

MINUTES
of the
ARIZONA STATE COMMITTEE ON TRAILS
of
ARIZONA STATE PARKS
MEETING OF JULY 20, 2007
Offices of Arizona Game & Fish
2878 E. White Mountain Blvd.
Pinetop-Lakeside, AZ

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Grandrud called the meeting to order at 11:00am. Ruth Shulman called the roll and advised Chair Grandrud that there was a quorum. John Vuolo addressed the housekeeping issues, such as restrooms, and meeting space limitations. He also spoke briefly on the history and demographics of Pinetop-Lakeside, along with mentioning the importance of outdoor recreation based tourism.

ASCOT Members Present: Reba Wells Grandrud, Chair
Don Applegate
Bonnie Bariola (arrived 11:50)
Cate Bradley
Maureen DeCindis
Anne Ellis
Tom Fitzgerald
Russell Freeman
Dan Gruber
Jim Horton
Vince Murray
Sonia Overholser (arrived 11:35)
Doug Potts
Steve Saway
Charles Scully
Linda Slay
Irene Smith
David Troutner
John Vuolo
Erik Wilson
Bonnie Winslow

ASCOT Members Absent: Andrew Fish
Carrie Miracle-Jordan
Eric Smith
Kent Taylor

Arizona State Parks Staff: Annie McVay, State Trails Coordinator
Ruth Shulman, Advisory Group Coordinator

Guests: Don Ziegler, ASCOT Contributor

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

Members and staff introduced themselves. Chair Grandrud set the order of the agenda for the meeting.

C. ACTION ITEMS

1. Approval of Minutes from the May 4, 2007 Meeting.

Linda Slay noted that on page 12 “800 volunteers” should be changed to “800 volunteer hours”. Bonnie Winslow asked that the reference to providing her with information regarding National Trails Day should be reviewed, since she does not recall asking for the information to be forwarded to her personally. Ruth Shulman will review the tape to double-check, and make the changes noted. Chair Grandrud noted that the Preservation Training Workshop mentioned in the minutes will take place.

Jim Horton moved to accept the minutes as amended. Cate Bradley seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

2. Consider Supporting the Pinal County Open Space and Trails Plan.

Annie McVay noted that Kent Taylor, who is seeking ASCOT’s support for the plan, was unable to attend this meeting so she would be providing information on the plan in “bullet points”. Kent Taylor is requesting that ASCOT provide a letter of support for the plan to go to the County Board of Supervisors.

The plan addresses Pinal County’s needs regarding key open spaces to be protected for the future, five regional parks to be acquired and developed, a large trail system to provide the “backbone” and recommendations for planning and zoning ordinances.

Bonnie Winslow asked whether the ordinances were geared toward preventing trails access blockage by development. Annie McVay said that the ordinances provide for open space within developments but do not address trails access. Annie McVay noted that the plan is posted online at the Pinal County website, and is very long. The public comment phase is open until early August; the County Board of Supervisors will hear the plan at their September meeting.

Chair Grandrud noted that ASCOT supports the idea of open space and trails planning in and of itself. Cate Bradley said that perhaps members could review the plan on their own time and submit objects by Friday, July 27, 2007. A support letter could then be written the following Monday. Doug Potts asked if it would be possible to send a letter of support noting objections and providing advice on changes to the plan. Annie McVay said that another ASCOT meeting would then be necessary and

time constraints prevent that. She feels that the only possible objection might be specific trails access protection.

Erik Wilson said he did not see how ASCOT could support the plan without seeing it. Annie McVay said that she addressed this with Kent Taylor. John Vuolo said that the overall concept of planning could be supported, while the plan itself could be reviewed outside. The letter could be drafted in that way.

Steve Saway said that perhaps the key access issues of the plan should be identified for suggestions to provide the planners. Vince Murray said that he would personally prefer to review the plan, and perhaps letters of support from each constituency represented in ASCOT could then be presented. Chair Grandrud said that both sides of the discussion have been well represented and asked for a motion on the topic.

Don Applegate moved that ASCOT not send a letter of support until the members have had the opportunity to read the plan. Erik Wilson seconded the motion.

Linda Slay asked what mechanism would be used to provide responses to the plan. Annie McVay said that unless ASCOT was willing to set another meeting date to discuss input on the plan, there would be no mechanism. Arizona State Parks (ASP) as an entity could support the plan, individual ASCOT members could support the plan, but ASCOT as an entity would not be able to support the plan. Dan Gruber felt that a letter of support for the plan could be drafted without reviewing it. He suggested that after the vote on the current motion, an alternative motion be considered in which ASCOT drafts a letter supporting the concept of planning in and of itself. Chair Grandrud called for the vote. The vote: 7 ayes, 10 nays, the motion fails.

Dan Gruber moved that ASCOT send a letter supporting the concept of planning for open space, trails and other recreational opportunities. Maureen DeCindis seconded the motion. Discussion on the idea of sending a letter that does not support the specific plan followed. Steve Saway noted that perhaps this could be discussed in the October meeting. Annie McVay said that the County Board of Supervisors would be hearing the plan at their September meeting, so October input would not be timely. Jim Horton asked if the letter supporting planning but not this specific plan would be valuable. Annie McVay said that the letter would be worthwhile but perhaps ambiguous. Cate Bradley noted that trail planning in the state needs to be supported, and ASCOT would be otherwise missing an opportunity. Chair Grandrud noted that the letter could be wordsmithed to include the most appropriate language. She then called for the vote. The motion passes with 13 ayes, 2 nays and 2 abstentions.

Annie McVay will write the letter to the Pinal County Board of Supervisors along with input from Maureen DeCindis and Kent Taylor.

3. Discuss ASCOT Assistance Needed for the State Trails Conference

Bonnie Winslow noted that a “to do” list appeared in the agenda packet. The Trails Conference planning group has been meeting regularly and now individual tasks are ready to be “divvied up” among ASCOT and OHVAG members. Most of the tasks are those that will take place during the Conference. Volunteers are necessary to accomplish the day-to-day tasks.

Going down the list:

Bonnie Winslow and Cate Bradley are handling back-up speakers.

Tom Fitzgerald volunteered to photograph the event

John Vuolo will handle set up for the poster session; this involves tables for the displays, signage, etc.

Bonnie Winslow will be handling the ASCOT poster/exhibit, and will also be helping with the OHVAG poster/exhibit. She is looking for photos of trails, especially multi-use trails.

Maureen DeCindis, Linda Slay, Vince Murray, and Jim Horton volunteered to assemble the program folder materials. The materials would be ready in September.

Annie McVay will handle pre-event needs, as far as A/V etc.

Nametags at registration will be “do-it-yourself”.

Cate Bradley, Troy Waskey and John Vuolo will take care of room signs/directional signs. Some of this can be done in advance, some will need to be done at the event.

Troy Waskey will make the signs and the others will help post them.

Irene Smith will handle volunteer recruitment and coordination. This involves providing volunteers with the information they need to do their tasks.

Tom Fitzgerald and Dan Gruber will develop an evaluation form for the Conference and make sure the evaluation forms are available at the event.

To be determined is the person who will provide event day assistance with the A/V equipment.

Linda Slay, Doug Potts and Cate Bradley will help set up the rooms for the sessions.

Linda Slay, Doug Potts, and Irene Smith will set up and manage the registration table for both days. Irene Smith will focus on the volunteer aspect.

Dave Troutner will assist in providing extra sleeping bags, towels, pillows, etc.

Annie McVay will provide the office supplies, such as scissors, tape, pens, etc.

Amy Racki and Bob Baldwin will handle the sign-up sheets for the events including entertainment, including the band for Friday night.

Troy Waskey will handle providing snacks and water for the Conference.

To be determined is a coordinator for the Human Foosball event.

Russell Freeman, Doug Potts, and Linda Slay (if she’s available) will help out with the trail building event.

Chair Grandrud noted that all those who volunteered today should be added to the eMail list for communication. Bonnie Winslow noted that a site visit to the Prescott Pines Camp is scheduled for August 23, 2007. Bonnie Winslow also asked who would be interested in distributing the Conference flyers around. Annie McVay said

that flyers will be made available for distribution. Annie McVay also noted that there is no deadline for registration.

The Conference is scheduled to begin Thursday evening, October 4, 2007 and ends at noon on Saturday, October 6, 2007. The ASCOT meeting will be held earlier in the morning; time will be set later during this meeting. Events such as a mountain bike ride, and ATV certification will be held during the Conference. ASP may be covering the cost of the ATV training for attendees. The ASP website has a link to the Trails Conference website.

ASCOT expressed their appreciation for the Conference committee's hard work.

4. Facilitated Discussion of Potential Benefits of the State Trails System

Annie McVay began the conversation with a brief overview of the purpose and plan for the discussion, including a vision for the outcome that includes a clear mission, creative and far-ranging ideas tempered with practicality. She posted the Arizona State Parks mission, which is:

Managing and conserving natural, cultural and recreational resources.

Annie McVay also provided ASCOT members with an organizational chart from the Governor through the Arizona State Parks Board and the makeup of ASP Staff, as well as the Resources Management Team, which "handles" three advisory committees and then to ASCOT. ASCOT is the largest advisory committee because they have tasks set for them as well as tasks they take on for themselves. (Handout available.)

Annie McVay also provided ASCOT with a pie chart outlining her position and time spent on various tasks. (Handout available.) In addition to ASCOT, one task is "managing" the Arizona Trail fund, which this year is \$125,000 from which are funded a variety of projects helping to build and maintain the Arizona Trail. The majority of her time is spent on ASP Trails/Resource Management Planning, including the upcoming Trails 2010 Plan, which is a plan for trails written every five years. Another large portion is the STS with many variable tasks, including the nomination meetings. She also works with various counties and municipalities with their own trails planning, and provides support to those entities. She also provides liaison to professional groups and association and answers public inquiries on trails within the state.

Dan Gruber then led the discussion on the STS. He noted that the STS dilemma is summed up by the criteria for inclusion with the system. Those criteria are specific but some need clarification. One criteria is totally subjective, which is that trails admitted should be significant or noteworthy. The original purpose of the STS in fact was to recognize exceptional trails. The State Legislature then added a provision to the statute requiring trails to be listed in the STS in order to be eligible for Trails Heritage Fund grant money. Thereby come the dilemmas facing ASCOT with regards

to the STS: providing much needed funding for trails v. funding trails of lesser quality, leading to objective v. subjective criteria. These issues arise at every meeting, especially regarding the funding aspect. He noted that there are 650 going on 700 trails in the STS, some of which do not fit the original vision.

Maureen DeCindis noted that it is out of ASCOT's purview to affect the Heritage Fund criteria, but asked whether a two-tier STS would be possible. Dan Gruber said that would be an option, and some of those who responded to his survey prior to this meeting mentioned the possibility. Steve Saway recommended revisiting the STS membership criteria for receiving Heritage Funds. Annie McVay said that particular criteria is part of the statute, and introducing new legislation at this point could adversely affect the Heritage Fund as a whole.

Dan Gruber noted that he had received 23 responses to the survey, of which five were from Staff and/or former ASCOT members. The remaining 18 were from the current membership. Those responses received prior to the meeting were summarized and that summary was provided to the membership (Handout available.) The first question on the survey was: *If you were thinking about creating an STS today, what would be its purpose(s)?* There were eight purposes listed in the responses; a ninth response encompassed ideas that appeared once each in the survey results. Details of those responses can be found on the handout. The second question on the survey was: *Are there potential benefits from an STS if it wasn't tied to the Heritage Fund grants?* The "yes" responders were then asked to list the benefits and their recipients. Details those responses can be found on the handout as well. The third survey question asked: *What specifically would need to happen for the benefits you mentioned in Q2 to be realized in practice by the various parties? What would the state, ASP, and ASCOT need to do, what would land managers need to do, and who else would need to do what?* Details of those responses can be found on the handout.

Dan Gruber said that the common ideas from the survey are to recognize and promote outstanding trails and to define "outstanding" in this context, as well as making the information available to the public, and seeing that the trails are well maintained.

Cate Bradley asked if trails currently on the STS are looking for Heritage Funds. It would be important to look at the needs of land managers, including funds for operation and maintenance of the trails. Dan Gruber noted that managers of current STS trails are not all looking for funds, and those trails could be evaluated for continuing inclusion. Don Applegate said that the Heritage Fund objectives and the STS objectives are different so perhaps a redefinition of Heritage Fund objectives around trail building is in order. At this point, it was noted that the STS was established approximately 20 years prior to the Heritage Fund.

Erik Wilson said that he would like to see a redefinition of "significant" trails in this context so that ASCOT does not recommend funding every trail. Perhaps suggestions could be made to Heritage Fund applicants to help them reach significance as far as their trail. Annie McVay noted that each application is evaluated for appropriateness

to be funded; some applications do not meet the Heritage Fund criteria at the outset. Dan Gruber noted that some trails are worthy of funding without being outstanding and there is a reluctance on the part of ASCOT to deny funding to an applicant that otherwise meets the criteria for inclusion in the STS as it stands now.

Annie McVay noted that an increasing problem is urban trails. It may be possible to point urban trails applicants to other funding programs.

Tom Fitzgerald noted that there is a possibility every year that the State Legislature could “raid” the Heritage Fund, which also provides an incentive for ASCOT to recommend funding trails. Being hard and fast to the criteria might mean that funds go unobligated. John Vuolo noted that ASCOT waited to update the STS criteria, and now trails have evolved, meaning that the criteria should be reviewed and rewritten before doing anything else. That might mean removing urban trails from consideration since they don’t fit into the original mission of the STS.

Steve Saway suggested starting over by ignoring the Heritage Fund and the STS and determining what would be best for the state of Arizona as a whole as far as the trails viewpoint. What does the state want to promote?

Sonia Overholser said that if there are only outstanding trails belong in the STS then ASCOT needs to form a clear definition of “outstanding”. Most Arizonans are urban, so most urban trails are outstanding by user definition. Dan Gruber noted that it would be premature to delve further into this discussion.

Maureen DeCindis said that the overall goal of ASCOT is to ensure that there are lots of trails available to the public. She would hate to see new trails go unfunded and perhaps be lost because of the STS criteria. Annie McVay noted that it is always possible to change the vision of the STS. It’s important to keep recreational trails at the forefront.

John Vuolo said that municipalities by and large create urban trails; others are federal or state. The size of a grant always makes a difference in that building rural trails is less expensive.

Don Applegate said that he supports Sonia Overholser’s thinking about urban trails, and cited the example of the Stair Trail in Bisbee. He also noted that HOA sidewalks do not meet the STS criteria.

Annie McVay noted that it is always possible to discuss the uses of Heritage Fund dollars with the Grants section. Irene Smith asked whether the applications for grants differed by type of trail. She favors funding even pathways in order to get people out and moving. Annie said that there are different trails defined in the Heritage Fund, and those trails must meet differing criteria for funding.

Don Ziegler noted that what constitutes a “good trail” varies day-by-day and user-by-user. Hikers and other trail users do not care whether a trail was funded by the Heritage Fund.

Cate Bradley asked if ASCOT could agree that the target audience for the Heritage Fund is the land managers, and if so that would narrow the discussion to modifying the grant criteria. Jim Horton noted that when he served as a liaison to the grant rating team, they advised some managers on their trail building plans and the changes were made. He then asked how the STS came to be, and why it became a conduit for the Heritage Fund. Annie McVay noted that the original state trails group asked for an STS in 1973. The needs were different then, however. The Heritage Fund itself was created in 1991, but exactly why the Legislature tied the funds to the STS is unclear. Jim Horton then said that he feels the “big answer” is to create a two-tier STS.

Doug Potts noted that if the STS is the main driver for trails funding through the Heritage Fund, then what other incentive exists for trails managers to join the STS. Dan Gruber noted that trail promotion could be an incentive, if the promotion is done well and the trail remains important. However, land managers may not be interested in promoting a trail since they have limited funds for maintenance and other considerations. Doug Potts said that the STS trails should have the same quality and reputation as the Arizona Trail.

Bonnie Winslow said that land managers are interested in belonging to the STS because it’s a good recognition of their trail building efforts and the relationship can be used in planning if properly thought out, especially planning for tourism, etc. She also noted that ASCOT should keep paddle/water trails in mind during this discussion.

Linda Slay said that she feels when the STS was started that the goal was to recognize outstanding trails and to promote a “system” with regards to trails purposes and connectivity. Trails users want to have specific experiences and each constituency is important.

Tom Fitzgerald said that he is an urban trails planner, and most municipalities are unaware of funding sources in general. Perhaps ASCOT should provide alternative funding sources to urban trails applicants and perhaps provide education to applicants on alternative funding sources.

Bonnie Bariola said the current list of trails in the STS was available in the ASCOT manual.

Steve Saway said that trails are overlaid across the state perhaps the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the Arizona Office of Tourism should be involved in any discussion on promotion, especially as far as promoting outstanding historic or cultural values.

Dan Gruber noted that from following the discussion, there were three major options that had emerged. Those options are: 1) Create a two-tier STS, 2) Turn down trails that aren't outstanding, for which ASCOT will need to review and revise the criteria, and 3) Change the STS vision. Dan Gruber noted that with regards to creating a two-tier system, that would entail dividing out the trails that “merely” qualify for Heritage Funds and providing with them a specific designation or however that would be handled, as well as creating a subset for the outstanding trails. As far as changing the vision of the STS, the survey indicated that most respondents want to keep the vision as it is. Each option poses questions, and Dan Gruber suggested that ASCOT consider the option and the questions raised. In order to keep the consideration reality-based, there are also these items to take into account: 1) What resources exist with ASP to handle promotion and database support? 2) What is firmly within the purview of ASCOT to change? 3) What will provide support to land managers and develop their support as well? 4) What would help create a sustainable STS – trails maintenance and building questions. 5) What would be done with the existing trails within the STS?

Cate Bradley noted that there is a trend in the state toward linkages in urban trails for the future. Option two might be self-limiting if the STS were to focus on rural trails. Dan Gruber said that it would be best not to prejudge what the definition of “outstanding” would be, and to not leave out any class of trail when considering the options.

Dan Gruber suggested a straw poll to help focus the options consideration. Following discussion, the straw poll came to seven votes for option 1 (create a two-tier system), 12 votes for option 2 (turn down trails that are not outstanding), and 1 vote for option 3 (change the STS vision). Dan Gruber also provided some clear differences between the options.

John Vuolo noted that he liked Doug Potts' comment about prestige becoming an incentive to join the STS. It would help to justify membership in the STS by taking the money out of the discussion. Cate Bradley mentioned that since Heritage Funds are public funds, there should also be some accountability for maintenance and operation built in over a 20-year period.

Dan Gruber said that since ASCOT preferred option 2, he suggested an exercise in answering some of the questions raised by that option. Firstly, he asked how to deal with the trails currently in the STS.

Vince Murray suggested that the current STS trails be “grandfathered” in and over time review the trails and remove those not up to standards. Bonnie Winslow suggested that some trails perhaps have never received any funding, but have deteriorated and suggested working with the land manager before grandfathering in any trail. Erik Wilson noted that the discussion would seem to require a searchable database. Annie McVay reiterated that the project is being worked on. Steve Saway

said that it might be “cleaner” to start over and have trails compete again. Erik Wilson that he believes deteriorated trails should be removed over time.

Dan Gruber listed the above suggestions as 1) grandfather in existing trails, 2) delist substandard trails immediately or as soon as possible, or 3) weed out substandard trails over time. Sonia Overholser suggested that trails grandfathered in have a “sunset clause” of five years or so after which the trails would meet the standard or be de-listed. She noted that this idea would shift the burden to the land managers. Annie McVay said that land managers are already short-staffed and underfunded.

Russell Freeman asked if grants were available for operations and maintenance. If not, perhaps some changes could be made to the grant funding mechanism. Annie McVay replied that the decision not to provide funding for operations and maintenance is not in statute, but is a policy of the ASP Board. Russell Freeman then said that providing the trails promotion on behalf of the land managers would ease some pressure in that arena. It could all work together to help raise more funds, and therefore make extra funds available for maintenance.

Doug Potts said perhaps STS trails could be prioritized when using the RTP funds already designated for trails maintenance. That would be an incentive to join the STS as well. John Vuolo mentioned that operations and maintenance work could also be highlighted in the criteria and perhaps be a means to discourage applicants unwilling or incapable of the operations and maintenance tasks. Erik Wilson mentioned that the land manager’s attitude toward operations and maintenance might also answer the question of what to do with existing trails – if the land managers are unwilling or incapable of the maintenance, those trails should be de-listed. Steve Saway said the STS should showcase Arizona trails and that ASP should help with the operations and maintenance work.

Dan Gruber noted that the Nominations subcommittee has three items on their plate along with reviewing and revising the criteria for the STS: 1) decide on a mechanism for dealing with existing trails, whether grandfathering them all in, or weeding them out over time, or any other option, and bring that back to ASCOT, and 2) encourage sustainability by giving the land managers a “carrot” or several to keep trails to the STS standard, and 3) ensure the ideas are realistic, especially with regards to resources.

Annie McVay noted that it may be preferable to form a new subcommittee rather than leaving this with the Nominations subcommittee, especially given that there are 66 nominations for their review. Vince Murray said that a review of the nominations could help with develop criteria.

Dan Gruber said that creates four new options: 1) have the Nominations subcommittee do this work after September, 2) have the Monitoring subcommittee do this work now, 3) combine both subcommittees, or 4) create a new subcommittee

altogether. Vince Murray and Jim Horton each said they serve on both subcommittees. Consensus leaned toward combining the subcommittees.

Steve Saway wanted to take a straw poll regarding what to do with deteriorating trails and maintenance. Vince Murray asked for more options in that area. Annie McVay asked if ASP should be responsible for the maintenance of STS trails. Steven Saway replied that it would help make the STS designation meaningful. Annie McVay said that if the land managers cannot maintain the trails then what should happen? Further discussion on the Heritage Fund moneys followed.

Dan Gruber moved that ASCOT charge the combined Nomination and Monitoring subcommittees to work together following the Nominations subcommittee meeting in September to deal with the issues of reviewing and revising the STS criteria to reaffirm the vision of the STS, and to deal with the three issues of existing STS trails, STS trails sustainability, and realism. Erik Wilson seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

Annie McVay will schedule the first meeting for the combined subcommittees.

5. Discuss Candidates for the 2008 ASCOT Executive Committee

Cate Bradley led the discussion by first discussing the benefits of serving on the Executive Committee of ASCOT and encouraged members to run for the seats available for 2008. At the end of December 2007, there will be eight terms expiring, five of which will be filled because ASCOT is reducing its size. Several members whose terms are set to expire have expressed interest in submitting applications to continue with ASCOT. Cate Bradley also noted that ASCOT is “top-heavy” with members in the senior phase of their careers; these people have less time available to handle the tasks of ASCOT. Therefore, the recruiting subcommittee is looking to acquire new members with more time available to carry out the work of ASCOT.

The current members of ASCOT available to serve on the Executive Committee for 2008 are: Cate Bradley, Anne Ellis, Russell Freeman, Reba Grandrud, Carrie Miracle-Jordan, Vince Murray, Sonia Overholser, Doug Potts, Steve Saway, Charlie Scully, Irene Smith, Kent Taylor, David Troutner, John Vuolo, Erik Wilson and Bonnie Winslow. Their terms on ASCOT will continue. Those whose terms expire cannot be considered for the slate of officers, as it remains unknown whether they will be reappointed.

Cate Bradley continued by saying that she has been a member of ASCOT for four of five years, and she has been involved in the Executive Committee almost since the beginning. The benefits she has gained from serving on the Executive Committee include: coming to know Annie McVay both personally and professionally; she has a greater understanding of the workings of ASP, the State Trails System and the Heritage Funds; a much better understanding of ASCOT and its potential; and a much better understanding of the issues surrounding open space, trails, management,

funding, volunteerism across the state. Being on the Executive Committee is about working on a tight team, while also functioning in the larger ASCOT team. This has sharpened her leadership and engagement skills. Another benefit has been the networking and peer connection opportunities. These have been the benefits of serving on the Executive Committee for Cate Bradley. She noted that ASCOT members already know the benefits of serving on ASCOT itself. She noted that serving on the Executive Committee does require an extra time commitment, however the benefits derived are more than worth the time spent. She opened the floor to questions or comments.

Steve Saway asked how much of an additional time commitment was necessary. Cate Bradley said that the Chair of ASCOT is responsible for close communication with Annie McVay, for convening the Executive Committee meetings (sometimes monthly, sometimes bimonthly) in order to prepare for the ASCOT meeting, and for keeping track of the subcommittees within ASCOT. This generally works out to approximately two hours monthly, with perhaps another three hours in addition to help with subcommittee leadership. This comes to approximately five hours per month. Doug Potts noted that these meetings are particularly amenable to teleconferencing, so travel is not as necessary. Chair Grandrud noted that the Executive Committee meeting, like any other ASCOT meeting, is open to the public.

Cate Bradley noted that Chair Grandrud also instituted the tradition of having the past Chair sit on the Executive Committee to provide a continuity of knowledge.

Bonnie Winslow noted that the Executive Committee meetings are very productive and there is a sense of accomplishment. Cate Bradley invited everyone to volunteer to spend some time in leadership for ASCOT. Chair Grandrud said that in addition to those who work professionally in trails, the input of those who are not professionally involved is equally important.

Cate Bradley called for volunteers, either by voice now, or by paper during the meeting. These volunteers are for the slate of officers; the election itself will be held at a meeting later in the year.

The current Executive Committee is: Reba Grandrud, Chair; Maureen DeCindis, Vice-Chair; Tom Fitzgerald, Chair of the State Trails System subcommittee (replacing Eric Smith, whose job has expanded), and Bonnie Winslow, Chair of the Public Outreach subcommittee.

Maureen DeCindis noted that she is interested in serving again, however her term expires. Cate Bradley noted that the slate could be expanded once the new and continuing members of ASCOT are known. Bonnie Bariola asked about the officers serving this year being willing to serve a second term. Cate Bradley said that the slate is blank at the moment. Chair Grandrud also noted that the subcommittees serving under the State Trails System and Public Outreach groups are also very important to

the work of ASCOT. (ASCOT returned to this topic following the STS discussion above.)

Cate Bradley requested that members of the Executive Committee for Public Outreach and the STS discuss their work.

Tom Fitzgerald said that the STS Chair is responsible for facilitating meetings of that committee, working with the chairs of the various subcommittees, and keeps track of the tasks for each subcommittee. Those subcommittees are: Monitoring, Nominations, Historic Trails, and the Grant Liaison.

Bonnie Winslow said that the Public Outreach group has one active subcommittee, which is Workshops, for which Annie McVay organizes a lot of the work. She sees the Public Outreach Chair position changing over time so that the tasks will grow. Doug Potts said that the Decal subcommittee is part of Public Outreach as well. Further discussion of subcommittees and duties followed. Bonnie Bariola noted that many of the tasks for each group mesh together with those of another group.

D. REPORTS

1. Historic Trails Task Force

No update per Jim Horton.

2. State Trails System Task Force

Annie McVay noted that 66 nominations were received this year for the State Trails System. The members of the Task Force, Kent Taylor, Doug Potts, Sonia Overholser, Jim Horton, Linda Slay and Bonnie Bariola have their work cut out for them. Many of the nominations this round represent an influx of urban trails. Annie McVay noted that a clear definition of urban recreational trails must be set. The Growing Smarter initiative requires town and cities to set aside open space and trails, and this is causing an influx of a sort of urban trail that may not meet the vision of the State Trails System. Further discussion of setting a future agenda item for definitions and new policies on trails ensued.

3. Trails Monitoring Task Force

Annie McVay noted that one aspect of the trails monitoring effort that has been discussed is the need to clear out of the STS trails that were proposed but never built, in order to de-list trails. There are 134 proposed trails; Annie McVay has contacted the land managers responsible for approximately 60 of them.

Approximately 30 responses noted that the referenced trail had been built have been received. Other responses note uncertainty about the trail itself. A few note that the referenced trail has not been built, but the land manager does not want the trail to be de-listed. Those trails in particular will be brought to ASCOT next year for a final decision on de-listing. An ASCOT member asked whether ASCOT had a de-listing policy in place. Annie McVay said that the ASP Board allows trails to be de-listed,

and they need to consider the eligible trails every year. Doug Potts asked if the de-listing would be handled by the STS Nomination committee. Annie McVay said that next year will be the first time trails have been considered for de-listing, so that remains to be set. Annie McVay also noted that she has contacted 60 of the land managers so far, and there will hopefully be a set of trails eligible for de-listing by next October for the ASP Board's consideration.

4. Public Outreach Task Force

Bonnie Winslow noted that the Conference in October has already been discussed. She asked about the STS information being made available online and searchable. Annie McVay noted that the project has been approved and is moving forward. Bonnie Winslow also noted that National Trails Day has become National Trails Season so far as Arizona. There were several events in 2007. John Vuolo mentioned that Pinetop-Lakeside held a regional event coordinated with Show Low on the first Saturday in June. The TRACKS organization coordinated the effort this year. Irene Smith hosted an event in Pinal County in coordination with the Pinal County Wellness Coalition at Lost Dutchman Gold Mine. There were various levels of hikes, and the March 31st event went well.

(ASCOT adjourned for a fifteen-minute break from 12:20pm to 12:35pm following this discussion.)

E. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

None. Chair Grandrud thanked members of the public for attending.

F. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE, REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS

Sonia Overholser mentioned that the Black Canyon Trail Coalition needs volunteers, so please speak with her or Linda Slay about volunteering. The coalition will be putting on a media blitz around achieving connectivity on the trail.

Tom Fitzgerald said that the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has agreed to do the design and engineering work and build three piers of the bridge.

Bonnie Winslow reminded ASCOT that she is looking for photos for the ASCOT display at the Conference. Send digital files to her at BwinslowAZ@MSN.com.

Annie McVay noted that the agenda for the October meeting could consist solely of the STS nominations and the slate of officers since meeting time will be limited.

Steve Saway suggested that a future agenda item discuss the Heritage Funds. Cate Bradley suggested also adding other funding sources to that discussion. Doug Potts also suggested prioritizing STS trails for the RTP funding. Annie McVay suggested that would be appropriate for a later meeting.

G. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday, October 4, Prescott Pines Camp, 9:00am following discussion of options for start times. ASP will reimburse for lodging the evening prior to the meeting.

H. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Grandrud adjourned the meeting at 2:50pm.