



## Snowmobile Advisory Council

### Meeting Minutes

Thursday, Oct 3rd, 2019

#### *MULTIPLE LOCATIONS*

Conference Room at DNR Rhinelander Service Center, 107 Sutliff Avenue, Rhinelander  
Conference Room at DNR Green Bay Service Center, 2984 Shawano Ave, Green Bay  
Conference Room at DNR Spooner Service Center, 810 W Maple St, Spooner  
Conference Room at DNR Fitchburg Service Center, 3911 Fish Hatchery Rd, Fitchburg

**Council Members Present:** Bob Lang – Chair (@Rhinelander), Dale Mayo – Vice Chair (@Rhinelander), Bev Ditmar (@Rhinelander), Gary Hilgendorf (@Rhinelander), Jeff Schwaller (@Rhinelander), Steve “Fuzzy” Moran (@Rhinelander), Dave Newman (@Rhinelander), Mike Holden (@Green Bay), Lee Van Zeeland (@Green Bay), Andy Malecki (@Green Bay), Sam Landes (@Fitchburg), Arlyn Baumgarten (@Fitchburg), Tom Chwala (@Fitchburg), Nancy Olson (@Fitchburg)

**Council Members Absent:** Joel Enking

**DNR staff attendance:** Cathy Burrow (@Fitchburg), Jillian Steffes (@Rhinelander), Faith Murray (@Green Bay), Ed Slaminski (@Spooner), Kurt Byfield (@Fitchburg), Annie Loechler (@Spooner), Jeff Pennucci (@Rhinelander)

**Public attendance:** members of the public

#### 1. Call to order – 10:00am by Bob

#### 2. Agenda Repair

Discussion: GPS Units:

- Dale: Vilas county started four years ago. Two years ago 100% of the groomers. There’s no doubt about where you go or what you do. It’s going to clean up a lot of the stop – and will free up more money in the program. Will discuss more later.

**Motion to approve agenda by Bev, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Gary. MOTION PASSED**

#### 3. Chair and Vice-Chair comments

- Chair: (Bob Lang) –
  - No comments
- Vice-Chair: (Dale Mayo)
  - Thanks everyone for GIS, GPS will be the wave of the future.

#### 4. Public participation

- Roll call (see attendance above)

#### 5. DNR Report

- GIS Updates have come in. All high scoring “New Miles” projects are now “satisfactory” on meeting the GIS requirements. All counties have now submitted something, but some counties intend to GPS their trails this winter to get a more accurate data set.
- As a result of the GIS efforts, funding for 460 miles have been recouped and returned to the program.
- Governor’s Council Appointments
  - Jillian has been working with someone at the Governor’s Office (Flora Csontos), not had a lot of responsiveness.

- Mike, Fuzzy, Nancy, Arlyn and Gary expressed interest in being reappointed. Jillian will relay this to Flora Csontos and also email the Council with that contact info.
- Joel and Bev have had Senate reappointment contacts and worked with Zach Madden. (UPDATE – Zach is technically a legislative liaison, and advised us to work with Flora.)
- Trailing Signing Handbook – Published out on the web. We’re looking into printing options, would cost around \$2k for 2,500. Maybe we can split that with LE. Our grants cannot pay for printing so finding the funding is a challenge. (Some debate on the necessity of providing a printed copy).
- Introducing Jeff Pennucci, new Regional Grants Project Manager (CSS) in Rhinelander, taking over as the regional grants contact for Jillian. Covering Florence, Forest, Iron, Langlade, Lincoln, Oneida, Price, Taylor and Vilas
- Budget update in handout. Correction from last meeting – funds available ~\$392k not \$492k. Should still be sufficient to allow for funding of new miles today.

**6. Discussion: Guidance on GPS Units in Groomers**

Gary has drafted guidance to share with the clubs, with the input of Nathan at GTS and others on the council. Will FWD to Jillian to distribute.

Step 1 – Club notifies county of intend to use GPS & Reporting

Step 2 – Club fills out a request form in SNARS (set up of this in progress)

Step 3 – Club pays lease cost of \$250/yr per unit, which includes data and cellular service

Step 4 – Club installs unit per GTS instructions (must have clear view of sky)

Step 5 – Nathan will establish a Geofence to show where the funded trail is. Currently, grooming on funded trail is shown in green, non-funded in red. (Colors may change of color-blind have issues seeing). Also, dots show movement – green = moving, yellow = stopped. Nathan can change the Geofence if club notices it’s not accurate and notifies him.

- Other notes – unit will stop reporting “grooming” after 10 minutes of inactivity or if traveling over 15 mph
- Access to edit records would be limited to club admins
- If groomer is parked in shed immediately, the GPS may not have a chance to report activity but will as soon as it comes out of the shed next time. Similarly, can store data and send it to next available cell tower if out of service area.
- Currently, use of the GPS unit is proposed as voluntary.
- Presentation will be made at the AWSC Fall Workshop.
- Discussion on if this is usable in Class C groomers. Currently only focusing on A’s and B’s.

**7. Funding recommendations for Storm Damage Request.**

Grant Number	County	Discussion/Questions	Motions
S8	Tri-County (Cheese Country)	Also eligible for ATV, 50% should be requested of that program.	<b>Motion to approve at 50%</b> by Fuzzy, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Dave. <b>Motion carried.</b>
S9 & S10	Richland		
S11	Taylor		<b>Motion to approve S9, S10 and S11</b> by Dale, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Tom. <b>Motion Carried.</b>

Discussion on insurance for bridges. Who should insure, the county or other? Concerns about high deductible making it not worthwhile. Further discussion between DNR and county coordinators may be needed.

Storm Damage - counties that are working through FEMA will give us updates to their Snowmobile request after FEMA has reviewed. Any incoming applications will be presented at 2/10/20 meeting or at a special meeting not yet scheduled.

**8. Funding recommendation for grant applications & amendments.**

App #	County	Discussion/Questions	Motions
<b>Amendment Requests</b>			
<b>A2</b>	Iowa		
<b>A3</b>	Richland		<b>Motion to approve projects in this category by Andy, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bev. Motion carried.</b>
<b>Discretionary Relocation</b>			
<b>NM-42</b>	Iron	Originally submitted under New Miles but after further review, it became clear it belongs under Disc Reloc.	<b>Motion to approve by Bev, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Gary. Motion carried.</b>

**NEW MILES**

**General Discussion**

Jillian – DNR Grants staff have gone over all of their top scoring projects and made changes to project score where it seemed appropriate. Changes were made to several projects for parallel trails in particular.

Nancy – Concerns about flaws in the ranking system, county has no control over most of the scoring numbers used (such as snow depth and trail miles/county sq. miles). Nancy suggests considering top scoring projects from each county.

Dave – Next year may not have such a high point threshold, as the highest scoring projects will move off the list. Some of the counties Nancy mentioned are already at saturation (50%), such as Kewaunee & Shawano

General – No consensus to considering priority trails for each county. County coordinator can use their discretionary points to bump a project up on the main list.

Cathy B – Suggests any changes to the scoring criteria in general shouldn’t be made until Feb. Applications being considered today should be evaluated based on existing scoring criteria

Bob – Let’s review projects by score and only go over INDIVIDUAL projects where council members have a question/concern/observation.

**Will maintenance funding be available this year for projects approved by council?** Additional review by grants staff will be needed. If the review is straightforward, we will amend the County’s maintenance agreement to include those miles. If review and approval is complex, they may have to wait till next year.

**General commentary on scoring**

Q1 – Trail Longevity. In order to earn the top points, the **ENTIRE** trail needs to meet that threshold. “Trail on public land or permanent easement” = 3 points, but all of the trail needs to be meet that. Also, LUAs of 10 years, 5 years etc need to be **WRITTEN** Land Use Agreements/Easements, not “the trail has been there for 10+ years on handshake agreement”.

Q2 – Trail System. To earn points on “trail connects counties/states”, the trail needs to physically touch the border, not just connects to another trail within the county that connects.

Q7 – Parallel Trail within 5 Miles. Can measure at the furthest point between the two parallel trails. Doesn’t matter if the parallel trail is in another county. The exact definition of the parallel trail can be tricky, somewhat subjective – reviewed on a case by case basis. If the trails lead to different places, then it may not be considered parallel – generally speaking, they are parallel if they get the riders to-and-from the same place.

Q7 – Runs to Lake/River. No deduction if there is a bridge crossing that river. This deduction is to discourage funding trails that end at the lake shore (and become a club/lake trail).

*(Below are some of the comments/changes on individual projects.)*

App #	County	Discussion/Questions	Motions
NM4	Rock	Trail is actually in Dane & Jefferson, both of those counties are aware of and OK with the application. Rock already maintains this trail.	
NM-12	Bayfield	This project connects 3 counties, and is included in three separate applications (1 for each Co)	
NM-13	Taylor	Corr 25. Where does it go? (Map Reviewed). There is an existing parallel trail, 3 points deducted.	
NM-1	Forest	Parallel trail deduction applied	
NM-6	Taylor	Is this a loop? No, that's just the name of the (unplowed) road	
NM-11	Chippewa	Is this a shortcut? No, just a name	
?	Bayfield	No deduction for ice crossing on creek.	
NM-16	Price	Will they need a bridge? No, they will use the HWY Bridge	
NM-19	Monroe	Where does it go? Ties to La Crosse.	
NM-22	Taylor	Parallel trail issues? No connections, this ties to spur in Medford. Can they find a way THROUGH town?	
NM-226	Iowa	They have had a VERBAL agreement but that's not the same as a signed agreement of 10+ years. They should not get the 10+ yr scoring points.	
NM-21	Winnebago	How do they cross Hwy? Split to run w/ traffic. Faith will follow up on safety concerns	
NM-25	Marinette	If Co priority points were used differently, more of their applications could have scored "in the money". Should we change for them? No, those are the county's points to award, and they gave them to their top project.	
NM-228	Fond du...	Is this a parallel trail? Debated, ultimately left w/o deduction	
NM-24	Richland	Crosses many creeks, will they need bridges? Per club, not at this time.	
NM-34	Ashland	Is this an unplowed road? Also, Co will GPS this winter for more accurate mileage count.	
NM-38	Taylor	Original application was split into two and scored separately as they were not one continuous trail.	
NM-41	Lincoln	Where does it go? Into town, uses both sides of road	
NM-45	Grant	No county map provided. Does not appear to be parallel	
NM-44	Dane	Bridge? Sam believes they are using Hwy bridge.	
NM-47	Chippewa	Crossing lake? Doesn't appear so, connects to services	
NM-48	Dane	Parallel trail deduction applied	
NM-49	Calumet	Parallel trail? Consensus was no.	
NM-52	Oneida	Bridge? No, culvert	
NM-57	Bayfield	Closes a gap? Does not appear so, score changes from 10 to 9.	
NM-64	Oconto	Trail in Marinette but to be maintained by Oconto.	
NM-58	Chippewa	Rail grade? Yes.	<b>Motion to approve projects with a final score of 10+ by Andy, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bev. Motion carries.</b>
NM-23	Taylor	Another spur to Medford? Parallel but comes into town at a different location, so no parallel deduction	

<b>NM-29</b>	Grant	No county map provided. Hard to tell how it connects regionally. Allowed application acceptance this year but may NOT next year if they can't provide the required docs (maps).	
<b>NM-53, 55</b>	Jefferson	No county maps. Need larger context, but accepted this year. Is trail 40' off road? Yes per Tom.	
<b>NM-70</b>	Columbia	Why did the trail go that way? Private property, avoiding crops	
<b>NM-74</b>	Polk	Funded trail on a lake connected to proposal. Verified not receiving funds for lake miles	
<b>NM-73</b>	Waushara	More than 40' off road? DNR staff will review in due diligence	
<b>NM-92</b>	Adams	Clarify which trail to be considered. Stops at Co Line	
<b>NM-89</b>	Bayfield	Indicated in application that it closes a gap but it doesn't, score adjusted.	
<b>NM-75</b>	Tremp.	Has deduction for running to water but it only crosses a creek. Deduction not needed, score changed.	
<b>NM-96</b>	Burnett	Goes to lake and ends (population center, services). Unfunded trail across lake. OK.	<b>Motion to approve projects with score of 9</b> by Sam, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Jeff. <b>Motion carries.</b>
<b>NM-8</b>	Chippewa	Currently scores 10, but includes several spurs (short N-S spurs connecting main E-W stretch of proposed trail to the existing funded trail). If scored separately they would not meet the threshold. County was asked to separate but did not. Bob proposes excluding the spurs and have them be submitted separately next year. Other council members agree.	<b>Motion to not fund the short N-S spurs, only the main E-W spur of 14.68 miles</b> by Dale, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Bev. <b>Motion carries.</b>
<b>NM-106</b>	Marinette	Jeff indicates that this trail should be scored as "closing a gap". Connects 2 funded trails and provides shortcut. But it was noted that the trail crosses a lake, which would give it a deduction. Also observed that the submitted map does not accurately depict trail, it is within 40' of roads. With lake deduction, project scores 6, out of the money.	
<b>NM-107</b>	Price	Didn't have GIS in August but does now. No change.	
<b>NM-35</b>	Oneida	Currently scored as an 8 but reconsider parallel deduction. Very close to 5 miles parallel.	<b>Motion to consider NM-35 as not-parallel, awarding 11 points</b> by Fuzzy, 2 <sup>nd</sup> by Steve. Ayes from all but Bob (Nay), <b>Motion carries.</b>
<b>NM-114</b>	Jackson	Currently scores an 8 with parallel deduction. Destination trail, does not end at the same place as the suggested "parallel trail". Score adjusted to 11.	
<b>NM-62</b>	Dane	Currently scores a 7 with parallel deduction. Reviewed but deduction remains.	
<b>NM-133</b>	Vilas	Currently scores a 7 with parallel deduction. Reviewed, significant debate on what constitutes a parallel trail (spur vs. loop, does lake destination play a factor, etc.) Ultimately project remained at 7.	
<b>NM-99</b>	Shawano	Did not certify >40' from road. With GIS, Co ratio (Q4) changed to under 50%.	

**Motion to stop considering new mile projects that score 8 or below by Mike, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Bev.** Discussion on looking at 8s, but most of those have not been thoroughly vetted. The 600+ miles of new trail already approved will be a big workload for DNR to review/fund. Additional disc on pros and cons of continuing to lower scores. Ultimately, **Motion carries.**

## 9. Council member items.

Gary – The GPS units will be a good direction for the program to move in. Lots of work to get ready for that change in the coming winter.

Bev – The program has come a long way, let's recognize the success and the room for improvement

Dale – Thanks to all for their hard work

Jeff – Would like to have seen more miles funded but happy with the new miles opportunity. Happy to be getting trails measured and GIS under control.

Fuzzy – 40' rule questions to Dave

Dave – Legislation in progress to change (eliminate?) the 40' rule. Documents circulating, looking for co-sponsors. Ch 20 cap change also being circulated. Hope to get these changes passed by winter. Glad to fund what we could for new miles, wish we could have gone further down the list.

Nancy – Happy with the start on new miles, need to tweak the scoring

Arlyn – Let's not characterize GIS measurement corrections negatively, trails change over time and measurements were correct at the time. Lots of additional new miles this year, more new applications will come in next year. Education to applicants may be needed for more complete applications

Tom – Everything satisfactory today, looking good moving forward.

Sam – New CSS's (DNR), New Co's, New Project Managers...education is needed. Trail pass program working. WI River Bridge and Blue Mounds are on the horizon

Lee – no comments

Andy – Good work today. Let's get the new mile funding out to the counties/clubs ASAP. In support of stopping where we did, more storm damage is coming.

Mike – Good job today. Need to tweak guidelines and get better justifications from counties, but overall good.

Ed (CSS) – If committee to review new mile ranking is formed, Ed would volunteer.

Dave – Audit sub-committee and ranking-sub committee will be formed.

**Motion to adjourn by Andy, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Gary. MOTION PASSED**