

ORTAB Meeting Minutes

January 22, 2010

ATTENDEES:

ORTAB Members Present:

Jenifer Kohout – Anchorage (Board Chair)

Erling Westlien – Mat-Su / Copper River Region (Board Co-Chair)-morning session only

Andy Morrison – Inter-Board Liaison

Kate Walters – Representative for Individuals w/ Disabilities

Jeff Budd – Southeast Region

Steve Taylor – Northern Region

John Rowe – Northwest Region

Shelly Lawson – Kodiak / Southwestern Region

Not Present: Molly Chythlook – Western Region (prior commitments)

DNR Staff:

James King – Director, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation, DPOR

Bill Luck – State Trails Coordinator, DPOR

Steve Neel – Grants Administrator, DPOR

Andre Kaeppele – Natural Resource Specialist (Trails), DPOR

Sally Davies – Administrative Assistant (Meeting Minutes), DPOR

Kyle Kidder – Easement Adjudicator, ML&W

Public:

George Schaaf – Trail Mix, Inc.

Lisa Holzapfel – Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program

Joe Gallagher – Municipality of Anchorage (Parks and Recreation)

Sandra Key – Cooper Landing Trails Committee

Jack Campbell – Mat-Su Trail Council

Tony Torini - National Wildlife Federation

Debra Daisy – Chenega Corporation, IRA Council

Max Gruner – AK Trails, Inc.

Bruce Paulsen – Matanuska-Susitna Borough

Leslie Jackson – Ketchikan Gateway Borough, conference call

INTRODUCTION:

Bill: Brings the meeting to order at 8:33 am.

Indicates that the focus of the meeting today will be the review of all 34 grant applications. 46 applications were received, 12 were determined ineligible.

Will provide breakdown of expenditures after introductions and hand over meeting to Chair and Co-chair.

Initiates a round table of introductions starting with himself after welcoming Shelly Lawson and Kate Walters. Jenifer Kohout is recognized as the Board Chair. Erling Westlien introduced as Co-Chair.

Round table introductions – ending w/ James King, Division Director

Bill: Emphasizes the importance of keeping to the “Roberts Rules” during the course of the meeting.

Bill: Describes the distribution of grant funds as follows -

\$650,000 dollars is the total allocated for the sum of all categories of grants.

40% (260k) will be appropriated to the diversified category.

30% (195k) will be appropriated to the motorized category.

30% (195k) will be appropriated to the non-motorized category.

\$36,931 is available for Safety and Education projects. This number is derived from 5% of overall program apportionment.

Based off of these minimum/assumed funding levels, Administrative funds for the program will be \$51,705. This number is derived from 7% of overall program apportionment.

Describes the public demand for grant funds as follows -

\$419,556 in requests for DIVERSIFIED projects.

\$247,551 in requests for MOTORIZED projects.

\$357,921 in requests for NON-MOTORIZED projects.

\$102,317 (2010) / \$0 (2009) in requests for SAFETY and Education projects.

The following pages are brief overviews of the projects that the Outdoor Recreational Trails Advisory Board (ORTAB) ranked and scored. The summary of each project was created from information provided in each grant proposal. This year's application deadline was November 1, 2009. The initial remarks (pros and cons) were completed prior to the meeting by the State Trails Coordinator, Bill Luck. Additional comments are included at the bottom of each project sheet to provide the Board's rationale for scoring each project. Motions to fund or not fund a project are included in each comment section.

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

The ORTAB's scores and recommendations were provided to the Director, James King by the State Trails Coordinator, Bill Luck. On 1-29-2010 the Director approved the ORTAB recommendations, and on 2/1/2010 tentative award letters were sent to applicants. Project applicants currently await the completion of State Agency Review and final approval from our funding source the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

If more funds are allocated to the Alaska Recreational Trail Grant Program, projects further down the ORTAB list will be funded. Please see the spreadsheet at the end of this document which shows the rank and score of each project according to Board member and the DPOR Director's approval.

Applicants for all proposals will receive notification which states whether or not their projects were awarded tentative funding. Grant agreements will not be signed until all State Agency and NEPA review requirements are met. FHWA makes the final determination on whether or not all requirements have been met and if projects will be funded.

If there are any questions related to this review process, please feel free to contact Bill Luck, the State Trails Coordinator at (907) 269-8699 or by email at Bill.Luck@alaska.gov.

1. Big Lake Trail Survey

- **Bruce Paulsen, Matanuska-Susitna Borough**
- \$32,477 (requested) / \$8,119.25 (match) / \$40,596.25 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 175 miles of trail to be located and mapped.
- Funding to be used to hire a surveyor and cover administrative costs to oversee the grant; match provided through project oversight and use of a trail guide.
- **Land Owners:** To be determined by survey; in general: Mental Health Land Trust, University of Alaska, Native Corporations, misc. private, State of Alaska - DNR, Matanuska-Susitna Borough

- **PROS**
 - a. Applicant has performed extremely well in past.
 - b. Mat-Su Borough has made the protection of recreational trails a priority – through media, hiring of personnel, numerous letters of support, and inclusion of trails in various management plans.
 - c. Trails are heavily used by the public and this project would work to dissolve trespass issues, while protecting trails.
 - d. Claims to protect trails for trail users from all cross-sections, including Handicap Accessible trails. (Note: no use of youth)

- **CONS**
 - e. Project will go out to bid, but no detailed basis for the \$30,930 to be expended. How did applicant come up with that amount?
 - f. Always a risk that data may never get used when paying for surveys; however, applicant acknowledges collection of data is a required first step and provides detail on what will be done w/ data. (page 10 – narrative)

Project Description: The Big Lake Trail Survey project consists of obtaining the services of a professional surveying firm to locate the extensive network of recreational trails in the Big Lake-Knik-Houston area. From the data acquired land ownership will be determined. The ultimate goal is to obtain recreational trail easements from affected property owners along the trail routes to preserve future public use and enjoyment of the trails and to provide for signing, marking, maintenance and management of the trails. Surveying the trails is the required first step.

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Morrison | Easement trails surveys. There is public concern to get them in place. |
| Budd | I like what was done on the application but I think that the survey costs are too high. |
| Rowe | Rates for work to be performed are actually reasonable. |

Morrison There is a general lack of quotes in these projects but we rely on the state to get the proper quotes when work is needed.

Westlien I have doubts when survey costs are too low. I feel the quality of the work may not be good enough.

Rowe Because of the expansion of the trail the understanding of easement is a good thing for all of us.

ORTAB Vote: YES__7__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

2. Purchase of a Canycom S160 Carrier

- **George Schaaf, Trail Mix, Inc.**
- \$31,000 (requested) / \$7,750 (match) / \$38,750 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- Equipment purchase.
- Funding to be used solely for purchase of machine; match provided through payment of shipping and purchase of tracks.
- **Land Owners:** N/A, equipment purchase.

- **PROS**
 - a. Non-profit highly regarded in the Juneau area for sustainable trail design and construction. Highly regarded by local community.
 - b. Extensive grant history.
 - c. Purchase of the equipment will enable greater efficiency – will reduce project costs, resource impacts, and limit required labor hours.
 - d. Applicant is currently renting similar equipment attributing to increased construction costs.
 - e. Equipment is suited to build trails to ADA standards. (Note: no use of youth)

- **CONS**
 - a. Applicant does not address any of the trails where the equipment will be used.
 - b. Cost comparisons for rental vs. purchase would be good to know.
 - c. No bids included in the application.
 - d. Timeline should incorporate the dates the equipment will be used, what project(s) it will be used for, scheduled maintenance, storage, etc.
 - e. Budget: if bids have not been solicited – how are the costs derived?

Project Description: This grant will fund the purchase of a Canycom S160 Rubber Tracked Carrier, to be used for trail maintenance and construction on municipal, state, and federal public lands in the Juneau area.

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Budd | When I was trying to score I was confused because I thought I was scoring for equipment and not trail a trail project. |
| Lawson | Are we funding equipment not tied to a project? |
| Luck | We need more information about this project. |
| Morrison | I rated it low. I need to see more specs on the equipment. We all would like to see all the options to know what this machine does. |

Budd Are we clearing parking lots or is it the responsibility of the property owner?

Taylor The Municipality of Fairbanks has invested in this particular machine for trail maintenance. I too would like to see some bids and quotes.

Kohout I scored it lower because of the lack of bids and quotes. I didn't really know how to score this project because of lack of descriptions.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO_____ *Approved* **only if additional funds become available.**

Kate Walters did not vote on this project and claimed a conflict of interest.

3. Caribou Hills Trailhead Parking and Maintenance Improvements

- **Dave Mastolier, Snomads, Inc.**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62500 / (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 17 miles of trail to be maintained, 11 miles of trail to be reconstructed, 100 miles of trail to be connected.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska, DNR

- **PROS**
 - a. Very well-supported project by the public - many, many letters of support. Appears to be strongly supported by ML&W and local government.
 - b. Restoring the Deep Creek Dome and the Center Plateau Trails will allow greater connectivity for increased access, including benefits for the Tustumena 200 Race.
 - c. Project will help to reduce trespass on native lands.
 - d. Improved parking area makes access easier for individuals with disabilities. Use of youth questionable - “hope” to use no guarantee.

- **CONS**
 - a. Land designation is difficult to understand due to the scope of the project. Applications are in progress and ADL is questionable for the Deep Creek Dome trail – although it appears to be on a seismic line and may not require an easement?
 - b. Need further clarification on this project from Kyle Kidder.
 - c. Application pertains only to issues of connectivity and does not describe in detail the work to be performed; maintenance, clearing widths, type of equipment to be used.
 - d. Task schedule is vague.
 - e. Explanations for quantities of materials for budget are minimal. Better explanation could have been provided in the narrative.

Project Description: Project funds will be used to make improvements to the Caribou Lake Trailhead.parking area; repair and trail mark the Caribou Lake Trail; restore and provide trail signage to the Deep Creek Dome Trail and the Center Plateau Trail.

ORTAB Comments:

- Taylor I don't see any permission to cross native lands. I feel that time should have been spent in proofreading the document before submission. The budget is too vague in what they will spend it on. I don't see where the match is being met. There is an \$11,000 cost for snowplowing. Is this a cost that ORTAB should be funding? I also don't see where a state agency review has been done.
- Kohout Is the \$11,000 for parking lot snowplowing?

Taylor Yes.

Kidder On the matter of permission to cross native lands the state has a Limited State Holding easement with the native corporation. There is permission in place to cross native land.

Lawson I see this project as non-ground disturbing.

Morrison There will be hardening of the parking lot.

Taylor They are not disturbing the habitat.

Kohout Bill, would you consider this a ground disturbing project?

Luck I would have to look at the scope of the project again.

Morrison For these projects to get funded they have to go through the agency review.

Kidder They have submitted a coastal zone application for permitting and an application for cutting.

Taylor Groundwork is not a threshold for permitting.

Lawson Is cutting branches back ground disturbance?

Morrison Up to the 5 feet of the trail width is not disturbance.

Taylor Is the permitting for the parking lot only or for the trails also?

Luck We should contact them and see what their actual intent is. Maybe funding should be contingent on the amount of ground disturbance.

Taylor I am uncomfortable with the \$11,000 for parking lot plowing.

Budd I make a motion that we deduct \$9,000 for snowplowing from the grant.

Taylor I second.

Kohout I call a vote to deduct \$9,000 for snowplowing from this grant application.

ORTAB Vote: YES__7__ NO_0__ Approved w/\$9,000 deduction. Project is also conditional on the degree of ground disturbing activity, since now SAR checklist was completed. One final condition, the match in the application is short; must see if they can provide full match.

4. Chicken Lake Cross Park/East Redshirt Lake Trail

- **Vic Stanculescu, Alaska State Parks (Mat-Su)**
- \$23,368 (requested) / \$5,592 (match) / \$27,960 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 9.5 miles of trail to be maintained and signed
- Funds will be used to pay for an additional ACC trail crew member, tools, and various equipment.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska, DNR

*Note additional funds are being requested to supplement a previous grant proposal for this project. A beaver has flooded the work area which requires the reroute of the trail, hiring of additional personnel, and rental of an excavator.

Remaining Balance of Original Grant: \$20,419

- **PROS**
 - a. Ongoing grant that has performed well in the past.
 - b. Addresses resource damage that is occurring and providing better access for the public.
 - c. Rather than destroy the beaver dam, managers have chosen to work around the wildlife issue for added public experience.
- **CONS**
 - a. Does not show specific area of impact or where bridge will be placed.
 - b. No quotes, bids, or plans on the design of the bridge.
 - c. \$20,419 exists in the original grant and the applicant does not explain what will be done with those funds.
 - d. Not ADA & though they are open to utilizing youth, do not specifically acknowledge using them for this project.

Project Description: This request is for the continued support of the Chicken Lake Cross Park /East Red Shirt Lake Trail upgrades. Due to increased beaver activity and a public request for grade reductions and visual sight improvements, additional funds are being requested for materials, equipment and supplies to complete the 9.5 miles of trail improvements and construct the redesigned Beaver Creek Bridge 1.2 miles from the Nancy Lake Parkway trail head. Additionally funds are requested to hire an Alaska Conservation Corps (ACC) crew member for 5 months.

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| Walters | I felt they gave a good explanation of costs. |
| Morrison | I don't want to see the same volunteer grants every year |
| Kohout | Does it feel like it is on-going maintenance to you? |
| Morrison | Yes. With everyone having budget cuts it feels like they are saying "lets go to ORTAB" to fund us. |

- Neel Andy's correct. The grant has been modified but basically it is the same grant as last time.
- Taylor Why does it need the excavator so long? The project description wasn't very clear.
- Kohout On the initial grant is this the same work as is stated on this new grant application?
- Neel I will have to look at the old grant for particulars.
- Morrison What would they do if they didn't get the funding?
- Luck Where they would get their funding, I don't know. Capital improvement requests from the general fund is about it. They are a very motivated group and do quality work. Their history has shown that. Some Park areas take the time to apply for grants and others do not. At least this group has consistently made an effort to obtain funds where they can. There aren't too many options for funding.

ORTAB Vote: YES__7__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

5. Chena Hot Springs Road Trail Safety and Maintenance Upgrades – Phase I

- **Steve Taylor, Fairbanks North Star Borough – Parks and Recreation**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 5 miles of trail to be maintained, 1 mile of trail to be reconstructed, 21 miles of trail to be signed, 100+ miles of inter-connecting trail to benefit from project.
- Funding to be used for project management and construction materials.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska - DOT

- **PROS**
 - a. Excellent grant history and performance.
 - b. Nice diagrams and photo documentation. Well-composed application.
 - c. Substantial support for the project and good documentation from DOT to perform the work on the trail.

- **CONS**
 - a. There is mention of trail crossing private parcel driveways but map does not portray this. Mapped locations of these sights would give better idea of how much work needs to be performed.
 - b. Contract will go out to bid if awarded, but there is no explanation of how the applicant derived the \$19,000 cost for construction.
 - c. It appears that some landowners do not like the trail (even though it is a legal public ROW) and have tendencies to block the path.
 - d. Proposal presents trail as a moderately difficult ADA trail which appears to be a stretch from the photos; however, improvements could be done to make it easier for handicapped individuals to snowmobile and ATV along the trail. No youth development.

Project Description: Grant funds will be used to rehabilitate degraded sections of the Chena Hot Springs Road Trail (CHSR Trail), located within the right-of-way for Chena Hot Springs Road from 4.5-mile to 25.5-mile. FNSB proposes to reconstruct the trail approaches at driveway crossings, repair damaged sections of the trail, and install signage. These cost effective upgrades will greatly improve safety for trail users and residents.

ORTAB Comments:

- Rowe This project is well needed.
- Budd The costs seem a bit high to me.
- Morrison I misread this project and put it on the Safety and Education form.

ORTAB Vote: YES__5__ NO____

Approved / Not Approved

Steve Taylor did not vote for this project and claimed a conflict of interest. Andy Morrison did not vote or provide score since the wrong score sheet was accidentally used.

6. Cooper Landing Trail Grooming

- Sandra Key, Cooper Landing Community Club, Trail Committee
- \$ 18,782 (requested) / \$4,696 (match) / \$23,478 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 8.1 miles of trail to be signed, 7.9 miles of trail to be groomed, 6 miles of additional trail being planned for grooming, 100+ miles of interconnecting trail.
- Funds will be used to purchase grooming equipment, pay for freight, and signage.
- **Land Owners: Chugach National Forest**

- **PROS**
 - a. Excellent letters of support from the Kenai Peninsula Mayor and the USFS Ranger. Appears to be heavily supported by the USFS.
 - b. Well-planned project with high enthusiasm.
 - c. Good use of existing facilities.
 - d. Places strong emphasis on making trails that are more accessible for individuals with disabilities – mention of Special Olympics and Challenge Alaska. However, applicant does not clearly show use of youth organizations.
 - e. An applicant that actually provided bids!

- **CONS**
 - a. May be an issue with the plowing of parking areas, contingencies are in place but could pose a significant problem.

Project Description: Grant funds will be used by the small community of Cooper Landing to create eight miles of groomed ski trails where none have existed before – in unused road corridors within the Cooper Landing, Russian River and Quartz Creek Campgrounds. For less than \$20,000 an estimated 8000 people, including persons with disabilities, will be able to enjoy high quality and safe skiing. The project provides a missing link in South Central Alaska's growing skiing community.

ORTAB Comments:

Westlien	I scored it low because of lack of backup to be able to score this project.
Morrison	Same here.
Rowe	Same here.
Luck	We can remove Westlien, Rowe, and Morrison from this particular grant approval because they didn't get all of the information to score properly. Somehow it did not get sent to them and this is not the applicants fault.
Budd	This application was nicely written and it had 3 bids attached.
Walters	It is the only application that addressed disabilities. I like that.

ORTAB Vote: YES__5__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

Erling Westlien, Andy Morrison and John Rowe's votes and scores were not included since they did not receive all of the information they needed to adequately score the project.

7. Chugach State Park Equipment Purchase

- **Matt Wedeking, Chugach State Park**
- \$23,300 (requested) / \$5,825 (match) / \$29,125 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- Equipment will be used to maintain up to 256 miles of trail.
- Funding will be used to purchase two ATV's, a Canycom wheelbarrow, a Tag-A-Long belly dump and safety equipment.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska, DNR

- **PROS**
 - a. Chugach State Park has increased its trail crew capacity by obtaining sufficient crew levels. The purchase of adequate equipment will compliment the effort to build sustainable trails.
 - b. Efforts made by the park to increase trail crew staff and equipment are to calm complaints from the public about the condition of CSP trails. Chugach State Park trails are some of the most heavily used in the State and are in very poor condition.
 - c. Support is shown by the Municipality, Alaska Trails and the CSP advisory board. Specific ADA trails were identified and SAGA is used annually.

- **CONS**
 - d. Applicant could have provided more specifics of the work that will be performed on each of the trails that the equipment will be used.
 - e. Bids are provided - but not 3 bids per item. Canycom quote does not match budget.
 - f. Application packet is somewhat thin- but concise and to the point. Could have elaborated more on the need and what they are currently working with, or without.
 - g. Letters of support could have been submitted from the public.

Project Description: The purpose of this grant is to purchase equipment for Chugach State Park's trail crew. This equipment would allow us to accomplish our trail work more efficiently. It would also allow us to maintain our degrading trail system and continue to rebuild the trails to sustainable standards.

ORTAB Comments:

Morrison	I happen to know the applicant and this is a thoroughly put together application.
Kohout	Were you able to score fairly because of know this applicant?
Morrison	Yes.
Kohout	This is the only grant that had letters of support from the area Advisory Board.
Morrison	What they requested and the narrative made a lot of sense, but the budget didn't make sense.

Luck The digital format doesn't provide enough space for budget information. We are working on fixing it.

Kohout I had a problem with their matching funds.

ORTAB Vote: YES__7__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

Funding for this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds to the Recreational Trail Grant Program.

8. Upper Dewy Lakes Trail Restoration – Phase II

- **Tom Smith, Municipality of Skagway**
- \$19,999 (requested) / \$5,000 (match) / \$24,999 (total)
- **Non-Motorized**
- 1,080 feet of trail to be reconstructed.
- Funds will be used to pay for project labor, helicopter time, materials, and grant administration.
- **Land Owners: Municipality of Anchorage**

***Note:** An applicant cannot apply for funding for a project that is currently under grant agreement with DPOR. However, an applicant who is currently receiving grant funds may apply for a different project or apply for the same scope once the existing grant has been closed. REMAINING BALANCE: \$20,131

- **PROS**
 - a. Excellent grant history.
 - b. Appears that the project is a priority to the Municipality and gets a LOT of use.
 - c. Trail is included in major planning documents developed by the city. Appears to be a major attraction for the tourism industry.
- **CONS**
 - a. From a technical standpoint, I have never heard of stone pitching before (most refer to this type of work as “riprap”). If not done incorrectly, the project could be a huge waste of money and increase braiding in the area – further impacting the resource.
 - b. Concerned about design concepts and spending such a large amount of money on a short stretch of trail (1,080 feet).
 - c. The applicant says that SAGA “may” be brought in, but does not account for them in the budget. A trail at this elevation would not qualify as a project that would be accessible for individuals with disabilities, particularly with the degradation that is occurring.
 - d. Administration and Development could be considered the same; however, both combined are below 7%. Volunteer time cannot = \$30/hr.

Project Description: This project is part of a multi-stage process of restoring the Upper Dewey Lake Trail as well as performing deferred maintenance. The trail requires extensive work to remedy its poor original design and to fix years of use and erosion. These problems were exacerbated by storms in recent years that damaged significant portions of the trail, resulting in rutted and dangerous trail beds. The construction technique of “stone pitching” will be utilized to fill these voids. The intent is will to mitigate ongoing resource damage and provide a safer walking surface for trail users.

ORTAB Comments:

Kohout I thought we couldn't have 2 active grants for the same group.

Neel We won't sign an agreement with them until the first grant is finished.

Kohout If we approve it, will it be on hold pending for a length of time?

Neel Yes. We won't sign the new grant until we close out the first grant.

Lawson They didn't attach an Environmental Review Checklist.

Luck Those details are not required until grant is approved.

Kohout How many phases are there going to be? Do you see them spending the first grant soon?

Neel I don't see it finishing right away. The spending will probably start taking place in the warmer months. Around April, May and June.

Kohout I am worried about the timeline for finishing this first grant.

Neel They are not out of compliance.

Taylor I don't want to hold up other groups that could qualify for funding if this applicant is slow to finish off the first grant.

Kohout Do we take this applicant off the list or put them at the bottom of the list?

Luck My suggestion would be, if you don't to approve funding right now (b/c they haven't finished the prior grant), then I wouldn't fund them at all for this cycle because of the guidelines.

Morrison We can encourage them to apply next year.

ORTAB Vote: YES____ NO__7__

Approved / Not Approved

Board unanimously voted not to fund project since there is already a grant in place for the same trail. Before an applicant can apply for additional funds for another phase of a project, previous grants from the same program must be closed and in compliance, unless there are unforeseen circumstances that occur which are beyond the applicants control.

9. Eska Trail Remediation

- **Scott Lapiene, Mat-Su Borough Trail Council**
- \$ 50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 1.5 miles of trail to be maintained, reconstructed, and signed; expand the parking area from a 2-3 car facility to a 6-8 car parking area.
- Project funds will pay for labor, rental of heavy equipment, materials and administrative overhead.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska, DNR - (SCRO) & a shared management agreement with the Mat-Su Borough (expires in August 2010).

- **PROS**
 - a. A very well-developed grant application. Good narrative, task descriptions, budget and inclusion of legal documents.
 - b. Extensive grant history.
 - c. Reasonable amount of support from the public.
 - d. Proposal acknowledges specific physically disabled groups that would utilize the trail, such as the Wounded Warriors.

- **CONS**
 - a. ****Very strong opposition from the Sutton Community Council. They would like to see a trail plan developed before any funding goes into the maintenance of the trail. They believe this would be a short-term fix and a long-range plan should be implemented before any improvements are made. Similar comments came from the South Central Regional Office – however, language exists which allows for groups such as the Mat-Su Trails Council to apply for funds to improve the trail.
 - b. ****General consensus from other entities – a comprehensive trail plan should be completed before any remediation work takes place.
 - c. Mention of possibly using the Boy Scouts, but no reference in narrative or budget

Project Description: Project funds will be used to harden sections of degraded trail using slot-trench trail construction and utilization of local fill material. The current parking area will also be expanded to accommodate increased use in the area. Where practical the project will use field work and techniques outlined by DNR and Alaska Trails (non-profit) as part of an Alaska Trails Initiative prescription project: #10795847 " Layout and Prescription for Eska Creek Area Trails".

ORTAB Comments:

- Morrison I have been on this trail and know it well. There are more diverse users further up the trail. At what point are trucks not allowed and how are they going to enforce it? Overall, it is a worthwhile project.
- Westlien I see this grant as a case study for these issues they are facing. I see it as an opportunity to use what works for them in other areas.

Morrison I would like to see it formalized further on motorized usage.

Kohout I didn't get a sense of agreement in the committees on the easements.

Westlien If easements are established and trails aren't being made, what good are the easements?

Morrison The project needs more oversight. If this project is put off, then more degradation is going to occur.

Lawson They didn't provide trail plans that are referred to in the grant application. Was this an old road? I need clarification of what a trail is, or can be defined as.

Luck Some old roads have become trails - by letting vegetation re-grow. A lot of trails are old road beds. RS2477's are an example. Many of those corridors were transportation corridors for vehicles and not just foot or animal traffic. Determination of how a trail is classified depends on usage. ORV trails are as wide as roads, but still considered trails in many instances.

Kidder Mining, Land and Water has flagged and routed the trail. The next step is to get the trail marked so easements don't get lost.

Luck They didn't complete the state agency review so unfortunately that automatically disqualifies them. Not having a completed SAR checklist essentially eliminates the chance for funding the project.

Westlien Can't we as a board waive the state agency review checklist?

Luck That would be unfair for the applicants that we have deemed ineligible in the past and even during this grant cycle.

Rowe What is the difference between not having the review complete and not providing enough match?

Luck With state agency review the applicant has a limited amount of time to get certain permits in place. If that window is not addressed within a certain amount of time, particularly with a contentious and heavily impacted project, program funds get locked up and become ineligible for the entire program. With match, applicants can generally provide more than what is required – this is typically not as big an issue as completing the checklist. Applicants should really know what kind of permits are needed before a project is applied for. That is why it is a basic eligibility requirement. Unfortunately, I missed this during my first review of the grant.

Morrison I suggest that they apply next year. We may have to bend to make things happen in these rural areas.

Luck If you do there will be legal issues.

ORTAB Vote: YES ___ NO __7__

Approved / Not Approved

This project was not approved b/c it did not have the State Agency Review checklist complete and also due to the high level of opposition since repairs were proposed for the trail without an adequate trail management plan that would address long-term issues with the trail. The applicant is encouraged to work with the local community to help develop a long term trail management plan so that resources can be allocated to the project appropriately. The application scored very well, but these issues prevented the proposal from being funded.

10. Girdwood Multi-Use Nordic Trail System

- Deb Essex, Girdwood Nordic Ski Club
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 3.2 miles of trail will be constructed, maintained, and signed; 7 miles of trail will be groomed; 1 mile of connecting trail will benefit from this project.
- **Land Owners:** Heritage Land Bank

- **PROS**
 - a. Good land use documentation from the Heritage Land Bank.
 - b. High level of community support – 20+ letters.
 - c. Minimal experience with grants b/c of newly developed organization, but successful so far.
 - d. Likely to be a very successful and popular trail system in Girdwood.

- **CONS**
 - a. Maps are difficult to read. Appears to be more than one land owner.
 - b. VERY limited explanation of budget expenditures for a \$50,000 grant. No bids included. Match not clearly defined.
 - c. Difficult to fund a project when the expenditures are so minimally described.
 - d. Applicant says that there are pledges from the APU ski program to maintain trails but no documentation is provided in narrative or match explanation w/in budget sheet. Marginally provides opportunity for individuals with disabilities – could have been described better and should have named groups that would benefit.

Project Description: The Girdwood Nordic Ski Club plans to develop, and maintain, a Nordic / multi-use trail system within the Glacier-Winner Creek Valley. A 10 kilometer trail system has been designed, but the group will begin with development of the first 5 kilometers (Phase 1) to keep the project manageable.

ORTAB Comments:

Morrison	This is a good application. I haven't had much involvement with this group other than volunteering to groom the trail using Municipality of Girdwood equipment.
Luck	I see a conflict of interest.
Kohout	Would it be appropriate to remove Andy's scores?
Luck	Yes, we'll have to. Sorry, Andy.
Walters	I saw the value in this project as a successful endeavor for the community. I would like to see a more detailed budget.
Lawson	I didn't understand what their match was going to be.

Kohout I would like to see what the nature of the construction work being done and more budget information.

Budd Can they use existing trails to make the loop instead of making a new trail?

Morrison I see that they want to do minimal tree cutting and have good local support and they have addressed the issues clearly.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

Funding for this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds to the Recreational Trail Grant Program.

11. Ester Dome Single Track – Happy Valley Trail

- **Geoff Orth, Alaska Trails**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 5 miles of new trail to be constructed; 8 miles of interconnecting trail.
- Funding will be used to pay for labor and construction fees.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska, DNR

***Note:** An applicant cannot apply for funding for a project that is currently under grant agreement with DPOR. However, an applicant who is currently receiving grant funds may apply for a different project or apply for the same scope once the existing grant has been closed. THIS STIPULATION HAS BEEN WAIVED FOR THIS PROJECT DUE TO AN UNEXPECTED BREAKDOWN OF EQUIPMENT AND THE INABILITY TO REPLACE PARTS BEFORE THE 2009 SEASON ENDED. ALL PROJECT FUNDS (\$59,626) ARE EXPECTED TO BE FULLY UTILIZED BY THE END OF NEXT SEASON.

REMAINING BALANCE: \$9,626

- **PROS**
 - a. Popular trail project with numerous letters of support.
 - b. Land use permit included.
 - c. Significant and highly successful grant history.
 - d. Budget shows that if funded this round of funding should complete the project.
 - e. Excellent media reviews on the trail and exceptional volunteer effort to complete sections by hand.
 - f. Proposal identifies that it will use a Girl Scout Troop to construct/install kiosk.
- **CONS**
 - g. Project is being constructed on a mining claim that has precedence of the trail. If the claim is to become active again, then the trail will have to be rerouted at the grantee's expense.
 - h. First round of funding has not been completely spent due to a breakdown of the contractor's equipment. The parts could not be replaced until the winter season. Those remaining funds will be expended next summer when phase I is completed. Approximately \$9,626 remain.

Project Description: This project is a continuation of the Happy Valley Trail Phase I that began in the summer of 2009. From that season 3.5 miles of trail were constructed and an additional 5 miles are planned for 2010. The trail will be designed for use by mountain bikers, hikers, snowshoers, etc. Clearing widths will not exceed 6 feet in width. The resulting trail will be naturally surfaced and avoid low boggy areas. Design parameters will adhere to modern sustainability requirements for alignment, grade, integrated water control, and durable tread.

ORTAB Comments:

Kohout My sense is that this is a decent project by looking at the scores.

Taylor It is done well by incorporating volunteer work. It is always well attended with work parties and it is a popular area.

Budd Very well written.

Luck Again, we can't have two consecutive grants. We did make an exception to this one because of the machinery problems for Phase one. Phase one is almost completed.

ORTAB Vote: YES__7__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

12. Iktua Bay Trailhead Facility

- **Deborah Daisey, Chenega IRA Council**
- \$44653 (requested) / \$11,163 (match) / \$55,816 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- Funds will be used to pay for a cabin kit, labor, transport fees, supplies and administrative overhead.
- **Land Owners:** Chenega Corporation

- **PROS**
 - a. If funded, this will be one of the first water trail projects facilitated by the Alaska State Trails Program and will diversify the type of projects supported by the program.
 - b. Applicant has strong project and grant performance history; good maps; excellent letters of support.
 - c. Project is viewed as a pilot program to gauge the potential of creating a network of water trails within PWS, which will include a network of cabin and campground sites, if successful.
 - d. The water trail concept is being utilized to test the economic potential for ecotourism in rural areas of PWS.

- **CONS**
 - a. Potential for cabin not getting as much use as expected, or that water trail concept will not take-off in PWS.
 - b. Cabin site could be too far removed and difficult to get to.
 - c. Application is extremely longwinded (though thorough) in areas - sometimes excessive, and does not follow format of the application. For example, the budget and narrative.
 - d. Proposed cabin will not be designed to ADA standard or and the grantee will not utilize youth orgs. for construction.

Project Description: The Chenega IRA Council is developing a cabin in Iktua Bay, on north Evans Island, two miles from the village of Chenega Bay in southwestern Prince William Sound. This public use cabin, accessible by ferry, kayaks or boats, will be located at the trailhead of the proposed water-based Prince William Sound Marine Trail and would provide a safe and dry facility for people to use while traveling the water routes or camping in southwest Prince William Sound.

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|--------|--|
| Budd | Well written. I like the idea of non-profit doing the project. The benefit of use in this area is not cost effective. |
| Lawson | It is a new idea. The public like to walk or boat to cabins. It is an exciting project. I would like to know who else makes cabins and would like to see bids. If bids can't be provided I would like to see backup as to why. |
| Kohout | The public notice was more detailed about trailhead use. |

Luck It also discussed cabin use.

Morrison There is not a lot of public support for marine trails. Prince William Sound
always has lots of questions and concerns of this type of usage.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

*No score or vote was provided by Andy Morrison since he was unable to finish the review of all applications.

*Funding for this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds to the Recreational Trail Grant Program.

15. Juneau Ski Trail Grooming Equipment

- **Jack Kreinheider, Juneau Nordic Ski Club**
- \$27,468 (requested) / \$6,867 (match) / \$34,335 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 14 miles of trail to be groomed.
- Project funds will be used to pay for grooming equipment – 2 snowmobiles and grooming drags.
- **Land Owners: State of Alaska – DNR, City and Borough of Juneau**

PROS

- a. Letters of permission and support from: Southeast Park Superintendent, Eaglecrest Ski Resort (that holds lease with the City/Borough of Juneau), and one resident.
- b. Quotes are included.

CONS

- a. Absolute minimum effort for a grant application.
- b. No mention of signage or frequency of grooming.
- c. Poor maps.
- d. No explanation for budget expenditures.
- e. No inclusion of trails in management plans.
- f. Applicant has a grant history and did not provide it.

Project Description: Grant funds will pay for the purchase of two snowmobiles and grooming attachments for grooming of cross country ski and snowshoe trails at the Eagle Beach State Recreation Area and the Eaglecrest Ski Area. This grooming equipment will improve the frequency and quality of grooming on both trail networks.

ORTAB Comments:

- Budd The maps all look ok. There is not enough description. It has a very high budget. Why do they need two grooming machines?
- Taylor Not much commitment on who will be maintaining the trail.
- Walters Eagle Beach is way out of town. Not much trail usage.
- Kohout Do we take it off the funding list?
- Lawson There is also not enough due notice.
- Rowe I am ok with dropping this application. It is very poorly done.

ORTAB Vote: YES___ NO__7__

Approved / Not Approved

This project was not funded due to the lack of effort put into the application.

16. Lookout Mountain Trailhead Development

- **Alan Parks, Kachemak Nordic Ski Club**
- \$48,236 (requested) / \$12,059 (match) / \$60,295 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- This project will provide new bathroom, storage, and warming facilities to benefit trail users and include signage for 10 km of multi-purpose trails.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – DNR, Kenai Peninsula Borough

- **PROS**
 - a. Project development is included in multiple strategic plans and provides a resolution of support from the Kenai Peninsula Borough. Lease agreement and ADL #'s provided as well.
 - b. Previous phase of this project (the development of ski trails) proved successful and heavily supported by the local government and residents.
 - c. Project will have handicap accessible facilities – demonstrated throughout the application.
 - d. Photos of site location and potential facilities to be used are included.

- **CONS**
 - a. Maps do not clearly delineate land ownership and we wrestled with this at great length before funding the previous Alaska Trails Initiative grant. Applicant has better land ownership maps and did not include them. This is important b/c some parcels are in the process of being conveyed from the State to the Borough.
 - b. Minimal letters of support – only two and one stresses concern about parking issues.
 - c. No bids for the Weatherport or building materials.

Project Description: Funding will be used to improve the popular Lookout Mountain Recreation Area by adding bathroom facilities, equipment storage, a safety/warming hut and a kiosk at the trailhead, and by adding directional signage along the ski trails. These additions will provide necessary safety facilities at the northern end of the larger trail system in the hills above Homer.

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|---------|--|
| Budd | Is it really ADA compliance? Driving up to a cabin and watching is not the same as being able to participate also. |
| Walters | It looks like the cabin is ADA. It looks like there is a ramp up to it. It is hard to tell from these pictures. They are not very clear. |
| Lawson | Why do they need a weather port to store equipment in during trail construction? Why can't they build the cabin first and then store the trail equipment inside while trail is being constructed. Can they have an Alaska Trails Initiative grant and apply also for a Trails Grant? |

Luck Yes. You can have an ATI grant and a Recreational Trail Grant. An applicant cannot have two grants at the same time for the same project under the same program. These two grants would not conflict with each other.

Kohout Is the parking lot ADA compliance?

Walter The bathroom is ADA. They can't get into the cabin to warm up. Pictures shows cabin is raised and not have a ground level entrance.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

Only 6 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants.

17. Shelter Cabin at Mary's Igloo

- **Noelle Weemes, Native Village of Mary's Igloo**
- \$21,449 (requested) / \$5,362 (match) / \$26,811 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 16' x 20' shelter cabin to be constructed.
- Funds will be used to pay for labor, materials, fuel for transport, food for construction crew, and administrative costs.
- **Land Owners:** Mary's Igloo Native Corporation

- **PROS**
 - a. Strong match amount from the Rasmuson Foundation. Shows that other entities find value in the quality of the project.
 - b. Project provides for safety along a winter recreation and subsistence route. Rare to receive applications for trail projects in such rural areas.
 - c. Applicant appears to have had other grants before - likely performed well?
 - d. Appears to be the first step in securing a safe route from Teller to New Igloo. A permanent trail marking project is to take place after the construction of the safety shelter.

- **CONS**
 - a. Maps are not labeled very well and difficult to discern.
 - b. No bids are provided for the purchase of materials.
 - c. Support documentation is limited. Overall explanation of project is somewhat limited but the logistics appear to be reasonably planned.
 - d. Would have been good to include some sort of diagram or drawing of the planned shelter. Photos of the site would have been helpful as well.

Project Description: The Shelter Cabin at New Igloo Project will consist of constructing a 16'x20' emergency shelter for public use. The cabin will provide a warm and safe place for seasonal subsistence and recreational users to escape extreme weather conditions that are common in the Bering Strait Region.

ORTAB Comments:

- Budd I like this grant. They didn't ask for as much as they really need.
- Morrison I am big on these remote rural area projects. I want to see money get off the roads and out in the wilderness.
- Rowe Is it more for public or rural youth camps?

ORTAB Vote: YES__7__ NO____

Approved / Not Approved

18. Moose Range Trails

- **Jack Cambell, Mat-Su Trails Council**
- \$23,050 (requested) / \$5,763 (match) / \$28,812 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 20 miles of trail to be maintained and groomed.
- Funding will be used to pay for grooming equipment, signs, materials, and administrative overhead.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska - DNR

Note: This project was originally submitted to SnowTRAC for Snowmobile Trail Grant funding. Since the proposal was considered to be more of a diversified trail project (vs. solely a snowmobile trail project) SnowTRAC recommended that it be reviewed by ORTAB for consideration of Recreational Trail Grant funding.

- **PROS**
 - a. Project is supported by the South Central Regional Office of ML&W, as per Cliff Larson.
 - b. Applicant provides a detailed description of grooming rotations and will utilize a system of reusable, non-permanent signage by way of signs attached to posts that are weighted into the snow with concrete buckets.
 - c. Excellent maps. Quotes included for purchases. Will utilize Boy Scouts for preparation and placement of signage.
 - d. Once trail network is completely established, it could tie into a larger statewide snowmobile trail system.
- **CONS**
 - a. Applicant used a non-uniform budget sheet, but since the current sheet is limited by space, applicants *were* allowed to attach supplemental budgets separately.
 - b. Only 3 letters of support... applicant could have provided more.
 - c. Project does not appear to be a priority through management plans but has support.

Project Description: The project will consist of purchasing equipment and material for grooming, signing, and maintenance within the Palmer Moose Range trail system.

ORTAB Comments:

Budd/Rowe	Zero us out in the scoring because we didn't receive the backup documents.
Campbell	I have a problem with getting electronic attachments to the board members.
Taylor	I have concerns about the reference to the easement that has been applied for.
Campbell	Moose Range is on state land.
Kohout	This was a nice application. Budget outlay was good.

Lawson It states that will be using youth groups such as Boy Scout and Eagle Scouts.
What about incorporating Girl Scouts?

Taylor I need to see more information on why so much mechanical grooming versus
hand grooming. Why are there temporary signage instead of permanent signage.
I didn't see any commitment letters from organizations providing any of the
services. Their Resolution of Support document was from the year 2000. I would
like to see an updated resolution.

Luck Just to clarify on the use of temporary signage, there is a considerable amount of
summer use in this area. It is preferred to have temporary signage in areas such as
this to limit resource degradation.

ORTAB Vote: YES__4__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

Only 4 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants and
Jeff Budd and John Rowe did not receive certain attachments.

19. Moose Ridge Loop Trail

- **Joe Gallagher, Municipality of Anchorage**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 1000 feet of new trail will be constructed, 1000 feet of new trail will be laid out, and 2200 feet of existing trail will be reconstructed.
- Funds will be used to pay for labor, building materials, and heavy equipment.
- **Land Owners:** Municipality of Anchorage

- **PROS**
 - a. Good narrative, but overall cost for the trail seems excessive considering the amount of work that is being completed.
 - b. Excellent maps.
 - c. Youth crews will be employed if project is funded.
 - d. Sustainability and long-term maintenance appear to be a priority.

- **CONS**
 - a. Project could have benefited from more letters of support.
 - b. Initial response to costs for YEP crew seem high but considering that they will be lead by Alaska Trails staff, a good product could be produced from the unskilled youth. However, 1-2 weeks of labor costing \$30,000 still seems very high. No bids.
 - c. No record of grant history.
 - d. No provisions for handicap accessibility.

Project Description: Project will include improvements to tread, drainage, and trail corridor to maintain the Moose Ridge Loop trail to its intended classification of a Pack and Saddle Class II standard. A reroute will be developed where the trail is heavily braided through areas with poorly drained soils.

ORTAB Comments:

Budd I tried to figure out the math. It wasn't adding up.

Taylor I had a problem following the narrative. I also had a hard time deciphering the ownership map.

Morrison We need to see just how big the trail condition problem is by some photos.

Kohout Also by supporting letters.

Rowe I have a problem with all of these Davis-Bacon wages. The map was really confusing. I would like to see a letter that states their matching.

ORTAB Vote: YES__7__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

*Funding for this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds to the Recreational Trail Grant Program.

20. Mt. Juneau Trail Reroute and Rehabilitation

- **George Schaaf, Trail Mix, Inc.**
- \$48,041(requested) / \$12,010 (match) / \$60,051 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- .9 miles of trail to be constructed and .3 miles to be reconstructed. 11 miles of interconnecting trail to benefit from work to be performed.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska - DNR (with easements that pass through private parcels)

- **PROS**
 - a. Very heavily used trail suffering significant resource damage. Dangerous terrain for trail users to traverse. Safety issues and resource degradation need to be addressed.
 - b. Applicant applies dates in timeline when many other applicants do not. Particularly important for Trail Mix since they are applying for multiple grants.
 - c. Excellent public notification. Good start with environmental review process.
 - d. Excellent organizational background.

- **CONS**
 - a. Task schedule could conflict with Mt. Roberts trail project if both are funded. Applicant does not state how Trail Mix would manage both projects at the same time.
 - b. Poor itemization of budget. No breakdown of any of the costs shown.
 - c. No bids for helicopter time or explanation in the project narrative for its use.
 - d. No opportunity for ADA accessibility due to terrain and no employment of youth crews for labor.

Project Description: Project funds will be used to continue construction of a sustainable trail between the Perseverance Trail and the summit of Mt. Juneau. The existing trail ascends Mt. Juneau at a grade of up to 110%; this project will replace the existing fall-line trail with a full-bench, singletrack trail between 8% and 15%. Additional work will include rockfall stabilization, drainage features, and general tread maintenance.

ORTAB Comments:

Taylor	This application was put together very well. I do need to see a description of how the project will be finished. The maps were not clear enough.
Lawson	It would have been nice if pictures were provided.
Rowe	This purchase of hand tools as a match? Is it an allotment for only new tools?
Neel	It is very difficult to use small hand tools as fund match.
Kohout	Can they put money in the project for food?

- Neel If the area is remote and there is no access to purchase food, then a grant can have a food allotment. They will need to provide justification backup.
- Morrison I see Southeast grants are well represented by Trail Mix, Inc. in this group of grant applications. It feels like the board is weighted to fund in favor of this organization.
- Luck Many of these projects are on state lands and Trail Mix is supported to complete them through the Memorandum of Agreements. Often times, non-profits will apply for grants on behalf of the State since the State is inadequately staffed to apply for grants or do not have the trail expertise.
- Westlien Are some of the Memorandum of Agreements contractual with the state?
- Luck Yes. MOA's are generic contracts with the State to perform work. Mount Roberts is on State land and Trail Mix is applying to fix the trail on behalf of the State. I'm not sure if this is by our request, but our management in that area supports their efforts to acquire funds and fix the trails.

ORTAB Vote: YES__5__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

No vote was provided by Kate Walters due to a conflict of interest and Andy Morrison did not vote since he was unable to review all applications.

21. Mt. Roberts Trail Reroute and Rehabilitation

- **George Schaaf, Trail Mix, Inc.**
- \$44,207 (requested) / \$11,052 (match) / \$55,259 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- .8 miles of new trail to be constructed and .5 miles of trail to be reconstructed. 10 miles of interconnecting trail benefit from work to be performed.
- 500 ft of new trail constructed
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – DNR (w/ easements that pass through private parcels)

- **PROS**
 - a. Extensive grant history with excellent reputation for build sustainable trails.
 - b. Trail is very heavily used with significant resource damage and potential safety hazards to the public. These issues need to be addressed.
 - c. Good public notification process. Good start with environmental review process.
 - d. Strong support from Alaska DPOR and local advisory board.

- **CONS**
 - a. Project appears to overlap with Mt. Juneau. Applicant does not address this.
 - b. Poor description / really no description of budget items. Very bad.
 - c. Could have provided support letters from the City of Juneau or the Tramway Corp.
 - d. No opportunity for ADA accessibility due to terrain and no employment of youth crews for labor.

Project Description: This project will continue the construction of a sustainable trail along the lower Mt. Roberts Trail, between the Basin Rd. trailhead and the Tramway Terminal at 1,800' elev. The existing ridge- and fall-line trail will be replaced with a full-bench, singletrack trail with grades of 8% to 15%. New switchbacks will be constructed to discourage shortcutting; remaining staircases will be reconstructed; and water drainage improved to halt erosion and tread damage.

ORTAB Comments:

Budd What is the average cost of the construction? I would like to see a dollar amount from the company.

Rowe Isn't this the third Trail Mix, Inc. application in this year's funding group? I find that I scored it lower because of so many applications for money.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

*Funding is contingent on the receipt of additional funds to the Recreational Trail Grant Program. Kate Walters did not vote due to a conflict of interest.

22. OHV Obstacle Course

- **Scott Lapiene, Mat-Su Borough Trail Council**
- \$6,250 (requested) / \$1,563 (match) / \$7,813 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 1 mile of new trail to be planned; 30 miles of interconnecting trail.
- **Land Owners:** Mat-Su Borough, State of Alaska - DNR

- **PROS**
 - a. Applicant demonstrates clear understanding of steps needed to secure easements, to include the public process for planning, and perform the environmental review processes.
 - b. Applicant has an extensive and involved grant and trails history.
 - c. Applicant states that many veterans and physically challenged individuals would be better able to recreate on trails such as the one proposed if more were available. Specifically mentions “Wounded Warrior” club.
 - d. Extensive language in management plans to support motorized recreational use.
 - e. Applicant has support of Bill Stoltz and Charlie Huggins – both strongly support motorized activity throughout state.

- **CONS**
 - a. Exceeded the allowable administrative costs, should be no higher than \$437.50.
 - b. No quotes for the survey.
 - c. Youth development alluded to in the question but no mention of it in project description or budget.
 - d. Opposition to project was voiced. Individual wants project out of anadromous streams; applicant intends to route trail away from any streams.

Project Description: This project will be completed in two phases. The first, this grant, will use funds to pay for the survey and record of an easement for the creation of an OHV obstacle course in or adjacent to the Knik River Public Use Area. The second phase will be the complete design and construction of the Obstacle Course.

ORTAB Comments:

Budd	I like this project. I thought it was awesome.
Taylor	I agree. Fairbanks has a similar application that uses this planning approach.
Luck	It is exciting to see our program diversify with an obstacle course such as this.
Westlien	Projects like this support motorized users.
Lawson	This seems like an application to write a grant.

Luck We need to support programs/projects from the bottom up. This includes being able to secure easements and plan trails accordingly through proper survey of an area.

Kohout We support easement projects

Campbell We need grant support for planning and easement funding.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO____

Approved / Not Approved

Only 6 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants.

23. Point Higgins Trail Extension – Phase II

- **Leslie Jackson, Ketchikan Gateway Borough**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- .34 miles of trail to be constructed, 1 mile of trail to be maintained, 1 mile of trail to be groomed, and 3 miles of interconnecting trail to benefit from the project.
- Funds will be used to pay for project labor, helicopter time, and materials.
- **Land Owners:** Mental Health Land Trust

- **PROS**
 - a. Reasonably good maps. Great budget.
 - b. What lacks in the narrative is somewhat made up in the timeline.
 - c. Very strong community support.
 - d. Trail mentioned in the Ketchikan Coastal Management Plan.
 - e. Good environmental review progress.

- **CONS**
 - a. Narrative provides limited detail on trail construction such as structure implementation, labor, existing resource degradation, types of use, etc.
 - b. No bids.
 - c. Through review of the description and photos of the trail, difficult to see it becoming ADA. Although applicants may use youth organizations, doesn't mean they will unless they specifically plan for it in narrative and/or budget.

Project Description: This project proposes the extension of a popular recreation and educational trail in Ketchikan, the Point Higgins Trail. The first portion of the Point Higgins Trail is constructed with a high quality, low maintenance gravel design which traverses Borough property. The second portion, the Point Higgins Trail Extension, is located on Alaska Mental Health Trust property and is muddy, badly eroded and targeted for completion in the next two years.

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Budd | Driving to trail head is not ADA. |
| Rowe | I see no commitment to use youth groups. |
| Morrison | I saw it as a youth opportunity. (Due to proximity to school) |
| Walters | The trail doesn't seem wide enough for wheelchair access. |
| Rowe | Lack of local private support letters. |

ORTAB Vote: YES__7__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

24. Pratt Museum Forest Trails Project

- **Michele Miller, Pratt Museum**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- .33 miles of trail will be constructed and .4 miles of trail will be reconstructed. More than 5 miles of interconnecting trail will benefit from the project.
- Funds will be used to pay for planning, development, materials, labor, and equipment.
- **Land Owners:** Pratt Museum

- **PROS**
 - a. Portion of the trail will be handicap accessible.
 - b. Excellent grant history and nationally recognized.
 - c. Detailed budget. Excellent maps.
 - d. High volume of users/visitors to the facility.
 - e. Heavily supported by the community.
 - f. Well on the way with the environmental review process.

- **CONS**
 - a. Large amount of money for the amount of trail to be built.
 - b. No detailed information on the need for trail improvements and what interpretive information will be used throughout the trail.
 - c. No bids or mention of who will complete the contract work.
 - d. Youth points do not apply since their assistance with the project is not clearly identified.

Project Description: This project will expand and improve the Pratt Museum's forest trail system, which provides connectivity between an existing trail and pedestrian network that links the Museum to central Homer, residential neighborhoods, schools, parks, and other popular destinations. This .73-mile project will create .33 miles of new trails, including .2 miles of trails accessible for ADA users and reconstruct .4 miles of foot paths to support a variety of recreational uses, including exercise, exploration of the natural world, and birdwatching.

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Kohout | I see a lot of the project costs are geared toward planning. |
| Taylor | There is a two hour allotment for community meetings. I want clarification of how many there will be. |
| Rowe | Davis-Bacon wage rates again and then there are non-standard wage rates also. Is this an issue? |
| Neel | No. |

Budd They need \$50,000 for such a short amount of trail. I scored it high anyway.

Morrison Sometimes you have to pay Davis-Bacon wages depending on the construction company that is awarded the bid.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

Only 6 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants.

25. Rainbird Trailhead Improvement Project

- **Wendy Gierard, University of Alaska, Southeast**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- .5 miles of trail to be constructed, maintained, reconstructed, signed, groomed, planned. 1.3 miles of interconnecting trail to benefit from this project
- Funds will be used for labor, materials and project administration.
- **Land Owners:** University of Alaska, Southeast; City of Ketchikan

- **PROS**
 - a.

- **CONS**
 - a. Project appears to be an extension of the Safety and Education Project. Possibly applying under both categories to get around funding limitations.

Project Description: The project is the improvement of a hiking trail that begins at the University of Alaska SE-Ketchikan campus, and connects to the existing Rainbird Trail about one half mile to the southeast.

ORTAB Comments:

Budd	This application was very confusing to me. It is the same as a safety grant. The map wasn't very detailed.
Taylor	The matching was well over the funding asked for. There are more worthwhile projects.
Rowe	What is "other" in the budget description? I would like more description of what the other is.
Walters	No importance was stated on what will be done to the trail. Would like to see more detail on construction and maintenance.
Morrison	Seems worthy but it is not a high priority.
Lawson	It doesn't tell what the match will be.
Kohout	Do we want to drop this project?
Taylor	It is not high on our scoring list. Let's leave it on and proceed to the next application.

ORTAB Vote: YES__Y__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

Funding for this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds to the Recreational Trail Grant Program.

26. Reed Lakes Trail Reconstruction

- **Kym Miller, Alaska State Parks – Mat-Su**
- \$41,499 (requested) / \$10,375 (match) / \$51,874 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- .64 miles of trail to be planned and constructed, 2.75 miles to be maintained and signed, .61 miles of trail to be reconstructed. 4.5 miles of interconnecting trail to benefit from this project.
- Funds will be used to pay for labor, materials, and equipment.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – DNR

- **PROS**
 - a. Excellent description with TMO’s and prescription information included in the application packet.
 - b. Good maps and photo documentation.
 - c. Significant support for the restoration project.
 - d. Strong support for the trail through inclusion in various management plans.
 - e. Shown as a priority since Superintendent states park use has increased 28% in one year.
 - f. Excellent trail crew to complete work.

- **CONS**
 - a. A short window to perform the work, considering the elevation and distance of the project site.
 - b. No bids.
 - c. No SCORP documentation included.
 - d. Project description on the public notice is skimpy.

Project Description: This project will be a restoration and re-route of the badly degraded switchback section of the Reed Lakes Trail (Mile 1.5 to 2.75).

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Taylor | This is a state park application. So many don’t get support from their citizen’s advisory boards. They didn’t get any support last year either. |
| Budd | They applied last year? Did we fund them? |
| Luck | Last year we didn’t fund. |
| Budd | A Natural Resource Tech gets \$30 an hour? |
| Lawson | That cost is wage and insurance costs. I would like to know what constitutes a youth organization. At 18 years old you aren’t a youth. |
| Budd | The Dept. of Labor states youth is 16-24 years of age. |
| Rowe | Organizations that use 18 years and younger are fine to help construct the trail. |

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO____

Approved / Not Approved

Only 6 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants.

27. Reflections Lake Interpretive Trail

- **Marian Elliott, Alaskans for Palmer Hay Flats**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- .9 miles of trail to be maintained and construction of a viewing platform and boardwalk.
- Funds will be used to pay for a 346 sq foot viewing tower.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska - DNR

- **PROS**
 - a. Applicant appears to be very well-organized and supported in the community; sponsors such as Connoco Phillips, ADF&G, DPOR, and multiple other youth development entities. Strong letters of support.
 - b. Project allows for a unique perspective within the refuge.
 - c. Project will utilize Teeland Middle School Students for revegetation efforts.
 - d. Good grant performance and included in management plans.

- **CONS**
 - a. Project description could have talked more about expected site visitation and why the size of the tower was chosen.
 - b. The aerial maps are good but do not really show where the tower will be constructed.
 - c. Estimated cost was determined by D&C in DPOR, but no information was provided to substantiate the \$150/sq ft quote.
 - d. Existing boardwalk is built to ADA standards, but the tower will not be.

Project Description: Project funding will be used to pay for the installation of a raised wildlife viewing tower at the Palmer Hay Flats State Game Refuge. Interpretive panels will also be placed at strategic rest and viewing sites around the trail. These trail upgrades will enhance trail user's experience while contributing to a deeper awareness and appreciation for the value of this important wildlife habitat.

ORTAB Comments:

Lawson	It seems that 100% of the funding is going to the construction of the tower and not the trail.
Luck	The match is the trail maintenance.
Rowe	Is it truly ADA accessible?
Walters	Not the tower access.
Morrison	I think it scored well because of how the grant was written. What they want us to do is fund the tower. This can wait another year.

Budd The fastest growing sport in the state is bird watching.

Luck And people will use the trails more with the tower in place.

Morrison It is ironic that we can build remote cabins in the middle of nowhere cheaper than this viewing platform.

Lawson Are we comfortable funding regardless of scores?

Neel Historically this group matches more that what is required on the grant.

Luck The tower is an attraction to the trails.

Budd I'm for leaving it in.

ORTAB Vote: YES__7__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

28. Refuge Cove Trails / Trailhead Rehabilitation

- **Mary Kowalczyk, Alaska State Parks Ketchikan**
- \$26,011 (requested) / \$6,503 (match) / \$32,514 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 2000' of new trail to be reconstructed, 30' of trail to be constructed, 3.5 miles of interconnecting trail to benefit from this project.
- New trailhead dimensions: 125' x 14' x 6'
- Funding will be used for labor, equipment, and picnic tables.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – DNR

- **PROS**
 - a. Thorough and detailed project description.
 - b. Excellent maps and photo documentation.
 - c. Project appears to be logistically well-planned.
 - d. Excellent grant history.
 - e. Project will provide access for individuals with disabilities. Boy Scouts will be utilized to reclaim and upgrade 120' of trail.
 - f. Excellent support from the community.
 - g. Environment review process is in progress.

- **CONS**
 - a. No bids.
 - b. Only opposition is that local Rec. Trail applicants in the community fear competition with so many grants coming out of Ketchikan - will limit their chances of getting funding.

Project Description: The rehabilitation project proposed for Refuge Cove State Recreation Site will occur in 3 contiguous locations. 600' of existing trails in the picnic area will be hardened with gravel to a minimum width of 36". A 250' trail section within it will meet minimum ADA accessibility standards. The trailhead parking area will have riprap boulders placed on the ocean side of its sloughing embankment. 1,400' of existing unimproved path in the forest between the beach and road will be rehabilitated to 32" with gravel and curb logs, and delineate access to the beach and road

ORTAB Comments:

Kohout Great application. We should put it out on the website as an example.

Budd It is great.

Lawson I too thought it was a good application.

Walters I took myself out of the scoring on this because of a conflict of interest.

ORTAB Vote: YES__5__ NO_____ Approved / Not Approved

No vote was provided by Kate Walters due to a conflict of interest and Andy Morrison did not vote since he was unable to review all applications.

29. Sheep Creek Trail Reroute

- **George Schaaf, Trail Mix, Inc.**
- \$31,914 (requested) / \$7,979 (match) / \$39,893 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 1 mile of new trail will be constructed, .3 miles of existing trail will be reconstructed, and 9 miles of interconnecting trail will benefit from this project.
- Funds will be used to pay for labor costs.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – DNR

- **PROS**
 - a. Letters of support from State Parks and advisory board.
 - b. Excellent grant and organizational experience
 - c. SAR well-addressed and in progress.

- **CONS**
 - a. Very limited explanation of budget and cost of personnel.
 - b. No bids.
 - c. Project Match and Sponsor Commitment show that grant funds will be used to pay for helicopter time and gravel, nowhere is that stated in the budget.
 - d. General letters of support have been submitted for the Mt. Roberts, Mt. Juneau and Sheep Mountain projects. Each allude that Sheep Mountain is the lowest on the priority list, perhaps due to use.
 - e. Trail work will not make accommodations for individuals with disabilities and no youth groups will be used.

Project Description: This project will reroute a section of the Sheep Creek Trail between the Thane Rd. trailhead and the unnamed ridge above Gastineau Channel. Approximately one mile of new trail will be built to replace about half a mile of existing, fall-line trail that has become extremely eroded and unstable. The project will be suitable for mountain bicycles, and help provide access to the Sheep Creek Valley.

ORTAB Comments:

- Taylor All three Trail Mix, Inc. applications were well written. There needs to be more detail regarding the scope of work that will be done. I had issues with reading the vicinity maps.
- Kohout Would also have liked more details on the work descriptions. It was hard to see if portions of the trail might be on private land because of bad maps.
- Rowe I scored it lower because of lack of support letters.
- Morrison Some users like these more rugged trails.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO____

Approved / Not Approved

Funding is contingent on more funds being allocated to the Recreational Trail Grant Program. Kate Walters did not vote due to a conflict of interest.

30. Watermelon Trail – Public Land Re-routes and Educational Signage

- **Alder Seaman, Homer Soil and Water Conservation District**
- \$14,325 (requested) / \$3,581 (match) / \$17,906 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- .5 miles of new trail will be constructed, 1.5 miles of trail will be maintained, 10 miles of interconnecting trail will benefit from the project.
- Funds will be used to pay for kiosk construction and materials, labor, equipment rental and administrative costs.
- **Land Owners:** Kenai Peninsula Borough, State of Alaska – DNR

- **PROS**
 - a. Project is supported by the KPB by resolution of support and ADF&G is providing assistance to relocate trail (however, no letter of support was included from ADF&G or the KPB).
 - b. Project appears to be extremely popular with community.
 - c. Also appears to be a priority for the State and Borough to rectify trespass and resource degradation issues, though the permitting process is going slowly.

- **CONS**
 - a. Project is to remove trail from encroachments and trespass on the “Perry” parcel and CIRI Corporation lands. Description alludes to there being an original route that bypasses the Native land but has become overgrown. Confusion surrounding whether or not all easements are in place, some are admittedly not – they are in the permitting process. Need to clarify with ML&W. Can project proceed under General Allowed Use guidelines for surrounding state land?
 - b. Unsure of State and Borough’s support for physical construction of trail. All information points to their support but is not confirmed.
 - c. No bids. No ADA accessibility incorporated into to trail construction, nor is there use of youth development crews.

Project Description: The Watermelon Trail leading north from Homer is one of the most viable ATV routes to the Caribou Hills trail system, and has already been assigned ADL 229161. This project seeks to reroute the trail around the small 'Perry' parcel and reestablish an already-built reroute around a corner of CIRI land for the purpose of obtaining public easement status. A trailhead kiosk will be installed about the Anchor River/Fritz Creek Critical Habitat Area, since a large stretch of the trail passes through it.

ORTAB Comments:

Lawson Do they have permission to do this?

Taylor The Kenai Borough supports this but there is no documentation to that fact.

- Kidder There is a homestead at the lower part of the trail and they want the trail off of their land. There is state land on all sides of the trail but in that one particular portion. The reason for the curve in the trail is to avoid making the trail through native lands. We need to get easements for this curved portion of the trail and the Borough needs to help in getting them. The issue is that the easement can't get done until the trail work gets done. And the trail can't get done without funds.
- Luck Is this something the states easement section supports?
- Kidder We totally support the easement because we do not want to trespass on native lands.
- Lawson There is a letter of support for the trail from Fish & Game.
- Kidder Fish & Game is the original easement applicant because the trail goes through some critical habitat.
- Luck The only thing that was not submitted was a letter of support from the Kenai Borough.
- Kidder I am all for starting the ealy entry process to start the survey process.
- Luck The early entry process is contingent on getting permission from the Borough.
- Taylor We will need to see something in writing from the Kenai Borough for that small part of the trail easement.
- Kohout This early entry contingency will need a deadline.

ORTAB Vote: YES 6 NO

Approved / Not Approved

This project is approved upon the contingency of getting formal approval from the KPB to construct the final portion of trail on KPB land - so that the trail does not terminate at the KPB boundary. Only 6 members voted on this project as Andy Morrison was not able to review all applications.

1. Goldstream Valley Bike Pump Park and Skills

- **John Hiltenbrand, Goldstream Valley Lions Club**
- \$15,000 (requested) / \$3,750 (match) / \$18,750 (total)
- **SAFETY & EDUCATION / NON-MOTORIZED**
- A bike pump park would be produced from this grant, with focus on teaching others on design and safety concepts with building and riding such a facility.
- Funds would be used to pay for instructor travel and per diem fees, as well as construction costs to build the park.
- **Land Owners:** Goldstream Valley Lions' Club Land.

- **PROS**
 - a. The bike pump park will likely be a popular place for cyclists to ride and recreate.
 - b. Park will be open to people of all ages.
 - c. Seems to be a lot of support for cycling in Fairbanks, as well as this project.
 - d. Good maps and interesting concept, though a bit difficult to fit in the mold of the RTP program. Would have to be 2 separate projects.

- **CONS**
 - a. Project essentially needs to be broken into two parts - if funded. One half would include the curriculum and training derived from the instructor; the second half would be a trail construction/bike pump park grant. \$7,550 would have to be allocated from S&E funds, which would pay for consultant's travel and professional expenses. The remaining funds would have to come from standard non-motorized trail grant funds.
 - b. Budget is not adequately explained and there is no end-product design for the park when it is completed. It is basically unknown what will come from the funds when the course is completed. No photos, diagrams or examples of other parks that have been developed in the same fashion.
 - c. The Ester Dome project is very near this same location and provides ample opportunity for cyclists.

Project Description: The purpose of this project is to bring professional trail builders to Fairbanks to conduct an educational and safety workshop that teaches participants about bike pump parks and bike skills courses, including how to plan, design, and construct these facilities and how to deal with insurance, liability and safety issues. This workshop will be open statewide to biking enthusiasts and others who want to learn how to develop these facilities and, by doing so, offer a fun and exciting way for riders to learn bike safety and technical skills.

ORTAB Comments:

Lawson I saw the benefit where communities could go out and build their own. I felt the bids for fill, etc. was lacking in information.

- Kohout We are not getting enough information and detail for the construction.
- Luck The project like this would have to be split according to Washington, D.C. One part would have to be construction and the second part would need to be safety and education.
- Taylor In my job with the Municipality of Fairbanks I work with this organization and they have created a great park and have developed a good concept for its development.

ORTAB Vote: YES__5__ NO____

Approved / Not Approved

Funding of this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds being awarded to the Recreational Trail Grant Program. Votes were not cast by Steve Taylor (due to a conflict of interest) and Andy Morrison since he was not able to review all applications.

2. Trails Newsletter

- **Geoff Orth, Alaska Trails**
- \$8,640 (requested) / \$2,160 (match) / \$10,800 (total)
- **SAFETY & EDUCATION**
- Funding will be used to pay the wages for the author and production costs associated with the Alaska Trails Newsletter.

- **PROS**
 - a. Funding of the project would continue to keep the trail community informed of upcoming and current trail events, training opportunities, initiatives, construction and maintenance projects, and collective action needed to ensure proper stewardship of trail resources statewide.
 - b. The product is free to the trails community – all that is required to receive the newsletter is to get on the mailing list.
 - c. The author, Eric Troyer, has volunteered his time and effort for this project for a number of years and has a strong passion for trails in general.
 - d. Annually, Alaska State Trails Program news is provided in this publication, including specific grant awards made by the Division. ORTAB members have also been recruited through the newsletter.

- **CONS**
 - a. The application did not provide much detail for an individual that is not familiar with the newsletter. More information could have been provided concerning who the newsletter is distributed to, additional information about the content, etc.
 - b. Minimal effort was applied to the grant application, but the newsletter is an extremely valuable resource to the trail community and is the “premier” document for trail news in the state.
 - c. Timeline should at least show the approximate dates the newsletters are released.

Project Description: Funding for this project would be used to help produce the Alaska Trails Quarterly Newsletter, which contains news about trails from across the state. The newsletter comes out 4 times a year with smaller “Action Updates” coming out most months in between the quarterlies. The newsletter contains no advertising and is distributed free by Alaska Trails to over 500 individuals statewide.

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| Taylor | As a consumer of this newsletter I find it provides lots of valuable information. I do have a problem with pre-funding before publication. |
| Westlien | It is an important communication tool for a small number of subscribers. I don't feel that this should be ORTAB funded. |

- Lawson Can we say it can be funded with more requirements?
- Luck Yes.
- Kohout We need a commitment from the applicant on the dates when the newsletter will be published.
- Westlien Are recipients of this newsletter member of AK Trails?
- Kohout It is word-of-mouth because it is a free newsletter. The applicant needs to provide print dates. I suggest let them know that they can be eligible for funding when further information is provided.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO____

Approved / Not Approved

Funding of this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds being awarded to the Recreational Trail Grant Program. Only 6 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants.

3. Rainbird Trailhead Development

- **Wendy Gierard, University of Alaska, Southeast (Ketchikan)**
- \$25,000 (requested) / \$6,250 (match) / \$31,250 (total)
- **SAFETY & EDUCATION**
- Funds will be used to upgrade a steep section of trail with a stone staircase. 10 signs, 3 types of brochures, and 2 trail counters will also be purchased.
- **Land Owners:** University of Alaska lands and Ketchikan Borough

- **PROS**
 - a. Safety issues with the steepness of the trail will be addressed.
 - b. Educational materials will be designed and distributed to heavily visited areas of the city.
 - c. Nice drawings/schematic of the staircase is provided.
 - d. Sample brochures are provided and look reasonable.
 - e. Strong letters of support. Trail appears to get a lot of use and is a priority for the city and local organizations.

- **CONS**
 - a. The main problem with brochures is that people tend to use them once, if at all, and then throw them away. On trails they often times become litter. While these are reasonable for their practical use – perhaps it would have been better to design a brochure with more appeal.
 - b. There isn't much information to understand the extent of the safety hazards with the trail. For the amount of money being requested, the budget isn't itemized very well for the cost of the construction.
 - c. It would helpful to see photos of safety issues... staircase.
 - d. Not sure if the attachments are the brochures or what will be part of the signage? No detail on what the signage will entail.

Project Description: The UAS Ketchikan Rainbird Trailhead Safety & Educational Grant will provide educational signage on the trail itself, describing the history of the trail, the local and cultural uses of the trail. The grant will provide funding for improvements to the end of the trail to increase safety for users. Additionally, the project will create general educational materials to distribute to the community and visitors about the Rainbird trail location, access and history.

ORTAB Comments:

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Rowe | This application should have been in the construction funding and not classified as safety and education by the applicant. |
| Taylor | There is substantial construction that doesn't belong in this category. |
| Luck | The applicant may have broken the project up to get more funding. This application should have been a construction project. |

- Westlien I too was very confused. It definitely should have been split into a construction application and the remaining into a safety and education application.
- Kohout If we tell applicants that the education cap for funding is \$15,000, we need to have them stay within that limit.
- Holzapfel If the cap is \$15,000, is this the match and state funds combined? The \$15,000 cap is not clear in the grant application.
- Kohout The brochures and mock-ups in this application on the educational materials seemed more promotional than educational.
- Taylor I don't want to fund any construction costs under an educational grant.
- Kohout I agree. I suggest we support only the funding of the educational brochures.

***Note: There is no funding cap for Safety and Education projects under the Recreational Trail Grant Program. The 15% stipulation was confused with the 15% cap that the Snowmobile Trail Grant Program is limited by.**

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO____

Approved / Not Approved

Funding of this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds being awarded to the Recreational Trail Grant Program. Only 6 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants.

4. Trail Costing

- **Max Gruner, Alaska Trails**
- \$29,997 (requested) / \$7,499 (match) / \$37,496 (total)
- **SAFETY & EDUCATION**
- Funds will be used to pay for two cost calculating trainers / trail professionals to travel from California and provide 13 days of instruction. Other fees include educational materials and administrative overhead.
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Chugach State Park

- **PROS**
 - a. Revenue generated from the course will be reused to hold a similar training at a later date.
 - b. During the training, an Alaskan trails specialist will be trained to provide this training in-state.
 - c. Good partnering agencies working in collaboration on this project.
 - d. As seen through countless applications submitted to the Recreational Trail Grant Program and the Alaska Trails Initiative, there are many agencies and organizations that could benefit from an in-depth seminar on trail cost estimates - our program included

- **CONS**
 - a. 18 months seems to be a long time before having another class - considering there will only be 18 people per course. It would affect more managers to offer the course annually. Annual trainings would also help with retaining knowledge - for both instructors and students.
 - b. Cost for the California instructors seems very high for 13 days of work.

Project Description: One of the biggest shortcomings of any trail program is the development of appropriate funding to complete the project within scope and time allotments. Participants will learn trail construction cost estimating that is inventory based with construction production rates, material costs and logistics worked in. This type of estimating can be applied to developing accurate budgets. This information will be valuable to the agency trail manager, the bidding trail contractor, the project implementing trail crew supervisor and others. At the end of the training, participants will take away software templates that can be used for future projects.

ORTAB Comments:

Budd I think this was a good idea.

Taylor Great idea and it would be useful. The funding requested was above the limits for safety and education.

- Rowe I think the class is good. Should this be split into construction and then safety and education?
- Luck It is a bit high because of the instructors. It is more educational than construction. This application is teaching a class on how to construct a trail and not actual trail construction.
- Westlien I am less likely to move this project into the construction section because this is a great educational class to learn trail constructing.
- Gruner I just looked up the \$15,000 educational cap and it is under the SnowTrak board exclusively. There is no cap stated on the application for the Recreational Trail Grant Program.
- Kohout On the written application it does state “snow trail--\$15,000”.
- Gruner I want it noted that there is no educational cap stated on the trails application for the Recreational Trail Grant Program.
- Kohout We all agree there is no cap.

***Note: There is no funding cap for Safety and Education projects under the Recreational Trail Grant Program. The 15% stipulation was confused with the 15% cap that the Snowmobile Trail Grant Program is limited by.**

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

Only 6 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants.

5. Trail Mapper

- **Geoff Orth, Alaska Trails**
- \$12,480 (requested) / \$3,120 (match) / \$15,600 (total)
- **SAFETY & EDUCATION**
- Funds will be used to pay for contractual services with Tom Clark to develop a Trail Mapping website.

- **PROS**
 - a. Good product to have produced for the northern region (not sure about trails statewide). Alaska Trails would be a good facilitator for this project.
 - b. Tom Clark has already begun project with his own resources and initiative.
 - c. Excellent organization to manage the website with extensive grant history and statewide reach.
 - d. Reasonable amount of support from the local community

- **CONS**
 - a. Application was very hastily put together with minimal information
 - b. A similar interactive website is currently being constructed by the Alaska State Trails Office, but only for State trails.

Project Description: Funding to help produce an interactive internet application to allow trail users to find trails statewide.

ORTAB Comments:

Taylor I like this idea. I spend a lot of time trying to find trail information and this would help. I am a bit concerned about posting trails that don't have easements and all the safety issues associated with it.

Kohout We need more information on the trail expansion and phases.

Luck Our state interns are mapping and locating state trails. Andre can show the board some of the work being done.

ORTAB Vote: YES 6 NO

Approved / Not Approved

Funding of this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds being awarded to the Recreational Trail Grant Program. Only 6 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants.

6. Trail Rendezvous

- **Max Gruner, Alaska Trails**
- \$11,200 (requested) / \$2,800 (match) / \$14,000 (total)
- **SAFETY & EDUCATION**
- Funds will be used to pay for speakers and presenter fees, educational materials, marketing, reception space, transportation, and administrative overhead.

- **PROS**
 - a. Strong support for this gathering in alternation with the annual Alaska State Trails Symposium.
 - b. Excellent organizational background with assembling/facilitating trainings such as this.
 - c. Excellent grant history.
 - d. Applicant has the appropriate connections to bring good speakers and attract the various agencies that would attend such an event.
 - e. An overall good idea to keep the trail community involved and proactive to maintain the ethics of sustainable trail construction

- **CONS**
 - a. Many of the budget items are vague – not broken down adequately.
 - b. Unsure from which agencies the match would come from.

Project Description: Alaska Trails would like to provide trail users and the wider public an opportunity for training and networking. It is our belief that such an opportunity for a rendezvous would ultimately lead to more trails (planned, developed, and maintained in sustainable ways), would lead to more opportunities for healthy recreation, provide the potential of connecting youth to the outdoors; an opportunity for networking and training such as this would benefit all trail users in Alaska as well as all other agencies, organizations, and individuals who are concerned with sustainable land management, trail use, and education of the public.

ORTAB Comments:

Westlien	I didn't have any problems with this project. I feel it is an innovative idea that is needed in the state.
Budd	I liked that it had youth involvement.
Kohout	I would have liked to see a timeline reflected in the budget.
Gruner	Clearly grantees have to start the application process earlier than the money is available.
Westlien	Should this project go forward it is an opportunity for motorized users to get involved.

Morrison We have been having this discussion with SnowTRAC.

ORTAB Vote: YES__6__ NO_____

Approved / Not Approved

Full funding of this project is contingent on the availability of additional funds being awarded to the Recreational Trail Grant Program. **Currently only \$6,394 is available from remaining Safety and Education project dollars.**

Only 6 members voted on this project since Andy Morrison was unable to review all grants.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Geographic Representation

- Kohout Southeast was heavily represented for funding this year.
- Luck We should have more board representation from the Northwestern area. The Fairbanks area is represented by two board members due to the fact that it is difficult to recruit representation for that region.
- Rowe We have enough latitude to make sure that we are granting funds all around the state.
- Kohout I would like the grant application to say grant experience instead of trail grant experience. There are a lot of outlying areas that may not apply because of the wording on the application. I know that the smaller communities have grant experience and are not applying for funds because of the application wording.

Application Process

- Budd I am not fond of the electronic application scoring process. I would like to see a hard copy.
- Rowe I didn't mind the electronic format. I would like more space available. We need to standardize how we are going to organize the support letters we receive. I would like to log-in to a website to read the letters instead of downloading all of them onto my computer.
- Lawson A jump drive with all of the information works for me because some of us live in areas with slow internet.
- Taylor I would like to see the application sections streamlined. There are repetitive questions. The Safety and Education application needs more narrative space.
- Morrison I would like to see the score sheet integrated with the application so comments can be made right on the application.
- Luck I will look into seeing if we can make a feature for the reviewer to make remarks with each question. Maybe we can do some of the modification internally.
- Kohout The budget boxes are too small.
- Luck We also need to have an attachment that could include photos.
- Budd I would also like to see separating the agency letters from the public letters.

Gruner There are no guidelines for ADA in the wilderness.

Morrison Change the ADA wording on the application and the scoring of the youth corps.

Taylor It is up to all of us to interpret and be judicious with the bonus points.

Morrison I would like to see change the high score system from 110 points to the basic 100 points.

Public Participation

Morrison It seems reasonable for small points of clarification from the public participation. If they can't make it to the meeting they can call the conference line. Everyone has access to a telephone for communication.

Lawson It is hard to find a balance with participation with the smaller communities that can't come to the meetings for application clarification questions.

Rowe I like the idea of a 10 minute presentation from applicants.

Morrison I am more in favor of the board asking questions if it is needed because of your time limitations in approving the applications.

Gruner When a grant applicant applies for funding, the application is their presentation to tell the board what their project is all about. The application process should be completed as stated in the guidelines. Then it is up to the Chair to ask applicants questions for specific clarification on the application.

Taylor In the next meeting we should start our process with the conference callers so they don't have to stay on the telephone for hours.

Easement and Planning Funding

Rowe We need more planning and easement acquisitions funding. We need guidelines on what can and can't be funded. Smaller communities need funds to help with design work and easement and planning.

Kohout Yes, those things can be part of a project. On the grant, what would the percentage for these funds.

Rowe I propose up to \$10,000 of the overall grant can be used for planning and design.

Taylor In our application guidelines it doesn't say where we can allow for that.

Morrison We need to see what the federal guidelines are before we make any decisions.

Luck Our money comes from the Federal Highway Administration. For the most part we need to see tangible work for this money. Some money can be used for planning and design but we are limited by national standards and guidelines for the Recreational Trail Grant Program as a whole.

Rowe Then, can the applicant use their planning and design expenses as the match?

Luck Yes, if it is occurring concurrently with the project while under grant agreement.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

Recreation Trails Program Grants - 2010

Ref. #	Project Name	Submitted by	Funding Request	Scores										Trail Classification	Average	Cumulative \$
				J.K.	E.W.	J.B.	A.M.	S.T.	J.R.	K.W.	S.L.	M.C.	ORTAB Approve			
28	Refuge Cove Trails (Non-Motorized)	DPOR - Southeast	\$ 26,011.00	105	107	110	NS	105	89	C	108		YES	Non-Motorized	104.00	\$ 26,011.00
24	Pratt Museum Forest Trails Project (Non-Motorized)	Pratt Museum	\$ 50,000.00	90	102	92	NS	100	96	105	106		YES	Non-Motorized	98.71	\$ 76,011.00
6	Cooper Landing Trail Grooming (Non-Motorized)	Cooper Landing Comm. Club	\$ 18,782.00	91	?	88	?	97	?	97	94		YES	Non-Motorized	93.40	\$ 94,793.00
26*	Reed Lakes Trail Reconstruction (NMD)	DPOR - Mat-Su Area	\$ 41,499.00	95	102	86	NS	88	90	99	91		YES	Non-Motorized	93.00	\$ 136,292.00
8**	Upper-Dewey Lakes Phase II (NMD)	Municipality of Skagway	\$ -	90	93	91	94	87	93	93	89		NO	Non-Motorized	91.25	\$ 136,292.00
20	Mount Juneau Trail Re-route (Non-Motorized)	Trail Mix, Inc.	\$ 48,041.00	84	89	79	NS	93	90	C	92		YES	Non-Motorized	87.83	\$ 184,333.00
21*	Mount Roberts Trail Re-route (NMD)	Trail Mix, Inc.	\$ 44,207.00	87	85	78	86	91	83	C	88		YES	Non-Motorized	85.43	\$ 228,540.00
29*	Sheep Creek Trail Re-route (NMD)	Trail Mix, Inc.	\$ 31,914.00	63	77	73	79	88	85	C	82		YES	Non-Motorized	78.14	\$ 260,454.00
25	Rainbird Trailhead Improvement	University of Alaska, SE	\$ 50,000.00	78	81	55	82	70	85	81	84		YES	Non-Motorized	77.00	\$ 310,454.00
15	Juneau Ski Trail Equip. (Non-Motorized)	Juneau Nordic Ski Club	\$ -	60	67	47	70	69	61	65	68		NO	Non-Motorized	63.38	\$ 310,454.00
		Total =	\$ 310,454.00													\$ 310,454.00
			\$ 184,333.00													

Current Funding limit

Ref. #	Project Name	Submitted by	Funding Request	J.K.	E.W.	J.B.	A.M.	S.T.	J.R.	K.W.	S.L.	M.C.	ORTAB Approve	Trail Classification	Average	Cumulative \$
13*	Happy Valley Trail Construction (NMD)	Alaska Trails	\$ 50,000.00	95	94	90	97	95	103	98	94		YES	Diversified	95.75	\$ 50,000.00
27*	Reflections Lake Interp. Trail (NMD)	Alaskans for Palmer Hay Flats	\$ 50,000.00	92	103	82	89	97	80	103	89		YES	Diversified	91.88	\$ 100,000.00
23*	Point Higgins - Phase II (NMD)	Ketchikan Gateway Borough	\$ 50,000.00	92	88	95	82	91	94	89	92		YES	Diversified	90.38	\$ 150,000.00
4	Chicken Lake Cross Park (Diversified)	DPOR - Mat-Su Area	\$ 22,368.00	88	88	85	90	76	90	97	90		YES	Diversified	88.00	\$ 172,368.00
10*	Girdwood Nordic Ski Trails (NMD)	Girdwood Nordic Ski Club	\$ 50,000.00	85	84	87	C	92	97	77	85		YES	Diversified	86.71	\$ 222,368.00
16*	Lookout Mountain (NMD)	Kacemak Nordic Ski Club	\$ -	86	93	74	NS	86	89	94	79		YES - ATI	Diversified	85.86	\$ 222,368.00
7	CSP Trail Crew Equipment (Diversified)	Chugach State Park	\$ 23,300.00	80	94	84	90	84	75	94	85		YES	Diversified	85.75	\$ 245,668.00
14	Iktua Bay Trailhead Facility (Diversified)	Chenega IRA Council	\$ 44,653.00	83	78	72	NS	93	87	92	95		YES	Diversified	85.71	\$ 290,321.00
19*	Moose Ridge Trail Loop (NMD)	Anchorage Park Foundation	\$ 50,000.00	86	95	57	84	63	72	93	84		YES	Diversified	79.25	\$ 371,321.00
2	Canycom S160 Carrier (Diversified)	Trail Mix, Inc.	\$ 31,000.00	88	64	97	67	90	67	C	78		YES	Diversified	78.71	\$ 371,321.00
		Total =	\$ 371,321.00													\$ 371,321.00
			\$ 245,668.00													

Current Funding limit

Ref. #	Project Name	Submitted by	Funding Request	J.K.	E.W.	J.B.	A.M.	S.T.	J.R.	K.W.	S.L.	M.C.	ORTAB Approve	Trail Classification	Average	Cumulative \$	
5	CHRS Trail Safety and Maint. (Motorized)	FNSB Parks and Recreation	\$ 50,000.00	96	101	80	NS	C	99	95	95			Motorized	94.33	\$ 50,000.00	
1	Big Lake Trail Survey (Motorized)	Matanuska-Susitna Borough	\$ 32,477.00	97	74	74	101	83	83	98	86			Motorized	87.00	\$ 82,477.00	
9	Eska Trail Remediation (Motorized)	Mat-Su Trails Council (No SAR)	\$ -	66	94	79	104	76	99	95	72			Motorized	85.63	\$ 82,477.00	
30	Watermelon Trail (Motorized)	HSWCD (Tentatively Awarded)	\$ 14,325.00	83	85	84	NS	81	96	87	82			Motorized	85.43	\$ 96,802.00	
22	OHV Obstacle Course (Motorized)	Mat-Su Trails Council	\$ 6,250.00	59	84	95	NS	94	94	93	75			Motorized	84.86	\$ 103,052.00	
17	Shelter Cabin at New Igloo (Motorized Diverse)	Native Village of Mary's Igloo	\$ 21,449.00	79	82	74	95	86	80	77	84			Motorized	82.13	\$ 124,501.00	
3	Caribou Hills Trail and Trailhead (Motorized)	Snomads, Inc. (less \$9,000)	\$ 41,000.00	71	103	78	97	57	85	79	79			Motorized	81.13	\$ 165,501.00	
18*	Moose Range Trails (Diversified)	Mat-Su Trails Council	\$ 23,050.00	77	?	?	NS	71	?	85	81			Motorized	78.50	\$ 188,551.00	Current Funding limit
Total =			\$ 188,551.00											\$ 188,551.00			
Grand Total =			\$ 870,326.00											\$ 188,551.00			

Available (30%)	\$195,000
Available (40%)	\$260,000
Available (30%)	\$195,000
Total =	\$650,000

Total =	\$ 184,333.00
Total =	\$ 245,668.00
Total =	\$ 188,551.00
Total =	\$ 618,552.00

\$ (10,667.00)	Under Budget
\$ (14,332.00)	Under Budget
\$ (6,449.00)	Under Budget
\$ (31,448.00)	Under Budget

C = Conflict of Interest
NS = No Score
? = Missing Files

Ref. #	Project Name	Submitted by	Funding Request	J.K.	E.W.	J.B.	A.M.	S.T.	J.R.	K.W.	S.L.	M.C.	ORTAB Approve	Trail Classification	Average	Cumulative \$	
4	Trail Costing Class	Alaska Trails	\$ 29,997.00	92	95	86	NS	97	94	91	87			Safety and Education	91.7143	\$ 29,997.00	Current Funding Limit
6	Trail Rendezvous	Alaska Trails	\$ 11,200.00	75	100	87	NS	97	82	87	86			Safety and Education	87.7143	\$ 41,197.00	
1	Goldstream Valley Bike Pump Park and Skills	Goldstream Valley Lions Club	\$ 15,000.00	75	97	74	NS	C	84	86	91			Safety and Education	84.5	\$ 56,197.00	
5	Trail Mapper	Alaska Trails	\$ 12,480.00	67	82	71	NS	94	87	89	80			Safety and Education	81.4286	\$ 68,677.00	
3	Rainbird Trailhead Development	University of Alaska, SE	\$ 10,000.00	69	96	72	NS	74	74	94	84			Safety and Education	80.4286	\$ 78,677.00	
2	Trails Newsletter	Alaska Trails	\$ 8,640.00	73	70	73	NS	93	89	82	77			Safety and Education	79.5714	\$ 87,317.00	
		Total =	\$ 87,317.00													\$ 87,317.00	
		Grand, Grand Total =	\$ 957,643.00														
			\$ 29,997.00														

Available S&E = \$36,931

UnderBudget = \$6,934

Current Apportionment:	\$	533,542
Current Obligation Limit	\$	533,542
7% Admin Rate	\$	37,348
Remaining Balance:	\$	496,194
5% Safety and Ed. Funding	\$	26,677
Remaining Balance:	\$	469,517
30% Non-Motorized Projects	\$	140,855
30% Motorized Projects	\$	140,855
40% Diversified Projects	\$	187,807
Total available for projects:	\$	469,517

A	
Standard Apportionment:	\$ 738,636
Standard Obligation Limit	\$ 738,636
7% Admin. Rate	\$ 51,705
Remaining Balance:	\$ 686,931
Safety and Education (5%)	\$ 36,931
Remaining Balance:	\$ 650,000
30% Non-Motorized Projects	\$ 195,000
30% Motorized Projects	\$ 195,000
40% Diversified Projects	\$ 260,000
Total requested for projects:	\$ 650,000

B	
Standard Apportionment:	\$ 937,693
Standard Obligation Limit	\$ 937,693
7% Admin. Rate	\$ 65,638
Remaining Balance:	\$ 872,055
Safety and Education (5%)	\$ 46,885
Remaining Balance:	\$ 825,170
30% Non-Motorized Projects	\$ 247,551
30% Motorized Projects	\$ 247,551
40% Diversified Projects	\$ 330,068
Total requested for projects:	\$ 825,170

A	B	N/A	
Funding based from a \$650,000 budget.	Based on all motorized being funded.	Overall funding request.	
\$ 195,000	\$ 247,551	\$ 357,921	Non-Mot.
\$ 195,000	\$ 247,551	\$ 247,551	Motorized
\$ 260,000	\$ 330,068	\$ 419,556	Diversified
\$ 650,000	\$ 825,170	\$ 1,025,028	Sub-Total
\$ 51,705	\$ 65,638	\$ 84,854	Admin 7%
\$ 36,931	\$ 46,885	\$ 102,317.00	S&E 5%
\$ 738,636	\$ 1,762,863	\$ 1,212,199	Total