

**SnowTRAC Meeting Minutes
December 10, 2009**

ATTENDEES:

Ozie West - Disabilities
Joe Gauna - Anchorage Area (Co-Chair)
Cynthia Hite - Mat-Su/Copper River Basin
Bill Luth - Kenai Peninsula/Valdez/PWS Area
Eric Morris – Northwestern Area
Mark Wilke - Southeast Area (Chair)
Myles Yerkes - Northern Area
Andy Morrison – Inter-Board Liaison w/ORTAB

DNR Staff:

Andre Kaeppele - Parks
Bill Luck - Parks
James King - Parks
Sally Davies - Parks (note taker)
Steve Neel - Parks
Kyle Kidder – Mining, Land & Water

Public Guests:

Bruce Paulsen - Mat-Su Borough Land Management Division
Gary Anderson – Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers
Corky Matthews - Lake Louise Snowmachine Club
Ron Ringel - Lake Louise Snowmachine Club
Harry Holt - Lake Louise Snowmachine Club

Attendance/Introductions and Travel Paperwork

Wilke: Call meeting to order. Begin a round of discussion.
All: Introductions made from all attendees.
Wilke: Do we have any travel paperwork?
Davies: Please turn in all your receipts by the end of the session tomorrow.
Wilke: Are there any changes or amendments to the Agenda?
All: No.

MISSION

Wilke: What is the Mission of SnowTRAC? Our goal is to define what our mission is and make SnowTRAC guidelines.
Yerkes: Who drafted this current Mission?
Wilke: No one drafted it. This current Mission was hashed out with Director and this is what we came up with as a starting point.
Morrison: I have some grammar issues with the wording. It is too wordy and needs to be shortened with punctuation.
Yerkes: Primary mission is to advise Parks not advocating to groups for Parks. Delete promoting and advocating wording. Advocating to legislature will cause trouble.
King: How about we say the Board will fairly represent.
Morrison: The Board will fairly represent all Alaskans.
Wilke: Take out fairly. We are a watch dog. Our only mission is to promote and advocate if public issues arise.
Yerkes: Where does it say that the board advocates?
King: Parks wants the board advocating. Keep it broad and open with no specifics in the statement.
Hite: Use the words fostering and developing as in Title 41. Fostering and developing is the same as promoting and advocating.
Wilke: Why can't we advocate?
King: The Board can't lobby the Legislature. They can educate the Legislature.

Wilke: How about it says the Board will represent all Alaskans to improve and develop snowmobile opportunities.

Gauna: Title 41 also states it also attracts visitors to the state.

Morrison: Replace promoting and advocating with fostering and developing.

Luth: We are representing Alaskans, not visitors.

Yerkes: Take out advising Division, organizations and agencies.

Wilke: I disagree. Our job is advising.

West: How about work with other agencies and organizations?

King: You will have to keep in mind that the Board has no authority to advise the Dept. of Fish and Game.

Wilke: The Board should be able to make decisions on their own without getting permission from Parks.

King: The Board and Parks have to continue to work together on important issues to avoid problems.

Morris: I don't see what the argument is about. We are fostering and promoting snowmobiling. The Division has the authority to promote the mission and the Board has the ability to develop the mission.

Hite: The mission typed up right now on the screen is clear on what it needs to say.

Luck: We have arrived at the core issues. The Board was developed to advise the Director.

Kaeppele: A mission statement should illustrate the objectives.

Wilke: We now have three proposed missions up on the screen.

Gauna: I move to adopt number two.

Yerkes: I second.

Morrison: The Board is focusing too much on growth and development and I would like to see maintenance of trails, safety of trails and trail marking mentioned.

Luck: The Division is not mentioned anywhere in the new version.

Morris: I suggest we take the first statement and add maintenance, safety and marking.

King: Change right-of-way to access. Take out trail and keep development and maintenance.

Wilke: We have a current motion on the table. Joe, would you like to withdraw your previous motion?

Gauna: I withdraw my motion of number two and make a motion to accept the current one on the screen.

Wilke: Do we have a second?

Yerkes: I second.

Luth: I call for a vote.

Wilke: All those in favor of this mission statement?

5 YES 3 NO 0 Abstain MISSION PASSED

- *See appendix A for the adopted SnowTRAC Mission Statement.*

OPERATING PROCEDURES

Wilke: I put together three documents and sent them to the Director and staff for input.

1. OPERATING PROCEDURES

Gauna: When did we change from a committee to a council to a board? Are we a council, board or committee?

Luck: Documents always referred to committee.

Kaeppele: Keep it as council because the logo says council.

Wilke: In name we are a council and in action we are a board.

Gauna: Replace board with council.

Wilke: Hearing no opposition?

All: No opposition.

2. AUTHORITY

Gauna: In procedure finish the complete phrase of AS 41.21.010.

Wilke: Hearing no opposition?

All: No opposition.

3. THE PURPOSE OF THE SNOWTRAC BOARD IS AS FOLLOWS:

Wilke: In procedure title take out the word purpose and insert Mission Statement. Then take out the entire first sentence of the procedure.

Wilke: Hearing any opposition?

All: No opposition.

4. DUTIES

Wilke: In procedure we need to share all information with DNR. We don't keep any information to ourselves.

Hite: In the red typing, change the word collective to representative.

Wilke: Also, in the red typing it needs to say users and take out Alaskans.

Kaeppele: The Board represents all user groups and not just specific users.

Wilke: How about user group?

Gauna: I don't think we can represent all groups but we do have to consider all users.

Wilke: Any suggestions or changes to procedure? Any objections?

All: No objections.

5. MEMBERSHIP

Gauna: In procedure, I would like to see no board seat go unfilled. All geographic areas need to be represented.

Kaeppele: The purpose is to get someone from each geographic area that knows what the needs are for snowmobilers in that area of the state.

Yerkes: What about filling the seat only if we can't find anyone to sit on the board in a specific area?

Kaeppele: If they didn't live there we wouldn't know their specific needs and that area of the state would be under represented.

Wilke: We need the best person for the seat and not limit ourselves to the limitations of specific locations.

Hite: Perhaps we need to broaden the requirements.

Luck: If you don't have a geographic representative, it makes those users feel under represented.

King: The reason for geographic representation is to keep the Board from drifting towards an all Anchorage board.

Hite: What about using registration dollars to determine representation?

King: Registration dollars is not a criteria for getting area representation. Representation of the areas is separated from funding.

Gauna: I don't want to see any seats go unfilled.

Wilke: Let's go back to representation and talk about the ORTAB liaison.

Kaeppele: Having an inter-board liaison helps with the understanding of snowmobiling as a motorized sport.

Morrison: I see the need to get some more of the ORTAB funding for motorized sports. I advocate for motorized sports when I am at the ORTAB meetings.

Luck: Andy helps to educate ORTAB on motorized projects. I see Andy as the 10th position to SnowTRAC and a valuable asset.

Wilke: ORTAB shouldn't have any bearing on SnowTRAC. We should be separate funding.

Guana: I see Andy as a liaison to find out what ORTAB's needs are and to keep SnowTRAC informed. I disagree with Mark and see value in Andy's position.

Yerkes: I propose we adopt the language 'whenever possible'.

West: Second

Morris: Substitute criteria with constituent.

Wilke: All agreed with current language to the procedure?

All: Agreed

Wilke: Move to vote to accept procedure?

Yerkes: I move.

Wilke: All those in favor? **8 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain PASSED UNANIMOUS OPERATING PROCEDURE 5.**

6. TERM OF MEMBERSHIP

Wilke: On procedure six are there any limitations on how long a member can serve on a board?

Kaeppele: You will have to go through the appointment procedure but there is no limit if you are elected.

Wilke: Any opposition to sixth procedure as stated with the strikeouts?

All: No opposition.

7. COMPENSATION

Wilke: Any objections to procedure?

All: None

8. REMOVAL AND RESIGNATION OF MEMBERS

Yerkes: In the procedure I would like the wording to say an officer may be removed from the board instead of member.

Luck: An officer is elected but a member is appointed. That is the difference in using the word member.

Hite: Break removal and resignation into two sections.

Gauna: Remove the word resignation from title.

Morrison: Removal before service time is up?

King: The Director has the authority to appoint and to remove board members as needed.

Hite: Keep DNR's red wording. Can we do procedure number eighteen all under number eight?

Luth: I motion that the removal and resignation in number eight, that the word resignation be struck out.

Hite: Second

Wilke: All in agreement?

Yerkes: We are just removing the word resignation?

Wilke: Correct. Any further discussion?

All: No.

Wilke: Let's see a vote of hands. **8 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE**

King: Can we skip to procedure twenty-two Grant Scoring?

Wilke: Any objections?

All: No.

22. GRANT SCORING

Kaepple: We did a calculation on the yearly SnowTRAC program process on funding allocation. There are about a dozen steps which take approximately four months to complete.

Luth: Can we shorten the 30 days application review to three weeks because of the slow mail process?

Luck: We can add the extra week from the application review to the recommendations.

Morrison: Can you email the packets before mailing? Email copies can start the review process before receiving the hard copies in the mail.

Kaepple: Yes.

Wilkes: No more arguments regarding application time frame?

All: No.

Wilke: Why should members provide scoring review seven days prior to meeting?

Luck: In past meetings I have seen scoring of reviews one hour prior to start of meeting.

Hite: I'm OK with early collection of scores.

Yerkes: I don't think if you don't get your scoring in seven days prior to meeting that you can't vote. Regardless of scoring you should be allowed to vote.

Gauna: Let's do away with scoring altogether.

King: We need scoring for objectivity and for public scrutiny regarding favoritism.

Luck: The grant selection could be biased if scores are turned in after the meeting.

Morrison: Clarify the seven days. Are we talking seven business days? I have a problem seeing scoring on the web prior to meeting.

Wilkes: That's a valid point.

Gauna: DNR staff reviews the scores, we then have discussions among ourselves so scores are final, then the scores are posted on the web.

Wilke: Any objections with the time period to get scores to DNR?

Morris: Sheets to DNR? Hard copies?

Kaepple: It can be email scores.

Yerkes: Could we have some advance notice by email that packets are being mailed so we can look for them?

Kaepple: Yes.

Yerkes: Let the Director decide to inform members that they can't vote because scoring wasn't sent in.

Hite: Why can't they come to meeting even if they didn't score?

Neel: Don't keep them away from the meeting. They have valuable input on other grants. Just don't let them have input on scoring application. Don't penalize all grants by their exclusion.

Wilke: Any objections?

All: No.

Kaepple: I am concerned about not leaving in paragraph three. If language is not in the procedure then not sending in scoring may get worse.

Luck: The Board can discuss this.

Yerkes: Motion to remove paragraph three.

Gauna: Second.

Wilke: All those in favor to strike paragraph three? **7 YES 1 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED**

Wilke: In paragraph four before any motion or funding we call for any declaration of any conflict of interest and answer questions concerning grant. We can't advocate but can answer questions.

Gauna: Are we good on paragraph four?

All: Good

Wilke: Are we good on paragraph five?

All: Good

Wilke: Are we good on paragraph six?

All: Good

Wilke: Are we good on paragraph seven?

All: Good

Wilke: On to paragraph eight

All: Good

Gauna: On paragraph nine I would like score not to go up until board has had a chance to discuss.

Hite: Rescore after discussion before Andre presents final score.

Morris: Then are the grants based on wants instead of scores?

West: Can we say they are preliminary scores before discussion?

Gauna: Scores don't reflect individual views of board members.

Morris: We have more grants to score than there is funding.

Gauna: After discussions and scoring, the highest scores get funding.

Morris: If we have ten grants scored and only funding for eight, do only the top eight get funded?

Wilke: Yes.

Morris: I disagree. I have seen lower scored grants get funding.

Luck: Sometimes the board does decide to fund a lower score grant because of need.

Morrison: Scores are a numerical value of how well a grant is written. Scores don't necessarily score the issue of the grant itself.

Wilke: When do we get to see an individual grant score?

Kaeppele: It makes more sense to do it after the discussion.

Wilke: Can we see an individuals score?

Gauna: We are trying to avoid this.

Morrison: What if we throw out the highest and the lowest score?

Wilke: That is a popular concept.

Morrison: Scores have everything to do with funding.

Luck: Letters of support are important to the scoring process.

Wilke: A grant has to stand on its own merit not whether it can be funded or not.

Gauna: Scores should reflect what percentage a grant gets funded at. If a grant gets a high score it should be funded.

Wilke: How are we going to document our scores?

Luth: Two spreadsheets.

Wilke: Let's move forward to what do we do on review.

Gauna: All final scores are displayed in rank order for Board review.

Morrison: Recommend funding line in spreadsheet.

Wilke: How are we going to justify grant rating?

Hite: We need to believe that when we get to this point that we have scored properly, that we have done our job.

Gauna: Let the scores make our decisions.

Gauna: Grants should stay in rank order according to scoring. Then adjust the funding accordingly.

Luth: We don't change the scoring, just the funding of the grant.

Wilke: The Chair will call for a motion, there will be discussion on the scoring and then another motion.

Kaeppele: I suggest we read through grant scoring wording that is now in as it stands now.

Wilke: Let's put space between this for now and go back to operating procedure nine?

9. ATTENDANCE

Wilkes: Any issues?

Yerkes: I do, about absence from two regular meetings.

Wilke: How about two quarterly meetings.

Kaeppele: Can we say two meetings in a calendar year may constitute removal from board.

Wilke: Any more changes to procedure nine?

All: None

10. BOARD RECRUITMENT AND NONMINATION

Yerkes: Can we take out "will" request from all candidates to "may" request from all candidates?

Luth: Is it "will" or "may"?

Wilke: The word will gives us the opportunity to request. Any other suggestions?

All: No.

11. MEETINGS

Kaeppele: In procedure it may not be in the best interest of board to have a meeting every two months. May not have enough funding.

Luck: Maybe we can find out how much these meetings cost.

Wilke: Not hearing a lot of objections to procedure let's move on.

Yerkes: I am not finished with section eleven. We should allow members to attend meetings by telephone.

Kaeppele: That is addressed in section 12--Quorum.

12. QUORUM

Wilke: We need flexibility in bylaws to what defines a quorum.

Morrison: Majority of the board.

Luth: Let's say a meeting starts with a quorum and someone leaves. Can we continue?

Yerkes: Bylaws currently says if you drop below five members we have to stop.

Luck: If you start with a quorum and three board members leave, it doesn't seem like a majority vote for the entire board. Not a fair consensus.

Yerkes: What about a quorum starts a meeting and can continue until meeting is over even if one or more leave?

Luth: A quorum shall consist of a simple majority. We need to remove the DNR representative from the quorum.

Luck: DNR needs to stay as a representation.

Wilke: Any opposition to number twelve?

All: None

13. MAJORITY ACTION AS A BOARD ACTION

Wilke: I am OK with it.

Gauna: Please clarify paragraph two's wording.

Wilke: What you need it to say is a proposed action instead of an action.

Gauna: I think it should say "to be considered" instead of all that legal stuff.

Hite: It needs to say to be considered a board action.

Gauna: The rest looks fine.

Wilke: Is everything good with thirteen?

All: It's good.

14. PROXIES

Hite: Is everyone happy with fourteen?

Gauna: Will proxy be included to make quorum for a meeting. Does a proxy mean they are present?

Gauna: I don't think a proxy should be a vote.

Hite: I motion we accept fourteen as written.

Morris: Second

Wilke: All those in favor of fourteen standing as written? **8 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

15. CONDUCT OF MEETINGS

Yerkes: I would like to see meetings run by Roberts Rules of Order.

Wilke: Are you saying for the entire meeting?

Yerkes: Only that Roberts Rules of Order prevail in any procedural disputes.

Wilke: Can we say may elect to use Roberts Rules of Order?

Gauna: Does DNR have a copy of Roberts Rules of Order?

Luck: Yes.

Yerkes: Any action can be disputed if Roberts Rules of Order are not used in the event of a procedural dispute.

Matthews: I am Corky Matthews of the Lake Louise Snowmachine Club. I would like to submit a safety handbook that our club developed and thought it would help you in developing yours.

Luth: We thank you for bringing this in.

Matthews: I would like to be involved in the grooming regulations.

Kaepple: We will give the public time to comment on the trail grooming program tomorrow, and specific meetings on trail grooming will be held in the future.

Wilke: Thank you for coming in.

Wilke: Back to section 15, conduct of meetings.

Luth: I would like the inclusion of DNR staff in fifteen. The Director specifically wants one DNR representative and a note taker.

Wilke: I would like to get opinions on that. I don't think we need DNR present.

Luck: Why do you feel this way?

Wilke: We are big boys and girls.

Luck: You need DNR for a checks and balances on your decisions. Not having DNR participate doesn't represent all users.

Hite: We need a mutual relationship. DNR is the nuts and bolts to these meetings and we wouldn't be able to have them without all the technology DNR brings to the table.

Kaepple: It is important for DNR to understand how you come to your recommendations and conclusions.

Wilke: Over the years the perception from DNR is that the board needs to be reigned in. That our independence needs to be restricted.

Luck: Without the Director there is no need for a board.

Wilke: I think from my perspective, DNR is the one given free reign and we are here to receive their information only. We are not given any ability to make decisions of our own.

Gauna: Everything changed once the money started flowing from the Legislature and then all of the sudden DNR wanted to be totally involved. It changed from the SnowTRAC making decisions to DNR making the decisions and DNR controlling us. I would like to have meetings and advocate without DNR.

Kaeppele: We need your help on how to administer funds. We value your input but we have to represent all users. Together we foster the growth of the program.

Wilke: DNR needs to take a hands off approach to us and not control us so much.

Hite: What do you do with the information you get from these board meetings?

Kaeppele: It helps us to decide how to allocate funds. We need to understand how you came up with recommendations.

Davies: I suggest we close this meeting because it is 4:45 p.m.

Wilke: Move to adjourn.

Gauna: Second

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 4:45 P.M.

OPERATING PROCEDURES---CONTINUATION OF OPERATING PROCEDURES DISCUSSIONS FROM DECEMBER 10, 2009 MEETING.

Wilke: Let's continue the Conduct of Meetings section discussion from yesterday.

Gauna: I motion that we waive the Roberts Rules of Order unless there is a procedural dispute.

All: Second

Wilke: I call for a vote to waive Roberts Rules of Order unless there is a procedural dispute.

6 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE

Hite: Can I make a suggestion to take the wording that we took out in the Quorum section and put it this section of DNR representation at meetings.

Morris: Then we wouldn't be able to have a quorum if the wording of DNR representation and a secretary is not in section twelve. We wouldn't be able to make our quorum without them.

Luth: Is it necessary to have a secretary present at all meetings.

Kaeppele: It is necessary to have DNR staff take minutes. It doesn't have to be a secretary. It can be one DNR staff as representation and one DNR staff take notes.

King: The point is to have notes taken at SnowTRAC meetings. DNR also needs to be present at SnowTRAC meetings to make them an official function. The Board's authority is to advise DNR staff and the Board can not do that if DNR is unaware of what is discussed in the meetings.

Wilke: I still don't see the need.

King: There are three main reasons for DNR presence to SnowTRAC meetings. 1. To take notes. 2. To make the SnowTRAC meetings official. 3. The ability to gather information to use in the guidance process.

Wilke: What if we have potential working problems with a specific DNR staff member. How do we go about resolving it? Can we only resolve it in a Board meeting?

King: If there is a problem with a DNR staff member then the SnowTRAC Chair and the Director has a private conversation and come to a mutual solution.

Wilke: With DNR presence we can't have our own private conversations.

Morris: I think that you are making too big of a deal about this Mark.

King: At every official meeting you need state representation. I can't stop you from having private conversations outside of the meetings where there is no DNR presence. But during official meetings DNR representation needs to be present.

Hite: I believe under a Title Board they need the representation of DNR staff. They are very important and helpful to our goals.

Gauna: Should we accept the text as it is?

Luth: Even if you have a problem with a DNR staff member? We need to be able to ask for a replacement.

King: I agree 100%. Requesting a DNR staff replacement is acceptable, but DNR representation will be at all official meetings.

Kaeppele: Since SnowTRAC can't be an advocacy group can we discuss advocacy in an official board meeting?

King: Absolutely. It is appropriate for Advisory Boards to discuss strategies in their meetings on how to approach the Legislature.

Wilke: That is a comfort to know.

King: The more DNR and the board talk, the less we are in court tomorrow.

Morris: Under #12—Quorum, does the DNR presence wording go away?

Kaeppele: We would like to include the language of DNR presence into #15.

Wilke: It is more appropriate to have it in #15 instead of #12.

King: Anytime the board is voting on an official decision I would like DNR representation.

Wilke: Anymore discussion on #15?

All: No.

22. GRANT SCORING

Wilke: James, what happens if we don't want to fund a grant?

King: You make a final recommendation. DNR has a week to decide on your recommendations. We make changes, if any, and then you accept the changes or not.

Gauna: I think we can accept #22 as it is.

Luth: That works for me because I can go back to constituents and explain it better if they have any questions.

Morris: Let's accept it as previously recommended.

King: The spirit of the wording is generate greater communication.

Gauna: So, are we good with #22?

All: Good.

23. DISTRIBUTION OF SNOWMOBILE FUNDS

Wilke: We need to discuss a formula of percentages for funding grants.

King: No formula will ever come out perfectly. Putting in a guideline is fine but we need to be flexible.

Luth: Take out "will" and put in "may". It will give us the option to change the percentages.

Gauna: It makes more sense to keep it flexible.

Kaeppele: Make percentages based on interest for allocation.

Luth: Do you have anything that says "We Need Your Help" kind of flyer for kiosks?

Kaeppel: We can make a flyer for the kiosks.

Morris: Let's accept Bill's wording.

Gauna: If we combine safety/groom programs it will make the accounting easier.

Kaeppel: Accounting would be easier.

Gauna: I move that we adjust allocation of funds to two funds. One is Grants and the other Grooming/Safety.

Luth: I want to see more money used on the ground for users.

King: We should say any remaining grant funds may be distributed between safety, grooming and grants.

Luth: I make a motion to remove "will" with "may" and combine grooming program with safety program.

Morris: Second.

Wilke: I call for a vote on Bill's motion. **6 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain PASSED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE**

Luth: I do have a question. How much is in the prudent reserves?

Kaeppel: Around \$92,000.

King: I would like to see some of the prudent reserve be spent on excess snowfall issues.

16. OFFICERS

Wilke: Any issues?

Hite: Change wording to from Vice-chair to Co-chair.

17. ELECTION AND TERM OF OFFICERS

Wilke: Any issues?

All: None.

18. DUTIES OF CHAIR

Wilke: Any issues?

All: None.

19. DUTIES OF THE VICE CHAIR

Wilke: Any issues?

Gauna: Take out from "shall" through "have" in the first sentence.

20. ETHICS

Wilke: Any issues?

All: None.

21. ADOPTIONS AND PROVISIONS

Wilke: Any issues?

Morris: Do we accept the DNR suggested wording in red?

All: Yes.

Wilke: Do we all understand the present wording in the Operating Procedures?

All: Yes.

Gauna: I make a motion that we recommend to the Director to adopt the operating procedures as edited.

Luth: Second.

Hite: I call the question.

Wilke: All in favor of the motion on the table? 6 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain **PASSED UNANIMOUS OF OPERATING PROCEDURES**

- *See Appendix B for the adopted SnowTRAC Operating Procedures*

SnowTRAC Meeting Minutes December 11, 2009

ATTENDEES:

Ozie West – Disabilities
Joe Gauna - Anchorage Area (Co-Chair)
Mark Wilke - Southeast Area (Chair)
Bill Luth - Kenai Peninsula/Valdez/PWS Area
Eric Morris - Northwestern Area
Cynthia Hite - Mat-Su/Copper River Basin

STAFF:

James King - Parks
Andre Kaeppele - Parks
Sally Davies - Parks (Note Taker)
Kyle Kidder - Mining, Land & Water
Candace Snow - Mining, Land & Water

PUBLIC:

Randy Crosby – AK Snow Cat
Dave Hendrickson – DAV/DOR Enterprises
Doris Hendrickson – DAV/DOR Enterprises
John Scudder – Anchorage Snowmobile Club
Corky Matthews – Lake Louise Snowmobile Club
Gary Anderson – Cabin Hoppers
Ron Ringel - Lake Louise Snowmachine Club
Harry Holt - Lake Louise Snowmachine Club
Debra McGhan - North America Outdoor Institute (NAOI)

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Wilke: Now that this meeting has been called to order us there any unresolved issues from yesterday's meeting?

OPERATING PROCEDURES

To facilitate consistency in discussions of the Operating Procedures, the December 11, 2009 notes have been added to the December 10, 2009 Operating Procedures discussions. Please refer to the Operating Procedures notes on the first day of the meeting.

SAFETY PROGRAM

Wilke: The public is better served by a comprehensive plan on the safety program. What is our roll?

Gauna: SnowTRAC would allocate dollars to public coalitions for their programs.

Morris: There are two main things that would improve the safety program. 1. Better public communications. 2. Better marked trails.

West: Vehicle safety training programs.

Gauna: Put on seminars. Go to schools and parks to train users in safety issues. Something like the Boating and Safety program.

Wilke: SnowTRAC provides the training materials so local groups can request for them to train.

Holt: I represent the Lake Louise Snowmachine Club and would hate to see regulatory requirements for machine safety training. The users that live in our area are safety aware. We have problems with the weekenders.

Hite: You believe safety is an issue in your area?

Holt: Definitely, especially on the weekends.

Luth: We would need standardized material for each region.

Holt: Distribution of materials in libraries would be good.

Luth: How about a booklet with a DVD?

Kaeppele: Boating and Safety Program has had great success with a DVD.

Wilke: There are local educators at schools and clubs in the various regions that can get the safety information out with a DVD.

West: Troopers are always willing to help with safety training.

McGhan: I represent the North America Outdoor Institute. I see a need for education in the schools. We would also like to start programs in the remote areas. We are working on an internet interactive safety course for children. We have a helmet incentive program that is very successful. We would like SnowTRAC's involvement for educational materials.

Wilke: We will only have around \$30,000 to work with and won't be able to educate all the schools.

Hite: Have you had success with training in the schools.

McGhan: Yes, with the 4th through 10th grades in the schools we have been able to go to.

West: There are other resources out in the public that can help out with funding a program.

Wilke: The cost of a DVD is expensive to develop. It would be around \$100,000.

McGhan: It could be updated annually.

Wilke: If this is what we want to do we should go forward with it.

Kaeppele: Remember your funding limitations.

Wilke: We can split the costs over a two year cycle.

Gauna: I make a motion that we develop and sponsor a consistent but regional safety program.

Hite: Second

Wilke: All those in favor of the motion? **4 YES 0 NO 2 Abstain MOTION PASSED**

GROOMING AND GRANTS

Wilke: Let's start with public input with comments limited to 5 minutes.

Crosby: Petersville/Trapper Creek groomer. The process of acquiring grant funds needs to be more streamlined. Documentation of letters of interest is inconsistent.

Kaeppele: We are working on this problem.

Crosby: I would like to see the trail grooming contact in my section to be raised from \$40,000 per season to \$50,000.

Wilke: Is there an increase in usage in your area?

Crosby: Yes, especially the East/West Express.

Matthews: Lake Louise Snowmachine Club. Are you going to set a funding rate for the size of the trail?

Luth: Yes, but we need your input.

Gauna: We would like to raise registration fees for a larger grooming fund.

Holt: Does 100% come back to us?

Luth: Yes, and a bit more. ORTAB gives us some.

Hendrickson: Groomer in Hatcher Pass area. I would like to see the groomer contracts have a "move in, move out" funding for the large equipment we have to use on some of these trails. These costs come out of our pockets right now. Also, mileage of groomed trail is an easier way for payment.

Crosby: The terrain is variable and some miles in some areas may take longer to groom. I prefer the current by-the-hour method. Who determines the scope of the contractual work?

Wilke: DNR.

Kaeppele: It is up to the groomers how they want to be paid through contracts and bids.

Crosby: The current \$28 a mile is an inflexible system. We have cost losses. We need a base rate and then extra money for extra labor in the next contracts.

Kaeppele: We need to come up with a reasonable payment standard.

Anderson: Cabin Hoppers. Paid by the hour is more reasonable because sometimes you can spend more than an hour on a mile of trail. If paid by the mile we lose money.

Crosby: I would like to see a payment system more like the federal government. Be paid a base amount per hour, per machine, per terrain.

Hite: What do you think of raising registration fees?

Holt: People will want to know what the extra money will be used for.

Hendrickson: How about flyers and radio/tv ad campaigns?

Matthews: DNR should ride the trails with the groomers to see what each trail's terrain is like.

Wilke: What are the big picture goals of the Grooming Program?

Hite: To have designated trails that are groomed each year.

Luth: To have trail systems that are connected, such as from Anchorage to Glennallen.

Gauna: A goal to have all trails maintained, groomed and identified.

Hite: A goal to educate the public.

Crosby: We need to make sure that we provide better grooming of the trails we do maintain.

Wilke: Anymore input from the public?

Public: No.

Wilke: Thank you all for coming.

CONCLUSION OF MEETING

Wilke: We need to state the major SnowTRAC goals.

1. To establish a comprehensive statewide safety program.
2. To establish a comprehensive statewide snowmobile grooming and marking program.
3. To designate a statewide snowmobile trail system.
4. To pursue funding sources to enhance snowmobiling for Alaskans.
5. To improve public awareness of SnowTRAC and its goals.

Wilke: Can I have a motion to approve goals as they stand?

West: I motion.

Hite: Second.

Wilke: Let's take our vote. **6 YES 0 NO 0 Abstain** **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

Gauna: Who would like to serve on and chair a sub-committee for the Safety Program?
Cynthia Hite—Chair
Mark Wilke
Ozie West

Gauna: Who would like to serve on and chair a sub-committee for the Grooming Program?
Joe Gauna—Chair
Bill Luth
Cynthia Hite

Kaepple: There is a request out for use of some of the prudent reserve to fund some of the trail signs in the Mat-Su area.

Wilke: We don't allow any group or club to ask for money after funding has been approved.

West: We shouldn't set precedence.

Kaepple: They are requesting around \$7,000.

Wilke: Do I hear a motion to fund the request? Hearing no motion, let's move on.

Morris: The prudent reserve is currently at \$92,000.

Kaepple: I suggest that the remaining reserve go towards grooming and signs.

Luth: How about using reserves unused funds for the educational DVD?

Gauna: I make a motion the prudent reserve be funded at no more than \$50,000 and any unspent funds to into the trail grooming grant pool.

Luth: Second.

Wilke: A show of hands for the motion. **5 YES 1 NO 0 Abstain MOTION PASSED**

Gauna: This concludes our meeting.

MEETING AJDJOURNED