

Agenda Item	Key Points	Outcomes, Next Steps, Assignments
Introductions	<p>Members Present: SRC: Dale Mayo, Gary Hilgendorf, Lee Van Zeeland; ORVC: Rob McConnell, Adam Harden, Bryan Much</p> <p>Others Present: DNR: Cathy Burrow, Faith Murray; Dave Peterson, Langlade County</p>	
Public comments	None.	
Agenda repair	None.	
Bridge standards	<p>Dale shared the recent history that lead to the SRC considering bridge standards and taking action. It started with the USFS bridge standards, then they found it wasn't much more money to build to a 25K load than a 14K load. The idea was to increase the infrastructure standard over time as bridges were built and/or rehabbed, because the system is too large to tackle it all at one time.</p> <p>Rob shared the ORVC's concern that targeting bridges randomly may not help if other nearby bridges cannot support the same load. Also, if equipment is already present that exceeds bridge loads that is a problem that needs to be dealt with and increasing some bridge loads may be perceived as approving use of larger equipment.</p> <p>More discussion regarding posting weight limits on bridges, protecting the overall system, disincentives for purchasing larger equipment, developing a program to preserve the current infrastructure, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove overload provision in the bridge guide. • Ask counties to post their bridge maximum load. (Eligible expense under maintenance grant.) • Suggest counties add to their club contracts a provision requiring adherence to the posted bridge loads. Meaning heavier equipment may not be used on those bridges when maintaining that trail. • DNR add the following information to the motorized recreation grant application regarding bridges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are your bridges posted? ○ What's the max load of the other bridges that the equipment used on this bridge also grooms/grades? ○ What is the weight of the grooming/grading equipment that will be used on this bridge? ○ Not required but inform counties that the Councils are interested in knowing the condition of and rehab plans for the other bridges. <p>Conclusion: SRC will fund bridges up to a</p>

		<p>capacity of 25K. ORVC will consider funding bridges up to a 25K capacity based on the data provided in the application and what the situation warrants.</p> <p>Publishing an article on this issue in the two user group magazines was suggested. Bryan volunteered to develop an outline of the topics that would be important to address.</p>
ORVC & SRC cost-sharing percentages	<p>ORVC shared their concern that ATV/UTV winter use may not be sufficient to warrant spending ATV money on winter-use only trails. The ORVC is pursuing options to obtain data regarding winter-use.</p> <p>The multitude of rules regarding winter ATV use was also discussed which make decisions difficult as well. Sometimes ATV-use is allowed when snowmobile trails are open, sometimes when they're closed, some depend on temperature, etc.</p> <p>SRC shared their stance that resurfacing gravel will likely only be covered at the \$500/mile rate as outlined in s. NR 50.09(5)(bp)4. Wis. Adm. Code.</p>	<p>Ideas: Winter-trail pass for ATV/UTV users to gather data regarding usage numbers including area of use (trail pass sales would need to include info regarding areas of use). A standard state-wide winter-use rule was also discussed.</p> <p>Conclusion: All joint use trails will start at a 50-50 cost-share on the application funding spreadsheets and changes will be made by the Councils depending on the specific circumstances.</p>
Determining equipment rates	<p>Cathy explained that a rates committee was formed in the SRC to deal with the implementation of SNARS. That committee consists of 4 Council members: Larry Erickson, Bob Lang, Gary Hilgendorf and Dale Mayo.</p> <p>Additionally, because of the increase of basic snowmobile maintenance from \$250 to \$300 per mile, the Council synced up the rates with current DOT highway rates. Cathy stated she failed to coordinate that effort between the two councils.</p>	<p>Conclusion: Potential rates changes will be discussed between the two Councils (or representatives of each) before formal action is taken.</p>
Council Member Issues	<p>Adam: Explained the Safety Enhancement Program is likely to be funded again allowing enhancements to the Trail Ambassador program and other safety and outreach activities. Biggest issue is road building vs. trail building. That is a problem.</p> <p>Rob: Bridges, we can't live without. Right now, we're spending money on gravel that would be better spent on bridges even if it means funding a bridge at 100%.</p>	<p>These two Councils need to maintain communication and meet when the need arises.</p>

	<p>Bryan: Need to maintain flexibility so we can deal with all situations. We can't set hard and fast rules for all situations.</p> <p>Lee: We represent the end users and must always remember that we do needs to benefit them.</p> <p>Dale: Good core group, we went over some tough issues but we're dealing with things that have been put-off for a long time. Continuing to communicate and periodic meetings are very important.</p> <p>Gary: Communication line is vital between the two Councils. The equipment rates overall only changed by about one dollar. Many of the changes were due to simplifying things for SNARS implementation.</p>	
Action items	As stated in the Outcomes column.	