania state parks for ATV riders.

The third and fourth meetings highlighted environmental protection as a priority, and DCNR’s responsibilities as land stewards for all Pennsylvanians. Additionally, the demonstrated impacts of ATV use, both legal and illegal, on other forest users was frequently mentioned. Attendees at these meetings expressed concern about the trail impacting the wild character of this area.

The final meeting was the most diverse in terms of the backgrounds of participants. It demonstrated the diversity of opinions about the project. Feedback ranged from welcoming the promise of the project for the good it would do for communities to questioning why DCNR was abandoning its ATV trail development policy. That different groups of stakeholders should reflect different opinions is hardly news; ATV use is a polarizing topic for many Pennsylvanians. It’s more interesting to examine the common themes expressed between groups.
Safety was perhaps the most unifying theme, with all groups expressing concern about accidents and the burden the trail would place on emergency response resources. Increased accessibility for citizens with disabilities was acknowledged by all groups. Enforcement was another shared concern, from motorized recreationalists’ concerns about the actions of a minor percentage of users casting a shadow over their activity, to concerns expressed by other groups regarding riders leaving the designated trail and affecting surrounding lands.

Everyone was concerned about environmental impacts, especially related to watershed protection and water quality. The trail’s potential for educating users about the natural, geologic, and cultural history of the area was discussed at length. Respecting private property was mentioned in all meetings, albeit from different angles. Finally, the need for maintenance of the trail, by DCNR staff, contractors, or volunteers, along with questions about how to fund it were raised by all groups.

Each group also expressed unique thoughts. The motorized group spoke about trust more than any other; it’s clear that this group has little trust in DCNR. Many people from the ATV groups indicated they would support higher registration fees if the funds provided better maintenance and more opportunity. They discussed their willingness to self-regulate to curtail illegal activities.

The conservation group questioned the assumption that the corridor would be an economic driver, pointing to existing ATV trails and the lack of impact they’ve had on communities around them. This group expressed the need to survey all users of this area and suggested that if DCNR has the funding to engage in this feasibility study, then there should be more funding available to address the needs of other users.
Regarding trail layout, stakeholders expressed design preferences, areas to avoid, areas to incorporate, safety, and other considerations for LDG to include in the feasibility study, including:

1. Utilize natural, aesthetic features as often as possible, such as vistas and scenic overlooks;

2. Water quality was a concern of all groups. Stream crossings will be avoided where possible and well-constructed where necessary;

3. If possible, the trail should take advantage of educational opportunities presented by CCC camps, timber harvesting, plant identification, or geology;

4. Trail tread design should allow passing and good lines of site;

5. The corridor should feature turns periodically to reduce straight away length and regulate speed;

6. While scouting the preferred alignment, LDG should evaluate the utility of areas for helipads or other means of extracting injured ATV riders;

7. Trail head access should occur at multiple points along the proposed trail;

8. Keeping ATVs away from high-quality wetlands will reduce environmental impacts.

This feasibility report provides the first step in evaluating a trail connector between Bloody Skillet and Whiskey Springs via Renovo. The stakeholder process has provided insight into the differing opinions about the connector and the merit of pursuing its construction. From LDG’s perspective, stakeholder feedback demonstrates that sound design and engineering principles will need be implemented in the determination of alignment, with great importance placed on safety and sustainability. All of this information will be helpful in informing DCNR’s decision.
On the following pages, you’ll find a collection of feedback from each of the stakeholders’ meetings. The feedback has been color coded by group for easy reference, and keywords that were mentioned multiple times by each group have been capitalized and underlined.

The groups are comprised of the following stakeholders:
Group 1: Government Officials and Economic Development
Group 2: Motorized
Group 3: Non-Motorized
Group 4: Conservation
Group 5: Schedule Conflicts

As we move forward with the conceptual alignment of the trail, we’ll use this feedback as a guide.
## STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK + COMMENTS

### ACCESS
- Accessibility (Handicapped)
- Facilities – Emergency access and restrooms
- Opportunity for handicap accessibility
- Opportunity for handicapped citizens to get out and enjoy the forests
- Accessibility to new areas
- Access from/to camps
- Accessibility
- Accessing “multiple” areas and variety of trails from one location.
- Opportunities for disabled

### AMENITIES
- ATV access to state park camping
- Adding additional access and parking areas
- ATV users can get from one destination to another (and stay in hotels, get gas, etc.)
- Lodging/Camping on state parks (change legislation)
- Facilities – emergency access and restrooms
- Restroom facilities and parking – will need to be a lot of thought put into it
- Rest room access
- Mid-trail access (trail heads along)
- Access to facilities (food, gas, lodging)
- Comfort facilities
- Fuel
- Camping opportunities/economic impact
- No camping (would like to have it back)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER GROUPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gov’t Officials &amp; Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Conflicts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STAKEHOLDER AMENITIES
- Lodging
- Access for folks with special needs
- Access to the forest for, possibly, those who can’t walk in
## Stakeholder Feedback + Comments

### Attractions
- Historical areas – Civilian Conservation Camps
- Vistas
- Outlooks
- Coffin Rock
- Renovo downtown
- Renovo/South Renovo (towns in general)
- Connect to scenic sites like Hyner and Fish Dam
- Bring people closer to nature
- Opens the Wilds to a new group of people

### ATV Culture
- Historical areas – Civilian Conservation Camps
- Vistas
- Outlooks
- Coffin Rock
- Renovo downtown
- Renovo/South Renovo (towns in general)
- Connect to scenic sites like Hyner and Fish Dam
- Bring people closer to nature
- Opens the Wilds to a new group of people

### ATV Access to Scenic Opportunities
- Vistas
- Hogback Tunnel
- Overlooks
- Kettle Creek state park
- Scenic vistas (Hyner landing strip)
- Scenic opportunities
- Wildlife viewing

### Bias against Motorized Recreation (ATVs) – Want Equal Treatment
- Legal ATVs
- Police our own
- Self-policing
- Responsible riding
- Conservation groups (disproportionate voice)

### Vistas (Elk motodrive)
- Elk scenic highway
- 144 Scenic route

### Loss of Historical Structures and Features
- Vistas
- Contradictions to Pennsylvania Wilds theme
- Fall Foliage
- Existing vistas?

### Hogback Tunnel
- Rivertown System
- Vistas
- Elk viewing
- Hunting/fishing access
- PA Wilds
### STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK + COMMENTS

#### EDUCATE
- Historical areas - Civilian Conservation Camps
- Educate that negligent riders are only the 2%
- Flora/fauna signage
- Educational family opportunities
- More people exposed to more of what area has to offer
- Educational signage (Flora)
- Utilize local knowledge
- Access to historic sites – signage (Hogback Tunnel)
- Historic sites
- Historical sites
- Showcase local history/education
- Historical sites (Indian villages)
- Local history (Civilian Conservation Camps), lumber, coal, tannery
- Natural Areas/education
- Visibility for other outdoor and natural resources
- Civilian Conservation Camps – Education/historical
- Encourage registration to emphasize training
- Civilian Conservation Camps – educational/historical
- Archaeological sites

#### ENFORCEMENT
- Help with enforcement - higher fees and fines to support trail development and maintenance when project complete
- Those who won’t abide by the rules
- Police ATV traffic
- Policing the trail
- Larger license plates
- Maintenance costs – enforcement
- Vandalism potential (1-2 outlaws)
- Rule enforcement – trespassing, law enforcement, costs
- Law enforcement – ATV license plates are too small – need to be larger so they can be better identified
- ATV’s on hiking trails
- Mudding
- Trespass
- Litter
- Enforcement
- Bridge – how to cross river
- Private developments
- Lack of funding for enforcement
- Enforcement/trespass – off trail riding
- To provide structure and eliminate outlaw riding
- Other vehicles using the trail
STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK + COMMENTS

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

- Communicate, ahead of time, with municipalities/communities along the trail so they have storm water management, plans in western Clinton County, plans need updated, enforcement
- Avoid Renovo watersheds
- Avoid Wild and Natural Areas
- Wild Areas/Natural Areas
- Cranberry Swamp Natural Area
- Avoid birding areas
- Environmental impacts (noise, garbage, silt, air and water pollution, run offs to high quality streams)
- Water tributaries – need to be aware of those identified tributaries that could be impacted
- East Branch Swamp
- It continues to fragment the forest
- Impact to quality of life for camps and homes along the trail
- Campsites
- SF leased camps
- Increased traffic conflicts with Natural Heritage Inventory
- Mountain streams
- Wetlands/streams
- Natural Areas
- Unfragmented areas
- Weed-free areas
- Impacts to streams
- Erosion/sedimentation
- Fragmentation – forest
- Wild Areas
- Natural Areas/Wild Area wetlands, bogs
- Important Bird Areas (unique)
- Environmental damage
- Protection of Wild Areas
- Wild and Natural Legislated Areas – Bucktail
- Excessive erodible slopes
- Petes Run road
- Halls Run watershed
- Preserve wildest place
- Preserve wild character – State Forrest Resource Management Plan
- Steep slopes
- Forest Fires
- Headwaters, Exceptional Value and High Quality
- Water pollution, stream degradation from stream crossings
- Noise pollution
- Noise
- Impacts to wildlife
- Wildlife – elk, fisher, bear research
- Potential spread of invasive species
- Fragmentation of the unbroken forest by projects like this will lead to impacts upon songbirds
- The extension of songbirds
- Black bear population impact (at risk)
- Protected species (rattle snakes)
- Invasive species – expansion/spreading
- Spread of invasive species

- Watersheds
- Wetlands
- Noise

- Natural Areas (Bucktail, Cranberry, Ross Letterman, East Branch)
- Wild Areas
- Crossing the river
- Tributary headwaters EV streams
- Impact on forest fragmentation of a forest that’s already fragmented
- Western Conservancy
- Young conifer plantations
- Responsible stewardship
- Sound pollution affecting leased camps and residents
- Camping and campsites

- IBA Audobon
- Conservation Ethic
- Passive water treatment systems – Huling Branch, Two Mile Run, Middle Branch (mine water)
- Birding areas (Audobon designation), woodcock singing area
- Interception of natural Areas, Exceptional Value Streams, Bucktail SP Natural Area
- Bucktail Special Protection Natural Area
- Letterman Natural Area
- Natural Areas
- Paddy Run watershed
- Halls Run watershed
- EV watersheds
- Environmental impacts – streams, steep slopes, sensitive areas
### STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK + COMMENTS

#### FAMILY
- Family together activity
- Opportunity for expanded family recreation
- Provides family-oriented opportunities

#### MAINTENANCE
- ATV/Trail maintenance training
- Maintaining the erosion and sediment?
- The infrastructure, with that many people, can it support this?

- Lack of maintenance on current trail system/new trail system
- Maintenance (regular)
- Maintenance costs – enforcement

- Maintenance costs, what type, who is responsible, possible partnerships with DCNR and other groups, too
- Potential partnerships for funding
- Partnerships
- Sustainable and funding
STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK + COMMENTS

OPPORTUNITY

- Would keep ATV enthusiasts in the state
- Business growth/opportunity – corollary businesses
- Business prosperity – what this will do for the business community
- Focus to community development
- Employment growth
- Dozen small communities will benefit
- Downtown revitalization
- Economic for communities
- Promote restaurants and hotels
- Resources for economic development
- That it would support future development
- Exposes lightly populated areas to outsiders’ investment
- Could lead to increased property values
- Connecting – economic opportunity
- Opportunity for all age groups for outdoor recreation

- Business opportunities – services, growth
- Employment opportunities
- Western Clinton County
- Non-recreational opportunities
- Opportunities for local economy

- Impacts to fishing, hunting and birding
- Insight enthusiasm for the non-consumptive uses vs motorized uses
- Impact to commercial forest – jobs
- Private and economic developments
- Economic development this use would produce
- Economic boom – validity of
- Funding for all users of the forest
- Could this lead to state funds for other uses in forests
- Orviston – no services, people. Monument.
- Loss of birders, hikers, anglers
- Hunting clubs
- Should there be a survey for other forest users (non Off Highway Vehicles)
- Local businesses/services in Renovo
- Existing businesses in Renovo

- New businesses – repair shops, services specific to trail users
- Enhance existing businesses
- Existing businesses in Clinton County
- All other users of the forest (hiking, birding, biking)
- Loss of existing users of the forest
- Extended trip (2-3 days)
- Loss of what attracts people to this area – quietness, little development

- Promote fishing/hunting
- Job opportunities – small businesses
- Camping opportunities/economic impact
- Activity for all ages
- Out of state rider revenue
- Economic survival
- Local economic boost (larger)
- Connecting towns/economic impact
- Local investment
- Tax increase
- Destination vacation state
- Added fees
- Support non-profits/fundraising
- Reciprocity with other states
- Businesses
- New business opportunities
- Involve new people
STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK + COMMENTS

RESPECT

- Get to meet a lot of new people – camaraderie! Friendships established
- Respect to community churches
- Conflicts with other forest users
- Respect of private property
- Private landowner liability when people go off course

SAFETY

- People going outside the trail area (injuries/accidents)
- Safety – access to communications
- Safe sharing with other vehicles/switchbacks
- Facilities – emergency access and restrooms
- Pipelines/settling pipelines
- Emergency management would need rallying points

- Permanent residents
- Hostile neighbors
- Private landowner protection
- Neighbor sensitivity

- Technology (Cell)
- Emergency access
- Unsafe terrain
- Safety in numbers

- Too many opportunities for accidents
- Potential future funding for emergency services
- Emergency access – landing zones
- Drain on local emergency resources
- Cell phone coverage
- No cell phone coverage
- Railroad crossings and right of way
- Railroad
- Powerlines (PPL)
- Pipelines (Texas Eastern – Dominion)

- Eminent domain potential

- Lack of emergency services and access
- Safety for all, emergency access, communications
- Lack of cell coverage
- Speed on straight-aways
- Pipelines and well sites
- Pipelines
- Safety
- PennDOT and railroad – jurisdictional right of way’s safety

- Safety for all, emergency access, communications
- Pipelines, right of way and well sites

- Pipelines, right of way and well sites
STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK + COMMENTS

TRAIL

- Experience trails
- Revitalize old trail systems
- Joint-use road, could the trail be shared?
- Hiking trails
- It addresses a real need/interest from locals and out-of-towners alike
- Plank roads through sensitive natural areas
- Popularity of Whiskey Springs
- Post markers
- All-season use
- Seasonal scheduling
- Timely construction
- Time to prepare/plan
- Designated/planned ATV Trails make for more positive usage

- Is ATV healthful outdoor recreation?
- Utilize existing pipelines
- Make a great connector

- Add ATV “features” in areas that are already degraded/already designated for ATVs
- Trail is intrusion
- Hiking trails
- Corridor width/surface
- Preventing project
- Populated areas
- Public roads
- Cost – who pays for it

TRUST

- That it won’t get built
- Conservation groups (disproportionate voice)

- Variety (but safe)
- PennDOT bridge – can the whole project be shot down if PennDOT doesn’t allow ATVs?
- Trail contamination by trails that are not part of the system
- More trail than road
- Longer trail rides
- Without enough designated trails people ride everywhere
- Work both trails
- Trail maps/signs
- Too much “road” type riding – want trail experience
- More trails
- Mid-trail access (trail heads along)
- Accessing “multiple” areas and variety of trails from one location
- Trail alternates – will there only be one trail opportunity (could lead to overuse)
- Length
- Too high a standard – don’t make it too perfect
- Bad design/construction
- Time for process
- Bridge in Renovo
- Law/regulations “change”
- Utilize local knowledge
- Need to consider dual use roads
- Heavily congested roads/areas
- Bridge/state roads
- Updated government legislation
- Use of Bureau of Forestry roads
ATTENDEE + ORGANIZATION PER MEETING

01

GOVERNMENT & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

:: 02.09.17

BEECH CREEK TOWNSHIP
Joseph Berry
Keith Bittner

CENTRAL MOUNTAINS ATV ASSOCIATION
Ed Eisenhower
Henry Sorgen
Rich Wykoff

CHAPMAN TOWNSHIP
Tim Horner

CLINTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OFFICE
Pete Smeltz
Jeff Snyder

CLINTON COUNTY ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP & VISITOR’S BUREAU
Julie Brennan

CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Kate de Silva

CURTIN TOWNSHIP
Wayne Stover

DCNR CONSERVATION & NATURAL RESOURCES (ADVISORY COUNCIL)
Bob Kirchner

LEIDY TOWNSHIP
David Flack

MCCLURE ASSOCIATION CONSULTANTS
Don McClure

PARTNERSHIP TOURISM CHAIRMAN
Dave Text

QUIET OAKS CAMPGROUND
Carla Flack

RENOVO BOROUGH
Kari Kepler
Thomas Tarantella Jr.

RESIDENT – RENOVO, PA
Mina Blair

STATE REPRESENTATIVE
MIKE HANNA
Mike Hanna
Mitzi Gallagher

STATE SENATOR JAKE CORMAN
Matt Wise

STATE SENATOR JOE SCARNATI
Chuck Dillon

SNOW SHOE RAILS TO TRAILS
Larry Mayes
Trilby Mayes
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CAMERON COUNTY ATV/UTV
Jeff Swell
B W Bush

CAMERON COUNTY ATV ASSOCIATION
Lee Burnell
Leslie Burnell
Brenda Condo
Keith Dunlap
Harvey Fink Jr.
Carl Johnson
Tom Johnson
Dennis McGregor
Henry Sorgen
Bob Thompson
Wayne Yahn

CENTRAL MOUNTAINS ATV ASSOCIATION
Lee Burnell
Leslie Burnell
Brenda Condo
Keith Dunlap
Harvey Fink Jr.
Carl Johnson
Tom Johnson
Dennis McGregor
Henry Sorgen
Bob Thompson
Wayne Yahn

CENTRAL PA CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU
Brenda Hall

CENTRAL PA SLEDS AND TREADS
Ernie Shumbat

CENTRE COUNTY COMMISSIONER
Michael Pipe

CLINTON COUNTY COMMISSIONER
Jeff Snyder

CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING
Greg Smith

DCNR CONSERVATION & NATURAL RESOURCES
Bob Kirchner

LEHIGH VALLEY ATV ASSOCIATION
Dave Miller

PA OHV
George Fetterman

PA OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ASSOCIATION
Dr. Jack Clark

LEHIGH VALLEY ATV
Gregg Buvar
Dale Harten
Michael Stirk

RETIRED
Robert Davey

SENATOR JAKE CORMAN
Matt Wise

SNOW SHOE RAILS TO TRAILS
Robert Harris
Carole Jensen
Charles Jensen
Larry Mayes
Trilby Mayes
Jack Miller
Andrew Shultz
Jason Vaux

SNOW SHOE TOWNSHIP
Rod Preslovich

STATE REPRESENTATIVE MIKE HANNA
Mitzi Gallagher

VALLEY ATV
Carl Shaw
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03 NON-MOTORIZED :: 03.15.17
CENTRAL MOUNTAINS ATV ASSOCIATION
Henry Sorgen
CENTRE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Susan Hannegan
CLINTON COUNTY COMMISSIONER
Jeff Snyder
CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Greg Smith
CLINTON COUNTY VISITOR’S BUREAU
Julie Brennan
DCNR CONSERVATION & NATURAL RESOURCES
Bob Kirchner
George Durrwachter
KEYSTONE TRAILS ASSOCIATION
Butch Davey
Bob Merrill
LUCAS OUTDOORS
WESTERN CLINTON COUNTY SPORTSMEN’S ASSOCIATION
Gregg Lucas

04 CONSERVATION :: 03.21.17
BUCKTAIL WATERSHED
Kirk Bainey
Steve Vaneerden
CLINTON COUNTY ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP & VISITOR’S BUREAU
Julie Brennar
CLINTON COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Greg Smith
CENTRAL MOUNTAINS ATV ASSOCIATION
Carl Johnson
Rich Wykoff
CLINTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
Jeff Snyder
KEYSTONE TRAILS ASSOCIATION
Dave Gantz
Joe Neville
LYCOMING AUDUBON SOCIETY
Gary Metzger
MCCLURE ASSOCIATION
Don McClure
NORTHCENTRAL PA CONSERVANCY
Robert Davey
PENNSYLVANIA FOREST COALITION
Ralph Kisberg
Richard Martin
RESPONSIBLE DRILLING ALLIANCE
Robert Cross
STATE REPRESENTATIVE HANNA
Mitzi Gallagher
Joal Long
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SCHEDULE CONFLICTS
:: 04.13.17

CENTRAL MOUNTAINS ATV ASSOCIATION
Henry Sorgen

CLINTON COUNTY COMMISSIONER
Jeff Snyder

CLINTON COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES
Tammy Lannan

KEYSTONE TRAILS ASSOCIATION
Butch Davey

MAYOR, RENOVO BOROUGH
Carl Olshefskie

SIERRA CLUB
Jeff Schmidt

SNOW SHOE RAILS TO TRAILS
Jack Miller
Andrew Shultz
To Whom it May Concern:

Upon review of the Connector Study’s mission or scope of work, it is unclear if Trail Gap #272 is included in this preliminary investigation. The original presentation on February 9, 2017 referenced Gap 60, “South Renovo to Bloody Skillet” and Gap 62, “Renovo to Whiskey Springs”. Please verify if Trail Gap #272 is included as part of the preliminary investigations?

1) Trail Gap 272 – Tamarack to Whiskey Springs

Respectfully,

Eric Bruggeman
PA Trails Advisory Committee Member – ATV Representative
717-232-0593
March 9, 2017

Mr. Christopher E. Keiser
Project Manager
Larson Design Group
1000 Commerce Park Drive, Suite 201
Williamsport, PA 17701

Subject: Bloody Skillet / Whiskey Springs ATV Trail System

Dear Mr. Keiser,

On behalf of the 70,000+ men and women of the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen’s Clubs (PFSC) I want to advise you that PFSC supports the efforts to connect the Bloody Skillet and Whiskey Springs ATV Trail System.

PFSC is the commonwealth’s oldest and largest group of hunters, anglers, trappers, second amendment advocates and conservationists.

Responsible ATV use is enjoyed by many of our members. The ability to recreate outdoors, especially in pursuit of hunting, fishing and trapping are activities that our organization supports. Connecting these and other trails will certainly create opportunity for all Pennsylvanians to enjoy the outdoors.

PFSC offers to be a resource of information for you and your staff on matters that come before you during this project.

Sincerely,

Dennis Fillmore
President

Cc:
Cindy Adams Dunn, Secretary, DCNR
John W. Norbeck, Deputy Secretary, Park & Forestry, DCNR
Fred Brown
Mary Hosmer <wlhab@windstream.net>

Although I do not own an ATV and likely never will, I wholeheartedly support multiple-use, motorized access on DCNR-BOF state lands. Not only do I support connecting trails, but I would also support complete ATV Trails on DCNR-BOF lands.

The Allegheny NF has shown that controlled seasons of use and maintenance with the ATV registration fund works. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Mary Hosmer
Habitat for Wildlife
wlhab@windstream.net
814-512-2101
PA Forest Steward
RGS/AWS Volunteer
PA Fed of Sportsmen’s Clubs Member
March 17, 2017

Jason Albright, Assistant State Forester
PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Bureau of Forestry
PO Box 8552
Harrisburg, PA 17105-8552

Ref: ATV Feasibility Study to Connect Bloody Skillet and Whiskey Springs ATV Trails

Hi Jason,

Thanks for your time talking about the feasibility study to connect the Bloody Skillet and Whiskey Springs ATV trails. I appreciate your insights, and recognize that this will be a challenging project for you.

As we discussed, WPC is most concerned that any future ATV trails do not impact the Tamarack Swamp Natural Area north of Renovo or the adjacent properties WPC acquired and conveyed to DCNR. Attached are a location map and an aerial of the properties. WPC conveyed these three tracts to BOF in 2003 specifically to protect the high ecological values of Tamarack Swamp.

Tamarack Swamp is a non-glacial bog dominated by northern and boreal conifer trees, and has the highest importance in the Clinton County Natural Heritage inventory due to its exceptional wetland communities and rare species of plants and insects. The site is one of just a few examples of such a natural community in Pennsylvania. Tamarack Swamp contains, or has records of, populations of plants designated as species of “special concern” in Pennsylvania and five historic or confirmed animals of “special concern.” Further, Tamarack Swamp forms the headwaters of Drury Run, designated as an Exceptional Value stream.

WPC’s specific concerns include the following:

1) The westernmost tract that WPC conveyed to DCNR, which we refer to as the Foley tract, was acquired with North American Wetlands Conservation Act (NAWCA) funds. For that tract, the deed contains restrictions which we interpret as prohibiting any motorized vehicle use. Although only the northeast portion of the property is in the designated natural area, these restrictions apply to the entire property, and any motorized vehicle use would be a violation.
APPENDIX C

Map Displayed at Meetings