

ORTAB Meeting Notes February 11, 2008

Introduction of attendees:

ORTAB Members:

Andy Morrison (AM) – Originally from Maine, owns a guide and outfitters business, also serves as a member on the SnowTRAC Advisory Board. Andy represents the Kenai / PWS / Valdez region

Paul Schmidt (PS) – Originally from Minnesota, all through college and continuing work with trails and outdoor activities. Paul represents the Northern (Fairbanks) region.

Jeff Budd (JB) – Originally from Ohio, BS in Recreation, previously owned tour business. Jeff represents the Southeast region.

Molly Chythlook (MC) – From Dillingham, recently elected to serve on the ORTAB. Molly represents the Western region of Alaska.

Jenifer Kohout (JK) – From Anchorage, degree in Natural Resource Law and Policy, previous member of the Chugach Advisory Board. Jenifer represents the Anchorage area.

Susie Byersdorfer (SB) – From Kodiak, current Chair of this board, previous member of the State Parks Board. Susie represents the Southwestern region of Alaska.

Erling Westlien (EW) – Lives in Anchorage, has property in other areas of Alaska, current Co-Chair of this board. Erling represents the Mat-Su and Copper River regions.

Bill Lundsford (BLD) – Absent; newly nominated ORTAB member. Bill is a representative for individuals with disabilities.

DNR Staff:

Bill Luck (BL) – Trails Coordinator, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation

Linda Byrd (LB) – Note taker

Steve Neel (SN) – Grant Administrator II

Kristy Gray (CG) – Grant Administrator II

Jeanette Wilkinson (JW) – Note taker

Margaret Brodie (MB) – Chief/Manager III of Administration and Grants

Olga Lotosh (OL) – Account Tech II

James King (JK(D)) – Director of Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation

Neil Shishido (NS) – Southcentral Regional Land Office

Sam Means (SM) - Southcentral Regional Land Office

Meeting began at approximately 8:40 a.m. on February 11, 2008 and ended at approximately 4:15 p.m. The Board took a working lunch and four 10 minute breaks.

A Few Words from the Director

James King welcomes all members of the board and extends his appreciation for all of the hard work they do on their own time (board members are volunteers). James covered funding and his vision for Trails.

LWCF Program Presentation

Kristy Gray gave a presentation regarding the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). Funds come from National Alaska Service and are Federal portioned to fund outdoor recreation projects each year. The program currently has \$151,000 available. 2008 funding amounts are not available yet. Kristy covered the scoring of applications for funding and asked for input from board members.

Alaska Heritage Trail Program Funding Overview

Sam Means gave overview of Alaska Heritage Trail Program, program is currently funded for 2 years through September 2009, the project started 5 to 6 years ago, they create legal access through ML&W Resource Specialist II for many trails to protect the trail to public use and in order to obtain grants for use (if this is not done and the land is sold to a private individual or organization the new owners are not obligated to provide use of trails to the public)

- AM - Will they eventually become roads or stay trails?
- SM - Easement document states certain width of trail access; if someone wants one to become a road then they have to come to us for a road easement.
- AM - What about historical trails on Federal land?
- SM - These have been documented (600 trails) and adopted in statute, it would be a Quiet Title Action in courthouse trails, State believes has rights, Federal disputes this.
- AM - ORTAB can support State stance.
- SM - Exploring possibility of settlement agreement with Federal to acknowledge State easements
- JK - Question funding State versus land project, the funding of the Natural Resource II
- BL - Will not impact grants, funding already set aside
- MB - 100% legal access is the only ORTAB grants approved, if no legal access there is a great liability
- BL - Definitely need Natural Resource II
- JK - Never enough money to do everything that needs to be done, State is asking for needed new positions, Natural Resource II is seen as necessary by ORTAB for at least full 20 years
- SM - Probably as this project expands
- BL - Strong Public support for this
- SM - Can never give the Public enough
- AM - Ties in with Molly's concern for the trail access in her area
- SM - Not only Public, example is the railroad wants to expand tracks and they will cross several trails, we need to reserve legal access
- JK(D) Your input as a board is stronger than mine and Sam's input
- SM - True, they listen to me but trails is not their main concern
- EW - This board can act as clearing house for this, to get the Public passionate about this matter
- AM - We need to ask Public what they want, not tell them what we want
- MC - User group need to realize the need for this, with an in-flux of people trails are an issue, most people in my region do not want public access, they fear invasion
- JK - I will draft a letter regarding this and send to each board member by end of month, anyone can use the letter

SM - That is great

JK(D) As you draft the letter think about what ORTAB is and types of communities you service and how it serves their needs

SM - Something to think about is that without these legal access the Iron Dog Sled Race, Iditarod, and Yukon Quest just to mention a few are in jeopardy, we need to work on legal access

SB - Called meeting to order at 10:51am to facilitate scoring of projects with discussion of pros and cons of each project

SB - Where does money not allocated go

MB - State Parks Fund

EW - Grooming pool definitely need help

MB - Can grant non profit or bid for contracts for ATV trails, no reason ORTAB can not support grooming trails, it is motorized, can set funds aside for it (you can put together a sub committee to keep information and I will work with them)

EW - I am willing to work on it

MB - Great, bids go out for each region as discussed

EW - ATV groups, force working together

AM - Money for ATV trails, non profit groups for work, I volunteer for the sub committee

SB - Feel better about giving to grooming pool where is needed rather than just giving it to someone

MB - Done through procurement, sub committee gives authority to do and then goes to procurement

SB- Motion to create sub committee to utilize left over money from motorized, members of the sub-committee being Andy Morrison, Paul Schmidt, and Erling Westlien

PS- Second the motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

AM - Need better communication to advise Public of meetings

BL - Yes, put out notices, need to expand

JB - Question use 800 conference call and notify all to give input

PS - Question what will happen to diversified money left over

BL - Reverts to State Parks, James has some great ideas what to do with it

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 order 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. Bill Luck's scores were not included.

Ultimately, the ORTAB's scores and recommendations were taken to the Director, James King by the State Trails Coordinator, Bill Luck. On February 19, 2008 the Director approved the ORTAB recommendations, and on February 22, 2008 tentative award letters were sent to applicants. The 2008 Recreation Trail Program projects currently await a final State Agency Review and final approval from our funding source Federal Highways.

1. Walking Trail at Bear Paw Rec. Area

- **Houston Lions Club, Houston Chamber of Commerce**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$22,000 (match) / \$102,000 (total) (Incorrect)
- **\$48,500 (requested / \$22,000 (match) / \$100,500 (total) (Correct)**
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSE**
- 1 mile of new trail construction to be implemented
- Interpretive signing and a 50' x 50' trailhead
- City of Houston - park dedicated land

- **PROS**
 - a. Part of community development plan
 - b. Significant public support / community involvement
 - c. Park dedicated land / strong desire to improve community

- **CONS**
 - a. No detail on trail construction, no bid amounts, no cost of construction materials
 - b. No plans for the trailhead
 - c. **Admin. fees are too high = 10% (\$5,000)**
 - i. Can only request \$3,500**
 - ii. Maximum grant request = \$48,500**
 - d. Lots of signatures, but no letters of support
 - e. Applicant lacks organizational exp. for this type of project

Project Description: A walking, skating, biking trail will be constructed around the perimeter of the Bear Paw Recreation Area. This trail will be used by children, young adults, and senior citizens. It will provide community members with a controlled recreational area, away from the traffic of the currently used highway bicycle trails. Many parents will utilize this trail while their children play at the planned skate park and play area. This project is intended to encourage healthy exercise (close to resident homes) and safe trail access, away from the dangerous traffic of the Parks highway.

ORTAB Comments:

JK – A lot of missing information; not well planned

SB – Only 1 year land owner authorized access

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3,#8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

This project was approved by ORTAB, but did not rate high enough to be funded.

2. Lazy Mountain Southside Trail

- **Matanuska-Susitna Borough**
- \$14,250 (requested) / \$7,050 (match) / \$21,300 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED (single-use)**
- 1.25 Miles of new trail to be constructed and signed (every ½ mi)
- Interconnects 6 miles of trail
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – MSB currently has application in w/ state for a 50' wide trail easement

- **PROS**
 - a. Replaces a fall-line trail
 - b. Funds include a trail construction workshop
 - c. Well-supported by the public
 - d. Included in the MSB Trail plan to alleviate erosion and reduce hazards.

- **CONS**
 - a. The old trail appears to be reasonable enough to keep; this secondary trail is being developed for increased ease of accessibility.
 - b. **Applicant does not provide legal access documentation for the proposed project.**

Project Description: This project includes the design and development of 1.25 mile hiking trail on the south flank of Lazy Mountain. The property is owned by the State of Alaska. Obtaining authorization to build a new trail and acquiring public use easement is part of this project.

ORTAB Comments:

PS - They don't have legal access for the proposed trail work. The application is considered incomplete if there is no legal access. Legal access is a major problem in the Fairbanks area.

AM - They're in the process of applying-fund portions that gain easement. They sent their app in Feb 07. Many months have passed, call the applicant to see what's going on.

BL – Easement access will potentially be approved in time. Whatever we decide we need to be consistent.

EW - Application is incomplete.

JK - Agree. Bring back the packet next year when they have the easement. It's not the ORTAB board's responsibility to follow-up.

AM - Motion to deny funding for now, but with a strong recommendation for next year when access is obtained.

**JK - Approve motion for first part of Andy's motion only.
6 in favor.**

3. Trail Markers for Independence Mine Ski Trails

- **Alaska State Parks**
- \$2,125 (requested) / \$1,029 (match) / \$3,154 / (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- 20 kilometers of trail to be posted
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – public access

- **PROS**
 - a. Heavy winter use / will address safety concerns
 - b. High visitation – 8-10,000 / winter (increased need for proper trail marking)
 - c. Trail is part of the Hatcher Pass Management Plan
 - d. Carsonite posts can be reused, year to year, vs. bamboo that is currently being used, which has shorter lifespan and lesser visibility

- **CONS**
 - a. Could be more descriptive on placement of markers
 - b. No quotes for markers

Project Description: This project will include buying 250 carsonite trail markers and installing them on the Independence Mine ski trails.

ORTAB Comments:

JB – Good value for our dollars. Not a bad deal.

AM - Good volunteer effort. Should ask if the users want the markers.

PS - It would be good to see letters from users supporting the project.

JK - Dropping score to 90.

AM - Might drop his score to 90, because of the lack of letters of support.

BL - Agrees with the issue of support.

EW - #3 and #25 both at Independence Mine.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3, #8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

4. Bean Creek / Resurrection Trail

- **Youth Restoration Corps**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$28,850 (match) / \$78,850 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- Grant request is for 2 summers of funding (2008-9); 3 crew weeks per each summer season; 17 crew members
- 6 miles of trail maintenance (affects 37 miles of interconnecting trail)
 - a. Trail hardening
 - b. brushing,
 - c. clearing hazard trees
- **Land Owners:** Chugach National Forest

- **PROS**
 - a. Program puts local youth to work
 - b. Support from Friends of Cooper Landing and FS
- **CONS**
 - a. Wages not clearly specified / no purchase quotes
 - b. Resolution of support has been written in own favor
 - c. Applicant provides blanket agreement w/ Forest supervisor, but supervisor does not give support for individual projects.
 - d. No vicinity map
 - e. A substantial amount of money for a maintenance project

Project Description: Youth Restoration Corps is proposing to complete trail maintenance along the Bean Creek trail and the northern Resurrection trailhead (located at Mile 54 of the Sterling Highway). Work will be completed by local youth under adult supervision. Project work will include trail clearing, flagging, and stabilization of existing tread surfaces. Hauling gravel and implementing a new trail base will take place in areas specified by the USFS.

ORTAB Comments:

JK – Not a solid project; did not see current letter from Forest Service - an old letter attached.

JB – Three separate youth recreation applications were submitted, they all ask for 2 four wheelers with trailers.

SB – I am all for youth corps but this project seems to cost a lot - question cost per hour.

PS – No map; not a very detailed budget.

EW – Youth Corp. matches not realistic and question cost of food.

SB – Poorly written, no map, vague details. How are they flagging and signing it? Labor seems high, no cost for number of people, no letters of support.

AM – Sending wrong message if we do not fund some of these projects.

Overall consensus: Application is very poorly written, but does qualify = Bean Creek is a go. If this was in the Non-Motorized pool it would not have been funded.

SB – Motion to fund all DIVERSIFIED except Moose Range

JB – Second the motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

5. Troop Lake Trail

- **Youth Restoration Corps**
- **\$33,400** (requested) / \$10,700 (match) / \$44,100 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSE**
- .5 miles of new trail to be constructed (affecting 3 miles of interconnecting 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. Wages not clearly specified / no purchase quotes
 - b. Resolution of support has been written in own favor
 - c. **Grant total is incorrect (\$34,700 listed, should be \$33,400)**
 - d. Poor vicinity map

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:

JB – ½ mile within 2 weeks of work at \$34,000 - can that happen?

SB – Lot of cost towards training.

PS – Map confusing.

SB – Need better maps (on a lot of these).

BL – In future we should work to request better maps.

JB – When done with the scoring we can give recommendations to what needs to be done for improvements in applications

PS – Budget lacking perception and explanation, lack of work to be done

MC – Check list is great for scoring (application and score sheet need to be collective)

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3, #8) as listed by board scores.

SB – Second motion.

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

This project was approved by ORTAB, but did not rate high enough to be funded.

6. Mills Creek Trail

- **Youth Restoration Corps**
- \$23,600 (requested) / \$8,750 (match) / \$31,750 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 2.5 miles of trail to be maintained
 - a. Trail hardening and erosion control
 - b. Installation of culverts
- **Land Owners: Chugach National Forest / 100 year**
- **PROS**
 - a. Program puts local youth to work
 - b. Provides maintenance to an impacted **Motorized** trail
- **CONS**
 - a. Wages not clearly specified / no purchase quotes
 - b. Resolution of support has been written in own favor
 - c. No clear permitting of access on State land. One portion of the application says the land is owned and managed (solely) by the FS. According to the vicinity map, that the applicant provided, it is State acquired land.
 - d. One area of the application says the project will take 2 weeks; the timeline states from May 27 to July 10.
 - e. One part of the application states that the crew will spike in a remote camp; another part of the application says that they will provide part of their match through an in-kind donation from the school district, which allows the youth to be sheltered at a school. Conflicting information.

Project Description: Youth Restoration Corps is proposing to complete trail maintenance along 2.5 miles of the Mills Creek Trail located at Mile 49 of the Seward Highway. Work will be completed in cooperation with Chugach National Forest, including the design, implementation, and oversight of all work that will be performed. Work is expected to be completed within two weeks of the start date, and will require the use of one mini-excavator and two four-wheelers. Trail stabilization and culvert installation is expected to be completed. Local youth hired from the Kenai Peninsula will work under authority of Youth Restoration Corps - a non-profit organization.

ORTAB Comments:

JK – Not a solid project, did not see current letter from Forest Service - an old letter attached.

JB – Three core youth recreation, ask for 2 four wheelers with trailers

PS – community support, Mills Creek do not have access rights yet

AM – Only ATV access trail on the Kenai Peninsula

BL – It is permitted for ATV use - miners with permits.

AM – Ties in with Huts, talk to ranger about these projects, funding/support not there for them to happen-this is not happening

AM – We should approve Mills Creek of the three, I would like to see one of these funded.

SB – Could we move this to another category?

BL – Trail does not appear to be heavily impacted for an ATV trail - used mostly by miners.

AM – Chugach needs funding

PS – Land access, flag on this, shows to be obtained for Mills Creek.

EW – They advise need to negotiate with DNR.

PS – Access not confirmed, show as incomplete.

PS – Instructions that we send out advise access as qualifying criteria. We set this standard for others.

MB – Must have legal access, in past some went through with promise and grants were given.

PS – Written instruction advised proof of access before application is considered.

MB – Can conditionally approve and obtain proof before actual grant approve.

AM – Let's leave it up to actual approval of grant.

MB – Goes through many agencies and reviews before given grant.

EW – If applicants have to have proof of access before applications are due, and we approve some applicants conditionally, are we not short changing other well-prepared projects?

PS – Everyone should be held to the same standards

JB – Let's do a motion, I make motion to remove Mills Creek due to non compliance with RFP

PS – Second motion

VOTE TAKEN, 4-YES, 1-NO, 1-ABSTAIN, MAJORITY RULE, MOTION PASSED

EW – Motion to approve all motorized funding except #22 and #6

PS – Second the motion

VOTE= 5-YES, 1-NO (wanted to see all motorized funded)

7. **Isberg Recreation Area Trails: 100 mile Loop**

- **Fairbanks North Star Borough – DPOR**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$12,500 (match) / \$62,500 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 1,180 feet of trail to be reconstructed (100 miles of connectivity)
 - Trail hardening
 - 700' geo-block
 - 480' geo-fabric / turnpike
 - Erosion control
 - Installation of culverts
 - Brushing
- **Land Owners:** Fairbanks North Star Borough
- **PROS**
 - Significant public support
 - Good maps, photo-documentation, and good land documentation.
 - Complete and well-organized application
- **CONS**
 - Opposition has been received and the applicants are addressing the problem by hiring Design Alaska, Inc. to mitigate resource damage concerns from motorbikes.

Project Description: The FNSB will rehabilitate the most critical sections of existing trail within a one mile section of the 100 Mile Loop Trail located within the Isberg Rec Area. On this section of the trail, the tread will be hardened to allow for year-round recreational access through an area which is currently impassible due to severe rutting.

ORTAB Comments:

PS - Conflict of Interest- this project is from the department that I work for.

JB – Has decent wages and hours.

AM – Great application.

JB – Does not use any youth (not a big issue).

EW - Excellent application, should be used as a model for others.

JB – Davis/Bacon wages.

SB – Motion to fund all DIVERSIFIED except Moose Range (#20).

JB – Second the motion.

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

8. Hillside Single-Track Project (Phase II)

- **Alaska Trails, Inc.**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$22,393 (match) / \$72,393 (total)
- **Non-Motorized (Diverse)**
- Approx. 8 miles of new trail to be constructed
- Individual trails to be constructed in loops
- Will connect Far North Bicentennial Park and Chugach State Park trail systems
- Phase I is funded by the ATI (\$91,571)
- **Land Owners:** Municipality of Anchorage / 30 yrs
- **PROS**
 - a. Trail will be built to International Mountain Bike Association Standards (IMBA)
 - b. Strong public support / significant cash donations (\$22,393)
 - c. AK Trails, Inc. will bring in renowned trail specialists
 - d. Appears to be well-planned and well-received by public and local businesses
- **CONS**
 - a. Extensive project, good potential for hitting trouble spots and slowed production
 - b. Potential user numbers not mentioned, but appears to have very strong public support.
 - c. With size of project, could provide some accommodation for individuals w/ disabilities

Project Description: Alaska Trails and Single-Track Advocates will plan, design, and construct approximately 8 miles of single-track trails in the northeastern and southeastern areas of Far North Bicentennial Park (FNBP). This project will provide Anchorage's first system of soft-surface, narrow trails sustainably built for mountain bikes and foot traffic to meet the need of users who enjoy the recreation opportunities provided by trails that retain more of the natural characteristics of the landscape.

ORTAB Comments:

PS - Hard time with the maps, they're illegible. The budget explanation for the trail builder contract is lacking. Questions about the construction of the trail.

AM - SAGA; money better spent in other areas.

SB - Well written. Questions about the budget.

EW - Lots of effort towards design and planning. The grant administrators assure that things are on the up and up.

JB - Motion to fund both #25 & #8

EW - Second the motion

MB - Have some additional grant money available that has to be delegated in the amount of \$17,000

SB - Everything above #8 qualified and funded

BL - Yes, but we are \$50,000 over

EW - Give \$50,000 to #25 and give the \$17,000 to # 8

JB - I have made a motion we need to vote on

SB - Vote now # 8 give \$50,000

5 votes total, Andy abstained

BL - Need \$3,000

MB – We can use old money for the deficit balance of \$3,000.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3, #8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

9. Stiles Creek Trail Hardening

- **Alaska State Parks**
- \$49,438 (requested) / \$60,633 (match) / \$110,071 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 4 miles of **new** trail to be constructed (affecting 15mi of interconnecting trail in the summer and 80mi trail in the winter)
- 1 mile of **existing** trail to be constructed
- Focus will be to move low-lying boggy trail up to higher, more sustainable ground
- Areas of steeply graded trail will be rerouted to areas that will provide sustainable grades
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska / Chena River State Rec. Area / 45 yrs

- **PROS**
 - a. Significant State match \$49,438 / \$60,633
 - b. Considerable resource damage is occurring, as shown in application photos – trail improvements are obviously needed
 - c. Comparable trail work has been completed in the northern region before, and with good results – experienced personnel

- **CONS**
 - a. Obvious discontent from the public on the degradation that occurs from poorly maintained / aligned motorized trails
 - b. Only one purchase quote was included in application
 - c. No numbers on amount of trail use. Currently implementing trail counters.

Project Description: This project will contract for a trail dozer to construct 4 miles of new trail rerouted from boggy lowlands to higher sustainable ground using today's best trail maintenance practices. The first 1 mile of trail from the trailhead at 31.6 will be hardened using fractured rock and gravel.

ORTAB Comments:

AM – Sweet one

SB – Good information

JB – 4 miles for \$50,000

SB – Margaret, is cost shown on these realistic

MB – ATV trails are expensive, do not even blink at \$50,000 for ATV trail

SB – Maintenance free for long time

EW – Motion to approve all MOTORIZED funding except #22 and #6

PS – Second the motion

VOTE= 5-YES, 1-NO (wanted to see all motorized funded)

10. Upper Dewey Lake Outhouse

- **Municipality of Skagway**
- \$24,305.80 (requested) / \$6,154.85 (match) / \$30,460.65 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED (Diverse)**
- Applicant seeks to replace two outhouses on the along the Upper Dewey Lake trail – waste from current facilities is leaching into nearby water source
- **Land Owners:** Municipality of Skagway

- **PROS**
 - a. Dewey Lakes Recreation Area is covered under the Skagway Municipality land management plan
 - b. People are so repulsed by current facilities that they relieve themselves in the area of the outhouses, and not within them. A human waste issue is getting out of control. This project would mitigate the waste issue.
 - c. Heavy visitation necessitates a greater need for new outhouse facilities.
 - d. Applicant has a strong grant history.

- **CONS**
 - a. No provision of 3 bids for the outhouse. However, b/c this is a specialized item – three quotes may be difficult to secure.

Project Description: Funding will go towards the replacement of two dilapidated outhouses, with one custom vaulted backcountry outhouse. The replacement of the two outhouses will eliminate a human waste issue and drastically reduce long-term maintenance costs.

ORTAB Comments:

AM - No special use permits; employee use only; Will the helicopter drive up the expense?

JB - No money from the cruise industry.

JK - Are they removing the old outhouses?

AM - Skagway municipal code; don't want mass usage on the trail.

JK - There's no letter from the helicopter company saying that they'll donate services.

Score needs to be corrected from 82 to 92. Bill corrected it.

AM - Problem, \$18 for site pumping, \$30 to rotate barrels (state rate \$18.77, volunteer donated rate, per Steve Neel)

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3,#8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

11. Hollis Harris River Access Trail

Ineligible

- **Hollis Community Council**
- \$6,000 (requested) / \$1,200 (match) / \$7,200 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- Proposal is to develop planning for the new construction of a $\frac{3}{4}$ mile foot-trail
- **PROS**
- **CONS**
 - a. No detailed description that verifies what is to be done with the funds or where the match will come from
 - b. No detail of where trail is going to be constructed
 - c. Applicant did not address all of the threshold questions
 - d. **Incomplete application**

Project Description: The applicant proposes a recreational boardwalk / foot trail from the Harris River footbridge, downstream to a scenic waterfall area. The trail will be approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile in length, composed of a combination of boardwalk and trail, and will be moderate in grade. The project includes a proposed covered picnic / rest area near the trailhead, with restroom facilities and parking areas. Phase I of this project, which is what this application is for, is for plan development that can be submitted for future grants.

ORTAB Comments:

BL - This project is ineligible. Deficient in a number of areas. Will work with applicant in the future to improve application.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3, #8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

12. Cordova Breakwater Trail

- **Copper River Watershed Project**
- **\$33,134 (requested) / \$27,277 (match) / \$57,698 (total)**
- **NON-MOTORIZED**
- .20 miles of new trail to be constructed with a 50' x 50' trailhead
- **Land Owners:** City of Cordova / 10 yrs

- **PROS**
 - a. Significant community support
 - b. Project is included in the Cordova Waterfront Master Plan and the Recreation Commission Master Plan
 - c. Program puts local youth to work

- **CONS**
 - a. Has been funded in the past for same dollar amount and only 200' of trail were completed

Project Description: The Copper River Watershed Project proposes to add to Cordova's recreational and tourist attractions by completing construction of the Cordova Breakwater trail. This community walking trail is located between two striking vistas, with an expansive view south to the Gulf of Alaska and north to the Chugach Mountains. Trail Construction will greatly improve the safety of an area that is already heavily used, and affords high quality birding, photography, and in-town recreational use.

ORTAB Comments:

JK - How did they progress with the original project?

BL - Was opposed to the project at first, but after speaking to them, changed his mind.

Grant reporting should be watched. There was some misunderstanding in the past.

EW - Weigh factor from past projects.

AM - Grass roots effort; gill net; project might be gone in a year or two; worthy project.

SB - Gill net should have a good life.

MC - Do we weight anything for liability? Concerns about people falling off of the trail.

AM - Should consider the safety of users; Recommend boardwalk with railings.

ORTAB supports it.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3,#8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

13. Chugach State Park Maintenance

- **Anchorage Snowmobile Club**
- \$20,310 (requested) / \$19,008 (match) / \$39,138 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- Proposal is for maintenance of 3 SP trails over the course of 2 yrs (30 miles of trail)
 - a. The Eklutna Lake Side Trail
 - b. Penguin Creek Trail
 - c. The Upper-Huffman Snowmobile Corridor
- Maintenance will include:
 - a. The clearing of deadfall
 - b. Brushing of trail corridors
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Chugach State Park
- **PROS**
 - a. Strong public support / numerous letters
 - b. I have personally received phone calls about the overgrowth on the Penguin trail – sounds as though it needs maintenance.
 - c. Strong grant history and reliable trails organization.
 - d. Well-written application – first / only application with 3 bids!
 - e. Significant match and personal investment.
- **CONS**
 - a. Not sure that we want to advocate steady maintenance of Cow-Parsnip and Devil’s Club. Typically, heavy, woody overgrowth should be addressed. Alder thickets are more justifiable.

Project Description: This project will include the clearing and maintenance of the Eklutna Lakeside trail, the Upper Huffman snowmobile corridor, and the Penguin Creek trail at Bird. Using a rough cut mower, brush cutters and chainsaws (purchased through this grant) the above trails will receive maintenance for a two-year period.

ORTAB Comments:

AM - Keep coming back for money, keep wanting chainsaws, like to know where they store and use them.

BL – Equipment is stored at the Chugach State Park maintenance shop; they have a good relationship with staff – highly regarded.

SB - Should have an explanation for why they need a large brush cutter, no vicinity map

BL – Concern about Devil’s Club and Parsnip and the maintenance on this. Typically only want to brush woody plants.

AM - Cutting cow parsnip can be caustic to skin.

SB – Motion to fund all DIVERSIFIED except Moose Range (#20)

JB – Second the motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

14. Chicken and Redshirt Lake

- **Alaska State Parks**
- \$18,314.96 (requested) / \$41,284.25 (match) / \$59,599.24 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 9.5 miles of trail to be maintained and signed (affecting 24 miles of inter-connecting trail)
- 2.5 miles of new trail to be constructed
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Nancy Lakes State Rec. Area

- **PROS**
 - a. Significant match
 - b. Substantial seasonal use – need for improved trail conditions
 - c. Numerous letters of support

- **CONS**
 - a. Applicant could be more descriptive on improvements that need to be made to trails and trail structures

Project Description: This recently re-opened multi-use trail needs 1) extensive trail work, 2) two bridges, 3) 500 feet of boardwalk, 4) several drainage structures, 5) filling/reconstruct several standing water sections with geo-block, corduroy, geo-textiles or fill per BMP (Best Management Practices), 6) signage at three trailheads.

ORTAB Comments:

PS - Trail specific, drawings missing, budget has an error-total is wrong.

BL - Needs to be more descriptive on where and why

AM – Yes, need more information on project

SB – Huge match

SB – Motion to fund all DIVERSIFIED except Moose Range (#20)

JB – Second the motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

15. Battery Point Phase II

- **Alaska State Parks**
- $\$36,200 / \$23,091 = \$59,291$
- **NON-MOTORIZED (Diverse)**
- 0.35 miles of new trail to be constructed (affects 8 miles of inter-connecting trail)
- 0.40 miles of trail to be reconstructed
- **Land Owners: State of Alaska – Chilkat State Park**

- **PROS**
 - a. The most popular trail in Haines and in great need of numerous repairs

- **CONS**
 - a. Applicant could have put more effort into the application.
 - i. Minimally detailed timeline
 - ii. Only one letter of support
 - iii. No quotes provided / no detailed description of need for materials
 - b. Trailhead funding was provided for the previous grant, but appears to have only been a band-aid for the situation
 - c. Trail appears to be a money pit and in poor alignment

Project Description: This is a continuation of a project to widen, harden, provide maintenance and reroute sections of the 1.8 mile long Battery Point trail. This is the highest use trail in Haines and is currently little more than a footpath.

ORTAB Comments:

PS – Lacks a good description for trails, no map.

AM – Only \$10.00 per hour for crew.

SB – No letters.

JB – Less than 1 mile and 1 grand.

SB – Want a helicopter; no support for this.

BL – Funded in the past but I do not see it this time.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3, #8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

This project was approved by ORTAB, but did not rate high enough to be funded.

16. Arctic Valley / South Ship Creek Trail

- **Anchorage Ski Club**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$20,000 (match) / \$70,000 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED (Diverse)**
- 4.5 miles of new trail to be planned and constructed
- 1 mile of trail to be reconstructed
- **Land Owners: Anchorage Ski Club (lease) and State of Alaska**

- **PROS**
 - a. Project is identified in SCORP – one of CSP’s top ten priorities
 - b. Trail would provide a missing link
 - c. Project will put youth organization to work

- **CONS**
 - a. Match is not clearly identified
 - b. Budget is poorly described
 - c. No quotes
 - d. Only one letter of support.
 - e. No detail on techniques and standards to be implemented on the trail design
 - f. 4.5 miles of trail is a significant portion of trail to construct with hand crews in the timeframe given

Project Description: This project is the second phase of an effort by the Anchorage Ski Club to improve trail access in the Arctic Valley area for residents and visitors. The first phase constructed a segment of hardened, handicap accessible gravel trail from the Alpenglow Lodge and parking area to a hardened overlook above Ship Creek. This phase will identify, survey, plan, design and begin construction of the 4.5 mile segment of trail from the new overlook along the hillside north and east, contouring the hillside and connecting Hunter Pass overlooking the South Fork of Eagle River and rebuild and rehabilitate the existing trail that descends to the South Fork parking area.

ORTAB Comments:

JK – Third of what they are asking for is planning. I feel this is excessive.

PS – I consider it incomplete.

SB – No vicinity map, no Public support.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3,#8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

This project was approved by ORTAB, but did not rate high enough to be funded.

17. Trail Crew Leader at Nancy Lakes

- **Alaska State Parks**
- \$11,320 (requested) / \$30,150 (match) / \$41,470 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 45 miles of trail to be maintained (affects 80 miles of interconnecting trail)
- 9 miles of trail to be reconstructed
- Work area will cover Lynx Lake Loop and East Red Shirt Lake Trail
- Crew Leader will be an Alaska Conservation Corps Crew Leader that will (typically) supervise unskilled college students
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Nancy Lake State Rec. Area
- **PROS**
 - a. Significant match
 - b. Position has been heavily utilized in the past (2005 & 2007)
 - c. Well-supported by park staff and local trail organizations
 - d. This would be a good position to have for other Recreation areas
- **CONS**
 - a. The volunteer trail crews were previously trained and lead by ranger staff. Hopefully the ACC member will be familiar and competent enough to manage the trails projects.
 - b. Projects do not necessarily appear to be a priority, but necessary for continued maintenance needs.

Project Description: Funding is requested for a trail crew leader at Nancy Lake State Rec. Area to supervise a crew of volunteers. The applicant will match the grant funding over 70% by providing additional labor, supervision, transportation, and tools necessary to work on diversified recreation trails within the Nancy Lakes State Rec. Area. Project areas will include the Lynx Lake Loop and East Red Shirt Lake Trail.

ORTAB Comments:

AM – I like this project, lots of volunteer labor.

JB – Have canoe trail.

AM – They are matching \$30,000 to our \$11,000.

MB – Chainsaws bought with previous grant money, can't use as match, they will meet their match but not with what they have listed.

EM – If can't get match do you (Margaret) ratchet them down

MB – Yes

SN – We give them a chance and if the match cannot be met, then they receive no grant.

PS - Concerned funding this time, question what work the crew of people will be doing (broad description), need detail on what will be accomplished at end of year.

SB – Motion to fund all DIVERSIFIED except Moose Range (#20)

JB – Second the motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

18. Tsirko River Bridge Replacement

- **Haines Borough**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$16,664 (match) / \$66,667 (total)
- **MOTORIZED**
- 70' bridge to be replaced on the Tsirko River (affecting 5.5 miles of inter-connecting trail)
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Fish Habitat Permit has been issued

- **PROS**
 - a. Bridge provides essential winter access for local residents
 - b. Has been maintained by local residents for the past 20+ years
 - c. Strong public support to have the bridge replaced
 - d. Safety concern for those who use it for access
 - e. Bridge is identified under the Haines Comprehensive Management Plan and the DNR Northern Southeast Area Plan
 - f. A Resolution of Support was included in the application

- **CONS**
 - a. There is potential for the new bridge to be washed out as the old bridge was; however, the old bridge did last 20+ yrs
 - b. Only one quote for new bridge, but it is a specialty item

Project Description: This project replaces a winter bridge spanning the Tsirko River at a strategic point on the Dalton Trail where a spur accesses recreational land and the residential community of Chilkat Lake. The cobbed bridge used and maintained for decades by resident volunteers broke into two pieces during the 2006-7 winter seasons. The proposed replacement bridge is manufactured aluminum with timbered approaches.

ORTAB Comments:

JB – Question request for funds, bridge for 6 Home Owners, 21 weekend users, thought I saw a bridge on the map that could be used.

PS – I question this at first then I saw documents supporting recreation, Haines Borough contributes a significant amount to project.

SB- Where is bridge going? I could not determine from the map.

AM – I question the cost for project, not enough information in the application.

BL – Question: Steve, if you request 3 quotes, would you accept this application without 3 – considering that it is a specialty item?

SN – We accept what is within reason. We like 3 but if it is shown that an effort was made to get them and they could only get 2, then we would work with them - if they had canvassed all possibilities

SB – Snowmobile bridge? Maybe they should have applied for a snowmobile grant instead of this?

AM – Yes, primarily a snowmobile bridge, but can be utilized for other uses.

MC – Trail built before, any water quality issues?

BL – Permit from previous one, but would require new one before grant given.

EW – Motion to approve all MOTORIZED funding except #22 and # 6

PS – Second the motion

VOTE= 5-YES, 1-NO (wanted to see all motorized funded)

19. Lake Louise to Tolsona Trail

- **Lake Louise Snowmachine Club**
- \$7,462 (requested) / \$1,693 (match) / \$9,155 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 10.6 miles of trail will be widened to a 16' corridor
- 1.3 miles of trail will be reconstructed
- Signs will be placed over 23 miles of trail
- **Land Owners:** Mat-Su Borough and State of Alaska
- **PROS**
 - a. Addresses safety concern for the hazardous icefall area
 - b. There is an increased need for adequate signage on all snowmobile trails
 - c. Good grant history
 - d. Seemingly high snowmobile trail use area – 200 people / weekend
- **CONS**
 - a. Dates for the upgrades on the trail are for the current application period; however, end date is 12/31/2009
 - b. Not certain if the trail reroute will stay within the designated easement - maps are vague
 - c. No proof of inclusion in local management plans
 - d. Match is under 20% - should be \$1865.50

Project Description: Funding will be used to widen the existing trail to 16 feet and upgrade signage of the Lake Louise to Tolsona trail from mile 0 at Lake Louise to mile 23 at Tolsona Lake. The trail needs to be widened to allow grooming with commercial grooming equipment and relocated to avoid a dangerous icefall area.

ORTAB Comments:

BL – There is an issue with the match on this one.

PS – Match not met

SB – Correct, match not met.

AM – Community effort is impressive, lots of work with disabled individuals. I know it is being done because I have seen it.

MB – If match is not met, we typically ask for new budget. If the applicant cannot meet then we will lower the grant amount to meet the available match.

BL – I think they could come through with the match.

PS – I agree on that.

AM - Recommend fund 50% of each project (#19 and #25), they both had match issues.

- This comment was not agreed upon by the group.

SB – Motion to fund all DIVERSIFIED except Moose Range (#20)

JB – Second the motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

20. Moose Range Trail Improvements

- **Palmer Soil and Water Conservation District**
- \$27,128 (requested) / \$8,540 (match) / \$34,708 (total)
- **DIVERSIFIED**
- 800ft of new trail to be constructed and signed (affecting 100 miles of interconnecting trail)
- Heavily impacted areas will be reinforced with Geo-block
- **Land Owners: State of Alaska**

- **PROS**
 - a. Heavily rutted areas of the trail will be hardened and improved, delineating trail braids
 - b. The applicant currently has another grant to install a bridge to also improve trail conditions for the area
 - c. Community involvement expected in the restoration of the trail

- **CONS**
 - a. Some more land feature info. could have been provided, such as areas of maintenance needs, lengths, #'s, and types of structures to be implemented
 - b. Extremely poor and lacking vicinity map
 - c. SAR may take longer than the applicant anticipates (with regard to timeline and purchase of materials) – anadromous streams are involved in project area

Project Description: Trail Hardening will take place using Geo-block and Polynet along 800 feet of trail. This area is severely damaged and in need of a stable surface. Revegetation will take place along the sides of the newly hardened trail using willow cuttings.

ORTAB Comments:

PS – Process is ongoing for legal access.

JB – 800 feet for \$27,128 does not seem appropriate.

SB – Confusing budget, question if met match, different amounts in two different places, signs listed in budget but not in narrative. Where will the signage go?

BL – No legal access available yet; we decided earlier that if the applicants didn't have it, then they would not be eligible. A fairly good project, but will have to re-apply next year.

SB – Motion to fund all DIVERSIFIED except Moose Range (#20)

JB – Second the motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

21. 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:

EW – Surveyor not competitive. Can they survey trails they do not have ownership on?

SB - \$150 an hour for the surveyor and the surveyor has no equipment?

BL – I agree, charge is high for surveying but it seems they should have own equipment.

EW - Have a hard time with the mapping; I question 100 miles in less than a week.

PS – Very optimistic timeline, data gathered that quick is marginally usable. It cannot be highly detailed. They also talk about mixed ownership of land and private parcels - no permission from anyone to do this?

NS – GPS track gathering began about 3 or 4 years ago. It is good to document established trails and record easements. The trails are well-groomed and in open country – could be easy to move faster. You can still get a good signal in denser areas, if going slow.

EW – Question to Grant Administrator: Do they need to get 3 bids for the surveyor?

MB – If they do not use one employed by the Mat-Su Borough they have to get bids.

SB – Motion to fund all DIVERSIFIED except Moose Range (#20)

JB – Second the motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

22. Trapper Creek Glen Ridge Trail

- **Trapper Creek Glen Homeowners Association**
- \$33,000 / \$17,325 = \$50,325
- **MOTORIZED (Diverse)**
- 2.5 Miles of trail to be maintained (affecting 8+ miles of interconnecting trail)
- 2.5 miles of trail to be constructed
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska & Mat-Su Borough

- **PROS**
 - a. Project will improve areas that are receiving considerable resource damage from poorly aligned trail segments
 - b. Strong Association participation
 - c. Strong grant history
 - d. Applicants appear to get things done

- **CONS**
 - a. Concern with where borrow-pits are being established
 - b. Because trail is situated on section line easements, it is troubling to think that trails will be perpetually situated in poor alignment - this is likely going to be a financial drain and a perpetual resource damage issue
 - c. Where is the dozer being rented from for \$50/hr?
 - d. Maps are somewhat difficult to understand

Project Description: This project will include the repair and improvement of approximately two and one-half miles of north-south trail, connecting the Trapper Creek Glen Mile 118 of the Parks Highway to Mile 120 of the Parks Highway and will provide access to families with recreational property in and near Trapper Creek Glenn subdivision by other dedicated right-of-ways within the subdivision. Proposed work will include boardwalks across existing muskeg, grading, and smoothing of rough, rutted sections of trail. Project includes purchase of equipment for use on this project, and for continued maintenance of recreational trails to and in the subdivision, as well as use for other recreational trail projects by other entities in the vicinity.

ORTAB Comments:

JK – Users are all property owners; seems more like access use rather than recreation.

SB – I concur with mostly home owners use, rather than public; scored lower for this.

JB – Pretty exclusive use; dropping score to 86.

AM - This project has had previous funding. Trail ties into some snowmobile trails.

JK – The primary use for this trail is for access to private property.

EW – Fear of equipment ending up in someone back yard.

BL – Recreational trail as well as local use.

AM – Can we go back to an applicant if someone needs help and requests the use of the equipment for their project?

JK – A committed group but project should not be funded with recreational dollars.

EW – A core of people, not the public, want access to their cabins. I do not see as recreational use.

MC – Public use versus private funding, private won't levee public use.

EW – Home Owners Association spends money for maintenance; it looks like they want a reimbursement for it. Home owners should go to Borough and request help. The focus of this board is recreational not personal use.

EW – Improvement of road is for the Home Owner Association.

AM – Improvements made by them for other items such as boardwalks.

JB – If we approve this one, precedence will be set for other request of the same.

BL – Agree that this project can be a money pit. How can you say that it is not access to recreational cabins? No clear way to determine the primary use of the cabins.

PS – I do not feel that they did a good enough job proving that it is a recreational trail; dropping my score to 89.

BL – Lot of motivation, they are making an effort to show as recreational, let's take a vote.

EW – Need a motion to vote if the grant is eligible for funding.

PS – Need to voice our option.

NS – Question public/private access.

JK – I make a motion this request is ineligible due to applicant has not provided adequate information to prove recreational use of trail.

SB – Second motion

VOTE TAKEN, 4-YES, 1-NO (Andy Morrison requested to be shown as felt it should be kept), 2-ABSTAIN, MAJORITY RULE, MOTION PASSED

EW – Motion to approve all MOTORIZED funding except #22 and #6

PS – Second the motion

VOTE= 5-YES, 1-NO (wanted to see all motorized funded)

23. Forest Muskeg Trail Restoration

- **Alaska State Parks**
- \$14,210 (requested) / \$11,337.50 (match) / \$25,547.50 (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. 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:

JB – ADA - I like that. Project has long term maintenance plan and lots of public use.

PS – No maps

SB – No maps, wrong years, no bids for expensive items, no letters of support.

AM – Like to see this ahead of Battery Point; worthy of approval and has lots of information about trail.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3, #8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

This project was approved by ORTAB, but did not rate high enough to be funded.

24. Reber Trail

- **City of Homer**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$109,000 (match) / \$159,000 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED (diversified)**
- 0.4 miles of new trail to be constructed and signed (affecting 4 miles of inter-connecting trail)
- Trail will connect the West Hill residential area to the city of Homer
- 0.4 miles of trail to be maintained
- **Land Owners: City of Homer & (Private) August and Neline VanDyke**
- **PROS**
 - a. Trail will be constructed to ADA standards
 - b. A resolution of support was submitted – Trail included in the City’s Capital Improvement Plan – significant match
 - c. Applicant shows strong grant history and well-prepared grant proposal: good maps, legal documentation, budget, etc.
 - d. Professional contractors will design and construct the trail
 - e. Strong support
- **CONS**
 - a. Preliminary cost estimates provided for the construction materials, but will be refined when project is fully designed and sent out to bid.

Project Description: This project will construct the Reber Trail as a multi-use gravel-surfaced pathway connecting Fairview Avenue to Reber Road, providing non-motorized access from the lower elevations of Homer to the west hillside.

ORTAB Comments:

AM - Great project, near school, connecting trail areas.

BL - Well organized.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3, #8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

25. Reconstruction of Independence Mill Trail

- **Alaska State Parks**
- \$50,000 (requested) / \$10,010 (match) / \$60,010 (total)
- **NON-MOTORIZED (single-use)**
- .5 miles of trail to be signed, maintained and reconstructed (affecting 3 miles of inter-connecting trail)
- Upgrades would include 450' of safety railing and fence-block, implementation of a new foot bridge, an information kiosk, a new staircase and various viewing pads
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Alaska State Parks

- **PROS**
 - a. High visitation and heavily degraded resource – safety concerns will be addressed
 - b. Interpretive kiosk to be implemented in trail design – educational value
 - c. Utilization of local youth organization

- **CONS**
 - a. Did not answer appropriate threshold questions
 - b. No quotes provided for materials
 - c. Does not meet match / Match should be \$12,500
 - i. Can possibly reduce funds and allocate money from SAGA funds – if approved

Project Description: This project involves the reconstruction of the Mill Loop Trail at Independence Mine to a level of safe sustainable trail parameters. Upgrades include hardening and reconditioning of trail tread, rerouting of poorly aligned trail sections, and installation of viewing pads. Safety upgrades include installation of handrail and signage, grade reconstruction, and timber bridge replacement. An interpretive kiosk is also planned for the proposed project.

ORTAB Comments:

BL - The trail is heavily used - good project.

SB - Have concerns - a lot of money for not much trail. Match not met. Not much support for the project. The timeline is confusing. There are no itemized costs. The supplies and equipment are not consistent.

PS - They should have a breakout of salaries, food, and lodging.

AM - Recommend for next year?

EW - Score 90

JB - Score 88

Reduce scores to drop below the line. Group wanted to see the Hillside Single-track project funded over the Independence Mill Trail. Also, we do not scratch a project just because it does not meet the match.

BL – Let's relook at #25 Independence Mill Trail after we have rated all of the applications and see if we still do not want to fund it.

PS – Scoring sheet covers the match. We should not drop a project b/c match is not met – we should reduce the scores as the application requires.

AM - Recommend fund 50% of each project (#19 and #25), they both had match issues.

MB – Both have lots of support

- Group did not decide to fund #19 and #25 at 50%

JB – Motion to fund both #25 & #8.

EW – Second the motion.

MB – Have some additional grant money available that has to be delegated in the amount of \$17,000. We can partially fund #25 from this pool of money.

SB – Everything above #8 qualified and funded

BL – Yes, but if we vote for #25 and #8 then we are \$50,000 over our budget.

EW – Give \$50,000 to #25 and give the \$17,000 to # 8.

EW – We have two projects at Hatcher Pass: #3 and #25, both at Independence Mine.

Decision was made to fund the Hillside Single-track Project (#8) over the Independence Mill trail (#25). If more funds are made available to the Non-Motorized pool, ORTAB would like to see the Independence Mill trail funded.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3,#8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

This project was approved by ORTAB, but did not rate high enough to be funded.

26. Granite Tors Trail

- **Alaska State Parks**
- \$16,161 (requested) / \$11,534 (match) / \$27,695 (total)
- **\$!5,982 / (requested) /\$11,534 (match) / \$27,516**
- **NON-MOTORIZED DIVERSIFIED**
- 2 miles of trail to be maintained (affecting 15 miles of inter-connecting trail)
- 10 miles of trail to be signed
- 1 mile of trail to be reconstructed
- **Land Owners:** State of Alaska – Chena River State Recreation Area

- **PROS**
 - a. Well-supported by various groups and advisory boards
 - b. Addresses serious issues with people being lost
 - 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 on their admin fees (went over \$179.00)**
 - i. **Can only ask for \$1131.27**
 - ii. **Total dollar amount that can be requested is \$15,982**
 - iii. **Can only request \$1,118 in Admin**

Project Description: Grant funds will be used to replace 250 damaged boardwalk planks on the Granite Tors Trail. It will also fund 50 new trail signs to improve public safety along the 15 mile loop trail.

ORTAB Comments:

JB - They didn't address the question of long term maintenance.

AM - Signing and marking can detract from the trail.

PS - In the winter, the trail is difficult to follow. People get lost.

BL - Adjusted funding on the spreadsheet.

JB – Motion to fund top 6 non-motorized (#26, #24, #10, #12, #3,#8) as listed by board scores

SB – Second motion

VOTE WAS UNANIMOUS

Recreation Trails Program Grants - 2008																	
				Scores													
Ref. #	Project Name	Submitted by	Funding Request	S.B.	E.W.	J.K.	P.S.	M.C.	J.B.	A.M.	B.L.	AV	ORTAB Approved	Trail Classification	Average	Cumulative \$	
26	Granite Tors Trail Boardwalk Repair	DPOR, Fairbanks	\$ 15,891.00	96	98	84	96	55	97	87	95	88.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	87.57	\$ 15,891.00	
24	Reber Trail, Homer, Alaska	City of Homer	\$ 50,000.00	89	93	99	94	45	97	92	96	87.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	87.00	\$ 65,891.00	
10	Upper Dewey Lake Outhouse Replacemen	Municipality of Skagway	\$ 24,305.80	93	95	92	98	55	90	84	99	87.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	86.71	\$ 90,196.80	
12	Cordova Breakwater Trail	Copper River Watershed Project	\$ 33,134.00	92	90	95	97	15	95	90	95	82.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	82.00	\$ 123,330.80	
3	Carsonite Trail Markers for Independence Mine Ski Trail	AK State Parks	\$ 2,125.00	89	100	90	91	15	93	90	93	81.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	81.14	\$ 125,455.80	
8	Hillside Singletrack Project	Alaska Trails, Inc. Anchorage	\$ 50,000.00	94	96	82	90	15	98	76	95	78.70	Yes	Non-Motorized	78.71	\$ 175,455.80	Funding Cap \$172,791.00
25	Historic Independence Mill Trail Reconstruction, Upgrade	AK State Parks, Mat-Su	\$ 50,000.00	70	90	82	86	45	88	89	90	78.60	Yes	Non-Motorized	78.57	\$ 225,455.80	
15	Battery Point Trail Rehabilitation - Phase II	DPOR, Haines Borough	\$ 36,200.00	66	85	73	86	50	92	64	70	74.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	73.71	\$ 261,655.80	
23	Forest and Muskeg Trail Restoration	DPOR, Sitka	\$ 14,210.00	63	95	67	76	15	98	91	79	72.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	72.14	\$ 275,865.80	
5	Troop Lake Trail	Youth Restoration Corps	\$ 33,400.00	71	88	60	79	15	81	79	81	68.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	67.57	\$ 309,265.80	
1	Walking Trail at Bear Paw Rec. Area	Houston Chamber of Commerce	\$ 50,000.00	59	63	40	80	55	74	83	80	65.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	64.86	\$ 359,265.80	
16	Arctic Valley Trails - Arctic Valley to South Fork via Ship Creek Trail	Anchorage Ski Club	\$ 50,000.00	65	77	49	57	50	80	70	71	64.00	Yes	Non-Motorized	64.00	\$ 409,265.80	
2	Lazy Mountain South Side Trail	Mat-Su Borough	\$ -	85	90	95	91	55	90	80	96	0.00	No	Non-Motorized	83.71	\$ 409,265.80	
9	Stiles Creek Trails Hardening and Re-route Dozer Work	DPOR, Fairbanks	\$ 49,438.00	92	96	98	95	45	94	92	95	87.00	Yes	Motorized	87.43	\$ 49,438.00	
18	Dalton Trail Tsirko River Bridge Replacemen	Haines Borough	\$ 50,000.00	83	56	90	91	45	90	92	98	78.00	Yes	Motorized	78.14	\$ 99,438.00	
22	Trapper Creek Glen "Ridge Trail" Improvement	Trapper Creek Glen Homeowners Association	\$ -	88	66	73	89	15	86	96	94	0.00	No	Motorized	73.29	\$ 99,438.00	
6	Mills Creek Trail	Youth Restoration Corps	\$ -	65	90	51	74	15	85	66	77	0.00	No	Motorized	63.71	\$ 99,438.00	
7	Isberg Recreational Area Trails: 100-Mile Loop Trail Improver	Fairbanks North Star Borough, DPR	\$ 50,000.00	91	100	100	*	55	92	90	100	88.00	Yes	Diversified	88.00	\$ 50,000.00	
13	CSP Trail Maintenance	Anchorage Snowmobile Club	\$ 20,310.00	87	88	88	93	50	97	93	96	85.00	Yes	Diversified	85.14	\$ 70,310.00	

14	Chicken Lake Cross Park East Red Shirt Lake Trail	AK State Parks, Willow	\$ 18,305.91	90	91	77	90	55	94	71	93	81.00	Yes	Diversified	81.14	\$ 88,615.91
21	Haessler-Norris/Emil Stancec Winter Trail Surveying	Willow Trails Committee, Mat-Su	\$ 13,990.00	84	73	85	85	55	90	92	91	81.00	Yes	Diversified	80.57	\$ 102,605.91
17	Trail Crew Leader, Nancy Lake State Recreation Area	AK State Parks, Mat-Su, Valdez-Copper River Area	\$ 11,320.00	89	97	65	86	45	95	87	90	81.00	Yes	Diversified	80.57	\$ 113,925.91
19	Lake Louise to Tolsona Trail Improvement	Lake Louise Snow Machine Club, Glennallen	\$ 7,462.00	82	84	81	89	15	93	96	80	77.00	Yes	Diversified	77.14	\$ 121,387.91
4	Bean Creek / Resurrection Trail	Youth Restoration Corps	\$ 50,000.00	59	83	54	77	55	77	73	75	68.00	Yes	Diversified	68.29	\$ 171,387.91
20	Moose Range Trail Improvement	Palmer SWCD	\$ -	84	91	68	80	50	87	84	81	0.00	No	Diversified	77.71	\$ 171,387.91

Total =	\$ 680,091.71
---------	---------------

* = Conflict of Interest

Available (30%)	\$ 172,791.00
Available (30%)	\$ 172,791.00
Available (40%)	\$ 230,387.00
Total Available	\$ 575,969.00

Total =	\$ 175,455.80
Total =	\$ 99,438.00
Total =	\$ 171,387.91
Total =	\$ 446,281.71

\$ (2,664.80)	Deficient
\$ 73,353.00	Surplus
\$ 58,999.09	Surplus