

**Washington State Parks
SNOWMOBILE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Summer Meeting Minutes**

August 6, 2022
Microsoft TEAMS Virtual Meeting

ATTENDANCE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Tom Shields (Area 1)
Bob Henrie (Chair, Area 2)
Norris Boyd (Vice Chair, Area 3)
Kurt Millard (Area 4, Absent)
Roger Brittain (Area 5)
Steve Riggan (Area 6)
Frank Benish (Absent, Non-Motorized)
John O'Brien (Non-Motorized)
Cindy Hoover (Non-Motorized)
Larry Leach (DNR)
Rob Jones (Absent, WAOC)
Tony Leonetti (WDFW)

Washington State Parks Staff:

Corey Tolar (Winter Recreation Program, Acting Manager)
Jason Goldstein (Winter Recreation Program)
Rob Sendak (Washington State Parks)
Travis Larson (Winter Recreation Program)

Guests:

Christina and Tanner Hamlyn
Wayne Mohler (WSSA)
Tim Penelerick (Boulder Creek Enterprises)
Marilyn Mylius (Lake Wenatchee Rec Club)
Bill Burgess (Pacific Mountain Services)
William Burgess (Pacific Mountain Services)
Matt Mead (WSSA)
Todd Schmutz (US Forest Service – Snoqualmie RD)
Stephanie Margheim (DNR)
Jason Holmes (WSSA)
Ron Lind (R&R Grooming)
Lindsey Pruet (US Forest Service – Cle Elum RD)
Austin Rollins (Chewelah Trail Twisters)
William Rutherford (Yakima Grooming Council)
Paul Mosman (WDFW)
Glenn Markovits (Sno-Jammers Snowmobile Club)
Bob Seelye (WRAC)
Jim Burts (Apple Country Snowmobile Club)
Rosemary Seifried (US Forest Service – Methow Valley RD)
Dallas Glass (NWAC)
Bill Davis (Methow Valley Snowmobile Association)
Craig Stahl (Methow Valley Snowmobile Association)
Sean Culp
Thomas Bolt (WDFW)
Mike Bratton
Kevin Davis (WA State Parks – Crystal Springs)
Paul Edgren (Selkirk Trailblazers)
Jamey Brittain

Nick Whitman (LandTek)
Markus Loftis
Cal Anderson
Dan Johnston

Saturday August 6, 2022, Agenda

CALL TO ORDER	Bob called the meeting to order and passed it on to Travis for Teams etiquette.	Information Only
TEAMS ETIQUETTE	<p>Travis went over the functions of Microsoft Teams including how to mute, disable camera, share screen, and the reactions tab to raise hand.</p> <p>Corey reminded everyone that the meeting was being recorded and that the chat was visible to everyone as a reminder to the guests.</p> <p>Cindy asked how the voting will work.</p> <p>Travis said it will be up to the discretion of Bob.</p> <p>Bob said that he will probably go one by one for votes. He then passed it onto Rob for a staff update.</p>	Information Only
STAFF UPDATE	<p>Rob spoke to the committee about staffing changes that has happened within Washington State Parks and the Winter Recreation program itself.</p> <p>He mentioned that Pamela retired and hired Lara Gricar to replace her. He also mentioned that Diana Dupuis was hired to be the Director of Washington State Parks from the region manager position of the Inland Empire Region in Spokane. He mentioned that Lara was hired to replace Diana as the Region Manager of the Inland Empire Region.</p> <p>He stated that almost immediately he appointed Corey Tolar as the acting manager of the winter recreation program. He stated that he is hoping to have the position filled by mid-September give or take a couple of weeks.</p> <p>He gave a shoutout to Jason and Travis for continuing to keep the program going during this time.</p>	Information Only
INTRODUCTIONS	<p>Bob had the committee introduced themselves along with Parks staff introduce themselves.</p> <p>Rob thanked for the committee for what they do and supporting this program and State Parks.</p>	Information Only
REVIEW/APPROVE WINTER MEETING MINUTES	<p>Bob moved to reviewing/approving the meeting minutes and asked if anybody had any comments.</p> <p>Norris motioned to approve the minutes as submitted</p> <p>John O'Brien seconded</p> <p>Bob called for a vote</p> <p>All committee members said aye</p> <p>Motion passed unanimously</p>	Motion passed - Winter Meeting Minutes approved as is.
FINANCIAL REVIEW OF 2021/2022 SEASON	<p>Bob moved to the financial review and passed it onto Corey.</p> <p>Corey showed last year's expenditures including a total budget of \$3,325,130 with expenditures of \$2,715,130 and explained that there was a bill that had come in since this was produced</p>	

	<p>so the numbers were slightly off. He showed that there were some grant reimbursements in total of \$404,800. He reported a revenue amount of \$2,176,698 and a total of 22,929 registered snowmobiles. He then moved to priority 1 and mentioned that there was a buyout for Pamela's saved up vacation and sick days that would normally come out of the budget, but Parks Operations picked up the cost. He explained that the communications budget went over due to the staff getting work cell phones. He shared that there was a rate increase with the storage unit which resulted in an overage. Total budget was \$411,900 with expenditures of \$357,774 resulting in \$54,126 left over.</p> <p>John O'Brien asked about the signs budget.</p> <p>Jason stated that staff wasn't traveling very much so signs were not delivered.</p> <p>John asked if the \$6,000 was a normal amount.</p> <p>Corey stated that is the normal budget and would probably see more expenditures in the sign category this upcoming season.</p> <p>Corey moved to priority 2 which is major equipment repair. Total budget was \$100,000 with expenses of \$55,713 resulting in \$44,287 remaining. He showed that one of the larger expenses was the Okanogan PB100 that had repairs for \$12,645 in a single expense.</p> <p>Corey then moved to priority 3 trail grooming. He stated that for state-owned trail grooming there was a budget of \$181,061 with \$149,943 in expenses resulting in \$31,118 left over. He then moved onto trail grooming private owned. He showed that there was a budget of \$1,708,250 with \$1,646,889 in expenditures resulting in \$61,361 left over. This resulted in the total trail grooming with a budget of \$1,889,311 with \$1,796,833 in expenditures resulting in \$92,479 left over.</p> <p>John asked about the balances of Stemilt-Colockum and Cle Elum River/Teaway.</p> <p>Jason stated that Stemilt-Colockum had limited snow this season and that was why they had the remaining budget that they had.</p> <p>Jim Burts stated that the trail system in Stemilt-Colockum there is an elevation difference that in the lower parts lose the snow. He stated he would like to get a road to a higher elevation but would cost too much money.</p> <p>Tim Penelerick spoke about the Cle Elum River/Teaway stated that when there was a big dumping of snow in early January, the county didn't plow the road which resulting in losing 9 days of possible grooming. He also stated that they</p>	<p>Information only.</p>
--	---	---------------------------------

	<p>didn't get on the snow until the 18th of December.</p> <p>Corey moved onto snow removal. He showed there was a total budget of \$333,135 with expenditures of \$261,130 resulting in \$72,005 left over.</p> <p>Paul Edgren asked about the Hanks Butte budget that was approved last year and where it was on the budget.</p> <p>Corey stated it would be in priority 5 and 6.</p> <p>Corey then moved onto the sanitation budget. He showed that there was a budget of \$75,277 with \$67,963 in expenditures resulting in \$7,314 left over.</p> <p>Norris asked to be reminded why the budget for Wind River/Mt. Adams was so much.</p> <p>Jason stated that the program has a contract with US Forest Service, and they have a lot of vault type toilets.</p> <p>Corey then moved on to E&E showing that they have a budget of \$83,485 with \$71,407 in expenditures resulting in \$12,077 left over.</p> <p>Corey then moved onto the emergency reserve that had a total budget of \$30,000 with \$31,926 in expenditures resulting in an overage of \$1,926. He also stated that most of it was spent on snow removal in the I90/Blewett area.</p> <p>Corey then moved onto the priority 5 and 6 from last year. He went over each funding application showing the budget and expenditures. Showing a budget of \$89,163 with \$73,065 in expenditures resulting in \$16,098 left over.</p> <p>Bob asked a question from the chat asking how much of 70 road in Greenwater emergency funded.</p> <p>Corey said he had \$3,056 marked for Greenwater but didn't know if it was 70 Road.</p> <p>Jason stated that was the main road it was used for.</p> <p>Tony asked Jason if he knew about any outstanding bills.</p> <p>Jason stated that he thinks they are good shape but may receive a bill from Pend Oreille County for Hanks Butte, but that would be it.</p> <p>Corey then concluded the expenditures from the previous season.</p>	
<p>PRIORITY 5 AND 6 PRESENTATIONS</p>	<p>Bob moved onto the new funding applications for priority 5 and 6.</p> <p>Norris asked Bob to explain what priority 5 and 6 funding applications are.</p>	

	<p>Bob stated priority 5 is new applications for grooming and priority 6 is everything else for new applications but primarily education and enforcement. He stated that they go through 3 years of funding before they are moved into the permanent budget.</p> <p>Blewett/Clear Lake/ Lily Lake Connection TG (2nd year - \$5,100)</p> <p>Bob Seelye spoke on the presentation and stated that the current hold up is the Forest Service doing a NEPA study.</p> <p>Bob Henrie asked if the money is for the grooming.</p> <p>Bob Seelye stated it was for the grooming and a study.</p> <p>Lindsey stated that some of her staff will be heading out to the trail on Tuesday to check it out and doesn't see any issue in getting it open.</p> <p>WDFW Blue Mountains E&E (3rd year - \$5,000)</p> <p>Paul Mosman spoke on behalf of WDFW stating the history of the funding of the application. He stated that they lost a snowmobile during the season and caused some issues of getting on the trail. He stated that \$5,000 led to about 38 officer days and is seeing a decline in tickets being written which he believed is a good thing. He stated that the biggest issue is still currently out of state snowmobile registrations.</p> <p>Increased Grooming Glacier Canyon Creek (2nd year - \$15,000)</p> <p>Tom Shields spoke on behalf of Glen. He stated that the traffic has been very heavy in the area and the public was complaining that the grooming wasn't frequent enough and the extra funds significantly helps the quality of the roads.</p> <p>Methow Valley Trail enhancements (2nd year - \$1,886)</p> <p>Bill Davis presented on behalf of the Methow Valley Snowmobile Association. He spoke on the huts in the area and what the funds do as far as maintenance. He stated the huts have seen an increase of use in the last couple of years.</p> <p>Bob asked if the funds included insurance.</p> <p>Bill Davis stated it included the insurance, the tabs, the permits on forest service land, annual repair, and paint repair.</p> <p>John O'Brien asked how the huts were funded prior to the grant or if it was new expenditures.</p> <p>Bill stated that they were previously paid for by the Methow Valley Snowmobile Association dues or fundraising efforts.</p> <p>Larry asked if the hut vendors helping pay for some of the</p>	<p>Information only</p>
--	--	--------------------------------

	<p>maintenance.</p> <p>Bill stated that most of the labor is done by volunteers, and this is just for the bare request.</p> <p>USFS Methow Valley RD E&E (2nd year - \$7,175)</p> <p>Rosemary Seifried presented on behalf of the Methow Valley RD. She stated it is a mirror of the non-motorized proposal and can be flexible depending on funding. She stated it would fund a forest protection officer for 25 days during the busiest time of the season. She also stated there would be no law enforcement presence without this funding. She stated the first year went well and the public appreciated the upkeep of signage and bathrooms. There was also an improvement on compliance.</p> <p>Norris asked if Rosemary knew what the initial cost of an avalanche beacon check station would be.</p> <p>Rosemary stated hers was donated by the snowmobile club and she did not know off the top of her head.</p> <p>John O'Brien complimented Rosemary's application and appreciated the matching funds breakdown.</p> <p>Tom Shields stated that the four signs were \$2500 each in response to the avalanche beacon check station.</p> <p>Bob asked if the WRAC funded this request last week.</p> <p>Travis stated that they did.</p> <p>Tony asked if they knew the dollar amount.</p> <p>Bob stated it looked like the previous request was \$7,675 but this was \$7,175.</p> <p>John stated it looks like it increased \$500 for equipment.</p> <p>Rosemary stated that they had a lot of outdated equipment such as beacons and helmets and was just looking to help replace that.</p> <p>Corey stated that the WRAC funded \$7,175.</p> <p>Bob stated he could not see on the previous year's expenditures where the expenses were reported.</p> <p>Corey stated that they had a \$7,175 budget last year and spent \$7,077.</p> <p>Tony asked if it funds 25 days of a non-LEO kind of assist.</p> <p>Rosemary stated that was correct it funds a forest protection officer which is right below law enforcement and can still write tickets.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Tony asked when they work.</p> <p>Rosemary stated they primarily focus on weekends and holidays.</p> <p>Tony asked for a breakdown of the funding for the two proposals.</p> <p>Rosemary stated it was 25 days for each proposal so if both were funded it would be a total of 50 days.</p> <p>Hanks Butte (2nd year - \$5,000)</p> <p>Paul Edgren presented and asked if anybody had any questions.</p> <p>Bob asked if the request is for snow removal and sanitation.</p> <p>Paul stated that was correct.</p> <p>Norris stated that he wouldn't count on Pend Oreille County not billing every year.</p> <p>Jason stated that they have been doing it in kind previously, but this was the first year it was contracted, but he would remind them. He also stated that he believed the forest service is doing the sanitation currently.</p> <p>Norris stated that the sno-park was unofficially used the last couple of years but cuts out about a 30-mile drive to the next sno-park.</p> <p>Paul also added that it adds some loops that were desperately needed.</p> <p>Ahtanum Increased Grooming (2nd year - \$11,335)</p> <p>William Rutherford presented for Mark Tharp. He stated that the funding was particularly for the middle fork in the Ahtanum that allows access to higher elevations. He stated the grooming equates to 25.5 miles 1 day per week. He stated it is also the main access point for emergency services.</p> <p>John asked the committee if areas with lower elevations are seeing less snow, should the funds be shifted from the lower elevations to higher elevations.</p> <p>William stated that the North Fork and Middle Fork can both depart into the trail system within the same geographical location, but North Fork loses about 3-4 miles at the lower elevation. Middle Fork could facilitate access.</p> <p>Roger stated that of the areas in his area, the Ahtanum receive the most snow. He stated that the Middle Fork has plenty of snow even on a low year.</p>	
--	---	--

Tony asked what funds are already given to that area. He also asked who the groomer would be for the additional funds.

William stated that the budget for last year was \$82,343 and R&R Grooming would facilitate the grooming.

NWAC E&E (2nd year - \$10,000)

Dallas Glass prevented on behalf of NWAC and showed the source of funding for NWAC as well as numbers of visitation on their website. He stated that the funds will help expand their forecasting staff. He showed data that highlighted their outreach.

Tony asked Dallas when they plan on moving to the east side of the state into the tri-county area.

Dallas stated that on a national level there is a forecaster in Bellingham that focuses on the Idaho panhandle center and working on underrepresented areas such as northeastern Washington but comes down to funding and staffing.

Tony stated that he would like to see on the NWAC side of it with increasing funding to include all of Washington.

Dallas stated that NWAC is one of the longest running avalanche centers in the country and nationally have expanded tremendously in the last ten years and would like to find where the holes are in their coverage and systematically cover those holes.

Chewelah Additional Grooming (New - \$7,500)

Austin Rollins presented on behalf of the Chewelah Trail Twisters. He stated that the contractor decided to finish the season even with a shortfall of funds. He said the contractor roughly donated \$5,300. He also stated that this amount would help account for fuel price increases as well as inflation to keep qualified staff.

Cindy asked about the use of the area.

Austin asked for clarification

Cindy asked if this was a new trail or to extend the season.

Austin stated this would be to extend the season to a full season.

Norris stated this is an up-and-coming area. He stated the new contractor works with the club and there has also been some logging going on in the area. He stated that the area is getting more and more usage.

Tony seconded what Norris said and has been pleased with the work the contractor is doing.

DNR Expanded E&E Ahtanum (New - \$15,750)

Stephanie Margheim presented on behalf of DNR. She stated that this funding is extra focused patrols. This would occur on holiday weekends and high usage times. She stated with this area changing from a trailhead to a sno-park compliance has been low. She stated that there is high usage even beyond the grooming season. She stated there has been a traffic counter and averages about 6000 vehicles from December to the end of April over the last two years.

John asked if the funding was for a warden and if that was the same as an LEO. He also asked how they came up with the number for the number of hours that it would provide.

Stephanie said their E&E wage is \$60 an hour, 10-hour days for 25 days. It could be a little less though if it is paired with the LEO. She also stated that everything else would be covered by the agency.

WDFW E&E Hwy 12 & Hwy 410 (New - \$6,000)

Tom Bolt presented on behalf of WDFW. He stated that State Parks asked them to participate in a pilot project last year. He stated that the areas they can cover are high use areas with limited enforcement. He stated that it was mostly education last year whether it was trail etiquette or safety precautions. He stated that there is only 1 forest service LEO in the district so being able to assist him will help enforcement. He stated they got positive feedback from the community last year.

Cle Elum RD Snow Ranger Staffing (New - \$7,000)

Lindsey Pruett presented on behalf of the Cle Elum RD. She stated that this funding would hire another GS9 position. She stated that there are 9 sno-parks, 500 miles of groomed snowmobile trails. She stated that to match the funding the forest service provides the equipment, training, CXTs and wants to improve the signage. She said she would like to recruit more volunteers. She stated that there are significant safety issues with small parking lots and mentioned Gold Creek Pond and wanting to purchase land to help with the issues.

John asked why the applications stated non-motorized and didn't see much about snowmobiles in the application.

Jason stated it is a split funded application.

Lindsey stated that she wants to be able to mix the positions and have it as a dual use position.

Bob asked if the WRAC funded the position.

Corey stated that they did fund the position.

Norris asked for clarification that the total request is \$15,000.

	<p>\$7500 from non-motorized and \$7500 from motorized.</p> <p>Lindsey stated that was correct.</p> <p>Bob concluded the priority 5 and 6 applications.</p>	
RCO FIVE-YEAR TRAIL PLAN	<p>Norris stated that he has been participating in a committee to work on a 5-year plan with that is headed by an employee of RCO. He stated that he believed they were about 40% done and would be presenting in October a draft. He said that they will be asking for comments on the 5-year plan, and he highly encouraged folks to comment on the 5-year plan.</p> <p>He also gave a shout out to Jason, when sharing what the committee had available with the snowmobile trails and what the program had done with their technology they were impressed.</p>	Information only
PUBLIC COMMENTS	<p>Bob moved to public comments. He started by addressing the issues that have been brought to the attention of the board about the Greenwater trail system. He stated that he has had some discussions with Corey and Rob. He stated that he thought that this budget meeting is not the place to do it. He also stated that there are two funding applications in with Greenwater and they will not be funding both applications, but Greenwater will still be funded. He then passed it onto Corey to talk about the issue on State Parks end.</p> <p>Corey started by reiterating that funding will be there for Greenwater. He stated that State Parks will be conducting a review of the Greenwater area and conclude by October 1st. He said he would notify the board and discuss their plan. He stated that they will be talking to everyone involved.</p> <p>Bob stated when Corey said all parties involved, that would include the project sponsors, grooming contractor, the State Parks contracts division.</p> <p>Tony asked if the board would be a part of the discussion. He also asked if the amount for the two contracts would be put aside for the meetings discussion.</p> <p>Corey stated that even though there were two applications, the funding will be the same. He said it is essentially two applications for one source of funding. He stated that the board will be involved.</p> <p>Travis asked a comment that was in the chat asking if the public will be able to contribute or attend the Greenwater discussion with State Parks.</p> <p>Corey stated that State Parks hasn't decided how they will proceed and doesn't know the avenue of that.</p> <p>Bob encouraged anybody that has any comments to reach out to either Glenn Markovits or Mark Tharp. He stated that they don't want to exclude the public but keep the process as short as they can.</p> <p>Rob stated that he thought Corey and Bob covered it well but</p>	Information only

	<p>said anybody is welcome to send feedback to him or Corey via email.</p> <p>Bob then opened it up to any additional comments from the public.</p> <p>Roger asked how he could make a comment if he wanted to.</p> <p>Bob stated that Travis had posted Rob and Corey's email addresses in the chat where comments could be sent.</p> <p>Corey added that the winter inbox could be reached as well so there are 3 different sources to send the information.</p> <p>Travis stated that he is the one monitoring the winter inbox so if someone sends information regarding the Greenwater area that he will be forwarding it to Corey and Rob.</p> <p>Glenn Markovits wanted to thank the committee, Rob, and Corey for recognizing that there is a valid issue that warrants a discussion. He stated that they had been approaching the issue since December of last year and wanting to remind that the winter season is approaching and didn't want to be behind the 8-ball come December 1st.</p> <p>Corey stated that State Parks acknowledges Glenn's feedback and wants to have a plan prior to December 1st.</p> <p>Wayne Mohler commented that since the program started there isn't a procedure for who can be a project sponsor. He stated that there have been numerous times multiple people have applied for the same contract. He recommended coming up with a procedure to determine who can apply for funding.</p> <p>Bob stated that Wayne had a good point and in his time on the committee hadn't happened or needed to be addressed. He also stated that he wants to do what is best for the user group.</p> <p>Norris stated that having two applications using the same groomer is confusing.</p> <p>Jason stated he had both user groups submit applications to be safe and to think of it as two user groups applying for one contract.</p> <p>Rob stated that he concurred with Wayne and State Parks staff needs to take a long-term approach to how these things happen and come up with a palette of options and how applications are looked at in the future. He also stated that everyone has their commitment that they are going to talk to all parties involved and do what is prudent of stewards of taxpayer dollars.</p> <p>Bob asked Travis to explain how the committee will be doing the scoring of the priority 5 and 6 presentations.</p> <p>Travis told the committee to send their scoresheets to the</p>	
--	---	--

	winter inbox.	
BREAK	Bob released the meeting for a break to resume at 10:45	No Action
BUDGET REVIEW AND APPROVAL FOR 2022/23 SEASON	<p>Bob brought the meeting back from break.</p> <p>Travis stated that Corey is still compiling the scores of the priority 5 and 6 presentations but should be done shortly.</p> <p>Bob stated that the board has more than likely had a chance to preview the scenarios that State Parks staff prepared and thinks the biggest question is if the committee wants to buy a new snowcat this season or not.</p> <p>Norris stated that the program has a backup cat at this point.</p> <p>Jason stated that the Ferry County cat broke down in the mountain a couple of winters ago and Okanogan County hauled it out of the mountains. He stated that the cat has been prepared and is sitting on the new private contractor of the area's property.</p> <p>Bob stated that Okanogan County has a backup Tucker that did have to be used last season but is available.</p> <p>Jason stated that they ask the county to use it occasionally, but the rest of the equipment is pretty old. He added that the Pomeroy cat caught on fire a couple of seasons ago.</p> <p>Roger asked what piece of equipment Jason thought needed to be replaced the most.</p> <p>Jason stated the Pomeroy cat needs to be replaced.</p> <p>Roger asked what the size of the cat is and how many hours it has.</p> <p>Corey shared his screen and showed that the Pomeroy cat has 7,066 hours and it is a BR MP+ that was purchased in 1999.</p> <p>Norris asked if it was new in 1999.</p> <p>Jason and Corey both replied that they did not know.</p> <p>John commented that this is a statewide program and the way the program is set up, they need to adequately fund the statewide grooming and for money to be put aside to replace equipment.</p> <p>Norris agreed with John about the equipment replacement funds. He then asked staff if leasing equipment was an option.</p> <p>Jason said that they could. He stated that they will more than likely never buy new equipment again, but newer used equipment. He stated that if leasing a snowcat is very expensive.</p> <p>Corey stated before they decide on that they would need to</p>	

	<p>explore the costs.</p> <p>Norris stated he was asking because in his business he has a lot of equipment, and he has found that some companies will lease used equipment and the rates begin to make more sense. He stated that he isn't ready to decide if they should be a new snowcat until they explore every option.</p> <p>Bob stated that the equipment replacement fund has been used as a surplus rather than a replacement fund. He used the example of if the committee puts \$100,000 in the equipment replacement fund this year, that money should be put aside. He also stated that if he knows if they put money aside in the past the legislature has gone after it, but they need to dedicate some money to replacing the equipment. He also added it may need to be a 2- or 3-year thing.</p> <p>Roger, Norris, and John agreed with that.</p> <p>John stated he things it is more than a 2- or 3-year thing, but more of an ongoing thing.</p> <p>Bob stated that the equipment replacement needs to be a line item rather than a budget item.</p> <p>Norris stated that staff had an estimation of funds needed to replace equipment of \$290,000 and asked if that is an accurate number.</p> <p>Jason said if it was used. He stated that new pieces of equipment go up to \$400,000.</p> <p>Bob stated he doesn't remember the exact year that Okanogan County bought their snowcat but thought it was over \$300,000.</p> <p>Corey stated in 2019 a cat was purchased for \$285,632.</p> <p>Cindy voiced her support for buying a new snowcat or beginning to properly fund the equipment replacement funds.</p> <p>Bob agreed with Cindy but stated that the reality is that they are dealing with declining funding and trying to find the balance of funding the new equipment and supplying a good product to the people.</p> <p>John stated that inflation is not going away before the winter, and they are dealing with higher fuel prices. He stated that each snowmobile registered roughly brings in \$100. He said that to fund the new projects at roughly \$100,000 you would need 1,000 more registered sleds to cover the costs of those new projects.</p> <p>Norris stated that he agreed with John's statements, but they have allowed snow bikes and tracked UTV's are now allowed on their trail and he believed that market was not slowing down.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Bob stated that he believed the tracked UTVs would be a good avenue to get more registrations, but they are more expensive than snowmobiles especially when adding tracks to the purchase price. He also answered a question in the chat stating if the legislature can take away the money why any would be saved, and Bob stated that he doesn't know how else to do it unless they cut the grooming budget by \$300,000 which is shown in one of the scenarios as a 10% cut.</p> <p>John stated that on the non-motorized side they keep a large amount of money in the equipment replacement fund.</p> <p>Bob stated that there has been 2 or 3 times since he had been there where they heard the legislature was looking at sweeping their account and all it took was for someone to lobby that they are self-funded, and it usually goes away.</p> <p>Roger wanted to clarify that because the program only works off money they already have in the account, the legislature sees the whole budget and not just the equipment replacement fund.</p> <p>Bob turned it over to Corey to go over the scenarios that staff has produced.</p> <p>Corey stated that there currently is a fund balance of \$3,182,325. He reiterated that the fund balance is not the exact official fund balance.</p> <p>Corey began in priority 1 and stated that last year's budget was \$411,900 and believe they can reduce that to \$410,150. He stated that they are not recommending changes to salaries and benefits. He stated that staff is recommending a reduction in the office equipment budget. He stated that the communications budget increased due to staff getting work cell phones. He stated there was an increase to GPS to get a couple more units as well as the fuel/maintenance fund due to the increase in fuel prices. Kittitas County Parks & Rec increased their fee for land use.</p> <p>John asked if they were planning on filling the admin 3 position.</p> <p>Corey stated as soon as the permanent program manager is on board, they will begin that.</p> <p>Corey pulled up the 4 scenarios that staff had created.</p> <p>Corey stated that scenario A is a 3% increase across the board.</p> <p>Corey stated that scenario B is keeping everything at the previous year's budget.</p> <p>Corey stated that Scenario C is a 3% cut to trail grooming.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Corey stated that Scenario D is a 10% cut to trail grooming but would also fund a snowcat for the program.</p> <p>He then moved priority 2 and stated that staff was recommending leaving the equipment repair at what it was last year.</p> <p>He then moved to priority 3 and showed how the budget would adjust with each of the scenarios.</p> <p>He then moved to emergency reserve and that staff recommended the budget be raised from \$30,000 to \$40,000.</p> <p>Cindy asked if there was any reason why in the proposed budgets that all of priority 5 and 6 was funded.</p> <p>Corey stated that there was no reason but was just primarily to show the budget if they were all funded.</p> <p>Roger stated that he didn't like any of the scenarios and would like to see priority 5 and 6 be last. He would like to see grooming at least stay where they were last season.</p> <p>Bob stated that in the past the equipment replacement hasn't acted like a fund and more like a line item.</p> <p>Roger asked what the budget would look like if they put \$150,000 to the equipment replacement fund and how much money would they have to fund priority 5 and 6.</p> <p>Corey stated that he could in the future have there be a line item of the equipment replacement and then have an additional line for the leftover amount kind of how the current equipment replacement works.</p> <p>Tony stated that he liked the way the discussion is going but his max for this year would probably be \$100,000 in the equipment replacement.</p> <p>Bob stated that he is hesitant to add more grooming miles because it makes it more registrations required to fund those grooming miles. He also stated that when sled registrations are down, he is hesitant to add new priority 5 and 6 funding.</p> <p>Corey then showed the committee the results of the scoring for the priority 5 and 6 presentations.</p> <p>Norris asked to look at the state and private grooming for trail grooming. He asked if in the proposed budget the numbers shown were what the funding applications asked for.</p> <p>Corey stated the budget from last season is what was requested.</p> <p>Cindy asked if the current system of the budget isn't set up to accrue money in the equipment replacement.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Corey stated that is correct.</p> <p>Cindy then asked to fund a new piece of equipment if they would need to do it all this year?</p> <p>Bob then stated they have been discussing a mechanism to make it possible to save funds and make it untouchable next year.</p> <p>Roger motioned to have a line item in the budget that is set aside for equipment replacement.</p> <p>Cindy seconded</p> <p>Bob called for a vote.</p> <p>Tom voted yes</p> <p>Bob voted yes</p> <p>Norris voted no</p> <p>Roger voted yes</p> <p>Steve voted yes</p> <p>John voted yes</p> <p>Cindy voted yes</p> <p>Larry voted no</p> <p>Tony voted yes</p> <p>Motion passes 7-2</p> <p>Roger stated that he likes keeping the funding for grooming at it was last year, putting \$75,000 into equipment replacement and having the rest go to priority 5 and 6.</p> <p>Jason stated that if they do the funding from last year and even funded all the priority 5 and 6, they would have more than \$75,000 in the equipment replacement fund.</p> <p>Norris then stated that if Roger only wanted \$75,000, they could take the rest and give it to the program activities.</p> <p>Roger stated then he should be looking at scenario A.</p> <p>Tom stated he liked that more because with the increase in fuel prices, the contractors are already going to be taking a cut.</p> <p>Roger stated he would like to see more money in the equipment replacement fund though.</p> <p>John commented that he believed anything less than \$125,000</p>	<p>Motion Passes – Equipment Reserve to have line item of funds set aside from what is approved this budget.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>in the equipment replacement is just kicking the can down the road. He also stated that he believed it was going to be another year of sled registrations going down due to inflation and fuel prices going up.</p> <p>Jason Holmes stated that the program needs to work on the enforcement of sled registrations. He also stated that he believes the cost of a sled registrations need to go up. He added that the contractors are going to be hit with a significant fuel tax starting January 1st.</p> <p>Jason Goldstein added that the program has 9 contracts that are expiring and will have to go back out to bid and more than likely will have an increased hourly rate.</p> <p>Bob stated that his general feeling is that he is leery to add any new projects this year.</p> <p>Cindy stated that she recommended also not fully funding the current priority 5 and 6 grooming applications that had previously received funding.</p> <p>Roger stated that why they aren't looking at reducing other funding applications and only picking on grooming.</p> <p>Tony stated that he thought the pilot project done last year with WDFW would benefit the program. He also stated that the Chewelah grooming does a good job and if the contractor is spending his own money, he would like to see some funds go his way. He also stated he doesn't like cutting the grooming at Mt. Baker or Ahtanum. He suggested reducing the NWAC forecaster budget.</p> <p>Larry stated that as a land manager if E&E is slashed, he is afraid it could turn into the wild west and the land could be abused which may limit the amount of land is opened for grooming.</p> <p>Corey stated that from a staff perspective he doesn't like seeing E&E cut because it brings money back to the program.</p> <p>Tony stated that the money goes to the county where the ticket was written in the case of WDFW. He stated that the way they do it in his district is a warning that gives the user a week to get a registration or sno-park permit that allows the money to go back to the program.</p> <p>Austin Rollins commented that he would ask the committee to consider the Chewelah additional grooming funds because the area has good momentum, and the groomer is currently donating his time and funds to finish the season and would like to see the momentum going.</p> <p>Tony asked Austin if \$5000 would be sufficient.</p>	
--	--	--

Austin stated that any money would help and that any amount would help, but \$5000 wouldn't have finished the season last season.

Bob stated in looking at scenario A and took \$5000 out of the forecaster budget and \$2500 out of the Chewelah grooming, funded all the E&Es, they would have to drop the 3% increase to a 2% increase and that would leave about \$90,000 in the equipment replacement fund.

Wayne Mohler commented that the miles the committee has authorized over the years are not fully funded now. He stated that last year the miles authorized was 78,294 and last years funding at the formula grooming rates was 56,898 allowed by the funds. He stated that the money going to these applications isn't funding new miles but prioritizing a few areas that aren't fully funded compared to other areas. He stated it might be beneficial to do an across the board increase rather than funding a select few areas to get increases.

Tony shared his thought of cutting each of the grooming priority 5 and 6 funding requests by \$1500, cutting the Naches E&E to \$4500.

Norris motioned to approve priority 5 and 6 in accordance with column I (total funding of \$86,246)

Tony seconded

Bob called for discussion.

John stated he doesn't understand the process of how they got there and have not used the scoresheet to base how the projects were funded and asked for more detail on how they are proceeding.

Norris stated that he would like to see all of them funded and found the ranking of them to not be enjoyable. He felt that adjusting them down \$10,000 was appropriate.

John stated that he doesn't want to go under the assumption that they will all be funded.

Roger stated that the committee would be setting the precedent that funding everything rather than basing it off the scoresheet and reducing from the lowest scored funding presentations.

Larry thought the approach the committee is taking is appropriate and recognize the work the projects have done.

Tom questioned why Ahtanum E&E didn't receive a cut when it scored below others that are currently receiving cuts.

Tony stated that he believes that the Hanks Butte needs to stay where it is, as well as the Blewett/Clear Lake/Lily Lake connection as well. The Methow Valley Trail Enhancements

	<p>were reasonable. He then suggested reducing the Methow Valley E&E, Ahtanum E&E, and Cle Elum E&E \$500 and adding \$500 back to Mt. Baker Trail Grooming, Ahtanum Trail Grooming and Region 3 WDFW E&E.</p> <p>Norris stated he would amend his motion to align with Tony's suggestion.</p> <p>Tony seconded.</p> <p>John asked if the motion was funding all the priority 5 and 6.</p> <p>Norris stated that was correct and it is only about priority 5 and 6.</p> <p>Tom asked if the funding for those is reduced, would the amount roll at the reduced amount or the requested amount.</p> <p>Corey stated that it would be based off the funding from the prior year. But whatever it is funded at its 3rd year is what gets rolled into the budget.</p> <p>Tony asked Jason if a cat is given to surplus if the funds come back.</p> <p>Jason stated they could do a trade in, but he wasn't sure if a surplus would come back.</p> <p>He later stated that some of the funds would come back.</p> <p>Bob called a vote</p> <p>Tom voted yes</p> <p>Bob voted yes</p> <p>Norris voted yes</p> <p>Roger voted yes</p> <p>Steve voted yes</p> <p>John voted no</p> <p>Cindy voted no</p> <p>Larry voted yes</p> <p>Tony voted yes</p> <p>Motion passes 7-2</p> <p>Bob stated now that priority 5 and 6 are taken care of, now the committee needs to decide if they want to do a 2% increase or what.</p> <p>John asked if part of priority 4 has been pulled out for a cat</p>	<p>Motion Passes – Priority 5 and 6 approved with Methow Valley E&E, Ahtanum E&E, and Cle Elum E&E reduced by \$500. Grooming requests reduced by \$1000 and WDFW Naches E&E reduced to \$4500.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>replacement.</p> <p>Bob stated that at the current funding there would be \$89,932 they would have next year and not touch it.</p> <p>Cindy restated what John had stated earlier and that anything less than \$125,000 in the equipment replacement fund and would like to see program activities reduced to get to that amount.</p> <p>Bob stated he would like to know what a 1% increase would look like.</p> <p>Roger motioned to go with scenario A with a 2% increase across the board.</p> <p>Tom seconded</p> <p>Tony stated he would like to see what Corey came up with at 1% before voting.</p> <p>Norris stated that he has a problem with telling people at a particular sno-park that they had to cut back grooming at their sno-park to fund a new groomer somewhere else.</p> <p>Roger asked that if a sno-park in area 5 has a cat break down that those people should get no grooming because someone somewhere else should not have to take a cut.</p> <p>Norris stated that the current situation is that area 5 does have a groomer and the funds to repair the groomer and there is a backup groomer to use.</p> <p>John asked if the users would notice a reduction of 2% in grooming.</p> <p>Bob stated that when the costs go up it is more felt because it results in less miles.</p> <p>Glenn Markovits commented that some of the contracts are coming up and the rate is going to go up. He stated that the cost of fuel in his area makes up for 17% of the hourly rate so there is still room for money to be made. He stated that a reason that a lot of the contractors still groom is because they are making money.</p> <p>Corey showed the scenario with a 1% increase.</p> <p>Cindy stated that she is a lot more comfortable with that.</p> <p>Bob called for a vote</p> <p>Tom voted yes</p> <p>Bob voted no</p> <p>Norris voted yes</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Roger voted yes</p> <p>Steve voted yes</p> <p>John voted no</p> <p>Cindy voted no</p> <p>Larry voted yes</p> <p>Tony voted no</p> <p>Motion passes 5-4</p> <p>Roger stated that he wasn't happy with the outcome, he would have liked to see more in the equipment replacement fund, but also would have liked to see more go to grooming.</p> <p>Bob stated that he believed this was an okay compromise and asked if the budget was just voted for.</p> <p>Tony asked if the committee would see the equipment replacement number as a line item in the next budget.</p> <p>Corey stated that it will be a line item on the next budget.</p> <p>Bob thanked the committee for the thought put into the budget and believed the committee did some hard work.</p> <p>Travis stated that Bob, Norris, and Kurt this would be this last meeting.</p> <p>Rob wanted to say thank you to the committee members and the public. He stated that Bob, Norris, and Kurt have served the state with dignity in what they do. He also stated that maybe sometime in the winter they could celebrate in person or at least do something virtually.</p> <p>Travis stated that Steve's term is up but would be able to reup if wanted.</p> <p>Rob stated that the new program manager would look at the terms and figuring out the vacancies and terms of everyone.</p>	<p>Motion Passes – 2% increases across the board for priority 3.</p>
<p>NEXT MEETING</p>	<p>Travis stated that the next thing would be finding a date and location for the winter meeting.</p> <p>Travis stated the WRAC chose the 27-28th of January in Cle Elum area.</p> <p>Bob stated it would be nice to see the committee meet in person and have a field day on Friday.</p> <p>Rob stated the committee could come up with the date and the new program manager could work with the committee to find a location.</p>	

	<p>Tony stated he would recommend the 3rd and 4th of February with the location to be determined.</p> <p>Bob stated unless he heard different, he would accept the 3rd and 4th for the winter meeting date.</p> <p>Winter Meeting to be held on February 4th with a field day February 3rd with a location to be determined by Parks Staff.</p> <p>Tom motioned to adjourn the meeting</p> <p>Cindy seconded</p> <p>All voted aye.</p> <p>Motion Passes.</p>	<p>Staff to provide accommodation for a location to be determined for weekend of February 3-4.</p>
ADJOURN	Meeting adjourned at 1:07	