SnowTRAC Meeting Minutes
08/27/2009

ATTENDEES:

SnowTRAC Board:
Eric Morris – Northern Area
Mark Wilke – Southeast Area (Chair)
Joe Gauna – Anchorage Area (Co Chair)
Bill Luth – Kenai Pen, Valdez, PWS Area
Andy Morrison – Inter Board Liaison
Cindy Hite – Mat-Su, CR Basin Area
Janet Athanas – Western Area

Park Staff:
Bill Luck – DNR Parks
Andre Kaeppele – DNR Parks
Steve Neel – DNR Parks
Kyle Kidder –MLW
Martin Stahl - MLW
Linda Byrd –DNR Parks (Note taker)

Public Guest:
Bruce Paulson – Mat-Su Borough Land Management Division
Laura Bedard – Iron Dog Inc.
Gary Anderson – Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers
Jack Campbell – Mat-Su Trail Council
Scott Lapiene – Mat-Su Trail Council

Introductions and Program Funding

Wilke: Call meeting to order. Begin a round of introductions.

All: Introductions made from all attendees.

Bedard: I understand the board is opting to increase registration fees in fall. I support this but in order to get more support from the public they need to know where the dollars go.

Kaeppele: You will see that today in this meeting and all of this information will be posted on the web.

Anderson: I agree, the public needs to know where the money goes. That is the big question from everyone.

Luck: Meeting minutes, grant application scores, and funding allocations are posted to website. All this information is available to the public now.

12% of the SnowTRAC dollars are for administration of the program. We have been only using about 10%, the other 2% goes towards grooming and trail signs, which I feel is what the people want.

We were previously funded at $200,000 / year; now we are at $225,000. After Parks takes $25,000 for Admin we have $200,000. This year we have $50,000 supplemental ORTAB funds equaling a grand total $250,000 for grooming, signage and projects.

Bedard: Do the books show dollars coming in for registration fees?

Luck: Actual program dollars do not match the registration fees. Slightly more money is collected in registration fees than what we receive.

Wilke: There is no absolute link between dollars for the SnowTRAC program and registration fees. Program dollars come from Governor's budget.

Gauna: DNR submits a request as a line item every year.

Luck: Yes, and we always ask for more.

Grant Application Process

Paulson: Is it possible for DNR to make the grant application programs less cumbersome?

Luck: It is not our intention to make it difficult. We need all of this information to insure grant money is being used properly based on rules and regulations.

Gauna: Some areas would like to see State Parks identify grooming pool trails to groom and take bids rather than having trail groups fill out grant applications. This would avoid that cumbersome process.

Kaeppele: An intensive application process results in better planned projects and insures that all agency regulations are met.

Wilke: There should be a balance between large and small projects. The bottom line is that we need more grant applications. An easier application process would facilitate that.

Luck: We need more than five, at this time we only have five applications (does not include grooming pool).

Morrison: We need more agencies and (native) corporations on board. Many groups put up their own trail markers, they need to be part of SnowTRAC and the program should support their trail marking.

Morris: The grant process is difficult, this is why people stop applying or don't apply at all.

Wilke: Previously funded grantees should not be required to complete the entire application packet every time.

Athanas: Would it be possible to have meetings around the state to explain to people how to properly fill out the application?

Luck: We have a grant that allows us to do this. We need to go to your communities and coordinate public meetings and trainings. We need you to help coordinate this.

Campbell: Filling out the application for the first time is the most difficult, it is hard to locate the required agency contacts to get the necessary information. Now that I have the contacts established the next application will be much quicker and easier.

Morrison: Want to bring other organizations into mix such as the villages. There are a lot of safety projects to be done in rural Alaska. Perhaps we could get funding from DOT to help out rural areas where trails are the life blood.

Anderson: Grant application process is overwhelming. If something is missing within the application is the whole thing ineligible?

Luck: If specified criteria and requirements are not met then projects are deemed ineligible.

Gauna: I think what Gary meant to say, is if you add a trail to an existing grooming pool network and something is missing within the application, do you then lose funding for previous trails that you already had approval for?

Luck: Sorry, I misunderstood, no. You do not as long as all permitting requirements are in place you can get the new trail included in your grooming pool proposal. If not, just that trail is excluded.

Kaeppele: Access must be established, must have legal, public access before a trail can be funded through this program.

Anderson: Do not want to lose total grant because only one trail is ineligible.

Kaeppele: I would recommend applicants put in grooming request for established trails, and complete a grant application for new trails to be added. That way you separate previously approved trails from new ones, and if the application is deemed ineligible, you still have the funding request for existing trails.

Morrison: A grant application can be for the establishment of legal access for a trail. An applicant can get the funding necessary to establish an easement (conducting a survey, application fees, etc…), and down the road another grant to can be applied for to fund grooming of the now legal trail.

Lapiene: We've been successful at Mat-Su Trail Council in getting SnowTRAC funds. We have had internal discussions about streamlining the application process. The inconsistency between state agencies is difficult to deal with. Is there a way that DNR

can collaborate with other agencies to make the application requirements more straight forward?

I agree that public meetings to educate others on applying for SnowTRAC grants would be extremely helpful.

Morrison: An example of this inconsistency is the difference in equipment weight limits on general state land. Between DNR and ADF&G there is a 2,000 pound difference, the allowable use through the Division of Mining, Land, & Water states 10,000 pounds, while the allowable use through the Division of Habitat states 12,000 pounds. Why is there this inconsistency on lands owned by the same entity?

Lapiene: If equipment used for trail work over 10,000 pounds, a permit is required (90 day process), additionally a permit is required for any work over anadromous streams.

Luck: In the past we have asked for an expedited permit process for certain projects, however we could not get that because of staffing shortages and backlog.

Lapiene: 90 days is what is stated, but around 60 days is more common.

Gauna: Why can't ADF&G and DNR communicate with one another to come up with a consistent requirement? This would streamline the application process.

Morrison: If equipment under10,000 pounds is used for trail work, than there is no permit required?

Lapiene: Correct.

Morrison: Can we do the trail work with equipment less than 10,000 pounds?

Lapiene: Safety is in jeopardy if we do.

Gauna: What if heads of DNR and MLW got together and said refer all to AF&G guidelines?

Kaeppele: We will take a look into this issue and in interest of time let's move on.

Lapiene: Why doesn't the State maintain legal trail atlas for SnowTRAC trails?

Kaeppele: We are working on this as we speak.

Grants Funding

Wilke: Now let's move on to the grant application review process.

Athanas: Does SnowTRAC have more money available for grants than requests?

Kaeppele: No, we received $66,350 more in funding requests than what we have available.

Gauna: Do we not need to set aside a dollar amount for grooming and allocate the remainder for grants?

Kaeppele: As a comparison in 2008 $142,000 were allocated for grooming, while in 2009 (last winter) $183,000 were allocated for grooming.

Gauna: If use about the same formula this year, it would leave about $50,000 available for grants.

Morrison: Board has the option of can passing grant application to ORTAB if there is not enough funding here.

Hite: Do leftover funds from a previous year carry over to the next year's SnowTRAC budget?

Luck: Yes, left over funds are rolled over. We have about $40,000 in funds left over from last which is held as a "prudent reserve" fund for unexpected expenditures such as extra grooming in heavy snow years.

Wilke: The public's perception is that if there is money not used it is lost.

Luck: That is incorrect, SnowTRAC monies stay with SnowTRAC and are only to be used for their grants and grooming.

Wilke: Our budgeting spreadsheet needs to show all of these carry over monies.

Gauna: These carry over funds need to be listed in the public record.

Luck: With the $50,000 additional allocation from ORTAB, the prudent reserve this year is $93,921.

Hite: You are definitely saying left over funds from previous years get carried over?

Luck: Yes, definitely.

Kaeppele: Our total funding request this year is $240,000 for grooming requests and $91,000 in grant requests.

Wilke: Do I have a motion to delegate money for grants and grooming?

Hite: <u>Motion to make all dollars request for grants available for grants requested and have the remainder of the funding go towards grooming.</u>

Morris: Second the motion.

Wilke: All in favor of this motion raise your hand

7 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

Grant Applicants Review

(SEE ATTACHMENT A)

Grooming Insurance

Wilke: Now that the grants have been completed let's move on to the issue of insurance. (At this point time was taken to read the insurance handout that the board members had).

Kaeppele: The insurance requirement is as follows: When the state provides funds such as for grooming they need to be released from responsibility of liability in the case of an equipment breakdown or grooming operator's injury. There are many different levels of liability required based on type of equipment being used and the type of business doing the grooming. This is where it is up to the individual grooming contractor to meet with an insurance agent and determine what type of plan would be appropriate for their group, the activity, and the equipment used based on the stipulations identified in the insurance handout I provided.

Wilke: We have been looking for cost effective alternatives for this. We transferred our grant request to Trail Mix (Non-Profit) and were then placed under their liability insurance saving our group $5,000.

Kaeppele: I was advised by the division of risk management that it is a prudent idea to have a trail groomer be a part of someone's business/organization/non-profit that already has established insurance so that the grooming activity will fall under this existing plan.

Gauna: Even small operators need to have insurance. Can they get a smaller policy based on the number of employees and the amount of work done?

Athanas: In my organization 1099 our employees and they have to worry about their own insurance.

Gauna: Just make sure whoever you get to groom has liability insurance per Risk Management Guidelines.

Luck: I think all of the existing grooming groups have the necessary insurance. This was a bigger issue last year because it was the first year we began to enforce it.

Gauna: When you screen the grants if they do not show proof of insurance, they should not be sent to the board.

Campbell: How should the insurance charge be applied in the funding requests?

Wilke: I feel it should be charged as a general overhead.

How do we tell everyone about the insurance requirement?

Luth: They should already know.

Hite: We need to clarify the requirement that if a group does not have insurance, then they are not eligible for funding.

Wilke: Insurance requirements are not only applicable to grooming activities.

Kidder: That is correct. In regards to a Land Use Permit for MLW, bonding and insurance may both required depending on the scope of the project.

Kaeppele: Purpose of bonding is that it protects interest of state regarding the use and subsequent change in value of state land.

Gauna: SnowTRAC needs to change the application form to include the insurance requirements.

Luck: This will be included for the next application round.

Gauna: Before sending the revised application form to public, could DNR staff please send the revision to the board to proof?

Luck: Okay.

Wilke: We'll need to show a statement in the application similar to: "funding contingent upon proof of insurance". Is there any need by this board to go further on this since we have covered and conversed on this several time in the last two years.

Luck: This was previously a large issue. It has since improved, people are finding ways to get this covered.

Wilke: Yes, but need to keep it consistent year to year.

Now on to legal establishment of grooming pool trails and DNR permitting process.

Grooming Pool Trails Identifications (1)

Gauna: The board needs to get together to determine which trails to groom and which not to groom. We will discuss this in great detail tomorrow. We should take a close look at main trails and maybe feeder trails to determine which ones should be left out of the pool due to money restraints.

Hite: Who decides now which trails will be funded?

Campbell: We will need to setup guidelines to do this.

Hite: The board should designate the trails and then not add any more new trails until more funding becomes available.

Gauna: We need to determine criteria for ranking trails from 1st on down to help decide which trails to groom based on money available. We will need to get information from areas as to what it would cost to groom specific trails. We have to go to each area and have them help us establish a priority of trails.

Luth: How do we get trails to expand from five feet width class to a 12 foot width class?

Kidder: We will need to figure this out. These issues should ideally be addressed in the easement application.

Wilke: I suggest bypassing State regulations and using the legislature to get trail classes changed.

Luck: We are already working with the legislature on a registration fee increase, you may want to fight one battle at a time.

Kaeppele: In order for a trail maintenance permit to be successful, the applicant must be active in the application process and follow up with staff members to get results.

Paulson: State will often refer applicants to the Borough, they are then required to pay a $50.00 application fee to get the permit. If State would defer applicants to the Borough this could happen much easier.

Wilke: It is fast approaching 4:30pm, we will pick up on this topic again tomorrow. All, please go over the guidelines for grooming book we were given.

The main issue for tomorrow will be to designate trails.

MEETING ADJOURNED – 4:30 pm

Meeting notes for day 2 (August 28th)

SnowTRAC Meeting Minutes
08/28/2009

ATTENDEES:

SnowTRAC Board:
Eric Morris – Northern Area
Mark Wilke – Southeast Area (Chair)
Joe Gauna – Anchorage Area (Co Chair)
Bill Luth – Kenai Pen, Valdez, PWS Area
Andy Morrison – Inter Board Liaison
Cindy Hite – Mat-Su, CR Basin Area
Janet Athanas – Western Area

Park Staff:
Bill Luck – DNR Parks
Andre Kaeppele – DNR Parks
Steve Neel – DNR Parks
Kyle Kidder –MLW
James King – DNR Parks
Karlyn Herrera – DNR Parks
Wayne Biessel – DNR Parks
Teri Zell – DNR Parks
Linda Byrd –DNR Parks (Note taker)

Public Guest:
Bruce Paulsen – Mat-Su Borough Land Management Division
Gary Anderson – Cabin Hoppers
Scott Lapiene – Mat-Su Trail Council
Kevin Hite – Alaska State Snowmobile Association

Registration Fee Increase (1)

Wilke: Call meeting to order.

Luck: Introduces James King and Karlyn Herrera.

Wilke: Asks James if would like to address the board.

King: Would like to express State Parks appreciation for all the hard work that the board put in. Would like to acknowledge the board accomplishments and we support their goals.

Wilke: The political process for increasing registration fees is open for discussion.

King: I am supportive of this issue. The key to make this successful is to get with the legislature. I have already done some of the leg work. However the process could easily die if the Division of Parks was the only one who pushed for it. This needs the advisory board and the public to keep it alive. You need to make known to legislature that the public and board support this effort.

Hite: Is there another way of accomplishing the fee increase without having to go to the legislature?

King: You could go to Governor. I feel he would be supportive if the board has the public behind them. He is very approachable, but I feel this is an issue better suited for the legislature.

Luck: I would like to suggest that by March the board has a sub-committee to go to the legislators and to gather support from different user groups.

Wilke: We need to be ready by the first week of the session and talk to other legislators. It needs to be done face to face, not as a telephone call.

Do we have any supportive information from DMV?

Herrera: We have talked with them but have not received pertinent information from them.

King: DMV is not required to give funds to the program, but any language that can strengthen a funding commitment is good.

Herrera: I will get a good contact at DMV to discuss this issue.

Wilke: Margaret Brodie previously forwarded an Email with some DMV information to the board, I will forward this Email to you.

Lapiene: I encourage members of board and all interested parties to start now to contact all legislators. Start now before they convene for legislative meetings.

King: Get letters of support from all groups and clubs and mail them to Mark. Mark can get a package together with the letters and pictures (before and after trail pictures) to leave with legislators so they can review.

Hite: Can we get this information on a website?

Luck: It may be possible to use Survey Monkey to help show support.

Morrison: Need some talking points that can catch some non snowmobilers. Economic impacts for rural areas, safety issues, etc.

Wilke: Bush legislators will be tough to convince because there is no grooming there, but they do want safety. This may be a way to earn their support.

Lapiene: Eddie Grasser would be a good contact. He worked on the 1st round of registration fee language. He knows the political ropes.

Hite: Who will be the go to staff person to ask questions regarding this?

King: Andre, Bill and I will give help to answer the questions.

Wilke: I am having trouble finding any current economic information about this issue, all information I have found is outdated.

Morrison: Is there another way we can solicit funds (such as donations) so that we can avoid having to go through the legislative process?

Gauna: That is a whole bucket of worms. We have tried before.

Athanas: Could folks adopt a trail to help with maintenance and funding costs?

Gauna: Our trail organization does that now with in-kind labor, but not with money.

Grooming Pool Trails Identifications (2)

Wilke: Back to the grooming program, at close of the meeting last night we were looking at the prioritization of trails.

Athanas: Where are the areas we have trails and who is using them? If we want to engage the bush, we can't just do this where trails already exist.

Gauna: That's correct, but we are not getting grooming requests from the bush. Perhaps you can help get the program information out there.

Athanas: Yes, I do not think people currently know about this.

Gauna: I do not understand because we advertise statewide and we did get one request for an emergency shelter.

Wilke: Maybe we should take a step back and address how trails will be regionalized before address the trails themselves.

Lapiene: So to do an accurate assessment we need to engage the villages.

Athanas: I can have 56 villages at a table if I do a meeting about this program.

Luck: I encourage the board or staff to help us come up with meetings/venues to educate snowmobilers statewide about the program.

Advisory Board Visioning

Hite: I have three questions:
1. What does DNR view as the SnowTRAC board roles?
2. What does SnowTRAC view as the roles of DNR staff?
3. What do people think of state administered safety program idea?

Wilke: Yes, we want to know what direction we are going and if everyone on the same page. Let's go around the table for each person's thoughts.

King: Roles and priorities for the SnowTRAC board are as follows. It represents what Alaskans want, it is there to serve the people, to help facilitate what users want like the grooming, trail marking, and building trails. It represents Alaskans first, DNR's opinion second, my vision serves the people.

Kaeppele: You advise staff as to what recreational snowmobilers throughout the state want, you are the ones out there that hear from the users and are the ones that represent the users, we are here to help the board get through State process so that the users can get the types of things they want with their registration fees.

Luck: You're advocates for the people, your expertise and knowledge really help us, we facilitate.

Neel: As a grant person I need input so when I work with grantee I know what is going on.

Morris: The board represents Alaskans and the SnowTRAC program, my area does not register snowmobiles and we are really not contributing to the program. Trail marking as well as grooming number one priority in my area of Alaska, it's the key to bring registration out in rural Alaska.

Gauna: My idea of SnowTRAC is bringing citizens together to advise DNR to help snow goers decide where to spend available money, members have responsibility to go back to regions/area and spread the word about the happenings of the program. Later grooming became the focus of the program because it is what the people wanted, it is the easiest to see and view on the ground and is now one of biggest focus of SnowTRAC. We need to let our regions/areas know what is available.

Wilke: Number one priority is grooming but we need to get away from this and add staking, safety, and education to the program. Trail development needs to come back to the

program as it seems to have left. Right of Way issues are hardly talked about anymore and are a huge issue. We are the voice back to DNR, the eyes and ears of our regions/areas.

Hite: I would like to see safety funded as a statewide curriculum managed by DNR rather than piece meal grant applications. If we can get this done can get to new grant applications each year instead of spending hours discussing same safety requests and issues each year.

Morrison: We are getting a lot more support from the State now and are growing in the right direction. We must be the eyes and ears of our areas. I hear so much when I am out riding. Easement is an important issue and needs to move forward so that we can grow and preserve our trail systems.

Luth: We are stewards between DNR and the public. We need to get as much information as possible from the public to support them. People are scared that trails are going away. We need to look at the future, not just recreation but transportation trails. This is going to be a big issue.

Athanas: We need to do a press release so that the board can take information back to the people, we should set a date to do so everyone does this at the same time. Education statewide is a good thing.

Wilke: Janet, could you start the work on a press release.

Athanas: Yes, I will do it.

Anderson: I have learned a lot these last two days sitting in on your meeting. Good direction, you put a lot of work into it. I agree to get the word out to everyone.

Lapiene: We are in an infancy stage compared to the lower 48, been reactive rather than proactive. In order to make the program proactive requires committed staff and not just volunteers. We need to seek more grants, 5 just isn't enough. I wonder if people think that the grooming is the whole program and that is part of the reason we don't see more grants.

Paulson: This entity acts as guiding force as a statewide program for trails, marking of trails, safety and education. I feel boroughs need to work closely to help the board to accomplish this. People want maintenance of trails rather than new trails.

Kidder: This is a good way to see need for easements statewide.

Biessel: The most endangered species in Alaska is access. This group should focus on this, without access it has nothing. I would like to see the group work on fair allocation process for grooming pool, it needs to mature and it needs your input. There needs to be an assurance and assessment program to insure that funds are being used wisely.

Zell: We should build on assessment, I would like to see a part time staffer familiar with trails to go out and give input how it is being done. Really need this and an allocation of funds needs to be done.

King: I have made a summary of what everyone has said and this is what I hear from you:

"The board will fairly represent all Alaskans while promoting and advocating improved snowmobile opportunities and advising the Division on snowmobile issues including the snow machine registration program, how best to spread available funding, safety, grooming, trail marking, education, trail development, acquiring legal right of ways and other issues."

Wilke: Do I hear a motion to accept James' summary as our SnowTRAC vision statement?

Athanas: Motion to accept the summary as our vision statement.

Gauna: Second the motion.

Wilke: All in favor of this motion raise your hand.

7 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

Program Reserve Funds

Luck: Do we have a list of all trails we groom?

Wilke: It is better to have a list of trails when asking for money. In the past grooming was done based on geographic areas, and now we know it is not the best method. We need to list the trails which are requesting grooming and assign some dollars values to them. Let's work up a matrix.

Luth: Some areas will need to help with this and have no representation here today.

Gauna: I make a motion to request State Parks make a continuing prudent reserve fund of no more than $50,000 and move the rest into the grooming pool.

Hite: Second the motion

Luck: I would feel more comfortable with more than $50,000 in prudent reserve.

Gauna: $50,000 is plenty.

Athanas: Bill, what do you do with the money?

Luck: Excess hangs out there and is put into another account and used as backup if money falls short due to unforeseen circumstances, used as rollover dollars.

Neel: It is used the next year before using new monies.

Luth: Rollover funds were used last year on a trail signing project.

Wilke: Reserve funds used to should go back into pool and not set aside. I hear grief from the public that they do not like the idea of a reserve fund.

Gauna: State has the right to reserve funds.

Luck: No way to know exactly what funding will be needed in a particular year, we need the reserve preserve the program.

Lapiene: I agree with Bill. I feel we need a prudent reserve. If we set a cost allocation per mile for trails we will know what is needed for funds and additional funds can be used for high snow years.

Zell: In the past we have had to cut off contractors due to lack of funds and still had snow to be groomed.

Gauna: I am not saying should not have a reserve, I want it limited to $50,000.

Neel: Forget the word reserve, it is money left over from end of year and moved over to the next year (rolled over).

Gauna: I just want to know excess goes into grooming pool.

Wilke: Let's vote. All in favor of motion to keep the "prudent reserve" funds at $50,000 raise your hand .

5 YES 1 NO 1 Abstain MOTION PASSED

Grooming Pool Trails Identifications (3)

Wilke: Trail Priority Matrix for grooming.

At this time there was much discussion over this issue, as a result a matrix was setup to rank trails with the categories of:

1. Trailhead Access	2. Number of users per week	3.Length
4. Width	5. Distant from grooming base	6.Terrain
7. River/water crossing	8. Frequency of grooming required	9. Average snowfall
10. Economic impact	11. Loop/network trail	12.Trunk/feeder/local

13. Length of season

At one point members realized that matrix would need to be divided into two separate ones. One would be loosely based on public demand and use while the other would be loosely based on the maintenance costs for grooming and signing trails. Due to time allowance members agreed to table this issue and to move on to allocation of dollars for grooming for the 2009/2010 winter season.

Athanas: Based on a class of trail could we have an estimate of the cost to maintain it?

Kaeppele: Costs will be different for a different class of trails, we need to work out on hourly or mileage cost to achieve this.

Wilke: For now we need determine geographic areas, and we can then continue to work on the matrix priority.

Gauna: We should use the following regions – Western, Northern, Southeast, Southcentral, Mat-Su.

2009/2010 Snow Trac Funds Allocations

Some of the monies requested of the grooming pool and grantees were amended to reach the budget of available funds. Following is the discussion leading to the final funding allocations.

Wilke: Moves to accept grooming pool allocations at $216,403.

Luth: Second the motion.

Biessel: I would like to go back and take a look at the numbers.

Kaeppele: Allocations for Chugach and Wood Tikchik state parks have not been addressed.

Gauna: Do we have requests from these areas? If they want money they need to request it.

Wilke: I agree.

Luck: It is only fair, they need to ask.

Kaeppele: Parks has never had to ask for funds before, it would be unfair to require it now without notification.

Gauna: They are not exempt from requesting.

Morris: To deny them funding without forewarning or knowledge is unreasonable, I suggest we allocate them funds this time and notify them that they must submit requests for future funding.

(ALL AGREED)

Luth: I would like to see Big Lake grooming funding increased.

Gauna: If they wanted more they could have asked for it.

Biessel: I believe there are additional funding needs in Big Lake and Hatcher Pass, would like to revisit funding allocations in these areas.

Gauna: Do you want amendment our motion?

Athanas: I would like to amend the motion that unallocated funds from grooming pool go to Chugach and Wood Tikchik state parks.

Morris: Last year Chugach and Wood Tikchik spent $2,000 each and someone else suggested $5,000 in additional funds for Big Lake.

Gauna: Before we move money around remember that Wayne has flexibility to move money around during the season if it needs to be moved based on conditions.

Luth: Make a motion to use $8,040 left from grooming pool to fund a part time position for a grooming contract administrator.

Hite: Second the motion

Wilke: Isn't State Parks already responsible for this? They already get administrative funds.

Luck: We talked about putting Andre out there once week per each month for four months and you asked about a trail counter and signage.

Morrison: If someone is already there let them do the signage.

Gauna: Who?

Morrison: Andre, if he is the one there.

Wilke: Andre is already 100% budget funded, State Parks agrees Andre will do this.

Kaeppele: We have the capability to do this through Administrative funds, $8,040 left over can go somewhere else.

Gauna: Will you do that? Spend one week a month for four months in the field doing compliance checks with existing administrative money.

Kaeppele: Yes.

Gauna: Statewide?

Biessel: If the travel statewide equipment will be needed.

Kaeppele: I could go with groomer or club member.

Lapiene: Audit needs to be independent and separate from the club. Does State Parks not have snow machine to use? (Answer is yes.)

Hite: Make a motion to fund Chugach and Wood Tikchik at $2,000 each and the rest to Big Lake.

Morris: Second the motion

Gauna: All in favor raise your hand.

7 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

(SEE *ATTACHMENT B* FOR FINAL SNOW TRAC BUDGET ALLOCATIONS)

Registration Fee Increase

Gauna: Now let's move on to the registration fee increase issue.

Hite: We have talked with James King about the process this morning.

(At this point Kevin Hite, President of Alaska State Snowmobile Association (ASSA) was introduced- Kevin arrived a few minutes earlier, was not present for all of the meeting.)

K. Hite: Our association has had a lot of discussion going on and the general consensus is they support the increase in fees to support snowmobiles.

Going to Juneau is a big step. However, in order for the ASSA to lobby, they need direction from SnowTRAC and State Parks. Our main concern is with grant program and how closely it is monitored on the ground.

750 people were surveyed (Anchorage base) and the majority are in favor of the increase.

In order to successfully lobby though, I have some points that need to be addressed:

1. Originally SnowTRAC formed in 1978 and allocated 15% of the funds to safety and the rest to grants. We feel that allocation is no longer there.

2. Parks Staff is not going to have time to do the compliance. If we get the fee increase contract administration demands are going to be huge and administration will have to be a full time position.

3. Transparency of the program is an issue, all funding allocations and registration fee incomes needs to be visible to the public.

I want to be able to talk to people about this happening. Currently we have talked about ASSA newsletter dedicating space to SnowTRAC to show work being done. At this time we cannot support increase, we hope by June that will change.

Kaeppele: I agree with what you said. With that amount of funding increase the program will need to be ramped up and that will need to be planned for and laid out.

K Hite: Those are the answers I need to be able to support this; I need the program guidelines for a $1 million dollar program before I can lobby to support the increase.

Wilke: The frustration with this program is the amount of time it takes to deal with these concerns and you walked right into the middle of it. Come to us with some suggestions for ramping up the program to support an increase. I know you have ideas that would help.

K. Hite: Yes, I understand. I will be glad to give a presentation to you with some ideas. I'm not throwing rocks, I want this to work.

Luck: A Lot of your points are very valid. The group is in the process of reconstruction. This is a solid group of people. The intention is to grow but it is a bit premature to grow at this time based on a $1 million dollar budget. The Board needs to look at this program on a statewide level.

However, I strongly disagree with the transparency of programs. Accounting books are at every meeting we go to. There is a huge commitment here for transparency.

The task of monitoring has not fully been thought out yet but I do believe that Andre is the one individual to initially take on the task. Before going to the Snow Rider magazine we should have a meeting to talk about the direction of program.

K. Hite: Did not mean to question transparency. I know these people are working very hard. I feel this program is one of the best things that has happened to Alaska. I want it to grow.

Wilke: If we go to increase fee registration, there will still be support out there. Essentially there is not enough time to work out all the kinks for this session. A suggestion is to move to 2011 legislature session, in order to be completely prepared. At this time the program is not prepared to administer the increase.

Lapiene: Mat-Su Council in support of the fee increase. The money available now is not there to do everything. The current $5.00 annual registration fee is minimal. An increase to $20.00 is a drop in the bucket compared to other states. A $1 million dollar program is nothing. I am surprised ASSA is saying that they won't support this. People are out there buying $8,000 snowmobiles for a $5.00 registration fee. As president of the Mat-Su council I will carry back this information and still support the increase.

K. Hite: The ASSA supports the increase. However, I need to be able to go out and convince others. I want to have all snowmobilers support this, and getting the items I mentioned fixed will help this. I just want it to be more prepared.

Lapiene: If they are not educated yet what will another year do?

K. Hite: We take some of the blame for this. There are some areas we need to work on to get the support. If we fail in Juneau it will be a long time before can go back. We need public support for the pull.

Gauna: It is almost time to adjourn.

Morrison: Maybe we need outside help, maybe a consultant could help.

Biessel: One final point regarding grooming standards, criteria established today is important, dollars per mile look at adjusted, trail mileage = $ per mile
miles **X** width **X** frequency/per week
1 = 5 to 6 feet 2 = 7 to 12 feet 3 = 13 to 16 feet
I will put this out in an Email to you and we can work with it, it could be a technical element.

Meeting Scheduling

Hite: We need to schedule the next meeting, a quarterly schedule is good. For the next meeting I suggest taking a look at groomer operation guidelines, a statewide safety curriculum, and a close look at the registration fee increase and where the money would go. We should put this on the agenda.

Kaeppele: Let's set a firm date for next meeting.

Luck: Where are we on the January 19th date? (This is the first day of the legislative session)

Wilke: Not sure if it is realistic to plan a meeting to lobby the legislature this year.

Luck: I agree, there are not enough answers yet.

Wilke: The purpose of the next quarterly meeting should be to deal with a statewide safety program, it is the least difficult issue to deal with and we can get hands around it. We need to come up with how SnowTRAC wants to do safety in Alaska. Curriculums already exist. We need organization(s) to take out to the riders.

Hite: This could work the same as grant, however it would be a onetime grant in which outside organizations would help DNR out.

Wilke: I propose a separate meeting for each of the following issues – safety, grant application, grooming program.

Luck: In the meantime we can start Andre with the contract administration work.

Next quarterly meeting tentatively scheduled for December 3rd and/or December 4th.

MEETING ADJOURNED 4:30 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

1. Project Name: Mat-Su Trail Marking and Signing II

- **Applicant: Matanuska-Susitna Borough**
- **Funding:** $ (10,557)/ $ (28,620)/ $ (39,177)
- **Project type:** Trail Maintenance
- **Land Owners:** Various (state, borough, mental health, etc..)

-PROS

a. **High level of public support**
b. **Clearly depicts need for service**
c. **Budget is thorough**
d. **Legal land access clearly described**

-CONS

a. **Fails to address storage and maintenance of remaining signs**
b. **Distribution of signs difficult to determine**

Project Description:

The proposed project will fund the purchase of 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 the installation and maintenance of the trail markers and signs.

Board Discussion:

Neel: Grantee is currently finishing up Phase I and is in compliance with the current grant.

Morris: Motion to fund.

Luth: Second the motion.

Paulsen: This is an extension of a 2007 grant. The borough works with trail care program partners. DNR has given the Borough management authority of these trails. We have third parties that do the ground work. The borough has acquired the public easements and is now into marking trails. There is a public need for additional funds to purchase more signs.

Gauna: What percentage of these markers and signs end up on trails where snow machines do not go.

Paulsen: None

Hite: How many organizations are involved in the program?

Paulsen: 19 in all.

Luth: The program is very efficient. Required signs are quickly distributed to groups.

Morrison: What is the response to the signing?

Luth: In my area alone I have lots of beginners. The signing has increased compliance with staying on trail easements and it helps the public know where they are. The response is generally very positive.

Gauna: I have seen the same response.

Hite: I have been there, it is great to see the signs.

Kaeppele: Is this to purchase new signs or to replace signs?

Paulsen: This request is to meet demand for signage we could not do so with the first grant.

Kaeppele: My concern is not to spend thousands each year to replace reusable signs.

Gauna: Most people will retrieve the old signs.

Neel: This request is under $15,000 and does not require a match.

Lapiene: Borough has been very successful at this and there is always a need for more signs. Is the borough contributing to this project?

Paulsen: We are providing a match through our general fund.

Luck: Are the signs available to all applicants?

Paulson: Yes, we send out a letter to all organizations (in the Mat-Su, not statewide).

Wilke: All in favor of the motion raise your hand

7 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

2. Project Name: Moose Range Trails

- **Applicant: Mat-Su Trails Council**
- **Funding:** $ (26,705.09)/ $ (17,146.36)/ $ (43,851.45)
- **Project type:** Trail Development
- **Land Owners:** State

-PROS

a. **Large public interest**
b. **Potential to link to other trail systems**

-CONS

a. **Grooming will be done by Nordic ski club**
b. **State agency permits not complete (F&G anadromous stream)**
c. **Doesn't adequately describe maint, storage, and use of equipment**

Project Description:

Project will consist of signing, grooming, and maintenance of approximately 22 miles of trail in the Palmer Moose Range. Grant funds will be used to purchase grooming equipment and signs.

Board Discussion:

Wilke: Does staff have any information to offer?

Kidder: Looks to be all State land, which makes grooming a generally allowed use.

Wilke: Is there an easement for this? If not, we can't fund this.

Luck: There is a generally allowed use for grooming on State land, therefore this is a legal activity that we can fund.

Wilke: If this is funded, can they do the work without an easement?

This board has to prove beyond a doubt that the applicant will have legal access. Kyle, would you fund this grant based on that?

Kidder: Yes.

Luck: They have legal access since this activity is on general state land.

They can proceed with the current proposal. The only thing that would be a problem is if a 5 foot corridor was widened without a permit.

Campbell: There is no discussion to widen a trail in this application.

Hite: Who uses the trail?

Campbell: Almost everyone that lives in the area.

Hite: Do skiers use the trails also.

Campbell: Yes.

Kaeppele: Elaborate on who will do the grooming and to what frequency.

Campbell: We are expecting 350 hours of grooming year.

Luth: How many miles?

Hite: 22 miles?

Luth: We do 100 miles for 400 hours as a point of reference.

Wilke: Motion to fund?

Luth: Make a motion to fund.

Janet: Second.

Wilke: Open for discussion.

Luth: It seems most people using the trails are from the local area, skiers are the largest user group users.

Hite: Are cross country skiers the primary users?

Gauna: This cost is way over estimated. We shouldn't be grooming these narrow local trails. This goes away from our concept of well maintained wide trails. Can we send this project to ORTAB?

Luck: The biggest issue that I see is that these trails are not primarily for snowmobile use but for skiers. I think we need to take a vote to find out or not, this could be a good candidate for the Recreation Trails Program.

Wilke: Do I hear a motion to move to ORTAB?

Luck: I suggest the grantee refine the budget and give the application to ORTAB.

Hite: Motion to move to ORTAB

Luth: Second the motion.

Campbell: Can I get a list of changes or additional information needed to submit this to ORTAB?

Gauna: I suggest you work with Bill and Andre on this.

Wilke: All in favor of motion to move to ORTAB raise your hand.

7 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

3. Project Name: Be Snowmobile Safe

- **Applicant: North American Outdoor Institute**
- **Funding:** $ (15,000)/ $ (21,000)/ $ (36,000)
- **Project type:** Safety and Education
- **Land Owners:** Not Applicable

-PROS

a. **Good medium (internet) to get safety message out**
b. **Project supported by Senators, Governors, and City Government**
c. **Credible instructors used for teaching**
d. **Previously successful grant applicant.**

-CONS

a. **Budgeting doesn't account for a set number of courses**
b. **Difficult to gauge the success and compliance of an online system**

Project Description:

Provide statewide snowmobile safety education training programs that include online courses and live training with both multi-media information and hands-on field exercises taught by professional, certified avalanche and snowmobile safety trainers. The information will include practical, easy to implement skills delivered in an engaging format that appeals to students in 4^{th}-12^{th} grades as well as outdoor enthusiasts of all ages. Each workshop will be customized for the audience skill level.

Board Discussion:

Neel: This grantee is not out of compliance.

Luck: This group continuously acquires grants, they are very successful, they go to Expos and give programs.

Last year this group applied for 3 grants, and this was the only one the board approved.

Gauna: We did not have enough money last year to fund more than one of their grants.

Lapiene: What is the certification level of their instructors?

Morrison: They are heli ski guys.

Kaeppele: There is no documentation in the applications, but all instructors listed are well trained in avalanche safety.

Morris: Are they required to have match?

Neel: No, this grant is under $15,000 and is for safety.

Wilke: Hear a motion to fund?

Athanas: Motion to fund

Morrison: Second

Wilke: Open for discussion.

Gauna: Their budget does not seem correct. They are not soliciting the required quotes for instructor charges.

Luck: This is a personnel charge, there is no bid requirement for this.

Hite: Is the contract worker the instructor? Do they use their own people? Is $7200.00 the actual funds for the instructors?

Wilke: Last year we funded a $15,000 website grant, and I have not seen any changes to their website in the last year, with no additional online training opportunities. Where did that $15,000 go last year?

Luth: The public wants to see this money on the ground in trails, they are not supporting this.

Hite: I believe in safety programs but need to know how the dollars are used. There is no evidence of this in the last web project we funded from this group.

Morris: It seems as though the funds are being used to fund a ski instructor's life style, does anyone else provide this service?

Morrison: I have been to a few of these, they are an organization that pulls together and get people in a room to get the word out and taking lead.

Kaeppele: I attended one of these at the Iron Dog Expo. It seemed out of context. It was a skier discussing avalanche danger to a snowmobiler at an Iron Dog Event. I think a curriculum focused on high speed snowmobiling, navigation, winter survival, and remote travel would have been more appropriate. Additionally there was only one snowmobiler in attendance.

Gauna: SnowTRAC safety dollars should go into state funded program.

Hite: I agree, we need statewide program, if we promote this we will not get there.

Gauna: It could be modeled after the Boating and Safety program.

Wilke: We need a program, we need to stop these small deals.

Kaeppele: If this grant is not approved there will not be a lot of means to get out safety instruction this winter.

Morrison: Can we move this to ORTAB?

Luck: Can not guarantee it would be approved, it may be a good fit for this application.

Wilke: In past we have funded grants for less than the requested dollars.

Luck: We can fund for less dollars.

Wilke: All in favor of motion on the table raise hand.

1 YES 6 NO 0 Abstain MOTION FAILED

Morrison: I recommend that applicant applies to ORTAB for funding.

Morris: They will need to clean up the application before it goes to ORTAB.

Morrison: Bill, do you advise them of this.

Luck: I will cover this with them before ORTAB.

4. Project Name: Snowmobile Helmet Safety Incentive

- **Applicant: North American Outdoor Institute**
- **Funding:** $ (15,000)/ $ (10,000)/ $ (35,000)
- **Project Type:** Safety and Education
- **Land Owners:** Not Applicable

-PROS

a. **Project supported by Senators, Governors, and City Government**
b. **Previously successful grant applicant**
c. **Can provide on the ground safety around the state**
d. **Motivates snowmobilers to learn about safety**
e

-CONS

a. **Does not account for income generated from helmet sales**
b. **Pricing quotes are inconsistent and hard to compare**

Project Description:

Provide snowmobile helmets as an incentive for attending safety education training programs that include online courses, live, multi-media presentations and hands-on field exercises taught by professional, certified avalanche and snowmobile safety trainers. Each participant that successfully completes assigned tasks and a short quiz to demonstrate their knowledge of the material presented will be eligible to purchase a Snell/DOT approved snowmobile helmet for approximately $25-$50 ($150 value). Each workshop will be geared appropriately for the audience skill level.

Board Discussion:

Wilke: Question any conflict of interest, if so please excuse yourself, any public comments? Is there a motion to fund?

Athanas: Motion to fund grant.

Morris: Second

Wilke: Open for discussion.

Neel: This project does not require a match.

Athanas: What are they doing with the income they are receiving from helmet sales?

Gauna: I want to know too.

Gauna: The applicant has three helmet bids but there is a different amount of helmets on each bid so that they cannot be compared comparative.

They should have a quote per unit but this application has a different quantity on each quote, they need to be comparative.

Hite: I amend motion to fund to include a clause that helmet income will be put back into more helmets next year?

Morris: I accept that and add a requirement to show where the helmets are going.

Neel: Quarterly reports will show the amount of helmets sold.

Lapiene: Programs like this need to be self sufficient, income funds should go towards more helmets.

Wilke: Have amendment to motion to show that helmet sales monies from this grant to pay for helmets and distribution with a report/receipt showing who/where helmets were sold to. All in favor of this amendment raise hand.

6 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE
(Andy Morrison had to leave before vote was taken)

Wilke: I did my own research on this application. I always had questions about the facts and figures with this grant. I checked the Bio Medicine website, and the report is not even close to what is depicted in this application. I have a problem with grants that provide incorrect information to solicit funds.

Lapiene: My concern is that other organizations get donations and give away helmets, while this organization wants money to buy and sell them.

Morris: I like the fact that people have to pay for the helmet, this gives people a stronger sense of ownership and appreciation for them.

Gauna: Call the question. All in favor of the grant as amend raise your hand.

3YES 3 NO 0 Abstain MOTION FAILED
(Andy Morrison had to leave before this vote was taken)

5. Project Name: Iron Dog Safety Expo

- **Applicant: Iron Dog Incorporated**
- **Funding:** $ (24,688)/ $ (21,375)/ $ (46,063)
- **Project type:** Safety and Education
- **Land Owners:** Not applicable

-PROS

a. Good venue will reach a lot of snowmobilers
b. Several safety organizations will be present under one roof
c. Fully supported by industry and local government

-CONS

a. Cost unreasonably high for one day event
b. Grant funds would pay for vendors to market products
c. Does not specifically outline safety seminars and materials available

Project Description:

Free public EXPO that promotes snowmobile and outdoor education and safety through presentations, seminars, industry vendors, public safety organizations and through the distribution of educational brochures. The EXPO will be held February 13, 2010 in Anchorage at the Dena'ina Convention Center.

Board Discussion:

Wilke: Can the staff provide any information about this grantee?

Neel: They have a history total compliance.

Wilke: Are there any comments from the public?

Bedard: This is 27th year of the Iron Dog Race. The safety inspection expo has been in existence for four years. This is a large event and is organized by a non-profit organization Iron Dog Inc.

This event is an opportunity to for the snowmobile industry to collaborate with the user. This event promotes economical growth, safety, and recreational opportunities.

The funding requested is a fraction of what it takes to run this event. For the last three years the EXPO has been held in Wasilla at the sports complex. This event will be in Anchorage, which will draw more people, but also require more funding. The match amount on the budget does not itemize all expenses, many expenses aren't foreseeable until the event takes place. Our organization owns nothing and must therefore rent everything.

Hite: How do you think public would respond to spending $25,000 for an Expo instead of a trail?

Bedard: Here is an opportunity to reach out to the user, provide safety information, and explain the program and which trails are groomed.

Hite: The Iron Dog title makes this seem like a racer only event, how do you promote this to the general snowmobile user?

Bedard: Three years ago the event open up as Safety Expo which changed the event from and Iron Dog event to an event for the general public. Last year much of the public did attend, the general consensus is that they would like to see it grow.

Athanas: What is the possibility of doing this event earlier in the season when people need a safety refresher before heading out on the trail?

Gauna: This event falls a week before the Iron Dog race, this leads me to believe the focus of the event is for the race. Why should Snow TRAC fund the whole event? What amount of the total dollars is specifically for safety education and not the race oriented? A one day safety seminar cost of $24,000 plus is too high.

Bedard: Anything can be done cheaper but we would like to see more participation by holding the event in Anchorage. $12,000 is to rent the Dena'ina Center, this covers about 50% of the whole event cost.

Gauna: Is safety expo in conjunction with other show or all by itself? Looks like you are asking to help finance the whole event.

Bedard: A large part of the cost is for advertising, one advertisement alone is $5,000.

Hite: Are there other organizations coming in? Do you charge for booth space?

Bedard: This event is not to make money, we invite organizations and do not charge for booth space.

Morris: Are there any manufacturers that contribute to this event?

Bedard: Not in actual dollars.

Lapiene: There would be a large decrease in participation if this was only a safety event and not associated with the Iron Dog. The Iron Dog label draws more participants.

Wilke: Is there a motion to fund?

Morris: Move to fund.

Gauna: Second.

Wilke: Open for discussion.

Hite: Expensive for a one day event. Rather see this combined with another safety event, and have the Iron Dog event another day.

Bedard: This is the largest snowmobile event in the State of Alaska and it will cost much more than we are requesting.

Campbell: Iron Dog is a powerful vehicle to attract people, adding safety to it applies.

Luth: I agree along with that, suggest partially funding based on the money we have.

Wilke: What do we get out of it if funded? What is in it for SnowTRAC?

Neel: Andre and I went last year, this is a great opportunity for interested people new to the sport to learn about it and how to do it safely.

Wilke: To Andre and Bill – would you guys go there?

Kaeppele : I went last year. It is a good venue to solicit more grant applications, hear from the public and what they want out of the program, and educate people on the grooming pool and the importance of registration. I believe it is an appropriate venue for safety education.

Lapiene: I encourage this board to participate. $24,000 is a small amount of money for an event of this caliber, having it in anchorage is a great attraction, what you will get out of it is a good return.

Athanas: Why does the budget spend more on web development than newspaper advertisements?

Bedard: Web development will promote safety year round.

Morris: Regarding the Iron Dog I don't believe you Can enjoy a trail at 100 miles an hour, and generally unsafe as well. Regardless I will support this, but I still believe it is cheaper and more appropriate to have in Wasilla.

Wilke: Still seems like a lot of money for a one say event. What is the possibility of decreasing our funding contribution? What about Tesoro, can't they sponsor the event as they have in the past?

Bedard: The event is no longer sponsored by Tesoro.

Wilke: This does seem like a safety program, actually the event hosts several safety programs. I see at least four, I don't know that SnowTRAC can afford all of these. Perhaps we can fund a fraction of the programs. I believe this is the best of all of the Safety and Education grants, but $24,000 for one day is too much.

Athanas: Vendors should be required to pay for part of the event.

Bedard: They are not considered vendors in this capacity, they attend the event to promote safety.

Luth: The booths don't have a rental fee?

Bedard: No charge.

Campbell: There should be a charge.

Gauna: Would like to amend to the amount of funding SnowTRAC will vote on from $24,000 to $15, 000.

Luth: Second

Wilke: Any more discussion (NONE)

Wilke: Vote to fund grant.

6YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE
(Andy Morrison had left before this grant was put before the board)

Wilke: Now vote on amendment for decrease of funding to $15,000.

6YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE
(Andy Morrison had left before this grant was put before the board)

ATTACHMENT B

Grooming Pool & Snowmobile Trail Grant Expenditures 2009/2010

		Requested	Appropriated
GROOMING POOL			
Southcentral Grooming Areas			
Big Lake	Estimate	~~$ 5,000~~	$ 9,040
Petersville	Estimate	$ 40,000	$ 40,000
Lower-Susitna Drainage	Estimate	$ 6,225	$ 6,225
Mid-Valley Trail Club		~~$ 19,000~~	$ 14,000
Lake Louise		$ 21,003	$ 21,003
Willow Area Trails		$ 16,000	$ 16,000
Caribou Hills		~~$ 14,997~~	$ 20,000
Denali Highway		$ 18,000	$ 18,000
Hatcher Pass	Estimate	$ 20,000	$ 20,000
Snowmads		$ 19,610	$ 19,610
Montana Creek Motor Mushers	Estimate	$ 5,565	$ 5,565
TOTAL		**$ 185,400**	**$ 189,443**

Interior Grooming Areas					
Yukon Quest		~~$ 15,000~~	$	10,000	$5K Increase Director Decision
Chena River Recreation Area I	Estimate	~~$ 6,000~~ -	$	4,000	
Chena River Recreation Area II	Estimate	~~$ 6,000~~ -	$	4,000	
TOTAL		**$ 27,000**	**$**	**18,000**	
Southeast Grooming Areas					
Juneau Snowmobile Club		~~$ 12,000~~ -	$	6,000	
TOTAL		**$ 12,000**	**$**	**6,000**	
Other Areas					
Chugach State Park		~~$ 8,000~~	$	6,000	$4K Increase Director Decision
Wood-Tikchik State Park		$ 2,000	$	2,000	
TOTAL		**$ 10,000**	**$**	**8,000**	
Snowmobile Trail Grants					
Mat-Su Trail Signing		$ 10,557	$	10,557	
Moose Range Trails		~~$ 26,705~~	$	-	
Be Snowmobile Safe (NAOI)		~~$ 15,000~~	$	-	
Snowmobile Helmet Incentive (NAOI)		$ 15,000	$	15,000	Director Decision

Iron Dog Safety Expo		~~$~~	~~24,688~~	$	15,000
TOTAL		**$**	**91,950**	**$**	**40,557**
Program Administration					
Statewide Program Administration		$	13,000	$	18,000
Southcentral Grooming Administration	Estimate	$	11,000	$	11,000
Interior Grooming Administration	Estimate	$	1,000	$	1,000
TOTAL		**$**	**25,000**	**$**	**30,000**
GRAND TOTAL FUNDS REQUESTED		**$**	**351,350**	**$**	**268,000**
PROGRAM FUNDING AVAILABLE		**$**	**282,233**		
DEFICIT		**$**	**69,117**	**$**	**24,000**

PROGRAM FUNDS APPROPRIATED

PRUDENT RESERVE FUNDS APPROPRIATED

PROGRAM FUNDS FY 2009/10	
$ 236,000	Legislatively Transferred Funds
$ 46,233	Rec Trail Transferred Funds
$ 282,233	**TOTAL**
$ 268,000	**Board Appropriated Funds 2009/10**
$ 14,233	**Remaining Funds**

PRUDENT RESERVE FUNDS	
$ 113,269	Rollover (Older RTP Funds Remaining)
$ 14,233	Remaining Program Funds 2009/10
$ 15,000	Used 2009 / 2010 Safety Ed Grant
$ 5,000	Used for Yukon Quest Grooming
$ 4,000	Used for Chugach State Park Grooming
$ 103,502	**Prudent Reserve Remaining**

$ 292,000 **TOTAL FUNDS APPROPRIATED 2009 / 2010**

FUNDING BREAKDOWN	
$ 221,443	Grooming Costs
$ 40,557	Grant Costs
$ 30,000	Admin Costs
$ 292,000	**Total**

Snowmobile Trail Grant Program - 2009/10

			Scores											
Ref. #	**Project Name**	**Submitted by**	**M.W.**	**J.G.**	**B.L.**	**M.Y.**	**A.M.**	**C.H.**	**E.M.**	**J.A.**	**O.W.**	**A.K.**	**S.N.**	**B.L.**	**Avg**
1	Mat-Su Borough Trail Marking and Signing II	Matanuska-Susitna Borough	97	92	98	-	-	75	99	91	-	86	-	-	92
2	Moose Range Trails	Mat-Su Trails Council Inc.	68	30	79	-	-	56	89	89	-	79	-	-	58
3	Be Snowmobile Safe	North American Outdoor Institute	36	32	81	-	-	81	79	93	-	97	-	-	67
4	Snowmobile Helmet Safety Incentive	North American Outdoor Institute	43	43	82	-	-	86	82	88	-	97	-	-	71
5	Iron Dog Safety Expo	Iron Dog, Inc.	86	52	83	-	-	81	92	98	-	98	-	-	82
			SnowTRAC Board									DNR Staff			