

# Outdoor Recreational Trails Advisory Board (ORTAB)

## MINUTES

NOVEMBER 2, 2017

11:00 AM– 12:30 PM

TELECONFERENCE

<b>MEETING CALLED BY</b>	Jean Ayers, Grants Administrator, Land & Water Conservation Fund
<b>TYPE OF MEETING</b>	LWCF Applications: Funding Recommendations & Rankings
<b>FACILITATOR</b>	Jean Ayers, LWCF Grants Administrator
<b>NOTE TAKER</b>	Jean Ayers
<b>TIMEKEEPER</b>	all
<b>ATTENDEES</b>	5 of 7 ORTAB members present: Jeff Budd, Mike Sirofchuck, Mike Rearden, Seth Adams, Ira Edwards Unavailable: Ron Lurk and Mickey Todd Staff Present: Ethan Tyler, Director; Melissa Richie, Admin Ops Manager; Diane Houston, Accountant II

### Agenda topics: LWCF Applications: 4 Local and 1 State

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Roll call was taken and a quorum established. Jean acknowledged receiving and averaging applicant's scores received from 6 of 7 ORTAB members. We didn't receive Mickey's scores.</p> <p>Jean then explained that the Department of Interior (DOI) had begun, some months ago, to pull applications requesting over \$100,000 and were holding them for further review. In fact, 4 of the 9 applications ORTAB recommended at our January 2017 meeting are still pending. To avoid these long delays associated with DOI review and subsequent NPS delay in issuing grant agreements, 2 of our current applicants (Sitka and Ketchikan) reduced projects substantially to request just under \$100,000. DOI, becoming wise to this maneuver nationwide, decided to also pull some applications under \$100,000. NPS, recognizing this problem, have asked applicants to revise budgets to reflect reality.</p> <p>Since we have current applicants affected by this cat-and-mouse game, NPS recommended that we give all 5 applicants the opportunity to revise their budgets. At the same time, NPS okayed lifting our artificial ceiling of \$125,000 in LWCF assistance per applicant, especially since we received, just one week before the end of the fiscal year, an unusually large and very late LWCF apportionment for FY17. Ultimately, we have \$1,236,989 in LWCF money to allocate, and \$1,108,339 in revised requests.</p> <p>Jean provided a synopsis of the four LWCF applications from local communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Municipality of Anchorage: Folker Park.</b> Project would add ADA-compatible play equipment and safety surfacing, labyrinth plaza, and reflexology path, and result in creating a new LWCF-protected area. Originally requested 125,000. Revised request: \$225,000.</li> <li>• <b>Ketchikan Gateway Borough: Ester Shea Grandstand Cover.</b> Project would construct a covered seating area for spectators at the athletic field. Requested: \$99,999. Creates a new LWCF-protected area.</li> <li>• <b>City &amp; Borough of Sitka: Crescent Harbor Playground, Phase 2.</b> Proposal seeks to replace outdated play equipment with marine-themed and ADA-compatible equipment and safety surfacing. Originally requested \$99,991. Revised request: \$120,000.</li> <li>• <b>City of Homer: Ramp 2 Restroom.</b> Project would replace 43-year-old restroom facility serving Homer's Small Boat Harbor on the Spit. Originally requested \$125,000. Revised request: \$263,340.</li> </ul>
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	<p>ORTAB members stated each of these projects were worth funding. Homer's restroom, built decades ago, is heavily used and a necessary facility on the Spit. Sitka's project has demonstrated huge community support. The Anchorage project shows dedication to public health and wellness with innovative ways to connect people with the outdoors. Ketchikan receives roughly 200" of rain a year, so a grandstand cover is definitely warranted.</p> <p>Ira noted that he scored Ketchikan's app lower because he didn't think they met the priorities of the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). Jean replied that their project actually did meet current SCORP priorities. However, Ketchikan had inadvertently cited the old SCORP, rather than the most current SCORP in their application.</p>
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>
Motion to recommend funding the 4 local proposals at their requested amounts, and rank in order of their averaged scores: Anchorage, Homer, Sitka, and Ketchikan. (Scores were 72, 70, 69, and 67 respectively.)	<b>Motion:</b> Seth Adams
Motion approved unanimously.	<b>Second:</b> Ira Edwards

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p>Jean introduced the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation project and clarified that State proposals do not compete against local proposals. Typically, DPOR reserves half of each year's LWCF apportionment for State projects. State funding requests are not limited by a ceiling.</p> <p><b>Anchor River State Recreation Area: Slidehole Facility Improvements.</b> This project would rehab roads and parking; upgrade or replace campsite furnishings, the orientation kiosk, entrance gate, picnic shelter roof, and signage. The project would also revegetate / stabilize the riverbank, and construct an elevated, light-penetrating walkway with river-access stairs. LWCF Request: \$400,000.</p>
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Various participants mentioned that they had visited or fished at Slidehole, and agreed the site could use many improvements.
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>
Motion to recommend funding the proposal for Slidehole at the requested amount.	<b>Motion:</b> Seth Adams
Motion approved unanimously.	<b>Second:</b> Ira Edwards

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<p><b>Comments or Concerns:</b></p> <p>ORTAB members pondered why so few communities had applied for funding. Possible answers included: fear of the extensive application package, hesitancy regarding perpetual responsibilities inherent in accepting an LWCF grant; lack of adequate match for these 50-50 grants; and potential applicants having their hands full with a current grant project.</p> <p>Ira also mentioned that he felt applicants were glossing over parts of the application where they could easily make more points, such as by responding more thoroughly to questions about ADA accessibility and making accommodations for people with a variety of abilities.</p>
<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>	Staff thanked ORTAB members for their time, energy, and input in this process. Hearing no further comments or concerns, Jean entertained a motion to adjourn.
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>
Motion to adjourn at 11:34 am.	<b>Motion:</b> Seth Adams
Motion approved unanimously.	<b>Second:</b> Mike Sirofchuck