

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

August 2-3, 2024
Wenatchee, WA/ Microsoft Teams Meeting

ATTENDANCE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Tom Shields (Area 1)
Bob Henrie (Chair, Area 2)
Norris Boyd (Vice Chair, Area 3)
Kurt Millard (Area 4)
Justin Davis (Non-Motorized)
John O'Brien (Non-Motorized)
Cindy Hoover (Non-Motorized)
Sam Hensold (DNR)
Tony Leonetti (WDFW) (Virtual 8/2, Absent 8/3)

Washington State Parks Staff:

Corey Tolar (Winter Recreation Program, Manager)
Rob Sendak (Washington State Parks)
Rhonda Dobbs (Washington State Parks)
Montse Walker My (Winter Recreation Program)
Kari McNay (Winter Recreation Program)
Owen Rowe (Washington State Parks)
Peter Herzog (Virtual, Washington State Parks)

In-Person Guests:

Glen Wilkinson
Dean Meakin, WSSA President
Matt Mead
Chris Shiers
Bill Burgess
Marilyn Mylius
Mike Borman
Tim Penelerick
Max Rochester
David Yager
Ron Lind
William Rutherford
Randy Skillman
Nick Whitman

Virtual Guests:

Kim Olive
Bob Seelye
Shannon Lawler
Robert Lind
Tyler Bahrenburg (WDFW)
Jack Thurston

Friday, August 2, 2024

CALL TO ORDER	<p>Bob calls the meeting to order.</p> <p>Bob lets the audience know that the meeting is being recorded.</p>	No Action
INTRODUCTIONS	<p>Bob has the committee members introduce themselves as well as the audience.</p>	Information Only
ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS	<p>Tom Shields, Area 1 Not much to report. Had good season, got warming huts out.</p> <p>Bob Henrie, Area 2- Had fairly normal winter, late start but snows stuck, and grooming was able to be done through season. Notes that people don't want to pay more for registrations, but people also don't want to register. Problem for committee to tackle.</p> <p>Roger Brittain, Area 5- Area 3 had very little snow. Eastern DNR went to level 3 fire quickly. Trail clearing has not begun yet.</p> <p>Kurt Millard, Area 4- Groomers adjusted schedules to groom all the way to the end. Due to clerical error, Lone Butte was plowed all season with no funding.</p> <p>Bob notes that Roger and Steve are absent.</p> <p>Cindy Hoover Non-Motorized – Had great season while able to recreate last season. Thanks staff for hard work heading into meeting. Thanks Justin and Corey for number crunching.</p> <p>Justin Davis Non-Motorized- Season was not plentiful with snow which impacted both motorized and non-motorized. Roughly 1/3 of usual days available.</p> <p>John O'Brien Non-Motorized- Awesome season at Crystal Springs with Lake Easton State Park grooming. Awesome plowing at Crystal Springs.</p> <p>Sam Hensold DNR- DNR picked up quite a bit of plowing late in season. Did not bill for full amount. Notes avalanche late in the season.</p>	Information Only
24/25 SEASON BUDGET REVIEW	<p>Corey notes low snow throughout the season and states that both the low snow and inconsistent amounts of snow affected budget with some areas dipping into emergency reserve and others underspending.</p> <p>Montse begins budget review, walking committee through overview of budget. Notes \$2,140,000 available funds. Explains budget layout to committee. While explaining the budget percentage, notes that largest percentage of budget is trail grooming (56%).</p> <p>Montse presents.</p>	Information Only

	<p>Priority 1. \$410,500 budget, \$351,138 spent. Notes leftover balance. States due primarily to staff vacancies which impacted indirect as well.</p> <p>Priority 2 Notes that budget was \$80k, spent \$39,025. Were careful with spending.</p> <p>Priority 3 <i>Trail Grooming State-Owned</i> \$169,909 budget; \$112,989 spent.</p> <p>John asks why only 2/3 of budget spent. Corey explains Mt Spokane had low snow, spent less. Cle Elum area grooming could not be done without certain amount of snow.</p> <p>Sam asks about equipment repair. Does this cover privately owned equipment or just state owned? Corey: Just state owned.</p> <p><i>Trail Grooming Privately Owned</i> \$1,606,528 budget, \$1,544,895 spent. Montse allows committee to look through this portion of budget.</p> <p><i>Snow Removal</i> \$299,955 budget, \$246,447 spent. Less snowfall meant less spending.</p> <p><i>Sanitation</i> \$66,481 budget, \$60,579 spent Some remaining in Chelan area. Some remaining in South Cascades. Some remaining in I-90.</p> <p><i>E&E</i> \$90,493 budget, \$73,883 spent.</p> <p><i>Emergency Reserve</i> \$50k budget, \$28,411 spent.</p> <p>Some areas went over contract amount in snow removal. Corey notes that a few of these sno-parks were in Naches RD. Naches RD contacted us early in season noting that could not provide snow removal. Had to reach out to private contractor which comes with rate increase. Notes error for Glacier/Canyon Creek. Randy reached out and staff verified how much was spent (used to calculate budget).</p> <p>Mt St Helens had snow in bunches. When it did, contractor received additional funds. Corey notes final time (\$1500) was approved by Bob Henrie for the School for the Blind event.</p> <p>Montse asks if there are any questions. No questions.</p> <p>Priority 4 Brings up table with equipment list. Notes no money was spent under equipment replacement.</p> <p>Norris asks if Groomer at Republic that was no longer being used is on the list. Corey states that it is the Ferry County BR 180. Norris asks if it was sent to Mt Spokane. Corey states that it had not been yet.</p>	
--	---	--

	Sam asks Owen if State Parks can request capital appropriation to get caught up on equipment replacement. Owen states he will look at this. Notes possible pushback due to statute requiring program to be self-supported.	
REVIEW OF 2024 WINTER MEETING MINUTES	<p>Bob asks the committee if they reviewed the Winter 2024 Meeting minutes.</p> <p>Norris motions to approve winter minutes as submitted.</p> <p>Justin seconds.</p> <p>Bob calls for vote.</p> <p>Tony states “I” in chat.</p> <p>Motion passes unanimously to approve Winter 2024 minutes.</p>	Motion passes unanimously to approve Winter 2024 minutes.
COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENTATIONS	<p>Bob passes mic to Justin to present maps sent to Winter Recreation.</p> <p>Justin Davis</p> <p>Justin walks committee through CalTopo interactive map system. System provides visual representation of where each park is. Sno-parks show non-motorized vs. motorized. Requests help from staff and committee in labelling all these accurately. Has elevation and position listed. Notes “S” sno-parks as “staging areas”. Believes graphical representation could be valuable to staff, committee, and users. John asks if url is available. Justin confirms that it is. It is currently in a Caltopo account but can be exported and shared to Parks to be hosted in any GIS application.</p> <p>Cindy asks if “S” sno-parks are recommended for service suspensions. Corey confirms this to be true. Notes recommended areas would not have services in upcoming season(s). Notes that this will be explored and discussed more in slide presentation tomorrow.</p> <p>Justin demonstrates filtering options for map markers/information. Justin again asks for help cleaning this up to be shared with State Parks.</p> <p>John asks if State Parks is thinking of using this on website or just in-house. Corey states that this is very new. Does not know if Parks website is able to host this. Must explore this further.</p> <p>Justin walks committee through ARCGIS interactive map. Notes registration data available by ZIP code. States that idea is to show where there is density of users-where registrations are, relative to sno-parks.</p> <p>Justin notes issues with this style of data (i.e. Seattle area codes smaller, so look lighter). States this is not perfect measure but hopes it drives toward type of data we need.</p> <p>Bob states that ARCGIS map is map he wants to see when digging into budget. Bob notes that this type of information has been used by SMAC and staff when coming up with cuts to budget moving forward. Warns that tomorrow will be tough day with real numbers.</p> <p>Cindy asks if State Parks could take map and break it down by county. Bob states that registration information by state is already broken down by county, so we have looked and can continue to look at that data.</p>	Information Only

	<p>Justin states that detailed information regarding number of trips to sno-parks, down trails cannot easily be obtained but can be inferred through means such as this to help provide ideas.</p> <p>Sam mentions cell phone data project. Parks, DNR, DFW in phase 2 of project that uses cell phone data to track park visitation. Huge missing component however is USFS. Notes that project costs \$40-\$50k one-time to implement. Could be a long-term consideration for committee.</p> <p>Bob notes WSPRC Snowmobile Survey. Notes that surveys are only useful as a guideline. Surveys are one of tools we will use moving forward. Hoping to receive even more survey responses.</p> <p>Justin comes back to data. Hopes that we crunch data multiple ways and all end up in same place to get feel for where users are and services need to be. Goal is to add to certainty.</p> <p>John O'Brien John O'Brien introduces E&E data slide. Notes % snowmobiles displaying registration during trail patrols based on agency reports. John suggests that there is discrepancy between what SMAC/Parks/etc sees vs what LEOs/agencies see. Suggests sitting down with agencies such as USFS to address disconnect. Suggests possible compliance-related subcommittee as possible path moving forward. Randy notes "on trail" citations as zeros across the board.</p> <p>Cindy asks if John knows whether "total number of personal contacts" is all snowmobiles. John states that that number may be non-motorized than motorized, but box checked at top of applications says "motorized" which is where he got this data.</p> <p>Justin mentions that he did individual study at "last resort" fewer than half of snowmobiles were registered.</p> <p>Bob notes compliance notices were attempted but did not help. Idea now is that tickets should hurt those who are non-compliant. Randy reminds committee that SMAC policy used to be "no mercy".</p> <p>John reiterates that discrepancies with LEO reports. Proposes further discussion with agencies.</p> <p>Tony Leonetti (in chat) recommends board add work times such as "weekend required" for E&E officers. Bob suggests compliance requirements in contracts to provide money.</p> <p>John touches on E&E report discrepancies again. Tim notes that only 136 tickets were written in total.</p> <p>Tony states that WDFW value includes various equipment, machinery, etc.</p> <p>Bob agrees that E&E conversations need to be had. Corey follows up by stating that contract language has been added in last winter season specifying weekend requirements and high-use day requirements. Corey states that staff will investigate how to tighten up language.</p>	
RECESS FOR EVENING	<p>Bob Henrie notes that tomorrow's meeting will be reined in to be effective, but public comment is allotted and welcomed.</p> <p>Bob motions to recess meeting for the evening.</p>	Motion Passes to recess meeting for the evening.

	Meeting recessed for evening.	
--	-------------------------------	--

Saturday, August 3, 2024		
CALL TO ORDER	Bob called the meeting back from recess.	Information Only
INTRODUCTIONS	Bob had everyone in the room introduce themselves. Introductions are made. Bob welcomes everyone to the meeting.	Information Only
TEAMS ETIQUETTE	Kari reviews Teams Etiquette for both the in-person and virtual audiences.	No Action
AGENDA REVIEW	Bob reviews the agenda with the committee. Bob notifies the audience that the committee has been meeting with State Parks throughout the year since the last Winter meeting and passes mic to Corey.	No Action
STAFF BUDGET REVIEW	Corey explains the prep work that has been done prior to WSPRC Slides and Budget presentation. Corey begins slide presentation. <i>Slide 3:</i> Briefs the audience on registration decreases and projected 25% decrease in funding. Explains that options are raising registration fees, reducing services, or combination of both. <i>Slide 4:</i> Last year's budget was \$2.8 million; this year's forecasted budget is \$2.1 million. \$707, 865 will need to be cut. How do we protect revenue? <i>Slide 5:</i> How did we get here? Corey explains that WSPRC met with SMAC several times, grooming councils, land managers, clubs, etc. Notes survey creation as well. <i>Slide 6:</i> Notes what we have heard from SMAC. Explains that temporary suspension of services at select sno-parks and reaching out to grooming councils are items that have been implemented. <i>Slide 7:</i> Corey introduces the 3 SMAC approved strategies. 1: Limit size and scope of program services while protecting revenue.	Information & Discussion Only

	<p>2: Reduce administrative costs for the 24-25 season. SMAC winter meeting will be virtual next season. Temporarily not filling open staff position. Reduction in supplies, training, marketing budgets, etc.</p> <p>3: Redirect \$75k in equipment replacement budget to maintain trail access</p> <p><i>Slide 8:</i> Introduces Savings per category for the approved strategies. Notes that the biggest proposed reduction is in trail grooming (~\$468k). Walks through proposed reductions in snow removal/sanitation, administration, and equipment replacement as well.</p> <p>Corey notes that there are limitations with suggestions provided but that staff did everything possible to make the budget work going forward.</p> <p><i>Slide 9:</i> Corey introduces list of proposed sno-parks to suspend services at. Explains that these were chosen after consulting multiple clubs/grooming councils/etc. Corey mentions that if someone wants to park at a sno-park they can if land managers allow, but there will be no services.</p> <p><i>Slide 10:</i> Corey briefs committee on survey citing 879 responses. Reminds everyone that survey is still open, and everyone is encouraged to take it.</p> <p><i>Slide 11:</i> Brings up list of most popular sno-parks and mentions that top 5 will be seen again as they were factored into budget reductions later on in presentation.</p> <p><i>Slide 12:</i> Corey explains trail grooming reduction model. Clarifying that reductions were based on % registration reductions from 23-24. Notes that considerations were made for the top 5 sno-parks to protect revenue, adjusted reductions down slightly as that is where visitation is highest.</p> <p><i>Slide 13:</i> Corey introduces the budget model preview. Explains that this budget proposal was created collaboratively. States that this is what Winter Rec feels as best way forward with the proposed budget</p>	
BUDGET MODEL OVERVIEW	<p>Montse begins budget model overview. Notes difference of ~\$707k (25%). Shows expenditures. Notes balance after expenditures. Shows that carries over to budget for next year.</p>	Information and Discussion Only

	<p>Notes staff recommendations, which reduce budget by \$709k in total. Explains that calculator is available on budget model to adjust in real time.</p> <p>Priority 1: States proposed \$60k reduction in salaries and benefits. Notes cuts in training, travel, etc. bringing total proposed Priority 1 reduction to \$84.8k.</p> <p>Priority 2: Spend total of \$39k out of \$80k budget last year. Proposing budget of \$60k.</p> <p>Priority 3:</p> <p>Trail Grooming</p> <p>Staff is proposing 30% reduction to state-owned trail grooming. For private trail grooming, reductions modified from 22-29% based on factors such as popularity, feedback, registrations, etc.</p> <p>Snow Removal</p> <p>Notes that lines with 100% reductions are areas where services are being suspended.</p> <p>Total reduction of \$32k recommended.</p> <p>Sanitation</p> <p>Notes that lines with 100% reductions are areas where services are being suspended.</p> <p>Recommending total reduction of \$9k.</p> <p>E&E</p> <p>Recommending no reduction.</p> <p>Emergency Reserve</p> <p>Recommending \$20k reduction, \$30k budget.</p> <hr/> <p>Corey acknowledges that most of the cuts are coming from trail grooming. Notes that TG is biggest part of budget (62% of budget). Corey notes that private trail grooming cuts were based initially in percent reductions of snowmobile registration. Corey notes areas with lower percentages than percentages decided for area are areas with higher visitation. Citing Crystal Springs, Canyon Creek, etc.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Corey reminds committee that these decisions have been worked up to over months, no easy decisions were made. Notes only 18k registrations with an almost 4k reduction from last year. There is no option but to make difficult decisions. Notes these decisions are to get us through NEXT season. But if things do not change with the state of registrations, we will have to continue this process.</p> <p>Corey implores the committee to start looking ahead. Where is this program going to go? Wants everyone to be prepared for the possibility of looking at a 1.8 mil type of budget if registrations do not increase. Wants everyone to be prepared.</p> <p>Summarizes staff recommendation going forward. Snow removal and sanitation from recommended select service suspension areas. For E&E, there was recommendation to keep at what it was at last year. Knows there will be some discussion of contract language with E&E, how can we make this better? Admits E&E is double edged sword.</p> <hr/> <p>Norris asks if we are ready for questions. Bob calls for board discussion. Norris states that with private contractors, 30% cut may lead to them not fulfilling contract. Are we legally allowed to make this type of cut?</p> <p>Corey: Contracts state that amounts are dictated by budget availability.</p> <p>Norris: Are contractors legally obligated to take what we give them, or can they bail on contract?</p> <p>Corey states that if contractor cannot provide services at that amount, he can let Parks know and Parks can take contract and put it out to bid. Corey hopes this does not happen but has considered this as a possibility.</p> <p>Norris. Vacant WSPRC role. Will that stay vacant in budget?</p> <p>Corey: Yes. That will stay</p> <p>Montse notes that budgets were balanced more evenly across so even once position is filled, we will still see reduction from where it was previously as WRAC has taken on more of that cost.</p> <p>Norris: Are we going to fill that position in FY25?</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Corey: Yes, but after season.</p> <p>Norris: That's in budget?</p> <p>Corey: Yes.</p> <p>Corey notes that admin has been and will be put under strain due to not filling position.</p> <p>Norris: What is the split between NM & Moto as far as staff is concerned.</p> <p>Corey: It has been moved to 50/50 from original 63/47 split.</p> <p>Montse: This was just for purposes for sustainability, with legislative fixes, hopefully this will be better addressed moving forward.</p> <p>Owen notes that there will be a loss in terms of program operation with reduced staff.</p> <p>Bob calls for other questions from committee.</p> <p>John O'Brien: Is there any strategy is we burn through emergency reserve quickly?</p> <p>Corey: When we recommended move from \$50k to \$30k, we took on a risk. There may be opportunity to move things in budget around a little. But toward the back end of the season once main budget is spent, we may have to cut off services toward end of season once all is spent. Notes that this is a risk, especially if we will have a good snow year. We may run out of the emergency reserve.</p> <p>John: Do we have all equipment repair bills? Are we confident that what was spent is accurate?</p> <p>Corey: Yes.</p> <p>Montse: We did reach out to vendors to make sure we had all bills. Notes that some contractors to donate time and services.</p> <p>Corey: This happens every year, but yes some did donate time. Equipment repair reduction is also a risk, but prudent thing to do with all other budget reductions occurring.</p> <p>Justin: Wanted to contrast this budget process to last year's. Last year first time committee saw budget was day of meeting. This year has been much better and thanks staff for work put into this budget. Feels this is improvement in process. Lack of</p>	
--	---	--

	SMAC comment this morning does not reflect lack of thought, as work has been going in over last few months.	
BREAK	Committee takes 10-minute break. Bob encourages everyone who would like to speak, to sign up for public comment at the back of the room.	No Action
PUBLIC COMMENT	<p>Meeting resumes.</p> <p>Bob opens for public comment.</p> <p>Question: \$60k for staff reduction, shouldn't benefits bump this up?</p> <p>Corey: That \$60k is for not having the position filled (calculated based off OFM salary projection, etc.). Corey notes shift to 50/50 split.</p> <p>Comment: \$60k is calculated after the 50/50 split.</p> <p>Montse notes that OFM projections are at highest wage and include overtime buffer.</p> <p>Question: Gold Creek will no longer be available for the next two seasons. Was this automatically reduced?</p> <p>Corey: Gold Creek should be open until the end of our season next year, will be closed following that.</p> <hr/> <p>Comment: Bethel Ridge/Soup Creek: That did not come up in grooming council. That would shut off entire system.</p> <p>Question: We're saying that budget is down roughly \$710k. Snowmobile registrations are down 4k don't match.</p> <p>Montse: We have carryover balance.</p> <p>Bob: Budget is comprised of carryover from previous year and grant money received. Not sure what we started with last year.</p> <p>Montse: Other part of this is RTP Grants.</p> <p>Bob: RTP Grants were missed. No blame, but that will not happen again. That grant funding likely in future.</p> <p>Justin: Grant we are applying for this year will not be available until the FY26 budget.</p> <hr/>	No Action

	<p>Comment: Every year we talk about enforcement. Quit writing “fix it” tickets, that only tells people to ride until they get caught and they may never get caught. No incentive for people to register sleds without pain.</p> <p>Bob: You’re echoing sentiment of committee. Used to believe fix-it tickets work but figured out that is not the case.</p> <hr/> <p>Comment: Nowhere in survey was it explained what numbers would be next year. Need question about would you be satisfied given massive reduction? State Parks and WSSA should be getting information out to users, groomers should not have to do this.</p> <hr/> <p>Question: Operating procedures signed 10 years ago, last-in, first-out model is to be used. Do we go by this anymore?</p> <p>Question: Why are groomers taking brunt of this?</p> <p>Comment: Invoices being processed to late after being received.</p> <hr/> <p>Question: Is 11% reduction in sno-park an across the board for state and private contractors?</p> <p>Montse: Not an across the board cut, just the total from suspension suggestions.</p> <p>Bob: We’ve heard that most areas don’t want across the board cuts, which is why we structured the proposal the way we did.</p> <p>Bob (addressing comments from section above) notes that 60-90 days for payment is not right, will be addressed, but blame is not on Winter Rec. We have talked about last-in, last out solution, may come up again later.</p> <p>Bob notes that we have varied opinions on many topics, trying to make this work around all of them.</p>	
BUDGET DISCUSSION & DECISIONS	<p>Bob begins budget discussion and decision.</p> <p>PRIORITY 1.</p>	Information & Discussion

	<p>Calls for questions about Priority 1 budget as presented by Winter Rec budget.</p> <p>Justin: Change from last year's procedure, previously no cuts?</p> <p>Bob: Yes, they have cut travel before to help with budget, but this is first major cut in years.</p> <p>Cindy: We need to do in terms of outreach (social media, etc.). Does Winter Rec have Outreach capacity with limited staff? Should SMAC take this on?</p> <p>Corey: Staff does not have social media access but can submit to WSPRC staff for these.</p> <p>John O'Brien: If I suggest all motorized sno-park have signs stating that there must be registrations to access trails, do we have the budget for that?</p> <p>Corey: I don't think our sign budget would cover these. This item is more to cover stock for what we put out every year.</p> <p>John: P5/6 request on NM for signs like this. Thinks signs like that are necessary.</p> <p>Corey: We could implement phased approach for signage under current budget.</p> <p>Bob: Any issues with proposed Priority 1 budget from this committee?</p> <p>No issues.</p> <p>Bob notes general committee approval for Priority 1.</p> <hr/> <p>PRIORITY 3:</p> <p>Emergency Reserve / E&E/ Equipment Repair</p> <p>Opens for discussion about cuts.</p> <p>John O'Brien: Feels uneasy with \$20k Emergency Reserve. What would happen if we took \$20k out of E&E and put into Emergency Reserve? Just a thought, not a recommendation.</p> <p>Montse: If we did no emergency reserve reduction, E&E would have a \$20k reduction under this model.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Sam: Do we know average expenditure for emergency reserve over last several years?</p> <p>Corey: Depends on year. Some years there is more, some less. Notes that \$20k emergency reserve cut is risk. If we get snow dump, the remaining \$30k will not last. Corey open to this discussion.</p> <p>Sam: Is there precedent for program being able to negotiate temporary reduction of indirect rate? Owen: No precedent. This program is admin burden and needs to have that connection to IT, Payables, etc. that comes from indirect.</p> <p>Sam and Owen agree to further discuss this later.</p> <p>Justin: Question to Winter Rec. How would E&E reduction be perceived by our LEO partners? Would this lead to even less attention from them?</p> <p>Corey: I think they would view it from both sides. Different reactions from different RDs. If we reduce it, could take away time from those who are actually out there, doing the ticket writing. Removing funds from them, they will be out there even less with fewer interactions. Staffing issues with RDS, WDFW, WSPRC. Not a justification, but reality. Some can and can't write tickets, etc.</p> <p>Rob notes possible need for subcommittee to work with LEOs.</p> <p>Committee begins proposing various adjustments to percent &/or dollar amount reductions in both E&E.</p> <p>Montse makes adjustments and SMAC comes to possible 30% cut to equipment repair, 8% reduction to E&E, 24% Emergency Reserve.</p> <p>Sam: What was main driver for E&E being underspent by 18%? Corey: Main driver was staffing.</p> <p>Justin: Feels like we are close with current model. Can we move on?</p> <p>Bob: Is committee comfortable with current E&E, Emergency Reserve, and Equipment Repair?</p> <p>Norris: Wants to see full \$16k that was unspent in E&E.</p> <p>E&E budget reduced by 17% which would decrease E&E by \$15k.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Equipment Repair reduced by 30%</p> <p>Emergency reserve reduced by 24%,</p> <p>Bob confirms that committee is comfortable with adjusted cuts.</p> <p>No dissent. Committee moves on.</p> <hr/> <p>PRIORITY 3:</p> <p>Trail Grooming- State</p> <p>Bob asks about 31% cut for state grooming. Montse makes change.</p> <p>Sam: Are there monthly costs with state equipment? Could program take hit because of this?</p> <p>Corey: Only costs typically incurred from state is during season. Maintenance comes out of equipment repair.</p> <p>Norris: Who does grooming at Crystal Springs?</p> <p>Corey: Lake Easton on state side (small portion) but most snowmobile grooming is private- Nick/Landtek.</p> <p>Norris suggests adjusting state trail grooming to a 32% reduction. Montse makes the adjustment.</p> <p>Committee asks Montse to also adjust Equipment repair to a 32% reduction. Adjustment is made.</p> <p>Bob verifies that committee is comfortable with a 32% reduction to Trail Grooming- State budget.</p> <p>No dissent. Committee moves on.</p> <hr/> <p>PRIORITY 3:</p> <p>Snow Removal</p> <p>Bob does straw poll to leave snow removal at proposed amount (11% reduction).</p> <p>Committee unanimously agrees.</p> <hr/> <p>PRIORITY 3:</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Trail Grooming- Private</p> <p>Bob: We need to figure out how to put funds back into private trail grooming. Start with highest percentages?</p> <p>After committee discussion, Montse applies reductions by line, changes overall percentage of reduction to 24.98% for Trail Grooming- Private (though per line/area reductions vary), leaves budget with \$1,884.</p> <p>Justin: Asks to do audit to make sure no line items were missed.</p> <p>PRIORITY 3:</p> <p>Sanitation</p> <p>Begins to look at sanitation. Corey confirms for committee that reductions are based on sno-park closures.</p> <p>John: Weren't there sanitation cost increases?</p> <p>Corey: Some last year. Went \$600 into emergency reserve. Could happen this year. Last year we pulled portable toilets early last year, could do again. Could also reduce areas with multiple toilets.</p> <p>Some discussion of individual lines follows.</p> <p>Sanitation percent reduction set at 14%.</p> <p>Justin suggests allowing staff short amount of time to confirm adjustments and double check changes.</p> <p>Bob asks if committee is comfortable with where we are at in budget.</p> <p>No dissent.</p>	
BREAK	Committee breaks for 15 minutes to allow staff to review adjustments.	No Action
BUDGET APPROVAL	<p>Meeting reconvenes.</p> <p>Bob confirms that Montse was able to verify the math on adjustments.</p> <p>Bob summarized reductions</p>	

	<p>Bob motions to approve the trail grooming (state & privately owned) budgets at 32% decrease for state and average 24.98% decrease for private trail grooming.</p> <p>Justin seconds motion.</p> <p>Motion passes unanimously.</p> <hr/> <p>Snow removal remained same as proposed (11% reduction)</p> <p>Bob calls for motion to approve snow removal budget as proposed.</p> <p>Cindy moves.</p> <p>Justin seconds.</p> <p>Vote is called.</p> <p>Motion passes unanimously.</p> <hr/> <p>Norris motions to approve sanitation budget upon review of South Cascades sanitation budget with any potential savings being put in private grooming.</p> <p>Corey confirms total amount is correct on budget, but per area amounts need to be updated. Total amount for South Cascades USFS is accurate.</p> <p>Justin states concern with wording of motion. If South Cascades amount is correct, then what?</p> <p>Bob states Norris' motion is to take sanitation budget as presented and if there are no savings, then it stays as is, if there is an issue, remaining funds will be placed into Trail Grooming- Private.</p> <p>Bob calls for vote on Norris' motion.</p> <p>Vote passes 7-1.</p> <p>Motion passes.</p> <hr/>	<p>Motion passes unanimously to approve trail grooming budgets with reductions at 32% (state) & 24.98% average (private).</p> <hr/> <p>Motion passes unanimously to approve snow removal budget with 11% reduction.</p> <hr/> <p>Motion passes 7-1 to approve sanitation budget at 14% reduction, with agreement that any savings found upon further review be allocated into Trail Grooming- Private.</p> <hr/>
--	---	---

	<p>Bob motions to approve E&E as what was spent per area last year.</p> <p>Cindy moves.</p> <p>Motion seconded.</p> <p>Bob calls for vote.</p> <p>Motion passes unanimously.</p> <hr/> <p>Bob motions to approve for emergency reserve (24% reduction).</p> <p>Tom moves.</p> <p>Justin seconds.</p> <p>Bob calls for vote.</p> <p>Motion passes unanimously.</p> <hr/> <p>Norris moves that we approve the overall budget and few dollar difference gets put excess and put into private grooming.</p> <p>Tom seconds.</p> <p>Cindy asks for explanation on the excess amount.</p> <p>Montse explains.</p> <p>John asks if the excess amount is effective going into trail grooming. Could we put it into the emergency reserve?</p> <p>Bob agrees that this would not even change the trail grooming budget by 1%.</p> <p>Montse suggests leaving balance and allowing later discretion for its allocation.</p> <p>Discussion follows regarding how to do that procedurally.</p> <p>Bob calls for vote on motion.</p>	<p>Motion passes unanimously to approve E&E budget at the amounts spent per area last season.</p> <hr/> <p>Motion passes unanimously to approve Emergency Reserve budget at a 24% reduction.</p> <hr/> <p>Motion fails 2-5 to approve budget with excess funds being distributed to Trail Grooming- Private.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Motion to approve budget with excess funds being distributed to Trail Grooming- Private fails 2-5.</p> <hr/> <p>John motions to approve the budget with any remaining be put into emergency reserve.</p> <p>Kurt seconds.</p> <p>Motion passes 7-1.</p> <hr/> <p>Budget approved.</p>	<hr/> <p>Motion passes 7-1 to approve budget with excess funds being distributed to Emergency Reserve.</p> <hr/> <p>Budget is approved.</p>
LEGISLATIVE STRATEGIES	<p>Owen thanks the SMAC for their hard work and expertise.</p> <p>Owen introduces himself and notes that last fee increase was in 2016.</p> <p>Owen notes decreasing registrations and reminds everyone that gas tax comes from these registrations as well, so the amount from decreasing registrations is more than just</p> <p>Owen notes that snowmobiling has a barrier to entry, climate change factors in as well.</p> <p>Owen shows expenses vs revenue model and walks committee and audience through this.</p> <p>Owen shows fund balance graph. Fund balances are important as ending fund balances dictate what we believe we can spend moving forward. Notes increases around 2017 and in 2021.</p> <p>Owen shows slide with budget adjusted for inflation. Notes 1-million-dollar gap per year under this model.</p> <p>Owen shows survey data slide and notes that over $\frac{3}{4}$ of survey respondents were open to fee increase.</p> <p>Owen goes through \$100 increase slide. Notes that Dean Meakin from WSSA called out fee increase as too high. Owen agrees that doubling a fee is not common and would hurt.</p> <p>Owen shows cost-comparison slide, noting differences with Alpine Skiing, Ice Skating, Baseball Tickets, Movies, Non-Motorized Permits. Notes that these are just some recreational activities which can put into context how far \$50 registrations go.</p>	Information Only

	<p>Owen introduces Legislative Recommendations. Notes session starts in January and there will be a new governor and a chaotic session. Notes fewer than 10% of the 3k bills last year passed. Explains that legislation options are broken down into likelihood/difficulty.</p> <p><i>Easiest options:</i></p> <p>Easiest option is increasing fee from \$50 to \$100. Suggests mirroring WRAC and letting WSPRC set the fees to make the adjustments more nimble/moveable. Suggests reinvesting account revenue into Winter Rec accounts. Thanks Cindy for her letter of support on our attempt at this last season. These accounts in the state treasury are charged interest which goes into the general fund. None of that goes to this program. Notes that \$25-30k would likely be return from this.</p> <p><i>Possible options that could come forward if requirements are met later:</i></p> <p>Owen notes that a special grooming permit as designated sno-parks would take too much time and data gathering to introduce this session.</p> <p>Notes Norris has been hammering on non-resident registration fee idea with an estimate of roughly 1k out of staters.</p> <p>Owen discusses idea of decoupling the sno-park permit from the registration fee. Owen states that he is open to this but would need to work with DOL counterpart. Likes that this would help from an enforcement standpoint as stickers on back of vehicles is easiest to enforce.</p> <p><i>Ideas that are least likely/will not bring forward:</i></p> <p>Explains gas tax distribution is a non-starter as it would cause “civil war” between all gas tax recipients. State also looking at moving away from gas tax to road use tax.</p> <p>Notes the idea of implementing a multi-year registration.</p> <p>Owen concludes presentation.</p> <p>Owen answers questions and some discussion of legislative options follows.</p>	
PUBLIC COMMENT	<p>Bob opens floor for public comment.</p> <p>Comment: 30% of survey respondents is closer to 5% of snowmobile public. Need to be humble about statistics.</p>	No Action

	<hr/> <p>Question: Who appoints Parks Commission members?</p> <p>Owen: Governor appoints them, and they serve as volunteers like SMAC.</p> <p>Comment: Constituents can speak to their legislators but cannot speak to Parks commission. Taking away from users by moving to Parks commission.</p> <p>Owen: Opposing perspective. From experience in legislature, hard to get audience around specific issues, not with Commission.</p> <p>Comment: Never received email from Parks Commission.</p> <hr/> <p>Question: What has been ROI on E&E money and what we've put forward? Knows how billable hours work, etc. Are we establishing guidelines on compliance?</p> <p>Corey: We allow discretion for what they do. Have focused more on education in past. Notes that we put in contract need for focus on weekends and busy days. Notes we are trying to shift language from education to compliance via citations.</p> <p>Comment: yes, these parameters can be set. This may help generate compliance and revenue.</p> <hr/> <p>Comment (Matt): As someone with 4 snowmobiles, I am hit harder. There are families out there with multiple snowmobiles.</p> <p>Comment: Should tackle out of state registrations simultaneously with other options. Should be easy.</p> <p>Comment (regarding possibility of WSPRC setting fees): I prefer the legislative option as WSPRC doesn't answer to anybody.</p> <p>Comment: Want to get program back but putting it on backs of families is not way to do it.</p> <hr/>	
--	---	--

	<p>Bob acknowledges that groomers don't make money on this. No way to address this without increasing registrations. Everything else on the planet has gone up in last for years, but this hasn't. States that it is a fact of life that costs are going up.</p> <p>Bob states that the committee hears all these problems. Hopes for better communication between SMAC and WSSA to make better decisions.</p>	
FINAL COMMENTS/ DISCUSSIONS	<p>Norris states that users are the ones who need to solve the problems and make this work. Users must be motivated to solve the problems. Whatever our opinions are of WSSA, it is most united user group in state. As we try to solve these issues, need to make sure that there is an agreement between WSPRC, SMAC, and WSSA to make things move. WSSA is a valid resource/power to have symbiotic relationship with. Need to agree on registration increase together and move forward.</p> <p>All users need to participate to move things through legislature. To generate tighter connection, suggests instituting working group between SMAC and WSSA. Suggests possibly adding WSSA seat to SMAC. Each party can decide how many members but need to move forward together.</p> <p>Norris concludes.</p> <p>Bob asks if we should take care of this today.</p> <p>Norris suggests motion to put together a working group with two SMAC members and two WSSA members to help Owen with legislative push to come up with increase amounts.</p> <p>Discussion of whether WSSA is allowed to do this. Idea is that they are allowed to do this. WSSA also looking into same idea.</p> <p>Randy asks why we need a subcommittee. States that it will drag this out too long. Norris states that this will help with what needs to be done.</p> <p>Justin motions to create working group between SMAC and snowmobile user community.</p> <p>Norris seconds the motion.</p> <p>Justin explains that WSSA does have waning membership but wants to leave this open-ended due to declining WSSA memberships.</p> <p>Sam: For every hour that we are working on increasing fees, we should be spending an equal amount of time on education</p>	

	<p>piece and registration piece. Solving both ends of the problem by catching up with inflation and tackles compliance.</p> <p>John O'Brien: Doesn't like idea of calling it a user-group. Too vague and broad. Needs more structure for how to involve community.</p> <p>Justin: Intentionally left vague.</p> <p>John: Who decides who is in working group and when is it decided? Need structure for this.</p> <p>Justin: Open to discretion of SMAC or WSPRC for how working group comes together.</p> <p>Corey asks for clarification. Do you suggest having WSPRC put this together?</p> <p>Justin: Just in terms of agenda, how to collaborate.</p> <p>Corey: Support idea of joint working group. Who chooses who is in group? Staff does not have capacity.</p> <p>Norris asks to modify motion for chairman of SMAC to appoint 2 members of SMAC to working group and WSSA appoints 2 members to the working group.</p> <p>Cindy seconds.</p> <p>Vote is called</p> <p>Motion for modification passes 4-2.</p> <p>Amended motion vote is called.</p> <p>Motion passes 4-2.</p> <p>Bob asks if SMAC wants to appoint a WSSA member to committee.</p> <p>Owen: We need to be careful about that.</p> <p>Corey: WAC/RCWs direct SMAC makeup, so WSPRC will investigate this more and get back to committee on that decision.</p> <hr/> <p>Bob asks SMAC to provide direction for legislative decisions. Owen wants vote on general direction for legislative action.</p>	<p>Motion for chairman of SMAC to appoint 2 members of SMAC to working group and WSSA appoints 2 members to a working group passes 4-2.</p> <hr/>
--	---	--

	<p>Tom motions to approve all green legislative options (increase snowmobile registration fees, Allow Parks Commission to set registration fees, reinvest interest revenue) and the blue legislative options (“decouple sno-park permit from registration fee”).</p> <p>Kurt seconds.</p> <p>Justin: Everything in green and blue, he would like to see done. Wants to know what is helpful.</p> <p>Owen: can do work on this with just general direction.</p> <p>Norris: Non-resident snowmobile tag is low-hanging fruit and we should work on that.</p> <p>Bob establishes that Owen has what he needs to proceed.</p> <p>Vote is called.</p> <p>Motion passes 7-1.</p>	<p>Motion to approve all “green” legislative options (increase snowmobile registration fees, allow Parks Commission to set registration fees, reinvest interest revenue) and the “blue” legislative options (decouple sno-park permit from registration fee) passes 7-1.</p>
MEETING ADJOURNED	<p>Bob motions to adjourn the Summer Budget Meeting.</p> <p>Motion is seconded.</p> <p>Vote is called.</p> <p>Motion passes unanimously.</p>	Meeting Adjourns
	Meeting adjourns.	