

ORTAB Meeting Minutes

January 16, 2009

ATTENDEES:

ORTAB Board:

Susan Byersdorfer - Southwest Region (Board Chair)

Erling Westlien – Mat-Su Copper River Region (Board Co-Chair)

Andy Morrison – Kenai / PWS / Valdez Region

Molly Chythlook – Western Region

Jeff Budd – Southeast Region

Steve Taylor – Northern Region (New Member)

John Rowe – Northwest Region (New Member)

Parks Staff:

James King - Director

Bill Luck – Trails Coordinator

Steve Neel – Grants Administrator

Andre Kaeppele – Natural Resource Specialist

Olga Lotosh – Grants Administrator

Public:

Russel Wicka - Tongass National Forest (Yakutat)

Dan Kruse – Mat-Su Trails Inc. (Big Lake)

Mona Fremont - Mat-Su Trails Inc. (Big Lake)

Jack Mosby - Alaska Trails (Anchorage)

Justin Selvik - State of Alaska (DNR)

Kara Moore - State of Alaska (DNR)

INTRODUCTION:

Bill: Brings the meeting to order at 8:35 am.

Discusses amendments to the Agenda. Kristy Gray will not be attending the meeting today, therefore there will be an abbreviated discussion of the LWCF program and SCORP.

Indicates that the focus of the meeting today will be the review of all 32 grant applications.

Initiates a round table of introductions starting with himself. Susan Byersdorfer is recognized as the Board Chair.

Susan: Would like to acknowledge the fact that State Parks has difficulty maintaining trails for the long term.

Suggests application requirements are amended to include a more descriptive maintenance requirement.

Bill: Suggests a teleconference would be the appropriate venue to discuss amendments to the application requirements.

Identifies the Northwestern Region Board Member as a resident of Fairbanks. Indicates difficulty in recruiting board members from this region. Suggests the board and park staff make an effort to recruit a representative from the area.

James: Director James King introduces himself and expresses the importance of reviewing grants to identify quality sustainable projects that represent all regions of the state. Discusses the evolution of the application process and how the present application is designed to force applicants to design quality projects.

Introduces the LWCF as a federal program designed to fund recreational projects. It has funded over 400 projects in Alaska over the last 30 years. Recently there has been talk of ramping up the program in Alaska. LWCF funds go directly to federal, state, or municipal entities.

Introduces the SCORP (Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Plan). SCORP identifies the needs for recreation statewide. Data is gathered through surveys and facility assessments. The plan is updated every 5 years, and is a requirement to be eligible for federal funding for recreational grants. Thanks the board for their hard work and dedication.

Molly: Expresses concern that she does not have a professional background in trails management and therefore finds it difficult to assess trail project based on design.

James: Replies that there is immense value in having perspectives from rural parts of the state. These perspectives allow the grant funds to be used for the benefit of all Alaskans in all regions (urban and rural) of the state.

Molly: Illustrates the fact that trails in rural Alaska are generally used for utility such as transportation between villages, or for access to subsistence resources. Thus trails in rural Alaska are a part of the livelihood and not just for recreation.

Susan: Emphasizes the importance of having a voice on the board for a particular area, and the value of regional representatives to solicit for applications in otherwise under-represented areas.

Bill: Discusses the importance of the application scores submitted by the board. Scores are released to the public and must therefore be representative of the professional evaluation by the board.

Thanks the board for their exhaustive hard work completed prior and up to the meeting.

-Break-

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Andy: Concerned about the misunderstanding by applicants of the differences between motorized and non-motorized projects. This may be in part due to the way projects are characterized in the application instructions. This may require revision, as it was felt that many diversified projects could have (and should have) been categorized as motorized.

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

Describes the distribution of grant funds as follows -

\$650,000 dollars is the total allocated for 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.

Describes the public demand for grant funds as follows -

\$380,556.84 in requests for diversified projects.

\$253,360.00 in requests for the motorized projects.

\$642,170.80 in requests for non-motorized projects.

Identifies a primary goal of the program as not to adversely affect funds provided to the public.

Indicates a lack of motorized applications, therefore additional motorized applications are being accepted after the initial deadline. Of which two project representatives are in attendance to present their projects. Additionally there is flexibility in moving diversified projects around to other categories to increase competition.

Andy: Suggests that several of the diversified projects be categorized as motorized.

Bill: Replies that this has been done with the most obvious projects such as the Seven-Mile Trail and the Compeau Connector. Additionally the deadline for motorized trail grant applications had been extended to allow for the solicitation of additional projects. One of the venues solicited was the Willow Trails Conference, which represents a large motorized user group in the state.

Jeff & Susan: Concerned that the application deadline extension has not been adequately advertised to all regions of the state.

Bill: Responds that a media release was generated, and public venues were solicited.

Describes the Snow-TRAC grant program and grooming pool. Explains that snowmobile registration fees are specifically used for winter trail signage and grooming.

Andy: Indicates that some grooming pool projects have been soliciting the Rec-Trails grants for funds because additional motorized funds have been available. This is in part because there isn't enough funding in the grooming pool to meet all of the statewide grooming needs. When Rec-Trails funds go towards the grooming pool they are immediately put into the trails.

Bill: Identifies that there is no shortage of motorized projects as long as they are correctly categorized. Additionally more applications result in more competition which results in better quality projects being funded.

Andy & Susan: Expressed interest in having funds dispersed to more projects for lesser amounts, instead of having the top three or four projects in each category funded for \$50,000 each. This would likely result in a greater variety of projects covering a greater geographic region.

Bill: Responds that although this sounds ideal, it would require more bureaucracy managing more projects. For example, imagine having to review double the projects.

Introduces Russel Wicka of the Tangass National Forest to present his project near the Dangerous River in Yakutat.

MOTORIZED GRANT PRESENTATIONS:

Russel: Presents his grant application for the Middle Dangerous River Trail in Yakutat.

-Please refer to the grant application for project details-

Susan: Questions the necessity of helicopter use and the use of yellow cedar for boardwalk. Feels that the cost is very high for a small section of improved trail.

Russel: Responds that the helicopter would prevent the first portion of the trail, which is in good condition, from suffering the degradation that would likely occur from the transport of materials overland.

Responds that yellow cedar was chosen as boardwalk material due to its high rot resistant properties and its aesthetics in the surrounding environment.

Bill: Thanks Russel and introduces Dan Kruse and Mona Fremont from the Mat-Su Trail Council to present their grant.

Dan: Presents the council's grant application for the Iron Dog Trail Restoration.

-Please refer to the grant application for project details-

Susan: Questions the need for heavy equipment and stump removal for trail clearing.

Dan: Responds that the equipment will create a much better, longer lasting, lower maintenance requirement trail for the long term.

Responds that equipment will be transported to the site during the winter months reducing environmental impacts.

Responds that stump grinding will eliminate the need to remove stumps, which can cause soil damage.

Andy & Susan: Express their interest in having applicants present their projects. This gives applicants an opportunity to answer any questions the board may have.

Suggest video teleconferencing with applicants be considered in the future.

Jack: Warns this could double or triple meeting times.

-Break-

GENERAL NON-MOTORIZED TRAIL GRANT DISCUSSION

Susan: Illustrates the fact that the top scoring grants are all \$50,000 grants. This leaves less funds for lower priced projects.

Bill: Responds that some of these lesser priced projects can become eligible by diverting some of the \$50,000 projects to ATI funds.

Andy: Points out that funding applications on scores alone reduces the diversity of projects. Repeat applicants write good applications to fund different phases of the same project.

Indicates that project funds should not be awarded based on scores alone, but rather based on need for the diverse users throughout the stat. Funds should be pulled away from phased projects to fund a greater variety of projects.

John: Feels that application scoring should incorporate past funding, and that the applicant needs to demonstrate an explicit need for the project.

Bill: Responds that scores can be adjusted during the meeting to address these factors. One of the purposes of the meeting is to adjust scores based on group interpretation with sound rationalization.

Andy and Susan: Feel staff should provide Board with succinct information summary related to each application. Also applications should be all organized in the same manner prior to board members receiving them so that they are easier to score and compare.

Further, applications should be completed on-line to organize the flow of the applications, and to eliminate budget errors, such as having the proper match.

Erling: Suggests a standard cost per mile of trail be determined for particular regions of the state.

Susan: Suggests that applicants are not eligible to apply for the same grant in two successive years.

Board Discussion of maneuvering projects so that a greater variety can be funded.

Bill: Identifies the “Sitka Cross Trail” and “Hillside Singletrack Trail” as ATI funded projects.

Jeff: Makes a MOTION to remove “Sitka Cross Trail” and “Hillside Singlrtrack Trail” from the application pool. These projects would be funded with ATI funds and free up more room for other applicants to be eligible for Rec Trail funds.

Andy: SECONDS MOTION.

VOTE : 6 yeas – 1 nay

Erling: Voted nay because he believes this is unfair as part of the application review process.

The following pages are brief summaries of the projects that the Outdoor Recreation Trails Advisory Board (ORTAB) reviewed and scored. The summary of each project was created from information provided in each grant proposal. The initial remarks (Pros and Cons) were completed by the State Trails Coordinator, Bill Luck. Additional comments are included at the bottom of each project sheet to provide the ORTAB's rationale for scoring a particular project. Motions to fund or not fund a project are included in each comment section.

As can be seen, the following projects are listed in order by a reference number. The projects were not reviewed by the Board in the in which they are presented; instead they were reviewed by their rank (Score of 1-100) and category (Non-Motorized, Motorized, Diversified) according to the Board's averaged scores. The order in which the projects were actually reviewed, and the overall scores for each project, can be referenced at the end of this document in the Excel spreadsheet. The scores were only averaged with the Board members scores (DPOR staff scores were not integrated into the averages).

Ultimately, the ORTAB's scores and recommendations were taken to the Director, James King by the State Trails Coordinator, Bill Luck. On January 30, 2009 the Director approved the ORTAB recommendations, and on February 2, 2009 tentative award letters were sent to applicants. The 2009 Recreation Trail Program projects currently await final State Agency Review and final approval from our funding source Federal Highways.

1. Trail Crew Leader, Nancy Lake State Recreation Area

- **Vic Stanculescu, Natural Resource Technician II**
- \$44,730 (requested) / \$15,525 (match) / \$57,255 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 9.5 mi. of trail reconstruction, 17.5 mi. of trail signage, 85 mi. maintenance
- Funding to be used to hire a trail crew leader to facilitate trail projects
- **2 year funding request**
- **Land Owners:** State Land - State Recreation Area

- **PROS**
 - a. Position has performed extremely well in past
 - b. Funding leader position allows for oversight of **volunteer** crews to perform annual maintenance and construction
 - c. Appears to be priority and need for applicant – considering the number of apps submitted to facilitate this project
 - d. Heavy public use area
 - e. Necessary to fund this position to complete project that was approved last year

- **CONS**
 - a. No detail on trail construction projects; no bid amounts
 - b. Public notice stated – but no proof provided
 - c. Applicant has provided 3 proposals for the same project; one project (this one) requests funding for 2 yrs
 - d. Tools, PPE, and equipment are charged in other grants as well – triple dipping.

***This project should be funded before project #5 (Luck)**

Project Description: Funding requested for a Trail Crew Leader at Nancy Lake State Recreation Area to supervise paid and volunteer trail crew members. Grant matching will be achieved through additional labor, supervision, transportation, and tools provided by Alaska State Parks. Funding will go towards a variety of trails within Nancy Lake and other Willow area parks.

ORTAB Comments:

Jenifer: This project and projects #5 (Nancy Lake Trail Crew) are separate parts of the same project. As a result, if they score high enough for funding, the combined award for both projects should not exceed \$50,000.

Susan: Agrees with Jenifer's comments. As an alternative only one of the two projects could be funded.

Bill: Notes that this project should be a higher priority than project #5 because volunteer effort can be used for the trail crew.

Jeff: Notes that this is a two year funding request. This should be acceptable.

Susan & Andy: Believe that it is unethical to use grant funds to pay standard wages for park employees. Rather funds should be designated for a particular project with tangible "on the ground" results.

This project was approved for project funding.

2. Denali State Park Kesugi Ridge Trail System Sustainable Access Improvement Project

- **John Wilber, Chief Ranger**
- \$48,492 (requested) / \$11,990 (match) / \$62,082 (total)
- **\$48,492 (requested) / \$12,123 (match) / \$62,215 (total)**
- **NON-MOTORIZED (single-use)**
- New trail const. 0.72 mi, 37.5 maintained trail, 0.75 reconstructed trail, 37.5 mile signed, inter-connects 43 miles of trail
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Denali SP

- **PROS**
 - a. In general, a nicely completed and organized proposal
 - b. Highly popular trail; heavily use
 - c. High desire to upgrade park trails to sustainable standard
 - d. I have hiked this trail and it needs help
 - e. Included in the Denali SP Master Plan

- **CONS**
 - a. Needs more detail on specifics of construction; needs more detail on the use of the trail crew; no bid amounts
 - b. Could use more detail on NRS II wages
 - c. **Match is short, should be \$12,123 (\$133 difference)**
 - d. Only one letter of support
 - e. SCORP could have been referenced

Project Description: Funding will support a four person trail crew in Denali State Park. Four main alpine routes would receive repair, reconstruction, and maintenance. Examples include installing grade reversals, re-establishing a 5% out-slope, vegetation removal, and trail tread widening.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Feels the funding request was not detailed or explicit enough. This led to some confusion in the funding.

Jenifer: On page 5 of the application, the applicant states this is “very similar to the 2007 request” that was funded. So why are we being asked to fund the similar work?

Andy & Steve: Identify that this project should be categorized as non-motorized instead of diversified.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

3. Reed Lakes Trail Restoration and New Trail Upgrades

- **Kym Miller**
- \$41,675 (requested) / \$7,435 (match) / \$49,110 / (total)
- **\$41,675 (requested) / \$10,419 (match) / \$52,094/ (total)**
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 1 mi. new trail construction, 2 mi. trail maintenance, 1 mi. reconstruction, 1 mi. signage
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Hatcher Pass SP

- **PROS**
 - a. **Very well-organized application**
 - b. Highly popular trail
 - c. Support from community (numerous letters)
 - d. Trail is part of the Hatcher Pass Management Plan; resolution of support included
 - e. Resource degradation is apparent and should be addressed; good photo representation

- **CONS**
 - a. **Match is not met by a significant margin = \$2,984**
 - b. This application says 100,000 visitors / year and other HP app. states 72,000?
 - c. Does not adequately state the utilization of the trail const. crew, or provide detail on the methods of construction
 - d. Map could portray where work begins and ends
 - e. Some timeline, project description and budget items do not correlate

Project Description: Funding will restore the first mile of the Reed Lakes Trail which has been heavily damaged by flooding and resource degradation. Funding would also be used to construct 1 mile of new trail which would bypass a heavily degraded switchback area.

ORTAB Comments:

John: Identifies the match as not met. Therefore the project should not be eligible for funding.

Andy: Project failed to identify a need for the trail improvements.

Susan: Feels that only one project should be eligible per park unit per grant cycle. This will help funds have better dispersal throughout the state for a variety of projects.

Also indicates that the timeline for the project is not well laid out.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

4. Northwest Arctic Borough Trail Staking

- **Northwest Arctic Borough**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 1,034 mi. trail to be maintained and signed
- Tri-pods will be assembled and placed on miles of trail throughout NWAB region
- **Land Owners:** State, BLM, NPS, Borough, Native USFWS

- **PROS**
 - a. **Very exciting to see a project that supports 1 rural native and village communities**
 - b. High levels of support from local and federal agencies
 - c. Strong community involvement and commitment to the local, inter-connecting trails – established program
 - d. Provides safe routes for community members to travel from village to village and recreate
 - e. The use of GPS to track signage and Tri-pod locations is great!
- **CONS**
 - a. Because there is such a large area covered there is increased potential for encroachment of trails and trespass
 - b. Letters supporting agencies indicate that there is potential for this and they are willing to assist in any situations that may arise. (sounds like the nature of the beast due to the scope of the trail network)
 - c. No bids; unclear how the \$50/ mi reimbursement was derived; contractor and shipping information is weak

Project Description: Funding will maintain and restore trail markers on approximately 1,034 miles of existing winter trails connecting villages and communities in the Northwest Arctic Borough.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Concerned that the proposed budget calculations are based on cost per hour as opposed to cost per mile. This makes it more difficult to estimate total project costs.

Jeff: Feels the project accomplishes a lot of work for a relatively low cost.

Commends project on its heavy community support.

This project was approved for funding.

5. Trail Crew, Nancy Lake State Recreation Area

- **Vic Stanculescu, Natural Resource Technician II**
 - \$24,055 (requested) / \$5,886 (match) / \$29,941 (total)
 - \$24,055 (requested) / \$6,014 (match) / \$30,069 (total)
 - **DIVERSIFIED**
 - 9.5 mi. of trail reconstruction, 17.5 mi. of trail signage, 85 mi. maintenance
 - Funding to be used to hire a skilled trail crew to complete trail construction projects
 - **Land Owners:** State Land - State Recreation Area
-
- **PROS**
 - a. Paid trail crews vs. volunteers: provide a more committed and stable workforce to complete work in a remote setting for a prolonged period of time
 - b. Offers less of a need to re-train volunteers all summer
 - c. A skilled trail crew would likely turnout a better product
 - d. Appears to be a strong commitment to this trail by park staff; high use area
 - **CONS**
 - a. Project does not clearly identify details of const. projects or why a skilled/paid crew is needed to complete them vs. volunteers
 - b. We already provide money for trail crews and ACC crews for Park projects – albeit, not for full seasons
 - c. This project has been funded with another grant last year; if we were to provide additional funding for it, I would recommend funding the trail crew leader position (previous grant was primarily for const. materials)
 - d. By submitting multiple grants for the same project, it appears that the applicant is trying to exceed the \$50,000 cap for project funding. We cannot do this out of fairness to other applicants. It also takes everyone more time to review and prepare multiple apps, when they could have been combined.
 - e. Match should be \$6,014 (off by \$128)

Project Description: Funding would be used for a three person ACC trail crew in Nancy Lake State Recreation Area for a three month period. Grant funds will be matched through additional labor, supervision, transportation, and tools provided by Alaska State Parks. Projects include the Lynx Lake Loop, Chicken Lake Cross Park, and Redshirt Lake Trails.

ORTAB Comments:

Bill: Explains the motive of this application. In the past the trail crew has been a volunteer effort. The park would like to solicit higher skilled labor by paying wages for the service. The goal of the trail crew is to re-route several trails so that owners may have access to their in-holdings.

Steve: Feels this application is not descriptive enough in describing maintenance needs.

Erling: Feels more value should be placed on the trail crew leader (project #1) than on this trail crew application.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

6. Reconstruction and Upgrade of the Independence Mine Historic Mill Loop Trail

- Kym Miller, Mat-Su Ranger
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$10,825 (match) / \$\$60,825 (total)
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$\$62,500 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- .5 mi to be maintained, reconstructed and signed
- Implementation of:
 - a. Interpretive panels
 - b. Construction of new stairways, handrails, and bridges
 - c. Re-grading and alignment of existing, highly degraded trail
- **Land Owners: State Land – Alaska State Parks**

- **PROS**
 - a. **A very nicely done application**
 - b. Highly popular trail; the public is literally “loving this site to death”; protection against resource degradation (historical and natural) needs to take place
 - c. Barely missed the cut-off for funding last FY by <1%
 - d. A far-more organized application has been submitted this year – shows commitment
 - e. **Other projects in the same vicinity of the Mill trail have been completed amazingly well. Applicant can be trusted to produce a highly sustainable trail**
 - f. One of the top trails the Trails Coordinator feels should be funded; strong support from other groups as well

- **CONS**
 - a. **Match is not completely met, but I feel comfortable that they could meet the \$1,675 difference**
 - b. **No quotes / bids**
 - c. **No direct correlation to SCORP – and there could be**

Project Description: Funding will be for the upgrade and reconstruction of the Historic Mill Loop Trail at Independence Mine. Work will meet sustainable trail design parameters. Upgrades will include tread enhancements, rerouting of the current alignment, installation of viewing platforms with interpretive boards, railings, signage, stair grade reconstruction, and timber bridge replacement.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Identifies the match as not met.

Indicates that the long term maintenance plan has not been discussed.

Steve: Lowers score due to the use of outdated letters in the community support section.

Jeff: Decreases his score due to a lack of bids.

Andy: Feels this project is a low priority and could be deferred. Argues that the current condition of the trail is not such that would require immediate attention.

Jenifer: Would like to see more information about “natural resource tech” position.

Timeline indicates they “start” during the period when the trail construction is underway, then they continue to work through mid-December. What exactly will they be doing?

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

7. Trailhead Maintenance and Public Safety

- **Justin Selvik – Alaska Department of Natural Resources**
- \$3,418 (requested) / \$1,000 (match) / \$4,418 (total)
- **MOTORIZED DIVERSE / POSSIBLE SAFETY AND ED PROJECT**
- Will provide
 - signage at trailhead
 - Boulders to prevent trespass of Off-Highway Recreation Vehicles
 - Pay for transportation and labor costs associated with moving the large obstacles
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska - DNR

- **PROS**

- a. Will restrict highly-destructive vehicles from entering the Moose Range
- b. Obstacles such as the boulders need to be put in place to prevent continued degradation of local area trails – impacts from these vehicles are limiting other intended recreational uses – horseback riding, hiking, Mt. bike riding etc...
- c. Fairly inexpensive project and could prevent much more degradation to adjacent trails, if implemented correctly

- **CONS**

- d. The Moose Range Management Plan needs to be updated and there needs to be a commitment from the State to provide enforcement in this area. Signs could be implemented to mitigate trespass, but I fear that they will just continue to be shot at. Boulders would be much more effective
- e. Only 1 quote and 1 letter of support provided; \$24.50 per sign sounds expensive and there are multiple being purchased so they can be replaced after they are shot.
- f. **This will only resolve access on one side of the trail system... What about other entry points?**

Project Description: Funding will promote public safety and educate users about responsible use of natural resources and about land use regulations. Trailhead improvements include installation of barriers around the forestry gate, and signage. This project complements proposal by Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District.

ORTAB Comments:

Bill: Indicates that the management plan for this project is ineffective. Rather it should support sustainable trails. The proposal for bridging creeks will not eliminate the OHV's from avoiding them and causing resource damage.

This project was not funded b/c the Board agreed that it would not adequately address the resource degradation issues.

8. Sevenmile Lake Trail Reroute, Phase I

- **Kara Moore, DNR / DML&W**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED (Could qualify as a motorized trail)**
- Approx. 2.5 miles of new trail to be constructed; Completed trail will be 6.5 mi.; 3.2 mi of inter-connecting trail to benefit
- **Land Owners: State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources**

- **PROS**
 - a. Well-packaged application; reasonable progress on SAR
 - b. Good public support; applicant is working with excellent partners to assure a sustainable trail is built and designed
 - c. Language included that relates to the SCORP
 - d. Addresses a safety concern for local business owners that have had to go on search and rescues for people lost on the current trail
 - e. Protects the resource

- **CONS**
 - a. To complete the entire project will take more of a monetary commitment; applicant does not show where remaining funding will come from to complete it.
 - b. SWECO costs are somewhat generalized; not sure that it accounts for unforeseen conditions
 - c. Project lacks multiple bids
 - d. Not as much support from motorized trail users, so it alludes to it being potentially more of an ATV trail

Project Description: Funding will develop a new trail to Sevenmile Lake along a sustainable route previously mapped by the Rivers, Trails, & Conservation Assistance Program. The new trail would discourage the use of the existing degraded trail.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Identifies the application layout as disorganized and difficult to follow.

Concerned that equipment rental costs exceed the cost of purchasing new equipment.

Jeff: Illustrates that the applications lacks bids.

Steve: Feels trail design is geared towards only a small user group.

This project was approved for funding.

9. Denali Highway Trail Maintenance

- **Alaska State Parks**
- \$30,000 (requested) / \$7,000 (match) / \$37,000 (total)
- \$30,000 (requested) / \$7,500 (match) / \$37,500 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED (Dog mushers and Snowmobilers) Could be Motorized...**
- 137 miles of trail to be maintained and signed along the closed Denali Highway during winter months
- Maintenance of equipment through purchase of Piston Bully tracks
- Purchase and placement of a hut, to protect trail users from a windy and exposed section of trail
- **Land Owners**: State of Alaska, DOT

- **PROS**
 - a. Addresses a **safety** concern and provides shelter for an exposed section of trail
 - b. Applicant has an excellent grant history and performs well with the equipment provided
 - c. DOT is in support of efforts; **SIGNIFICANT** public support and enthusiasm for the work of the applicant
 - d. Appears to be primarily for motorized use but the project obviously caters to various groups and is appreciated by all

- **CONS**
 - a. Very weak and generalized timeline; no indication of the cycle of grooming that occurs
 - b. Insufficient match, should be \$7,500 and they have \$7,000
 - c. Trail use #'s seem high but they could be reasonable

Project Description: This project is to help the Denali Highway Trail Club continue to provide the exceptional trail maintenance that they have been providing for the past five years. Currently their Piston Bully is in need of a new set of tracks and if approved, this grant will be used to purchase them. Funds will also be used to bolster safety concerns along the Denali Highway winter trail by purchasing and placing an emergency shelter in a very high wind area that has left people stranded in the past.

ORTAB Comments:

John & Steve: Identify the match as not met in this application.

Andy: Feels the project has good community support with compelling letters of support.

Jenifer: Application made a strong case for the grooming belt; but there was little detail/specific support for the emergency shelter.

This project was approved for funding.

10. **Deception Area Highland Trails / Lloyd's Historic Trap-line Trail Surveying Project**

- Willow Area Trail Committee
- \$8,250 (requested) / \$3,400 (match) / \$11,650 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- Project will pay to have a surveying crew map approximately 75 miles of Willow area trails
- **Land Owners**: This project is to determine land status.

- **PROS**
 - a. Current land status determination is greatly needed in this region to protect and reserve the recreational access for various groups throughout the mentioned areas. This project will be the start initiating the trail adjudication process.
 - b. Benefits multiple types of trail users, particularly dog mushers, skiers, and snowmobilers.
 - c. A similar project was funded last year through the Recreational Trail Grant program and could this project could easily be amended to it since the applicants and the intent is the same.

- **CONS**
 - a. This could have been easily added to last years project proposal
 - b. Landowner permission will be difficult to obtain and this could encourage trespass. This topic was addressed with Neil Shishido last year, but we agreed that it was a necessary process to inventory the trails to know if they needed to be re-routed. Private parcel information can also be researched by the surveyor and efforts can and should be made to avoid them.
 - c. Maps are like spaghetti and difficult to follow
 - d. Bids were an issue last year and not presented again

Project Description: The purpose of this project is to have the Deception Area Highland Trails / Lloyd's Historic Trapline Trail, which are part of the Haessler-Norris Winter Trail System, referenced in the Willow Area Trail Plan, to be surveyed with the state's minimum mapping standards. This survey will then be used in the near future to determine land status and to start the easement adjudication process for the trail system.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: This application lacks bids. Feels that bids should be required for contractual work.

This project was approved for funding.

10A. Haessler-Norris Winter Trail Surveying

- **Willow Trails Committee**
- \$13,990 (requested) / \$4,900 (match) / \$18,890 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- Approximately 100 miles of trail to be mapped (100+ miles of interconnecting trails to be affected)
- **Land Owners:** To be determined through implementation of this grant application / project

- **PROS**
 - a. Acquiring a trail inventory will allow for a knowledge-base of what exists in this region – trail easements can then be legally acquired and reserved for public use.
 - b. Strong community and local government support
 - c. With the number of miles of trail and varying types of users, many groups could be positively benefit from improved easement dedication - this would be the first step in making that progress

- **CONS**
 - a. **Only one quote from a surveyor provided; three quotes are required.**
 - b. 100 miles of trail inventory in 6-7 days seems optimistic.
 - c. With the wide range of areas to be covered, who is to say this surveyor will not be trespassing on lands while collecting the data?

Project Description: The purpose of this project is to have both the Haessler-Norris and Emil Stancec winter trail systems, both referenced in the Willow Area Trail Plan, to be surveyed with the State's minimum mapping standards. This survey will then be used in the near future to determine land status and start the easement designation/acquisition process for both trail systems.

ORTAB Comments:

-See Project #10 above-

11. Troop Lake Trail Project

- **Youth Restoration Corps**
- \$29,000 (requested) / \$11,600 (match) / \$40,600 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSE**
- .5 miles of new trail to be constructed; interconnects 3 mi. of trail
- **Land Owners:** Chugach National Forest and State of Alaska (FS has 10 yr. easement on State land)

- **PROS**
 - a. Opens recreational opportunities for fishing and hiking
 - b. Resolves trespass issue occurring on ARR right-of-way
 - c. Program puts local youth to work
 - d. Support from Fish and Game, FS, ARR, and the Kenai Peninsula Borough Mayor

- **CONS**
 - a. Lacks detail on trail construction to be completed
 - b. Project will not even begin until 2010
 - c. Still no authorization or proof of cooperative agreement from the State. Should be achievable but no action has been taken
 - d. No immediate need for this project
 - e. Poor map, does not distinguish boundaries between FS, State and ARR
 - f. No quotes/bids

Project Description: Youth Restoration Corps is proposing to construct ½ mile of new trail and post a trailhead sign at Mile 12 of the Seward Highway. The new trail construction will allow public access from a new trail owned by the Chugach National Forest Service to a lake that is currently stocked by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. This access and trail system will allow the public this fishing and hiking opportunity without trespassing on the currently used Alaska Railroad right-of-way.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Feels project has a high cost for a low return.

Jenifer: Concept of using youth a good one but the application did not support need for this particular trails project; nor did it give confidence that organizers were familiar with sustainable trail development.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

12. Sockeye Run Bike Path and Fitness Trail

- **Bristol Bay Borough**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$90,000 (match) / \$140,000 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 1.5 new mi. of trail to be constructed
- **Land Owners:** Bristol Bay Borough

- **PROS**
 - a. **HUGE** community support!
 - b. Appears to be a great project to bring community together, through the initiation of a trail project by one little girl and her mother
 - c. Many agencies / groups involved to make this happen
 - d. Good learning opportunity for little girl and a way to provide a recreational opportunity that connects young and old
 - e. Bettering community health and interaction seems to be a primary goal

- **CONS**
 - a. The construction plan is still in-progress and funding requests appear to be rough estimates (though they seem to have a good team of folks working on this project)
 - b. No real schedule on how to coordinate volunteer efforts (though I am pretty sure they can pull it off)
 - c. No bids or adequate breakdown of costs

Project Description: Sockeye Rund Fitness Trail / Bike Path is a proposed 1.5 mile non-motorized use trail, starting at the intersection of the Alaska Peninsula Highway and School Road in downtown Naknek. The trail would follow School Road, then form an exterior circle surrounding the Bristol Bay Borough K-12 school, the Southwest Elders Home, Bristol Bay Borough Pool Facility, the ambulance barn EMS Housing and Camai Clinic. Thus, allowing easy access to the school children for daytime physical education classes, the elders, the emergency staff and the public.

ORTAB Comments:

Jeff: Indicates application does not have the required 3 bids.

Commends effort put forth in community support of a third graders idea.

Steve: Indicates the access for the project has not been completely resolved.

Jenifer: Good Project with tons of community support. No evidence of access from borough or DOT. Would have like to have seen documentation of \$90,000 in promised match to better understand nature of labor/equip/services involved.

Molly: Illustrates that it is not always possible to solicit three bids in rural areas of the state.

Andy: Has taken a non-conventional approach to scoring. Applications were either scored high, average, or poor. Scores reflect community and state need more so than the quality of the application

Board: Feels Andy's comments are of value, but scores should not be incorporated into the average for fear of unjustly skewing the results.

Susan: Indicates that applications should primarily be scored based upon scoring criteria.

After scoring is complete the board can discuss comments related to community need or other factors affecting the feasibility of the project.

This project was approved for funding.

13. Chilkat Valley Winter Trail

- **JoeTelford, Chief Ranger, Haines**
- \$20,310 (requested) / \$19,008 (match) / \$39,138 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED (Could be motorized and benefit SnowTRAC)**
- Project would groom up to 60 miles of trail; inter-connecting 104 miles of trail
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – DNR & Div. of Forestry

- **PROS**
 - a. Would provide a new and safer recreational opportunity for the community of Haines
- **CONS**
 - a. Minimal effort appears to be put into this application
 - b. No numbers of users included; one letter of support and not from a beneficiary.
 - c. Many areas are left blank or incomplete.

Project Description: Funding will purchase two Ski-Doo WT Snowmobiles and two Yellowstone tow behind groomers. Alaska State Parks will use this equipment for winter trail grooming along forest roads within the Haines State Forest and Alaska Chilkat Bald Eagle Preserve.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Identifies this application as incomplete without much explanation for the funding request.

Bill: Agrees and indicates that minimal effort has been put forth for this application.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

14. Battery Point Trail Hardening

- a. Joel Telford, Chief Ranger Haines**
- b. \$17,800 (requesting) / \$18,800 (match) / \$36,600 (total)**
- c. NON-MOTORIZED (Diverse)**
- d. 0.25 miles of trail to be reconstructed (hardened)**
- e. Land Owners: State of Alaska – Chilkat State Park**

PROS

- a. The most popular trail in Haines and in great need of numerous repairs
- b. Visited the trail this summer and it does need work; work accomplished so far is great
- c. Continued funding would eliminate a lot of resource damage that is occurring
- d. High use trail!!!

CONS

- e. Applicant could have put more effort into the application.
- f. Minimally detailed timeline
- g. No letters of support
 - h. No quotes provided / no detailed description of need for materials
 - i. Good project, poor application effort.

Project Description: This project is to harden a quarter mile of trail with gravel. This is a continuation of trailwork that has occurred over the past three years.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Feels Project has a high cost for a low return.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

15. Matanuska Valley Moose Range Trail Restoration

- a. Palmer Wasilla Soil and Water Conservation District**
- b. \$30,186 (requested) / \$8,211 (match) / \$38,398 (total)
- c. Motorized - Diverse**
- d. .25 miles of new trail to be reconstructed and signed; inter-connects 30+ mi. of trail
- e. **Land Owners: DNR – DML&W**

PROS

- a. Excellent group to work with; motivated and well-intended

CONS

- b. This is one of the worst trails that I have hiked and I have difficulty funding it further until a revised management plan is in place.

Project Description: Funding used to improve trail surface approaching five bridges that span Wasilla Creek, to redirect segments of trail approaching three bridges, to restore the stream banks at five bridges, to place signage along the trail, and to place obstacles in rouge trails as necessary.

ORTAB Comments:

Jeff: Identifies this project as very expensive relative to what is provided.

John: Feels the project failed to identify a strong purpose or need.

Erling: Lowers score from 93 to 73.

This project was not funded b/c the Board agreed that the project would not appropriately resolve the resource degradation issues.

16. Eagle River Nature Center Trail Maintenance

- **Friends of Eagle River Nature Center Inc.**
- \$14,550 (requested) / \$14,555 (match) / \$29,105 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSIFIED**
- 10 miles of trail to be maintained
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Alaska State Parks

- **PROS**
 - a. Not a very strong pro for this application
- **CONS**
 - a. Project description is incomplete and doesn't address how and where equipment will be used.
 - b. Task schedule and timeline aren't sufficient to understand the scope of the project. Doesn't indicate specific uses or tasks for the new equipment.
 - c. Proposed budget does not have adequate bids and include potentially unnecessary trail maintenance equipment. (i.e. log splitter).
 - d. Insufficient community support (only 1 letter).

Project Description: Funding will purchase trail maintenance equipment for staff and volunteers to conduct trail maintenance all year.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Feels this project failed to demonstrate a need.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

17. Forest Muskeg Trail Restoration

- **Alaska State Parks**
- \$27,755 (requested) / \$13,800 (match) / \$41,555 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- .75 miles of trail to be maintained
- Fresh cap of gravel to be implemented and new coat of Weather-Seal on the boardwalk
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Alaska State Parks

- **PROS**
 - a. Good effort to provide preventative maintenance before letting the trail fall into total disrepair
 - b. **Applicant obviously wants to upkeep the ADA accessibility for the trail – few other applicants have advocated for ADA**
 - c. One letter of support reinforces the need for repair and desire to keep it maintained as an ADA trail

- **CONS**
 - a. Excessive detail on the surrounding trail environment; could have provided more info. on the maintenance needs
 - b. The boardwalk appears to need sealant, but the gravel trail seems to be in fairly good condition.
 - c. No map. No quotes. Thin application.

Project Description: The Forest and Muskeg trail is about .75 miles in length, starting in thick young growth alders, leading to large muskeg areas, and ending in a beautiful old growth Sitka Spruce forest. The level of difficulty is easy with its wide gravel and boardwalk trail and is highly valued by the elderly, persons walking carriages with children, and people with disabilities. The Forest and Muskeg trail has thinned out from erosion and the boardwalk is in desperate need of sealant to protect it from unforgiving Sitka weather.

ORTAB Comments:

Jeff: Supports this project. Identifies trail is in need of restoration. In addition this trail will generate revenue for the parks through user fees.

Bill: Commends project because this is the only project which is fully ADA accessible.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

18. Kuskokwim 300 Trail System

- **Kuskokwim 300 race committee**
- \$44,175 (requested) / \$34,773 (match) / \$78,948 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSIFIED**
- 300 miles of trail signed
- 300 miles of trail groomed
- **Land Owners:** Kwethluk Native Corp.

- **PROS**
 - a. Project description is thorough.
 - b. Timeline and task schedule is well thought out.
- **CONS**
 - a. Proposed budget does not adequately account for \$8,000 in contracts. Funding request may need to be reduced.
 - b. SAR process is not addressed
 - c. Fails to illustrate projects relation to land management plans

Project Description: Funding will be used to purchase and post reflective trail markers along the entire trail system. Use of wooden stakes with reflective markers along the trail will increase public safety and reduce the likelihood of deviating from the trails and becoming lost.

ORTAB Comments:

Steve Neel: Illustrated the fact that this applicant has been convicted of grant fund embezzlement in the past. However, the organization is under new management and therefore this may no longer be a concern.

Steve T: Identifies inconsistencies in the land use permits for this project.

Erling: Concerned that equipment required for this project exceeds its scope and need.

This project was approved for project funding.

19. Ester Dome Singletrack – Happy Valley Phase

- **Alaska Trails**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$24,553 (match) / \$74,553 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSIFIED**
- 5 miles of new trail construction
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska

- **PROS**
 - a. Maintenance plan is reasonable and undertaken by local club.
 - b. SAR review checklist is complete and all issues addressed.
- **CONS**
 - a. Project Location maps fail to identify land ownership.
 - b. Proposed budget does not contain adequate quotes or clearly identify construction costs (they are all lumped into one large sum).
 - c. Pending easement issues are not fully dealt with

Project Description: Funding will construct a five mile non-motorized multi-use trail in Happy Valley (Fairbanks). Trail will be built to Forest Service Class II mountain bike trail standards. These standards incorporate sustainability requirements for alignment, grade, integrated water control, and durable tread.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Concerned that project lacks necessary trail design details as well as location and map details.

Feels budget is not itemized well enough. There is a high project cost relative to the budget detail.

Andy: Identifies the project as unnecessary due to the existing deferred maintenance issues in and around the area. Feels maintenance issues should be resolved prior to a new project being undertaken.

This project was approved for project funding.

20. Sitka Cross Trail Reconstruction – Sitka High to Kimsham and Gavan Hill

- **Sitka Trail Works**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$13,345 (match) / \$63,345 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSIFIED**
- 1 mile of trail reconstructed
- **Land Owners:** City of Sitka

- **PROS**
 - a. Good detailed description with trail design plans included
 - b. Public benefit clearly described, and portions of trail will be ADA accessible.
 - c. Consistency with SCORP and other local area plans is clearly illustrated.
 - d. Excellent history of grants and project success

- **CONS**
 - a. Task schedule and timeframe not well thought out. Not enough time allocated for project.
 - b. Proposed budget does not contain adequate quotes.

Project Description: Funding will reconstruct over 5,000 ft of a popular trail in Sitka. The project will correct environmental degradation and resolve dangerous trail structures. Culvert installation will correct standing water and flooding of the trail bed, failing trail structures will be removed, and the trail will be widened and hardened to 8-10 feet.

ORTAB Comments:

Jeff: Supports project because it is located in his representative area.

Points out that this project will bring the state funds through user fees.

This project was approved for funding through use of unallocated funds in the Alaska Trails Initiative.

21. Copper Center School Trail Project

- **Copper Valley Development Association**
- \$25,000 (requested) / \$10,500 (match) / \$35,500 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 0.95 miles of trail signed
- 0.95 miles of trail maintained
- 500 ft of new trail constructed
- **Land Owners:** University lands

- **PROS**
 - a. Solves problem of providing community with recreational and educational opportunities.
 - b. Numerous support letters from public agencies

- **CONS**
 - a. Description lacks details of trail construction methods, interpretive panel plans, and bench construction plans
 - b. Scope of project dependent on adjacent landowner and therefore cannot be fully understood in application
 - c. Proposed budget lacks necessary elements such as bids, explanations of expenditures, and labor requirements

Project Description: Funding will be used for interpretive signs along 0.95 miles of trail. Funding will also be provided for the grooming of 0.95 miles of trail. Funding may also be needed to re-route 500 ft of trail off of adjacent land interests.

ORTAB Comments:

Jeff: Feels this project has been well written with pertinent appendices included.

Jeff & Steve: Identify the legal access to lands as unclear.

This project was approved for funding.

22. Chena Flats Greenbelt Project – Dosch/Vanderpool Acquisition

- **Interior Alaska Land Trust**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$77,164 (match) / \$127,164 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 2 Private parcels purchased and used for recreation
- **Land Owners:** Michele Vanderpool ; Henry Dosch

- **PROS**
 - a. Good Description of project and legal step required to acquire property
 - b. Public benefit is clearly and completely described.
 - c. Good grant history.

- **CONS**
 - a. Timeline seems too constricted for the entire purchase process.
 - b. Proposed budget Estimates land costs without landowner quotes or appraisals

Project Description: Funding will allow the trust to acquire two parcels of land adjacent to other trust lands acquired with grant funds. Parcels would be included in the Chena Flats Greenbelt Project, and increase the size of the greenbelt to 241 acres preserving 1.1 miles of trail in the process.

ORTAB Comments:

This project was approved for funding.

23. Nagoonberry Loop Trail

- **The Nature Conservancy**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,915 (match) / \$62,915 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 2.5 miles of gravel trail constructed and maintained
- **Land Owners:** The Nature Conservancy

- **PROS**
 - a. Good project and location description supported by photos and maps.
 - b. Public benefit is clearly and completely described.
 - c. Trail is ADA accessible

- **CONS**
 - a. Budget does not contain bids and budget table descriptions lack detail.
 - b. Applicant did not complete the SAR procedure

Project Description: Funding will construct 2.5 miles of gravel trail in the Gustavus Forelands on Nature Conservancy Lands. The trail will be owned, maintained, and managed by the conservancy.

ORTAB Comments:

Jeff: Identifies Gustavus as a small southeast community that would greatly benefit from this project.

Steve: Likes how the project incorporates a variety of users.

This project was approved for funding.

24. Hillside Singletrack Project – Phase II

- **Alaska Trails**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$50,250 (match) / \$100,250 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED (DIVERSIFIED)**
- 4 miles of singletrack trail design, construction, and maintenance
- **Land Owners:** Municipality of Anchorage – FNBP

- **PROS**
 - a. Detailed Project Description
 - b. Successful completion of previous grants shows commitment
 - c. Applicant shows strong grant history and well-prepared grant proposal: good maps, legal documentation, budget, etc.
 - d. Excellent grant history
 - e. Reasonable timeline and task schedule

- **CONS**
 - a. Allowable match exceeded.
 - b. Budget lacks quotes and is inconsistent with Project Description. (i.e. 4 miles vs. 3 miles in budget)
 - c. Did not solicit current public support for phase two of project. (used phase 1 letters).

Project Description: Funding will provide for the design and construction of approximately 4 miles of singletrack trails in Far North Bicentennial Park in Anchorage. Trails will be built to sustainable standards for bikers and hikers.

ORTAB Comments:

Jeff: Feels project was well written with lots of community support.

Andy: Identifies the project as successful last year. Indicates that this project will essentially be a continuation of the previously funded project.

John, Susan, and Steve: Lower score as a result of Andy's comments.

Steve: Indicates that Alaska Trails have good accountability and get projects done.

Susan: Feels this projects illustrates the importance that “need” should have in the scoring process.

This project was approved for funding through use of unallocated funds in the Alaska Trails Initiative.

25. Trailhead / Parking Facility Access Caribou Lake Trail

- **Homer Soil and Water Conservation District**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$23,200 (match) / \$73,200 (total)
- **MOTORIZED-DIVERSIFIED**
- .5 miles of road improved (surfacing with rock and gravel)
- **Land Owners:** Private, State of Alaska

- **PROS**
 - a. Extensive community support
 - b. Consistent with SCORP and other localized trail plans
 - c. Good grant history
 - d. Good long term maintenance plan (borough to take over)

- **CONS**
 - a. Land Ownership issue not fully addressed with no maps or easement paperwork provided.
 - b. Timeline and task schedule are vague and inconsistent.
 - c. Budget lacks quotes or bids, and is not adequately explained.
 - d. Questionable whether project should be eligible for trail funds.

Project Description: Funding will improve a .5 mile of road to provide legal access to the trailhead and parking for the Caribou Lake Trail near Homer. Improvements include surfacing the existing road surface with fractured rock and gravel.

ORTAB Comments:

- Andy: Chose to score the project low because it is premature to start a new project here.
- Steve: Concerned about the project's maintenance plan, which is unproven.
- John: Feels the maintenance category should hold more weight in the application scoring process.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

26. Calvin & Coyle Woodland Park Nature Trail Re-Development Project

- **Homer Soil and Water Conservation District**
- \$21,098 (requested) / \$6,635 (match) / \$27,733 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 1,260 ft of trail re-routed
- 3,608 ft of trail to be hardened
- 1 wooden kiosk constructed
- **Land Owners:** Kachemak Heritage Land Trust, City of Homer

- **PROS**
 - a. Well-supported by community
 - b. Project consistent with area trails plan
 - c. Heavy visitation – high use trails (8,000 people/yr)
 - d. Good grant history

- **CONS**
 - a. Missing 3 quotes for materials and equipment
 - b. Exceeded allowable on their admin fees**
 - c. Fall-line trail requires extensive boardwalk and
 - d. maintenance

Project Description: Funding will re-route a section of trail to a more appropriate location. It will also improve the tread of the existing trails system. In addition funding will help to develop trail interpretive materials.

ORTAB Comments:

Andy: Feels it is premature to start a new project .

Steve: Identifies the maintenance plan has not been proven; and therefore may not work.

John: Feels that maintenance plans should hold more weight in the application scoring.

This project was approved for funding.

27. Hollis Harris River Recreational Trail

- **Hollis Community Council**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$20,276 (match) / \$70,276 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSIFIED**
- Reconstruction of 0.75 miles of trail
- rest-rooms and picnic area
- trailhead parking
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska; Private (USMS 1406)

- **PROS**
 - a. Public benefit clearly identified (1st trail in community)
 - b. A Portion of the trail will be ADA accessible
 - c. Extensive community support
 - d. Land status plats provided, and land access secured

- **CONS**
 - a. Project details lacking in description, tasks, and timeline
 - b. Proposed budget does not include required bids
 - c. Match not detailed.
 - d. Missing some SAR documents.

Project Description: Funding will reconstruct an existing poorly degraded trail. The reconstruction will construct the trail to 60” of width for 0.75 mile to a scenic waterfall. In addition funding will provide a sheltered picnic area with rest-rooms for area residents. Furthermore funding will provide for the construction of a parking area accommodating 10 vehicles. The construction of this trail will provide a trail for a community with minimal recreational resources.

ORTAB Comments:

Jeff: Feels this project would be a good addition to a very small community. It would be a large boost for their tourism development.

Susan: Feels this project is well deserved, as it would be the only developed trail in the community.

Steve: Indicates that the access documentation is incomplete

Due to a lack of funds, this project was awarded a portion of the funding request - \$28,762.

28. Angel Rocks Trail Hardening Project

- **Brooks Ludwig**
- \$48,993 (requested) / \$13,651 (match) / \$62,644 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSIFIED**
- Equipment purchase (tracked gravel hauler)
- Hardening of 1,000 ft of trail
- **Land Owners:** Alaska State Parks

- **PROS**
 - a. Succinct project description is to the point and supported by photographs.
 - b. Illustrates heavy usage and popularity of trail
 - c. SAR process adequately completed

- **CONS**
 - a. Project area not indicated on maps
 - b. Proposed budget does not include required bids
 - c. Existing trail not severely degraded. Need for improvement not fully justified.
 - d. Substantial cost for short segment of trail.

Project Description: Funding will purchase a tracked gravel carrier for hauling gravel and hardening a 1000 foot section of the Angel Rocks Trail. Currently the trail contains exposed root and uneven boulder tripping hazards. The gravel carrier would bring in the material necessary to fill and level these areas.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan & Jenifer: Troubled by the fact that the project only has one quote for purchasing equipment.

Susan & Andy: Feel that equipment purchases should be held to long term maintenance needs.

Andy: Perhaps equipment rentals can be substituted for purchases in a lot of instances.

Molly: Increases score by 10 pts.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

29. Lookout Mountain Recreation Area Trailhead Parking Development

- **Kachemak Nordic Ski Club**
- \$49,500 (requested) / \$12,375 (match) / \$61,875 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSIFIED**
- 840 ft of road improvement
- 14,400 sq ft of parking lot
- **Land Owners:** Kenai Peninsula Borough

- **PROS**
 - a. Excellent project description
 - b. Excellent maps indicating ownership and design.
 - c. Proposed budget is clear and concise with all necessary bids.
 - d. Extensive community support.
 - e. SAR well addressed

- **CONS**
 - a. Timeline not submitted in the correct format

Project Description: Funding will improve an existing driveway and build two terraced parking lots for access to the Lookout Mountain Recreation Area. Parking Lots will be approximately 14,400 sq. ft. in area and will the road upgrade will be 840 ft of the Ohlson Mountain Road.

ORTAB Comments:

Jeff: Identifies project as being inconsistent with SCORP.

Susan: Expresses concern that the project cost is high for a small area.

Jenifer: Based on my reading of the application book, roads are not eligible for trail funding. Further, I don't believe they should be. Road projects have many other sources of funding available to them (while opportunities for trail funding are limited). Also, ORTAB is not the appropriate entity to determine whether a road is being built to the correct local/state/federal standards.

Steve & Andy: Believe promoting access should be eligible because it improves the overall infrastructure of an already existing trail.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

30. Tsalteshi Trails Maintenance Project

- **Tsalteshi Trails Association**
- \$41,800 (requested) / \$17,640 (match) / \$59,440 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSIFIED**
- Purchase grooming equipment
- Repairs, fuel, and maintenance of grooming equipment
- Purchase signs, banners, and fencing
- **Land Owners:** Kenai Peninsula Borough

- **PROS**
 - a. Extensive outreach and support of project.
 - b. Sponsor match is explicitly identified
 - c. SAR well addressed

- **CONS**
 - a. Proposed budget solicits funds for unforeseen repairs
 - b. Quotes for equipment not provided
 - c. Maintenance exceeds the needs of the community

Project Description: Funding will be used for trail system maintenance. This includes repairs, fuel, and modifications to trail maintenance equipment. It also includes race banners, signage, fencing, and utility costs. Further it includes the purchase of new grooming equipment and funding for grooming and maintenance personnel.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Concerned that funding is going towards salaries instead of “on the ground” trail work.

Feels that grooming is not a sustainable trail, and requires extensive maintenance. Therefore these project will need fresh funding every year without increasing recreational opportunities.

Suggests that there should be a category in the application that forces the applicant to address the long-term maintenance issue.

Decide to lower score because of funds going towards salaries and un-sustainable trails.

Andy: Concerned that workman’s compensation issues aren’t adequately addressed to provide funding for wages.

This project was not approved for funding, due to a lack of program funds.

31. Susitna Corridor Trail Signage Project

- **Willow Trail Committee**
- \$3,500 (requested) / \$3,272 (match) / \$6,772 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- Purchase Trail Signs
- Post Trail Signs
- **Land Owners:** State, Mat-Su Borough, OTHER???

- **PROS**
 - a. Project increases public safety

- **CONS**
 - a. Project description does not address necessary topics such as sign spacing, posts, materials
 - b. Legal land access not properly addressed only 2 easements mentioned which does not cover the 100 mile route through several land interests
 - c. Quotes not provided for purchases
 - d. No letters of support provided

Project Description: Funding will be used to purchase and post informational, directional, and safety signs for 100 miles of winter snowmobile trail (from Big Lake to Denali State Park, Alaska).

ORTAB Comments:

Bill: Due to the relatively low cost of this project, there may be leftover funds available for it.

This project was approved for funding.

32. Compeau Connector Trail – Phase II

- **Brooks Ludwig**
- \$49,860 (requested) / \$12,260 (match) / \$62,120 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED or MOTORIZED**
- Cut an 8' bench in the Compeau Trail
- **Land Owners:** Alaska State Parks

- **PROS**
 - a. Thorough description identifies challenges project may face.
 - b. Excellent project location maps and photographs
 - c. Maintenance plan is well thought out and proven on other projects

- **CONS**
 - a. Proposed Budget does not solicit bids for contract work.
 - b. Match just short of requirement

Project Description: Funding will hire a contractor to utilize a tracked dozer to cut an 8' bench finishing the Compeau Trail. This is a continuation of work conducted in the summer of 2007 and 2008 in which grant funds were used to layout and construct 5.6 miles of trail.

ORTAB Comments:

Susan: Identifies this project as lacking adequate bids.

Steve: Identifies this trail as heavily used.

Bill: Describes the equipment requested and how it works.

This project was approved for funding.

CLOSING STATEMENTS

Susan: Makes a MOTION to vote Jenifer in as the new chair of the board.

Erling: SECONDS the Motion.

UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT FROM BOARD, MOTION PASSES.

JENIFER KOHOUT VOTED IN AS NEW CHAIR.

Susan: Suggests we attempt to solicit applicants to invite them to present their projects. This allows the board to better understand projects.

Further Susan suggests that the scoring of applicants is based on more categories so that average application scores will have greater diversity, making the approval decisions easier.

Board discusses issues raised in projects #1 and #5. Because projects hold several similarities, the board decides it will fund only one of the two. The decision is made to fund project #1 (Nancy Lake Trail Crew Leader) over project #5 (Nancy Lake Trail Crew).

Motorized project review was left pending the scoring of the two motorized projects presented to the board this morning. An additional teleconference will be held to determine the motorized projects approved.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5 P.M.

The Board later scored and approved the funding of the Iron Dog Trail Restoration Project and the Middle Dangerous River Trail project.

All projects nominated for funding must first comply with any and all NEPA laws, as well as sufficiently complete and acquire any permit authorizations required by the State Agency Review process.

Recreation Trails Program Grants - 2009

Ref. #	Project Name	Submitted by	Funding Request	Scores								Trail Classification	Average	Cumulative \$		
				S.B.	E.W.	J.K.	M.C.	J.B.	A.M.	S.T.	J.R.					ORTAB Approved
12	Sockeye Run Bike Path and Fitness Trail	Bristol Bay Borough	\$ 50,000.00	92	100	86	89	89		91	96	Yes	Non-Motorized	93.30	\$ 50,000.00	
20	Sitka Cross Trail Reconstruction - Sitka High to Kishman and Gavar	Sitka Trail Works, Inc. (50K)	ATI	85	100	94	85	86		99	87	Yes	Non-Motorized	92.00	\$ 50,000.00	
24	Hillside Singletrack Project, Phase II	Alaska Trails (50K)	ATI	82	97	94	81	82		92	89	Yes	Non-Motorized	89.38	\$ 50,000.00	
26	Calvin & Coyle Woodland Park Nature Trail Re-Development	Homer Soil and Water Conservation District	\$ 21,098.00	95	89	99	75	86		86	87	Yes	Non-Motorized	89.38	\$ 71,098.00	
19	Ester Dome Singletrack - Happy Valley Phase	Alaska Trails	\$ 50,000.00	72	92	88	85	83		C	96	Yes	Non-Motorized	88.00	\$ 121,098.00	
23	Nagoonberry Loop Trail	The Nature Conservancy	\$ 50,000.00	89	94	90	73	88		94	86	Yes	Non-Motorized	87.71	\$ 171,098.00	Funding Cap
27	Hollis Harris River Recreational Trail (\$21,238)	Hollis Community Council	\$ 28,762.00	94	91	89	72	86		83	87	Yes	Non-Motorized	87.50	\$ 199,860.00	\$ 199,860.00
28	Angel Rocks Hardening Project	Brooks Ludwig	\$ 48,993.00	86	87	85	70	86		96	89		Non-Motorized	87.38	\$ 376,108.00	
17	Forest and Muskeg Trail Restoration	State Park Specialist James R. Bunting	\$ 27,755.00	77	79	80	85	92		93	92		Non-Motorized	87.25	\$ 276,608.00	
6	Reconstruction and upgrade (interpretive signage and safety)	Ranger Kym Miller, Alaska State Parks, Mat-Su District,	\$ 50,000.00	82	90	76	80	81		90	81		Non-Motorized	86.11	\$ 326,608.00	
29	Lookout Mountain Recreation Trailhead Parking Developmer	Kachemak Nordic Ski Club	\$ 49,500.00	98	43	NS	72	89		95	NS		Non-Motorized	85.63	\$ 376,108.00	Potential ATI
3	Reed Lakes Trail Restoration, and New Trail	Ranger Kym Miller, Alaska State Parks, Mat-Su District,	\$ 41,675.00	81	96	76	75	76		86	83		Non-Motorized	85.30	\$ 417,783.00	
2	Denali State Park Kesugi Ridge Trail System Sustainable Access	John Wilber, Chief Ranger	\$ 48,492.00	67	87	83	63	76		94	83		Non-Motorized	79.80	\$ 466,275.00	
30	Tsalteshi Trails Maintenance Funding	Tsalteshi Trails Association	\$ 41,800.00	80	78	C	61	78		NS	NS		Non-Motorized	79.40	\$ 508,075.00	Potential ATI
16	Eagle River Nature Center Trail Maintanance	Friends of Eagle River Nature Center, Inc.	\$ 14,550.00	65	92	77	34	75		89	70		Non-Motorized	74.75	\$ 522,625.00	
11	Troop Lake Trail Project	Youth Restoration Corps	\$ 29,000.00	56	65	55	53	77		67	NS		Non-Motorized	72.89	\$ 551,625.00	
14	Battery Point Trail Hardening	Joel Telford	\$ 17,800.00	64	73	68	42	76		84	74		Non-Motorized	72.63	\$ 569,425.00	

Total = \$ 569,425.00

* To allow maximum benefit to the applicant pool, the two highest scoring projects that were previously funded with Alaska Trails Initiative dollars are being channeled back to the ATI budget. There is approximately \$100,000 remaining in the ATI budget from older projects that never completed the State Agency Review process. Use of these funds will allow the State to provide more Recreational Trail Grant dollars to more applicants for this fiscal year.

4	Northwest Arctic Borough Trail Staking	Northwest Arctic Borough (Kotzebue, AK)	\$ 50,000.00	93	98	100	88	77		99	88	Yes	Diversified	93.80	\$ 50,000.00	
22	Chena Flats Greenbelt Project - Dosch/Vanderpool Acquisitor	Interior Alaska Land Trust	\$ 50,000.00	94	96	C	99	80		C	84	Yes	Diversified	91.83	\$ 100,000.00	
10	Deception Area Highland Trails / Lloyd's Historic Trapline Trail	Willow Trail Committee - Willow Area Community Organization	\$ 8,250.00	94	69	95	73	67		97	86	Yes	Diversified	86.90	\$ 108,250.00	
21	Copper Center School Trail Project	Copper Valley Development Association	\$ 25,000.00	79	79	70	90	85		94	91	Yes	Diversified	85.50	\$ 133,250.00	
9	Denali Highway Trail Maintenance	Denali Highway Trail Club	\$ 30,000.00	67	97	79	71	73		85	83	Yes	Diversified	85.10	\$ 163,250.00	
5	Trail Crew, Nancy Lake State Recreation Area	Vic Stanculescu, Natural Resource Technician I	\$ -	74	85	72	64	80		82	NS	No	Diversified	83.67	\$ 113,250.00	
18	Kuskokwim 300 Trail System	Kuskokwim 300 Race Committee	\$ 44,175.00	71	81	60	90	90		90	87	Yes	Diversified	83.63	\$ 207,425.00	Funding Cap
1	Trail Crew Leader, Nancy Lake State Recreation Area	Vic Stanculescu, Natural Resource Technician I	\$ 44,730.00	72	89	72	65	74		87	NS	Yes	Diversified	82.33	\$ 252,155.00	\$ 266,480.00
7	Trailhead Maintenance and Public Safety at Wasilla Creek	Justin Selvik - Alaska Department of Natural Resources	\$ 3,418.00	70	74	74	62	79		82	NS		Diversified	79.63	\$ 205,573.00	
15	Matanuska Valley Moose Range Trail Restoration - Project #1	Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District	\$ 30,187.00	80	73	C	45	71		84	77		Diversified	75.71	\$ 235,760.00	
25	Trailhead / Parking Facility Access Caribou Lake Trail	Homer Soil and Water Conservation District	\$ 50,000.00	84	48	NS	62	69		93	76		Diversified	75.71	\$ 285,760.00	
13	Chilkat Valley Winter Trail Grooming	Joel Telford	\$ 22,250.00	65	67	71	34	72		83	72		Diversified	70.50	\$ 308,010.00	

Total = \$ 358,010.00

8	Sevenmile Lake Trail Reroute, Phase I	Department of Natural Resources Division of Mining, Land & Water	\$ 50,000.00	80	70	91	92	78		97	88	Yes	Motorized	87.10	\$ 50,000.00	
32	Compeau Connector Trail Phase II	Brooks Ludwig	\$ 49,860.00	80	93	90	68	80		NS	NS	Yes	Motorized	85.17	\$ 99,860.00	
33	Iron Dog Trail Restoration Project	Mat-Su Trails Council	\$ 50,000.00									Yes	Motorized		\$ 149,860.00	Funding Cap
34	Middle Dangerous River Trail	Russell Wicka - USFS	\$ 50,000.00									Yes	Motorized		\$ 199,860.00	\$ 199,860.00

Total = \$ 199,860.00

* It is noted that the Iron Dog Trail Restoration Project and the Middle Dangerous Trail Project were submitted to the ORTAB on the 16th of January and presentations were made to the group prior to application review. Initially there were not enough eligible Motorized trail projects to meet the 2009 funding cap, so the deadline was extended for additional proposals to be submitted. These two projects were reviewed and approved by the Board and the DPOR Director.

Grand Total = \$ 1,127,295.00

C = Conflict of Interest
NS = No Score

Available (30%)	\$199,860	Total =	\$ 199,860.00
Available (30%)	\$199,860	Total =	\$ 199,860.00
Available (40%)	\$266,480	Total =	\$ 252,155.00
Total Available	\$666,200	Total =	\$ 651,875.00

\$ -	Surplus
\$ -	Surplus
\$ (14,325.00)	Surplus