

SnowTRAC Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

August 25-26, 2011

Thursday, August 25th

ATTENDEES:

SnowTRAC Members Present:

Mark Wilke (MW) – Chair, Southeast Alaska
Joe Gauna (JG) – Co-Chair, Anchorage
Steven Enochs (SE) - Fairbanks
John Scudder (JS) - Anchorage
Bill Luth (BL) – Mat-Su/Copper River Basin
Eric Morris (EM) – Western Alaska
Gary Anderson (Tinker) – Kenai Peninsula/Valdez/PWS
Cynthia Hite (CH) – Mat-Su/ Copper River Basin
Andy Morrison (AM) – Inter-Board Liaison

DNR Staff:

Ed Fogels – Deputy Commissioner, DNR
Ben Ellis – Director, DPOR
Darcy Harris – State Trails Program Coordinator, DPOR
Steve Neel (SN) – Grant Administrator, DPOR
Justin Wholey – Natural Resource Specialist II, State Trails Program, DPOR
Jessie Meybin – State Trails Program, Minute-Taker, DPOR
Kyle Kidder (Kidder) – Alaska Department of Fish and Game
Sally Davies (SD) – Grant Administrator, DPOR
Karlyn Herrera (KH) – Chief of Administration and Grants, DPOR

Public Present:

Dan Mayfield (DM) – Big Lake Trails
Kevin Hite (KH) – President, ASSA
George Woodberry (GW) – excavation, Big Lake (Iron Dog, Big Lake Trails)
Vern Monet (VM) – Recreational cabin owner at Big Lake
Pat Daniels (PD) – Alpine General Services
Jenny Daniels (JD) – Alpine General Services
Scott Mueller (SM) – Resident, Big Lake
Craig Christiansen (CC) – Recreational cabin owner at Big Lake
Cathy Mayfield (CM) – Board member, Big Lake Trails
Dan Kruse – President, Big Lake Trails, Inc.
Orville Wenholz (OW) – Groomer, Big Lake Trails, Inc.
Eileen Stackhouse – Recreational cabin owner at Big Lake
Wayne Stackhouse – Resident, Big Lake
Debra McGhan (DMG)– NAOI Exec.

INTRODUCTION:

Mark Wilke makes OFFICIAL CALL TO ORDER: 8:30am

Round table introductions, starting with board, then state, then public attendees.

Ellis: I would like to thank everyone on the board. I was on a board down in Kenai, I can tell you it's a lot of work and sometimes you wonder if anybody's listening. I've got empathy. I've tried to go to every advisory council we have in the state... not a one-time thing, but as much as possible to interact with the group. Unfortunately I have to pop in and out today, but I wanted to introduce Darcy, replacing Bill Luck. She will be an integral part of the state working with you. I support the possibility of the snowmachine fee increase, along with other issues that try to promote this fantastic sport I love. One of the nice things about this job, I've gotten out to areas I've never been to before.. and I am looking forward to going out with different clubs. Please give me a holler if you've got a club I'd love to come out

We've got 16 advisory boards under division: some commissioner, some director... they share the same goal.. to provide user input into state parks as we are attempting to address issues as responsibly and logically as we can with the best guidance possible. This is where advisory boards come in. A lot of times in outdoor issues we will have feelings, were in these things because we're passionate. The one thing this government is very big on as well as the commissioner and myself, as we go through these big decisions, we have respect for peoples opinions.. even if not in agreement, it is important to respect the voices and there might not be answers as quick as you want, but we will work through a process that fits the position. We will provide the staff to be able to provide input, the advisory board runs the show, but we have players from our side, Wayne Biessel, Karlyn Herrera. She was there at the ORTAB meeting earlier this month. We'll try to give you the details and facts so you can make the best decision possible. I look forward to getting info from this group. Please pick up the phone, if you have a concern or interest, please contact me. Tomorrow morning I think, if possible, our dep. Commissioner Ed Vogels would like to stop by. Ed's in Palmer today because he wanted to bring a message more directly.. he was at the last ORTAB meeting and wants to talk about issues of motorized access. He is just a very, very good person as far as being able to work with. Fortunate to have him on the commissioners office. I know you have a lot on your plate, if you have any questions please speak up.

AM: What are your impressions of how the snowmobile program in AK is shaping up?

Ellis: Kind of worried, I went up to Fairbanks and saw how much of a trail system they have. I'm used to Caribou Hills, etc.. that are more open. I know some of you have worked on these east-west trails, I think we're on the verge of developing a very sophisticated trails system, both the lower 48 idea of trail systems, but also there's room for the AK idea of highway systems.

This is something that this state and administration is very supportive of. Whether you are hauling logs to your cabin, or whether you're out on a family ride, or whether it's a bunch of go-getters and you're going over Valdez Pass on some kind of wild adventure, it's all access the way I look at it. I'm very interested in providing that type of access to our resources.

AM: how do you feel about registration increases, fee increases? I know we're drawing on a lot of different pools of money. Maybe your thoughts on a state-wide connecting trail system... any other forms of revenue, like gas tax?

Ellis: I love the interlocking trail system, administration very supportive of that, we would make it an initiative of the commissioner on funding. Two sources of funding: one through ORTAB is federal funding through the Transportation Bill, which is under heavy federal scrutiny... no guarantee if that will stay at level it is or if it will be there at all. All ORTAB, other than staff time, is 100 percent federal, and that goes away. Then we deal with going to our legislature and having some kind of funding source. Shaky at this time... Senator Murkowsky.. Its pretty dire, things are going to get cut. I encourage like-minded people to keep talking and communicating with their delegation about how critical that federal funding is. On SnowTRAC, we have the \$250,000 based from snowmachine registration fee. My position is that unless the governor's office decides they will introduce a bill or places it in the Division budget; my direction is I'm neutral on it. Doesn't mean I'm against it, it means its more the responsibility of the user groups to move forward, talk to legislators, we would like to do this, this is what the money would be used for.. that office contacts me, we would be in dialogue... if I'm contacted by a law-maker I'm required to respond. I wouldn't necc say we are in support of that, but probably would say we are in need of "x,y, and z". As the SnowTRAC advisory, this group could easily create a 'here is the need; here is how we would like to go forward. I know in the past, we as an agency have talked about a certain amount of increase fee. Whatever this board decides and wants to move forward with is what we will respond to. We won't be for or against anything, but we will respond if you bring it up to legislature. It becomes a discussion between user groups and the legislature.

AM: What your thoughts are about getting portion of state gas tax for trails?

Ellis: Don't know enough about it to give definitive answer. I would be interested in getting some thoughts and ideas to me about how it would work. It would take legislative measures. I don't know enough about it now... I know there's probably a model within the boating safety program "sport fish gas, dollars... goes into that particular user group program" ...could be modeled here I would assume

AM: Your thoughts on the grooming pool... where we might be with dwindling stack of applications... some going to regional, etc.

Ellis: I'm going to look toward the board and Darcy for guidance on that, because I have tried to understand that (8 month on job, came in January when everything was moving along) what we may be doing to cause that, what we could do to encourage more applications. With Darcy on board, we could have very pos working relationship. Mine and commissioners' intentions that we move forward in very positive and productive way. I hope that over time I will have an answer for you, and over time the group will help me find what the answer is. I just again appreciate the time, effort and energy, for you and the public coming out, for you to make a very positive impact on this sport that I love.

MW: Additions to agenda: Late applications...

MW: Any public comment on non-agenda items?

SE: Where are we on filling the vacancy? I would still like to see another member from Fairbanks.

MW: Trails coordinator and State Parks will recruit new member. We have pretty good lay out procedures on process of hiring.

We decided not to fill the ADA guy because we should all fill those requirements, so didn't need specific position.

JG: 1 from southeast, 2 from anchorage, 2 from Matsu/copper, 1 Kenai, 1 western, 2 Fairbanks (one vacant)

AM: We got some bridges down in Turnagain Pass, Iditarod at least 1 million spent on bridges connecting Turnagain Pass, Johnson Pass. Closer to the road system, this was basically Ted Stevens working on getting that first national historic trail, cutting a foot trail right now right up turnagain pass... we as snowmobilers got a trail that cut through the trees.. bridges 10 ft wide... no railings. We'll see, there's no grooming plan in place down there yet

BL: I was contacted about ranger district down there about grooming and what equipment would work.

AM: They didn't understand the type of equipment they needed.

WB: Will the trail be operational this year?

AM: I think, yes, for the most part the trail was already cut in to trails that already existed, also on state land the forest service cut a trail down to Ingram Creek. Efforts to put it into an easement. Hasn't been used much, something we might be able to push.

Ellis: That's a recommendation that needs to come from this council

SE: I've said that probably the best thing that they could do down in Chugach NF is to build a loop trail... nice motorized experience down there. Usually they'll acknowledge the idea and that's about it. I feel like closer to anchorage it's those family style recreation experiences we're missing.

Also notice that we don't have any apps from rural Alaska. I know most of us right off road system and thinking about rec experience rather than life/death. Getting real passionate about rural areas and locals. Don't want to get into conversations where we miss how big the state is. Grooming out there is a foreign concept.

MW: In the past we've gotten a lot of rural requests: rescue gear, shelters... pretty much dried up, we need to fix that

AM: We talk a lot about seasonal marking on trail. Used to put reflectors, now we put stakes up... one question I posed in rural AK is that we need uniform signage. Put one stake by river and kind of go by stake. International standard is put two stakes to define trail within. Tripod system, etc...

JG: Well if they don't ask we don't know to give them the money. If the folks don't ask for it they're not going to get it.

SE: Quick thought on tripods... quick and less man power way in long run. Put it up some winters, it's coming down in spring. You have to really pick where you put a tripod. If it's in a stable condition... best in the long run. Stakes come down and have to go back up next year.

TZ: Maybe there's been a turnover of people who were involved in it, and no one knows about it now... maybe we need to get the word out somehow to get the newspapers out in western and northern Alaska

AM: The process is intimidating too.

MW: Our application needs to be 4 pages and we need to move along.

SE: RS2477... is that an issue here in the Anch; Mat-Su bowl area... we have lots of issues in the southeast with this.

JG: Probably most misunderstood mining law... people have so many ideas about what it is and most of them are wrong. DNR has good info on website. This can benefit us in a lot of ways... important fact for Alaskans

SE: Fairbanks North Star Borough tackling those issues...

JG: Where commissioner and state can help to push as RS2477s

MW: Lists trails that have been nominated... the more you find out about it the more excited you get and then you find stuff that isn't true

When we return we are going to go into the Big Lakes issue. We'll have a public comment session, so if you're here to talk about Big Lake you'll have a chance.

MW: Final decision on Big Lake is NOT A SNOWTRAC decision... more likely decision for State procurement office... this is the first time we've had competing organizations going for grooming pool money... not for profit vs. commercial business... learning process for you and for State Parks

KevH: We do have 2 competing grant requests... lot of history lot of people involved back and forth. Put down what I thought were goals for today. 1 define SnowTRAC's scope of responsibility 2 define Parks scope of responsibility 3 we have two strong reps from Big Lake and want to give them area and time to give their thought processes and proposals 4 SnowTRAC and DNR plan to get this resolved... not happening today, but we need decision process or plan.. get this done quickly as we can, but right 5 plan forward, put this process in motion... so the next time this happens there is a process and procedure in place for dealing with the grant. They've asked me to be the whipping boy, so if I choose a place to get beat on; this would be as good as any. Our advocates: you decide who wants to go first?

DM: Pat can go first

There were complaints/friction about performance (have documentation of good and bad performance). Doesn't seem to be a resolution... two somewhat familiar grants competing will go to state procurement process. We don't have a set standard for trails in Big Lake, Kenai, etc... that is a BIG BIG gap in our organization

WB: We have had competitive groomers... but in that case they were all commercial.

KevH: One of the gaps that keep us from getting to the EVALUATION or INSPECTION process is that we have no set standards. Grant scoring process is different evil system than grooming pool. Bad situation b/c somebody's going to lose, but good opportunity to deal with these larger SnowTRAC issues.

KH: Introduces herself. First of all, I have discussed this with our procurement officer -

MW: Excuse me, we have set out an agenda and we're going to stick to it. We have already outlined a time (towards the end of the day) for the state or financial explanations.

KH: Trying to save you time because it would save effort... some of this won't matter in procurement process

Big Lake Discussion/Presentations

PD: I'm a resident of Big Lake, property in Willow, came here in 2008. This information here I'm handing out, I've owned multiple companies in NV, have a general contracting and framing company... don't want to overinflate anything. I have my business resumes here. In NV I also have a race team that we race on. I also brought the rough draft proposal from last year that got turned around negatively to the community. I think we have been played against each other in manipulation. We had a Big Lake clean up in spring because the trails were so bad. We have trails that don't lead to nothing, that end on public roads. The entrances of our trails caution bad roads use at your own risk. I'm not the best at this public speaking thing, I'm a little passionate. Thank you for the opportunity. I'm probably over prepared and over passionate for some. As long as the information is coming out and being communicated it is good. I believe that this is more than free grant money. Funds came from fee from something or somewhere... grooming should come best quality, best price. Thank god we have room that's open, there are plenty of people that will step out of box to choose what is right, not which side, but what's best. I have supporters (names few). This is just a restart plan... should only take couple years, already working for multiple companies in Big Lake top ten points. 1= 2010-11 grant states "grooming practices and trails that are being ignored" for pres big lake trails, not a community club or non-profit organization. During the last Big Lake meeting he made it clear by saying to his wife as another member asked me a question, "he doesn't get to speak, he's not a member". As I left he said "where is your next AGS meeting, id like to attend" 2=maintenance, gas, etc. lack of time and plan for trail maintenance, trail slopes ravines, turns, brushing, etc. Trail trash cleaning and junk control removal. Real situation is it's not our land. Big Lake has comprehensive trails plan... BLT should do it as club, not because they have to. Miles of trails that could work with minimum work that could serve community very well. No equipment (brush saws, etc.) that goes out. Groomers with too much drag pressure, equip too big for time of year and snow conditions. By losing last 11,000 dollar match they have, they purchased another groomer this year through ORTAB. 2=Newsletter, picture posting grooming entire trail of 11, Jan 15..grooming and signs on trail 4, Id like someone to go to website and pull up pictures. All they did was put same picture on diff screen/diff date. Inspections prove its not being done. Were taking and submitting grants from the community and not providing them the quality trails they're paying for. Alaska State Trails Seminar, tried to address these issues again, we asked again to be considered for membership, part of the board, part of grooming standards and procedures to implement in Big Lake... I've got so much info 10 minutes doesn't cover it. Thank you very much. Three decades worth of maps, btw.

DM: Thank you for inviting us to speak today. Best the trails have ever been... main response we are getting from community. Lots of folks we deal with were part of writing the 'Big Lake Comprehensive Plan'. Identified lots of things we needed to do. Lots in danger, need to be preserved, lots didn't have agreements... figured was 10 year project. Work on specific needs... brushing, trail condition, education. Developed organization 2007-08, got official 501c3 designation in Oct 2008. Worked with Mat-Su Trails Org to get grant through them to get money for Big Lake bypass trail on Iron Dog... we were successful in completing that under budget. Big Lake trails present big plan unanimously endorsed by the assembly... part of our original plan. BL trail purchases – 2 groomers and 5 foot drags. Completed Iron Dog Restoration Process sooner and under budget. In May 2010 gave testimony to railroad to protect system from railroad work (also on plan) in July in coop with Mat-Su Borough, got funds for survey of trail system, they received money just last year, we assisted them with completing that. In Nov we bought a 2002 Skandic and 2 heavy equip groomers... Snow Cat and Bombardier. One of the things I wanted to mention is that of 2011 Big Lake trails is the biggest service organization in the BL area... we did not get there by not performing.. we got there by doing what we said we were going to do. Quick pictures of our equipment... Polaris, Tucker Sno-Cat, Bombardier Ski Dozer (some maintenance problems last year, refurbished now. We are really connected to community, esp. by the recreation plan, chamber of commerce, community council. Our board members work with an awful lot of people... cooperatively with other people. Members of community council, chair and members of water quality, land access, memorandum agreement to coordinate other comm. Groups, Alaska Trails, chairman of United Way, Red Cross, Mat-Su Parks and Rec.. point is obvious. Also local business operators, national corporate leaders... our group is volunteer group and we make a difference in other peoples lives. Concerns and solutions: signage last year (examples of signs, trail 14, 14, 6), last year we put over 200 new signs on trails 3, 4, 11, all those trails are fully signed, including red and green markers. We use the boy scouts to put up those signs. We found snowmachiners consider some stakes to be targets, so we put up Carsonite signs... no reflectors yet... easy fix, we'll put them up this year. We signed trail 14 to gas like. Quick example of signage plan for Houston Loop Trail. Quality of grooming seems to be big issue. Were towing around 3400 lb drag and that's what trails look like when you do that. We got a guy here saying he's been traveling trails since 60s said they've never been better, guy who lived there 30 years says never been better, etc, etc. Last year we had 34.7 inches of snow, we had strangers and neighbors alike who were content with trails. Have to look back at what Big Lakes was before. Those of you interested in conclusion there are print-outs on the table.

KevH: This part now opens for public testimony. Limit each person to 2 minutes please

GW: Live out at Big Lake and have couple businesses, avid snowmobiler, and race. I hear both sides of the clubs. I'm more familiar with DM side of it because of community prospect meetings. I see the comparison of the statements, but I don't know what type of grooming equip is going to be available for BL trails. Very specific on what type of grooming, signage. Both parties said this is not going to happen over night. Going to take a lot to make trails better... no reflectors... some have no signage... frequency of grooming. I volunteered and several other individuals to participate... training to go through (community effort) like the prospect of community involvement. Monday – Thursday schedule. Leaving no conflict between this and Snowmachine.

VM: Have rec cabin and go involved helping Big Lake trails. My basic philosophy was have place and don't like riding bad trails. Was there when a lot of grooming was being done as a volunteer. Seeing people riding trails and having nothing but good things to say about it. Something that hasn't been brought up is Iron Dog trail has a bunch of races, so as soon as they happen it's not groomed any more. I think they've been going through growing pains, I think the equipment is right for conditions, you can't use tiller, not enough snow. Dan would attest to passion about this... Big Lake has so much to offer... lots to connect together... connect Houston to Big Lake to Nancy Lake to Willow. Prior to Big Lake, rode in Willow all the time. Condition of ground underneath trail dictates how the trails going to be when people ride on it.

CC: Army National Guard, past director of Fur Rondy. Speaking on behalf of BL trails, they have improved over last year and will continue. Trails are best I've seen them in years... and you get value added when it's a non-profit it adds a lot of benefits... area businesses, local events, volunteers, community and chamber of commerce meetings. I would ask for your consideration of facts and longevity rather than presentation and passion of things

WS: Have cabin on the north shore of Big Lake. Can't overstate, the condition of trails around like are absolutely impeccable. Impossible to get my wife out on trails and this past one she enjoyed it! Signage was significantly improved. Would encounter grooming crew sometimes on trail, can't express how much crew has done... plan on keeping snowmachine in cabin and look forward to this year.

OW: First time I snow machined on Big Lake was 1970. Took daughter and was going to go riding but we had to come back because it was so bad. Now we live off grid in Horseshoe area, and when they started grooming I volunteered

SM: Also volunteer with BL trails... awesome what groomers did last year... looks like you're on pavement machine, beautiful. Trying to get kids from our lake to big lake, we put in a trail section between trees, now it's a super highway. There's many of us who are with the BLT

that are involved with other aspects of BL community volunteering, and we're all concerned about what's going on with this situation.. we don't think you would get same benefits from commercial company

PD: Not trying to offend, first person I would like to address: Vern has money to be made from Big Lake as public member, the other gentleman if he can second it doesn't really matter... you were the conversation that got interrupted in the meeting. Diff between non-profit and profit, don't know how that works. For profit means you've figured stuff out, it's your business, so you know stuff already. How do you get same quality from non-profit that only operates on weekends?

DM: I'm just going to take the opportunity to cover the last slides... wanted to touch on future of deliverables... one thing you can look forward to is a \$44,000 dollar grant for another groomer, so that will be an addition to our equipment.. and comes with a compactor, plus the hydraulics are set up so we can use our other drag. Also can carry 4 passengers. Extra value from non-profit: in deal where we're going to sign deal for big piece of land between BL and mud lake... the mental health trust will NOT allow a profit org to do this, only a non-profit. Work with railroad on impact of trails, safety concerns on Deadman hill, brushing plans on Iron Dog. Thanks!

VM: We call them trails, but much more than rec. trail... we use this to bring goods to our cabins

SNOWTRAC BOARD COMMENTS

MW, PD

MW: You're not asking us to purchase any equipment, 2 snowmobiles

PD: As a business, my understanding of it is truly in business I would give scope of work...

BL: You've got bid for 18,000 dollars, all per hour over 500+ hour operation

PD: This is a minimum amount of time and minimum amount of hours that anything would be done. There's a catch here. A lot of the grooming that was done last year was done by me because they are non-reimbursed trails. I have this accumulated info and type that I donated to community because trails weren't reimbursable. Rightfully we would have put it in as a bid for a contract, not a grant.

MW: Two sibs and drag grooms is it possible to groom those trails with just snowmobiles

(room responds with negative noises, "not Iron Dog," etc.)

PD: I was going to fund the Tuckers last year for Big Lake. We can do that this year... I know that our system is in a big issue of snowfall, we don't have enough of it so small equip is the way to groom with, not big equip

SE: One of first things I got involved with in the board was understanding these grant requests... performance, performance... no one has an exclusive right to public money... when I look at these things I try to see what they want to do through poorly written grants on poorly written form... one of the nearest dearest things to me is public money.. and I don't get to look at performance, and it's a concern of mine that if I'm going to be a part of an entity that gives away public money, I want to make sure they are using it for what's intended... I don't care if it's for or non-profit... performance is what matters

Tinker: For Pat, how many hours with 2 sleds and drags in a week? How would you do this with many businesses?

PD: Don't have businesses anymore. Retired and blessed with time... summer I fly, winter I snowmachine

JS: What are the chances of dividing the area in half... N/S, E/W... that way if one operator equip breaks down the other could be contracted to keep the system up.

JG: Are you suggesting they get together, split the trails so they each get a portion of trails and work together to keep area open?

JS: Keep the trail system going

AM: Could create more of a conflict. Several operators could be grooming the same trail, but different groomers will have different ideas of how wide the trails will be, etc. It's hard when you have conflicting ideas on how to do it... but the main goal is to get the trails flat.

VM: Iron dog can NOT be done with snowmachines

KevH: State Parks, DNR, the floor is yours

WB: We would like to at least describe what the procurement process is. I'll let Karlyn speak first since she has more knowledge even though we

KH: Because there are two parties interested in the same area (same money). This group can decide what you want to say, how you want the work done... but you cannot decide who gets the job... not only are those 2 parties interested in it allowed to apply, when the public notice goes out, anyone could apply.. the 2 parties have to propose for the bid, but anyone else can too... basically it ends up being the same type of thing – kind of depends on what type of money involved.

MW: Who evaluates

KH: (names procurement specialist and producer) will basically select

MW: So it won't be based on the criteria this board sets out. We don't have the time or resources

KH: The trails coordinator will convey it and present it for you

JG: It's not you guys just sitting down yourselves

KH: Well it does involve the board, you're in here to discuss what you can give out and this one you can't do because it's become a procurement issue.

SE: If my obligation is to review grants... even if there's two competing grants I think it's our duty to score both grants

Ellis: You're more than welcome to score.

SE: Well I did

Ellis: What we're trying to say is that your ability to recommend is not there right now. What we're trying to say is that instead of scoring, there is absence of input from the advisory council. We will do the very best we can to scope the RFP. Joe is saying yes, we want as much input because we've never done this before and number two we want info from the user groups. If it goes forward and there are two competing requests, it is my responsibility to create the best RFP (if that's the vehicle). All we're asking is that if this council wants input we're asking for guidance.

SE: I've been in an RFP before years ago on the state side, but my follow up question is that you submit this RFP and everybody submits and you look through them all and you pick one. You go through the requests and you choose somebody. So are you awarding the grant?

KH: The procurement officer will award the grant

JG: Because it's not a grant anymore?

KH: it's a contract. But it still comes from the SnowTRAC grant

TZ: You're still going to allocate what the funding is from that area... when the RFP goes out; it will not exceed what you have decided... the bids cannot come in higher than that. Lots of talk about commercial vs. non-profit operator, one big factor is MATCH. Volunteer, time... like the rest of our commercial operators, they bill, and that is in-kind services. There has to be match provided,

DM: The merits of resetting the clock and opening it up again... to me, what benefit does that do... you might as well go to every one of these organizations as well. Both groups are being put back to the beginning of process. Is there an inherent prejudice against us?

MW: Every entity in the state had an opportunity to fill out app. For funds.

KH: It's all in how it's written

JD: Whatever contract you decide to award, how does the board know how much money is going out?

KH: We decide today and put the cap on it, and then it can't go over

MW: In the past, we've had a big grooming pool of dollars. If we've had a low snow area we can apply it to others, if we award any of these a contract, we lose that money. So can we take money away from the contract that's been awarded?

TZ: We can take money from other grantees; we can take grant money and add to contract, but not contract money from grant

KH: This one will still be a GRANT. We will have to go through a contract process, but it will be a GRANT

KevH: At this point the next issue we have is concerned participants in this issue

DM: I'm a little concerned that both of our groups will be disenfranchised from this process. The state knew about this months ago. Yesterday, I got an email saying we're doing an RFP. So we leave the whole community of BL hanging while we wait. There has to be a 21 hour waiting period. I would ask that you folks look at this scoring criteria to line up, look at equalization.

TZ: The scoring criteria will not be exactly like it is on the score sheets. And

DM: Last year we knew who was getting funding at the end of the meeting.

TZ: As soon as the board allocates the funding, the grant team will get together, I don't see why this wouldn't go to procurement by the end of September.

TZ: The Big Lake folks are going to get their stuff groomed, just don't know by whom yet.

AM: There's a lot of attention to the trails in BL. Lots of people involved, if we start doing this competitive business process and if we start bidding lower and lower were going to lose some of the volunteers and passionate people involved in the process.

GW: My concern also falls in with the volunteer process and the org is out there judging from past processes and becoming better each time. My concern is that by the vetting process of having two people... it would be unfortunate to the community on both sides. You can't use the vote from the committee... just by the paperwork in front of you. We're all here to contribute to say yea or neigh to each others sides and then the board forwards it on to the granting process, but it doesn't sound like that's what's happening this year

TZ: The procurement officer, he goes out and checks safety gear, past performances....it is a huge process and it takes weeks to pull all that information together. It's a BIG deal. Not just looking at the paper. Of course, it goes into his basket and gets dealt with in order, but he knows its going to be a long process.

KevH: I'm going to let the co-chair go, and then we can get on to the grants

1--Define SnowTRAC scope of responsibility= grading the grants per the numbering system that's in place now and assist DNR for writing the RFP to procurement for the decision on who gets to groom

--**MW:** Recommend allocation of funds to an area

AM: We don't have 2 grants in front of us, just one

JG: We have requests for grooming pool funds, not grants

AM: Had to ask Bill about this in the past... need application for new groomers

JG: NO, to add trails to the grooming pool, you need an application. If you just want to groom existing trails, you don't need the full application

DM: Bill did indicate that Pat had to fill a new proposal for entrance to the program

2—Define States scope of responsibility= write RFP to present recommendations to procurement officers, Procurement officer

AM: People forget that there's a telephone, too many assume we all check our email (directed to me)

KevH: I would like to see a time or date set, a time line for having that created for us.

MW: we ought to take the expertise from this board and have one or two of us guiding

CM: I have problem with BL being on committee since he has bias with AGS

GROOMING COMMITTEE as source for RFP (Joe, Cindy, Tinker)

WB: We will help you with procurement process, we'll take the big lake model that you've been doing for years, and we'll blend it in with the Hatcher Pass RFP scope. If you can get the scope to the p. officer, he can get it done rapidly.

DM: I don't know how you're going to resolve this, but you have an 11,000 lb. snow cat pulling a 34,000 lb. drag, how will you compare that with two snowmachines.

(hubbub starts about bias)

KH: (Gains order to room, threatens to clear out) Bill's not writing grooming criteria there are other members on this board, the state, there are many people you need to put your trust in that are making the decision. From this point forward, we need to look at the state for writing standards. Andre made mistake of asking what equip all groomers used....the performance and quality is what matters.

TZ: There is language built in to contract that says if the groomer fails to perform he will get deadline to improve, and if not, he will have the moneys and privileges revoked.

MW: On a personal note, I know Bill will be objective, no matter what side he's on

DM: We do have 30 years of empirical data that says Iron Dog cannot be groomed with sleds

BL: I can show you proof...

TZ: Regardless, he is SUGGESTING, the procurement officers and state will be writing

KH: We're back re-creating the wheel again, which we shouldn't be doing. There's a lot of attention in Hatcher. These will have to be inspected. They have to have somebody out there to inspect it... we can't take what he said/he said.

TZ: I get inspection requests and give them to rangers, who go inspect the operations... and no money goes to anyone until I get the results from them.

8/31/11 is DATE DECIDED ON FOR BIG LAKE COMMITTEE MEETING

CH: For two groups that are both passionate about the same area and activity, I think it's a shame that you can't get together and work it out. You both care about the trails at big lake and I would like you to try to work it out before we start this process.

TZ: Our committee here at the state didn't realize this was procurement... it wasn't until Wayne and I told them because they hadn't experienced the situation before. I apologize its going to take longer and you don't know who's going to get it, but it is what it is.

KH: I'll give both of you 2 minutes here

PD: Situation brought up, it has been addressed by me numerous times and they have all been turned down. Why is it that this issue is coming in front of the state? It's for this exact reason. I asked for a legit operating club that could do what is needed.

DM: I guess the way I can leave it with you folks is this: how would you feel if it was your organization? Put yourself in BL's shoes. I'm not going to go into what has happened between Mr. Daniels and the board and the community. Unfortunately it's turned into this... the board is very close to the community. We are the community... I can say we rep every single person. You cannot please everybody... and you def can't please someone with the motivation to not be pleased with what you're doing. If it was your organization, how would you feel?

MW: I want to personally thank everyone for coming out today. We've acted like adults and made some progress. We need to get moving and get these proposals started.

TZ: If more than one person or entity applies for a certain area... THIS IS GOING TO BE THE PROCESS... there shouldn't be a question of it from here forward

MW: I'd also personally like to thank Kevin. I think he was a little reluctant at first. At this point, I'd like to give everyone 10 mins to make contacts and talk around the room. Maybe layout the ground rules for grant scoring before lunch afterwards.

JG: Even if we get one bidder every year, this is good... we should be granting money for safety cabins, signage... requests for money to buy or do stuff... all grooming should be by contract like competitive bid

BIG LAKE

1-Scope of Responsibility SnowTRAC= (assist criteria for RFP-grooming committee, allocate funds to area)

2-Scope of Responsibility STATE= (create RFP, write contract, finalize criteria, send to procurement)

BREAK 10 MINUTES (BACK at 11:44)

BL: Makes motion to consider late application and make decision on whether to consider them

JS: seconds motion

TZ: Denali Highway Club, Lower Susitna River/Yetna River, Trailmix, Hatcher Pass, Petersville/Trappers Creek

CH: On minutes from last year, because SNOWMADS app was late last year, we had big discussion about new forms and decided to give them a break last year because of that. But we

definitely had a motion after that to never accept late applications again... and that motion passed. (reads quotes from last years minutes... vote was 8 for, 1 against.

TZ: Emails were sent out, some of the emails were incorrect... he did call and ask why he hadn't received anything. Media release sent out April 1st... it is buried... difficult to find. My suggestion for the future is that the grant team (I have list of all groomers and what they groom – sent out to all groomers before season... we get card back, we know they got it, and if they don't turn it in, they're SOL)

BL: We have new people in DNR this year... and snowballing effect of problems, so I think we should consider it this year... no one to call and remind of letter of intent

SE: We have more requests than we had funds. We had to place in priority... I would agree if there were issues above and beyond someone's control... I think we should consider looking at the late applicants; maybe it would help to penalize the ones that were late

JG: We didn't nick anybody last time... we found the funds

BL: My reason is because the state had so many turnovers this year with personnel, and club leaders changed over, so sometimes the wrong people were being contacted

Tinker: I got an email, press release, and then follow up phone call from Bill, was I the only one

AM: If we do decide to take a look or include these grants, how are we going to look at them?

TZ: Echols called last week and asked when he was asking when someone was going to contact him about submission

AM: How did we do on utilizing money last year? We allocated a bunch... did we use it all or have some left over?

WB: Mat-Su hasn't been involved so much, so I went through and tried to find it on state parks website and could not find it

MW: Andy you had strong feelings against accepting late applications)

AM: I think I was aligned with Eric or didn't vote

MW: Eric are you deadest against doing it?

EM: I think we're in jeopardy if we set rules and don't stick to them

MW: Someone put it in a sentence whether we're going to include applicants into the grooming pool or not? And can state parks reach out to those applicants that have not submitted this year, like Denali Highway?

BL: Being the fact that we have a way out for next year and the states having all sorts of problems getting the info out this year.

MW: Understanding our intent is to eventually not allow late applicants

MW: *Makes MOTION this round we accept the late application into the grooming pool, and ask the groups that have not submitted yet and have in the past if they would like to turn in an applications this year (10 days from Monday)*

A VOTE IS HELD:

8 for, 1 against

BREAK for LUNCH at 12:02... BACK at 1:07pm

SD: A lot of you will check out tomorrow morning, some of you will have later checkouts, so ill come back at 1 tomorrow again. I'll come back several times tomorrow, and those leaving Saturday just give your receipts to me as soon as possible and the faster you get them to me the faster you'll get the money back

MW: Let's go over the steps for scoring the grant. They've worked well the last two years; I'm hoping we all have the grants scored this year. If anyone has a conflict of interest, name it first. If the state has anything to add (easement issues, etc.) (anything that would influence our decision), and then we will open it to public comment from applicants. Answer any questions that board members might have, and keep on subject of the grants. We now have new information and we can revise our scores. Jessie you may not know this but you get to change the scores as we go along. Each grant is individual. Any members of the public here to speak specifically?

The following pages are brief overviews of the second round of new and existing projects submitted for supplemental funding through the Recreational Trails Grant Program that the Outdoor Recreational Trails Advisory Board (ORTAB) have ranked and scored. The summary of each project was created from information provided in each grant proposal for new grants. The initial project overview, coupled with the changes for additional funding, are summarized for each of the applicants with approved projects asking for more funding.

Comments from the Board members and the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation (DPOR) staff are included at the bottom of each project sheet. Comments have been recorded to provide the Board's rationale for scoring a each project. Motions to fund or not fund a project are included in each comment section.

The following projects are listed in order by a reference number. The projects were not reviewed by the Board in the order of reference number. They were reviewed by their rank (Score of 1-100) and category (Non-Motorized, Motorized, Diversified). The final scores determined for each project by the Board can be referenced at the end of this document in an Excel spreadsheet. In the spreadsheet, Board member scores were the only points to be averaged to create the final ranking for each project. DPOR staff scores were not included in the averages.

After completion of the ORTAB review process, scores and recommendations were provided to the DPOR Director, Ben Ellis, by the State Trails Coordinator, Bill Luck. On [REDACTED] the Director approved the ORTAB recommendations, and on [REDACTED] tentative award letters were sent to applicants. Project applicants currently await the completion of State Agency Review and final approval from our funding source the Federal Highway Administration.

1. **Big Lake – Alpine General Services**

- **Pat Daniels, Alpine General Services**
- \$18,815 (requested) / \$6,271.67 (match) / \$25,086.67 (total)
- DIVERSIFIED
- Remove weekend grooming, consistent weekly schedule, heavy duty steel grooming drag, updating existing signage, 10 new winter kiosks
- Project funds will pay for equipment, fuel, maintenance, signage, labor
- **Land Owners:** Mental Health Trust, Mat-Su Borough

Project Description: To provide a higher quality and more frequency of grooming to the State trails in Big Lake. To provide more emphasis of safety for the users, as well as provide and promote a better riding experience to all visitors coming out to the Big Lake recreational area

Discussed Above

2. Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers Trail Grooming

- **Gary Anderson, Caribou Hill Cabin Hoppers**
- \$0 (requested) / \$0 (match) / \$0 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- New trails with permits established, no new funds, established grooming pool funds plus volunteer hours, membership dues and gaming efforts such as pull tabs
- No funding requested
- **Land Owners:** Kenai Peninsula Borough

Original Project Description: CHCH is not requesting any additional funds for these trails providing established trails funds request is approved at requested funds. LOST CREEK, GOLD HILLS, JESSIE'S EXTENDED, BARRELL TRAIL, DEEP CREEK DOME

SnowTRAC Comments: (

CH: Moved application to Grooming Pool (9 for, 0 against).

JG: Any conflicts of interest?

Tinker: Conflict of interest (member of CHCH and volunteer groomer)

MW: DNR staff?

SN: I don't have any problems, don't think Teri does... they did get part of grooming pool last year

JG: Public comment

MW: Legal access on all these trails?

Kidder: Some are on application status but some are state land, others Kenai Peninsula Borough have signed off on them. It is one of the trail systems where establishing legal easements has taken years, and are getting to the point of getting the easement recorded is still in the books.

BL: So they still can legally groom that trail?

Kidder: Yes.

MW: There's a reference in here to Deep Creek Dome Trail for authorization only for summer non-motorized use.

Tinker: I can answer that, and yes on center plateau trail... Deep Creek Dome Trail... access fire cabins up there. The red line is the Deep Creek Dome Trail but Natives called it Center Plateau... Center Plateau trail is another trail already established. The non-motorized trail is the one that goes to fire access.

Kidder: That's an LHS, which is better than an easement

EM: So am I to understand you don't want to groom that fire trail

Tinker: No, guess she should put a sticky saying "not this one"

EM: So request to add trail to grooming pool

BL: With no extra money, actually cuts costs because it loops back... actually saves us money.

Tinker: Want to name them legally, add them to the state SnowTRAC Grooming Pool

EM: Do want to point out something to Tinker, know you didn't write the grant but there's no volunteer match on here. There's no value of grooming equipment that can count as a match. If it was rented, yes, but the value itself is not a match. You could claim the pickup truck cost as a match if you drove it there this way

Tinker: I think she listed it as value of what we own rather than needing the equip

JG: This brings up my? again about AHTNA. Does the easement clear riders; I just don't see it in the letter. You have an easement to groom that trail, but does SIRI also imply or add to that easement, because SIRI, like AHTNA, can shut off access to their land if they want

Tinker: Yes, because it's an LSH

JS: What about individual rider that goes off the trail onto individual land... riders restricted to trail?

(all say yes)

Kidder: Yes

Tinker: there are private property signs... river also limits where they can go. That's the other thing Cindy and I talked about in past years; this limits the trespassing issue on their other side lands. You get across the little piece and your right back on state land, just about ¼ of a mile.

MW: I'm fine with it

Tinker: Actually a lot of it has been signed by Snow Mads, Andre & Kidder

MW MOTION TO ADD Lost creek, gold hills, Jessie's Extension, Barrel Trail, and Deep Creek Dome TO SnowTRAC GROOMING TRAIL LIST

(not counting it as a grant, but we're turning in scores)

JG Seconds

VOTE 8 for, 1 conflict of interest

BREAK... BACK AT 3:50

SnowTRAC VOTE:

Wilke:

Gauna:

YES: _____ NO: _____

3. **Copper Country Winter Trail Grooming (Glennallen-Tolsona-Crosswind)**

- **Jerry Lesemann, Copper Country Snowmobile Club**
- \$6,000 (requested) / \$1,632 (match) / \$7,632 (total)
- DIVERSIFIED
- No detailed description but gives needed info, match funds from volunteer operator
- Funding to be used for tucker groomer rate of \$55/hour (includes fuel & maintenance), and snowmachines rate of \$15/hour (signage and light grooming)
- **Land Owners:** Ahtna, Inc.

Project Description: CCSC is requesting funds to groom winter trails located in the Glennallen-Tolsona-Crosswind areas. We propose to groom the trails 2 to 3 times a week over the winter depending on snow fall

SnowTRAC Comments: (

MW: Any conflicts of interest?

(no conflicts)

SN: We have never had them as a grantee before

(no public comment)

MW: Board discussion

Kidder: They have gotten permits on the AHTNA land before, since the BLM land is state selected, they get a concurrence from us.

BL: So all permits are in place for one year? As far as you can tell the permits are in place for the year

Kidder: Yes, they are covered

(JM looks for any other support letters, etc. none found)

JG: I see the permit for AHTNA to groom trail, but does that also allow them the use of the trail... riders

JS: When I was pres of anchorage snowmobile club, AHTNA sent us a letter that it was 50 per season, 10 per day, in order to ride on their land.

MW: Now they put signs up that say no trespassing

JS: So do we groom?

JG: Up in Cantwell and Broad pass, there are easements so they can't charge you... but the easement is on terrain that is so gnarly that there's a conflict because they can't stay on the terrain

Kidder: These trails being groomed are on that easement

MW: So AHTNA can't charge over the easement

BL: Your big parking areas are along the road or way... lots of access points

Kidder: Inspected Tolsona/crosswinds trailhead and there was an issue with parking at lodge, so they built extra parking next to a volunteer fire house. And there are signs for crosswinds/Tolsona at the access point.

JG: The easement satisfies me, but we have a one-year agreement, not ten

MW: But they can't because the land owner doesn't give those

Kidder: It's 10 years for public land, 5 for private

MW: If it's 17B then there's pretty much access forever

Kidder: But it's pretty much the drive-in and construction work access that needs to be permitted. 17Bs are purely access easements

MW: What about access across BLM lands, they don't address it in there

Kidder: In past years they worked with Glennallen, but now they're working with Justine McDonald at BLM. It looks clean from what I've seen... no right of way issues.

SE: When I was reading through, it is consistent with many applications... I just want to reiterate intent and experience (trying real hard for amateur group)... lets take into consideration spirit and intent... if they're trying to do something right, we should try to support it to the degree than we can

MW: Here it says 'detailed project narrative' they have nothing and there's 20 points

EM: Is this an application to add new trails to the grooming pool?

MW: I have to interpret as two-fold request... identify these as SnowTRAC trails, and give them money to groom. So maybe tell them send in returning grooming form next year. Add them to the trail list, which I have serious doubts about with the money we have

MW: last year we said we should concentrate on trails we have in pool, and not add more

CH: in 2001 we gave them a grant to survey trails

MW: let's assume then they do have legal access?

Kidder: yes. This is actually one of the easier areas, simple land ownership

JG: but they are not in the SnowTRAC grooming pool yet.

MW: have they proven to us these are legal easements? Are they going to be there year after year?
Does anyone know these people at all?

AM: doesn't sound like many of us have been up there. Seems like we're getting quite a bit of
volunteer match.

SN: actually match is wrong on budget sheet. It should be \$2,000

JG: 2 years ago we rode to crosswinds and someone had groomed it

BL: these guys have groomed it for free for years, hoping to get permits

JG: the benefit to the snowmobiler is most important. I'm not sure that grooming 3x a year is of max
benefit to the general public

SE: if there's less of a population, it shouldn't matter. Riders are riders, just because they're not in a
heavily populated area doesn't mean they don't deserve the use

BL: I think they could go into SnowTRAC, but what's the point if we can't fund them

MW: I remember discussion from last year about how if we add and add more trails it will dilute the
quality of the grooming

SE: I certainly have a difference of opinion in this area... I'm still concerned if we're not looking at
this in a fair play situation, then we're beginning to miss the point

MW: I don't think we actually need to score this one... we move to include these trails into the
SnowTRAC pool... they are legal trails. The decision to FUND will be on a year by year basis. I
would have no objection to adding them to the pool, and then we can see how many dollars
shake out year by year, and what they do with the funding they get

AM: I think its bad to get clubs to rely solely on grants to groom... however they do it, I think clubs
have lots of diff ways to raise money... taking a little more ownership of their own trails
they're riding on. I'm not sure the reg fee increase is going to go over. I think a lot of people
are putting up opposition to it... I think riders should support the organizations in their local

areas. When someone's putting effort into starting a volunteer organization. .. but maybe we need to pull some money out of Hatcher Pass... are they supporting themselves at all... or just riding on the state funds

MW Makes motion to move Copper Country Trails (5 mile trail, Crosswind Trail, Mile 175 Trail, Ewan Lake Trail) into SnowTRAC Grooming Pool.

BL: seconds motion

JG: my concern is that we as a group last year said we're not going to add any more trail... but if we add them in they'll come looking for more money

MW: what if we get in the situation where we don't get a drop of snow, and it gets dumped on up there

AM: I'd more push that we support the grant as is, and encourage them to apply next year too. We shouldn't penalize them because we're worried about future budget issues

CH: so we already added them to the grooming pool. (found file on her computer)

JS: page 18 of 22... description also includes signage. Are we buying signs or not?

MW Withdraws his motion, since it was already in Grooming Pool

CH Seconds motion

VOTED 8 for 1 against

AM thinks that it should be included as a grant this year

BL: so what do we do about the signs?

CH: it's to put the signs up though... gas and expenses

MW: I don't get the fact that they're asking for signs on here.

JM collects applications even though we are not scoring as application

4. Montana Creek Groomer Purchase

- **Ben Barclay, Montana Creek Motor Musers**
- \$12,500 (requested) / \$4,166.67 (match) / \$16,666.67 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- Funding will be used to purchase new wide track snow machine, similar to 2008 4-stroke Viking
- **Land Owners:** CIRI/Montana Creek Native Assoc., Mat-Su Borough

Original Project Description: Purchase of a new Wide track snowmachine to pull groomers.

Currently have 3 machines and one is approaching retirement and extensive maintenance costs. This new machine will maintain our ability to groom with three drags

SnowTRAC Comments: (

MW: any conflicts of interest?

(none declared)

JG: DNR information?

SN: they were awarded grant last year 4,000 and it was the only grant from last year that has not been done. Bill said there were permit issues. Don't know specific details... but \$4,000 have been obligated and is still sitting there.

MW: so not wrong that it hasn't been requested for reimbursement?

SN: not out of compliance. But there is \$4000 a year later that has not been obligated by me

Kidder: from the research I've done myself, it's tricky. It's a state-held easement that crosses native land... so got pushed to even smaller level. The state was holding and saying yes you can do the work with a land use permit, but also get native permission. So yes, go forward do the work, but let the Montana Creek Native Assoc. what's going on.

JG: the south fork Montana creek gang should be pursuing... so to a degree it's separated from this grant. And you encouraged them to contact the Native Assoc?

Kidder: yes, told them to write formal letter informing the Native Assoc to let them know activities and specifics

JG: is it inappropriate for the state to write that letter

Kidder: no, not exactly... I can give Ben Barclay a call

BL: it sounds like to me he didn't understand exactly what he needs to do

Kidder: I'll do that, and talk with Cliff and Candy and those folks

MW: so, public comments?

(no public comments)

MW: board comments?

JS: nothing current, all letters copied from past grants... support letters from couple years ago, no quotes

BL: I hate to say it but Ben knows he needs three quotes

EM: and there's no match

JG: ***MAKES motion to approve or not approve request.***

MW: would prefer we all turn scores in. pass scores up please

5. **Mat-Su Trail Marking**

- **Bruce Paulsen, Mat-Su Borough**
- \$6,275 (requested) / \$2,091.67 (match) / \$8,336.67 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- Only paying for signs... equipment, volunteer labor, fuel, maintenance are match
- **Land Owners:** Mat-Su Borough

Project Description: Purchase trail markers and signs for multiple-use winter trails, primarily used by snowmobiles. Mat-Su Borough will distribute the markers and signs to those trail groups and organizations who have signed agreements with the borough under the Trail Care Program. The trail groups will be responsible for installation and maintenance of trail markers and signs

SnowTRAC Comments: (

MW: any conflicts of interest?

(no conflicts of interest)

SN: one of the best applicants to deal with, always timely with reports and documentation. No problem at all

DM: just having worked with Bruce, have to say he's awesome... all in order, timely, good records, really good program; I can't encourage you enough to approve it

JG: I pretty much echo what Dan said, great grant but no budget

JG: there is a clarification of all the signs going to organizations for snowmobile signage?

JS: couldn't this be a safety and education?

BL: he likes to do a match because he likes the clubs to have to produce a match. He doesn't want to be a safety issue as much as he wants to get people out to do it

(all scored low because only odd pages went out)

BL: another clarification is that he calls to all the clubs and asks what they need and why. I'm sure he has the information detailed for us somewhere

CH: well, I score grants pretty hard and it's a 95 for me, so everything's there

MW: take time to make sure that everything you dinged it for is actually in the application

(take time to look back over app with all the pages)

MW: to those of you who go out and put out markers, are these consistent with state standards?

BL: oh yes

MW: there are lots of other signs places out there

BL: he uses Borough rules that say you need three bids

MW: score him lower then, so he'll know next year to include the bids if he has them

JG: if we think he should just put it in as a safety thing, we should let him know that

MW: turn them in

6. Iron Dog Snowmobile Safety Expo

- **Kevin Kastner, Iron Dog, Inc.**
- \$14,250 (requested)
- **SAFETY & EDUCATION**
- Project funds used for the cost of facility, equipment, project coordination, even communications and advertising
- Curtis M. Menard Sports Complex, Wasilla

Project Description: The primary purpose of the Annual Iron Dog Snowmobile Safety EXPO is to provide awareness to the public in snowmobile safety and education. Presentations and seminars have shown to be a strong means to accomplish this goal. With the inclusion of public safety organization, youth safety programs, industry vendors, and the distribution of educational materials, the EXPO reaches a vast and wide variety of the community. Iron Dog, Inc. will also conduct a public safety inspection of Iron Dog participant snowmobiles with required safety and survival gear. Strict safety standards are enforced for participant safety. The public will have the opportunity to gather educational information directly from the race participants.

SnowTRAC Comments: (

MW: any conflict of interests?

SN: no compliance issues. This is a safety and ed grant again

KK: I am the executive director. First thank you for taking the time to review the app. Some of you are familiar with the expo. I'm the new guy, took on the org last year. That being said, I think we've turned it around significantly. Been through it without grant last year, I'm hoping what I've written in application as my vision describes that. One thing that is key to note: in the past, safety was an add on, I plan to have it as a central focus. There are going to be actual demonstrations going on onstage as far as what training programs are coming up. Some partners have thrown some weight, and so now we have safety cards to distribute to the villages. So we really want to give stronger emphasis to safety. We have had some injuries... first thing we talk about is safety in our board meetings. I would like to see this happen at the EXPO. We don't ask our partners to pay a fee for the table, so that's why we need

money to run the thing. SO that's it in a nutshell, I think most of it's in there if you have questions I'm all ears

Am: student exchange program

KK: pilot thing I did last year, it's an urban role exchange.. 5 from King Career Center and 5 from Tanana... they come in and get to participate hands-on.. get to work on start of race. Then we take city kids and send them to bush Tanana.. experience dog mushing and other daily lives..; purpose is cultural, regional, geography... but really getting people who don't know what bush is to have that experience and take it home with them. Very minimal help last year, most came out of pocket... I heard some of the things you were requesting from NAOI and this is a good year for us to collaborate... together I think we can do that outreach.. and produce evergreen products.. making the investment so it has long and increasing value. After this year, I think next year we'll be addressing that idea. Great attendance last year... want something happening that they're going to pay attention to actively and passively.

AM: I know Iron Dog in these villages is huge. Riding through villages with these people the kids respect handing them safety information

KK: we also did ambassador team last year (National Guard colonel, etc... main mission public relation.. went ahead of time to shake hands and reach out). Went to school in Nome and did youth-oriented classes. Trying to do something this year that can be in hands.. some of it will get mailed out, some goes to ambassador team

AM: one thing I've heard in the past that villages feel race just goes through and they're supposed to do things for them but feel a bit used

KK: the whole point of that was addressed last year with the ambassadors and outreach, to tell villages we need them. Trying to expand the exchange program this year... expanding to 20 kids... safety is a message that is very easy to apply, now that Doyon is helping we can provide more concrete materials that talk about basics of snowmobile safety.

SE: while you were talking I was thinking about Iron Dog over the years and I don't know if my perception is along with the general publics.. I just saw it as a snowmobile race.. had no idea of the trail class, and all the other things that go along with it. I started finding out more and the club that I'm with in Fairbanks supports it , I started taking more of an interest, and last year I found there was a safety expo. Iron Dog offers a lot more than just a race. I would like to hear more about it.. I think more people need to hear about the full aspect

KK: last year was the first time we had it on live television. This year we intend to fully expand on that.. a lot of build up, lead up, getting to know the racers.. spend an awful lot of money this year to address the issue of getting the news out that we have these things going on. There's a lot of information that gets transferred in this one day event, because you can still come do the rookie workshop if you don't plan on racing. Here's what's coming, when its coming and what it's all about

SE: it's held in Wasilla, it's from public money, and I want people in Fairbanks to know

KK: we had volunteers take t-shirts up last year.. this year myself, other staff, snowmachine, and put effort into winter show in Fairbanks so people up there can get wind. We'll be right next to

compos so we're flush with supporting this part of the state.. we have a lot more to going out there as far as participation and support

MW: who are your sponsors

KK: still in negotiation stages.. still National Guard as title sponsor, Donlon Gold, all transportation provided, everyone who was involved last year will be back

MW: have they made a commitment

KK: NG can't commit to multi-year, so we expect from past performance that the funding will come no problem, but have to wait each year

MW: how many people at last years?

KK: 3,500 approximately.. at the expo was north of 2400. Tried to keep track.

MW: I personally have a problem with paying for one day events. I think if Iron Dog would like to come to SnowTRAC for money, I would like to see you asking to take money to the bush rather than blowing all the money in one day in a matter of 8 hours. I was really disappointed to not see one letter of support from one single snowmobiler... if you want to win this board, we need to see individuals saying I went to this last year and it was a really great event

KK: to be honest, it wasn't last year.. there was no existing organization basically.. this year I would like to prove if you do invest in this this year, you will get those kind of comments

JS: I've seen both sides of this I can remember back in the 80s when the safety check was held outside in the Wal-Mart parking lot. There wasn't too much safety going on in the Denali center the next couple years... but over the years more safety interaction going on. Looks like this year is focused on safety and that's good. Do have a problem with the application.. anything over 1000 dollars you have to have 3 bids. Facility and venue 5,000.. quotes for PC system were from last year.. and only one quote. Did the price go up, down, we don't know..

KK: we have to hire the guy, it's not just a PA system. Everyone want me to commit to 3 year deal, but I can't because we can't get 3 year sponsors.

MW: for one, I don't think he's the only one who does the service in town. By state limitations, you need to provide us with 3 bids. If you turn in a grant application and you don't have those three bids it really terribly effects your scores.

KK: I think we did two but we ended up with Marty because he was preferred.

JG: to clarify then, its 1000 that needs the bids.

SN: We ask for three, in some circumstances depending on what it is there are not three sources. But the request is for 3 bids for over 1000

MW: so the letter addressing the fact that you can't get three bids would suffice

KK: yea because for some things in the bush, there is really only one

SN: yes it does say 500 here, but it is supposed to be 1000

MW: any further questions for applicant?

AM: thank you for coming in here, it sounds like you're doing some great things

KK: thank you for having us. It will be easier to address the issues you've raised this year that we know now what presses your buttons

MW: the average rider really doesn't think that safety is that big of a priority because it's an individual thing. The public perception is very important for snowmobile community to see that safety is important. Turn in applications.

SN: (2:23pm) clarification on bids.. threshold of \$1000 applies to supplies, materials and equipment.. there is nothing online right now saying it's needed for contractors.

MARK CALLS FOR 10 min BREAK at 2:09pm

7. NAOI – Snowmobile Safety for Alaska

- **Debra McGhan, North America Outdoor Institute (NAOI)**
- \$15,000 (requested)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- Funds will be used to pay for labor, project supplies, program materials, marketing, and grant administration

Original Project Description: This project will begin with a statewide educational conference to attract and network snowmobile & avalanche instructors and those interested in becoming instructors. The conference will feature workshops and skills training for instructors to promote sharing and development of the most current and effective methods of instruction. This event will be followed by a public education training even which provides an opportunity for instructors to practice their skills and the public to learn from professional trainers. The goal of this project is to expand the pool of snowmobile safety instructors and encourage a culture of snowmobile safety.

SN: applicant is in compliance

SnowTRAC Comments:

Debra McGhan: what we are trying to do is bring people that are influential in the community of snowmobile enthusiasts, and try to encourage them to become snowmobile instructors. We have been using snowmobile safety people to teach sb safety training. The trouble is getting the info out to communities and organizations. When we do a project like this, we need to hear from you and get your input... we want to serve snowmobile riders. Snowmo safety conference, Alaska Avalanche info Center, Iron Dog, Arctic Man, APU... snow

conference in Nov before people get crazy... if you are snowmo riders interested in being an educator.. come to this conference and we can give the materials that can attract students through interactive fun lessons teaching the skills you need to be out there and safe. It starts with a conference, and then goes to events and communities around the state. The clubs and orgs that contacted us did get a program last year. So we want to hear from you. We've heard even from outside areas that want a snowmo program that is geared toward children. We need more riders as instructors so we can get these instructors out to these areas so they can serve the communities where they ride

AM: instead of reinventing the wheel.. come up with some consistency (curriculum).. something we can put out there that we can stand behind and put out there and provide for the public by a variety of means and information that is very cohesive

DM: last year we made a lot of progress towards a steady curriculum that meets that standard, and one of the measures we're taking this year is a peer review from around the nation... but we're doing these in a way where it is being effective. I'm here to rep the general public, I was born and raised in this state, and lost a lot of friends to snow accidents... I've been doing this for all the people I know and all the neighbor kids.. I don want to spend my time and the states money .. we need to look at what's being done around the world that we can adopt here in alaska.

BL: last year we were talking about what we wanted from the grant, and we were talking about getting people from these outer villages to come participate... so we actually asked her to produce this, we should remember

CH: what percentage of this money is going to the training?

DM: we've applied to Conoco Phillips and other agencies to do everything we need to do, we need 150,000.. to be effective and make impact we need the collaboration. Skidoo is considering sponsoring us, so that would make it stretch farther. We told Conoco we need to know by November, so we will know by the conference if we have enough funds and momentum to take it around the state. That's really the key is to get people in those areas to be in instructors.

JS: you did a great job bringing this.. its one of the best out of this whole bundle. I do see a little bit of problem. Now that I'm sitting on the inside, I have to protect the registration money. The users of the snowmobiles, it's their dollars. The type of users that benefit, you checked x-country skiers.. even went DIVERSIFIED .

DM: that's exactly the reason I did that because we noticed when we do a program for snowmobilers, we attract more users that use Snowmobiles even if they are not primary riders, if they sign up for specific class , they do the riding.. and get those techniques. The program itself is beneficial to everyone, not just riders.

JS: I'm going to have to answer to riders when they ask why their money is going to skiers. They see that you're applying for a grant that has the potential of skiers, dog mushers, snowboarders, which is good... but they may say why am I paying for that

DM: the program IS for snowmobilers, but if you are a dog musher that rides sb part of the time, it includes those that use them as means for other activities. What I'm saying is that this program is for snowmobilers, but if you ski or board you're going to benefit, but we're inviting the sb community to benefit from it

AM: I'd say half the snowmobiles going over turnagain pass have snowboards attached to them. Seeing a lot more diversified, mixed use.

DM: and if you're a skier on the back of that sled, you better know if the driver is taking you in safe places or not. The ultimate goal here is that we're trying to educate people so we don't have to fish them out of rivers or dig them out of snow banks. Ultimately if we had our way, we would be doing these for snowmobile clubs, that's our target here.. the communities and clubs that are snowmobile specific

BL: are you charging any fees for the class?

DM: unfortunately once we do the classes were at 0 again, so we're not getting ahead. We want to do it for free, but it perpetuates the program and if it's free they sign up and never show... it helps to have that commitment from the public.

BL: once they're trained are you going to help them set up classes and pay them to do that?

DM: yes, that's the goal of the whole program

MW: I've had a love-hate situation with safety education program. I do have to say you're getting closer to a program I can fully sign off on. Constructive criticism: still way too avalanche-focused (rates have gone way down), you need to concentrate your efforts on river travel, lake travel, collisions, fallen objects.. no material on open water crossings.

DM: that is in here

MW: what % are riding on glaciers compared to open areas, take some emphasis off avalanche. Build us a program that's catered to the average rider

DM: after the conference last year, we took all those suggestions and incorporated it in their, however when 2 people get lost in glacier, and Conoco loses two people in an avalanche we have to put it back in the program

BL: yeah those get better news coverage

MW: but it's not the real situation. Very focused on extreme rescue techniques, didn't see any one from native corporations.. you need to address getting people from outside areas into these conferences. I'm not seeing those people on the attendance lists.

DM: the list that you saw was the safety professionals doing the search and rescue, but I agree.. my goal is to bring those people in. I've been working on a list of people and as soon as we get the money, I'll call them in.

MW: we've had a lot of one-day seminars, conferences.. time to get the program out of the classroom and onto the field.

DM: my focus is community. We need a peer review to make sure the info, last year was very focused on addressing the things you brought up. Our key speaker is a head programmer from Canada. We want to pick his brain how he addressed their villages in outlying communities and figure out how he brought them in. That is the challenge, how do we get them here. Thank you

JS: just looked at the paper 2 weeks ago.. some rider tried to cross Susitna, ended up on an island getting hypothermic. Rivers are more of a focus

DM: would love for you guys to attend one of these programs, so you can see what we're doing. We do still address avalanches, but it was like a week long course, and avalanches were covered for half a day. A snowmobile safety instructor we have on board has been to all these villages and he said he wouldn't do it again out of pocket, but the stories are incredible from the different villages and what they try to do as far as riding

AM: who in the villages, once we train someone, where is the longevity? Is it the village safety officer? Can we identify a more specific person that might be in it for a career and have like a 10 year go at it?

MW: a certification program

DM: State troopers and public health nurses are really reaching out to us from the communities. But Andy's right, it's really important to identify people that are in it for the long haul

SN: this is a safety and education grant, doesn't require a match. Just pointing out that it isn't something she has to do

MW: turn in revised scores, and add

4:16pm

**Looking at final scores. CHCH and Copper Country were scored, but not considered Grants.
Leaving: Montana Creek at 38.56, Mat-Su at 87, Iron Dog at 67, and NAOI at 76.**

BL MOTIONS THE TOP 2 SCORES GET FUNDED, REST GET DROPPED

JG SECONDS MOTION

VOTE: 4 for, 5 against

SN: there is no more Safety & Education requirement anymore

MW: we were funding applicants we didn't really want to fund because we were required to fund 25%

AM: so we are the most contentious of Montana Creek. NAOI scored fairly well

EM: not a big difference between the 2 safety ones

Tinker: partially fund both?

MW: can't split it, because we can't provide solid justification for the reason of underfunding

JG: remember, the director can override and fund everything if he wants

MW: I don't like one day things, but it gives us good rep, and if we deny a safety grant...

BL: also funding a race, not recreational snowmobiling

MW: has anybody been to Iron Dog

CM: we've been to the expo and it's a wonderful thing

BL: what I'm going at is if there's only that amount, we need to groom trails. Is it worth the 1400 dollars that we don't have to fund Iron Dog

CH: this should have come out in the scores. This is the only process we have to give as an excuse to the public.

BL: we can pick any number of grants.. can draw the line anywhere

AM: if we fund Iron Dog this year and sticks around and comes back.. he'll come back next year with more snowmobile stars to do presentations in area, more exchange programs

SE: I've gotten a diff perspective of Iron Dog over the last years.. I agree with the one day thing, but I think the Iron Dog is much more.. and they should market it. If they can continue making the Iron Dog the event that it is .. it is an even that is indicative of snow machining, a sport of alaska.. if we can progress it to being what it can be I'm all for it

JS: so is the board against partial funding. The way I look at it .. Montana creek off the board, Mat-Su is strictly safety.. have their act together.. the other two, didn't really have the whole app together.. partially fund those

SN: after the director has made the call.. then people come back in and ask why didn't you fund this, etc. We've had issues with people that are up there that have come back and said something about the process. I would fund or not fund.

JS: if the person has three quotes, we can pick the lowest bid

MW: lets say a grantee is asking for 2 diff pieces of equip.. one you think they need, one they don't. You can say we'll fund one, but not the other. That's a quantifiable judgment. In this, you're just saying take 10-50 percent off the top.. no quantifiable explanation behind the decision

AM: I think one thing that we're focusing on is the 99%.. 325. We've struggled with these safety & ed for years and now we're getting some that are trying and really fixing things.. while we're still working on state-run safety program or not. I don't care that much about grooming I'm in the mountains.. you get so caught up with grooming, you leave a lot of the state in the dark. I think one day events sends the wrong message... we need to send the message that safety is important

BL: we basically have 3 safety grants up there.. can we take 2 and fund them, and if we get extra money, fund the 3rd? If we don't there's going to be all sorts of problems in here, whether we're talking grants or grooming

MW: last year we were flush.. it's harder when you have less money than requests

AM MOTION TO FUND IRON DOG, NAOI and MAT-SU

MW SECONDS

VOTE: 4 for, 5 against

SN: I would suggest you table this for tonight.. I will contact fed highways and try to get a positive answer.. if I do it will become less mute. Worst that can happen is at 8:30 we'll be in the same place.

SE: Andy's not going to be there tomorrow

(agreed we need vote tonight)

EM: I'm going to get something closer to Johns or

MOVES TO FUND MAT-SU at FULL, and IRON DOG and NAOI at 12,000 EACH

TINKER SECONDS MOTION

VOTE: 2 for, 7 against

MW: Eric, do you have a justification

EM: I'd be happy to pick out what should and should not be funded, and can give Ben the reasons if he needs them. I've always had problem with Iron Dog because it's funding a commercial race. NAOI I've had issues with over the years, but I remind you all to re-read our mission statement and we're being hypocritical if we don't fund any safety projects. So, until something else comes along I think we would be very remiss in cutting them off. I know what Iron Dog did last year in Western AK was very effective and Debra's group tries very hard to promote safety in the state, but maybe they don't need all that money if we don't have it

SE: I thought trail grants and grooming pool were on the same level, and I'm hearing that people want to take care of grooming pool over grants. I don't think that the pool has precedence over the grants. The pool has to score accordingly as well. What I'm hearing about both S&E programs was lots of criticism from the public and board... I think they're making an attempt to improve their applications back to us.. so I support NAOI. I think what they did in Delta Junction last year was good. I don't think I was supportive of Iron Dog last year because of the reasons you've mentioned. But this year my opinion changed, I think we should fund upon the merits and basis of what they're trying to do. I come from military background.. you always ask for more money than you need because you know you're going to get cut... I don't think here we should cut anything. If there was a problem, you should have scored it accordingly. To say at this point you don't want to fund them and put the extra money to grooming is BS at this point.

BL: is Iron Dog more valuable than what NAOI is trying to do, I think so. Iron Dog will happen whether we fund them or not, these programs will happen whether we fund them or not

AM: maybe it sounds like NAOI funding full but take items off Iron Dog's budget.. like advertising at \$5,000

JS: at 12,000 there is enough wiggle room in your budget, and if they're short in one section they can move the money around to where they need it. They have 3,500 for a project coordinator.

CH: and it's not under admin

JS: Iron Dog.. 5,000 in advertisement. They already have publicity agreements with other orgs.

MW: I have seen in the past us take money away from the grantee, you have to understand when you make that decision there are implications to doing that.. that will force the grantee to ask why they lost the 5,000. When we're putting a third of a million dollars and put it into grooming, but we cant give them 2,000 extra for their safety program, that's not a good argument to give to the director. I think we either fund them or we don't.

JS: what happens if we get 20 safety programs and can't pay for grooming

MW: you guys weren't here when we didn't have enough money to fund all we wanted to. We are much better funding both fully than partially. The return would be better.

SE: I think it's relevant to talk about registration fees, we have to approach politicians.. if we're all about safety with our words but we don't fund them.

MW: and we can use that too.. tell Debra and Kevin to talk to legislators for us

DM: the last ORTAB board meeting I attended.. they established a threshold of grading before the scoring.. so the line in the sand determined whether each was funded

MW: we tried that before, and people graded their grants anticipating where that line was.. it was ugly. That's one of the reasons we chose this method for doing this

AM: also there is no grooming pool in ORTAB we are dictated how much money has to go to each classification of applications

SE MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER VOTING FOR TOP THREE AND FUNDING THEM FULLY

EM SECONDS

VOTE: 6 for, 3 against

MW: congrats ladies and gentleman we have a majority. So the total that will be funded is \$35,525.
We didn't have time to go through grooming process, we'll start with that tomorrow.

Kidder gives out materials on ANCSA

MEETING CLOSED at 4:54pm

CALL TO ORDER AT 8:40

Public Comments:

Ellis: he was out of the city yesterday but he is here today

Fogels: I'm one of 2 deputy commissioners in the DNR. I get parks, agriculture and MLW and forestry and permitting. I love working with parks and land issues. I love meeting with the boards I have a meeting at 9 but its good to meet you. The commissioner has really charged me and Ben to look at access issues and we're really putting together this statewide program to give more access to Alaskans. More funds for transportation.. RS2477s fighting hard legally.. make sure Alaskans have their public land. We've got staff and arch. Out in the ? district so we can start asserting our rights legally. But also, very specifically, we want to be sure we provide more trail opportunities for all modes of transportations. But specifically we recognize there's a lack of motorized ops in Alaska right now and when I look back at this org I want to see more ATV and snowmobile trails. I'm a firm believer in that and it comes down from Commissioner Sullivan. Even broader, if you've got ideas that aren't related to grant monies we'd like to hear your expertise and hear where you would like to get more motorized recreation opportunities. I wouldn't mind just going around the room and hearing your names.

Tinker: down in the Kenai SnowTRAC board. First official meeting, but been to a quite a few of these in the past as a spectator.

JS: like tinker this is my first official meeting. Been with Chugach advisory board for 5 years, was president of Anchorage snowmobile club for 4 years and been doing lots of work in Anchorage

SE: this is year two of the board for me, been on other committees.. northern region back in the 990s, ASSA, along with the snow travelers in Fairbanks.

BL: with Willow Trail committee, my 3rd year, do Willow help out in others to.. create long corridor trail with other clubs.. riding since 1964

JW: trails specialist, alaska state trails program

SN: grant administrator for state

JG: like Bill, I've been riding since 1964 in Hatcher pass, pres of Anch snowmobile club. I just want to say now, if any of you are old enough or have been around enough, you'll remember Tony Knowles Access program (?) TRAC was originally put together with the SIMS money, now RTP, was TLU and all those different names fed agave to motorized recreation, each state had some board to distribute that motorized money. Unfortunately the first couple years it didn't help m users very much. It's good to hear motor users are back on someone's agenda. Other thing, great, BLM put in trails down in Turnagain Pass area and brushed them out and they're not motorized. Not a lot of cooperation with BLM, so at some point when it's an opportunity, it would be great to harden the ATV trail.

Fogels: one of the things that I've observed when you look at a situation like Rex trail, there might be resource damage on it, but really why you're having those resource damages is because there are very few opportunities elsewhere.

JG: like Boulder Creek Trail, it's a mess since its not hardening

Fogels: we're promising a lot, so hold me to it, hopefully 4 years from now they're not empty promises

Wilke: probably 12 years now, I've seen this go from the beginning. I'm from Juneau where we have 2 sb trails and no ATVs. So these issues are very important, even though we are a land of RS2477 trails, mine trails

CH: 3-4 years, live in Anch, have a cabin in Mat-Su where we spend most of our time

EM: I'm from White Mountain, been on board 6 years, one of the things I do is fire chief, search and rescue.. interested in late night uniform signage program

BL: transportation corridors

MW: what really needs to happen in AK is for some of these routes in between major pop areas should be designated as federal travel corridors

Fogels: we're really getting them tapped into Goodman in MLW, Brent's got most of the land (general state use) both of these guys need to work together and give us more room to play

DM: I'm co-founder and pres of Big Lake Trails.. helping to develop trails over the last 30 years

A lot of the trails that could be rode over RS2477 lands, but no one will ride on them because they feel that a USFS officer would be waiting for them. Would the state defend us, it seems like it would be within the states interest

Fogels: we have asserted those RS2477, but legally the way threat we get the ult authority over those is through the courts decision. So they will likely bust you for it. The strategy is to sit there and start fighting for these. We've only had 2 real fights and essentially lost both of them after spending millions in research and court fees... got a right-of-way established with the feds, but it wasn't a win for the RS2477 battle, but it was a win for access rights. There is so much detailed info that the courts ask for before a decision.. if you know where the tail is but not that there's a gap there it could effect their decision. .so were trying to hone in on it. We're starting with the 40 mile.. a bunch of routes together, so we can kind of hit the feds with a bunch of punches at once, maybe that will make them back of. Utah is coming up to

AK to explain what they did to gain access to RS2477 from the feds. A good thing for any of you to do is SCOTT OGAN (chief of Public Access and Social Defense Unit) AND DAVE SHADY (Lieutenant, CHAD.. second in command).. they can download all the dirty details and it would be very valuable for us to do this.. if there are RSs that

MW: one of the heartaches we've seen again and again is the backlog of easements.. we just hear that were working through them one at a time

Fogels: a huge commission is going on right now with permitting. The universe is huge... all the way to the permitting of big mines and gas .. in particular the Mining, Land & Water, they issue a zillion leases, permits, right-of-ways.. and they have been back-logged big time. DNR budget and staffing has decreased. Over the years for budget cuts reasons and fewer resources, plus workload is increasing.. more applications are pouring into DNR. We are a roadblock, we see that. Its imperative for not only the BPs to get their permits but the little guys too. Most of that back log is in water. He can hire a lot of new staff.. its not about the money, it's about the way we do business. We told the government we would eliminate the backlog in three years and were going to try out damndest so there's a push on getting that done

BL: Tangle Lakes area... it appears when I talk to people somehow that's rolled up in conversations for the last couple years... why is that being developed? Why is there resource development being looked at there

Fogels: its multiple use state land, general purpose, been identified for various resource values and

BL: haven't found anyone that supports it

Fogels: its just exploration for minerals at this point?

Fogels: pure nickel, it might be

BL: we got a lot going on with the new development, true north is just kind of sitting there

Fogels: working on the closure plan for that. Tangle Lakes, no ones discovered anything there yet.. favorable interest and interesting geology. A company is there and has been doing it for years. If decisions are granted to develop a mine it takes years.. so first they have to find something and then there is a real strict environmental process.. six mines all doing well... monitor both downstream and all fish are fine and happy. Can't let the mines hurt our fish, important to AK... make sure mining companies are tight. We have some of the best mines in the nation, some of the best for environmental reasons

BL: over the last 10 years Fairbanks has a good eco stability we haven't seen in the past so we realize the benefit

Fogels: nothing will happen without public involvement and giant process... have legal right to go in and explore, core drilling, collect samples, but all done by our staff.

BL: just from my own perspective, I know that personally, I like the tl area, I ride in that area to McClaron regularly.. the thought of seeing anything else there irks me.. .that 135 miles is very unique and id like to see it continue good access and stay just the way it is

Fogels: pleasure to meet you all, I'll show up to your meetings from time to time

BL: still waiting for transportation corridors to be recognized

Fogels: go visit with Scott Ogan and his crew.. really good at what they do and should get ideas from you as far as priorities for easements.. to Kyle Kidder

(FOGELS exits at 9:06)

MW: it's good to hear that somebody understands the importance of access issues as priority. So we left off yesterday having made it through the grant scoring process and the next step would be to determine the amount of

BREAK at 9:22 for SUMMARY SHEET CONSTRUCTION of GROOMING POOLS

BACK IN SESSION AT 9:47

SN: I emailed the federal highways gentleman and called him today.. he said he had submitted it to FEMUS.. which is a better yes than yesterday, not final yet, but he approved it and doesn't see any problems.. 99.9999999 there, the amount is 100,000.. not looking at any rescission on a fed level as far as this year. At the end of next week I can tell you where it is.

MW: are the programs required to have program audit..

SN: I will give some of this information to the feds so the state can be reimbursed. I get reimbursed from the feds for this amount. Does that make sense?

MW: I think we still need 2 budgets though.. it wouldn't be responsible for us to do just one. Do we want to approve some or all of the requests

JG: I MOVE THAT WE FUND ALL OF THE APPLICANTS AT A REDUCED RATE of REQUESTED AMOUNT TO MEET THE TWO AVAILABLE BUDGETS

BL: SECONDS MOTION

VOTE: 5 for, 3 against = MOTIONS PASSED

JG: all of the current requesters for grooming pool funds have a record for getting funds and here they are back for more

SE: I concur with the reduced rate.. I would like to look at what actually spent, and then use those numbers to decide on the reduced rate

SE: if they requested x amount of dollars and only used y.. who went over, who went under, who had things happen as to why they didn't spend the money

SN: Jess, I'm going to throw some numbers for the third column

(PwrPnt table with requested and late scores, with column of last years expenditures)

JG: so the two things that could happen with reduction are that the groomers could either groom all the trails less frequently, or leave out some trails and keep up with the schedule

MW: 332 requested, 196 available.. find out the percentage difference from that, and take that from the requested

BL: that's why I suggested funding 2 instead of 3 grants yesterday.. so we would have more money for the pool

MW: so we're there at the 196 basically.. I think we're close enough to begin a discussion as to whether we're fine with the reduced rate

VOTED AT 10:20am to FUND ALL AT LOWER LEVEL

MW: if somebody wants to move dollar amounts around, I will entertain that motion.. pick one reduce

BL: MOTION THAT WE REDUCE PETERSVILLE AREA DOWN TO A REASONABLE AMOUNT AND REDISTRIBUTE TO OTHER GROUPS

JS: I don't agree with Bill.. it's up to Wayne to decide where the money is shuffled over.. there's your reduction right there, there's already a mechanism in place. Say Petersville area gets heavy, he's just going to hit Wayne for more money. I say leave the area with blanket reduction.

JG: that's my backyard, all I can say is, I don't agree with Bill that it's out of line because of what's done. I think in the interest of fairness, if we reduce them we have to reduce someone else

EM: I don't really care how this plays out but I do want to point out that these numbers are arbitrary requests to begin with.. they may or may not be what they actually spent last year. Even if you decide to reduce, say Petersville.. don't redistribute it and it will go evenly

SE to be fair and equitable.. I think if somebody came to me and said why did we lose money.. I think a fair and straight across the board reduction is easy to accept for groomers that everyone had a fair reduction.. If we get that 93,000... that's still a lot of money.

EM: its only fair and equitable if the groomers are fair and equitable (using the money)

SE: lots of things could have gone into not spending the money.. just looking at the numbers that were spent last year verses the amount they requested this year. Without any favoritism or arrows pointed at any particular entity

JS: the request of a mile is basically a groomers anticipated costs. Take Petersville who requests 50,000 to request, even though he's been reduced to 35,00... his realistic bid to do what he needs is his requested amount.. give him reduced amount he's lessening his grooming season again

BL: just a little history on that.. Randy set up to ask for 35 last year and then asked for more funds in early march. It is reasonable to think that that area deserves to have that percentage of the grooming money for the state, I just don't feel comfortable with that

MW: reading from Randy's letter: this amount reflects what it took to groom last years trail and early season.. all the trails listed will receive some grooming.. extended or shortened by the amount of monies received.

DM: look at your biggest used areas.. Big Lake, Louise, Fairbanks.. recreational population centers.. balance where your populations going to play, and you'll get more bang for the buck in those areas

MW: I think if you actually charted out the number of riders for each area that # of riders would be pretty close across the board

PD: I think that we're setting up a condition.. that everybody's getting cut equally at certain percentages as an option.. Big Lakes is the only one that gets every thing they asked for.. not taking any hit on our reduction

JG: when we get bidders.. I expect the bid to be less than 25.000 depending on who bids

SE: we've already reduced it down from 60 with the two reductions

MW: if we do another motion to change a group, we apply it to another group in the first column to redistribute it

SE: I completely understand that, but it goes against the grain of what we just did

MW: let's get a solid motion and then discuss this. We have to move on here

SE: if there's anything that will rile me quicker than anything else, is that all the money stays in anchorage.. the legislature keeps all the damn money down here, it irritates the crap out of me that a piddly 13,000 goes north.. I'll be damned that because all the people are down here the money stays down here.. its crap and it's been that way for years

EM: and rural Alaska

BL WITHDRAWS PREVIOUS MOTION

MW: does anyone else have a motion to make about moving dollar amounts around?

Tinker: the Hatcher Pass, wasn't that a late application?

BL: they only requested 20 last year, but used 12 because of grooming problems

MW: there may be additional money coming back in and Wayne's been through this process a bunch of times and I feel confidently that he will be fair. I think we should live with these numbers

BREAK AT 10:45

BACK IN SESSION AT 11:00

(spread sheet is updated by reductions of 58% and 89%)

JG MOVES TO FUND ALL GRANT REQUESTS AT RATE OF 58% or 89% DEPENDING ON THE FINAL AVAILABLE BUDGET

TINKER SECONDS

VOTE: 7 for, 1 against = PASSED

SN: since André and Bill are gone and Darcy is yet to come up to speed with this, I don't want to speak as to where they want to go with these procedures. I don't know how relevant it will be

MW: let's not forget we had an amendment (meeting w director) and he suggested that we work on alternative wording and get back to this. Just a reminder, our policy and procedures set some requests on state parks to take our decisions into considerations. Mostly based upon the time requirement that he responds back to us, he struck that from the p and p. He was

probably okay with the thought behind it.. to seek our council as to why we made those decisions.. just the way it was set up I think is why he nixed it

JG: I think he wants to establish that he's still the boss.

MW: I'll craft up some new language and talk with the director on it. But our P and Ps are not done, we really need to work on some issues.

CH: did you let him know why we want him to come to us? Like when he decided to fund a grant we did NOT pass, and didn't know it was funded until people started asking me why it was

JG: that's why he said in the meeting he respects our advice but he has final say

MW: I say that we want to be consulted as to why we made decisions so he can know the information we made our decision with, so even if he still overrides it, we can at least understand why

JG: Luck is gone, I think we have an opportunity with Darcy to open lines of comm. And discuss that issue. With Bill and André both, they convinced James King to override our decision and he did

CH: I was under the impression that that's why state parks are here, so they can convey our reasoning to the director.. .in that case it was bills opinion that was expressed to the director

Tinker: and it should have been expressed back to us

MW: it was, the first point in that meeting was 'why the hell are we funding the helmets'

JG: I believe Bill reinforced his decision to give away the helmets to be the good guy

MW: I'll work with the director to figure out the language that we can both live with. To me, if a director signs a document, it's a commitment by the state. So let's move on, I'll work with the director. I'd like to take a few minutes to discuss something that's very important to me... how do we get more applicants into the pool of grantees. I'm embarrassed we only got 4 this year

SE: there's still other issues that have to be looked at, and there's still

BL: everybody's going to rec trails because they know we don't have any money

MW: I'm concerned we're not spending a dollar in the bush. How do we speak to native corps

EM: natives don't do things like that. There's a general lack of awareness and the amounts of money are small compared to the owners application process as well as the grant admin process. One of the grants from the old days was one I applied for and got, and it was not an easy process and turned out to be a lot more work than the amount of money was worth.. rebuilding shelter cabins around the country.

MW: it's a matter of reporting to those areas and then revising the application process

BL: it's got to go into the village newspapers and stuff like that

SE : many of you know the issues from Fairbanks, despite my efforts to change attitudes, still one of the things today is the process of sitting down and writing the grant, plus how much money

it takes having up front... the attitude is screw it were not putting in for grants we're just going to ride. I'd love to see improvements.. we don't need so much grooming as we need bridges and grants. The person who's going to sit down and work it out to get the application process done its just not that easy

EM: just to finish, much of what this group does, doesn't have relevancy.. there's no need for grooming, and I keep harping on trail marking, there's not that much that this program would fund other than trail marking.. and to go through the program for a couple thousand bucks worth of stakes isn't worth it

JS: back when Samantha was in charge.. you couldn't walk in, the phone numbers were wrong.. it is a tedious process. The grants you see now are wrote by professionals, its not set up for some common Joe coming off the corner that has problems spelling, maybe cant write that decent, but he has a great idea.. but it doesn't look that way from the states standards for applying. He's running around wasting time that wasn't required

SN: ORTAB or rec trails has seen a lot more participation from the west, cabins.. it wouldn't hurt to look at the rec trails applicants.. how can we work with that group to see if they want to come to us too. I only say this if you are willing to understand that these people will come in with maybe more grants of different types. But looking at what else ORTAB has might help, because they all have ongoing processes.. and it's not against the law to get money from RTP and this. Who are these players what are they looking at and how can we approach these people to gauge their interest in coming to SnowTRAC. It is complicated and hard to do these.. it becomes difficult, they get discouraged and they don't come back to the table. I think there are ways to get out that this is something you would like to see come to the program

MW: lets start with 5 recommendations on how we can increase the

JS: simpler form. More user-friendly. Case in point, anchorage falls into coastal mgmt zone.. lots of paperwork, whereas Petersville doesn't have to go through all of that

MW: 2 better public notice

JS: word of mouth or on the website.. nothing was sent to the clubs.. the clubs is what you want to bring in but we don't notify them by email

MW: email has become the standard for notification because you can make your message and hit one button

JW: so a phone call as well as email

MW: letters to clubs, local papers

SE: the issue that I see if we're going to get more entities is the disparity between well organized government agencies with the grant writing capabilities and expertise, but the clubs do not. How do you address that?

SN: you get little bitty orgs going against big agencies and there is no infrastructure for us to delineate between the little 501s and the big guys

SE: last year I asked and they said the state does give classes

MW: I think we've done it once is the reality

JD: they had a grant-writing class at trail Rony

EM: I think another appropriation. Way its done sometime is to have tiers of awards, so if someone like NAOI is applying for a 15000 grant then they go through a more rigorous app than if you want 5000. The clubs need to step up their game too if they want pub money.

MW: I think trail marking should be in the same pool of dollars like we're doing the grooming.. they're putting dollars in for staking or signing

Tinker: wouldn't that be more under safety, which actually increases the grant applications

MW: I think calling it into the pool attracts the local villagers and clubs. That's what I'm arguing here.. give the chance for those places to fill out the big app once and then every year after they fill out an easy application for some stakes each year. If grooming is important down here, staking is just as important out there

JG: to get on list of SnowTRAC trails, you need to do big app ONCE, after a trail is identified its already in pool.

SE: clarify staking?

MW: whatever's used in their traditional area.. identifying the trail, whether its tripods or single stakes. We should start calling it the grooming and marking pool. Back to public notice, add more

JD: when I was on alaska trails.. you can enter your email if you want to be updated.. that would be a huge help on the ORTAB and SnowTRAC websites. That would be something

SN: that would be beyond parks ability to implement.. we can control some of what goes on the website.. but as far as being able to link emails from a state website is big stuff.. maybe something we can look at. For media.. there is the public media release, anything else in advertising will come out of the admin budget.. anything that's not on the web.. not saying its bad idea but there is a cost to it

JS: what was the biggest shocker when we opened request formed... grooming requests are same as grant forms

MW: like new grooming requests to get trails listed

JS: simple form to break those two apart

MW: how many subscribers are there to the snow rider?

JG: 17 affiliated clubs.. 1500 every month.. an ad in SnowRider every month

JS: how about the coast magazine.. free at stores

SE: use ASSA as vehicle to promote..

MW: a letter.. invitation to apply to all snowmobile clubs in alaska

JG: Kevin has written articles in riding magazines about grant programs for years

SE: can we use ASSA in more ways than just Kevin writing quick letter. There's nothing prohibiting any of us submitting an article

CH: the octane international has a conf down here, and ASSA has a booth right beside SnowTRAC

SE: not asking for show, maybe use ASSA as vehicle to communicate to other clubs about what's there.. maybe I'll write an article and check with everybody to see if its accurate. I just think its widely used and reaches out to a lot for different folks out there.. there's nothing that prohibits us from submitting and saying hey this is SnowTRAC, this is what we are and what were looking for

CH: . SnowTRAC doing community outreach.. we as a board doing presentation at our local clubs

SE: I've gotten with parks and borough to let know we exist and care

JG: I think its incumbent upon us the board to contact your club, borough, magazines.. that's our responsibility.. not to come here for 2 days and this and that and forget it till next time around. Were supposed to be ambassadors to state parks and program all the time

JS: one quick comment on using SnowRider.. wasn't your main question get more applicants.. when the period is opened to accept applicants.. Full page or half page MEMO that we're accepting applicants

JG: why is there a period of application... why cant they apply for a grant any time instead of having set open period

BL: if we're going to sit down here today and make a decision we have to have a cut out point

JG: oh we'll have a deadline, just not a starting point

MW: if we had one good idea today, that may be it.

JG: I think though that simplifying the form and looking into the possibility of looking into MLW and weigh some or all of the requirements that are stupid,

MW: well talk about that in score sheet and application period. Dan, what's your perception about program and application?

DM: we got notified April 1st via email, but I also knew from years past that I better be totally sure of the opening and closing dates

MW: what would happen if you weren't there. So you actually have to go on website to find out about it?

JG: is big lake trails not an addressee of state parks?

DM: my email was on their list .. seal of alaska on it.. and got a media release.

JD: we obviously knew about it because of our familiarity with clubs, but otherwise we would not have known if we did not go to the website

JS: and these are people close to anchorage, your people are in the dark (indicating EM)

EM laughs

JG: extending the application period and letting them know about it more would help. But at some point if you don't ask and pay attention to what's going around you you're not going to get what you want. Cleaning up the website is a daunting task.. there are some things they can and cant do.

MW: any more ideas on how to increase # of grant applications?

SN: Darcy's coming in with fresh slate.. she'll be hit with rec trails and 2 million we're working with.. the future of it and ongoing things.. SnowTRAC is going to be bumped down if there is no advocacy on your part and state, in a pleasant way, how much you need to get her involved with it. They're coming in new, its going to take a year or two to get up to speed.. but if you wait 6, 9 months, you'll miss that window of opportunity the first year to make that point to her about how important this is to you... get it off the ground really quick before rec trails and other projects take precedence

MW: what would be the best way to communicate this to her?

SN: come in and meet with her.. not with 30 pages of stuff.. I would come in to break ground and say who you are and how important things are to you, and one or two things where you would want to see your views enlarged or changed.. if you come in with a sledgehammer right off the bat about how you want to see things changed you might turn her off. . but just an hour/half hour for her to know that SnowTRAC is more than just something that comes up twice a year and that's all

MW: we would ask you as second in command to present it to her as a program and introduce the idea to take the first step

5 RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1. *Simpler Form***
- 2. *Better Public Notice***
- 3. *Tiered Awards***
- 4. *Create trail-marking Program or Include with Grooming Pool***
- 5. *SnowTRAC Advocacy/Outreach***
- 6. *Extend Application Period (open to apply earlier)***

MW CALLS FOR LUNCH AT 11:55am

BEGIN AGAIN AT 1:10pm

MW: the score sheets are not a good reflection of the decision process we have to make on the allocation of funding. They are completely objective to where we cant use our knowledge and skills to make decisions

JG: we score some of them the way we want to score them so they don't do so well and that's were we use our judgment.. I can see where ASP wants to have an objective scoring system.. scoring things low when they look good on paper doesn't look good.. so I'm with mark.. we have to have a score sheet that allows both.. they need to get simpler and real

MW: I spent some time going over the score sheets and asked the board and DPOR with input. The score sheets that I proposed gave us an 'in the best of interest of snowmobiling' box.. and weighed it 55%, so it can pass mainly on the public benefit.. I think we've already been through the step where we have a new score sheet.. but what ended up happening is that the application tells which points were going to give what area.. but fixing this is relatively easy.. fixing this (application)

SN: There should be a way to do the transfer without having to communize these applications

MW: can you find the page with public benefit?

SN: that parks will have heartburn over (referring to 55 points)

MW: two reasons for point breakdown being taken away.. I think by giving individual scores for line items.. if they don't have it in the application you take away points and that's not fair.. by taking away the individual line items you have more leeway to make decisions on the quality of the project

SN: Bill had mentioned this before, I see it as if we go back and you could do a majority of the application based 55 out of 100 and its subjective.. parks will have a problem with it weighted and being objective. Maybe its just me.. but if it were less than half I don't think it would be as bad.. I think if you go that high that quick from ten people upstairs will have a problem

MW: lets look at what we're saying here: right now we're giving 25 points for a budget.. a quarter of the score is on budget.. too much. What's the most important thing? Is it primarily for snowmobilers.. so the primary weight should be on that subject

BL: can we bring it to an amount that parks will be ok with?

MW: in the past the score sheet was basically that weighting.. we were taking grant applications that were for a project that was not really for riding.. I felt that way about the NAOI grant.. mostly skiers show up for that class.. then we could give 0 score on public benefit and the grant would fail from that.

BL: 45 is still the majority of the point score.. if that's better for parks

SN: I think the problem word for Parks is subjective... I hate getting on the phone and saying any part of their grant was done subjectively and I don't have exact documentable reasoning as to what area they were weak in. It helps that you have 4 definitions rather than a blank space. In this would you put over the side 10 points for A or those 4 things are whatever would make up the total score. .

MW: they are the suggestive things to think about in giving the total score for each category.. with no numbers assigned for each line

CH: for an advisory board, it seems that we're not being very advisable that we're filling in two points because of one point of a budget.. the adversity towards subjectivity confuses me because we're an ADVISORY board. I think this project is not primarily for snowmobiles because... that would provide comments to provide when people ask.. more so letting us give the public commentary

SE: either I missed something, if I had to sit down and use that particular score sheet with the way the current grants are presented I already have a problem with scoring them... I felt compelled to give points toward things because they did what they were required to do on paper, whereas the whole project I thought was a load of crap. If I was using this 55 point rule right now for 2 of the 3 we dealt with on the grants, if I apply that to NAOI or Iron Dog in particular, I know I would have a diff outcome

MW: I scored them relatively high because of the scoring method as well

SE: I would have scored them significantly lower

JG: I would have too. I scored them low even following the form this year

SE: what I'm getting at is would this form arbitrarily

EM: I don't think its possible to come up with the perfect instrument. We need to at least project objectivity, even though we know its subjective.. if I knew that whoever was going to be scoring a grant I wrote was going to be completely subjective about scoring I probably would forget it because there's no guarantee of scoring. I think we should give each number of points for each section of score sheets.. and they should match the sections on the application, which they don't. that's a big fatal error in this process. 55 points is quite high.. never seen an applications with that high of a % of points in one particular section. Even if we lowered it down to 30, if we want to give someone a zero we will

JS: 55 is a little high, I can write a one-sentence grant with that info right there and get a grant. Meets all that criteria leaving out a lot of the rest of work.

JG: but as a board we would see through that and most of us would say ehhh..

BL: but if you're water-skipping you should be the ones that are eliminated from the gene pool

JG: or helmets

JS: I'd be happier if it was 45 or even 50

JG: I'm a forty guy myself

MW: this piece is already done.. this application, without the line item scores, and having more emphasis on public benefit we agree on. We just need more info from State Parks on the points and get the comment and opinion on this. I'm not stuck on 55.. it gives us the ability to reject a grant based solely on public benefit.

CH: I just want to make sure the application connects with the score sheet.. so lets keep that in mind while we do the application. Also, I don't know where the ADA will end up in the application

JS: item E, ADA compliance might not have to be on the score sheet at all, but there's 5 extra points if they meet the criteria

MW: what I would like everyone to do is grab out a grant application.

JG: to add trails to the SnowTRAC list, whether they are funded or not, I believe the general consensus is we submit a grant form?

EM: but should it be our procedure?

JG: application for trail maintenance, development, access, and adding trail to SnowTRAC list then.
IF there is a trail that is already on the inventory of some other list, can it automatically be put on .. if a groomer person wants to be a groomer, all they really need to do is identify a SnowTRAC trail and show intent to groom it

MW: so first section is fine, number 2 page “dear prospective applicant” we’re going to have to change Bill Luck at Alaska.gov to the new trail coordinator. We don’t need to put instructions in the application

JG: page 3 and 4 can go away.. that’s RTP.

MW: page 5

JS: one A.. is it a snowmobile grant..

BL: take out ‘businesses are not eligible’

MW: at least the qualifying criteria.. we need A but we can scratch out everything but the ‘snowmobile grant funding’

CH: do we care if they’re non=profit or private

MW: I don’t mind them asking, but its not qualifying material

EM: native corp. or gov... native has nothing to do with it

MW: number ones gone.

CH: number two: does the applicant need support from the following organizations?

SN: I don’t know that right now.. that needs to be looked at

MW: safety grants don’t need to be a part of them

CH: I scored one application this year low because they weren’t a part of one of these orgs, if its not a qualifying criteria we should get rid of it

JS: I think this should stay

JG: all of section 2 on page 5 should stay (A,B, C). When we turn to page 6 and look at section 3, that’s the public benefit

CH: In the whole community section in section 5 these questions are asked again in more detail.. so its redundant.

JG: but what I’m thinking is, this is here to disqualify an applicant

CH: and the reason for that is why?

JG: to weed out applicants that are just trying to get some bucks

MW: if you’re going to ask the three big questions that would disqualify you off the top, what would they be?

JS: do you have legal access?

EM: the first page should be the minimum requirements

MW: Access.. if you cant show me legal access, don't bother applying. Item 3, top of page 6 is the primary snowmobile question. So we got land owner authorization, primarily for benefit of snowmobilers, and some kind of local support requirement

JG: this is where we should tell the applicant.. you should have these three. This is one element, and we'll go over them in detail later

JS: some of them go to ORTAB and apply for a bridge, and then come back to us and apply for more

JG: they might have applied but the cycle takes longer so they might not know if they will get funding or not by the time they apply for SnowTRAC

SE: if we're looking for qualifying criteria I don't think that needs to be one

MW: so A B and C on page five would all be qualifying.

JG: we need to decide if we REQUIRE the applicant to have any one of these

Tinker: why would you want to limit it to one out of the three

JG: some applicants may not have local communities or boroughs

MW: do we want for a land management plan to be a criteria of funding

SN: A needs to be legally defined.. are you allowed to be on there for legal reasons

MW: if its not required , we should get rid of A. C though I might feel pretty strongly about. How many applications do we get without one letter of support

CH: I think the local government should go to

JG: trail maintenance, acquisition, assessment, and condition

CH: land ownership.. how did you word it?

MW: permission from *all* land owners.. private and public

EM: getting perm from all land owners is going to be an issue for many applicants, and there will be vetting from the state. Take the Iditarod trail.. anyone can go stake that trail.. and I don't want to need to go to DC to get the permission to do that

JG: before we can give state money to an applicant to groom, mark, or develop.. we need to have specific permission from the landowner to do what you want on that trail. On the Iditarod.. BLM doesn't say do that or don't do that but they don't stop them.. but if someone asked them if they can go mark the trail I think that they would provide a letter easily

MW: some access rights would allow you to access the trail but not be okay for heavy equipment.. would need special rights. One thing that frustrates me is that applicants will check the box that they have permission for legal access, but don't provide documentation.

JG: do you know if it's a matter of law (Steve) that before we give people money to do things that they have set permission from the underlying ground owner

MW: its common law.. if you went sticking stakes on private property someone would have a problem with that

CH: how would this work if someone was developing or surveying a trail?

JG: you get permission from landowner to go on land to survey

MW: and some landowners don't want you on their land even to survey

JG: just like the email notice for the opening.. Bill Luck supposedly had all the stuff to send to people, and Kyle kidder vetted them.. but somehow the documentation doesn't get to us

SN: when the application first comes in the coordinator filters them through a checklist.. so if that documentation is there.. it will move on without a comment

MW: so there's other people looking at the application and we need to consider them to

JG: I know I have seen grant requests that had proper easement letters attached to them

JM: this year was an exception.. sometimes (gives CHCH as example) it's the State's mistake documents don't get out, but also there are so many different types of easement (only good for one year, etc.) that you need a state rep (like Kyle) to verify those are the steps they need

JG: if it isn't attached when states see it, we won't see it. If it is, it will be copied and sent to us

Tinker: one quick question here; to tie up pg 6, item 3.. is this application to benefit A: snowmobile activity. Is that a little too liberal to say anything about activity.. or should we say community.

MW: I suggest we change it to "this is an application for snowmobiling?"

JG: even if its checked, there's sections later that will back it up or prove it wrong.

CH: this is all doubling up again..

BL: but now we're getting in to the attachments, which you need to tell them they need the attachments

MW: on page 6 I like the idea of listing all the landowners.. who all has an interest in this land. There's a condition 'must be valid for more than 5 years'.

JG: depends on what grantee is requesting.. if they want to develop the trail and get one year access

JS: even if they apply for a grant for one year to build a bridge... who's going to own it the 5 years after that

MW: but what about the corps that only grant up to one year? We saw it in the Copper Country this year. Is this a legal requirement?

SN: we don't know

CH: so lets let this go until we find that out

JG: on page 6: remove item 4

CH: section one.. compare it to section one in application

JG: page 7

MW: this should really be the front page

CH: I think the reason this was first was because it's a legal requirement.. if we cant get past this its not worth looking at this kind of thing

JS: drop it all off (types of use)

JG: if the applicant wants to add other users it will benefit, they can add it in the description

JS: the organization type is good to be in there for statistics

CH: if you leave it right there its fine

JG: as long as there's nothing behind it that's needed by the applicant

MW: and we can deal with the township meridian stuff in the instructions. Joe what else do you want to hack out of page 7?

JG: all that stuffs alright. Since this could be for development, I think a few short descriptions of what does need to be filled out for each project category

CH: redundant to me again.. planning and constructing same thing?

JG: page 8, asking for easement information again

BL: looks like this whole page is a repeat

JG: lets take 8 away. Page 9.. rec trail grants gets removed.

MW: they're asking for summation of the grant dollars here.

JG: change title from snowmo trail grants to 'funds requested'

JG: project summary... change to what do you want to do.. or identifying trail to be put on the list.. so far that's only in the title. If this is going to be the vehicle to identify a trail to add to list we need to ..

MW: lets take out what we don't need and then come back and put in what we do

CH: you could have that summary of funds on the same page as the detailed narrative (10)

SN: I would favor one summary

MW: just the detailed project narrative

JS: do we have to have a limit? Strike the character limit

JD: that info was helpful to us as grantees.. we could count characters and words and check it against the application

MW: we're not going to do away with the online version right now, so if that's a technical problem we'll change it later

JG: the timeline gives the inspector or visitor how much should be done by what time

MW: but when I vote and put numbers out I give almost no weight to the schedule

JG: page 12 'snowmobile trail grant budget sheet'

SN: administrative costs may not exceed 20% of match (RTP, can go out). If you inflate the match.. the fed highway looks at that and decides to give them less money because they don't need it. That's not the state.. even though we don't like telling people to inflate that.. I go by the minimum of 20%.. but that's something with feds. I don't like exaggerated match

MW: lets leave it in there. Lets keep the budget sheet

JG: page 13 goes away (RTP budget sheet)

JG: checks all project types against budget sheet... if the trail is going to submit landowner position and all that crap along with their thing here its going to cost them zip... and cost us zip to add ABC trail to the list

MW: we need a separate form for that I think is what its going to come down to. I'll want pictures of the trails and other things for that

CH: it says admin costs, but there's no section for that

SN: people usually put it under other

MW: if we put 'admin' on there, it will encourage people to add that amount

MW: labor is really what admin is.. we should strike the word out of the whole application

CH: can we do that?

SN: no.

JG: page 15, project funding and sponsor match

CH: that tells you where they're getting their funding from

JG: tells you what local business and companies are supporting and funding the project

MW: we've asked them in their budget where its going and what their match is..

CH: (reads from description on current application) doesn't make any sense

MW: I think we need something besides a budget line to know the names of organizations, club funds going in,

CH: just needs to have some explanation of what it is that's going in the budget

EM: some applications have 'budget justification sections' where they can explain the budget lines

JG: item 3 on page 16.. I'm good with leaving it in.. doesn't hurt anything

JG: page 16..

MW: number 5 needs to come out because it is assumptive that it provides a new rec opportunity (something you should consider, not NEED)

JG: how many users or riders.. do they get to count all the mushers and skiers too?

BL: so what? I just want a count

JS: I more or less want to see how many snowmobilers

JG: I may not want to fund it if its 12 snowmobilers and 700 skiers

MW: how does this project improve snowmobiling opportunities

JG: part a; how many snowmobilers, part b; total use

CH: now the next 3 questions to me are totally redundant (6,7 and 8)

SE: if we took em out I don't think it would hurt either

MW: so 6,7, and 8 all go

JG: this is RTP language here, I don't see a problem with asking if your trail provides a missing trail link

SN: the final thing DNR wants as far as a recreation plan .. I think they're going to want the rec activities to go into score.. I think they're going to want things to fall in line as close as possible with SCORP (number 8)

JG: number 7: trail links are real important. Lets take 6 out, leave 7 and 8 in

CH: they're not getting points on this

MW: 9 we'll put 5 bonus points on this? 10 goes away

JG: 4,5,7,8,9 stay

CH: it's the same up front as we are repeating back here

JG: up front it asks for land management, etc. All of page 17 goes away then

MW: where are we going to ask for letters of support from local communities and businesses?

SN: I need to know public posting locations

SE: we need to back up on 17..

MW: Explain any project 'opposition' (strait forward language) should be asked one time.

SE: got to keep the public notice

CH: here's the example of public notice. What is page 19? I don't get this page?

SN: I can tell you why I use it, but it has nothing to do with you guys. I know I can go to this page and find his phone number, etc. Not telling you not to change it though.

MW: is the long term maintenance plan beneficial for this application?

CH: if we're going to do it, I say put it under the project narrative?

JG: and how long is long-term? 3 months? 10 years? Past grant experience should definitely stay.

MW: now as much as we hate this, some of this might not be so bad.. just how do we let the applicants know which agencies they are supposed to go to?

JG: should this be farther up front?

SE: the reality is, you're not going to fill out a whole application without reading through it first?

JG: lots of people..

SE: then they should be at the bottom of the pile anyway!

JG: I think we should pick out what isn't required and then decide where to put it

MW: in the past years, not many grants have had to go through any of it (90% don't)

CH: please check the top of the instructions to see which of these are needed

MW: I say we rip this out of the application and put it in the instructions... what would you have to do to need to contact these organizations

JS: back in the beginning we had 3 things: access, public, permitting... if you need a permit, you better check to see if MLW has their act together... they would know in the beginning what they need/whether they want to apply

MW: there's a way around this, its going to take some clever though and rearrangement but my thought is we take it out of the applications and put it in the instructions as "if your project does this, they need to do this".

JS: need to give them a tool to get there

JG: what do we not need? Number 1. Coastal Mgmt's gone

JG: does your project require a fish and habitat permit? If you're crossing a creek you may require a permit. Two will be needed at some point. What we're looking for is everything we know absolutely isn't needed. Hell, who knows if my land is a water conservation site.

SN: typically Bill would take these over to Jean to check

MW: that's what we used to do..

JG: but State Parks cant do it till they get the app

MW: we provide info in the instructions "if your projects doing this...you will need a permit.. here's where to go to get it.. get started on it and apply anyways.. you can still get funding but you wont get it until your permits are in place". Going to take some give and take between us and state people who are not in their positions yet.

SN: rec trails if you don't have your permits in place we're not taking on the app. So it would be a change between programs

JG: if we fund someone and they don't use the money it doesn't go through

MW: most of the time the permits people are going for here are relatively easy to get. Don't think I've seen one grant that's gone through here that needs an ACOE permit. My experience in the Juneau area anyway was having a fish and game person come out and tell you whether or not you need a permit. I'm going to go back to this idea that we will have the little guy that wants to build a bridge over his creek, make it easy for him to apply.. get the application in, score it and grant it.. and have him securing his permit while his app goes through the process.

JG: if the money doesn't get spent, we'll get it next year

BL: if you're talking 30 days to less than a year that's doable

JG: what do we do with page 21? How is there any other way to say does the trail cover wetlands or water?

CH: keeps going back. I think its redundant too. Number 10, Johns talking about specifically

JG: page 22 change it to state trails coordinator and change email name

BREAK AT 3:05

BACK AT 3:26

MW: registration fees. We have a set of circumstances right now that make it the best time to stop talking about it and start doing something. I am urging this board to move forward on the fee increase. I think its in the best benefit for snowmobiling in the state of alaska to increase the money in the pool. I think we need to get this in the next session of the legislature

SE: I have not been in support of fee increase. I will support it if we have a good number we can all agree to, so if I'm going to go to the locals and reps up there, and say here's the story from the SnowTRAC guy, this is what's going on, because I think that numbers important if we want that increase. If we go too far, they're going to fight it with all they have

MW: when we started getting pretty serious about the increase, what number makes sense came up... and I did research on how many sbs are registered in the state , and 20 dollars seems like a reasonable amount to ask to take us forward in the future

SE: the bugaboo in my opinion, is what is the legislature going to give us? Because it goes through the federal fund.. so we have to ask for an increase along with that increase in registration fees

MW: the only argument we have is to look at the amount when it comes through each year and make sure its in there

JG: the leg would agree off the record that the amount we will be allotted will be close as possible to what the registration fee total is. I think we have a better chance of asking capital budget to increase. Somebody in State Parks says put in 20000 for the SnowTRAC program, so we need to convince them to ask the gov office to bump it up to 30000 or whatever. I think we have more of a chance of that than increasing the registration fee

SN: I think Karlyn could put in the budget and ask for 500000 but that requires some sort of justification

JG: its an unofficial agreement among legislators that are dead or gone, and it was supposed to be for a couple years and after SnowTRAC got going, Stratton was supposed to start pumping that up a little and it never happened

MW: new admin, new capital budget, one new mark from the governors red pen and SnowTRAC gone. The registration fee gives us a dependable amount. I addressed the ? with a local legislature that temp language can be added to the legislature for INTENT to dedicate to SnowTRAC

CH: it is a statute.. 28.01 or something. The actual 5 dollar amount is in there

JG: so it requires public hearing, notice and legislation to change.

MW: all it takes is one little line to change the statute and increase the fee

SN: since I've been here, there hasn't been a registration package change. I'm sure you still have to go through law and all that. It can be done, but its not as easy as it sounds. I've done ACC packages with health and social services and it was a long process

JG: where is that local law maker that will introduce a bill?

SE: there was a publication of law makers that are favorable?

JG: I got a representative last year.. and they were somewhat receptive, but nether one of them really .. what do we tell the bush? What does the bush get out of it?

MW: opportunity to build rescue shelters, signage programs

JG: they asked how many registrations out in the bush and I said not any new ones and they made their decision off that

SE: I based my request off an improper survey conducted at an octane show.. and they happened to get great benefit, so we went around and got the real public opinion off the internet and took it back as to why we don't support it. We have to be wiser and be sure that we give good representation across the state or at least attribute the benefit they could get. I bet we could find a legislator if we all agree on the plan and message we want to carry forward, we can find one to write the bill

MW: the bills already written.. I just haven't felt like I've had enough support to take it forward

SE: if we have a consistent message to carry.. the same one we all carry and support.. then you're not doing it by yourself

MW: as long as I feel like we have buy-in. not just the SnowTRAC board but ASSA as well.

SE: I know Kevin's not here but he's been a supporter. If the message is not just about a 20 dollar increase, but from the people I'm representing, and it's a good message and meaningful.

MW: define what you think is a consistent message?

SE: I didn't know if there was a consistent dollar amount that's acceptable. For a guy that owns 5 snowmachines.. 40 dollars every 2 years is expensive. A lot of people don't ride as much as they used to because of the price of gas.. and its still 40 cents cheaper down here than up north. There is a trend on registration right now.

JG: because its not point of sale, its re-registration. New sales are still happening.. registration trend is going down because they are forgetting or ignoring or saying the hell with it. A 300 dollar ticket comes from not having a registration..

SE: up north, the only place they check registration is Iron Dog.

BL: the only place I know in south central was in Hatcher Pass

JG: one of the things we talked about last year was get away from fix-it tickets and give the bust tickets

MW: but see that's the wrong solution. We have a much better chance with public information. The riders in those areas need to understand that the money goes back into SnowTRAC, and then to the clubs and individual areas

Tinker: you got the bush that doesn't pay registration, and there's still money that trickles up there

JG: well Dan Cruze was saying its 50 bucks in Montana because most land is private and there's a threat of losing access. There's no threat of loss of access or reinforcement here so people don't give a rats ass

SE: if I'm going to carry a message I would like to carry one like this: we'd like to increase registration fees because we're working our butts off to develop a state-wide signage system, and a safety and education program, and the only way we're going to be able to do this is with more money. Legislators will take this because you're talking their language

MW: one of the strongest arguments is understanding the economic benefits

SE: there's lots of statistics out there that show where Alaska sits worldwide, and US and Canada, and we're not at the top.... So this is an economic opportunity that we need to implement for the future of alaska. And I think it would be stronger in proponents for this particular thing if we had those three bullets out there that that is a good message to be carried out

BL: a few dollars would create such a huge economic system you're going to see your money come back through the state four to ten fold

JG: put those points in a letter to us, and we can all read it and memorize it and spell it

SN: I'm almost playing advocate against the state but if you came to me and said you wanted to increase it, the first thing I would ask is what are you going to do with this money.. grooming and funding projects is not specific enough.. I would have some sort of structure set up where you can say we're going to put in some sort of safety program and secure our grooming for a number of years at a certain ratio.

MW: so we need to dictate we're going to spend this much on grooming, this much on safety, etc.

SN: yes, what are you going to do with that money that you cant do now? Something to look at as opposed to you just asking for money

SE: I don't think grooming is a big enough argument in itself

SN: I hope rec trails stays around, I hope we get the money, but if I was anybody on this board I wouldn't count on it. We can't guarantee we're going to get any further federal funding on this.

SE: what's the benefit to north of the range? It goes back into the safety and it might be the one item we bring up regarding the bush and say too many people die!

JG: provide safety programs and much better support for those communities

SN: they're hitting the RTP grants.. there's a need out there that could be helped by SnowTRAC if you had the money. It would take some work letting them know that its here

MW: too many people are dying out there.. it started in Oct last year.. that's an argument there's no escaping.. if you look at the numbers its really bad. 15 people a year are dying on snowmobile accidents and avalanches are maybe 1 or 2. You've got them trapped at that argument because there's no refuting that information

SE: we had 2 people, one was a kid, on the Chena river. I know the EMT that almost lost his life going out to save him. We were lucky there was only one fatality

MW: another one that breaks my heart.. somebody went for a ride at night 15 miles from town and broke down.. they found the snowmobile and a mile away they found the body. That doesn't have to happen anymore,, they have spots that cost about 99 bucks and you push it and the coast guard comes and rescues you. I guess we're down to a half hour here. What I'm really hoping from this discussion today is an agreement from the board that we move forward on the fee increase. Lets either DO it or NOT do it. Lets make a plan, lets do it right, identify people and legislators

JG: Steve will identify points, we'll just have to

MW: I know that this means nothing to you and where you live (Eric) and I understand, but I need the rest of you on board to agree with me that we're going to move forward. Ben and his staff can do nothing until we talk to a legislator (Dennis Egan).. senator, and used to ride snowmobiles and is absolutely pro-access, pro-snowmobile, pro-business and if I said I need him to call the gov and raise the fee he'd be all about it. And here's the problem, he's a Juneau legislator, the bill would have to be introduced by someone in Anchorage or Mat-Su.

(everyone besides EM nods to signify their compliance and support)

SE: I know that we had some good people favorable to snowmachines in the past, but I think we lost all but one rep. I would have to update my contacts, but I can start going down the list

MW: I'll make a meeting with Senator Egan but I think we need to identify another person to introduce it. I have it written, in the right language, and it looks like a bill.. .but my contact who wrote it doesn't think it will pass if she introduces it. It says something like 'a bill changing snowmo registration fees to 20 dollars a year'

BL : is the intent in there

MW: that is something that the bill's sponsor would have to help us with

SE: so we need a presentation we can give to state leg and senators and then use that to find that person that would be willing to introduce. Although I can be sure no interior person would introduce but I can still ask them.

MW: as soon as I get back I'll call my contact and get a sit down with him and gets that piece out of the way. At least that gets the director moving forward, and can talk to the commissioner on that end. He thinks that's an excellent idea already

JS: say this doesn't work, can we still get a line item increase

MW: 2 ways to do that... director adds item into his budget. The legislature approves, not suggests, the budget. Then it goes to the gov where he can either add subtract or change it, then to the legislature where they can do whatever they want with it.

JS: even if it doesn't get bumped up he has the justification

SE: even if we don't get a legislator to represent the bill, they will hear about it

SN: the park puts in a budget every year, and that's about 250

MW: the legislature can amend the governors budget. So you could ask the legislator too if he can add money to the budget. You're going to be looking for a senator or representative that sits on a finance committee. They are the only ones that would be able to add new line items into the budget.

JG: how granular is the budget, is there a line item that says 'SnowTRAC funding 200,000'?

SN: say if we got 250 authority, and the budget comes back as more... if our receipt authority is only 250, then there would be a problem spending the rest. My fear is, we need to make sure we have receipt authority

MW: I think that that may be true about money coming into the budget from somewhere else. I think on capital budgets, legislature can change whatever they want to .

SN: then we just need to figure out how that would work. And if I'm wrong, I'm wrong and that's fine. Karlyn would be able to explain it better

JG: so I guess though that it seems that for so many years the DMV income has been linked to the 250 line item.. what I would like to see is to unlink that. State parks puts in a budget for trails or whatever it is and receives it for summer tourists and such, and then during the winter all the closed signs go up and the residents and snowmobile riders have to struggle to get money from that pool to survive

SE: the only way we'll get that separation is if we have other people contributing to the funds.

MW: if we go and ask for too much, it would mess up our message

JG: I think that might be the best thing because then we would have to stop grooming, people would be PISSED. But that could be the best thing that happens by getting people into action. It would send the clear message why we need the money to get those trails groomed

SE: I almost think what you're saying is equally important as an increase

JG: as I said earlier today, and yesterday as well, we're going to have to make some tough decisions that are really going to piss off some people in order to keep the quality

SE: it would piss off a bunch of people, but get their ears bent

MW: I think we limit it to one thing right now. If you ask for both, you're not going to get either.

SE: we should look at other alternatives in the long range. I tend to think we might have out best opportunity to go forward with the registration fee increase legislation, but we cant count on it

MW: we go to the intent language.. that link becomes permanent if you have the link in the legislature that that money goes to SnowTRAC. If someone argues you don't need that money, you refer back to where it says exactly what the money is for. I think we've beat this one to heck. I'll reach out to senator Egan and see what he says, but I guess I'm hoping we can lean on each other to get this passed. I think once the ball gets rolling and Kevin sees us moving forward and getting things done.

JS: if this does get improved, when would we see it

SE: leg meets next spring and makes the budget

MW: it might take 10 years before the whole pool actually comes in

SE: so we would start seeing incremental increase

MW: and as riders see it's the registration fees that are paying for the projects happening in their areas, we'll get more people paying their fees

JS: that's a good idea.. threaten to raise the fee and maybe we'll get an influx of people signing up

SN: as soon as I find out from fed highways I will email you and not a moment later.

MW: can you make some code words to make it fun? Like "the chicken has laid the egg"

SN: or the "Titanic is sinking"

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 4:30pm