Janice K. Brewer
Governor

Bill Feldmeier
Interim Executive Director

Board Members

Walter D. Armer, Jr., Vail, *Chair*
Maria Baier, State Land Commissioner, *Vice Chair*
Alan Everett, Sedona
Larry Landry, Phoenix
William C. Scalzo, Phoenix
Tracey Westerhausen, Phoenix
Reese Woodling, Tucson

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

of

THE OFF-HIGHWAY VEHICLE ADVISORY GROUP

(OHVAG)

of

THE ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD

Notice is hereby given pursuant to A.R.S. §41-511.22 to members of the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group (OHVAG) and the general public that the Group will hold a meeting open to the public on **September 16, 2011, at the Arizona State Board Room, 1300 W. Washington St., Phoenix, AZ at 1:00 p.m.,** pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-511.22. **Attendance via teleconference is available by dialing 1.877.820.7831 and entering the code number** *1731258*. The Group may go into Executive Session for the purpose of obtaining legal advice from the State Parks Assistant Attorney General on any of the agenda items pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431 et seq. Items on the Agenda may be discussed out of order, unless they have been assigned a time certain. Public comment will be taken. The Group will discuss and may take action on the following matters:

(The Chair reserves the right to set the order of the agenda.)

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL @ 1:06 pm

CHAIR SAVINO: I call this meeting to order. This is the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group for State Parks. The meeting is on September 16, 2011, at 1:06 p.m. Let's go through – I want an introduction of members.

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

CHAIR SAVINO: I'll start with myself: John Savino, Chairman, representing Members-at-Large.

MR. FRENCH: Don French from Kingman, Arizona, representing WMOTA.

MR. NASH: Bill Nash, representing Apache County.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas, you there?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes, I am. This is Thomas McArthur, representing Coconino Trail Riders of Arizona Motorcycle Riders Association. (Via phone)

CHAIR SAVINO: Mr. Baldwin, we do have a quorum and we are expecting to have Hank Rogers. He's in another meeting up north and he'll be calling in in a little bit; so we expect to have him. At this time I would also like to have staff – State Park staff introduce themselves.

MR. BALDWIN: Robert Baldwin, Recreational Trails Grants Coordinator.

MS. PULSIFER: Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Resources and Public Programs.

AAG HERNBRODE: Joy Hernbrode, Attorney General's Office.

MR. ZIEMANN: Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great! I'm going to read -- the "OHVAG Chair or designee will read the Mission Statement:"

The Statewide OHV Program Mission is to develop and enhance statewide off-highway vehicle recreation opportunities, and develop educational programs that promote resource protection, social responsibility, and interagency cooperation.

Okay, at this time I want to move on. The chairman has the prerogative to change things up. I'd like to ask Mr. Ziemann to give his presentation, please.

MR. ZIEMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I will be very brief. I thought it might help again to remind the group and kind of set the stage for the meeting today. There have been a few new things that have come up and I want to share those as we look forward in the next couple months as to the work we're going to be presenting or going to be having you look at.

First of all, today – today is one of the good days. You get to make some decisions and get some projects out of here. We'll get some money on the ground, we'll get some trails developed – those are all good. Doris is going to go through a staff kind of a matrix, a scoring system that staff has developed. Ultimately that's a tool for you. You guys decide whether it works, whether it doesn't. The idea – I think what staff has discussed is, it would be best if I saw a big "A" on one thing here.

I think what would work best is to have the members of the group continue to score the grants as you always have and then when projects come up have staff run them through this matrix and where you agree – then when you meet and where you agree, fantastic! Where you disagree – whether the group thinks a project is an "A" project and staff has more concerns; or the other way around: staff thinks it's great and the group – those are the projects that you want to pay close attention to. As Joy mentioned last time in her little talk, you know, that's where you want to state the reasons for the decisions you're going to take.

So it's really more of a tool just to alert where there might be issues, where there are discrepancies, where there are differences of opinion. But that's what we hope to accomplish today.

You're going to meet again in October. As we discussed, that will be a meeting where we spend an extensive amount of time talking about the Ambassador Program, going through all of that from its inception, expenditures – all the way through; talking about the merits and demerits, potentially, of the Ambassador Program. Then there's one other thing that the Parks' Board has just brought up in the last couple meetings that they're had. In June, the Parks' Board asked that all of its advisors – that staff go back and review all of the advisory groups that

report to the Parks' Board. What is their mission? Why they were established, what their purpose was? Whether they're established in statute or not? Basically, what each advisory group does? Believe it or not, there are ten such – you are one of ten advisory groups to the Parks' Board.

At the same time, the Governor's Office – if you're not aware – established about a year ago a Commission on Privatization and Efficiency – is that right? COPE is the acronym. That group just came out with their final recommendation. Within that recommendation they came up with a little schematic from Virginia, a little – it's about eight questions where you answer: yes or no – that talks about simplification and elimination/consolidation of boards, commissions and advisory groups.

So being the Governor's Office adopted this little model, the Board is going through this in October for themselves. They're going to run through these eight committees. And the Board asked us, staff, to meet with all of the advisory committees and go through this exercise, too. So the questions just – we will be forwarding all of this to you and at your October meeting, we'll have you go through and answer these questions. Then we will report back to the Board with all the other advisory committees in November. That's the process. You will be getting this probably early next week.

Some of the questions: Why was the Board or Commission established? You were established originally in statute, now through Board policy to advise them on off-highway vehicle issues; and does the purpose still exist? The purpose clearly still exists. It's those kinds of questions. So that's just an additional bit of work that you'll be asked to do in October.

The board meeting will then be in November. Typically we have solicited for new members. Then remember, John, you had your 15 minutes to come and talk to the Board. That was always in November for the past couple of years. That's going to be put off. The new members and the advisory committee's having that discussion with the Parks' Board will be put off until probably January so they can go through this exercise with all the Board members.

So that's what I know right now is on the horizon – the kind of work for OHVAG in the next few months. I will be in and out of here today. Do good work. Good projects to be developed. I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIR SAVINO: This is John Savino. What is your feeling about how the Board feels about the advisory committees?

MR. ZIEMANN: Well I think, to some degree, they're worried about resources – staff resources and monetary resources, whether all these ten committees need to continue to exist. The thing that has most radically changed for the Parks' Board is the elimination of the Heritage Fund. A lot of these committees were making recommendations on Heritage Fund Grant expenditures. The Heritage Fund no longer exists so the question logically is: Do all these groups need to continue to function or can they be melded? There are four or five of them that are actually historic preservation or archeology-based things and can they be melded

somehow? So that was really the gist of the thing. But again, you will be getting all this information early next week as we start to prepare this. All right?

CHAIR SAVINO: Any other questions from our panel? Thomas, do you have anything?

[No verbal response.]

MR. ZIEMANN: Okay, thanks.

CHAIR SAVINO: Anybody else?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, thank you, Jay.

MR. ZIEMANN: Thank you, appreciate it. Sorry about the temperature in here, but I'm glad you're here.

CHAIR SAVINO: You told us at the last meeting that you were looking forward to not showing up and we didn't ask you to show up and you show up. Okay.

I'm going to continue on with "Reports" – staff reports?

D. REPORTS

1. Staff Reports (Discussed out of order.)

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group. Yesterday the Governing Council for the Off-Highway Vehicle Ambassador Program met for the first time. That council was identified in the MOU that was routed to you several months ago that has been signed by all the agency partners. So they finally got together yesterday primarily to approve some bylaws for their own group. We also did kind of a history of the whole program and we did provide some information. Mr. Savino is your representative on that council and he was in attendance. Also, Mr. French attended. They can help give some insight if you have questions about what their impression was.

However, I've provided you there with documents we handed out in that process. Mr. Savino has asked for an accounting of the expenditures for the Ambassador Program since the beginning. That's all included there. The final version of the bylaws is a copy for you to keep. Also, we gave you a copy of all the – a summary of the accomplishments of the program since they started recording those back in September 2007. So that's the information that was handed out to you.

I think the meeting was very successful. It was a good opportunity for all the participants to get together, to discuss and get an idea of where that group came from and get an idea of where it needs to go in the future. Any questions on that?

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to make a statement, if I can? It applies to this, in particular, because you opened it up.

This meeting yesterday, it was a productive meeting; and what we did – I'm glad Bob was able to get this itemized list out. It did raise some questions. We brought these questions up. I feel the State Parks has the same questions: Where some of this equipment is right now? BLM had promised us that they're doing an audit to find out where some of this equipment is. There's some large equipment.

One of the concerns that I had that I expressed was, this is for an Ambassador Program and if some of the equipment was taken over to the law enforcement side without the knowledge of State Parks, then that has to be brought up. So I am – I feel confident that State Parks is on top of this in keeping on top of BLM to make sure they do account for this stuff; and I appreciate that. Okay?

Is that all on the staff reports?

MR. BALDWIN: Yes sir, that's it.

CHAIR SAVINO: **OHV Program Partner Reports –** may be attached or presented verbally or the information may be provided at the meeting and will address the following subjects.

MR. FRENCH: I've got a question about reports for Joy here.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. FRENCH: I'm just wondering what it was Jay just presented to us. I didn't see it on the agenda.

MR. ZIEMANN: [Inaudible.]

MR. FRENCH: But it's still not on the agenda. I'm just wondering, does it fall under "Staff Reports?"

AAG HERNBRODE: No. Normally there is a place on the agenda for items for the next meeting which I assumed was on this agenda; and then when I looked, I saw that it wasn't. It is okay to do it under a "Call to the Public," at this time because you didn't ask him any – there wasn't any discussion as a result of it; but we'll be more careful about that in the future.

MR. FRENCH: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Let me ask this to the general public? Jay, you don't want to speak anymore, do you?

MR. ZIEMANN: Not unless I have to.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Tom, the process? Is this in regards to one of the grants?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Eric and Tammie, in regards to the grant; Jimmie in regards to the grant; Kelli in regards to the grant and Jeffrey in regards to the grant. So

there's nobody out there in the audience that has something other than for the grants?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Then I'm going to move on, because I'm going to take care of the grant issues in a bit.

E. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes from the August 19, 2011, OHVAG meeting. (tabled)

CHAIR SAVINO: At this time I'd like approval of the minutes from the August 19, 2011 OHVAG meeting is to follow. We don't have those yet so we cannot approve them. We're going to table them until our meeting in October. So, at our October meeting there will be these minutes for approval and the minutes from August.

2. Staff will present and OHVAG will discuss a DRAFT OHV Project Evaluation Form. – At the request of one of the OHVAG members, staff has developed a project evaluation form that provides a quantitative analysis of projects based on the priorities for project selection identified in the off-highway vehicle statute A.R.S. §28-1176(E-H) and the State Trails Plan. OHVAG may suggest additions, deletions and/or changes to the form and will determine how and if it will be used in the project selection process. The discussion may include recommendations on project application requirements and considerations for funding future projects, such as a maximum project award and proof of user community support.

CHAIR SAVINO: Before I get to the grants, I want to talk about this evaluation form, because it kind of goes hand-in-hand. So, let's get into that. Do we all have our folder with this? I'd like to have Doris take over at this time.

MR. BALDWIN: Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay, we're discussing that great big chart you got in your packet?

MR. McARTHUR: Yeah, I got it here.

MR. BALDWIN: Hopefully we'll try to explain things so you can follow along.

MR. McARTHUR: Okay, which of the three pages are you going to be on?

MR. BALDWIN: Well, you're going to need to spread the whole thing out.

MS. PULSIFER: You all have your great big sheet there. The version that's up here – as a result of yesterday's meeting, I tweaked it a little bit; because I know that you were asking about – someone was asking about what the total was of all the grants and those type things, so I'll get to that in a little bit. With that in mind I've added an extra row; but I'll get to all that.

In your packets you received this humongous spreadsheet, because when I presented this, as you can see, it was too large. It's so massive that it's not all

going to fit. So I'm going to go through one section at a time on this presentation. You can follow along on the big sheet.

The purpose of this was in response to a request that someone from this group was asking about the way the process – if we could come up with a way to quantify and analyze all the projects that come in. This is in response to that request.

MR. FRENCH: Could I ask real quick who asked for this? I've never heard a name.

MS. PULSIFER: I don't recall.

MR. BALDWIN: It was David.

MS. PULSIFER: Was it David?

MR. FRENCH: Thank you.

MS. PULSIFER: So the purpose of this also is to hopefully bring everybody – put everybody on the same page. What this is not intended to be is a staff recommendation. None of what you see on the scoring on the worksheet is a staff recommendation. It's not intended to be OHVAG versus staff; or staff versus OHVAG. The whole idea is to – it's a tool to help us bring everybody on the same page, an analytical tool.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm glad you mentioned that because we were – we did get comments and I have some myself on this. How come it's already pre-rated?

MS. PULSIFER: And I'm going to get to that. I'm going to get to that.

It's intended to – for this process to make it more effective and more efficient. It helps save some time. But as Jay mentioned earlier, OHVAG still needs to review the applications and independently rate them. The whole idea behind this is, as the applications come in, staff will go ahead and start to document within the tool – and for this meeting just so you can kind of see how it works, I've gone ahead and I've rated them. Now, keep in mind that you may not agree with the way I rated it and that's perfectly fine. I'm a lot newer to this process than you are and that may have some benefits – some good things and some bad things about that – because I may have some fresh eyes and fresh ideas as to how I came up with the scoring; whereas you folks who have a whole lot more background and history in doing this and might come back and say, "Doris, you know, I see it this way." And that's fine. That's what this tool is intended to do.

Now keep in mind that when staff receives this and gives it to you, we're not – this is not a recommendation from staff to you. When we receive these applications and we enter them into the tool, we're kind of doing a pre-eligibility review. We're taking the applications, and based on what we see in the application, we're plugging in the scores. So that when you receive it you can look at it and you can take the application and compare it to what staff has done and either agree or disagree. Because we're looking at it, right now from this point, staff is only looking at it to see: is the project eligible? That's the first thing you have to do before you start to look at the rest of the picture to see

whether the project is a good use of money. That comes a little bit later in the process.

We have to first start with: Is the project eligible according to statute, according to what the statewide plan requires?

MR. FRENCH: Do you want questions as you go, or do you want to wait 'til the end?

MS. PULSIFER: That's something that's coming along later in the presentation, but go ahead.

MR. FRENCH: Okay. I'm just curious. So you're saying now that you guys are going to send us these with the numbers filled in?

MS. PULSIFER: We're thinking that's the way – it might be a little more efficient and help save some time. Because you're going to be receiving the applications, too; and you're going to be independently scoring them.

CHAIR SAVINO: The problem with that, Doris, is that we don't want to run the chance. Everything's nice now and everything; but we don't want it to be where there is a program where there's pressure put on State Parks for a specific program, albeit state trust land or what have you, that's pushed and you come back in your rating and you say, "Your rating was 58 and yet OHVAG rated it – or they voted it down."

One of the issues that we have here with this thing is – that I take into consideration and all our members do – is we represent the entire state. One thing that's not on this list and you can't put a number it – and one of the things when I rate my programs is that: have we put in money this last year for these four areas? How much money have we put in there for the last few years? Now, it's not fair to a program that comes in from the western part of the state that says they want money and they're rated a little bit lower. So, we need to be diversified throughout the entire state; and you can't put that in numbers.

So I'm afraid that with your number system we – we don't want to get into an argument with you later when you go to the Board – when Jay goes to the Board and says, you know, we want to push things through this program; we rated it number 58, you know, the highest of the marks. We'd rather see it with no – I would. I can't speak for the other members – but I'd rather see it with no numbers on here at all – a rating from you – for those reasons.

MR. NASH: If it truly isn't --

MS. PULSIFER: Hold that thought?

MR. NASH: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: Hold that thought. Let's get through the whole process and if at the end you still feel that way, you can certainly go that way. Like I say, this isn't meant to be shoved down your throats or anything. You can make changes, additions, deletions – and that's what this whole discussion is about.

MR. NASH: Question? On these priorities, going across: first level, second level, third level – do they have to be in equal amounts? I just noticed it's four, four, and four; but when you get into some of the bonus categories some are two, some are three.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay.

MR. NASH: Who prioritized this? Because some of us may think, for example, law enforcement may be a first-level priority versus a second-level priority.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, I'll get into that. Good question.

Let me start with how the whole thing works here. One of the things that I added is here – on your sheet – you're not going to have these first two columns. I went ahead and added that so that when you look at it you can see at a glance how many projects there are. That's all that is. The second little column matches the list you received in your packets so that you can tell which project went to which project that is listed – not on the great big one; you have another sheet – another listing in your agenda that looks kind of like the one you did in May. I added that just so you could distinguish which project goes with which one.

So we start with the project sponsor and of course the project title. This comes directly off the application that we receive. If anything, probably what – you know, if you decide you don't want staff to help you with the scoring, probably what staff should at least provide to you is the first part, the sponsor, the project title and the description so that you have at least that part. Let me keep going here.

Okay, now, this first section comes up to column T there. What I was trying to do is for all these points to add up to 100. So I had to kind of finagle the numbers until I finally could come up with a way to make it add up to 100 total available. So what we did was we took the three levels of the priority components that are right out of the State Trails Plan. As you know there are three components: the first level, the second level and the third level. The first level should rate the highest; the second level and little bit lower; and then of course the third level the lowest. That's how these eight came about.

So, everything that's in the first level are all eight; everything that's within the second level are all fours; and then everything within the third level are ones. Those are your base points. The total available are 52, so, it's going to be almost – probably impossible for any applicant to come in and get 52 points under the base category.

One of the other things that's in the statute is that they want preference to go to mitigation of projects. The other preference is that they want applications that encompass a large number of purposes. So in order to include that in this scoring we came up with different categories where an applicant can receive bonus points. The first section in category one is – if the applicant has scope items where 50 percent or more are within the first level, they can receive an extra 15 points. If 50 percent or more are within the second level, they can get

another 10 points. So, if they have a component in the first and second-leveled priorities, they can get up to 25. If they only have – if they only have scope items within the first level, then they would only get 15. If they only have scope items within the second level, then they could get up to 10. If they only have scope items in the third level, then they wouldn't get any because that's the lowest priority; and we're trying to encourage applicants to submit projects that have components that meet the first and second level. We have to focus on those highest levels.

MR. FRENCH: Is this an actual example? I mean, does this follow like A here – comes over to A on the top? Am I looking at that right?

MS. PULSIFER: Yes.

MR. FRENCH: Okay. I don't understand why it has a first-level priority 15 bonus when there's one – I guess I'm asking if I understand it right?

MR. NASH: If there's one in each it would be 15.

MR. FRENCH: I thought if they were multiple. Why is there a bonus on the first-level priority?

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, if you go back –

MR. NASH: Yeah, that would have to have two.

MS. PULSIFER: I don't have their application in front of me.

MR. FRENCH: You've got it on the – on the first sheet you've just got one eight on the first-level priority.

MR. NASH: Are you counting points or are you counting – because that's what I did. I mean, if you've got eight points on the first priority and then a total of eight points on the second priority; is that why it got 15?

MR. FRENCH: Yeah, why is there a bonus on category one? You've got the 15 bonus on first-level priority.

MS. PULSIFER: Because if you look at the application, 50 percent or more of their application has to do with maintaining and renovating existing trails. They got eight points here in this first priority. If you go over to the second level, they have points under the second level – they've got four under "increase on-the-ground management;" and then they've got another four points under "provide and install route times." So they got points in the first and second leveled priorities. So that means, if you come over here – and because they got points in the first-level priority, 50 percent or more of their total scope has to do –

MR. NASH: But it's not. It's like 47 percent because of that one point that's in level three.

MR. FRENCH: It seems to me this complicated and it's going to be hard to – again, I don't know if this is the time to bring it up; but –

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, the way I was looking at it – does the statement – it's more the dollar because dust abatement is actually a part of maintaining a trail. It's just that in the trails plan dust abatement itself is a priority. Even though it can be part of the – you know, the maintaining; but it's called out – it's pulled out and giving special attention to dust abatement. So if the project is doing maintenance, and within that maintenance it includes dust abatement, because that dust abatement is a priority in the plan, they would get an extra point because there's dust abatement. But dust abatement is part of maintaining, so, in the total cost of that project, 50 percent of that would be considered –

MR. FRENCH: What I'm hearing is this thing is really subjective.

MR. NASH: Well, the point in the third level is counting toward the eight points in the first level; which is making it nine which puts it over the 50 percent.

MS. PULSIFER: And some of it is going to be kind of hard to cut it – you know, slice it right in half. So it's going to be a matter of how you're looking at it. You know, look at the total project and what those costs are. If you can tell that at least 50 percent is going toward maintenance – and like I say, some of it's going to kind of overlap. If you can think of a better way, you know, let me know. That's why we're having this discussion.

CHAIR SAVINO: I have a question. Once it's all said and done and we add all these bonus points up and everything – an example is grant #A or letter A which totals – all points is 58 points – what you have down there. Is that considered – you have total bonus points of 41 and total of all points 58. Correct? Are we going to be held, when we rate these projects, to that number? Those numbers – if I have a – is that my number one project, then, if this is the highest point total? Then why are we doing the number rating?

MS. PULSIFER: Well because, first of all, we want to – at this point we're determining eligibility. Are they meeting the priorities of the State Trails Plan? Is their project meeting the requirements of the statute? So we're going through this part first. Once this part is determined, then you're going to look at, is this good use of the money?

CHAIR SAVINO: But where – if you had it without numbers on there and just an "X" to say, "Yes, this project (a) maintains and renovates existing trails and routes." I have an X there saying that yes it does. So I have that. This is a tool for me to judge how I'm going to rate my thing.

MS. PULSIFER: We need to be able to prioritize them because of the availabilities of money.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's where we come out later.

MS. PULSIFER: Yes, we're going to award the money to the projects as the money is available.

AAG HERNBRODE: Let me see if I can help a little bit.

Most grants – most state grant programs have some sort of numerical rating system so that – at least initially; so that you have an idea of an initial placement of your applicant. If you think that initial placement – you know, the numbers come out and you think, "Well, yeah, that highest rating project, that really is I think the best use of our funds." Then you don't have to justify any more than that as to why that's your highest rated grant project.

If you think that there's some reason that it shouldn't be your highest rated grant project – "We just awarded, you know in the last grant cycle, a bunch of other money to that area and so we'd like to spread our money around" – that allows you to tailor your motion, like we talked about last time, to explain why this project that might otherwise rate very highly, subjectively or objectively, than is lower down. So it allows you to explain to the Parks Board a little better why it is you're doing what you're doing.

MR. FRENCH: Or where we're going with this thing, it looks to me – tell me if I'm wrong. You guys want to rate these programs through the numbers instead of through a seven-man board. You want to sit here and put numbers on them; and then when we disagree with the numbers we're going to have to justify –

AAG HERNBRODE: No, no. This helps you identify those projects that the statutes and the grants world would say should be up in that top category.

MR. FRENCH: Has that been a problem.

AAG HERNBRODE: I'm only going to answer that question in Executive Session. If we're going to get into that, I would prefer to answer that question in Executive Session. But this – you know, we talked at the last meeting about doing a better job of documenting what your decisionmaking is – and you don't have to use, as Doris said, you don't have to use her categories. If there's some other thing that you want in there, we can do – you know, like you lose points if we spent a zillion dollars in that county for the last sand cycle or something.

CHAIR SAVINO: First of all I like – personally I like these categories. I like how you set it up. We needed something. Okay? The only issue I have is over the point system; and then the issue that it doesn't allow – you're making us go to the State Parks Board; because if it's rated like it is here, but we don't take into consideration a – I'll give you an example. Okay? Standard Wash in Havasu, they want to – they approached us yesterday where they want to talk about putting a "take-off" area that's badly needed. There hasn't been any work done there in a long time. We're finally getting them going on it; and they want to put a fence around the area.

Well, that doesn't apply under new trails, it doesn't apply under mitigation; it doesn't apply under any of these things in the bonus. So it would be down here. So according to the rating, it will be a low-money issue and it will be down here in the rating. So now what if I wanted – I do feel that should be a number-one priority because that's – we haven't invested any money over there in a long time. So there's nothing here that tells that.

So, the only thing you're saying is that I am forced – or one of our members is forced – we're going to have Bill go to the next meeting to get up in front of the Board to explain this to them why we did that. Well that's – we've already done it in our minutes, in our discussion that we have here, after interviewing the people – and I'll give you a chance in a minute. Okay? I'm a long-winded person.

After that person gets up here and we talk to that person, we already have it in our minutes all the questions we have. Now you're asking us: "Yes, there's a rating system here." You're asking Bill to get all that information from those minutes. First he doesn't have those. He has – before the next Board meeting he has to get Bob to give him a copy –

AAG HERNBRODE: That's not what I'm asking.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, what did you mean?

AAG HERNBRODE: That's not what I'm asking. Okay, remember at your last board meeting we talked about, why your reason for approving or denying a grant, needs to be in your motion.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

AAG HERNBRODE: Okay. That doesn't mean you have to send somebody to the Parks Board meeting. That means you need to put it in the motion, because the Parks Board isn't going to read your minutes –

CHAIR SAVINO: That's a one-hour motion.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, one of your concerns is that the Parks Board does not understand – is not doing what you want them to do because they're not understanding what you're asking.

CHAIR SAVINO: What we talked about – Jay brought it up at the last meeting and I was appointed to write a letter to the Board, the State Parks Board, stating that we wanted to have representation – as much representation – so, on any of these grants, we come up in front of the Board – there will be a person assigned to get up there and say, "Here's what we rated and how we rated it."

Well, first of all, the Board has other agenda items on there. I don't want to take up two hours – and I could very well take up two hours of the Board's meeting.

AAG HERNBRODE: Here's what I foresee your motion saying, and then you can choose whether to send somebody to the Parks Board meeting or not. Your motion would say – I forget the name of the Wash – Standard Wash – okay: "For the Standard Wash Project, we rate it at number one – I move that we rate it at number one because it provides badly needed facilities in an area of the state that we have not spent money in before," and that's your motion; because your minutes are not in any evidence of your decisionmaking. So it doesn't matter what you say in your minutes. If it's not in the motion, it is not an official action of OHVAG.

CHAIR SAVINO: But our minutes are an evidence of how we actually –

AAG HERNBRODE: How individual board members view things. But you don't act as individual board members, you act as a board.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's why we're here; and this is the only forum we have because of the open meeting to discuss this thing to where I can sit down one-on-one with Bill, or one-on-seven – six with our members to discuss. "Hey, Bill, I like this idea because of this, this and this." This is the only forum that we have to do that in.

AAG HERNBRODE: Right.

CHAIR SAVINO: And if we're just going by – just a number rating system and we're not allowed to have that – if nobody is looking at those minutes to decide that, then we're just putting the onus on that person to say it. Because with that statement you just made, I guarantee you that if Jay – and I hope that he never does again, because we're on real good terms as far – are you awake over there, Jay?

MR. ZIEMANN: I'm listening.

CHAIR SAVINO: As far as disagreeing, you know, with our thing; well, he has that time to get up there and speak. If we just come out – the motion is brought forward – I'd like some input from our other members.

MR. FRENCH: I had my hand up.

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh you have, I hadn't seen it.

MR. FRENCH: Let's go back to the beginning. This started out present state – the presentation started out as a – this was going to be a tool for us. In its context right now, I don't believe it's a tool for us. There are parts of it that I'd love to use. We can use this and this; but to have State Parks staff rate this for us before we ever get it; and then we have to justify going off of that, that is not a tool for us. You're not doing this for us, in my opinion.

AAG HERNBRODE: The ratings, the numbers that Parks are putting in there are not – are based on – they're checks in a category.

MR. FRENCH: They're subjective, though. I've gone through this thing beforehand and there are things I would have graded differently.

AAG HERNBRODE: They aren't intended to be subjective.

MR. FRENCH: But they are.

AAG HERNBRODE: I'm sorry that they are.

MR. FRENCH: This whole thing – the rating system – I mean, the more I look into it – and I'm all for working on a thing for – I need – I would love to have a lot of these tools to do my job; and I could help justify the thing. But to get this thing filled out, that's not a tool for me.

MR. NASH: This is a good tool, but it needed to be a tool that was come up with the OHVAG members as well as the State Parks.

AAG HERNBRODE: But what do you want – I think that's what we're here for. So what do you want to change?

MR. NASH: That's kind of like giving me a textbook and then telling me I can change it.

MR. FRENCH: Well, let's start. I mean, can we maybe work on the fact that it doesn't get filled out before we get it?

MS. PULSIFER: We can do that. I think that for at least this time I needed to fill it out –

MR. FRENCH: No, no, it's great. It's a good learning tool.

MS. PULSIFER: I at least needed to fill it out so that I could show you how the whole picture looks, how it works.

CHAIR SAVINO: The Chair would like to recognize Jay Ziemann.

MR. ZIEMANN: I anticipated your angst about some of this. Quite frankly, just in thinking about it, my idea would be that staff would do this; and you would do your individual rating of the grants just as you do now; and you wouldn't see this until you come to this meeting; and now we're going to consider all of these projects. Okay? And where you agree, we're both – where the group and staff say, "These are great projects! These four are great projects. Staff in their evaluation says that these are great projects and we'll fund those." The group says, "These two projects we don't feel very good about." And staff through their evaluation here after seeing them for the first time say, "We don't feel very good about those." Okay, well, let's set those aside for a second.

Now we've got three projects where there's this discrepancy. Those are the ones that you need to pay closer attention to – or be careful of because there's a difference of opinion – one way or the other. I'm telling you, however – if you think this is just a complete waste of time, then we'll get rid of it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Not at all.

MR. ZIEMANN: If parts of it work, let's enhance those. If parts of it don't work, it is a tool for you so that we can make good decisions. That's all we're trying to do.

CHAIR SAVINO: And we agree with that totally.

MR. ZIEMANN: Okay, if you want to see it – if you think it will enhance your ability to grade the things, we can work to get it to you ahead of time.

MR. NASH: What John brought up in regards to –

MR. ZIEMANN: If you prefer not to see it until the meeting –

MR. NASH: What John brought up in regards to though is there's no way to decipher if an area of the state is being completely ignored. If anything there should be – you know, like let's say this county has gotten a whole bunch of grants lately, there needs to be something there to tie that in.

MR. ZIEMANN: We'll take that down and add that to the matrix.

CHAIR SAVINO: In my role, I went and took all the grants and put a map of Arizona on there. I got those little stickers that we have, okay; and I had green for the thing – then I had from when we were doing – when Amy was doing those $10,000 grants – put those on there. Okay? Then I had those plastered – then I got a better picture, okay, of this area. Then I correlated it with one thing that I need to talk to our group about – I saw when a specific chairperson was in the position, the Safford area got a lot of attention – and that's a normal thing – you know – the legislature does that and stuff. But if we represent the entire, we need to spread that out.

MR. ZIEMANN: That's a great idea. We should incorporate that.

MR. NASH: It also needs to be based off the number of OHV users in each one of those areas, too. You have to take that into account.

MR. ZIEMANN: So, figure that out for us. Do we do it in quarters? Do you do it in counties? How do you do that? You guys figure it out, let us know and we'll incorporate that.

CHAIR SAVINO: The other fear I have is that one of the issues is – and we had to address that a little bit, Jay; is that – I see over here Jeff – I'm going to pick on Jeff. Jeff is diligent. He's working on grants daily, 24 hours, 7 days a week, 10 hours a day. He gets those. So he's more inclined to come here forward with grants for the area. Well, you know – more than that – so, that's not helping the other areas of the county –

MR. ZIEMANN: But they're not helping themselves.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, they're not helping themselves and we have to address that: How do we get out there to get them to do it.

MR. ZIEMANN: I would say two things. This program is just the same as every other grant program. We – staff, you as a group, are entirely beholding to folks like this bringing projects to you. You may want to spread the money out; but if the people in Kingman don't put in projects, you can't –

MR. NASH: You can lead the horse to water –

MR. ZIEMANN: Absolutely! And that's no different in this program from any other grant program we've got. We just did "Going Smarter" grants; we've got grants from Maricopa County. No one else put in any money – or any projects. So, that's part of it. Help us figure out how to distribute the money more equitably.

The other thing that, you know – I don't know if it's in here, but we have had it in other grant programs – if you have counties, applicants or whatever, that become a problem in terms of getting projects done. You give them a grant and it lingers and it lingers and it becomes a habitual problem. In other grant programs when we score them we actually reduce – because they haven't performed well. When they start to perform better, then they'll get those points back.

Again, I'm not surprised you have angst over this.

I think it's a great tool, just tweak it. Tweak it! Make it better. Please help us make it better and then tell us when you want to see this information. Sometimes the advisory committees like to have it ahead of time.

MR. NASH: Some of us want to see it ahead of time because I see some that are scored differently even though they have the exact same numbers in the same categories and they're showing up as different numbers. Why?

MR. ZIEMANN: Right! Those are perfectly valid questions. We're trying to make it – especially from this – much of the subjective part: Is this a good thing or not? That's where we've got to rely on your expertise. You're the experts on whether this is good or not. But whether it responds to a specific thing in the statute or in the Trails Plan, you ought to be able to – that's one of your objectives and we ought to be able to do that. That's the goal.

CHAIR SAVINO: Can I just say something here so we can go on? I'm going to run with what you said except we need to, you know, digest this.

Can we have set up maybe prior to our meetings – our meetings start at one o'clock. Come in here as a group – we'll probably have to have the open meeting laws to do this – but do a workshop specifically for this. Is that necessary?

MR. FRENCH: I would like to have some other members involved, too. I don't think we're going to make a decision today.

MR. NASH: No, we need more input.

CHAIR SAVINO: So, if you can go through this to give us an idea, we won't interrupt you very much, what we'll do – and that way we can get it done – then we can set up maybe a workshop to come in, say, two hours early prior to our next meeting? Is that okay with you, Bill?

MR. FRENCH: Is that okay with you, Joy?

AAG HERNBRODE: As long as it's held with the other meeting, well that's fine.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, then, let's do that.

MS. PULSIFER: What I'm going to do real quick is I'm going to skip over to category four because category four will allow [inaudible]. Within those categories OHVAG may have some priorities, like what you were talking about a few minutes ago. The idea behind this is that you would establish your priorities prior to each cycle; so that when the applicant applied they know what OHVAG's priority is which may be the same priority for two or three cycles or more; or you may change it.

One thing about the State Trails Plan is that it's a five-year plan. But within the five years things happen. Circumstances happen and events happen that may change things. As you're going through those five years OHVAG may recognize certain needs – different things that have occurred – that need special attention; and that you through this program can address. So prior to each funding cycle, this would allow OHVAG to say, "Okay, we think that because this, this and this

has happened in the last year, special attention needs to be brought to those kinds of things" whatever they are; and you establish those priorities. Then those priorities would be listed –

MR. FRENCH: Are those points negotiable?

MR. NASH: Yeah, I would say that they're a little light compared to support letters being – each support letter counts as a point. If you've got six support letters, that's six points. OHVAG with seven members on it counts as five, which is not on the same playing field.

MS. PULSIFER: Are you talking about –

MR. NASH: I'm just looking at category three and it says for each letter up to six points.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, I'm going to come back to category three.

MR. FRENCH: No, but we're comparing.

MR. NASH: I'm comparing the two.

MR. FRENCH: We're asking, is that five points for OHVAG priorities? Is that negotiable? Could that be like ten points?

MS. PULSIFER: Yes. When I was trying to do this –

MR. NASH: Get to 100 points.

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah. But anyway, going back to down at the bottom here. You're going to see OHVAG priorities. "OHVAG will identify and approve the following two priorities." There may be three priorities. This is just an example. Among the first, second and third-leveled priority components – fourth cycle, whatever cycle you're in – and then you list by priority – you decide – you identify through that cycle.

When your applications come in, if they have components that address those OHVAG – the priorities that OHVAG has identified, then they're eligible for some extra points. Yes, that's negotiable. If you want to make this ten and five somewhere else, we can do that. We can do that. So, are there any questions on category four before I move on?

[No verbal response.]

MS. PULSIFER: Let me back up to – I think we were on category one – category two. Because the statute says that preference should be given to applications that encompass a large number of areas – of priorities; if you come back here and then you come back to your first level, second level, third level; the more sections that an application can get points in, the easier it can get extra points for it here. So if they were able to get at least three components – and it doesn't matter what they're in, priority one, two or three; if they were able to get at least three components, they'll get an extra nine points. If they got at least two components, they get five. We're trying to get them to steer away from just one scope item.

MR. FRENCH: I understand that, but –

MR. NASH: I'm looking at "H" and "I" and it says they have the exact same one and three; but they don't have any 15 points for category one and they don't –

[End of tape.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Go ahead and answer that one.

MS. PULSIFER: They got eight points there, no points there.

MR. NASH: Wouldn't they both be the same in category two and category three; or, category one and category two, then, for bonus points?

MS. PULSIFER: Let me look at it on here because it's hard to see it on –

MR. NASH: They have one and three – one in the first level, one in the third level – both of them do.

MS. PULSIFER: Right.

MR. NASH: And category one says, if he has a first-level priority, there's a 15 point bonus; and a category two if there's a bonus – if there are two or more components, which there are – it would be five points.

MS. PULSIFER: And you're right. There should be a five there.

MR. NASH: And then 15 on the previous one in category one.

MS. PULSIFER: Yes, yes.

MR. NASH: Okay. All right.

MR. FRENCH: And my other question real quick – the way I understand this, even if they had three components in the third level, they'd still get a nine-point bonus?

MS. PULSIFER: If they had –

MR. FRENCH: Three components in the third level, even though they're in a level three?

MS. PULSIFER: Yes, because you're just trying to get more components. It doesn't matter where the components are as long as –

MR. NASH: And that's a numbers issue, too, that needs to be addressed.

MS. PULSIFER: And that's a good catch on that "H" and "I" there. At least I can see that you're catching the idea of it, because you're catching these things. That's good. I'm going to do this to make it a little easier for me. I'm going to free some of this up.

Okay, so category three – and this is if they have letters, if they have individual letters, they get a point for each letter from an individual. A group would give them a little bit – give them more points if they have at least – if they have two or more they get six points. So they get three points for each letter from a group up to six, so that's at least two.

CHAIR SAVINO: I have a suggestion. What I would like to see there as far as letters of support from OHV groups – it's not a matter of having, you know, five – it doesn't hold the same weight if I have one grant that has three letters from an OHV or OHV organization, vendors or dealers compared to three or five letters from the Sierra Club. It's not about letters, but the content of the letter and who the letter is from. So I would like to see that changed to something about OHV support letters.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: You follow me there? It doesn't mean anything to me on a grant if I see a Sierra Club letter of support for an OHV trail. What has meaning to me, you know, is the other.

MS. PULSIFER: If the support is coming from an OHV group. Okay? So do you want another category in there? Or do you want –

MR. ZIEMANN: We just need to make a definition of what those letters should be; so, in a star we could have down at the bottom to say, "Letters have to be," dah, dah, dah, da.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, okay. That'll work!

CHAIR SAVINO: And it could be from one person, from a group, or something. It doesn't have to be – you know – but it needs to be – you know!

MR. FRENCH: You wouldn't support a trail that had the support of the Sierra Club?

CHAIR SAVINO: It wouldn't hold as much weight as being supported by Ride Now.

MR. FRENCH: Because it must have some subversive reason for supporting that trail, right?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, maybe. I'm not saying they would, but –

MS. PULSIFER: Okay. If you're filling this out manually, you're going to need to do the math. If you're filling it out on here, the formulas are in there. It will automatically add up. So once this is completed all the way through, then you can take and sort and it will put them in the order of priority for you.

The next part of this is the funding part. This is showing how much is requested. This part, even if it comes out that you decide as a group that you want to do all the scoring, staff would still probably want to do this fund requested part, because you're going to need to know how much they requested and this part is more administrative as far as whether it should come out of OHV or RTP, depending on the type of project, what qualifies where.

MR. FRENCH: I'd like to say that's very helpful to me, because that's where your expertise comes in. A lot of times it's RTP money or something and that makes a difference on the decision; and to know how much we've got in each and which is going to be used, really –

CHAIR SAVINO: How can we get this – it's nice right now because it's "A" – Project A is the first one so he could put that – you could put this pre-filled out and it says, "695,577 minus the 66,000 comes to such-and-such and on down there. What I'd like – is it a difficult thing for you to do once we rate it – we send in our rating thing, you know, we rate it – then you take that project, whatever it is. If it's $100,000, then you plug that number in there because we'd like to see that. That's where the tool comes, where we see it come down and we know. Because one of the other issues that we have is that we may get to the $524,000. This may be the first month of the year – the first meeting of the year and we know we need to save some money for the other people who are going to come through with grants; so we don't want to give all the money right then; so we know at that point there that we're going to approve the first ones even though the rest of them are on that list except for the ones we denied. Do you follow me there?

MR. BALDWIN: Once we get the final numbers she can sort them into whatever priority they are; then they would automatically be conducted in that order.

MR. FRENCH: You say this program automatically does that, right?

MS. PULSIFER: Yes, that's what I was saying.

CHAIR SAVINO: You can do that while we're at our meeting.

MS. PULSIFER: Yes, that's what I'm saying. Once you finish scoring them and you know what the order of the priority is, and you sort it, it's going to automatically – these two green columns there are automatically going to give you your balance. As the funding gets approved, you're going to see what the balance is. That's the way it's meant to –

CHAIR SAVINO: Don.

MR. FRENCH: I just – something just got flashed in my head there. Why wouldn't there be a thing where you guys rate it and each one of us rate it and we do like we do our things, average the ratings out? Would that be something –

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm not following you exactly.

MR. FRENCH: Well, we all come up with a final number – total points – totals with the bonus points and everything. You come up with a total number. Why doesn't everybody – State Parks staff can come up with theirs, and we all do the worksheet and come up – that would give us some kind of average. It's just a thought.

MS. PULSIFER: The whole idea is that everybody comes to a consensus. As Jay was explaining, the idea behind having staff rate it first is that when you get it after you've already – then your individual review and we agree on – you know, leave the ones we agree on – leave them alone. They're done! But we're going to need to focus on the ones where we have discrepancies. We'll have to pull those applications out probably and figure out what is it, why is it, that we, the staff, thought that maybe this should be scored under this component and given this amount of points versus your disagreeing saying, "Well, I didn't see that as a

mitigation project. I saw it more as a maintenance project." Something like that, okay?

This is where we have a discussion and we determine what is it, is it maintenance or is it mitigation? You know that type of thing. Then, as a group, we have a consensus agreement as to where those points should go.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, the chair recognizes Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: Right, I was just going to expand on what she said. The thing that you need to do is say, "Okay, what is this first project accomplishing?" And that falls into these categories, do you agree with us or do you have your own opinion. Is it mitigation or is it more renovation or is it something else? So that's what the columns are all about. Does this project fall in this column? Does this project fall in that column? What column does it fall in? And that's all open for discussion based on what the project sponsors submits and the description of what they're going to do.

The next thing you want to look at is, okay, if it's a priority one; how much more important is that than a priority two? So if we give it eight points here, in priority two four points, or in priority three one point; is that sufficient? How many points should OHVAG have, and how many points should these letters be worth so that they're all, in the realm of things, relative to the importance of the project. Those are things that you guys can provide input on and you can decide. You can tell us, we want the number one projects to be ten points; and level two to be three points or whatever you want them to be. It doesn't necessarily have to add up to 100 points.

MR. NASH: Yeah, I was going to say –

MR. BALDWIN: Because nobody's going to get 100 points, you know, if they're not going to do everything. So it's all relative to what is the project accomplishing relative to the requirements of the program. How are they meeting the requirements of the program?

Again, you guys, that's what you need to look at in each of these categories: Is this enough points for a priority one? Is this enough for priority two? Is this enough for the letters? Is this enough for the OHVAG opinion, whatever that might encompass? And let us know. We'll plug those things in there and that's all we're trying to do. Like I say we'll discuss: Is it mitigation? Okay, we all agree so they get whatever points are in that category.

CHAIR SAVINO: On the financial end of it, you will come to the meeting prepared to know if we – because it does matter if there's RTP money that is available for that specific project. You'll let us know at that point there, because it does weigh a lot on how we put that out.

MR. BALDWIN: Right, well we can put that into the initial sheet when the project comes in.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right, I'd like to see that – something like that, because it does matter to me that if a project here wants X amount of money and I know $181,000 – but I know that they qualify for $100,000, then that changes the complexion of how I'm maybe putting those in my rating to get that – spread that money out.

MR. BALDWIN: And that was another point of discussion for this meeting, as Doris pointed out, going forward when we make an announcement of available funding you need to tell us: "We're going to limit projects to this amount" of OHV funding and whatever you want to put on RTP funding; and you need to say: "We're going to give priority to projects from west of Phoenix." Those are the things you have to tell us you want to consider the next time projects are accepted and we have to put that out there so when the applicants look at that, they know what they're competing against and they can decide, you know, if they want to spend their time developing a project or an application or not. You can't wait for them to bring it in and say, "Well we decided last night that we're going to consider only these types of projects." They have to know up front.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, you will provide us with that dollar amount that we can start with.

MR. BALDWIN: It's in your packet today. It tells you exactly how much is available.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MS. PULSIFER: Also the top part of this in the green section here gives you your starting amount.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay that $695,000, I think that's what it says.

MR. BALDWIN: That's what it says.

CHAIR SAVINO: I have a question on that. I know I'm getting off this a little bit.

MR. FRENCH: You are getting off.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I will wait until you're done with your presentation. How's that sound?

MS. PULSIFER: Well let me back up a little bit, again. Let's go back to the beginning of the previous section. Again in the blue are the amounts – staff will determine whether it's something that should be funded out of OHV funds or with RTP funds. Now this pink section is if you decide you want to put a ceiling on the awards so that you don't have one huge project come in and wipe out all the funding and not leave funding for the rest of the projects. Again, this is just an example. I'm using 300 and I'm using 300-to-500. That's up to you what ceilings you want to put in there.

So in this scenario we're suggesting that when we're using 300 as a ceiling – so any application that would come in at 300 or less – an eligible application or requesting up to 300 could receive 100 percent of their request. Now if you receive an application – I don't think I have any here, but – okay, if you had an application that came in that was 400,000 or 500,000, they would get 300,000 – get the 100

percent of the 300,000; and then here they would get 50 percent of the balance up to the ceiling that you've set. Again, you don't have one huge application that comes in and takes all the money. At least you can fund part of it and it would require that applicant to match the amount with their own funding or a donation or a contribution.

Again, this would be up to you to decide what you want those ceilings to be. This kind of gives you an idea of how that would work. The yellow just kind of adds it all up for you; and if the application shows there are some matching funds – I'm only using hard matches in there. This doesn't include "in-kind."

MR. FRENCH: Is that why the $28,000 isn't in the first one?

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah, because if it's in-kind – I'm just using hard cash matches.

The totals come over here; and again, whatever the total recommended funding that's going to come off the OHV part of the program – and it's not on your sheets there, but what I added today – because I know someone was asking yesterday what the totals were – so I added this program in here so you could see what the total requests are. Here's the total of that column. It's a total that has been requested in OHV funds, the total that's been requested in RTP funds and how much would be distributed after 100 percent, how much would be distributed up to 500. Here's your total recommended OHV funding and your total RTP funding, your total match; and your total overall. Again, this is just a running balance at any order of the priorities.

Any questions on the funding section?

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I think it looks good.

MS. PULSIFER: And this last part, remember we started with staff doing the initial scoring then you would receive it and do your scoring. Then you'd come back and we would pull out the ones we could identify some disagreements on and look at those closely and decide what those discrepancies are. Then we'd have a section here to document what your justifications – what your reasonings are for your decisions.

So I've added some – it's hard to do on the screen up here, but you can see it on your copy.

CHAIR SAVINO: Are you still there, Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: I am.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, just checking.

MS. PULSIFER: Here are some additional notes. You can see on your big page there some of the notes that I put in there to explain some of the areas of this worksheet. For example here, I was trying to document how the volunteers match some things with in-kind services and there's a value to that. Because I'm not documenting it under the sponsor match, but maybe you may want to recognize that there was a match in kind. You know, you can put those notes in there.

That's what this is for, more for your comments where you can document whether you concur or don't concur and why; and how – and what the decision was in that.

Like I say, if you have an eligible project that's eligible as far as the requirements of the statute and the plan, but maybe it wasn't a good use of the money and you moved it from the priority list down, at least you have a record as to what that justification was. It was ineligible but now you want to go back to your partner and say, "Your project was a good project, it was an eligible project; however, the way you're going about to meet the need in that project may not be the best use of the money. Can you go back, take your application, review it and bring it back to us." And maybe you may have some suggestions. "Is there another way you can accomplish this need, maybe with less money" or, whatever the situation might be.

CHAIR SAVINO: Or we want to see more money thrown towards it.

MS. PULSIFER: So you have your documentation here and your applicant leaves knowing exactly where you stand, what the issue is, those kinds of things. So you have the OHVAG staff and the applicant all on the same page. That's kind of pulling everybody together.

CHAIR SAVINO: I think it's a great – what you've done here is great. You've put a lot of work into it and I see you're getting a better concept of how to help us.

Two issues I have, and I'm going to address these to the OHV members. A lot of the time I've noticed over the years – and I am to blame for this. The first two years I was involved with OHVAG, I just came to the meetings. I got this packet and I rubber-stamped it and just assumed that everything was just great and just went along with the flow. Well then I started looking into it.

One of the issues that we still have – and I hate to bring it up at this time – is we need to be able to get out there and see some of these projects, too. When you have a Bill Nash or a Don French who is putting their name on a certain project, they need to be able to see this or to get out there in the field. We can't just rely on – Bob's one person and he's wearing four hats. He can't get out. We have to have the ability to get out there and see those projects for ourselves to rate these things. Some of us don't know these areas. It means a lot when we can get with the Tami PIKEs or what have you and get out there to see that – or Jeff.

MS. PULSIFER: I think the next stuff is actually going to the projects. If you want to hear some –

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, let me get back up there. I appreciate what you've done here and it's a really good tool and I think it's going to work out good. I look forward to getting with that little workshop –

MS. PULSIFER: Before we actually move on, is there any other thing you want me to change?

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas, do you have anything? Do you have any recommendations for this – comments?

MR. McARTHUR: I don't specifically. I just want to say thanks to Doris and staff. Thank you for giving us an excellent starting point. I think it is important to have a matrix to evaluate proposals. This is an excellent starting point and the Board has some great ideas and I think we're on a good path here.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great! Thank you, Doris.

Before I go any further with this, let's take a five minute break.

[Break.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas, are you there, still?

MR. McARTHUR: I'm here.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, thank you, I just wanted to see. I'm going to call this meeting back to order. We have a quorum. At this time I see Doris is raising her hand. She has another comment.

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah, just one thing I left out and thanks to Jeff he reminded me. In order for this to work the applicants – staff would have to come up with some kind of guidelines so that when the applicants go to fill out their applications they know up front what our scoring system is and what we're looking at. They know up front the structure of the scoring system. So when they write their applications they know that they need to try and hit those first-level priorities; that they can get extra points if they have two or more components, those type things. So staff will need to work on coming up with some guidelines.

CHAIR SAVINO: Would it help also – along those lines – for those applicants to know the amount available for spending?

MS. PULSIFER: We usually provide that. Like in our other grant applications, our other grant programs, we would always make that information available as to how much we have available for that cycle.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, thank you very much.

MR. FRENCH: I think Hank just joined us. (@ 2:45 pm via phone)

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, you on there now?

MR. ROGERS: I am. Sorry I'm late, guys.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, no problem. I'd like to recognize Hank Rogers. He's representing the Apache County ATV Rough Riders in northeastern Arizona. Welcome, Hank. Present here we have Don French, myself, Bill Nash and Thomas McArthur is also on the phone. What we've gone over so far Hank is we've discussed the spreadsheet – Doris gave a presentation on the spreadsheet that we're talking about doing as a tool to help us with our grant process – rating process.

What we've decided is that at our next meeting in October, what we're going to do is – we're going to have the meeting that's regularly scheduled at one – we're going to get it to like two hours, I think, which should be enough time to go over

this. We're going to have a workshop for two hours prior to this to discuss it and hash it all out. There will be some more information coming in to us at that time.

Also, Jay Ziemann gave a little presentation at the beginning. What he talked about is the staff has been mandated to discuss and review the roles and responsibilities, per se, of the advisory groups – all ten advisory groups. So they're going to send out some sheets – some information you'll be getting in the mail in the next couple weeks, I believe, to review that and go over it so we can discuss the roles and responsibilities. They want to – they've been mandated by the Governor to look at this stuff.

MR. ROGERS: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Do you have any questions at this time?

MR. ROGERS: Are we going to approve any of these grants today, then; or is that going to be next month?

CHAIR SAVINO: No, we are going to approve – this is the next phase. You came just in time. These grants – what I've done is – we had a little break after all that I just told you about. Now we're getting into the position where I'm going to call on the grant writers, per se, of the areas – the land managers – and have them talk about their grants and we can ask questions at that time.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, good.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right, let's go. I'm going to start at the top.

E. ACTION ITEMS

3. Review and recommend Sticker Fund projects for funding from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and the Recreational Trails Program. – Project sponsors will be allowed a brief period to describe their project(s) and respond to questions from the Group. Audio/visual presentations will be accommodated with two days advance notice. The Group will identify high priority projects based on the criteria identified in the 2010 State Trails Plan and A.R.S. §28-1176(E-H). They will select and recommend projects for funding based on the identified priorities and consideration for prudent use of the funds.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm going to start with Grant A. Don French?

MR. FRENCH: I've got a question on project selection 5, the considerations that we put out – Bob put out. There's one sentence on here: "If a project is not recommended for funding the first time it is reviewed, it will be considered the next review unless the project sponsor withdraws the application." I didn't realize that was a rule before. I thought it was dead and if they wanted to resubmit it they could.

MR. BALDWIN: That's been in the process since the first phase started back in January this year. We haven't really had any projects that fell into that category except – well, we've had a couple that we've rejected; but the project sponsors didn't want to proceed. So, I changed that. They're going to have to request to have it reviewed. It's not going to come up automatically.

MR. FRENCH: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: And they can change it or they can leave it in there.

CHAIR SAVINO: Does that answer your questions, then?

MR. FRENCH: Yes, it does.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, let's move on then. I would like Jeff Gursh from the Arizona Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition and the Arizona Trail Riders – are you going to talk about this first project?

MR. GURSH: What's your first project?

CHAIR SAVINO: The first project is A. Don't you know "A" goes first?

A	**BLM Hassayampa FO**	**Boulders / Table Mesa OHV Areas Site Steward**	**$66,000**	**$0**	**$28,000**	**$94,000**

MR. GURSH: I don't know which one's A.

CHAIR SAVINO: Gosh! The first project is called – it's from the Bureau of Land Management Hassayampa Field Office. What it is the BLM Boulders OHV Multi-Use Area, Highway 74 Table Mesa-HV Multi-Use Area, I-17, the Table Mesa – all legal routes? Okay? What it's asking for is – it's in partnership with a coalition – a site steward will work 40 hours. You know which one I'm talking about now.

Are there two presenters or one?

MR. GURSH: Kind of like together.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, come on up here to talk. We have two presenters today.

MR. BICKAUSKAS: I'm Tom Bickauskas, BLM Hassayampa FO Recreation Planner.

CHAIR SAVINO: Can you hear him okay you guys, on the phone?

MR. ROGERS: Not very good. Can they get a little closer?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Talk up.

MR. GURSH: Hi, Hank. It's Jeff Gursh.

MR. BICKAUSKAS: Tom from the BLM. So, we have a partnership. Right now we've written an assistance agreement which is a cooperative agreement. There are authorities to do such. BLM was able to partially fund an agreement. It needs additional funding to keep it moving. So part of what we're asking for – two-thirds of the money is salary money to continue the partnership; and the other third is accessories, basically. We need our steward to be accessorized with signs, fence materials, things that break need to get repaired – that kind of thing.

That's the meat of what we're wanting to do here is continue to fund our partnership. Feet-on-the-ground are difficult to come by. It's for a limited time. Our agreement is for three years. We're one year into the agreement right now.

CHAIR SAVINO: So you're asking for money –

MR. GURSH: Initially it was a one-to-one match with the BLM. Federal money paid for the first year of this program with the coalition matching one-to-one for each dollar. Now we're coming to the OHVAG for additional funds. As the BLM finds more money to put into the agreement, they will add federal dollars to keep the program running for the total of three years.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don, do you have any questions?

MR. FRENCH: I do. I see also included in this program here is $26,000 for materials' subtotal?

MR. GURSH: Yes.

MR. FRENCH: It doesn't really say – all it says is: "These include T-posts, wire fence, river area, steel fencing" – it doesn't say what it's used for.

MR. GURSH: Oh, I'm sorry. In the areas – this is a – Table Mesa is an unusual area if you've ever been there. We have a lot of illegal shooting and we have a lot of areas that were old mine roads and access roads that are closed off now. We use the fencing for ghost fencing and to parameter off the illegal shooting areas; and we also use it in the riparian areas so we can keep the users out and on the regular trails.

MR. FRENCH: Did you not close those trails?

MR. BICKAUSKAS: Nope. Basic in the coalition – it helps us implement the trail management plan that we finalized about a year-and-a-half ago. So, anything that we do out there is consistent with that plan; and the coalition has agreed to partner with us to implement that and we've actually opened up some new trails in the area.

MR. FRENCH: Okay.

MR. GURSH: As a matter of fact, you awarded us some money last year for those new trails.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Don, you have any more?

MR. FRENCH: That's it. Thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill, do you have any questions?

MR. NASH: Nope.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas, do you have any questions on this project lettered "A"?

MR. McARTHUR: No, I don't.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Hank?

MR. ROGERS: I'm good.

CHAIR SAVINO: Good, okay. I'm going to move on. We're not voting on these. We're not rating these at this time. I believe we're going to go on to "B" so you might still see both your names on this project so stay with us. Okay?

B	**BLM Hassayampa FO**	**Boulders, Table Mesa, Vulture Mtn Trail Maintenance**	**$105,000**	**$0**	**$16,000**	**$121,000**

This project is on your list, OHVAG members, as "B" and it's beyond Boulders OHV area, Highway 74, beyond Table Mesa OHV area of I-17, the Table Mesa Road area; and the Vulture Mountain OHV area. So there are three different areas there. Since early 2010, the three above areas have been improved through RTP and OHV decal grants. This was made possible through the statewide assistance agreement between the coalition and BLM. From there I'm going to let you take over.

MR. GURSH: Okay. They're probably the most popular areas in Maricopa County; and what we're working through the BLM's planning is to connect long-distance trail systems from Table Mesa and I-17 all the way through to the Vulture Mountains. So we have these long-distance corridors and OHV user areas.

One of the reasons we're asking for repair money again – and continuing repair money – is because this – every OHV use that used to be on the state trust land south of Highway 74, it's almost 70 square miles of land, is now closed to OHV use and they're pushed all onto the BLM land. So, we're not just trying to manage what the BLM originally had; we're trying to manage everything that was in the area, including state land that's now closed. The City of Peoria actually gives you the option of a ticket or go to the Boulders with a map – and that's how they send you off to get there.

So we're seeing huge increases in the use on the BLM land; and we've got to be able to keep up with the trail maintenance. Now the trail maintenance also falls besides the PM-10 area for dust. We have to work on the trail maintenance there to keep the silt off the trails to be in compliance with the PM-10 rules. So it's a double-edged sword for us. More users and more rules to follow. That's why we're asking for additional funds to do trail work here. We're also asking for the latitude to – because it's three different areas, we're asking that – if I have a big rain storm that damages trails at the Boulders, then I can take some of the money from the Vulture Mountain and be able to move it over to take care of the extra damage at the Boulders or vice-versa.

MR. BICKAUSKAS: Yeah, one of the things we tend to run into with our plans is, you know, the flexibility of being able to move things around as the need arises. That's one of the key components Jeff helped design into this.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I know – I have some questions here. First of all, I want to make note on both A and B so far – and they may go on further down – that there are the letters of recommendation. There are three letters of recommendation. One is from the Arizona Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition. There's another one from the Arizona Trail Riders Association, Don Hood; and then there's one from the Arizona State Association of 4-Wheel Drive Clubs and Sandi McCullen. Then also there's a fourth one from the Ride Now Corporation, Matt [unintelligible]. So those are letters of recommendation from both A and B there.

Since you mentioned the Vulture Mine – Vulture area – in this last grant cycle we issued a grant to the Wickenburg area. Will this tie – when you talk about tying in stuff, will this tie in to that area, if that gets thrown through there, so the Hassayampa area can work with that?

MR. GURSH: Right. The thing you're referring to would be the Town of Wickenburg for a staging area.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right, yes.

MR. GURSH: They're working on a plan right now for areas that aren't beyond. The concept does not actually tie into the BLM.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, that was my question.

MR. GURSH: The plan we're working on we should have out in a couple months is actually going to allow for that to happen. What we're even looking at is us taking on responsibility for certain trails on state trust land basically facilitated for that connection. So there would be – the connection is not necessarily directly from that staging area, but it would be using the Hassayampa River connecting into the area just north of Vulture Peak. Then you can get over to the Vulture Mine area to ride.

So, the connection isn't as direct as you might think; but yes it's there and that's what's important, I think, that we try to connect the Town of Wickenburg with these high-use OHV areas.

CHAIR SAVINO: In these areas is private land a big issue on private landowners?

MR. GURSH: It is around Wickenburg; and that's why the Town of Wickenburg is actually addressing that because they are uniquely positioned to deal with that because there are things that the landowners want and the town can give them. Or be better positioned to deal with state lands which is pretty much on the edge of where the BLM land is.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right. Bill, do you have any questions?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Don, do you have any questions?

MR. FRENCH: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, do you have any questions?

MR. ROGERS: No, I don't.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: Nope.

CHAIR SAVINO: Any more comments on that project, Jeff?

MR. GURSH: To address a question you had last week, when we do trail maintenance, we're not making a highway out of the trails. We're addressing the drainage – the sustainability of the trails. So there may be – on a mile-long trail, we might not put a blade down to work on the trail for half that distance. We're just looking to maintain the trail through the erosion process, trying to keep it from getting blown away. So we're not trying to mess up the experience for the challenging part of it. We don't want to make highways out of these. It loses that outdoor challenge experience.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, that's why I wanted to bring everybody up to date. One of the questions I had – one of the concerns I had for the off-highway community is, if we make these roads all level three roads to where they're just graded then my concern is that the OHV riders will be looking – they'll get bored on those roads and they'll be looking off to the sides and that's where we run into trouble when they say, "Hey, this hill looks more interesting to climb than this road." So we don't want to make all our roads smooth roads. We want to keep that challenge out there. So, that's one of the concerns that we have going forward.

MR. NASH: That and the speed is ridiculous, too.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah. By making it more challenging you're cutting down on the speed, which is safer. So, thank you on those two. Now, I'm gonna go – let me go – since I have it, if you don't mind me – I'm going to jump out of order, Tami, because you're up there next. I'm going to go – I think I have – do we have any more for – okay, I'm going to go to "G." You guys following me? I'm going to go to "G."

This is with Table Mesa OHV Multi-Use Area I-17 and Table Mesa Road area just north of Highway 74 with the help of the OHV Decal Fund Table Mesa area is being developed with trail signs and trail improvements, as well as new signs and new trails are being constructed and repaired. It's for $5,500.

G	**BLM Hassayampa FO**	**Table Mesa Trail System Access Guides**	**$5,500**	**$0**	**$0**	**$5,500**

MR. GURSH: Right now we're working with an interim map that we've produced that we basically just put on the information kiosk. But we have nothing to distribute to the public that's free. Where the trails are, the new trail connections we've made and funding really isn't available to pay for the printing

and producing the guide that we would need. We envision basically a pocket guide that we can put in a box on the actual kiosk leg. Flip the top and get your access guide and you can go ride the area.

So, this is what the grant is for, basically to provide a little bit of money to complete the design of the brochure itself and then to pay for the printing or it. Also to buy the boxes that they would go in on the leg of the kiosk.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I have a question. Is BLM done in this area with your travel management plan?

MR. GURSH: Yes, and that's actually why we're asking you –

CHAIR SAVINO: So you are – it's not a thing where you're going to come back next year and say, "Okay, we've added another thousand or subtracted a thousand trails," and what have you.

MR. GURSH: No, in this area – this is actually a pretty discrete area. It's only about 12,000 acres, which you know in terms of the government plan is not a lot of area; but it's pretty discrete. We call it the gateway to the Bradshaws. So we really want to market it as such. It's extremely heavily used and we've done a lot – we've moved it a lot in a year. These trail plans have been signed for a little bit over a year. So that's what we want to do, let people know there are some new trail experiences are here, rock climbing trails are here, the Black Canyon Trail runs through right in the middle of the area so the people can – you're asking if it's done. It is done. It's only 12,000 acres so it's going to be a pretty zoomed in guide. People are not going to get a huge view of the area.

Eventually, as we run out of these and we have other trail plans done that surround the area we may incorporate it into a bigger guide. But for now we envision printing about 5,000 guides and that should last us maybe two to three years.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, and I see that the kiosks are already up and you have the trails all marked.

MR. GURSH: Part of the grants from last year was the trail signage. Some of our RTP money was trail signage. We tried to do the infrastructure first so that we'd have a map to actually find the places on the ground based on the signs.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great! These are endorsements from the four groups that I talked about before.

Bill, do you have any comments or questions?

MR. NASH: Nope!

CHAIR SAVINO: Don?

MR. FRENCH: I asked my question.

CHAIR SAVINO: You did?

MR. FRENCH: I got it answered.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Thomas, do you have anything?

MR. McARTHUR: I just wanted to ask, when would these be going out, the trail maps?

MR. GURSH: As soon as they're printed. And this is coming from the BLM. I estimate it will probably take about a year to work through our process with public affairs. They end up doing the final design and letting the printing through the Government Printing Office. So it's a process I can say I'm honestly not very familiar with. It will be my first time dealing with them; but I would say it could take all year.

MR. McARTHUR: It could be a year – you mean the money wouldn't be approved until the funds are out there?

MR. GURSH: It could be a year, yeah.

MR. McARTHUR: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Any other questions? Hank, do you have any questions?

MR. ROGERS: I don't have anything.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I believe we have one more for you guys.

MR. GURSH: It's the one for the Little Pan – Table Mesa OHV Area, the Little Pan Road Improvement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. Go for it!

I	**BLM Hassayampa FO**	**Little Pan Rd #9998 Renovation / Dust Mitigation Project**	**$70,600**	**$0**	**$15,000**	**$85,600**

MR. GURSH: This is continuing the improvements for the Table Mesa Area. We've got the grant money and RTP money to improve the parking area; but the road is so miserable that the toy haulers and the campers park outside of the Little Pan Road on any place that's open. So we need to repair that main road into the Little Pan staging area so that we can get all of the people where we really want them. That's what this project is.

The county maintains the Askamine [phonetic] Road that it comes off of, the main feeder that comes in from Table Mesa and the highway; but we need to repair the Little Pan Road where we have the restrooms and the fenced-in parking and the future kids' tot lot so that we can actually move the parking and put it outside the PM tent area. So for a while we'll be safe from the wrath of PM-10, but that's the whole point. If we do this road, we are actually doing the dust mitigation process like we did at the Boulders, as we build it.

So we'll be in compliance when we get drawn into the PM-10 Area up there.

MR. BICKAUSKAS: It's actually within Area A right now. The Area A Lot expanded where the dust boundary is. So we're meaning to do some – a skein like we did on the Boulders, a skein of gravel so that we can comply with that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don, do you have any questions?

MR. FRENCH: I do actually. I kind of talked to you about this before. I don't – is that 999 Trail? It appears to me that it's going from a trail to a staging area; and I know that's not the case. I'm just trying to get a –

MR. BICKAUSKAS: No, there are three main roads in that area: Table Mesa Road which runs down to the lake.

MR. FRENCH: Can you see what I'm saying? It looks like it just goes from a trail to a –

MR. BICKAUSKAS: Basically a connection to Askamine Road, which is here. Askamine Road is the main road. ADOT has the right-of-way on that. They have the right-of-way up to a private parcel. So they're actually improving that as we speak. So that's their responsibility.

MR. FRENCH: Right. But it's a good road and you're just trying to –

MR. BICKAUSKAS: Right, exactly! We're fixing our part of that to get people to the staging area; and the staging area is like right in the middle of the area and all the trails emanate from it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Bill, do you have any questions?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, do you have anything?

MR. ROGERS: I do. What caused the damage to the road right now? What is it that caused it?

MR. BICKAUSKAS: Hank, this is Tom. It's actually an old haul road.

MR. ROGERS: What?

MR. BICKAUSKAS: A gravel pit haul road. There was a gravel pit down by the Agua Fria River. Ranchers and miners have actually graded it over the last 50-75 years. It's actually a 25-foot wide road; but it's just in disrepair because through our travel management plan we just needed an access-type of road. Now we have the okay to go in and actually begin to work on it. The gravel pit that was maintaining it quit doing that 15/20 years ago.

MR. ROGERS: My only thing is if you're going to repair it – you know, if it's getting washed out or whatever, let's make sure that we have the drainage and everything else we need in there so that we can hold the road for as long as we can.

MR. BICKAUSKAS: This includes raising the grade and addressing all the water-drainage issues. If we need a culvert we'll stick a culvert in. We're using rip-wrap on the sides of the wash areas so it doesn't take out the road in the future.

MR. ROGERS: Okay. I think it's a good project. Just make sure we've got the work done to protect it – to protect our investment. That's all I'm asking.

CHAIR SAVINO: Great, thank you. That's it for you guys. Now, I'm going to go to – Tami, are you the presenter for – this is going to be for – I'm going to go to Grant C as in Charlie. Eric Norman and Tami PIKE are here. So I'm going to go over this and explain what this one is for. It is for $104,800 and this is the Tonto National Forest Cave Creek Ranger District. Cave Creek is one of the busiest – we all know that.

The best thing to do is let you guys explain it.

C	**Tonto NF - Cave Creek RD**	**OHV Road Renovations North of Bartlett Lake Rd**	**$104,800**	**$0**	**$6,000**	**$110,800**

MS. PIKE: I'm going to let Eric go into the details, but for those of you who know the area, this is the area that has been closed since 2005 when we had three fires in this one area. So this is in preparation to try and get that opened back up. I'll let Eric talk about the details of it.

MR. NORMAN: We have approximately 36 miles of trail up in there and we're going to use some mechanized equipment to resurface some of the tread. There's a lot of erosion from some past flood events over the last couple years. As well we are asking for some additional funds for signs and some coverts, maybe, to delineate some future erosion problems or issues.

MS. PIKE: And this is in cooperation with Jeff Gursh and some other folks to try and get this area cleaned up. A year ago at this time we had a flood event out at Cave Creek that closed all entrances into our district. This area was heavily damaged from that. We lost two docks on Bartlett Lake during a four-day rain storm. So there's a lot of damage out here because of a lack of vegetation over the years and everything that's got to get repaired.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. You have anything else to add?

MR. NASH: This is the area where all the signage got torched, correct?

MS. PIKE: Yeah, where the 41 Road is. That one you're all well aware of.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don?

MR. FRENCH: No questions.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, you have any questions?

MR. ROGERS: Only the same thing I would say to Tami and them, just make sure whatever we do we protect our investment. If you can get in there and get the thing opened back up, I'm all for that.

MS. PIKE: Yeah, and Hank to answer your question, the direction that I've given Eric on our roads and trails is that whatever work we do we need to bring it into

what we call "sustainable condition," which means that it would take a major storm event or a major incident to do damage to it. I don't want to have to go out here and spend money on these issues every year.

MR. ROGERS: That's exactly the way I look at it. Is it closed now, Tami?

MS. PIKE: Yeah, this area has been closed. It's the area that's north of Bartlett Lake Road between Bartlett Lake and Camp Creek Wash. It has been closed since 2005.

MR. ROGERS: And once you get this road in and repaired you'll open it up?

MS. PIKE: We will be able to open it up quicker this way.

MR. ROGERS: Will you open it up once you have the read completed? That's my question.

MS. PIKE: As soon as our travel management is signed – which is supposed to be signed by December of this year. If we can get this work done shortly after that we can start opening it, yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: What's the possibility of your travel management coming back and saying, "No, we want to keep this as level one," just for your operation?

MS. PIKE: The routes that we're asking to have repaired now are the ones that are currently approved and won't change under travel management. Those routes that we're asking to add under travel management will be our next grant request.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, but these routes that you're asking this money for; we don't run the chance of this going away?

MS. PIKE: Not unless something happens that we're not proposing in any of our alternatives.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: I've got some real concerns with that because Tami you know I work very, very closely with the forest people up here. A lot of times they do change things on us. I hate to put a bunch of money into something and then the new ranger comes in or the new this or that comes in and says, "No, there are issues here. We found issues. You cannot open this up." That kind of scares me a little bit.

MS. PIKE: At this point there's no chance of that happening. The only chance of us not keeping these routes open would be something that we don't even see coming at this point; because these roads are currently approved to be open and are only closed because of the fire. Under no circumstance under our travel management would any of these routes be closed. And it is out of our hands to change at this point. I know that for a fact because I've written half of it and it is out of our hands for any changes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, you have anything else?

MR. ROGERS: Well I just – after what I've been through up here in the last couple months I'm just reluctant to throw my full support behind it because I've seen what's happened up here to travel management; I've seen what's happened up here because of this fire. You know, environmentalists come in and file lawsuits. We think whatever you're asking for here could be taken away from us. It could literally be swept right out from underneath us.

I'm sorry, Tami. I know you're a good person and I do trust you; but I do have some misgivings when it comes to dealings – when a road is currently closed I'm a little leery.

MS. PIKE: I will tell you, Hank, under the comments we took on the travel management already, none of the routes that we're proposing to do work on did anyone suggest should be closed. You know, I tried to be really careful working with Eric on this – and Jeff – that we didn't touch anything that we thought might have a problem in the future.

So, I hear what you're saying and I have tried my best not to put issues that I think could change on these grants.

MR. ROGERS: And as I said earlier I do trust you, Tami. I've known you a long time and I know you would not intentionally burn us; but that's just my concern on that. Personnel changes and things like that can come back and bite us. That's my only caution on that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, this is John. What do you suggest? What I'm hearing is that if it were a guarantee it would be a no-brainer – you would be for it. How do we do this? We know that we can't get a guarantee from anybody in life, so, I'm open for suggestions.

MR. ROGERS: When you deal with the government, nothing's guaranteed. It can change on us at any time. My heartburn is the fact that it's a closed road right now.

MR. NASH: Well it's only closed because of the fire and the signage that got taken out by the fire, Hank.

MR. ROGERS: What's that?

MR. NASH: I said it's only closed because of the fire and the signage that got taken out because of the fire. It was open and it had been open for years and years and years. We worked with Jeff to get this thing signed properly and two years later a fire rolls through and takes out all the signage.

CHAIR SAVINO: Let me ask you something, Tami. Were there any – prior to the fire, when these roads were open –

[End of tape.]

MR. NASH: . . . the area on the other side of the road is open. On the south side of the road, literally, it's across the road. They use the main road at Bartlett Lake as a

fire break to stop it so it didn't destroy the south side of the road. Unfortunately, it cooked the north side of the road.

MR. ROGERS: I'm going to give you my support on it Tami because I do think you've done your due diligence here and I just hope we don't get burned, you know, by some new personnel or something. But I'll give you my support.

MS. PIKE: And Hank, you have my word, that if I see anything coming that I think may change something, we will stop using the money until we clarify it.

MR. ROGERS: That's fair. That's very fair. Thank you, Tami.

MS. PIKE: You're welcome.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I want to real quick – I have to get back to – we have one more member on the thing then I'm going to give it to Bob Baldwin and Jeff Gursh on this thing subject to – Thomas, do you have any questions?

MR. McARTHUR: Not on this point. I was just looking here there are three proposals that basically seem to be all connected. I guess at the end of this if Tami could kind of give a prioritized north, south and talk about the overall of this thing.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great! We'll do that. Okay, Bob? Bob Baldwin.

MR. BALDWIN: These are level two roads?

MS. PIKE: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: Maintained for high-clearance vehicles?

MS. PIKE: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: So your standard passenger car, even after repair, would not be successful?

MS. PIKE: Well, I won't say they won't be successful, but it would not be designed for passenger cars.

MR. BALDWIN: So, primarily then for 4-wheel drive, ATV use?

MS. PIKE: Yeah, 4-wheel drive, ATV, UTV or dirt bikes.

MR. BALDWIN: And are these roads used to access any particular – the trails that are out there – do they serve a purpose of transporting someone from point A to point B of significance importance?

MS. PIKE: One of them, the 1058 Road will get you from the Horseshoe Lake area across to the 24 Road without having to go down Bartlett which has been a concern by the OHV public because they don't want to have to use that paved road anymore than they have to. The 41 Road runs along the lake which has been a very popular 4-wheel drive road for a number of years because it's not a well-graded road, you're not going far in a car on that one.

So these are routes that I've been taking calls for probably the last six months real heavily asking to get them back open for the OHV public in particular. Passenger cars and above are not really going to be using these routes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob, you have any other questions?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Jeff, I saw your hand. Jeff Gursh.

MR. GURSH: One of the other benefits is that these are also part of the Forest Service's commercial tours. They have Jeep tours for commercial use on the Forest Service, so there's a really big incentive for the Forest Service to keep them open because it's actually one of the few things they can make money on. It generates money for them, so commercial tourism and such is also on some of these trails.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right, thank you. Any other questions? Don?

MR. FRENCH: Nope. You think we need to answer Tom's question?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, but I need to go through the other ones, because they do tie together. Is that okay with you, Tom?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Let's go through D as in Don or Dog.

D	**Tonto NF - Cave Creek RD**	**OHV Road Renovations South of Bartlett Lake Rd**	**$26,380**	**$0**	**$4,400**	**$30,780**

MS. PIKE We don't know what your numbers are.

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh, okay. This is the south side of the Bartlett Dam Road Verde River Trail Corridor from 144 to 2123 entrance to Needle Rock Recreation Area.

MS. PIKE: Yes, this is in what we call the Desert Vista Area. This is the highest concentrated use area on the Cave Creek District. These are the main roads through there just like the ones we're doing on the north side have always been open; but because of all the water damage and some of the locations and misuse and everything, they really need some repair in there to get them back in shape. Because these are ones that are already approved and open and won't change under travel management and they're the main connector corridors in there, getting those repaired and back in shape will help us once December comes and we hopefully get a signature on a page with the rest of them, then we can start working on all the feeder routes that go around them.

MR. GURSH: It will lighten up the riding in this area, too, if that other stuff is up and running, which is the bigger concern. They don't have anywhere else to ride right now except for staying on the south side.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right. Bill, you have any questions?

MR. NASH: I ride there all the time. I love the area but it definitely needs some work.

CHAIR SAVINO: Needs some TLC, huh? Don, you have any questions?

MR. FRENCH: No questions.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas, you have any questions?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes, I do. I have a question here. North and south, which would you prioritize the highest?

MS. PIKE: I think we're going to have to go with the north side like Eric said because if we don't get some maintenance in there it's never going to get opened.

MR. McARTHUR: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Hank, you have anything?

MR. ROGERS: I don't.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'm going to move on to the last one there in your thing. I don't know if that was the question that Thomas had on that, but I'm going to go – the next one, "Cave Creek District with emphasis on Desert Vista OHV Area." Go ahead.

MR. NORMAN: I'm the guy on the ground in the field doing a lot of scouting and patrolling work, signage, and trail maintenance. A UTV would be an extremely valuable resource to help me accomplish a lot of the stuff I have to do out there. I can carry signs, tools, gasoline – this grant we just applied there's going to be some sweko [phonetic] work involved. I can follow along with gasoline for refilling. This UTV will be valuable for years to come.

This project we're proposing is going to be in phases. This is the first phase. There will be a couple more phases. It's going to be ongoing. We've got years of maintenance work ahead of us and a UTV would be a valuable tool to have.

MS. PIKE: And if you'll notice on this we're taking the ATVs that were purchased with State Parks OHV dollars in 2007 trading those in for this UTV. It's because of weight issues with those 800s and all of that we can't carry much on those, where the UTV will be able to carry a lot more and get a lot more places.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right. Why – up in the Lakeside Ranger District on the Apache Tours they buy their own UTVs or ATVs. They purchase their own. Why doesn't your ranger district buy your own. Will you own it? I notice that the Coalition is backing this. Where will that – where will that belong? What I'm going to get to is that yesterday we were faced with the thing with the Ambassador Program with mis –

MS. PIKE: Misuse.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm not going to say – there are some missing pieces that may have gone over to law enforcement. How are we assured that when the next ranger comes onto that area there, they don't say that's taken and "Well, we want to give it to the law enforcement end of it."

MS. PIKE: Well, I can answer that in a couple ways. First of all, the two ATVs that are there now – and I want to mention to everybody here in case you didn't know – these are the two that were in trailer that were stolen about three years back. With the OHV public's help we got them back.

When it was suggested that we trade these, there were other people on the district that wanted these and I said, "Uh uh, these were bought with OHV Sticker Dollars, you can't take these. If you want to pay me for them the same price we would get for the upgrade," you know because we're getting – I forget how many dollars for each of them for an upgrade – "if you want to pay that to me so I can go forward and get an upgrade, fine; otherwise no because these were bought with federal dollars."

We do have ATVs that we continue to maintain that we have that we're continuing to use. And last year, instead of buying a UTV I bought two dirt bikes. We took an ATV that fire was getting rid of – and before Eric throws something at me – it's coming apart quite frankly. We need a UTV. I don't have the dollars now to buy another vehicle, so it was a choice to trade in the two that we'd already gotten from you folks for the type vehicle we needed.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I guess my question is back to, will this be dedicated and what assurances do we have that this will be dedicated to OHV use?

MS. PIKE: The two that we have now show that since 2007 they have not been used by law enforcement, they haven't been used by other groups within the district, they have been devoted to this. That's what we intend to do with this UTV as well.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Don, you have any questions?

MR. FRENCH: None.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill?

MR. NASH: None.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, you have any questions?

MR. ROGERS: I don't.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: I'm good.

CHAIR SAVINO: You're good, okay, that was easy.

MR. ROGERS: I do have one question.

CHAIR SAVINO: Too late!

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Go ahead.

MR. ROGERS: The guy that's buying that, are you authorized to give tickets?

MR. NORMAN: Yes, I'm a Forest Protection Officer.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, good. I'm glad to hear that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob Baldwin?

MR. BALDWIN: These are the same projects that were turned back to the group back in May and the money was returned.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: And the reason that it was returned at that time was because you were able to proceed in getting a contract that you could afford to do this work with.

MA PIKE: Well there were actually two reasons. The first was the weather. We had taken such a beating out there with the weather we couldn't get it on the ground. By the time we could get on the ground we couldn't get the paperwork done to do it. We've rewritten these. There was some concern about the way they were written the last time by our contracting people, so we've rewritten these to take out the issue that they had.

MR. BALDWIN: So, who's going to do this work then?

MS. PIKE: We will be hiring someone for – you'll see on the – is this the north side – you'll see the tractor rental equipment and all of that; so we'll get a contract out and get that rented so we can get out and get the work done.

MR. BALDWIN: On the south side?

MS. PIKE: On the south side, I don't think we needed that amount of work because we've got a tractor of our own. So we're going to be using our tractor in one place and another tractor in the other place.

CHAIR SAVINO: While he was asking questions that brings up an issue or a question I have. You had mentioned earlier – first of all, Thomas, did you get your question answered on tying the two places together?

MR. McARTHUR: I got it that they had a priority for the north side; and if I could just follow up with that. How tied are these projects?

MS. PIKE: I'm sorry, I don't understand the question.

MR. McARTHUR: How are they tied together?

MS. PIKE: The north side of Bartlett Lake Road which is the one that we prioritized and the south side are the heaviest used portions of the district. We are trying right now to get them in shape so that once our travel management map is signed people will know where they're supposed to be so they're not getting tickets. That's the purpose of thee two grants because right now there's not enough signage out there for people to know whether they're on the right road or trail or not.

MR. McARTHUR: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great. Two questions that I have. One is, you had mentioned that this won't take place until the TMR. comes out?

MS. PIKE: No, this will take place beforehand so that they're ready when the travel management comes out.

CHAIR SAVINO: That was one of my concerns, what we're faced with with our sticker money is we want to get it on the ground and get it going. If it were a thing that we're going to have next year then we want you to come back next year with that not, you know, do this here. We're trying to get that money out.

The other question is more towards Bob on this. Any of these projects qualify for RTP money? So, there is RTP money there available for these projects. I see that on there you don't have any of that on there – that they qualify. That would help us to know if those --

MR. BALDWIN: We can do that when he wants to discuss funding.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we'll do that in a little bit, but I want to discuss that before we rate these because it does matter where that money comes from.

MR. BALDWIN: Well first of all the voters – Project A I would say is not eligible for RTP. Project B probably would be eligible for RTP. C and D would probably eligible. G, the one we just discussed would not be; and I would not be.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, but H?

MR. NASH: We haven't gone over H yet.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Sounds good. Any other questions for Tami and Eric? I believe that's it on yours. Thank you very much.

MS. PIKE: Thank you guys. We appreciate the support.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Let's go to F. F is going to be the Arizona Game and Fish. Jimmy Simmons is here presenting the thing. What this is for is this is for the purchase of ten side-by-sides and two UTVs. Go ahead.

F	**Game & Fish Dept**	**OHV Law Enforcement Equipment Purchase**	**$174,800**	**$0**	**$9,200**	**$184,000**

MR. SIMMONS: Two ATVs, actually. I think you guys have all had a chance to look at this. If there are any questions, I can answer. I did make the changes you asked for – some options. I made some options which you'll see towards the end of the report. Right before the cost estimate there are three options there. I just wanted to add to that. I came up with an idea after the fact. It's not in here, but if you for some reason don't want to fund the entire thing if you want to fund half of it; I have it here you can do it in phases if you like; but the way we look at it the more UTVs that we have out on the ground patrolling, whether it's one or ten, that's better than what we have now. So, however – yes?

MR. NASH: I had a question in regards to what model UTV are you guys looking for on this? Because when I went out on the east side of town to Desert Wells they're running around in I think 650 Artic Cats which aren't going to cut the mustard for you guys using these for law enforcement.

MR. SIMMONS: What we're looking at right now, the ones that we're going to try to purchase – I can't procure things through the State procurement process. I can't say "I want an Artic Cat," or "I want a Polaris." I have to spec them out.

MR. NASH: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: The ones that I recently spec'd out for the OHV law enforcement specialist we just hired, I spec'd him out a 50-inch maximum width machine. There are other specs in there; but basically what it comes down to is if they follow that specification right now the only machine I know of would be a Ranger Razor.

MR. NASH: Right.

MR. SIMMONS: Then we have the 800 cc, I think, 760 – we spec'd them at those. So that's probably what we will be doing. Those retail anywhere between $11,300 –

MR. NASH: Yeah, it just depends on the model.

MR. SIMMONS: So, did that answer that question?

MR. NASH: Yeah, because I saw what they had out there. I ride and I turned around and looked –

MR. SIMMONS: It looks like an agricultural machine?

MR. NASH: It is an agricultural machine.

MR. SIMMONS: Yeah. That was purchased before I was in the program. I've learned through the procurement process you've got to be creative so to speak in how you spec these things out to get what you want. If we say we just want a side-by-side that's a 700 or whatever, I could get a Ranger, I could get an Artic Cat, I could get – we do it on a reverse auction online.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don, you have any questions?

MR. FRENCH: First thing, I'm questioning your math here. One: ten single-axle trailers for UTVs it's $1,600 each?

MR. SIMMONS: Okay you have the older – I submitted a newer version. Did they get that? What happened was the $1,600 should have been $2,200. I'm sorry.

MR. FRENCH: Also, I've got a comment, I guess. I'm surprised to see this again.

MR. SIMMONS: You asked to have it reviewed again.

MR. NASH: With options.

MR. FRENCH: I thought you understood that we would be willing – I don't think we came out and said it, but with a lesser amount. Then you come back and ask for the same thing. I'm just a little surprised.

MR. SIMMONS: Okay. And that's why I gave you the options of the three phases; and like I said at the beginning, after the fact – I think there was a quick turnaround. You needed it like the next day and I was actually on the phone at your last meeting and I made the changes quickly and gave it to Jim Harkin to get to Bob because I wasn't at that meeting. So the changes had to be made quite quickly to get it into this meeting.

CHAIR SAVINO: I think what – I can only speak for myself when I suggested at the last meeting that you come back and, you know, present this different. What I meant by three phases or whatever, or two phases, is that the phases wouldn't be this meeting and then the next meeting and then the next meeting in the same year. I was meaning that you come in with a phase like for five right now; and then we have a chance to review because one of our issues was that we don't want this to be used strictly for law enforcement for writing tickets to going out there to see the innocent people. We expressed that out there.

MR. SIMMONS: Wait I'm not sure what you mean with that last sentence.

CHAIR SAVINO: I had talked about when you came up there – our club up there endorsed this, but I also had some reservations at the time that we've seen Game and Fish law enforcement people out on trails just stopping anybody. You know, I've been one of the ones and Don's been one of the ones who were stopped out there by the Game and Fish people. We don't want to see it. It's hard for us to sell it to the OHV community that we're giving their money to law enforcement so that they can be watching all the trails out there. So that's one of the issues we had there.

What we wanted to do was be able to – not "we." What I wanted to do is to be able to give five, per se; then look at it, review that program – how that program is going. I know if Jimmy Simmons is out there on that – in one of those – there's not going to be even an issue; but I don't know that about all the people. So I wanted to have the opportunity before we put a big chunk in there to, you know, look at that. That's why I was saying, come in with half now, let us review it; and then come with this.

MR. SIMMONS: That's the option I mentioned verbally.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, it wasn't on this. Okay. Bill, do you have any – let me go back, Don, do you have any other questions?

MR. FRENCH: Well I just feel like you're asking – you found three ways to ask for the same thing and that's not what I thought.

MR. SIMMONS: I'm not trying to deceive you or anything like that. You wanted some options. Those are options if you don't feel comfortable with funding it all at once was what I was trying to provide for you. I will say – just back to your comment about law enforcement – these are going to be – I want to make sure you all understand – they're going to be fully marked law enforcement machines.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, that's okay.

MR. SIMMONS: I just didn't want you to think they were going to be something – we don't build trails.

CHAIR SAVINO: I know that. I know that. I understand that.

MR. FRENCH: I have a comment I'd like to make real quick. It's hard to talk to you.

MR. SIMMONS: I'm a law enforcement officer.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to go on. Do you have any other questions, Don?

MR. FRENCH: None.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Bill, do you have a question?

MR. NASH: Nope!

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm going to go to Bob before I go to Hank and Thomas.

MR. BALDWIN: What's the life expectancy of these vehicles?

MR. SIMMONS: It depends on their use, how well they're maintained. We keep them on a PM – you know, preventative maintenance schedule. I'm trying to think, the one that I have that you saw, the Artic Cat, that's an '07. It's in real good shape. I used it in the Jamboree last week. I rode it all day for two days with those people.

MR. NASH: If maintained properly you can get ten years out of the thing, if you take care of them.

MR. SIMMONS: We've got some ATVs that are –

MR. BALDWIN: Federal equipment doesn't get that level of treatment.

MR. NASH: I can tell you that seeing their Artic Cat, I was impressed. They took care of it.

CHAIR SAVINO: I have a question. Are there provisions to put – I don't know if we want them or not – but stickers on there to say that this vehicle was funded by the Off-Highway Vehicle – I'm not sure we want to do that.

MR. NASH: Well, 95 percent of the people will appreciate it, five percent won't.

MR. SIMMONS: What we possibly could do that might even gain you more ground – I could talk to Jim Harkin our PIO and we could do some kind of a press release, you know, some kind of a thank-you type of deal. I can't guarantee that, but that's an idea.

CHAIR SAVINO: You know we could wrap this issue up with the kiosk – when the Forest Service puts up the kiosk, we want to have something to say that these dollars came from the Off-Highway Vehicle Sticker Program. I think it's the same thing on any of the material that we issue out there. It should be that identification that that's where the money goes.

MR. SIMMONS: I don't know why we couldn't. We do that when we get grant money. You know, I think about other grants I've written for wildlife projects, when we do a simple water catchment, there's a sign there that says, "The Arizona [unintelligible] Foundation and the Rocky Mount Elk Foundation funded this project." Why can't we put a sticker on there that says that? Why not? I'll look into that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, do you have any questions?

MR. ROGERS: Yes, I do. I look at this and in my mind this project here is ten times better than the Ambassador Program because these guys can do something. You know your Ambassadors can go out and hand out some literature, you know, and encourage people to do different things; but if we're going to fund this entire thing, we're going to put ten machines out there with ten guys out there who can help us get a handle on some of this wildcat riding and things like that that continues to hurt us. I think this, in my mind, is probably one of the best projects that's been brought forth today because it will do more to help us than the entire Ambassador's Program – and I'm not downgrading the Ambassador Program, but I think you all get my point. I think this is one of the best projects we've got going for us today.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, thank you. Thomas, you have anything?

MR. McARTHUR: No, I'm good, thanks.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Jimmy, you have anything else to add on to this?

MR. SIMMONS: I just want to make sure that you guys know, too, that there were two ATVs for training that are included in that. We've got a couple that are just getting old and need to be replaced. We do a lot of training. I actually, because of our budget this year – there were two from Flagstaff Wolverines that were going to go to State surplus and they ran. So I said "let's keep them," and we just spent a bunch of money working on them, putting in batteries and that kind of thing in them, not knowing if we're going to have money to fund any training projects. We do a lot of the ASI training, General Harkin and I and several other people in our agency. We train our people and other agency people.

MR. BALDWIN: What size are those?

MR. SIMMONS: The two Wolverines?

MR. BALDWIN: The ones you're requesting.

MR. SIMMONS: You know we'll probably do like 300s or 350s. You don't need anything big to do that ASI training. You're going pretty slow most of the time.

MR. BICKAUSKAS: Those Wolverines are 350s.

MR. SIMMONS: Yeah, yeah.

MR. BALDWIN: You might have a couple in the BLM.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, they're probably gone by now. I want to mention real quick while we're on the subject – Hank brought it up about the Ambassador Program. One of the things that I forgot to mention that Jay Ziemann mentioned is that in our next – in the agenda for the next meeting, Hank, we are going to discuss in length the Ambassador Program.

MR. ROGERS: Good!

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. All right. Thank you, folks, appreciate it. Okay, I'm going to go on to – that was F. Let's do H. H is the – let me get to it. Kelli Kessler from the Wildlife – staff officer from the Tonto National Forest is going to present us with the project description. The primary objective of this project is to improve habitat within the Whitlow Ranch Flood Control Basin.

H	**Tonto NF - Mesa RD**	**Whitlow Ranch Flood Control Basin Restoration Project**	**$181,021**	**$0**	**$22,139**	**$203,160**

MS. KESSLER: This area – I don't know if anyone is familiar with this area or the Mesa District. I know that Amy Raki our OHV Coordinator has applied for grants in the past for pipe rail. We've installed quite a bit of it over in the lower Sycamore Area and the Rolls area. She was actually the one who recommended that I apply for this because I have never applied for these before. This area is on grazing allotment. It's 106 acres that were fenced off back in '99 to remove livestock access to this area; because of the suitable, unoccupied wolf-like habitat, which is an endangered species.

Since that time, OHV use has increased significantly in this area. A lot of the valley residents are moving over – it's actually in Pinal County, but a lot of valley residents are coming over to this area because the lower Sycamore Area is so heavily used. So a lot of people are going, "Okay, let's go out here now." So what's happening is this area is expanding. We're getting a lot of unauthorized OHV use in areas where we haven't seen it before. So this project is designed for several reasons.

One, to curtail any kind of OHV use in unauthorized areas before it gets really out of hand; and two, the livestock operators has a really difficult time keeping the barbed wire fence and his livestock out because it's cut often. Part of this area – this exclosure [phonetic] – is within a wash and a lot of people – if you look at the map, there's a wash that runs just north of the – one of the access roads there. What happens is, people ride down the wash and then they cut the fence to get further down the wash. So that's actually part of the exclosure. We can't keep the exclosure fence up and so livestock gets in there. This will help manage livestock and OHV use in the area.

Since I applied for this grant I included just the $9,000 matching from the RAC committee. Since that time I've been – this project was approved for $57,400. So we can knock that off the amount that I'm asking for right up front. That brings

it down to $123,621 – I know it's a huge amount of money, so all the money would be used for the pipe rail and for the installation of it.

MR. NASH: How tall is this pipe rail?

MS. KESSLER: It's the standard three. That's what we've been using on the rest of the –

MR. NASH: So how is that going to keep livestock out or in?

MS. KESSLER: There will be a barbed wire fence on the inside. So we'll have the pipe rail and then the barbed wire fence. What will happen then, hopefully, is that OHV riders coming down will see the pipe rail fence and they won't cut the barbed wire fence because there will be no point. They can't get in there anyway. Just having the barbed wire there it serves no purpose. It's cut continually and it's a maintenance nightmare.

CHAIR SAVINO: Have you seen the OVH riders out there cutting the stuff?

MS. KESSLER: Not – if I did I would take it –

CHAIR SAVINO: Do you know that it's the OHV riders that are doing this?

MS. KESSLER: There are trails all through it so where the fence is open it's – that's where the trails go.

MR. NASH: But could those be Jeeps, trucks, anything else over and above that?

CHAIR SAVINO: Hunters?

MS. KESSLER: I doubt it's hunters. I don't know for sure. I haven't seen anybody do that – and OHV it could be, yes, it could be trucks, it could be – when I said off-highway vehicles I mean Jeeps, trucks.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so it could be kids going out there to party.

MS. KESSLER: No. Just knowing that area I know where people go to party and that's not – it's the – what they do is they stage right above the wash. There's a lot of staging and camping right there. What happens is, people drop down – instead of just coming back out onto the 357 Road, which is the highly – the Hewitt Station Road – if they came right out and go up the 357 to the 172 Road which is a huge loop and it's beautiful – beautiful ride. What they're doing is just going down into the wash, taking the wash right up to 172 to make that loop. It doesn't – it takes them maybe a second of time travel but they just drop down into the wash there. So this is just to keep them from doing that so that they come back out onto the actual road, back on to the –

MR. NASH: Are there any other options as far as – I mean, if there are access points to get into this wash are there other ways of fixing the problem like really big boulders or something to block the stuff off?

MS. KESSLER: No, it's bigger.

MR. NASH: What about adding it to the travel management plan? Because it's an area that's already being –

MS. KESSLER: It is. It is. It's currently open. In travel management it's proposed closed; but the road itself – if you look at the map, the 3 – 40/93 Road, even if we closed that road, let's say that was closed. What happens is, people would come up the wash, come around there so it would serve no – I would have to show you on the map why that –

CHAIR SAVINO: What you just said. You said it's currently open –

MR. NASH: But the road is closed.

CHAIR SAVINO: But you're trying to put a pipe fence across there?

MS. KESSLER: No, no – and I apologize for the confusion. There's the 340 – 3493 Road – I don't see what map you're looking at there, John. Okay. That is the road that's proposed closed in travel management.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, just that little spur?

MS. KESSLER: Just that little spur. The one that comes off of is the 357. That's the main artery road that goes through there. The 172 is the one they're accessing through the wash. So the area that's supposed to be fenced off now for the exclosure is cut. The part that's cut mostly is the part – if I could show you – it's the part just north –

MR. NASH: There's another road right above 3493 that's showing on there, that little short one that goes between the other road.

MR. FRENCH: Which map are you on, Bill?

MR. NASH: Hewitt Holding Pasture, proposed closure fence – exclosure fence. I mean, if those two roads were shut off right at the main road, wouldn't that solve the same issue?

MS. KESSLER: No. It seems like it would, but what would happen is people would still come down the wash and go right into the exclosure. They would come down the wash from the 172 Road which is further east. If you follow the 357 Road up –

MR. NASH: It just looks like we're paying for the guy's ranch fencing to me.

MS. KESSLER: No.

MR. NASH: I mean, this square here has already got fence on it.

MS. KESSLER: But it doesn't really have fence because this is where it's cut all the time in here.

MR. NASH: But if this road right here and this road are closed then –

MS. KESSLER: They still come right here and then they would still come up –

MR. NASH: And all these trails are all signed appropriately?

MS. KESSLER: There's no other trail except this road. That's 357. That's a major road that goes through there. It's dirt.

MR. NASH: But it's signed, correct, for trail use?

MS. KESSLER: Yes. It's access to private property back here.

CHAIR SAVINO: What is – there's a road across there right now, so what we're doing – you're asking to block it off because of the Fly-Catcher bird – may be in that area. Because I notice – and I want it explained to me – according to the paperwork here that is just an area that's ripe for that type of bird.

MS. KESSLER: It is not there yet.

CHAIR SAVINO: The bird's not there yet.

MS. KESSLER: Right.

CHAIR SAVINO: So you're wanting to put this money in -- $174,000 or whatever it is now – pipe off an area –

MS. KESSLER: Right.

CHAIR SAVINO: Because that bird catcher – Fly-Catcher bird may be coming in that area.

MS. KESSLER: And it's also – it's right there in the habitat – and a riparian habitat in the Sonora Desert is rare – a rare thing. It also has Harris hawks in there. There are other species that use riparian area. Most species use riparian areas.

MR. ROGERS: John, I've got a comment.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Hank.

MR. ROGERS: You know, this to me sounds like a law enforcement problem. You know, quite frankly, I think she ought to report it to Jimmy Simmons, you know, and go out there and write some tickets for a couple weeks in a row and you might be able to solve the problem rather than, you know, spending a hundred plus thousand dollars here in hopes that this bird will come flying back around. That's my recommendation that we, you know – let's get some law enforcement people in there working it for a few months and see if you can't resolve the problem through that, especially if you're going to close all the roads in there through trail management. That's my recommendation on this.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, thank you. Don French.

MR. FRENCH: Yeah I've just got a comment or question, I guess. Your only OHV endorsement is Tonto Recreation Alliance?

MS. KESSLER: I didn't realize that we needed to get more than one.

MR. FRENCH: Okay, that's the one that I see that we got. And the last sentence in this, "We would like to work with the Mesa District in the future on possible alternatives to permanent, unattractive and very expensive pipe fencing." It's not a very good endorsement.

MS. KESSLER: Right, right. They've been involved in a lot of pipe rail fencing projects, yeah.

MR. FRENCH: That's all I've got.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: I'd like to say one other thing, too. I've ridden a long time and I can tell you I have never – and there are a lot of barbed wire fencing up here – I've never seen barbed wire fencing cut by OHVs. I'm sure it happens. I'm not naïve enough to know that it's not out there happening; but to continually do it and continually do it, I just don't get that. I just don't see it happening. If it is maybe you need to get some law enforcement out there and write several tickets, you'll probably catch your culprit, you know, if it's the same guy. It could be. It could be the same bunch out there riding. It could be resolved with that.

MS. KESSLER: Okay, well, thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill, you have any more?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Don?

[No verbal response.]

MS. KESSLER: You guys are welcome to come out and see the area.

CHAIR SAVINO: I want to see one of these Fly Catchers, so what they are.

MR. BALDWIN: [Unintelligible] withdrew this last project.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right, that's it as far as our grants go. Are there any more comments from the public? Jeff you have any more?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Jimmy Simmons.

MR. SIMMONS: I just wanted to remind everybody so you can get the word out the OHV renewal notices are being done. You can ask to have those sent to you online now. You can go to our website. They currently going to be sent to you by mail, but we would like it if you asked to have it sent to you via email. It saves us money. It saves the whole OHV program money. Currently we've got around 200 people signed up for that in the last two months.

MR. ROGERS: Jimmy, I've got a question for you.

MR. SIMMONS: Sure.

MR. ROGERS: MVD was sending me a notice on my email for mine. Are you able to get those files?

MR. SIMMONS: I'm talking about the OHV decal, not the registration decal.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right now we can't – I'm sorry guys to interrupt you, but I'm getting a pounding in the head from other there – from Joy. We need to – this was a comment that was brought to – by Jimmy Simmons up there. I have to

address that. But we can't as OHVAG members we can't discuss this with him. Okay.

MR. ROGERS: Tell Joy not to be so technical.

CHAIR SAVINO: I know, tell me about it. Let's go on. Our next process – the next thing in this, the rating process for this. Okay? We all have our sheets.

MR. ROGERS: Hold on a second, John. I apologize for being late. Are we not going to get to vote on each one of these projects, individually.

MR. FRENCH: Yeah we are, but we're going to rate them first, though.

CHAIR SAVINO: We're going to rate them and then we go through the – once we rate them then we're going to go through and vote on each one of them and say a "yea" or "nay" on whether we even agree with the program – the thing or not – and have that vote. Is that okay?

MR. ROGERS: Yeah, that sounds good.

CHAIR SAVINO: But yes, we're going to vote on – but we first need to rate them and go from there. Then I have a question after we rate them, before we vote on them, is the money available and then we'll go down through that. Okay? I'd like to turn it over to Bob Baldwin at this point and go through it.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, Mr. Chairman and group, the same as we've done the process in the past hopefully we'll complete it this time. Each of you should have your rating sheet attachments E(3)(a) and you should have these projects in priority – your priority – and I will call on each one of you to give me your ratings in order. Then we add those up. The projects with the lowest score are the highest rated. Once we have every project in the rating order then we will review funding recommendations for those projects. Okay.

MR. ROGERS: Do we have time to get these in order?

CHAIR SAVINO: You be last.

MR. BALDWIN: Who is ready? Don French, first?

MR. FRENCH: How you want it, A(1), B(3), C(5), D(2), E(6), F(8), G(4), H(9), I(7).

MR. BALDWIN: All right, who's next?

CHAIR SAVINO: A(1), B(2), C(4), D(3), E(6), F(7), G(5) – then I'll go with – how many are there, nine? Okay, then I'll go – I have no down for H, but I'll go (9); and then I is (8).

MR. BALDWIN: Thomas, are you ready?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes, I am. A(1), B(2), C(3), D(4), E(7), F(8), G(5), H(9), I(6).

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, who's next Hank or Bill?

MR. NASH: A(1), B(2), C(3), G(4), D(5), F(6) H(8) – I'm sorry I(8) and H last – no, you can move I down.

MR. BALDWIN: I is nine?

MR. NASH: Yeah; and E would be seven.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Hank, you're up.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, you're making it tough on me. I still have some questions here. All right. B(1), F(2), I(3), E(4), B(5), C(6), G(7), A(8) and H(9).

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob is tallying up the numbers. What he will do is the one with the least amount of votes.

MR. ROGERS: Wait, wait, wait. If I said B(1), that's the lowest vote?

CHAIR SAVINO: Those lowest numbers will be the highest vote. If you rated A – if everybody rated A as number one there would be five number ones and that's five points.

MR. ROGERS: So he would be the –

MR. FRENCH: Your low number wins.

CHAIR SAVINO: Lowest number is topest [sic] choice – top choice – geez!

MR. BALDWIN: I've got 12 for number A, 10 for B, 21 for C, 19 for D, 30 for E, 31 for F, 25 for G, 44 for H and 33 for I. So the highest priority project is number B, Hassayampa Field Office, Boulders Table Mesa, and Vulture Mountain Trail Maintenance.

MR. FRENCH: Excuse me what was H?

CHAIR SAVINO: It was 44. Okay and then that project there is number one and qualifies for RTP money?

MR. BALDWIN: Number one does qualify for RTP money. To maximize the OHV Fund they would only need – is this $16,000 Coalition matching? Or is that federal matching?

MR. FRENCH: Boulders Table Mesa, Vulture Maintenance – trail maintenance.

MR. BICKAUSKAS: Program dollars or bureau management equipment for projects that could be either weighted – they're graded or back-hoe. There are water buffalo, there are welder fence equipment tools -- $2,000 is a BLM match; $2,000 is in ATV, sign equipment as well as volunteers installing from the Coalition.

MR. BALDWIN: That project would need a minimum of 10 percent – a minimum of $12,000 OHV money. You could give them any amount more than that –

CHAIR SAVINO: So they have $16,000 sponsored funds.

MR. BALDWIN: Again, the total project cost including the match is $121,000. The match requirement is 10 percent for federal – for the RTP. So, 10 percent of $121,000 would be $12,000 in OHV match.

MR. ROGERS: I have a question here. We're talking about B, is that right?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: They're asking for $105,000. They're already saving the $16,000 in match so why would they need any money for match?

MR. BALDWIN: To spend RTP money they need a non-federal match.

CHAIR SAVINO: Isn't that what that $16,000 is?

MR. BALDWIN: No, that's all federal expenses.

CHAIR SAVINO: I had that same question, Bob. That didn't make sense there. Does that answer your question, Hank?

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: So they would need a minimum of $13,000 OHV money and the other $92,000 could be RTP money.

MR. ROGERS: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Go ahead, Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: If you want to word it that way, take action on that one.

CHAIR SAVINO: You want to take actions on each one of these?

MR. BALDWIN: Yeah, let's go. On the next page, page three, there's a recommended motion if you'll plug in the name – project name and the amounts.

CHAIR SAVINO: Before that I want to pool the OHVAG members. My question is whether you want this funded or not? Yes or no okay on project B: Bill Nash, yes or no, on whether you want to fund this project?

MR. NASH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank Rogers?

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas McArthur?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, that's unanimous and I don't have to vote on that thing – I can't, right?

AAG HERNBRODE: What we were looking for in terms of your motion – and that's why Bob gave you the – we need all that language in there; and it's helpful if you have in your motion why this is your top-rated project.

CHAIR SAVINO: I will do that, but I –

AAG HERNBRODE: You don't need to do this middle part.

CHAIR SAVINO: I do need to do this middle part to know whether I want to – if I have the panel here it says that – yes, they rate it, but they don't want to fund it at this time; then I need to know that. Before we go to the – because that's what happened in the past, Joy. We've had this thing here and we've rated it, but we didn't necessarily want to fund this thing, so – before we go to the next step of me recommending – entertaining a motion for the recommendation for approval of this –

AAG HERNBRODE: What I'm telling you is what you just did is you voted to approve the grant.

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

AAG HERNBRODE: Effectively, yes. You can do it that way. There's nothing wrong with doing it that way.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'll go for that. So I would like at this point here in this process – I would like to entertain a motion from the OHVAG members to fund – I move to – I would like to entertain a motion for you to move to recommend the high priority project title BLM Hassayampa Field Office, Boulders Table Mesa, Vulture Mountain Trail Maintenance be submitted – okay – and receive X amount of dollars from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and encourage the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreement.

MR. ROGERS: I so move.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank Rogers moves –

MR. BALDWIN: No, no, somebody has to read the motion, fill in the names and the amounts –

AAG HERNBRODE: John didn't fill in the amounts.

CHAIR SAVINO: I didn't. I can't. Can I?

MR. BALDWIN: Who's going to make the motion? The one who makes the motion can read it right from here.

CHAIR SAVINO: All I'm doing is entertaining it to have one of the members read it.

MR. BALDWIN: Somebody can read the motion based on what's written right here.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. I can't make a motion can I? I'm asking a question. Can the chairman make a motion?

AAG HERNBRODE: No, the rules discourages you from doing so, but does not prevent you from doing so. So if you'd like to you can.

MR. FRENCH: In the meantime I'd like to make a motion. I recommend that the high priority project titled, "Boulders Table Mesa Vulture Mine Trail Maintenance submitted by Hassayampa FO receive $105,000 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and encourage the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreement.

MR. ROGERS: I thought you were going to go to the RTP for this?

MR. BALDWIN: Yes we are.

AAG HERNBRODE: Do you need them to designate which funding source it comes from?

MR. FRENCH: Not right now.

MR. BALDWIN: The motion is right here for them to do that. We just discussed that they would put $13,000 from the OHV fund and the balance which would be $92,000, so – I could provide the math if you need to do that.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, let's do it.

MR. BALDWIN: The second recommendation there, combined funding – on your sheet, page three, the sheet you just read from – recommends for combined funding. I move to recommend that –

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm not following you.

MR. FRENCH: I need to know the numbers. You threw them out there.

MR. BALDWIN: Ninety-two thousand from recreational trails and $13,000 in OHV recreation fund.

MR. FRENCH: Ninety-two and what?

MR. BALDWIN: Thirteen.

MR. FRENCH: This is my last one so you guys – I move to – no. I make a motion to recommend the high priority project titled Boulders Table Mesa Vulture Mountain Trail Maintenance submitted by BLM Hassayampa FO receive $92,000 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and $13,000 from the recreational trails program motorized portion and encourage the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Is there a second?

MR. NASH: I'll second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill Nash seconds the motion. All those in favor signify by – no, I'm going to poll it because we have two people on the phone. Hank Rogers?

MR. ROGERS: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas McArthur?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill Nash?

MR. NASH: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: There are four ayes, no no's. The Chairman can't vote. This is our number one project.

MR. BALDWIN: Number A was the next priority with 12 points, BLM Hassayampa Field Office Boulders Table Mesa OHV Area Site Steward is not eligible for RTP Funds, therefore, you'd use the first recommendation, OHV Recommendation for OHV recreation funds only.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'd like to entertain a motion to approve the monies for the Project A, Boulders Table Mesa OHV Area Site Steward, BLM Hassayampa Field Office.

MR. FRENCH: I'll give it one more shot. I make a motion to recommend that the high priority project titled Boulders Table Mesa OHV Area Site Steward submitted by BLM Hassayampa FO receive $66,000 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and encourage the Executive Director or a designee to sign the appropriate agreement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, do we have a second?

MR. NASH: I second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm going to poll again. What's that Hank?

MR. ROGERS: I just want to – I have an issue paying salaries with our money; so I'm going to be voting no on this. There's salary involved here.

[End of tape.]

MR. ROGERS: . . . I just have a lot of heartburn giving out salaries. I'm going to vote no.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. At this point I'm not asking for a vote. I'm asking whether there's any more discussion. Any discussion?

MR. FRENCH: I don't think you can have discussion after.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay I want a vote. Hank Rogers is a no. Thomas McArthur?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Don French?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill Nash?

MR. NASH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we have three yeses and one no. It passes. Aid will be funded.

MR. BALDWIN: Our next priority would be Project D, Tonto National Forest Cave Creek Ranger District OHV Road Renovation South of Bartlett Lake. They're not eligible for RTP Funding.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so it's number one. I'd like to entertain a motion.

MR. ROGERS: D as in dog?

MR. BALDWIN: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to entertain a motion to approve the funding for Project D, Off-Highway Vehicle Road Renovation South Bartlett Lake Road, Tonto National Forest Cave Creek Ranger District.

MR. NASH: Let me see how bad I can butcher this. I ask OHV – I recommend – OHVAG recommendation for OHV Recreational Fund only I move to recommend that the high-priority project titled –

MR. FRENCH: How 'bout I do it on this one?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. FRENCH: I make a motion to recommend that the high-priority project titled OHV Road Renovation South of Bartlett Lake Road, submitted by Tonto National Forest Cave Creek RD receive $26,380 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and encourage the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Is there a second to that motion?

MR. ROGERS: I'll second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Hank Rogers seconded the motion. Any discussion on this? I can have discussion after.

MR. FRENCH: After a motion?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, yeah.

AAG HERNBRODE: That's actually the time you're supposed to have discussion is after the motion.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, after the motion. Okay, so, I'm going to poll the group again. Hank Rogers?

MR. ROGERS: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas McArthur?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill Nash?

MR. NASH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we have a unanimous decision. This has been funded, D has been approved. Gosh, we're moving right along. Okay, we're going to number four. Bob?

MR. BALDWIN: Number four would be 21 points, number C – the letter C. Cave Creek Ranger District OHV Road Renovation North of Bartlett Lake Road and that would not be eligible for RTP Funding.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'd like to entertain a motion that we approve the Project C, Off-Highway Vehicle Renovations on the North of Bartlett Lake Road, Tonto National Forest Cave Creek Ranger District. Bill you want to try this one?

MR. NASH: Yeah. The project title just says – all right. I move to recommend that the high-priority project titled OHV Renovations North of Bartlett Lake Road, submitted by the Tonto National Forest Cave Creek Road Ranger District.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, do we have a second?

MR. FRENCH: He didn't add the money.

CHAIR SAVINO: The amount.

MR. NASH: Submitted by – oh, I'm sorry, $104,800.

CHAIR SAVINO: Wouldn't it be the – yeah, $104,800, correct Bob? Do we have a second on that motion?

MR. FRENCH: I second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French seconded the motion. Okay, any discussion?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: No discussion. Hank Rogers, yea or nay?

MR. ROGERS: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Aye. Thomas McArthur?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill Nash?

MR. NASH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's been approved unanimously. That project has been approved. So, moving on.

MR. BALDWIN: So the next priority would be number G, 25 points, the BLM Hassayampa Field Office Table Mesa Trail System Access Guide. Not eligible for RTP – not recommended for RTP, $5,500.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so I'd like to entertain a motion. Table Mesa to approve the funding for $5,500 for Table Mesa Trail System Access Guide from the BLM Hassayampa Field Office. Somebody? Don?

MR. FRENCH: Okay, I move to recommend that the high-priority project titled Table Mesa Trail System Access Guide submitted by BLM Hassayampa FO

receive $5,500 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and encourage the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, do I have a second?

MR. NASH: I'll second.

MR. ROGERS: I'll second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we have – Bill Nash said second first so he gets it. He gets to be the first second.

MR. ROGERS: Golly!

CHAIR SAVINO: Any discussion?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas McArthur, yes or no?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Did he say yes? Okay. Hank?

MR. ROGERS: **Aye.**

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill Nash?

MR. NASH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's been approved unanimously and we recommend you go forward with that.

MR. BALDWIN: The next project with the letter E, Tonto National Forest Cave Creek Ranger District OHV Equipment Purchase, no RTP eligible.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'd like to entertain a motion.

MR. FRENCH: Is this all – I didn't hear it. Is this all Sticker Fund money?

MR. BALDWIN: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to entertain a motion that the OHV equipment purchase for a UTV from the Tonto National Forest Cave Creek Ranger District for $14,255 be approved.

MR. ROGERS: So moved.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, that doesn't work. You've got to read it.

MR. ROGERS: I can't find it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Then Bill Nash will. We'll do all the work for you guys who didn't come.

MR. NASH: I move to recommend that the high-priority project titled OHV Equipment Purchase submitted by Tonto National Cave Creek Ranger District for $14,255 from the Off-Highway Recreation Fund and encourage the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, do I have a second?

MR. ROGERS: I second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: No! Yeah you can. You couldn't read it, but you can second it, Hank. All those that – okay, I want to take a vote. Hank Rogers?

MR. ROGERS: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas McArthur?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill Nash?

MR. NASH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's been unanimously approved and we recommend it. Move on.

MR. BALDWIN: Okay. Have you been adding that up? You're nowhere near the – there are plenty of funds there, so that's not an issue.

The next eligible project would be letter F, Game and Fish Department Law Enforcement Equipment. That would be not eligible for RTP.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'd like to entertain a motion that the letter F, Off-Highway Vehicle Law Enforcement Equipment Purchase from Game and Fish Department for $174,800 be approved. Do I have a – somebody enter a motion?

MR. FRENCH: I move to recommend that the high-priority project titled OHV Law Enforcement Equipment Purchase submitted by Game and Fish Department receive $174,800 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Fund and encourage the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, do we have a second there?

MR. NASH: Second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, it's been seconded by Bill Nash. Any discussion?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank Rogers?

MR. ROGERS: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas McArthur?

MR. McARTHUR: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, one no. Don French?

MR. FRENCH: No, as written.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, as written. Bill Nash?

MR. NASH: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Aye, so I have two no's and two ayes. Gosh, that leaves me. Okay, I have to stop for a second and ask a question. Okay? Can we approve it if – because mine is the deciding thing on this – I get this thing – big money there. If we cannot – at this point can I say I would like to recommend that only five be approved at this point?

AAG HERNBRODE: As I understand it you made a motion to approve the grant as originally submitted and they gave you a bunch of options as to what you might do. So if you vote no on the current motion; then you can take another motion to do something slightly different.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great! At this point then I'm voting no on the current process. Now I want to turn around and I'd like to entertain a motion –

AAG HERNBRODE: It might be easier Mr. Chairman for you to just make the motion as to what it is you want to do.

CHAIR SAVINO: Mr. Chairman is going to make the motion because it would be easier than trying to figure out what to do, okay? I would like to move to recommend that the high-priority project titled OHV Law Enforcement Equipment Purchase submitted by the Game and Fish – State – Arizona State Game and Fish Department receive – now, do I have to put in X amount of dollars there? I want to say half the amount. I want to see five UTVs and two ATVs received. How do I do that?

MR. NASH: That's a little more than half, too.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, it would be more than half, but I want to see five ATVs – or UTVs and two ATVs approved. That's my motion. Now how do I do that.

MR. FRENCH: And trailers.

CHAIR SAVINO: And trailers.

AAG HERNBRODE: Can you figure out how much money that is?

MR. NASH: I'm working on it.

MR. McARTHUR: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes sir.

MR. McARTHUR: In the proposal here on the options he gives with the options dollar amounts. Say it's $51,333 or $92,000. So maybe we can just use his figures here?

MR. NASH: We can come up with the figure. Do you want to commit the full $9,200 in match to that; or do you want to reduce your match on that?

MR. SIMMONS: We said five percent, so –

MR. NASH: Take half of the match?

MR. SIMMONS: The appropriate amount for five side-by-sides, five law enforcement packages, five single-axle trailers and two training quads at $8,500 is $105,100 minus – so it would be $99,845 – minus five percent in matching funds from Game and Fish would leave us at $99,845 for the suggested grant amount.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'm going to do this again, okay? I move to recommend that the high-priority project labeled Off-Highway Vehicle Law Enforcement Equipment Purchase submitted by the Arizona State Game and Fish Department receive $99,845 from the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and encourage that the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreement. Is there a second?

MR. FRENCH: Second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French seconded. Okay, now any discussion? My discussion that I have is that you do know that we want to monitor this thing and then come back and, you know, go from there. All those in favor – not all in favor, Hank?

MR. ROGERS: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

MR. NASH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, we have a unanimous decision. Okay, great! Let's move on.

MR. BALDWIN: Project I is BLM Hassayampa Field Office Little Pan Road Renovation and Dust Mitigation Project requesting $70,600 OHV, RTP not recommended.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'd like to entertain a motion that the Little Pan Road Number 9998 Renovation Dust Mitigation Project by BLM Hassayampa Field Office be approved. Somebody want to read that off?

MR. NASH: I move to recommend the high-priority project titled Little Pan Road 9998 Renovation Dust Mitigation Project submitted by BLM Hassayampa Field Office at $70,600 to receive from OHV Recreational Vehicle Fund and encourage the Executive Director or designee to sign the appropriate agreement.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, do I have a second?

MR. FRENCH: Second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don French seconds it. Any discussion?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: No, moving on. Hank, how do you vote?

MR. ROGERS: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill?

MR. NASH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's a unanimous decision. Okay, we're going to move on.

MR. BALDWIN: Next would be the only one left, the Tonto National Forest Mesa Ranger District Whitlow Ranch Flood Control Basin Restoration Project requesting $123,621. That was the revised figure that she gave us and that's not eligible for RTP.

CHAIR SAVINO: Not eligible, okay. I'd like to entertain a motion that the Whitlow Ranch Flood Control Basin Restoration Project, Tonto National Forest Mesa Ranger District for $181,021 –

MR. NASH: No, $123,621.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, $123,621 be approved. Do I have a motion on the floor?

[No verbal response.]

MR. FRENCH: Oh, okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: If you don't want you, you don't have to. It's not a thing where – right? Please explain this to us, Joy?

AAG HERNBRODE: You have a couple choices at this point. You can make a motion to approve and then that either goes or fails. If it fails then we'd want OHV – the OHVAG group to make a motion as to why you're not approving this motion – or this project. Or someone could make a motion at this time that you cut straight to the second step and say, "I make a motion not to approve" all that project stuff, "because," beta, beta, beta –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, now can I at this point – because let's say – okay, there wasn't a motion. I asked. There wasn't a motion and I'm coming back and I'm going to say, I'd like to entertain a motion that we do not approve the Whitlow Ranch Flood Control Basin Restoration Project for $123,621. Is there a motion on the floor? Is that correct?

AAG HERNBRODE: That'll work.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, does anybody want to – I'm entertaining that motion – I'm going to make the motion. Okay? The heck with it, I'm going to go forward.

MR. ROGERS: I'll second that motion.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right, but let me talk.

AAG HERNBRODE: He hasn't made it yet.

CHAIR SAVINO: I haven't said it yet.

MR. ROGERS: I thought he said he made it.

CHAIR SAVINO: This is John Savino, I'm making a motion that we do not approve the Whitlow Ranch Flood Control Basin Restoration Project on the Tonto National Forest Mesa Ranger District for $123,621.

AAG HERNBRODE: Because –

CHAIR SAVINO: Because I don't feel this is a valid project – why do I have to say "because?" I mean, why do I have to go in there if I didn't give a "because" on any of the others? That's where the discussion comes on the vote. After I do this, the discussion comes on the vote doesn't it?

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, the discussion – what an individual board member says doesn't matter. Once you make the vote that – just the vote – is OHVAG's opinion. So if you want to convey your grant application – which I would strongly encourage that you do so – why it is that this is not a project that you want to approve, then you should give them a reason. For instance, I heard some discussions and have some ideas about why you may not want to approve this. For instance, we believe a better idea –

MR. NASH: They want to spend the money on a bird that doesn't exist in that area at this time.

AAG HERNBRODE: I encourage you not to make that –

CHAIR SAVINO: Because there's better use of – okay, because I feel there are better uses for the OHV dollars? No? Tell me a "because" – somebody help me out here so we can get on with life.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, one of the things that you talked about was that you thought that there were more effective ways of preventing vehicle damage to this area.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Because – my motion is – the "because" on my motion is that there are better – I feel that there are better ways to utilize the OHV dollars in this area to manage the damage to this area. Is that good?

AAG HERNBRODE: I'm happy with that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Is there a second?

MR. ROGERS: Can I second it?

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank has seconded it. Okay, any discussion?

AAG HERNBRODE: At this point if some other member wants to add some other reasons –

MR. NASH: It's a lot of money to fence off an area for a potential bird habitat that doesn't currently exist today as well as there are better ways to stop the OHVs from riding in that area, such as law enforcement.

AAG HERNBRODE: Okay, so the person who made the motion, do you agree that there are two reasons why you shouldn't approve this?

CHAIR SAVINO: Three! Okay, go ahead.

AAG HERNBRODE: One, there are better ways to deal with the OHV damage in this area, including law enforcement; and two, it's a lot of money to spend on fencing.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes to all the above.

AAG HERNBRODE: Okay, so you agree with that? Hank, do you agree that could be added to your motion?

MR. ROGERS: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Any other discussions?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, then I would like to take a vote. Hank, how do you vote?

MR. ROGERS: I'm going to vote yea and I want to tell you – if I vote yea – yea is to reject it, right?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: I'm voting yea and the reason why: This is – this could be handled with law enforcement, but also, this is for another agency. You know, we're not involved in protecting or luring in endangered species. This is for someone else's pocketbook, not ours.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, thank you. Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don?

MR. FRENCH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill?

MR. NASH: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: We have a unanimous vote. This project will be rejected. Okay. That's all of our projects here. Bob, you have anything to add to that?

MR. BALDWIN: They don't go to the Parks Board, they go to the director for approval.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, at the last meeting you said that's one in the same. Did you not? You told me in that meeting that the Parks Board and the Executive staff is one in the same.

F. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETINGS - OHVAG will meet on the following date:

1. Friday, October 21, 2011 at 1:00 p.m. Location: Pima Motorsports Park, Tucson, Arizona – THIS DATE AND LOCATION ARE BEING RECONSIDERED.

MR. BALDWIN: The only other issue is the date and location of the next meeting. So we have the 21st of October at Pima Motorsports. It's on the agenda. If someone would like to suggest an alternative or if the group would like to select an alternative, then you're more than welcome to do that – either the date and/or the location.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we had discussed at our last meeting that we felt that – well, I did anyway – felt that since we had pulled it away from Kingman because of certain issues that it's only fair that – because of Joy – that it was only fair to take it back up to Kingman at that time. So I'm recommending that we move it to Kingman instead of the Pima Motorsports Park, and it be on the 20 –

MR. BALDWIN: The scheduled date is the 21st. Hank you had a conflict with October 21 didn't you?

MR. ROGERS: I do.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, now –

MR. BALDWIN: The next Friday would be the 28th.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don, are you good?

MR. FRENCH: Does anybody else?

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, it's going to be in your area.

MR. ROGERS: I've got a conflict on the 28th also.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we can't do it on the 28th, can we go into November with this thing? Bill Nash? What are you doing for Thanksgiving.

MR. NASH: I'm hunting.

CHAIR SAVINO: Will you be back on the 18th of November?

MR. NASH: How about the 4th?

CHAIR SAVINO: How about the 18th? Are you anywhere on the 18th?

MR. NASH: No, that's fine.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we have two 18ths – Thomas, how are you doing on the 18th?

MR. McARTHUR So far as I know that's okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Hank?

MR. ROGERS: I have a problem on that day.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, you can't get out of that meeting, right?

MR. ROGERS: Which one, on the 18th?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah. It's going to be your last meeting. We'd like to have you there so we can roast you.

MR. ROGERS: I'm going to be in Florence on the 18th. If we had it somewhere close by we can do it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Not in the prison are you?

MR. ROGERS: If we could go to Florence that would be great, or you know, close by.

CHAIR ROGERS: We need to have it on the 18th. We can't do it on the 11th or we can't do it on the 4th. The 25th's out because that's Thanksgiving and Bill's going hunting. So either – I'm going to make an executive decision here, we're going to do it on the 18th. Okay? In Kingman.

AAG HERNBRODE: Hank can't be in Kingman.

CHAIR SAVINO: I know, but Hank's one person and I want to have Hank there, but I've got to – I'll work on Hank.

MR. BALDWIN: Well, he's not going to be replaced – we don't know --

CHAIR SAVINO: I want to ask you that, too, do we have any applicants?

MR. BALDWIN: We're not accepting applications at this time until the board resolves –

AAG HERNBRODE: It's not on the agenda.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, that's been discussed.

G. ADJOURNMENT @ 4:58 pm

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay we have the time and place for the next thing. I'd like to entertain a motion to adjourn this meeting.

MR. ROGERS: I so move.

CHAIR SAVINO: So moved, and seconded by Don French. All in favor say yes.

CHORUS OF VOICES: Yes.

CHAIR SAVINO: There's been no no's. Okay, the meeting's adjourned.

[Meeting adjourned.]