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 **Wednesday, January 11, 2012, at the Arizona State Parks First Floor Conference 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 613038.** 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:

MINUTES

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

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

CHAIR SAVINO: I call to order the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group on this Wednesday, January 11, 2012 at 1:03 p.m. I'd like to do roll call.

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

CHAIR SAVINO: I am John Savino, Chairman, Member-at-Large, Chairman.

MR. FRENCH: I'm Don French, White Fountains Open Trails Association from Kingman.

MR. McARTHUR: Thomas McArthur, Coconino Trail Riders from Sedona.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill?

MR. NASH: Bill Nash.

MR. ROGERS: Hank Rogers, Apache County.

CHAIR SAVINO: Pete?

MR. PFEIFER: It's Pete Pfeifer. I represent the Southern Arizona Trail Riders in the American Motorcycle Association. (via phone)

CHAIR SAVINO: At this time I'd like to state that we have a quorum and then continue on. I'd also now like to have staff introduce themselves. Bob, would you like to start?

MR. BALDWIN: Robert Baldwin, Recreational Trails Grant Coordinator, Arizona State Parks.

AAG HERNBRODE: Joy Hernbrode of the Attorney General's Office, representing this public body. I have with me Neal Hawkins who is my intern.

CHAIR SAVINO: And Doris Pulsifer just stepped out. She's also joining us today.

Now I'd like – we have two people that are in – I can ask them if they'd like to introduce themselves. Okay, here we go; you can't talk. What I'd like to say to the people out in the audience, if you have something you would like to do during our call to the public, there are some forms up here you can fill out, then hand it to me then I'll address it when it comes time.

MR. ROGERS: Are you with State Parks?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, say your name.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'm going to continue on, then.

"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."

C. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

CHAIR SAVINO: At this time I'd like to call to the public – do you have a form or would you like to? You took a form. Are you okay?

SPEAKER: I'm okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: No other public so we're going on.

D. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes from the October 17, 2011, OHVAG meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes from the December 1, 2011, OHVAG meeting. (Not available.)

CHAIR SAVINO: Consent agenda – the following items of a non-controversial nature have been grouped together for a single vote – and I don't believe we have any consent agenda items, do we?

MR. BALDWIN: I'm going to ask you to table that to the next meeting?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we're going to table that. Approval of minutes from the October 17, 2011 OHVAG meeting.

MR. ROGERS: That's on your consent agenda.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's also all part of that consent. Okay, all right. Moving on.

NOTE: There was no Agenda Item "E".

F. OHVAG ACTION ITEMS

2. - OHVAG Will Review and Approve the 2012 OHV Ambassador Program Expansion Grant Manual. - "OHVAG will review and approve the 2012 OHV Ambassador Program Expansion Grant Manual. The group will review and approve the criteria for eligibility to apply for this grant and the criteria for evaluating the applications. The solicitation for program coordinators will be announced in early February."

CHAIR SAVINO: We have basically two items that we're talking about at this meeting. You want to go – she's not here, so you want me to go to the Ambassador Program Expansion Manual first? Okay, let's start with item F(2).

You all have your sheet in front of you? What I'd like to do here is just go down – I hope you've all reviewed this and I'd like to take it page-by-page. Doris is back in the room. Doris what we've decided to do since you stepped away is we're going to go to the Ambassador Program first and then go from there.

I'd like to take this page-by-page, and go through and review it. If you have anything on these pages, just bring it up.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chair, one thing I got here – and I don't see anything on it, so I think it needs to be discussed – is my biggest concern about this is a cap, as far as how much we spend on Ambassadors. That's not addressed in this here. I don't see anywhere in this Manual where it's addressed; and I think we need to address that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right – and I'm not sure we can. I agree with you, but that cap is out – this is for the Manual itself that goes out to the Ambassadors; and I'm not sure that cap involves that as far as the monies we grant per year. But we do need to discuss that.

MR. ROGERS: I think it should be part of the Manual, that's my point. I think we ought to ask them to, you know, make it part of the Manual that we are not to exceed a certain percentage. If it gets funded by a different program or whatever it's funded by, that we not exceed that. I think it should be in the Manual.

MR. NASH: The actual dollar amount for the grant is in here.

MR. ROGERS: Yes. But my point is, how much do we want to spend, overall, for all of the Ambassador Programs throughout the state? I think we need to be careful there. Because that's part of the problem that's come up, that we – some of us – I know I feel – I want to see a cap on it.

CHAIR SAVINO: And I agree, but the issue is whether it should be in this Manual or something –

MR. ROGERS: So, what does it mean by "expansion grant" then?

CHAIR SAVINO: That expansion grant is just the individual – what White Mountain Open Trails would be getting for their thing, not their overall program. The overall program is in a whole different –

MR. ROGERS: Okay, that isn't part of this?

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: That issue is discussed at the budget meeting that we have in May. The figure that's in this book is based on last year's budget approval, which was $330,000 overall; but $60,000 of that was for expansion grants.

MR. ROGERS: I'm okay with it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, let's go on.

MR. FRENCH: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. FRENCH: I'd like to make an overall comment on this whole thing. I read through this Manual like I was an organization that was going to apply for this grant. Speaking just for myself, if I read this and was interested in the beginning to apply for a grant, I wouldn't have been by the time I got through it. The hoops you've got to jump through; I understand there's gotta be legal stuff in here; but it seems like for a $15,000, three-year grant to jump through all these hoops is going to discourage a lot of people who would be interested. It's just a comment. I don't know how anybody else feels, but it's quite cumbersome, it's bureaucratic and just – yeah, that's my comment.

CHAIR SAVINO: Anytime during this – I'm going to keep this like an informal meeting. If you have some comments to make like that, a general overview of this thing, you can make them at any time. But let's go on through this thing and you know kind of give your comments as I go through each page; then at the end, let's see where we are; see what our feeling is about this whole thing. I'd like to start with page one; and I guess I'll start off with it.

I see on that first paragraph as it says here on the third line it says, "and interested OHV user groups." I know I'm nitpicking, but this was a – the program originally was set up as "OHV" user groups. Not just interested "user groups." We're missing the boat; because we're going back to the original thing. The people at OHVAG when they approved this thing, it was "OHV" user groups. Down further I have a thing that says – highlighted under where – the last paragraph. I'd like to see that myself, as far as that. I'd like to see it housed where it's supposed to be, in State Parks; not through BLM.

MR. ROGERS: I would agree with that.

AAG HERNBRODE: I don't think I understand your first comment. If we could go back to that?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, my first comment –

AAG HERNBRODE: Tell me if I misunderstood. What I understood you to say is that you want these grants to go to OHV groups.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I want it to be – yeah, in a sense. It said – what I wanted to be added in here, inserted in there after that third line in the first paragraph – actually when it starts it. It says, "Arizona Game and Fish Department and Bureau of Land and Management, Tonto National Forest and interested "OHV" user groups instead of just "user groups."

AAG HERNBRODE: Okay, you just want to further identify the people who were involved in the initial legislation, the OHV users.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. This shouldn't be the Heritage Group, you know, doing this stuff; this should be OHV user groups.

AAG HERNBRODE: This is not about who can apply for the grant?

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

AAG HERNBRODE: This is about who brought the legislation.

CHAIR SAVINO: And, it was OHV user groups who brought it.

AAG HERNBRODE: Then your second concern is that you do not want the BLM to continue being the lead on that. I think we've heard that loud and clear at the last several meetings.

CHAIR SAVINO: And you will continue to hear –

AAG HERNBRODE: The decisions that were made – you would prefer this grant cycle?

CHAIR SAVINO: All right. Then drop that. Let's go to the next thing. I'd like to at this time –

MR. FRENCH: We're in Executive Session.

CHAIR SAVINO: I know. I'd like to at this time introduce the new Executive Director of State Parks – Interim! Welcome to our OHVAG meeting.

MR. FELDMEIER: I appreciate that. (Joined the meeting about 1:15 p.m.)

CHAIR SAVINO: The last thing – if you don't mind, we'll just continue on.

MR. FELDMEIER: Please do. I'm sorry; I'm running a little bit late.

CHAIR SAVINO: No problem. Little notes on this thing, on that first page where it says "trained Ambassadors," should be trained "volunteer" Ambassadors. This is a volunteer setup. Does anybody have any questions – any comments?

MR. ROGERS: I have a question for Joy. So if we have heartburn over BLM or Arizona State Parks running this, where do we sound our objections? At what point do we do that?

AAG HERNBRODE: Those decisions you made are for 2013. The 2012 that we're looking at now is what we're stuck with.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, we're stuck with this right now?

AAG HERNBRODE: We're stuck with that organization right now. However, you need to start talking about 2013 at your next meeting or whatever.

MR. ROGERS: Okay. Are we under contract with them through the end of this year?

AAG HERNBRODE: I have no idea. I honestly don't know.

MR. ROGERS: Okay, just curious.

CHAIR SAVINO: You have any comment on that, Bob?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and Group, the work order with BLM is through September 30, 2012. So, this again is one of those items that should be

determined by the time the budget comes around; because when the budget – when recommendations for budgets come up and BLM wants money to run the program for the next year; then at that point you would say, you know, whatever you need to do so the money is budgeted through the State Parks programs.

CHAIR SAVINO: Are there any other comments on page one?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Page two?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Page three?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: I have a note down here of mine; where does it mention providing federal law enforcement with equipment? This is a general thing, to look at it to see what the statute says. It says to "designate, construct, maintain, renovate, repair or connect off-highway vehicle routes and trails. For off-highway vehicle related information" – you can read through those – three, five and six. I don't see anything – we've strayed away from that by providing federal law enforcement with equipment to do that; and I don't think that's – I'm just wondering where that came about?

MR. ROGERS: This is Arizona State Statute; and if we have heartburn with any of these, I know Jerry Wires – we all got the memo from Jay – this would be a good time to change this.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's why I brought it up and that's why we're addressing this here. Do we need at this time in this thing to spell out – because what they've done – and this is just speaking on my own with my own thoughts – first of all I like the program; and we do have to have an aspect of law enforcement out there. But do we have to spell it out now? Be real clear about, well, where that equipment goes? We have equipment out there right now that's still not accounted for – in law enforcement. Their answer back to us was, "Oh, yeah, we know where it is. Law enforcement has it." That's away from the program. So is it something we need to spell out now in this – prior to going forward?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: This is just a Manual to facilitate the applications for Ambassador Expansion Grants. It's not – and it only presents information that's relative to existing statutes. So this discussion does not really have any bearing on the Ambassador Grant Program. These are all statutes that have been there in the books; and any time you want to review statutes and make changes to statutes; that's a totally separate item.

So what we're asking you to do today is to look at this Manual, based on how the Ambassador Program is run. What we're looking for as far as partners to the Ambassador Program who will receive grants is determine whether or not this Manual is going to be sufficient to get that process done.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I understand that Bob. One thing that – we need that avenue to do it. We've never been able to approach that and discuss this stuff and lay it out, how it actually was. We're responsible for giving out that money; we need to have –

MR. FRENCH: We'll still have a time and place for it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, this isn't the time and place. I know that. But we need to make – somewhere along the way, make the time and place for it. Okay?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, the next time we have a meeting to discuss the Ambassador Program and such as we had at the last meeting, that's where these kinds of issues should come up.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right, I agree.

AAG HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, if I might? There are two entries -- there are some corrections there to the statutory cite there that I will make that I'm fairly certain you don't care about. Let me tell you what they are later.

CHAIR SAVINO: Then do you have to kill me?

AAG HERNBRODE: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Page four. Are there any comments on page four?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: I have one, naturally. On the first paragraph, down about the third line where it says, "The applications will be evaluated and scored by a review team." Personally, I feel that the scoring and review team should be made up of three members from OHVAG; two State Park employees and an OHVAG contributor. The last time the scoring and review team, we went out – we reached out and got the Community Forest Trust, the White Mountain Open Trails and the place in Quartzite that nobody on our group was sat on it. It's not at the fault of Bob; because he asked us to be a part of that. Nobody stepped up and volunteered. So they went ahead and had it. We need to have some representation. We have to have it spelled out that we need to be involved with that review team.

AAG HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, if you appoint more than one member from OHVAG to do that, you become a public meeting.

CHAIR SAVINO: I thought it was after more than three. We have seven members.

AAG HERNBRODE: No, because you then appointed a subcommittee and a quorum of a subcommittee of three is two.

CHAIR SAVINO: Then have it open for everybody. I don't care.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well that runs into some difficulties with the grant statutes which require them to be kept confidential. It's state law.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, then I'll play the game.

AAG HERNBRODE: But one member sitting with staff is ok, but it's not set up that way.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and Group, again, we've been away from the grant process for a while. As you may recall in the past, we did ask a member of OHVAG to sit in during the review process. They were not on the rating team. They do not rate the grants. Their input was only to observe the process and comment on items that the reviewers may have. Again, your opportunity to review and state your opinions on these is when we present them to you with our recommendations.

CHAIR SAVINO: That's not good enough for me. I sat on that rating team for that review process and like you say, all we were able to do – we didn't have any rating going on; it was all rated by State Parks. We just were there to witness it. I don't feel with this amount of money – and we're responsible to the OHV community – that we need to be on that rating committee. You're talking about – you have a BLM – two BLM employees on that; yourself; there should be somebody from OHVAG sitting there rating along with the rest. Is there any other input?

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. ROGERS: My question, Bob. If you had your one person there, how would he – if he disagreed with what was going on with the staff, how would he communicate with the Advisory Group without violating the open meeting law if he had concerns?

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, you're going to review – all of these come out at and OHVAG meeting. They don't end with the Parks review.

MR. ROGERS: I understand that.

AAG HERNBRODE: So all you do is – at the meeting –

CHAIR SAVINO: Wait! But what happens is – when they come back, just like before – they came back, they were already rated. What they were at that point, we couldn't – at that point discuss anything. It was just agreeing with their rating, basically.

AAG HERNBRODE: If you'll let me finish?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

AAG HERNBRODE: Okay, as those ratings come forward, then the OHVAG member who was sitting at the rating table will say, "I don't agree with this rating," and [inaudible]. So that's where it comes out in the open and OHVAG can do what it wants and needs to do. You're interpreting these ratings as the be-all, end-all. They're a guide.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, okay.

AAG HERNBRODE: Where you deviate from the guide is where you need –

CHAIR SAVINO: The Chair recognizes Hank.

MR. ROGERS: The only thing I would like to be able – and I'm not going to be involved – but the only thing I would like to be able to see is, you know – I want advance notice to these guys on some of the issues that are coming up so they have time to think about it, rather than putting everybody on the spot at that meeting. I think it would be fair for the members of this group to have advance notice of some of the objections. If I was the person sitting in, I would like that – for them to have that. That's all I'm saying.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Bob?

MR. BALDWIN: Again, Mr. Chair and Group, this is your opportunity to have input into this process that we're evaluating to select these groups. If you see something in this process that you don't like; now is the time for you to say, "Let's do it this way."

CHAIR SAVINO: That's what we're doing.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, no. This is going to dictate how these things are scored.

CHAIR SAVINO: Which is part of this Manual.

AAG HERNBRODE: Right – well, the Manual says how it's going to be scored.

MR. BALDWIN: All the review team does is evaluate what they presented in relation to what the criteria asked for and says, "Did they meet this criteria?" Yes or no? To what extent? What value is that, et cetera, et cetera? And that is what the score of the grant is. At that point, if we had seven applicants for four spots, we would need some type of priority to determine which grants were the best according to what we asked them to provide. That's what the whole Manual process is about. That's what we're asking you to do today also for the projects, to identify what you want in the project and what score it rates – we'll tell the applicants, but before they submit their application, what we're looking for.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MS. PULSIFER: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR SAVINO: Doris?

MS. PULSIFER: Also keep in mind that after these are rated and they go to – they're presented to OHVAG; the applicants also have an opportunity to come back and talk to you to discuss their applications. So if you have more questions, at that time –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I understand that. But answer this, why are you so set against not having an OHVAG member sit in there on the rating team? What's wrong with that? Then you solve the thing. We should be – we should have a person – not just sitting back and observing – we should have a person doing the rating. I don't understand why you guys don't want that to happen.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah.

MR. BALDWIN: The Parks Board has determined that your opportunity to review the grants is when they're presented for funding. If you have someone who is also in the rating process, then you're double-dipping in the process. When the grants are rated and brought to you, then you can have your input into the process. All the reviewers have to do is to determine, based on what the applicant presented and the criteria requested, to what extent does this application meet the requirements of the program.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Joy?

AAG HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can help you out. You have the ultimate – you tell State Parks what it is that they're looking for in these applications. That's on pages 14 and 15 where you tell Parks what it is that they're looking for and how many [inaudible] can you give people. You're asking for a little piece of the pie. You already have a big piece of the pie. Not only do you have the ultimate say at the end; but you have – you get to set up what the requirements are. Like, you know, [inaudible]. If the requirements are that the eligible applicant must own a horse and have brown hair, you get to decide that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, help me out here and then we'll end it. The only time we've had this come up was that we had three applicants in front of us. It was the last time. There were two people rating the thing, Chris Gammage and Marge Dwyer. The rating was a possible 17 points – that was the top rating; if you had less than 12, you didn't get rated. Okay? There were three applicants, Community Forest Trust -- which is not – it doesn't have anything to do with OHVs – got 17 points. White Mountain Open Trails got 12 points, the minimum. The other full OHV user group was the Arizona Sun Riders, they ended up getting four. We were presented with that. We had no way, at that point, to say "Okay, we're not going to allow --" The Arizona Sun Riders were out of the picture, totally. So at that point we couldn't do anything about it.

AAG HERNBRODE: I understand.

CHAIR SAVINO: They can bring what they want to us and we have to vote on what they have and that's not right.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, the 12 – and correct me if I'm wrong – I believe the 12 number is because the strategic plan, a certain number of the grant has to be over a percentage of the 80%. You have to look at the high-priority stuff first. What that tells me is that the group thing you're objecting to CFT.

CHAIR SAVINO: Community Forest Trust. I'm not objecting to them because we voted them through.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, they had a grant writer. That's what it tells me. They had a grant writer and nobody else did.

CHAIR SAVINO: So it's about how much money you have?

AAG HERNBRODE: No! I'll be honest with you, sometimes it is partially about how good – you know, you can have a really great program; if you can't put it down, it doesn't work. You don't get the grant – for any government program. But you need to package in what you're looking for. In an ideal applicant, in the

stuff on pages 14 and 15, that's where the meat – you're spending a lot of time on page five – which is kind of background – and on 14 and 15 is the stuff that really matters.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, but I also want to spend time on this and you're not going to get me off that. Hank?

MR. ROGERS: And I think, Joy, you bring forth a good point. That's what gives us heartburn. Number one, what happened in California. A lot of our groups don't have a professional grant writer. When you've got a group that's well funded and they have a grant writer, they can come in and raid our funds. That's what we're trying to avoid.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, they're going to raid your funds to use them for the purposes you say.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, how do you know they're using –

AAG HERNBRODE: I will sue [inaudible].

MR. ROGERS: Quite frankly, I'll be honest with you – this is me speaking – I don't want any part of these people; because I don't trust them. Because I saw what happened in California. You give them a toe in, eventually they're gonna come in and they're gonna hurt you some way somehow. There's a reason why they have a professional grant writer writing this grant. I don't know why that is. It makes me a little paranoid.

AAG HERNBRODE: That's how they finance their stuff.

CHAIR SAVINO: And what we've done is, we've gotten away from the original concept: Have our own user groups help keep our sport going through the years and police our own people, in a sense.

AAG HERNBRODE: I hope you know I don't disagree with you on that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh, you do, too!

AAG HERNBRODE: I do not. But you've gotta help – they've won; they've got to help themselves. They pool together and find somebody who will do some grant writing for them or something – but you also help somebody putting in their requirement – so when the rating team brings forward somebody, there's somebody you feel comfortable with.

CHAIR SAVINO: Any other questions or any comments on page four? Don.

MR. FRENCH: Under April, 2012: "State Parks staff will send a participant agreement to each successful applicant." Anyway, the last sentence in that paragraph changes to "the agreement may be negotiated." With who and how much room do they have to negotiate? That seems like a pretty open statement to me.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and Group, the Participant Agreement and the accompanying general provisions of the agreement are a legal document. They have legalese and terms; and we generally require they accept our terms. If for any reason there's a term in there they have heartburn over, then we are open to discuss it with legal partners who will determine whether or not we can allow

them to have what they want in that agreement or what we need to have. So this is before any money has passed, before any signatures are put on the document, this is just their final recourse to come to agreement with State Parks.

CHAIR SAVINO: Joy?

AAG HERNBRODE: I believe what you're asking – you're concerned that we're going to change the terms of actually what they do; but what Bob is talking about – we often have to deal with this sort of boilerplate language in terms of – there are certain provisions that are required by State Statute. For instance, when we contract with a county or with the feds, we often have to tweak those a little bit so that they don't conflict with their statutes. That's all this is, just making sure that – and I do that. They're not substantive. They don't change how somebody – what somebody has to do to comply with the contract, per se; they [inaudible]. It's not going to go from "you have to provide this, this and this," to "provide something different." It's how the non-discrimination clause is worded.

MR. FRENCH: Okay, well you guys like language and that to me was pretty open, but it will only be done through you? It's not something Bob or whoever's in Bob's position is going to sit there and negotiate?

AAG HERNBRODE: When there are changes to the legal provisions it all comes through our office.

MR. FRENCH: Can we state, "change the grant, maybe negotiate with legal?"

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, the previous sentence talks about being reviewed by the Group.

MR. FRENCH: Yeah, that's the grantee.

AAG HERNBRODE: Right, right. Well, I wouldn't want – Bob does a lot of my leg work for me in the beginning and I don't want to cut that off; because we want to get these done fairly quickly.

MR. FRENCH: Well I trust Bob. So it's not that. I don't know who's going to have his position next. I'm just – it seems wide open to me.

CHAIR SAVINO: Any other questions on that?

[No verbal response.]

SPEAKER: On page four – excuse me – I think that May 2011 should be 2012.

CHAIR SAVINO: Gosh you're good! I would like to see on the bottom of page four where it talks about the wrapping on the trailer. I feel that wrapping should reflect the area that you're in. In other words, if there's one up in the White Mountains we shouldn't have a desert landscape behind the trailer; it should be a timber landscape behind there. I know it's a little trivial, but I mean, it's just something that should be up there. If Hank's group has it, they should have the landscape in the back of the forest, not the desert cactuses [sic].

MR. NASH: What if it goes everywhere. What if someone in Maricopa County gets it, then they go to Jamboree?

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I'm gonna one up on you, then. Let's make it for all the different areas of Arizona on there.

MR. ROGERS: I think that's a good idea, Mr. Chair. Put a pine tree on there.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, just don't make it just a BLM landscape. We'll look into that.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and Group, I don't know if I sent you the pictures for the wrap; but the pictures for the wrap include desert and mountain scenery.

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh they do? Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: All the trailers are wrapped with that. The original master has that wrap on it. Unfortunately, the trailers you saw are nothing like those trailers.

CHAIR SAVINO: Great! That's handled then. We're moving right along. On five, on the first statement under "eligible applicants," I'm having a hard time with this. "Organizations, clubs, businesses, Arizona cities, county governments, tribal governments and any groups hereafter referred to as organizations that can meet the terms of the grant. . . ," we're way away from where we started. It was OHV groups – clubs doing this. Now we're even – and we have "tribal" in there. I know legal got ahold of this and wanted to put them in there and cover all the bases; but guess what, we can't even – there's only one tribal reservation that we can even ride in and they charge an extra surcharge of $25 a year. That's the Colorado River Indian Tribes.

We're going to have them now apply for a grant? To do what? To come out on areas? We can't ride on their area. So they're going to – we're going to give an Ambassador Program grant to a tribe, the Apache Indian Tribe, and we can't ride on their area. So, they're going to come out in the other areas, in non-tribal areas; and take care of this? I don't like that in there. We've gone too far with this.

SPEAKER: Is there a legal requirement for who we must involve?

AAG HERNBRODE: No. This has a kind of complicated background. If we're going to get into it too much, I'd want to get into an executive session. But, you are certainly in a better position to be over-inclusive rather than under inclusive.

MR. NASH: As it is, we have the discrimination to eliminate anybody who makes an application and comes before us. If we don't like them, we don't have to give them the grant.

AAG HERNBRODE: They don't need the grant from you, you don't have to give them the grant.

MR. PFEIFER: Mr. Chair, I have a question.

CHAIR SAVINO: Pete.

MR. PFEIFER: Could we in this Manual basically tie a point value to any club or organization with an affiliation here locally or nationally? In other words, a motorcycle club that's tied in with the Arizona Motorcycle Riders Association would receive extra points; or a four-wheel drive club that's associated with the state association where the four-wheel drive would receive extra points.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, you have a comment on that?

MR. ROGERS: In my work, I work a lot with tribal people. My feeling is that we do need to be inclusive; and let me tell you why. We're negotiating right now with White Mountain Apaches for trails on their reservation. For us to be

exclusive, that would hurt – if they found this out, which would hurt us in our opportunities to negotiate with them. If they wanted to come and apply, let's let them apply; and then say. "Okay, with that guys, we'd love to have your people out there; but we'd also like to have the opportunity to ride on your thing." I think it might open some doors for us in the future, in my opinion, in working with tribes – and it may not, too. But I work extensively with the Navahos, the Hopi's and the White Mountain Apache right now – and the Hopi's have some opportunities there.

MR. FRENCH: Well, just because we don't list them on here doesn't mean they're limited.

AAG HERNBRODE: This is a list of people –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, wait! You get back to the thing that if there was a club on the Apache Indian Reservation, an OHV organized group, then they fit into the OHV organized group category; then, they can apply. The thing I'm afraid of Hank – and I see where you're coming from – and I agree with you.

MR. ROGERS: You know what we're dealing with.

CHAIR SAVINO: I know what you're dealing with, okay; and I agree with that. But by having all this in here it also – what stops the Sierra Club from applying for a grant? Then you open the door up and then it comes out – we're sitting there, we can't even have a person on the rating team. They can rate. They have all the money in the world. They have – these attorneys sitting in their office writing these things up, they'll come out with something that'll blow the doors off of the Arizona Sun Riders that are trying to apply for it that's just a, you know, little small organization, or my organization or yours. We can't afford to go hire an attorney to write all this stuff up, so our rating is going to be down.

SPEAKER: As I understand, any of these groups are obligated to promote OHVA.

AAG HERNBRODE: You're forcing them to comply with the goals of the OHVA Program.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don?

MR. FRENCH: You're sitting here saying you've got to be specific on who you have in there, or they're eliminated. Well, that can't be right. But this last statement on here says, "Any group" – and that's all we need – "Any group that can meet the terms of the grant are eligible applicants." Why do you have to sit there and spell out, you know – I don't see "church group" on here. Are we discriminating?

AAG HERNBRODE: You'll only see an organization or a club.

MR. FRENCH: In a group that can meet the terms of the grant are applicable.

MR. ROGERS: Personally, I would be more concerned about counties and cities.

MR. FRENCH: Don't be specific – any group that can meet the requirements.

Well we only had this happen one time. We never turn down the tribes if they applied or anybody else. My point is, I'd like to see that entire paragraph erased

and go back to the original one that says, "This is open to OHV-organized 501(c)(3) groups." Period! Then have it that way.

MR. ROGERS: I like what Don said here. I think organization, clubs and businesses, period. You know what, if Ride Now wants to do one; they're going to do it first class; and we want --

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I agree.

MR. ROGERS: Just put a period after that. If a tribe comes to us and wants to do something with the State, that's what we're for – that's what this group is for, to disseminate all this stuff –

AAG HERNBRODE: For normal people, any group would incorporate and encompass all of that in the list of people out there. I can see us getting challenges that a group would not be a business, would not be a governmental entity at all.

CHAIR SAVINO: Truthfully, that's what they do. This program is set up for volunteers to go help – to work with government agencies. Not the other way.

AAG HERNBRODE: Okay, now let's say Apache County says, "You know, we don't have any OHV groups who are willing to step up on this; we have a volunteer coordinator who wants to run this program and get a group of volunteers and do the kind of things that the OHV Ambassadors do." You're eliminating that county from being able to do that; even though they could do it, if they could get an OHV group involved.

CHAIR SAVINO: Joy, I'd rather have them get that OHV group involved and let that OHV group apply than the county to do that; and do it that way. I'd rather have that group in place; because that tells you one thing. If there's no group in the area; then there are other issues involved there. First of all, why do we need that out there? Why do we need to go to places – this is for groups to go out and help take care of our own –

AAG HERNBRODE: Well because there may be a ton of OHV riders who don't – aren't part of a group. The group is very – you know, there are that many; and most of the people in those, I think, are lawful users. It's not the club members who need the Ambassador Program it's for people who aren't club members.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, but you need that club member mentality to be out there helping enforce those rules and doing stuff.

AAG HERNBRODE: If you want to eliminate it; I will look at it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, what I'm getting from everybody here is that we need to put down there that it's just – to eliminate the city, counties, governments; and go to back to the group thing.

MR. FRENCH: Pete, what's your take on this?

MR. PFEIFER: Well, I'm once again – you can leave the door open for anybody to submit an application – you know, submit a grant request; but we should be studying the points to say, what are the attributes that we want a club or organization that is seeking a grant – what attributes do we want in that club;

and then award points in that favor. That's the way you would basically be able to weed out the community for its trusts and agencies, like that.

CHAIR SAVINO: So, what do we do guys? So we can move on. Let's hear something.

MR. ROGERS: What did we – we're going through this handbook here; and we're going to make changes. Then they need to get it out. Do we need to make a motion to change this?

AAG HERNBRODE: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: So as we're going, if we make a comment, who's taking notes to make those changes? Bob is. So, we'd like you to change that to eliminate Arizona City and county governments.

MR. ROGERS: We need to vote on that, don't we?

AAG HERNBRODE: If you want to vote on each one individually we will be here 'til midnight; so I would recommend just voting at the end.

CHAIR SAVINO: Are we split on this?

MR. ROGERS: I want to put a period at businesses. That's where I'd like to see it end.

CHAIR SAVINO: And just have it "organizations, clubs and businesses?" I'm good with that.

MR. ROGERS: Maybe put "groups" in there.

AAG HERNBRODE: Write down what I have and what you have requested.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'm in favor of that? You like that? Okay, we don't need a vote. It's unanimous.

MR. ROGERS: Pete, you all right with that?

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, I'm fine.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, let's go to page six.

MR. FRENCH: Okay, one of the things here, "Applicants must provide previous two years of operating budgets or records of income, expenditures and recent bank," blah, blah, blah, "meet budget needs. . ." I'm wondering why they need that one. There are no matching fund requirements and it just seems like another step that's –

AAG HERNBRODE: Required.

MR. FRENCH: Even though on the next line the Articles of Incorporation –

AAG HERNBRODE: We also need those.

MR. FRENCH: So it's just a legal –

AAG HERNBRODE: Yeah. We have to establish credibility.

MR. FRENCH: Okay. I'm just trying to simplify it anywhere possible.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to see on that thing – right down at the bottom of that section Don was just on, added on there that another need – requirement is an endorsement from an OHV club or organization. Do you follow me on that? Do you agree guys?

CHORUS OF VOICES: I do.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, we'd like to see that Bob.

The next page, let's go to six. Any comments?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Down on "available funds," I'm just curious how it got to – "Arizona State Parks Board has allocated $60,000 from the available 2012 OHV Recreation Fund Money for four $15,000 grants." Who decided on these amounts? I don't ever remember – I looked through the minutes and we – those numbers – who came up with those numbers?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and Group, that was in the March – May last year proposal – it was part of the budget proposal for OHV Fund.

CHAIR SAVINO: Part of that proposal – okay, part of the proposal that we voted down.

MR. BALDWIN: That's right, $60,000 to be awarded –

CHAIR SAVINO: That's right. We voted that down and you guys threw it through. All right, any other comments on six?

MR. FRENCH: Yes, I have. On available funds – and this may not be the place either to bring this up. We're allowing $15,000 for three year's funding for these things; but I believe the last organization that got money for funding, we ended up hiring the administrator as part of that project. My question is, in the future, is that going to be part – when we award, are we going to be hiring full-time administrators for upcoming – you know, when we allow projects like this to go out; are we going to have to keep hiring – we have, what, three full-time administrators. I mean this $15,000 is nothing compared to the $65,000 each for this that's on a yearly basis. If we keep approving people to give these grants to, are we going to keep hiring administrators to go with it?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and Group, right under that available funds there it explains what the money can be used for. There are no paid positions under these grants. The same is true for the grant for CFT. There's no money allowed for payroll or reimbursement – whatever – for a coordinator. The coordinator under these programs is not strictly a person. Yes we pay Chris Gamage and Marge Dwyer to operate the programs statewide. Yes we entered into an agreement with CREC to provide a coordinator to expand the program in northern Arizona. That was with temporary positions; and the number one goal of that position in Flagstaff was to find volunteers. So, that was his goal as part of what he was hired to do up there in getting the program off the ground.

Typically, as far as these grants are concerned; there's no money for an administrator.

CHAIR SAVINO: As far as these outreach grants go.

MR. FRENCH: So, that's a temporary position; and it won't – it's not going to – and we won't need it –

CHAIR SAVINO: Next year.

MR. FRENCH: Next year or later on?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and Group; all the payment's issued are year-to-year. There is no long-term agreement with anybody for administration.

MR. FRENCH: I remember voting on that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I'd like to make a statement right now since we have your ear. I would like – personally like to see this Ambassador Program come back to where it originally was at, with State Parks. We had four full-time employees working on the OHV issues; two of those – well, one of them; that's how the Ambassador Program was developed when the previous director came on and staff started going down; they went away and reached out to BLM to do this. We're paying it out of OHV funds – that position.

I'd like to see that – those two positions – the two people, Chris Gamage and Marge Dwyer; we're paying for their employment. I'd like to see them working under the direction of Bob and Doris. That way what it does, it also helps out when they're not doing Ambassador issues – program issues – they can be out promoting the sticker fund program and getting it out there; and helping Bob who's wearing four hats now take care of this program.

OHV Funding, we're over ten percent of the entire operating budget of State Parks right now; and I've seen it since I've been on here go from four, full-time employees down to one with a supervisor. By pulling them over here and having them work on there, they can help out with the whole program and alleviate a lot of the problems that we have. Anyway, I just wanted to make that comment. I'm probably way off base on what I'm doing Joy; but oh well! Okay, let's move on. Anything on page seven?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Eight?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Nine?

MR. ROGERS: I have a question on nine, Mr. Chair. On number 12, "Cost associated with recruitment and retention of Ambassadors, including background checks." Are we doing background checks, Bob? Are these guys doing background checks on these people?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and Group, we do not do a formal background check; they are run through the sex offender website.

MR. ROGERS: Is it something you do here in the State Parks?

MR. BALDWIN: No.

MR. ROGERS: I'm just wondering how you guys do it. I really need to do it.

MR. BALDWIN: Chris and Marge do that.

MR. ROGERS: Oh, okay. So it's through BLM?

MR. BALDWIN: Well, through the public site.

MR. ROGERS: I was just wondering who's doing it.

MS. HARGROVE: There has been some movement lately to require more background checks [inaudible].

CHAIR SAVINO: Any others? Don.

MR. FRENCH: One more, "Number six, pre-approved travel expenses for a unit coordinator and ambassadors." Is that something we do? Travel expenses?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and Group, that is the ultimate use of the money given to the units under the grants. If there's something they needed to attend, to travel to, they will be reimbursed.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, then I'm going to bring up another thing while you're here, Mr. Director. Your previous – the previous director changed. When a lot of us first came on to OHVAG, we signed the papers and we got travel reimbursements for these meetings – to come down to these meetings. That was taken away from us. It doesn't sit well with us to see that you're paying people to run this Ambassador Program but you won't subsidize our travel expenses to these meetings or to other things around the state? We feel that we're just as valuable, if not more. We're overseeing this program and you're paying them, it doesn't seem fair.

MR. PFEIFER: Just a comment, Mr. Chair. I think we need to be careful, too, because I don't want to take it away from these guys.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I don't want that either.

MR. PFEIFER: But I think – I hope my point is well taken, then. Hearing these guys are funded, but we're not; I just wanted to make the point that I think these guys – I'm glad they are funded.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, they get gas reimbursements for out there on the trail and stuff; and they're doing a good job; and I don't want to see this program go away by any means; but it just doesn't seem fair.

MR. McARTHUR: Just a brief comment. Not necessarily yours, but I understood also that Parks Board members are not being reimbursed for their travel. I just want to look at the whole thing.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. What we originally set, our concept was – we have these funds. We didn't want to have to use any of your operational funds that you have. We felt that we had – the money that's sitting in the fund for project funds, that we should be able to use some of that money for our travel reimbursements. So we didn't want to touch the stuff that the Park Boards – well, when staff went and presented it to the Parks Board in June what they presented was – they said that we want you to review having all Advisory Groups reimbursed for travel. Well our Advisory Group happens to be one of them that puts a lot into your budget. Yes I know I'm way off base.

AAG HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, I know this is something you're very passionate about; and I know you want to talk to this – before we get into too much detail –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, if you'd like to talk to me in detail I'll talk. Great, let's go on.

MR. FRENCH: One more. On the same thing that I brought up before; "In addition to the cost of the equipment, grant funds can be used for the following activities," in parentheses, ("other desired uses may be cleared through the State Parks Grant Coordinator)." Again, I feel like we're giving – nothing against Bob. I trust Bob totally, but if he leaves and there's somebody else in there – it just seems like we're giving them a lot of leeway.

MR. ROGERS: The one thing I would point out here; to me, I don't want to do that. We've got to trust Bob and whoever takes his place – and I agree with you. If we're not happy with that, we have people we can go to. I don't want to get into micromanagement and stuff.

MR. FRENCH: I don't know why it has to be written. I think he has some leeway.

MR. ROGERS: So that's your concern? Why do we even write it in there?

MR. FRENCH: Exactly! It specifically gives him the right to authorize other uses of this money, rather than what's written here.

AAG HERNBRODE: If it's not in there, you can't do it. If it is in there he has total discretion.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right, let's go to – anything on ten?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, eleven?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Twelve?

MR. FRENCH: Can I make a comment on eleven? It's not a question.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah.

MR. FRENCH: They talk about the OHV Ambassador Program Expansion process is competitive. I know what that means but my statement is – I don't see it that – I know I'm taking it out of context; but it's not that competitive. We don't have that many people applying for the thing; so,

[End of tape.]

[Side B of tape 1]

MR. FRENCH: **. . .** I guess what I'm trying to say is, we should make it as easy as possible to get these grants because we are having trouble finding people to do the Ambassador Program.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chair, and I think one thing here, we're excluding a new club. They have no chance of, you know, a new club comes in – to effect – and there's no provision here for them to apply. You know, I think Don makes a good point,

you know, we don't have a lot of people lined up to do this; and maybe we need to be a little more inclusive there.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well that's where – one of my big fears, Hank, was that we have this and we have – we're going to grant three expansions this year, let's say. Okay? I'm just throwing that out there. We have four clubs that apply. Well three of 'em are big organizations that got a bunch of money can – you know, we've already proven that they can do that – write up a good application. Okay? That fourth group that's just a brand new club that wants us to get involved, we've gone up there and talked into getting involved, is just trying to write that – well their point system, they're gonna be down number four. They're not even gonna get the thing. How do you –

MR. ROGERS: Well, I don't know. But I – I think it's a point that we probably as a group ought to definitely consider in helping them, because there are a lot of new groups that are forming. You know, ten years ago we were in formation, you know, and – you know, who knows what groups are going to move forward. You're gonna find out I guess.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, Bob.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, the Ambassador Program is not about OHV groups being Ambassador Programs. The whole club doesn't have to participate as Ambassadors; and if an Ambassador club has a volunteer coordinator, they need to be open to accepting people that are out signing folks serving as Ambassadors. The Ambassador Program is a volunteer corps. It's volunteers that have trained under the Ambassador Training Program to do work on federal projects. All right? So anybody can be an Ambassador. They have to own an OHV, but they don't have to be a member of a club.

MR. ROGERS: Is that stated in here, Bob, somewhere?

MR. BALDWIN: No sir. That's part of the Ambassador – well, it might be under [unintelligible].

CHAIR SAVINO: That changed, Bob, from the original concept.

MR. BALDWIN: No, sir, it did not.

MR. ROGERS: I think you make a good point there, Bob. I think you make a great point. If I wasn't a member of a club if I wanted to be an Ambassador –

MR. BALDWIN: You could be one.

MR. ROGERS: . . . I could be one. But we need to – we need to maybe clarify that in here, be a little more clear that this is for groups or clubs only applying.

SPEAKER: [Inaudible.]

MR. ROGERS: Yeah. Oh yeah, that's true.

MR. BALDWIN: Once again, gentlemen, we're looking for volunteer coordinators. You're asking for some group to put someone out front that says, "This person will coordinate the Ambassador Program according to the rules and regulations of the Ambassador Program in this particular area. Then we can [unintelligible] through people from anywhere in that area to be Ambassadors and volunteer for

events. So all we're looking for is a person to provide volunteer coordination services. Now the reason it comes from a group is because originally the whole program was set up to be – to provide on-site management presences for the federal land managers – the land managing agencies – on-site management presence. Okay? And, the initial people thought, well you know, it would be great if a group, you know, that went out to this place, you know, volunteered to be Ambassadors and take care of the place. Well, it kind of expanded from that because there weren't groups that wanted to do that and identify themselves with any one area. It became a partnership between agencies and volunteers to accomplish the goals of the OHV program.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Bob, this is a – from your May 21, 2010 minutes, the minutes you wrote up. Down at the bottom it says, "OHV Ambassador Program grants: State Parks will establish a grant process to determine eligible grant applications and enter into agreements to provide funding for support equipment and materials, the land management agencies, and organized OHV user groups with 501(c)(3) tax status eligible to apply." That's what it says right there in your minutes. So don't tell that it's different. That's in your minutes. I'm not making up stuff.

MR. BALDWIN: That was in the proposal to the Board to establish the grants – initial grants that were offered last year.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, now –

MR. BALDWIN: When the grant manual came out – just like it is coming out now – for those grants, there was no requirement that the [unintelligible] had to be a Parks Board.

CHAIR SAVINO: Exactly!

MR. BALDWIN: It's because the program does not have to be run by a user group.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I see now, okay. Exactly what I'm saying here – okay – this was what was approved by the State Parks Board. When it came back and the BLM management – people running the Ambassador Program and you sat down, you changed it to read – what – how you wanted. That wasn't approved. This was approved. This was approved by OHVAG and the State Parks Board. Somewhere along the way it got changed and it shouldn't have gotten changed. It was changed by staff and it shouldn't have been. Yes.

AAG HERNBRODE: I got lost, John. What part of the – the app – the manual are we talking about? [Inaudible] change in the manual?

CHAIR SAVINO: It wasn't my –

MR. ROGERS: I have – I have --

CHAIR SAVINO: That was Hank's.

MR. ROGERS: It was mine. I was just suggesting that we maybe try to be a little more inclusive to the newer groups and –

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. We were talking about newer groups and I wanted to mention in that – and that's right there. Now you tell me if that's wrong? That's

what the State Parks' Board and OHVAG decided on. Staff took that and went in a different direction.

SPEAKER: [Inaudible.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Well I do too, but I – this is also important, Joy. And you're –

AAG HERNBRODE: I know you're very unhappy about this, John. I mean, that is exceptionally clear. And you're –

CHAIR SAVINO: Joy!

MS.HERNBRODE: . . .you feel the staff has done a bunch of stuff here – and you may be right.

CHAIR SAVINO: Joy, okay, listen! Please! As chairman, we – every meeting we get to this point and we say, "Okay, we have to get outta here and do this stuff." There's some of these issues that we need – now I know I blundered to go on with this stuff, but there's stuff that we have to get out. For that I will go on.

MS.HERNBRODE: Thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay? The – on page 12 I still – another thing we've already addressed. It says, "Equivalent tribal commission reports on G; and I think that could be taken outta there.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, they might be [unintelligible], but it's incorporated under tribal law.

MR. ROGERS: Yeah, it's –

SPEAKER: We can't take that out.

CHAIR SAVINO: We can't? Okay. All right, leave it in there. That's good enough for me. Okay, 13. Is there anything?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: I would like to see on the bottom of 13 where it says, "Grant is to award funding to" – right what I'm saying – "OHV organizations." 'Cause it says it in – down on the bottom, Don.

AAG HERNBRODE: The last line of page 13 –

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to see OHV organizations inserted in there, going back to my redundant thing –

AAG HERNBRODE: That would eliminate from your pool of eligible applicants anybody who is not an OHV organization.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

SPEAKER: We can't because you got businesses and other stuff that we just included in the previous parts. You can't –

CHAIR SAVINO: Gotta be one way or the other? Okay. Then forget about that. Go on to 14. Anything?

MR. PFEIFER: I have a question.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. PFEIFER: Is 14 where we get specific as far as an organization – what the character of an organization is. Is that the blond – the brown hair and blue eyes that Joy was talking about earlier?

AAG HERNBRODE: Yeah.

MR. ROGERS: You have to have a horse, too.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, that's right. I'm sorry.

[Laughter.]

MR. BALDWIN: Organizations are identified on page five where you said, eligible applicants are here after referred to as organizations.

AAG HERNBRODE: Right. This is where you start kicking out the points. And where you tell Parks how many points to give people for what [unintelligible].

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Anything else on that? Pete?

MR. PFEIFER: Well, it just says the goal, "as a recognized presence on OHV routes," you know, does that mean just anybody on foot; or – what does that mean?

CHAIR SAVINO: I don't know. Let's hear from –

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, these are the goals strictly – straight from the Ambassador Manual [unintelligible], so – I mean, this is an OHV program. So we're talking about motorized OHV use, "as recognized presence on OHV routes, Ambassador's model OHV safety and behavior to create a positive image and promote responsible motorized recreation and land stewardship."

SPEAKER: [Inaudible].

MR. BALDWIN: Again, you have to own a OHV – yes, you have to own a OHV.

MR. ROGERS: You know, on the South [unintelligible] Canyon Trails – if you use that as an example – walking on it, riding horseback on it is prohibitive. So – a lot of them are prohibitive.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, I guess my question stems from, you know, what Bob was saying earlier is that – you know – you just have to be an organized club, and be willing to get out and meet and greet people, and talk about responsible OHV recreation. But it sounded like it was anybody – horsemen, archery, you know, hunter, anybody, any organization could be basically tapping into the OHV dollars to get out there and be an Ambassador.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: They could.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay.

MR. ROGERS: I'm okay with an archery group that wants to do it, if they're riding OHV, because they're our friends.

MR. BALDWIN: As long as they provide an OH – a volunteer coordinator, who coordinates, trains Ambassador volunteers to perform under the regulations of the Ambassador Program in cooperation with the agency partner.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay, I'm good with that, but are we gonna award any bonus points to a national OHV club such as, you know, Hank or John's group? Or would this be the point at which we would give extra points for some organization like that?

CHAIR SAVINO: Don.

MR. FRENCH: I would like to see that rather than the bonus points for somebody that's had a – like GNH in the thing – that's had – you know, just 'cause they've had the land resource management agency thing before. I don't know. I'm not sure I agree with those two bonus points. I'd rather see bonus points for being an OHV group than because you've had prior agreement with the land management agency.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, those aren't really fair to a new group coming in.

MR. FRENCH: No, somebody new or somebody who's never had – necessarily just haven't had an agreement with the land management before doesn't mean they'd make good Ambassadors.

AAG HERNBRODE: How would you define OHV groups in that instance? You have the inclusive of – for instance the archery group Hank was talking about where maybe you could put down their number and only use OHVs? Or do they need to be specifically [unintelligible] club clause. You need to be specifically –

CHAIR SAVINO: For that category for the bonus points –

AAG HERNBRODE: I need some sort of – what is an OHV –

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Okay, for the bonus point they have to say right in their – their bylaws, basically, that they are an OHV group – a Jeep group of – you know – and then, that doesn't mean that the archery group can't apply; but the OHV group should get a bonus point for that.

AAG HERNBRODE: So, if I say in my bylaws -- you don't have an OHV group – so if I put that in [unintelligible], you're going to be okay [unintelligible].

MR. FRENCH: There's gotta be some way to designate –

AAG HERNBRODE: That's what I'm asking you for. What is that criteria?

MR. ROGERS: Good point.

AAG HERNBRODE: Because I can write a bylaw that says anything – yeah – because they're really not that exciting. So, you know, is there some purposes – otherwise, it's kind of throwing a dart at a dartboard [unintelligible]. Do they include in their name? [Unintelligible] seem to particularly care either.

SPEAKER: [Inaudible].

SPEAKER: Because we're a registered OHV owners and group.

AAG HERNBRODE: [Unintelligible] owners – of the members of the group are –

CHAIR SAVINO: Joy, I think one of the things we're afraid of is to go with Community Forest Trust. Okay?

AAG HERNBRODE: I get that, so that's why I'm trying to –

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. That's what I mean. But they had people that were members – we asked the guy that came in front of us at the meeting, does he own an ATV? And he says, "Yeah. I have it up on my ranch in Montana." Well, okay. Does that constitute a –

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, I mean – if you have a ranching group where all of them have OHVs, but they're using them for recreational use, you know –

MR. PFEIFER: They could still apply, but they just wouldn't get the bonus points; and the bonus points would come if you're associated with a national organization or a state organization.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well then you're kind of benefitting those – because don't you have to pay to be members of those organizations?

MR. PFEIFER: I couldn't hear ya.

AAG HERNBRODE: Do you have to pay to be a member – to be a associate member of those organizations – [unintelligible] affiliated if you wanted to be part of the national whatever association you've gotta pay for that?

MR. PFEIFER: Well, yeah. I mean anybody can join those organizations just like Tread Lightly or anything else. You pay your 20 bucks and you're a member for that year.

AAG HERNBRODE: Okay, I misunderstood. See what you're saying, not that the club who is applying is a member, but –

MR. PFEIFER: No, no, I'd want the club – you know, we have AMRA which has – Thomas, how many clubs are under AMRA Motorcycle?

CHAIR SAVINO: They have 230,000 members, I know that.

MR. McARTHUR: I think there's about nine clubs.

CHAIR SAVINO: Nine clubs.

MR. PFEIFER: And then under the AMA there's a lot of folks. Then there's the State Association of Four-Wheel Drives which has numerous clubs underneath it.

AAG HERNBRODE: And it doesn't – they don't require you to pay to be part of that – to be a club part of that?

MR. McARTHUR: Each club pays into –

AAG HERNBRODE: Okay. So there are some legal concerns with requiring some money – to pay money to a private entity in order to be eligible for your rent?

CHORUS OF VOICES: No, no, no.

MR. PFEIFER: They can choose not to pay. They just won't get the bonus points.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well, but to get a bonus point.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah.

AAG HERNBRODE: To get a point, you require 'em to pay money to a private entity? That has some serious legal concerns.

MR. FRENCH: Why?

AAG HERNBRODE: The registered OHV owners I [unintelligible]. The majority of the club –

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, but you have to pay to be a member of an OHV club.

CHAIR SAVINO: Sierra Club has registered OHVs – Jeeps.

MR. FRENCH: It's a bonus point. It's not a requirement for – you don't have a problem with them asking to have a –

AAG HERNBRODE: Agreement?

MR. FRENCH: . . . agreement with the land management. I mean –

AAG HERNBRODE: Because if you're asking 'em to do stuff on – and then there's property. So that indicates that there's [unintelligible] at building a relationship with that land management agency.

CHAIR SAVINO: CREC has an agreement with the a land management agency, the Forest Service. Okay? They do work all the time. They've done work for the last 20 years. They've never done OHV trails.

AAG HERNBRODE: Okay.

CHAIR SAVINO: They've done hiking trails. There's a big difference. This is back – like Bob just mentioned. This is an OHV program.

AAG HERNBRODE: I know. I was just explaining why that was relevant. You may decide that that's not as relevant as some other criteria – and that's okay. But I'm still not –

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, and it's not a requirement. It's just bonus points at the [unintelligible].

AAG HERNBRODE: Well – right, but you need to be – have a fair playing field.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, here's our fair playing field. Okay? It's either we get rid of these two things totally – the bonus points off this – or we make it to where we have it for OHV organizations.

AAG HERNBRODE: Defined as more than 50 percent of the numbers or 50 percent of the numbers are [unintelligible] –

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I'm not even gonna go there. It's just OHV organizations.

MR. FRENCH: Can that be –

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: If I might. On page 11 under required forms for eligibility, "eligibility" meaning whether or not they are a viable candidate and not – before they even get to the rating process says, "Legal staff of the organization" – let's see – "and they must provide Articles of Incorporations, organizational bylaws or charter." Okay? "B. Statement of goals and objections of the OHV – of the applicant or its organization." All right. Now, as you get into the grant criteria

part of it on page 14, each of those goals requires the applicant to identify one of the applicant's documented goals and the required documentation provided with the application that would also accomplish this goal, OHV route presence – recognizable presence – and explain how. So the Sierra Club is not likely to have charter information in their program that's gonna be able to provide an answer to this program; and each of those goals is tied in to the applicant's provided charter bylaws of the organization. So there's not gonna be any old organization that does anything – darts, handball, whatever it is – that's gonna have goals that are comparable to the goals of the Ambassador Program and allow them to score points in these areas.

That is the main reason that the Sun Riders did not score very well because they had no charter organization or bylaws – or at least they didn't provide 'em – that allowed them to score any points in these areas.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. All right.

MR. BALDWIN: There are an OHV organization.

CHAIR SAVINO: Any other questions on that.

MR. ROGERS: Let's not go back to 11, we're on 15.

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh, God! I know. Fifteen – any questions. None?

MR. FRENCH: I have one.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, Don.

MR. FRENCH: I'm not sure I agree with these bonus points on here. I don't know why you'd get a bonus point because –

SPEAKER: Can we just scrap this?

MR. FRENCH: I would like to.

CHAIR SAVINO: Let's scrap the bonus points, please? Is everybody in agreement with that? Please, Hank?

MR. ROGERS: I'll agree with you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. We're scrapping the bonus points off that. Okay, number 16? Anything?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Seventeen?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Eighteen? I have a couple. Why in the world do we care for a volunteer Ambassador Program, U.S. Congressional District – any the number o U.S. Congressional Districts in which the OHV unit will operate most often. Why? Explain that to me?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman and group, legislators want to know when their funds are appropriate to their [unintelligible] – any kind of funds; and we can document when so-and-so wants to know, "what have you ever done for me," we can tell them –

[Laughter.]

MR. BALDWIN: . . . we have ordered X dollars to your region under these grant programs.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so it's a tracking.

MR. ROGERS: Be sure and send him a letter of thank you.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right, that explains it. Going to 19, anything?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Twenty?

MR. ROGERS: That's boilerplate.

CHAIR SAVINO: Uh?

MR. ROGERS: Nothing.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Twenty-one?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Twenty-two? I think we're moving right along there.

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Twenty-three?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Twenty-four?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Twenty-five?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Twenty-six?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Twenty-seven?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Twenty-eight?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. BALDWIN: This cooperative agreement is the basis of the operation of the program. All of the requirements of the program – the volunteer – the person we're giving money to coordinate the volunteers are identified in this agreement with the land management agency.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MR. BALDWIN: Again, the core of the program is a partnership between a volunteer coordinator and a land management agency. This is the basis for that document.

Okay? This is what they agree to do for each other and make the OHV program – the Ambassador Program work. All right, so when we give them money and we have this kind of document; and we have a Ambassador Training Manual, and we have a participant agreement that's flowing down in here; they can't do anything else.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I agree. You're – we haven't had any objections so far on that section. We're doing okay. Twenty-nine?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Thirty?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Thirty-one? I'd like to know how you're on three where it comes – what is your preferred patrol area? Well we don't even have agents – groups – it's just looking out in the future on this, like Lakeside Ranger District, you know, Yuma, Quartzite? Is that what you're doing is just putting it on there to cover all basis for later on?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, yes sir. These are areas that we're looking forward for expansion when this is available on the website. It's there for anyone who want to apply as an ambassador to the program can identify where they're available to work; and as we have partnerships or events in those areas, they can be notified [unintelligible].

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, great! Thirty-two?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Thirty-three?

MR. ROGERS: I'd just like to point out on 33 on number three there. There is some more meat to help us with groups that get involved – and let me ask legal here – is this enough if we found – if we got a group – if that number three – is that enough to boot 'em outta the program if we – if someone gets into the program that you find is actually contrary to our goals and things, does that give you enough to boot 'em out?

AAG HERNBRODE: This is for each individual goal. This is a –

MR. ROGERS: Yeah, whether it be a vol – yeah, as a volunteer we could.

AAG HERNBRODE: Yeah, he says, yes.

MR. ROGERS: Do we have that anywhere as far as a group also? It's just – we might want to put that in there for the group, as well, so –

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, I have a question on that, real quick. When you say, "we," from what I understand the process is that all we're here for is just to fund the money. That's their governing council and stuff like that. Am I correct on that, Bob, on actually who oversees these programs? We don't do that.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, again, there is no group in the Ambassador Program. The ambassadors are individual volunteers that volunteer to provide their time to the program. They may volunteer to be primarily focused in the

Cave Creek Ranger District, or primarily on the Table Mesa Area; or they apply through the Prescott – apply to be part of the Prescott National Forest. The volunteers sign up for the Ambassador Program. Okay? There's no organizational requirement on them. If ten guys from the Scenic Club join, they're all just ambassadors.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bob, then why are you – did you ask – I recently filled out those papers for the Ambassador Program expansion, which was an inch thick by the time I had everything notarized and sent it in. You had the – it was all involved around the club, the White Mountain Open Trails Association. That was a club. It's an organization, it's a blooper. However you call it. It wasn't just a bunch of individuals doing it. It was a club. That's what you sought out to do, so where did it change from that and who had the authority to change it?

MR. BALDWIN: Again, Mr. Chair and group, you know, that was the initial goal of the program, you know. We thought that those kind of people would be – that goes to a grey scenario within their own region; but again, it was still open to have other people volunteer for the Ambassador Program if they went outside of their club. This application form requires you to have 15 applications.

CHAIR SAVINO: Under our club – under the umbrella of the White Mountain Open Trails Association – those people would come to us and we had our structure set up. You just hit on something. Okay? You said that was the original goal of it. Okay? It never came back to this group to say that we're changing the original concept. This was changed by certain individuals and that can't happen.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, the goal was to provide on-the-ground presence of volunteers for land management agencies. Okay? The volunteers would be OHV enthusiasts. All right? Yes, there was a mention and discussion of "It would be great if OHV groups would take on this Ambassador Program and get all the volunteers and run it themselves. That isn't working. The thing that works is to have a volunteer coordinator preferably associated with some type of OHV recreation and provide him with enough volunteers to meet the needs of his partner agency.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Joy.

AAG HERNBRODE: So John are you saying that you don't want as OHV Ambassadors anyone who doesn't belong to a club.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, what I'm saying is you have to have some form of organization there; and I'm just saying – basically what I'm saying is I'm asking, how it went from this to that?

AAG HERNBRODE: I think you guys are talking about apples and oranges. Because you're talking about who applies for the grant.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

AAG HERNBRODE: And that is a club.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

AAG HERNBRODE: Is it – there's somebody in the club who does all the work. It's not *the club* doing the work. There's some poor sop who did volunteer for that,

like you – okay – fill out all the paperwork, oversee volunteers and scheduling stuff. And State Parks says, "Okay, great! You've got five people in your club, if they don't wanna do this, we've got 15 more people who live in your area who are not members of your club who [unintelligible] too; and you'll coordinate those as well.

CHAIR SAVINO: Under the umbrella of the –

AAG HERNBRODE: Under the umbrella of that grant.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. Okay, Don.

MR. FRENCH: I'd like to understand – I'm not quite understanding what Bob's saying, I guess. Bob are you saying that one guy, me, could come and say "I wanna be the coordinator for – I wanna have a group and I'm – I'm gonna do all the work. I'm gonna get 15 ambassadors – is that something that could happen?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, no. You need to be associated with an organization eligible to apply.

MR. FRENCH: And it doesn't have to be a club?

AAG HERNBRODE: Individuals could be [unintelligible], but individuals are not an eligible entity.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Hank are you satisfied with your questions?

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Do you remember what your question was?

MR. ROGERS: No, I remember what my question was, but you know my concern was, you know, we have the ability – that we do have the ability to – if we identify people that are anti-OHV we have a way of getting them out. So that was my only concern.

MR. FRENCH: Well, I agree with Bob's [unintelligible] on that. There's no –

MR. ROGERS: Hopefully so; but sometimes someone might slip through and that just gives us a safety valve if we need to use it. That was my only point.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, let's go to 34. Anything?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Thirty-five?

MR. ROGERS: Hold on a second. Back to 33 for one small moment, too. On number four, I think that – in the behavior part of it. Our Ambassadors need to be – they need to be a good example out there; and if we find that one of 'em is not – you know, let's say he's done some cross-country riding, got caught and got a ticket. Do we have a way of taking that particular ambassador and – is that what this is for here, number four? And the only reason I bring that up, guys, that happened the other day.

AAG HERNBRODE: Well actually, number eight.

MR. ROGERS: Number eight? Okay. That helps it – so, that's the only thing I'd be concerned about.

CHAIR SAVINO: All right. Thirty-four?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Thirty-five? I'd just like to see down at the bottom of 35 under "other conditions," that the OHV Ambassador Program Governing Council will oversee and approve all expansion grant coordinator positions. That's the coordinator position for that expansion grant. Follow me what I'm saying?

AAG HERNBRODE: [Inaudible].

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I'm easy.

AAG HERNBRODE: Because the coordinator position –

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I'm not talking about the overall coordinator, I'm talking about the expansion grant coordinator for – example is the CREC person. That it should come back to the governing council of the Ambassador Program to oversee that appointment of that person.

SPEAKER: This is all volunteer –

CHAIR SAVINO: No, that person isn't.

SPEAKER: No, that's not to do with these, so –

CHAIR SAVINO: All right, let's go on. Thirty-six?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, I might point out that 36, 37 – through the rest of that is that agreement stuff that we talked about negotiating in chambers.

AAG HERNBRODE: These are the things that I work on [unintelligible].

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, so we don't need to go there?

AAG HERNBRODE: I'm happy with them.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well then we need to go through them. Then we really need to hit these with a fine-toothed comb, then.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Anything on 37?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Thirty-eight? This way it's recorded that we looked at it. Thirty-nine?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Forty?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Forty-one?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: We're done. I'd like to – can we – I'd like to entertain a motion that we approve the OHV Ambassador Program Expansion Grant Manual for 2012 Expansion Grant – Application Manual with the corrections that we talked about

at this meeting; and direct Bob Baldwin – State Parks Bob Baldwin to proceed with this manual.

MR. ROGERS: Did we do that legal?

AAG HERNBRODE: I want to see the –

MR. BALDWIN: Yeah, let me go over the changes that I have, if you'll glide through them real quickly. On page one, we're adding OHV in front of "interested user" in the second paragraph before – under "program information."

AAG HERNBRODE: [Unintelligible], second line from the bottom, "trained volunteer ambassadors."

MR. BALDWIN: Well by definition ambassadors are trained volunteers.

MR. FRENCH: [Unintelligible] "trained volunteer ambassadors" you think you need that in there?

CHAIR SAVINO: What page.

MR. FRENCH: Page one.

CHAIR SAVINO: Page one, no.

AAG HERNBRODE: I have a statutory change [unintelligible].

MR. BALDWIN: Okay. All right, and change the date on page four to May 2012; top of page five "eligibility;" strike out "Arizona city/county governments and tribal governments. Under applicants must provide the following timely application [intelligible] for endorsement by [unintelligible] organizations – on page 15 strike [unintelligible]. I think that's it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Everybody okay with that? I don't have a motion. I entertained a motion so if somebody would like – somebody make that motion or should I change mine to a motion?

AAG HERNBRODE: There's a recommended motion.

CHAIR SAVINO: I don't have that.

MR. FRENCH: I got it.

CHAIR SAVINO: You do. Let me see it. Okay.

AAG HERNBRODE: We'll use the [unintelligible] word, "as amended," to the end of that sentence.

CHAIR SAVINO: Read it. Okay? Read it, Don, you're the – make the motion.

MR. FRENCH: Okay, I'd like to make a motion. Okay, I move the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group approve the 2012 OHV Ambassador Program Expansion Grant Manual, as amended.

CHAIR SAVINO: Do I have a second there.

MR. ROGERS: I second.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank Rogers seconds. All those in favor?

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Pete?

MR. PFEIFER: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: Aye, so there's – it's unanimous. It passes.

F. OHVAG ACTION ITEMS

1. OHVAG Will Consider and Approve a DRAFT OHV Project Evaluation Form. – 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. 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. The Group will make a recommendation to staff as to how the criteria should be used to determine priority in awarding grant funds.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, let's move right on to the next thing. We're gonna discuss the – OHVAG will consider and approve a draft OHV Project Evaluation Form. 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) through (h); and the State Trails Plan. OHVAG may suggest additions, deletions and/or changes to the form. The discussion may be – may include recommendations on project applications, requirements and [unintelligible] for funding future projects, such as maximum project award and proof of user community support. The group will make a recommendation to staff as to how the criteria should be used to determine priority in awarding grant funds. Could it be any longer?

Okay, I'd like to turn the meeting over to Doris.

MS. PULSIFER: At the last meeting we made a couple changes – give me a minute here –

[Pause.]

CHAIR SAVINO: While Doris is doing that, anybody see anything wrong with this thing? Other than you can't print. I think Bill's the only one that can afford a printer –

SPEAKER: I have a printer.

CHAIR SAVINO: That could do this?

MR. ROGERS: Apply for a grant.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, apply for a grant to do this.

[Pause.]

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, your changes – if you remember correctly, you wanted to add – you wanted to increase the points, I believe, to – in this area as far as one point for each individual. I think that's the one.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I know – before we get to this because we may save some stuff, because I've heard from a couple of the members individually and stuff –

I'd like to have your opinion, around the table, on what you think about this form. Rather than getting into the nitty-gritty of it, do you like the form in its current concept with the number system? Hank?

MR. ROGERS: I do.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: I wanna say that this form is impressive. We – you know, when Dave originally asked for some – something that's like – you know, asked for [inaudible] – very well done, very well put together; and I think it goes way beyond what we actually need. What – when I originally stated that I think a metric is very helpful in getting us to evaluate different grants, but as I explained last time at the meeting, that when this goes out – and I was told that this will go out – then the ballgame changes. People are not necessarily writing grants for what they want to do, they are going to be writing grants to maximize their number of points. So the max – so the organizations that are going to have a leg up on this are agencies and people who can afford the good grant writers to maximize the number of points.

I think this, you know, goes beyond what our needs are and I would like to, you know, see some sort of scaling back where it becomes simply a fairly manipulable tool for us to use in – just in scaling our evaluations on – I just have concerns of using the metric that has become so impressively unwieldy. But, you know, you cover all the bases. I think it's [unintelligible] it's kind of a fusion reactor when we need a warm fire.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

SPEAKER: I see no reason for that to go out to somebody who's applying for a grant.

MR. McARTHUR: We were told that it is required that this will go out to everybody –

CHAIR SAVINO: No, what goes out – not this form – the – what's in there.

SPEAKER: All that's going out is the information and they can use the information accordingly. But there's no reason to give them that. None. Every organization before the State Parks [inaudible] before they bring it back, I guess. Joy.

AAG HERNBRODE: May I clarify it slightly? That is a public record. [Unintelligible] can walk through the door at any time [unintelligible] I want to see a copy of your scoring [unintelligible]. But you're right. I don't think he's entitled to see the published document that we're sending out. What we're sending out is a grant manual similar to what you just worked through that explains to people what it is that we're looking for. So what's driving them – I understand [unintelligible] on what's driving them is the score sheet. What we're hoping is that they will tailor their grants to do what it is that you want them to do, not – which will incidentally get them more points.

SPEAKER: And it's their job to enforce the fact that they scored those points; and now they have to actually fulfill their obligation.

MR. McARTHUR: I just need another nonprofit – situations where applicants are tailored to maximize point rather than –

AAG HERNBRODE: But they're still going to have to do what it is that they say they're going to do.

MR. McARTHUR: Oh, absolutely, yes.

AAG HERNBRODE: Which is hopefully what you want.

SPEAKER: Remember we had a high-scoring one that got shot down anyway. Because after it scored it still went through us and it didn't happen. And ultimately this is, you know, a tool for me to review these before I walk into a meeting and decide, (a) yeah, does it fit? Sure, but there's still going to be common sense that's gonna come into play at the end of it.

MR. McARTHUR: I hope that remains true.

SPEAKER: [Unintelligible], I'm pretty sure it is.

MR. McARTHUR: I don't know, you know, there's a tendency when developing these kind of metrics that they become the order of the day that the highest scoring grant wins. Now, as we've talked before in the hope that this doesn't become the case, that there will be some subjective evaluations coming in there; and I just have concerns about – about [unintelligible].

MS. PULSIFER: And I think one of the things that we discussed last time is that this will determine whether it meets the priorities of the Trails Plan and the statutes – and the requirements of the statutes. But it doesn't necessarily determine whether it's the best use of the money. So, as Bill just said at the end of the review in scoring, then you still go back and look to see is this the best use of the money; and that's what happened with the $850,000 grant. So, what this will provide you with – a section there at the end for you – you document what your concerns are and you have a justification for why maybe a high score – maybe it scored high, but the money – the project wasn't awarded or approved and you have your justification as to what that reason was.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. Hank, did you have something?

MR. ROGERS: Yeah, this is the point I would make out to respond [inaudible]. This is why it's so critical, you know, when you see people leave this Board like I'm going to that you put people on that understand and go in – and this is a great tool there. I think it's excellent; and it's already proved itself, as Bill pointed out. You know, none of us with for that $850,000 and it proved itself already.

CHAIR SAVINO: But we had to fight for that, so –

MR. ROGERS: Well, that's right. That's what we're here for. That's why – my point is, that's why it was so important that we put people on here that truly have passion for this –

SPEAKER: But then we went out and reviewed it with them.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, I know. We should have done that, you know, ahead of time.

SPEAKER: Yeah, we should have done it ahead of time – but we didn't. And they understood why it was turned down; and there were probably going to be

changes made and who knows, we'll probably see another – you know, another sales pitch here.

CHAIR SAVINO: You know, the thing I'm afraid of – and Don mentioned this. Don and I rode in from Parker today and stuff and he had mentioned something – put it in the same perspective as a jury. Okay? A jury gets stuff and they go into the deliberation room. They don't just, okay, we give folks five points here – the one with the most points loses. They have a deliberation. They talk about stuff. This thing should be a thing that we bring to the table for our own use and say, okay, "well, I mark this here," and then we discuss that among ourselves. We can't do it out of the open forum meeting law; but we need to be able to sit down and discuss it, because Hank may have a certain reason that he voted the certain thing so high, even if it's a litigation thing – and I'll give you an example of that.

Number one there, well, one of my things – just like on this chart we have, not a single one of these grants out in front of us has one of these number – project access – protect access to trails, acquire land for public access. It doesn't have it. Well we may wanna start looking for some of that. You follow me?

SPEAKER: [Unintelligible] want to reach out to other clubs and get them to write grants to go after that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

SPEAKER: But that's not what it's for. That for stuff that's already been submitted, and we're gonna review –

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, I agree with you. But it gives us a matrix to go out in the future.

SPEAKER: I just want the tool; and I want the tool to review it, make my own opinions, and when we walk into this – we can't obviously discuss it prior, we're supposed to make our own [unintelligible], we're supposed to vote on it –

MR. ROGERS: Well and your staff has already done a lot of the work for you. That's the other thing. You don't have to do that. You're going to get some briefing on what the application is, then they can kind of help us, too, [unintelligible].

MS. PULSIFER: Well, one of the thing, you know, if you're going to deny or turn down a project, you want to make sure that you're doing it for the correct reasons. So you want to be able to document what they do – where they do fit in in these different components, and then if you – like – as I said, if you're going to turn it down, you want to turn it down for the correct reasons with justification and be able to document that justification. So when it comes back, you have that justification. It also provides you with a tool to go back to the applicant and say, "Well, you know, you're weak in this area," or, "What can you do to mitigate your project and bring it back next time." It gives you an opportunity to have that discussion with the applicant.

CHAIR SAVINO: I see. Is there any other discussion right now before we let – okay, can you go ahead with your –

MS. PULSIFER: Okay. You asked to – last time to include a category – and I included – and that's the category number four there for matching funds.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MS. PULSIFER: And the other area –

[Pause.]

MR. FRENCH: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, Don.

MR. FRENCH: I thought we were going around the table with the discussions.

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh, I thought we were all done. I'm sorry. I was –

MR. FRENCH: I think Pete made his comment. I kinda agree with Tom – and I guess I agree with everybody. First of all, I think you did an amazing job on trying to cover all bases, bonus points – and we need a tool that we can use. I think this tool went too far. As far as bonuses points and stuff like that I like to see, you know, the things where we're at. I really like this part of it, the funding – where the funding's coming from, how much money we got – that's a good tool. Like I say, I'd like to see it simplified, but it's a good tool. I'm kind of on the same terms. I think everybody else is saying, it is a tool – I don't want my hands tied. There are so many different circumstances that come up on projects that you can't put down on paper, you know. They've already had a ton of funding. The place is going to be closed in three years. You can't take the human element out of it. I hope – I don't think it is and I hope that's not what this tool is for. And, like I said, I think you did too good of a job on making this thing because it's – I would like to see this stuff in here – like I said, the bonus points taken out. We can figure that out and have this funding – and that's my comment.

MS. PULSIFER: Okay, like I say, I added category four and the bonus points because the last time you wanted extra points for [unintelligible]. So, let me know what you want.

MR. FRENCH: Simplified. To me it's –

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, I have a question on that – real quick Joy – I have a question. This is for Sticker Fund money. Right? Or is this for – because bonus points for – there is no matching funds on Sticker Fund money. So right off the bat, then, if somebody has matching funds, unless they're into that RTP money, it doesn't apply; so then they won't get any extra points. I don't follow that.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, these projects will be evaluated for appropriate funding for either RTP or [unintelligible] funds.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right, but –

MR. BALDWIN: All you're doing is evaluating the project and saying, "This is a good project. Let's fund it." And then after we do that we'll say, "[unintelligible], federal dollars, instead of OHV dollars" – we have to spend that money, too.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right. I know. We do.

MR. BALDWIN: So, we can determine whether you want to go 50-50, if you want to meet the minimum match – and as far as match is concerned, the RTP program

requires it. So if they have their own match as opposed to using OHV funds as match, then that could be an advantage.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MR. BALDWIN: But, if they had – if for instance they have some kind of a – money that they've got repair on fire – fire-burn area or something, they're going to go ahead and use that money to repair trails and they'll match it against more RTP money to repair more trails. So that would just be their advantage because they brought something to the table.

CHAIR SAVINO: Don.

MR. FRENCH: I just think it's good to know where the money's coming from because, you know, if you've got some projects that are looking for money and only qualify for the Sticker Fund money, but there's money over in the other department that we can use for – and they apply for that, then you know – there's money there to do both, you know, so – and that's why I like –

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank, then Joy.

MR. ROGERS: You make a good point; and John I remember you guys wanted some more money on the Maverick Trail. We gave you the OHV – OHVAG recommended RTP Funds and then gave you Sticker money to match.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, we didn't have to have that match, though, did we?

MR. ROGERS: Yeah in RTP you have to match. So, what a great opportunity we have. This lays that out for us.

MR. BALDWIN: Nobody's got any money to do OHV stuff. You're only going to get it from us.

AAG HERNBRODE: And –

CHAIR SAVINO: Joy.

AAG HERNBRODE: The [unintelligible] point for the match – I mean, it's not a requirement of the program. You don't have to have a match for the Sticker Fund money, but if you are eligible for the Sticker Fund or that's all that's left and you have some matching funds – I mean, you guys are getting more bang for your buck and so you're giving somebody else those bonus points for coming up with their own cash or – I think that's what your discussion was last time. I also want to remind you that at one of these meeting Jeff Gursh was here. He was very excited about you planning things out so that he knew better what he should apply for and what he should say on his thing. So that he could score [unintelligible] to what you guys want to see rather than, you know, what they planned to [unintelligible].

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay back to Don, did you finish your – okay now, is there any other discussion before we move on to Doris.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, I had one comment.

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh yeah, Pete.

MR. PFEIFER: I just had a question about the numbers of the eight, four and one for the first priority, second and third. Were those numbers that we agreed on or are those numbers that we kind of are trying?

CHAIR SAVINO: We haven't agreed on anything yet. We're discussing – go 'head and answer that, Doris.

MS. PULSIFER: Yeah I went back and adjusted some of the numbers because I was trying to get the whole thing to come up to a hundred. So these are just numbers that I kind of played with. Because you wanted to add points for your own priorities; and you felt that deserved to have more points, if you remember right – I'm sorry, I'm having difficulty with this thing here.

CHAIR SAVINO: Pete she's having difficulties.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay. It's a complicated document.

MS. PULSIFER: No, I'm not used to this laptop.

MR. PFEIFER: Oh, I was going to say that at this point in time I wouldn't, you know, feel comfortable into using this. You know, it looks like a great tool but it's going to take some practice to get good at using it; and then the weighting of each category and stuff like that, I'd probably want to play around with that some more.

CHAIR **SAVINO:** Well, the biggest thing we want to get out there is that Bob is under the gun. He needs to get this out there to the grant applicants. Tell them what the playing field is like, what they – it has to be an even playing field so when it come in in front of us. So with that in mind we need to – not necessarily approve – we need to approve it. We need to get it going today.

MR. ROGERS: Yes and I will remind all of you – are they in session over here now – so we need to move, because they can raid our funds.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MR. ROGERS: Depending on what that budget has – what happens with the budget.

MR. McARTHUR: Like the Sticker Fund.

MR. ROGERS: Yeah, so –

CHAIR SAVINO: We can always some back and tweak it, but we need the priorities to give it to the – for this manual, this year, to go out so Bob can get it out to 'em, so they know what it's like. Correct, Bob?

MR. ROGERS: And the other thing is, you know, shoot it out there. Let 'em bring it in. That's what's going to tell you where the flaws are at. When it starts coming in to you, and you recognize the flaws, then change it at that point.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, I have a couple questions for you real quick. One is the logistics of this. How do we – are you going to send out a form this long to us in the mail? We don't all have right now sitting there to where we can print out this big form. Are you going to be able to send it out to each one of us so we –

MS. PULSIFER: I'll have to print it out on a [unintelligible] for you.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, because we need this. Well, you can see how I did it with tape and cutting and pasting.

MR. ROGERS: You have printers to do this don't you.

MS. PULSIFER: We did.

CHAIR SAVINO: Maybe a salesman job there I can afford to – you know how much one of these costs?

SPEAKER: [Inaudible].

[Laughter.]

MR. PFEIFER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes, Pete.

MR. PFEIFER: Would anybody have any heartburn with getting rid of category one, bonus 50 percent or more – that column there?

MR. FRENCH: Not at all.

CHAIR SAVINO: Where are we?

MR. PFEIFER: It's kind of in the middle of the form, you know, just to the left of the first green bar – to the right, excuse me.

MR. BALDWIN: That's part of the legislation.

CHAIR SAVINO: No, I wouldn't have any problem with that.

SPEAKER: That means it's 50 percent or more on the first part of it, remember, and that's what we talked about.

MS. PULSIFER: [Inaudible].

MR. BALDWIN: That's based on the legislation that says, "Projects that include more than one component should receive priority." That's what that does.

CHAIR SAVINO: So we have heartburn with that, Pete.

MR. PFEIFER: All I was trying to do is shorten the thing up a bit.

SPEAKER: No, it's still 48 inches long.

[Laughter.]

MR. PFEIFER: Mr. Chairman, I have another question.

CHAIR SAVINO: Regarding my chair?

MR. PFEIFER: No, it has to do with the numbers for first-level priority, second-level priority and third-level priority. Do we want to leave those as eight, four and one; or change those to, you know, ten, eight and six?

SPEAKER: Well, you can't go that high because it screws up the hundred points total.

MS. PULSIFER: Well, unless you –

MR. PFEIFER: The hundred total, we can work that out.

SPEAKER: I think they should be a little closer not a little further away.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, I agree.

SPEAKER: I think maybe three as a gap – max – total.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and group, you've got to look at the whole scoring across the sheet and is it relative. In other words, if you're going to give ten points for a priority-one project, then how much do you want to give your discretionary things, your extra letters, your OHVAG appeal categories, because that needs to be enough to compensate for – even though it's a high-priority item, you don't like the project so the points that you give – that type of thing. So you have to look at it all the way across the board to determine the relative importance in each category.

MR. PFEIFER: Can we start first with these first three since they're the ones that carry the most weight.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, what do you have in mind, Pete?

MR. PFEIFER: You know, I agree there really shouldn't be that much separation between a third level and a first level, because all of these are important. You know, I do understand there has to be a pecking order with 'em, but, you can go ten, nine, eight of that.

CHAIR SAVINO: Or eight, four, one.

MR. PFEIFER: Well, you want that much separation or percentages between the first and the third level?

CHAIR SAVINO: No.

MR. FRENCH: That way there needs to be a difference between the priorities.

MR. BALDWIN: Well, that's 13 points, so, [unintelligible] the 13.

MS. PULSIFER: You want the total or – you want each one of these to be ten, and then these to be nine?

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, all I'm looking at is the -- you know, do we want mitigation to have that much more weight over "promote volunteer programs," or something like that?

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, because we have a volunteer program with the Ambassador Program we're putting a lot in there.

[End of tape.]

CHAIR SAVINO: . . . this is for trails.

MR. ROGERS: Mr. Chair, I think Pete makes a good point. Do we want to give mitigation that high of a priority?

MR. PFEIFER: That first line has to be the same; otherwise it screws the whole thing up.

AAG HERNBRODE: Each of the components under each – under each level has to be the same.

CHAIR SAVINO: I do – Hank, to answer your question, I do. I'll give you an example. A big monsoon comes up on the Saffel Canyon. We've dump a ton of dollars in Saffel Canyon; or we had a fire up there, okay? Mitigation is going in here and already developed trails. Now we come back and that is a high priority. Because – especially since we've already put in tons of money into it.

MR. ROGERS: I agree.

MR. NASH: The north side of Bartlett Lake Road which has been shut down for five, flipping years.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right, exactly! That's the stuff – that's the mitigation stuff that I'm talking about – where we've already put into it.

MR. ROGERS: And I wasn't looking at mitigation in that sense; I'm looking more in the sense of going into an area where maybe the OHV guys – well, like Desert Wells.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yeah, right. No, I'm looking at it the other way.

MR. ROGERS: But I think that's a good way to look at it; and that's a good point. You and Bill there both have good points there; and I'll concede to that.

CHAIR SAVINO: So, where are we on this guys? Do we want to –

MR. ROGERS: My suggestion, Mr. Chair, is to go forward with what you've got and really to test and look and see. Then, after you do a couple rounds of grants, you know – sit down and look at it again. You're going to find where the problems are at.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, Pete, are you or Hank – or what's your name?

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: . . . Don?

MR. FRENCH: Bob, is this something that would work for you; or for the thing to – like, say, pretty much take it as it is now. Get a feel of it, work with it? Is it something we can change? Or is it something that's going to be real tough to change, once it's written and put out?

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair and Group I think we discussed in the last meeting that once we do this cycle we can tweak it any way we want before we announce the next cycle. But we need to be able to do that –

CHAIR SAVINO: Now!

MR. BALDWIN: . . . at that meeting so that we can continue to go. We've been – it will be eight months since we've given out a grant. The money is building up and people are in town.

CHAIR SAVINO: I agree.

MR. BALDWIN: So it's important that we get on a roll here. Obviously you have these things on your computers; so, you can score it with whatever points we allow this time; and then play around with this thing. "Well, what if we did this and this, what would it look like?" Then next time, when you come ready to do

this meeting you say, "Well, let's look at this. I graded them on six, four and two and here's where they came out," dah, dah, dah – and go from there.

CHAIR SAVINO: Let me ask this so we don't get Pete – because you brought up the thing – are you comfortable with doing that to where we have the generalized program – I mean – form in front of us; and then we tweak it, if we feel that the numbers should be in different orders and stuff – we do that next time around?

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, I mean – I'm just kinda going into this thing blind. I guess I kind of feel that way because I've never really used this form. So, yeah – I mean, I was listening to what Thomas said, which made a lot of sense. People are going to be looking at – "I made a lot more points from mitigation than I am for anything else on here; so – at least the other two columns.

CHAIR SAVINO: Well, Bob – do we have to – when we put out that form, can't we just say that, here are the priority levels we are – the rating committee will give first priority to – or highest priority are these four items. Second highest are these; third are these – we aren't putting a number system on it so they come up with – they don't know what our number system is. Like Bill said, this is our own form. They don't see the form – unless they come and ask for it.

MR. ROGERS: Then let them come and ask for it.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chair, they don't need to see the value of each.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right.

MR. PFEIFER: The highest priority are these; second –

MR. BALDWIN: What we had anticipated doing was identify each of the criteria and then define it. "Here's what we think fits in this priority, does your project include that?" Yes or no. Then if they say, yes; then we say, "Well, what did you do in your project that meets this requirement?" That's the only thing: Does it meet this criteria? Yes or no? If it's yes, it gets whatever points that were pre-allocated for it; if it's no it doesn't. Then there may be some discussion about well, what you've described really doesn't fit this category; but we'll give you four points over here because it does fit in this category.

Because they like to try to fit their project in the highest point things, like Tom was talking about. Again, when they describe the scope items that they're going to spend the money on; then they need to be able to justify that meets the definition of that criteria and that's why you're going to get those points. If it doesn't meet that criteria but it does meet this criteria you get those points. That's what we will be discussing when they turn them in. They may say this fits this, this and this; but when we get done with it, it'll be your determination.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, sounds good.

MS. PULSIFER: I have a question for Joy. So we don't have to disclose the points that we're assigning to these?

AAG HERNBRODE: You do have to sort of twist some things. I mean, you're going to say "You get a bonus point for 'X'" or for having matching funds, things like that. But you could say the priority components, 13 available points for – or however many available points there are – meeting things in these categories.

Did you – the grant amount you just approved, you notice it had eight points for one thing and nine points for another. So I mean you have to give somebody some idea of which thing is more important.

CHAIR SAVINO: Right, that's why you prioritize.

MR. BALDWIN: In all our grant manuals we've always told them exactly the points that are available in that category. So yes we would need to identify high level priority. Everything in this level one gets eight points, if you – if your project meets that –

MR. ROGERS: Or you could – do you want this Joy? Or you could just say, total points available in first-level priority components – just give them the total points that are available. You don't say how much is in each thing.

Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a motion if that's okay?

CHAIR SAVINO: First, before you – you want to make a motion to approve it, right?

MR. ROGERS: Yes, I am.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay, before – is there anybody in our group that has anything that is absolutely – that they can't handle on this sheet?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Once, twice?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay. I'd like to have – the Floor recognizes Hank Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: I move that the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group adopt an OHV project evaluation form to provide quantitative analysis of the projects based on priorities for the project selection identified in Off-Highway Vehicle Statutes ARS-28-1176 (e)-(h); and the State Trails Plan and direct staff to incorporate the priorities in the next grant manual to award off-highway Vehicle recreation funds and recreation trails programs' motorized portion funds.

CHAIR SAVINO: Do I hear a second?

MR. NASH: I second it.

CHAIR SAVINO: Bill Nash seconds the motion. Is there any discussion? We've already had discussion on it. Moving on to a vote. All those in favor? Hang on a minute, we have a discussion.

MR. BALDWIN: Mr. Chairman, should the motion say instead of "a" project evaluation say "the proposed" evaluation?

MR. ROGERS: I amend my motion to say that "the proposed evaluation." You want me to read it again?

CHAIR SAVINO: Without the paper, no!

MS. HARGROVE: You don't need to read it again; I just need the second to the amendment?

MR. NASH: Second.

CHAIR SAVINO: We have a second on the amended motion. Okay now, with the amended motion; all those in favor say aye.

CHORUS OF VOICES: Aye.

CHAIR SAVINO: All those opposed?

[No verbal response.]

CHAIR SAVINO: You guys didn't vote at all?

MR. FRENCH: I abstained. Can I do that?

MR. NASH: So did I. I don't wish to be negative about it.

CHAIR SAVINO: It's two and two. Pete, how do you vote?

MR. PFEIFER: I voted yea.

CHAIR SAVINO: We have three yeas.

AAG HERNBRODE: We have three yeas –

MR. ROGERS: John you voted yea.

CHAIR SAVINO: I can't vote yea.

AAG HERNBRODE: You can vote. You can.

CHAIR SAVINO: Oh, well there's three against two.

AAG HERNBRODE:: No, they don't count as a negative vote. They're just not voting; so you have three positives.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

AAG HERNBRODE: So the motion passes.

CHAIR SAVINO: The motion passed! Okay, let's move on and get this thing done.

G. REPORTS

1. OHV Program Partner Reports:

NONE SCHEDULED

2. Staff Reports:

a. Update on 2012 revenue in the Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation Fund and the amount available for projects.

3. Chairman's Report:

NONE SCHEDULED

CHAIR SAVINO: Reports – OHVAG Program Partner Reports? None scheduled. Staff Reports? Update on 2012 revenue in the OHV Recreation Fund and the amount available for projects.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, I handed this out to you guys. This is revenue through December; so total revenue, $1.3 million. That is – we still have to take the $692,000 that was re-directed for operations. Then there – I think there was like $133,000 in other sweeps – legislative sweeps from prior legislation. So there's

not nearly as much as there have been in previous years. But the bottom-line figure on your sheets – okay, well – yeah, the sheet that says "2012 through December," on the back side – the funny-looking one with all letters – way down on the bottom right-hand side; it say, $1.3 something or other? That is the amount available to award for grants. That includes carryover from last year minus all the other stuff, without a doubt. That has the hard dollars available to give out. That's just the sticker money. We have at least that much in RTP money.

CHAIR SAVINO: Now, Bob does this – that $330,800 for the Ambassador Program that we approved for that fiscal year; is that in this anymore or is that all from last year's?

MR. BALDWIN: If you look on the backside it shows all the deductions to the program.

CHAIR SAVINO: I did not go over that.

MR. BALDWIN: Look through that. That's going to tell you what's been taken out of there. There are categories – all the project money that we gave out last year is listed, all that kind of stuff. But that's where the figure comes from.

Now I put these other figures up here just as a comparison. As you can see, sticker sales have increased every year through December. December tends to be the highest collection month each year. Gas tax money has decreased a little bit. So people are out there, but they're not riding as much.

MR. PFEIFER: You know why it is in December?

MR. BALDWIN: Well they get their new bikes and they all go register them; or they've got them on that cycle.

MR. PFEIFER: They go to the Dunes and they get popped.

MR. BALDWIN: Oh, is that what it is?

MR. PFEIFER: They don't have their registrations on Thanksgiving weekend; and they all have to get registered so they can go back down over New Years.

MR. BALDWIN: And I think it's a reflection on enforcement efforts in this area, too.

MR. PFEIFER: Yeah, it is.

MR. BALDWIN: There's a lot more enforcement going on out there.

MR. PFEIFER: I watched 22 people get ticketed out of 25.

MR. BALDWIN: All right, so generally speaking, revenues are up.

So, between – for the next six months, it looks like it more than doubled both years; so if we look at more than doubling we'll have $2.6 or more. Again, that still has to be – this isn't the same as that figure. Because this doesn't have any of the deductions in it.

MR. FRENCH: I'm a little confused. Fiscal years –

MR. BALDWIN: Our fiscal year starts July 1st. So the first six months of our fiscal year ended in December.

MR. FRENCH: Okay so we have $1.3 through –

MR. BALDWIN: This is through December on all of these.

CHAIR SAVINO: We have that right in there right now, $1.307. Up until July we could gain whatever.

MR. BALDWIN: It could more than double. We should get more than that.

MR. FRENCH: So we need to get some money out.

CHAIR SAVINO: Get it out there.

MR. ROGERS: Beat 'em to the punch is all I can tell you boys; 'cause they're going to be looking for money, I betcha!

MR. FRENCH: Well they can't touch the sticker part, but they can sure take the –

MR. ROGERS: Oh yes they can!

CHAIR SAVINO: They'll try!

MR. ROGERS: They can take anything they want.

MR. BALDWIN: If you noticed the last report I gave you, the report to the legislature in September indicates that they had taken more money than just the gas tax revenue had generated. So if you want to go back and look at that report; they are taking sticker funds.

CHAIR SAVINO: And, I'll tell you one thing I just thought of. I'm just throwing this out there. Downstairs in the board meeting they were talking about there's a big push to try to get the revenues from State Parks back to where the revenue comes back to State Parks from their parks. That's it. That'll open the door. They'll try to grab it from somewhere else. They're not going to go away and say, "Well, we don't need that money anymore." They're going to try to grab it from somewhere else; and that may be us.

AAG HERNBRODE: May I suggest Mr. Chairman that might be an agenda item. I believe that what we were talking about is perhaps an agenda item for next meeting or another meeting.

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. BALDWIN: All right. Are there any other questions on revenue? That's just sticker fund. We still are getting RTP money. In fact, we found out that we got more money in 2009 because they miscalculated.

MR. ROGERS: I thought they were cutting off the RTP.

MR. BALDWIN: Well, they haven't yet. They don't have the ability -- all they're doing is operating under an extension.

CHAIR SAVINO: Go ahead, Don.

MR. FRENCH: Are we going to have grants before us at the next meeting? Or we have to get this out so it's going to be three months from February?

MR. BALDWIN: Well if you want to go to the last page of your agenda, our meeting on February 10 will be primarily for new members; and I have no applications

for new members as yet. And that can be a telephonic meeting and we can add some other things to it if you want. So, if you have any agenda items, discussion items that you want to discuss on February 10? April 6 will be the grants – you're reviewing the grants and making recommendations on grant money.

MR. ROGERS: So, Bob, what you're saying is on the tenth of February you don't have time to do it, right?

MR. BALDWIN: To do what?

MR. ROGERS: To do grants.

MR. BALDWIN: They won't be ready by then. They won't even be due until –

MR. ROGERS: Okay, gotcha!

CHAIR SAVINO: The grants will be – April 6 will be when we need to push to get these grants in there.

MR. BALDWIN: And that will be the joint meeting with the non-Motorized Committee. So, again, we'll have morning activities with the Joint Committee and then the afternoon will be the grant process. Because we couldn't do it in May since you're going out of state – I mean out of – almost out of state. In August we'll – hopefully we'll have another grant cycle between April and August; and we'll have grants on the agenda again in August. Then we should be back to the normal nomination review thing in November. So that will be basically the main thing for those agendas; but again, there are lots of other things to discuss.

H. TIME AND PLACE FOR NEXT MEETING

Friday, February 10, 2012 at the State Parks Office, 1300 W. Washington St., Phoenix, AZ

Friday, April 6, 2012 in Phoenix at site to be determined.

Friday, May 4, 2012 in Kingman, AZ at a site to be determined.

Friday, August 17, 2012 at a site to be determined.

Friday, November 2, 2012 at a site to be determined.

AAG HERNBRODE: Mr. Chairman, if I might? I apologize to you all, but unless the legislature does something drastically exciting this year, my office does not have travel money. So it is unbelievably difficult for me to get to your out-of-town meeting in May. If I'm not there –

CHAIR SAVINO: Would we have to do it without you?

AAG HERNBRODE: [Inaudible.]

MR. FRENCH: More than normal?

[Laughter.]

AAG HERNBRODE: I apologize for that. I realize it's inconvenient for you and difficult; and I wish that there were some way around it; but none of the agencies really have travel money.

MR. FRENCH: Do like we do, travel on your own money.

[Laughter.]

AAG HERNBRODE: [Inaudible.]

CHAIR SAVINO: Okay.

MR. PFEIFER: I just have a question about the new membership thing. Which counties are maxed out?

MR. BALDWIN: Maricopa's the only one that has two members.

MR. PFEIFER: Oh, okay.

MR. BALDWIN: And there can't be more than two in any county.

MR. PFEIFER: Okay, so it's just Maricopa.

MR. BALDWIN: However, Dave is up unless he reapplies.

CHAIR SAVINO: David hasn't re-applied yet. David is up for – he's due for his next three-year term.

MR. ROGERS: Has anybody talked to Dave?

CHAIR SAVINO: Awhile back I did. We can't talk about that right now because Joy is still here; but yes.

MR. FRENCH: Can I add one more thing for Bob real quick.

CHAIR SAVINO: Yes.

MR. FRENCH: Bob, when you send these grant manuals out, do you have a mailing list that gets them? And, can I add names to that? Okay, so I'll deal with you after the meeting.

MR. BALDWIN: Yeah, I just sent out a notice that the manual – that the program is open and information is available on the website.

CHAIR SAVINO: But some of these – some of them have to be led to the troughs.

MR. BALDWIN: They all got an individual notice that the solicitation is open. So, whether they –

MR. FRENCH: This manager is new there having taken over the Havasu area; and she seems real gung-ho. I'll give you her name.

CHAIR SAVINO: Her first name is Kim. (Kim Liebhauser)

MR. BALDWIN: Yeah, well give me their names and I'll make sure. I have most of the agency people; but if they're new to the agency. Plus the fact that when we [inaudible].

CHAIR SAVINO: She seems real energetic. We may get somewhere finally up there. Okay. Don, do you have anything else?

MR. FRENCH: No sir.

CHAIR SAVINO: Thomas?

MR. McARTHUR: I was going to say, we've only been here two-and-a-half hours. Is there something amiss?

MR. ROGERS: I think we should congratulate Mr. Savino.

[Laughter.]

CHAIR SAVINO: I do have something before – you have anything else?

SPEAKER: No.

CHAIR SAVINO: Hank?

MR. ROGERS: No, I haven't either.

CHAIR SAVINO: We may come out to the thing where Hank's not here next time for whatever – for whatever scheduling reason – and that will probably be his last meeting since we're electing a new one. I'd like to express our sincere gratitude to you for serving on this committee; and all your dedication toward the OHV communication in trying to make this go forward.

[Applause.]

I. ADJOURNMENT @ 3:35 p.m.

CHAIR SAVINO: I'd like to entertain a motion to –

MR. ROGERS: So moved!

MR. PFEIFER: Second.

[End of Meeting.]