

## MTO ORV Public consultation - Suggested talking points-

Please use these if they help to answer any of the questions in the MTO survey. Try not to cut and paste too much as it's better if each respondent has individual answers.

### Question #1

**What assessment criteria should the ministry use to determine what roads an ORV could travel along the shoulder of (or the travelled portion where the shoulder is obstructed or unavailable)?**

*Examples of highway selection criteria could include average traffic volumes, specified distance solely for the purpose of connecting trails where ORVs are permitted, proximity to amenities (e.g. gas station, lodgings, and restaurants), etc.*

- *Shoulder availability*
- *Traffic volumes & seasonal traffic volumes,*
- *Proximity to amenities*
- *Connection of trails*
- *Number of access points (and if those access points are in safe areas)*
- *Forward visibility on the highway.*
- *Access should also be considered for certain 4 lane undivided highways with large shoulders, as there is lots of room for safe ORV usage.*
- *Signage should also be considered, as a warning for normal highway traffic.*
  
- *-Number of local ORV users and/or the number of people who travel to that area for ORV use. (Higher consideration should be given to these factors. Ie. If you have strong local usage, or potential usage, these should factor highly in opening up local roads. A good example of this is Simcoe county, or the Kawarthas/Haliburton areas.)*
- *Compelling case where the type of ORV should be considered; ie many offroad motorcycles are operated by someone that already has a valid street motorcycle license. It is perplexing to them that they are licenced for the highway on a motorcycle, yet currently can't legally operate their off-road bike on roads to connect trails, access amenities etc.*
- *In some special cases, road access may have to be restricted to smaller ORVs due to space considerations*

### #2

**Should existing on-road access, which is limited to operate along the shoulder of a highway, be maintained? Or should it be expanded to include other permitted areas that may better accommodate larger ORV types (e.g. off roadway but within the right-of-way similar to snowmobiles)?**

- *Access should be expanded to include areas within the right-of-way, at least in areas where deemed appropriate;(ie. no shoulders)*
- *Municipality and/or Province could partner with a local club, or Federation to help with maintenance/development of the trail on areas that utilize non maintained areas within the right-of-way.*
- *It could be safer- utilizing an unused area beside the fenceline within a highway corridor helps to separate differing types of vehicles, driving at different speeds along a roadway.*

#3

***Should municipalities be required to specify that travelling on-road is meant only for recreational purposes (e.g. travel between one trail head to the next within a reasonable distance to access amenities such as food and gas)?***

- *ORV's that are used for work, or hunting should also be allowed. Why hinder economic opportunities?*

#4

***If so, what is a reasonable distance for off-road vehicles to be on-road (e.g. 1 kilometre in order to connect between one trail head to the next)? Are there other criteria, aside from measured distance, that could be used to determine what a reasonable allowance is? Please explain.***

- Distance Limits shouldn't really factor in.
- Focus should be kept on which roads will work and where they are located.
- May need to divert ORV traffic around certain areas; residential, industrial, wetland etc.
- Some areas may have greater distances between trail heads, amenities etc.

#5

***How can reasonable distance be easily and consistently communicated across Ontario (e.g. standard signage to navigate riders to connections between one trail head to the next)?***

- Standardized signage works in other Jurisdictions, as well as for the OFSC, so it should work here.
- We may have to develop new signage, or copy those used elsewhere.

#6

**Should ORVs that meet an industry standard (i.e. 2-up ATVs, side-by-side ATVs, UTVs) only be considered for on-road access? Or should others that do not meet any industry standards also be considered? Please explain.**

- All vehicles that are capable of meeting Transport Canada regulations, can be insured with standardized policies and plated by the MTO should be allowed.
- This includes vehicles with 2,3,4 or more wheels, steered with handlebars, steering wheel or steering levers; Off-road motorcycles, all ATV's, UTV's argos etc.
- Off-road motorcycles(ORM's) should definitely be on the list; they meet industry standards
  - o Most cases the operator is already currently licenced to operate a motorcycle on the street.
  - o logical to allow a licenced and trained operator of a motorcycle to operate one of their bikes on the street; a bike that meets industry or Provincial/National standards.

#7

**If the ministry were to extend on-road access to other ORV types, should there be passenger restrictions for operating on-road with an ORV operator (e.g. no passengers or limiting the number of passengers and passenger-age restrictions)?**

- The main requirement should be the same as for passenger cars and motorcycles; not more passengers than there are OEM seats
- All passengers should be utilizing all required safety equipment.
- For extra small passengers on 4, 6, 8 wheeled vehicles, the same requirement should be as for cars: safety seats, harnesses etc.
- For certain vehicles that can't support a safety seat, such as standard ATV's, motorcycles etc., the child should be old and large enough to be able to self support.
- Additionally, passenger aids could be employed to improve safety; backrests etc.

#8

**Do you have any concerns with allowing "single-rider" ATV, or other ORV, use on Crown land roads within a municipality?**

- Crown Land rules should be maintained as is.
- All ORM's and ORV's should have access under the current status quo.

#9

**What should be the minimum operating age for off-road use? Please provide a rationale with your comment.**

- No minimum operating age.
- Child should be able to comfortably reach and operate all controls on age appropriate machines.
- Recommended that child have some type of accredited training.
- Proper supervision should be in place.
- Supervision should be active supervision, not passive (supervisor is actively involved in the activity, not preoccupied with another task).
- Possibly supervisor should also have some type of training how to properly supervise, ie they should be knowledgeable in 'how' to properly supervise this activity.

#10

**What should be the minimum operating age for on-road use? Please provide a rationale with your comment.**

- Ideally the rules should be consistent with snowmobiles.
- Compelling reasons to allow underage ORM and ORV riders road access in certain situations;
  - o Snowmobile trails have a lot more flexibility in where they can be placed in the winter, allowing younger operators direct trail linkage and access to amenities etc.
  - o This is usually not the case in the Spring/Summer/Fall.
  - o Many families with ORV/ORMs in warmer months are presented with a difficult situation when out on the trail, as some road travel is required for trail linkage or access to amenities.
- The State of Michigan has the following rules to address this: *"A person under age 12 may not operate an ORV on a street or road. A child age 12, 13, 14 and 15 may operate an ORV on a road under the direct visual supervision of an adult and has in their immediate possession an ORV safety certificate. Children younger than 16 may not operate a 3-wheeled ORV or an ORV wider than 60" on a road. A child age 16 or 17 may operate without direct visual supervision provided they have a valid drivers license and an ORV safety certificate in their possession. Michigan will recognize an ORV safety certificate issued by other state or a province of Canada."*
- Consistent rules with neighbouring jurisdictions should be very helpful for everyone.

#11

**How should “adult supervision” be defined for riders under the age of 12 years?**

- Adult supervision should consider;
  - o The adult participating directly in the activity, or actively directing the activities of the children & are not pre-occupied with other tasks.
  - o Can keep the children in sight and/or accessible at all times.
  - o May be necessary that supervising Adults are trained in best practices for supervision of children on ORM's or ORV's.
- Children learn best and are safest when they can observe and follow an adult (properly trained) doing the same activity.

#12

**Should “adult supervision” also be required for riders between the ages of 12 and 16 years?**

- Yes, in public areas that are non-closed course.
- For closed course activities or private property, the definition and requirements could be different.

#13

**Should there be additional rider requirements for young riders both on-road and off-road (e.g. requiring the use of size-appropriate ORVs)?**

- All children should be on age, size and skill appropriate ORMs and ATV's, ORV's
- Training?

#14

**Should mandatory training and testing requirements be in place for riders under the age of 16 years or should mandatory training and testing apply to all riders? Should training include a practical on-vehicle component?**

- It could be helpful
- Properly implemented
- If road access is considered for under age riders?
- Utilize Associations and Federations for direction on this, they have expertise

#15

**Should a certificate be created similar to the [Motorized Snow Vehicle Operator's Licence](#) to accommodate drivers who are too young or decide not to obtain a driver's licence?**

- It could be helpful.
- Properly implemented?
- Especially if road access is considered?
- Utilize Associations and Federations for direction on this, they have expertise.

#16

**Should mandatory training only be required for certain operating tasks (e.g. on-road use, carrying passengers)?**

- For road use, perhaps a basic road knowledge course if the person doesn't currently have a Drivers licence.
- Perhaps all operators under 16 may benefit from some sort of standardized training.
- Anyone who supervises children could be trained as well.
- For operators 16 and over, some type of accredited recognized training could be beneficial.
- Consultation with recognized Associations and Federations such as the OFTR, OFATV for direction would be recommended.

#17

**What role do you think the government should play in rider training (e.g. approve curriculum-based standard, outline instructor qualifications, etc.)?**

- The government should work with recognized organizations such as OFATV, OFTR, etc. for direction
- to understand which training is appropriate and which should be standardized and what should be included.
- Help with education and safety programs
- Help financially