

**Joint Meeting of Committees comprised of Snowmobile Recreation & Off-Road Vehicle Council members  
AGENDA & RECORD – February 9, 2016**

Rib Mountain Community Building, Wausau, WI

Presenter/ Time	Agenda Item	Key Points	Outcomes, Next Steps, Assignments
	<b>Call to Order</b>	<p><b>Members Present:</b>  <b>Snow Council:</b> Bev Dittmar, Larry Erickson, Bob Lang, Andy Malecki, Dale Mayo</p> <p>ORV Council: Rob McConnell, Bryan Much, Jim Wisneski</p> <p><b>Others Present:</b> Cathy Burrow, Faith Murray, Jillian Steffes, Ed Slaminski, DNR; Grayling Brandt, USFS; Mike Peterson, WCFA</p>	
	<b>Public Comments</b>	None	
	<b>Agenda Repair</b>	None	
	<p><b>USFS Bridge Standards</b></p> <p><b>a. USFS Eligible Recipient</b></p> <p><b>b. Grants to Accommodate Groomers</b></p>	<p>Dale told of his 35 foot bridge that is going to cost upwards of \$120K, due to delays and what is felt as over-engineering for the purpose (recreation not highway) of the bridge.</p> <p>Grayling –They had a big conference in October and all agreed that they may be building their bridges to too high of a standard.</p> <p>He believes the USFS in Wisconsin will have an engineer in house which will help make things move quicker.</p> <p>Q: Does the USFS distinguish between a road and a recreational bridge?  A: They build the bridges for the type of transportation that will cross it. He gave some examples, if it goes to private property, it may need to be built to a higher standard.</p> <p>Q: If the USFS is going to own the bridge will they also</p>	<p>USFS restricts access and builds to a certain capacity; Grayling felt that 14,000 lb. standard will work provided the local clubs aren't using grooming equipment that is larger/heavier than that.</p> <p>Action item: The Snow Council needs to consider restricting funding for grooming equipment that exceeds the 14K load capacity of the bridge.</p> <p>USFS posts the weight limit of all their bridges about 20' ahead of the bridge. Many counties do as well. This should be encouraged when the load limit is known.</p>

		<p>maintain it?  A: USFS inspects their bridges. Grayling says they normally work with the counties on the maintenance. And why shouldn't the snowmobile or ATV fund pay or help pay the maintenance since they are the ones primarily using the bridges.</p> <p>It was commented that if the USFS is demanding a higher standard, they should also pay for a portion of the cost.</p>	
	<p><b>ORV &amp; Snow Council cost sharing percentages for grants</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a. Projects with large amounts of gravel</b></li> <li><b>b. ATV year-round vs. winter-only trails</b></li> <li><b>c. Bridge enhancement grants</b></li> </ul>	<p>The Snow Council's perspective is to fund 50/50 of a trail rehab less the cost of the gravel and the transport of the gravel.</p> <p>A previous agreement between the two councils called for summer/winter use trails where the rehab was clearly being caused by ATV use the agreement was 75/25 for rehabbing the trails.</p> <p>The agreement changed to 50/50 if there was bridge work.</p> <p>A big question is rehab vs. maintenance. Over the past few years rehabilitation requests have changed.</p> <p>Rehabilitation is (or should be) restoring a trail to good condition, if the goal is to over-build it, should be called an enhancement.</p> <p>It appears that some of the rehab requests have evolved into trail enhancement requests.</p> <p>Much discussion on the best design of trails to make them sustainable.</p> <p>Every trail is different based on native soils.</p> <p>Rob: Everything comes in at 50/50 and Councils do what they can with the money they have to work with.</p> <p>Big discussion regarding ATV winter maintenance and</p>	<p>Recommendation: On shared trails projects the default should be for a 50/50. If specific situations call for a different percentage, such as priority for ATV or Snow, materials required, who caused the damage, etc. Those percentages/amounts can be adjusted as needed. The Councils will do what they can with the money they have to work with.</p> <p>If CSS's have questions regarding funding percentages they can bring it to the pre-meetings and seek advice from the Council on changing the funding from 50/50. This should be done on an as-needed basis.</p> <p>DNR will remove the county ownership clause from bridge grants on USFS property, provided USFS will give DNR the same assurances regarding restricting access or conversion.</p>

		whether or not it should be used on simple maintenance or restricted only to grooming. Consensus answer is there are too many different rules/variables in different areas of the state to mandate this.	
	<b>Signing Handbook</b> <b>a. Update</b> <b>b. Split</b> <b>c.</b>	<p>Rob: DOT restrictions on road and bridge crossings. Follow the Hwy Maintenance Manual any time an ATV is crossing a state highway.</p> <p>Somehow make it more apparent in the book that a snowmobile blazer is a blazer and an ATV sign.</p> <p>New reflectorized signs being chewed off by blue jays and/or sap suckers.</p>	<p>Recommendation: Keep the book as one and update it.</p> <p>DOT Hwy Maintenance Manual requirements need to be added for ATV trails crossing state highways.</p> <p>Each Council will make suggestions to Gary Eddy by 4/30/16.</p>
	<b>Committee Member Issues</b>		General consensus that it's important for representatives of the two councils to meet and should continue.
	<b>Comments from Mike Peterson</b>	They've been seeing that native soils aren't working and that's why things are costing more. County forests aren't trying to build forest roads.	
	<b>Adjourn</b>		