

Janice K. Brewer
Governor

Bryan Martyn
Executive Director



Board Members

Walter D. Armer, Jr., Vail, *Chair*
Mark Brnovich, Phoenix
R. J. Cardin, Phoenix
Kay Daggett, Sierra Vista
Alan Everett, Sedona
Larry Landry, Phoenix
Vanessa Hickman, State Land Commissioner

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING
of
THE ARIZONA STATE COMMITTEE ON TRAILS (ASCOT)
of
THE ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD**

Notice is hereby given pursuant to A.R.S. §41-511.22 to members of the Arizona State Committee On Trails (ASCOT) and the general public that the ASCOT will hold a meeting open to the public on **Friday, April 26, 2013 beginning at 12:30 pm at the BLM-Arizona State Office, One North Central Building, 8th Floor, Phoenix (NE corner of Central and Washington)**. Visitors may park on the first level of the Parking Garage by entering off of 1st Street (heading north) from Washington Street (ONE WAY heading west). Please use the Visitor Stalls (marked in Green). Have your parking ticket validated at the reception desk on the 8th Floor before going to the conference rooms. **Attendance at this meeting is available via teleconference by calling 1.877.820.7831 and entering the participant passcode 522515.** Items on the Agenda may be discussed out of order, unless they have been specifically set for a time certain. Public comment will be taken. The Committee will discuss and may take action on the following matters:

SECOND AMENDED AGENDA

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

A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL 12:35 pm

Members Present: Linda Slay, Rick Kesselman, Claire Miller, Bill Gibson, Nick Lund, Dan Gronseth, Jackie Keller, Craig Stevens, Laurel Arndt, Phyllis Ralley.

Quorum established.

B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF

Staff Present: Robert Baldwin, Annie McVay.

C. CALL TO THE PUBLIC – The Chair will recognize those wishing to address the Committee. It is probable that each presentation will be limited to one person per organization and the time allotted by the Chair. Action taken as a result of acknowledgment of comments and suggestions from the public will be limited to directing staff to study or reschedule the matter for further consideration at a later time.

No response from public.

D. ASCOT ACTION ITEMS

1. ASCOT Will Review and Approve Minutes from the January 25, 2013 Meeting.

Kesselman makes motion to approve minutes. Slay seconds.

Baldwin stated that Craig Stevens sent in a correction to the minutes. On page seven of the packet, under ASCOT Member Reports, he noted that it should not say, "Trail Route Management Plan," it should say, "The Non-Motorized Trails."

Minutes approved unanimously, with correction.

2. Update from the Subcommittee Reviewing the AZ State Trail System – The Subcommittee will report on progress to date and future plans for re-evaluating existing criteria, purpose, and future of the State Trails System.

Jackie Keller, Chair of STS Subcommittee stated the subcommittee met twice since the last ASCOT meeting. The group met on March 7 and discussed what the State Trails Systems should be; how it could evolve and started discussions on what trail systems in the state could be, if it evolved into something different.

A facilitator workshop was conducted to identify items the trail system should do and the group categorized all the comments into ten different categories. The group talked about the trail systems list. It was commented there were too many in the list and it should be reduced to those trails that are of special significance as identified in the criteria. They also discussed whether the list should be frozen and eliminate unused trails or those not yet built. They discussed trail ranking categories to types and conditions, as well as a tiered system like platinum, gold, etc. They discussed planning, both public and private landowners. Funding and marketing were big items and the need to seek other funding. There was also discussion about a state trail system library or archive.

There were six action items recommended to ASCOT the subcommittee, with emphasis on four:

- a. To freeze the nominations for the state trail systems until the new phase or evolution of state trail system;
- b. To remove or de-list trails that are not built;
- c. Eliminate points for trail applicants who are competing for RTP grants that give them extra points;
- d. Develop criteria to identify a tiered system for the premium trails;
- e. Develop AZ Trail Systems Archive; and
- f. Retain committee or focus group to develop AZ Trail Systems' app, including all the systems in the state.

Chair asked whether committee would like to make a motion to approve the recommendations or do they want further discussion? Keller responded the group's recommendation is to have ASCOT decide whether or not it wants the subcommittee

to continue to try to deal with all the suggested recommendations or have different people assigned the four emphasized tasks:

- a. Criteria for state trail system, whether tiered, premium;
- b. AZ Trail Systems Archive;
- c. AZ Trail Systems app; and
- d. Funding criteria.

Chair requested a point of clarification regarding the archives: When group talked about putting together a database of all the trails in the state trail system, is that terminology synonymous with the archives?

Keller stated, no. Those trails would still be part of “app” mapping-wise. Chair concluded it’s a database and not necessarily an archive.

Kesselman inquired whether the criteria for the RTP funding had been limited if it turned out that there’s a freeze on new applicants to the AZ Trail Systems; and if the criteria for other trail applicants applying for RTP money would be they need to be in the trail system. If so, he’s suggesting the criteria be eliminated because there may no longer be new applicants. He indicated the discussion revealed a difference of opinions. Some were in favor of freezing the trail system because it has become irrelevant in that most of the trails had no special significance, which is part of the criteria to qualify for funding; so the emphasis should be moving into the 21st century with the app. Ralley indicated that one of the aspects of the discussion is that the AZ National Scenic Trail is made up of a number of different patches that were part of the state trail system. So using that umbrella heading would eliminate about 50 smaller state trail system trails. Keller clarified Kesselman’s statement that everything is still in discussion and that discussion will be finalized with the group tasked to continue with plans for the future trail systems. Now group is requesting recommendations to either have the same committee tackle all four emphasized tasks or whether there should be subcommittees for each.

Chair asked ASCOT to focus on the group’s request to either form subcommittees, a separate set of committees or have all recommendations come through one committee? One doesn’t have to be a member of ASCOT to serve. Ralley volunteered Bill Gibson and herself to take care of the app part and/or be a part of looking at the app. Chair indicated an update on the app appears later on the agenda.

[Male Speaker] stated he agrees that for expediency it would make sense to have all the subcommittees under the same sub-subcommittee, or at least expand the numbers in the group. Keller asked the question as to whether or not the group would still be bound by the Open Meeting Law; when more than two people get together, do they have to follow the requirements of the Open Meeting Law. Arndt responded, yes, if there’s a quorum present. Keller clarified that if a subgroup is formed in a subcommittee of four people, any time the two get together they would establish a quorum and she felt progress would be expedited if the subgroup did not have to conform to Open Meeting Law requirements. Chair indicated that the group is bound by the Open Meeting Laws and the process is that if you have various

members of this subcommittee working on a specific task, each of those various groups would be considered a subcommittee.

Arndt suggests Keller's idea was good and it would not be difficult to conform to the Open Meeting Laws which could be accomplished by getting an agenda out 24 hours in advance of the members' meeting and taking notes. Keller inquired whether posting an agenda is mandatory when there are only a couple members present. Arndt indicated that the agenda could be simplified by merely itemizing the topics to be discussed, however, if controversial or sensitive items are to be discussed, make sure you take clear notes. Chair strongly encouraged group to adhere to Open Meeting Laws.

Keller asked Baldwin if there are eight people in the subcommittee and two of them work on the app, do they need to advance an agenda? Baldwin stated that if two members have a discussion and present it to the subcommittee for a decision they would not be in violation of the Open Meeting Law. Gibson indicated that if the subcommittee tasks two people with an assignment, and they complete the assignment, come back and report to the subcommittee, do the discussions of those two people fall under the Open Meeting Law? Baldwin responded two people can communicate on the side and bring their findings back to the group without establishing a quorum. Stevens asked if two people are in a fact-finding mode on a project and they make decisions amongst themselves, does that breach the Open Meeting Law if, in their fact-finding mission, they make a decision without first bringing it to the board. Arndt indicated the bottom line is that if you have a subcommittee of eight, your quorum is four. If you have two people from that subcommittee of eight meeting and making a decision, the two would not establish a quorum, so, any decisions they bring forward to the group would get discussed among the group and then the quorum situation comes into play. But if you have a group of four people, then you need a quorum.

Keller recommends that the state trail systems subcommittee continue with the four topics emphasized and work as a subgroup. The subgroup would start first with the state trails system, the app and then the archives. The funding component would come later once the new state trail system has been established. Arndt asked McVay what part the states trail plan plays in this insofar as to how the state plan might end up. Will it impact the state plan? McVay indicated it would not impact the state plan. Slay asked whether the state trails plan included specific trails. McVay indicated it would include all 30,000 trails in Arizona.

Ralley asked if ASCOT is moving forward on the freezing of nominations. Keller responded, yes, that is one of the group's recommendations. **Keller moved and Ralley seconded** the motion that **"the state trail systems subcommittee continue to work on the four recommendations of developing criteria for the new phase of the state trail system, developing state AZ Trail Systems Archive, and assisting in the AZ Trail Systems' app and re-evaluating the funding criteria as we move forward."** [Male Speaker], amended the motion by replacing "archive" with "database." Keller and Ralley accepted the amendment to the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Keller made a motion to “**freeze the nominations for the state trails system until the subcommittee identifies what the new system will be,**” **Seconded by Gronseth.**

Chair clarified that the group would freeze the nominations for a period of time until the subcommittee can formalize its recommendations. Arndt indicated you can't really indicate a period of time unless you define the period of time. Keller suggested a period of one year from today's date. Baldwin stated that the statute requiring the group to do the trails plan says the “board shall prepare a state trails plan that describes specific policies, standards and criteria to be followed in adopting, developing, operating and maintaining trails in the system.” He also indicated the trails plan has never identified the state trail plan criteria within the plan, but if the group wanted to identify and codify the criteria in a plan, staff would have it ready for the next state trails plan and it could be included as a chapter in the plan for future reference.

Chair clarified that the motion on the floor is to freeze any nominations until the subcommittee can come through with its recommendation a year from now and asked if there's anything in the statute that says we *must* have the nominations? Baldwin responded the statute is not really clear and just calls for a state trails system plan that includes a general location and extent of significant trail routes and/or areas as part of the plan. You can move through the process, develop the criteria and as soon as it gets approved by the board start the process to re-establish it. Baldwin also stated that before the group announces another non-motorized trail cycle he would bring up issues as to what the criteria would look like, and any other recommendations the group may want to include in the rating process so we can correct it for the next grant cycle.

McVay recommended that the group remove the requirement for funding and not have it tied to the state trails system. Arndt asked McVay and Baldwin whether it would be onerous to let the other agencies know they're suspending nominations. Baldwin suggested it could be done in a press release. Ralley indicated they had one trail that applied that did not make it and they were invited to re-apply, it would still be pending. [Male speaker] indicated the nominees could be notified specifically that the nominations are being frozen. He also asked whether this group had the authority to ask ASCOT to freeze nominations. Baldwin indicated a motion should be made to take it to the Parks' board for consideration. McVay indicated only the Parks' board would have authority to freeze nominations.

Chair called for a vote on the motion. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Chair suggested that, without objection, he would move up the agenda item to now have the discussion on the app.

3. Update from State Parks Staff on Progress in Developing Statewide Trails App – Staff will provide the latest information on the statewide trails app being developed in partnership with ASU.

Ellen Bilbrey, State Parks Public Information Officer, first thanked everyone for their assistance on the trails conference. She stated the app still has a few glitches. Problems with the Android should be directed to Vince, but the iPhone is different, it must be done at ASU where all the certificates are. There are 16,000 trails in the app. She hasn't gotten feedback as yet from the other states and countries interested in what we were doing and their impressions of the different components, but after talking to the different forests and looking at the state trails list, she talked to the GIS people to get their upgraded shapefiles. Some of them weren't ready. Once she gets those updated shapefiles they're going to be put in the app. She indicated she had just noticed there are no state trails in the Kaibab Forest that were on the list. So they have to compile more information to find out what they have.

Bilbrey indicated maintenance is going on right now through October by ASU and AZ State Parks staff. A meeting is scheduled with Micah to get some things updated. The maintenance contract enables us to continue to use ASU students to upload data, coming up with and moving information around to enable the app to run quickly with the designed algorithms. There's a lot of work still to be done to stabilize the program so it can be launched on the Internet through the app store. It was launched in a beta form and as we get some of the files up to date we'll have a better understanding as to how it's going to work. The rangers are very excited about the new app. She welcomed anyone who wanted to come and meet with ASU to discuss it or ask additional questions.

Chair asked, considering the earlier discussion, if this group makes a recommendation to include a tiering system of the highly recommended trails, recommended trails – whatever the final criteria – can that easily be incorporated into the app? Bilbrey responded that it could if she could get more money to make changes. So far her requests have all been met with favorable responses, which can be risky with a set contract, but they have added things to the contract. The contract runs through October and we'll see how much they can do by then. She indicated a tiered system would be great and a lot of entities have them, but as far as the recreational trail systems in Arizona are concerned, there should be no problems or limitation of numbers. [Male Speaker] indicated he thought the Chair meant whether you can highlight the trails. Bilbrey responded yes, just like in the programs where they highlight and categorize the trails, indicating whether they're hard or easy.

Kesselman asked about the filters and how those filters could be distanced from where he is currently. Bilbrey responded you can browse by the region and sort that way and it will tell you where the closest one is. Kesselman asked whether you can sort by other categories such as difficulty, elevation, etc., and other criteria. Bilbrey responded we didn't have that capability, but others may, like cities would have that. Kesselman continued asking, if you were given that information it would be in there. Bilbrey indicated the current filters are, restrooms at the trailhead, parking available,

drinking water, no entrance fee, camping, handicap accessibility for staging, visitor or ranger center, skiing, leashed pets permitted and small paddle craft permitted. Kesselman asked whether length or difficulty were included. Bilbrey responded yes, you can sort by nearest, difficulty or alphabetically; or you can do the estimated duration. Kesselman asked who in Bilbrey's office or ASU are avid hikers, bikers, equestrians and intimately involved in creating all of these criteria for formatting information who are knowledgeable and whether there is an advisory group that's going to fine-tune these categories. Bilbrey responded that the original team was the GIS managers from each city who talked to Micah about preferences. She also indicated they're not adding new things.

Arndt asked to interrupt the discussion and let the group know that she got an email from a group called "The Mountain Project" that is a website administered by a number of people, nationwide, pertaining to every climb anywhere in the United States. This email details across-the-board information on any particular climb of interest. They said they are starting a new website called MBP Project, Mountain Bike Project and are asking for money. Her point being, the situation will never be perfect and it's going to be difficult to describe, so they should focus on being realistic about what we can afford to do versus our responsibility as a state organization versus our responsibility as a trail community and what we should do. She indicated she would send the link to Bob to share with the others. Kesselman indicated he did not want to mislead and advise the group to include *de minimus* information, but we need whoever is doing this app to get experts or other people where we want this app to go and not leave it up to the programmers.

[Male Speaker] asked whether the app will have the ability to have the land manager put in a notice, e.g., a trail is closed. Bilbrey responded, yes. Arndt indicated she strongly recommended the group look at some other apps and not get too caught up on details that will bog down the purpose of the application. Miller indicated, along the same ideas, that there are a couple apps she has downloaded and she likes the idea this is our app, with our information and activities we've approved. Arndt asked at what level we cut it off. [Male Speaker] asked what is the purpose of the app, are we trying to make it available to the residents of Arizona or visitors to Arizona using our trail system.

Chair asked if there's any interest in forming an informal/formal advisory group to do the things Arndt mentioned regarding the purpose of the app or just leave it to the people who are currently doing it. Bilbrey indicated she told Brad (ASP IT) she would complete a White Paper on the app, what's in it, how it was developed and where we're going that might be easier to work on. Keller indicated it fits in with what the subcommittee is working on right now.

4. **Update from the Subcommittee Nominating an RTP Funded Project for national recognition by the Coalition for Recreational Trails** – The Subcommittee will report on the nomination of an RTP funded project for the Coalition for Recreational Trails' recognition awards to be held June 2013 in Washington, D.C.

Baldwin asked who wrote the nomination for Black Canyon City. Arndt responded she was on the subcommittee and attended the meetings and that Jerry was going to make the write up. Don was the chair and the nomination did go through. Arndt also indicated it was stated in the meeting that staff would complete the nomination form and continue the process. Baldwin responded that the trail did get nominated, but he didn't think it won an award, it hasn't been announced yet. The deadline is April 30 and the nomination has been submitted. Chair mentioned that among the materials Baldwin sent the group, item number one stated, "Nominating Subcommittee made the following suggestion: 1) since this is an annual award, a subcommittee should be regularly utilized to more thoroughly review eligible products for the awards. Chair thought the subcommittee was recommending a standing subcommittee to work on the nominations and asked if anyone wanted to follow through. [Female Speaker] indicated that's a little different than the state trails systems nominations. She indicated she had signed up to serve on the committee and somehow there were two subcommittee meetings that she missed, so her participation was limited. She also stated she would not have recommended Black Canyon anyway. Baldwin mentioned another thing would be that the nominees needed to be project that use RTP money and there aren't a lot of them because we never had an RTP trail cycle, although a lot of the trails use trail maintenance money to make improvements. This group of projects would be eligible in the future. Chair stated that it would make sense if the review process and recommendations to ASCOT would come through this committee. [Female Speaker] responded that's what the group is set up to do, look at the different criteria. It would provide group a better handle on when things were due so they would have all the information. Baldwin stated that the group would need to look at the projects that are being started and find out how many are going to be finished in time to really determine whether it's an outstanding project, etc., by the time this rolls around next year.

5. **ASCOT Will Review, Discuss, and May Propose Amendments to ASCOT Bylaws** – Staff is working on developing uniform standards for Advisory Committees that encourages dynamic recreational trail stewardship and advocacy.

Chair stated that the group had a set of staff and committee member recommendations. The staff recommendation is for the options for a term lengths. They recommend a maximum of two consecutive three-year terms; and after a one-year absence from committee, a member may be appointed for up to two more consecutive terms. ASCOT recommended in discussion a maximum of two consecutive three-year terms to a maximum of three consecutive three-year terms upon a two-thirds vote of the committee. A member may be recommended for one additional term of three years. So that would make a twelve-year total term on ASCOT feasible. [Female Speaker] responded, "If somebody wants to serve for that

long, let 'em.” Chair indicated the gain would be a real history of knowledge and asked for recommendations. Keller stated that when the topic was brought up last time, Jerry made a couple comments about why staff was recommending the maximum of two consecutive terms and then a year absence. It was to allow other people an opportunity to become a part of ASCOT and commented about how it's each member's responsibility to find successors to ASCOT and would give the members an opportunity to involve younger members. Keller also stated there are many boards and commissions who have a youth advisor and that young people are more in tuned to social media. [Female Speaker] stated people volunteer as they get older in life because their lives clear up and that's the demographics of volunteership. [Male Speaker] asked the legal ramification behind a committee member serving two or three three-year terms if they changed their affiliation. If the member is with a certain organization and leaves the organization to serve as a “citizen-at-large” would the tenure of their membership start over? Several members responded, no. Chair stated, if you're on a committee, you have to apply to continue, your application goes through a review process and our group has to recommend the application to State Parks Board approval; so, if there's a need for a change, it's left to the latitude of the Board to accept or not. Stevens stated that, as a new member, he realizes there's a significant learning curve and having a member on the board for a length of time is an asset. He feels that if a member is not productive, ASCOT should have the ability to remove that member. Chair asked Baldwin whether or not the Parks Board merely rubberstamps ASCOT's recommendations and whether there is active discussion on the recommendations. Baldwin responded, it depends on the issue. If there's consternation, there's a discussion, otherwise it's put on a consent agenda and it would be its decision to discuss if further. They would normally say, “This is your committee, if this is how you want to run it, we don't have a problem with that.” Unless someone went to the Parks Board meeting and raised an issue and they took it off the agenda and discussed it, it would be consent agenda stuff. Arndt asked if the staff recommendation was to make the bylaws more consistent with other boards. Baldwin responded that he was not present during the discussion, but the general idea is that ASCOT was one of the few groups that had bylaws and issues were coming up that had no basis for decision. So this staff recommendation was to encourage the adoption of structure for the group, give it the ability to eliminate people if you need to or let them eliminate themselves without interruption to the group. Kesselman said he thought the staff recommendation is better, that the learning curve is important, but a one-year learning curve should be enough. [Female Speaker] stated she would like to make a motion to accept the staff recommendation. [Male Speaker] I second.

Chair asked for any further discussion. [Female Speaker] stated she would like to recuse herself from voting. [Male Speaker] asked for clarification on the statement, “after a year's absence, a member may be re-appointed.” Is that like, “rinse, dry and repeat?” Can we do that? Baldwin responded, no, they would have to apply and go through the nomination process. [Male Speaker] asked whether after two consecutive terms are they able to take an additional year off and serve another two years. Chair explained it was up to two more for a total of 12 years. Slay asked, if the group adopts this recommendation and she's not grand-mothered in, then she's

out. Chair asked whether this was her fourth term and she responded not quite, but she started in 2003, served one one-year term and this is her third three-year term, so it's been ten years. Chair stated they could make this recommendation effective the end of December. [Female Speaker] made a motion the policy start January 1st. Chair stated, and she agreed, that she is amending her motion. [Female Speaker] confirmed her motion is to accept the staff recommendation starting January 1, 2014. [Male Speaker] seconded motion. [Motion Maker] said, "I'm not trying to make it work, but I think that date is absolutely appropriate. We can't adopt it beforehand to change it." [Male Speaker] said, before I vote I'd like to ask Linda whether this would work with the one year off, or would that just be like having the three years and possibly another three years. Slay said she is on her third term – actually her fourth term, consecutively; one was a one-year term and wants to encourage someone from her group to apply. Ralley asked why they were considering recommendations to amend the bylaws. If it's true after six years you have a year out the door, why do we need this recommendation. Baldwin suggested the group have a "guest day" when they go to Pinetop and have all the members can bring someone they're trying to recruit and let them see the group in action. Chair suggested not only for the next meeting, but at all future meetings, if a member has someone they would like to introduce to ASCOT, bring them to the meeting. Baldwin responded that all the people who apply and are not accepted are invited to participate. Chair called for the vote on the motion to accept the staff recommendation for a maximum of two consecutive three-year terms; and after a one-year absence, the member may be appointed up to two more consecutive terms effective January 1, 2014. P. Ralley was the only "no" vote.

Motion passed.

Chair moved on to next staff recommendation to encourage regular attendance. Any member who is absent four meetings will be replaced when new member solicitation is announced. Any member being removed may continue to serve until the end of the calendar year and may reapply during the next solicitation and asked for discussion. Gibson asked whether the recommendation would become mandatory. Chair responded, no, because if a member is unable to physically attend a meeting, you can participate on the telephone. [Female Speaker] indicated it's an attractive alternative to be able to participate via the telephone when you can't physically attend the meetings. [Female Speaker] asked if recommendation covered "unexcused" absences. Chair said it just said "absences." Arndt indicated the real question is whether you would want to have a dialogue with someone who has missed three meetings, whether you should ask that member whether they were still interested in serving. Baldwin indicated it's difficult to qualify what's a good excuse because people usually find a way to do things they want to do. [Male Speaker] asked if, "at the discretion of the chair," could be added to recommendation. Baldwin stated staff could keep track of members' attendance and those in jeopardy of missing three meeting would be brought to the attention of the chair. Because each new member gets a copy of bylaws and if a member makes a violation they would be notified. Arndt asked whether staff would let the member know they were in violation of the bylaws, or would it be the chair; and that she did not feel it appropriate for the chair to have that dialogue. Chair responded it could be either staff or a member of

the committee who would notify the member in violation after they missed two meetings. Keller said everyone signed up to serve and that there are members who signed up who have not shown up for any meetings. A lot of people want to be a part of this group and members who don't attend meetings shouldn't be on board. She also indicated members are given a second chance and they can re-apply in the next new-member solicitation. [Male Speaker] asked if a motion is needed and moved the group accept the verbiage for attendance suggested for the bylaws given in the paragraph. Miller seconded the motion. Chair asked for voted.

MOTION PASSED.

Baldwin asked whether group had accepted the amended bylaws and Chair indicated, yes. Baldwin then asked whether it was done last time except for the things just discussed. Chair said that last time it was not on the agenda to do that. Baldwin responded, first of all, according to the ASCOT bylaws, you had to agree to the change of bylaws at one meeting and accept those changes at the next meeting. Chair responded, yes, that was the last time frame. What is decided today will have to be accepted at the next meeting. Baldwin reiterated for clarification that everything that passed today will show up as proposed bylaws for the next meeting and you should be able to accept the bylaws, as a whole, unless there's another piece that comes out of there. [Male Speaker] asked while they were at it, whether there are other changes anyone would like to make that they could consider today. Because changes to bylaws require a second meeting before amendments can be approved. [Female Speaker] said at this point in time it would be the discussion of making another bylaw amendment. She didn't think they could come up with an amendment, talk about it and then vote on it next time. She felt the process needed to be vetted. Chair asked for further discussion and encouraged everyone to read the bylaws to determine whether we should make additional changes. Arndt said it looks like, based on the completed motions it would make the draft the final document to be voted on. Baldwin clarified that what the group approved is already in the amendment, no additional changes are required, and he didn't feel there needed to be a motion. Chair said it's an agenda item this time in order to actually conduct the discussion and will be voted on next time; but it's the staff-drafted recommendations pertaining to the terms and the changes about attendance.

6. ASCOT Will Determine the Order of Funding for RTP Trail

Maintenance Projects. – At the December 4, 2012 meeting of the State Parks Board sixteen (16) trail maintenance projects were approved funding based the availability of funds after the selected grant projects are funded. Five projects that had not received money in the last two cycles or had only received money in the 2008 cycle were selected for funding prior to June 30, 2013. The remaining eleven projects will be selected by random drawing and funded in the order of selection if funds are available.

Baldwin reported that the trail maintenance projects are not graded so there's no point value to prioritize them. The first groups that were funded were the ones that got no funding during the last two cycles and one of those groups got funding once in 2008. He suggested he will just put the project names in a hat from Cave Creek down and have the members draw to determine the order the projects are to be

funded, and that method was stated on the application. Chair indicated that while he did that, the group was going to move on.

The Committee drew the following projects to be funded in the order listed below:

1st Kingman FO, 2nd Lost Dutchman SP, 3rd Globe RD, 4th Tusayan RD, 5th Mogollon Rim RD, 6th Safford FO, 7th Pleasant Valley RD, 8th Scottsdale, 9th Hassayampa FO, 10th Flagstaff RD, 11th Cave Creek RD.

- 7. Discuss Possible ASCOT Involvement in the Partnership for National Trails Conference.** – The Partnership for National Trails will hold a conference in Tucson in November. The Chair of the Outreach Committee will present information about the conference and opportunities for ASCOT members to participate.

Chair notice that Ralley, chair of the Outreach Committee, was away from room and when she returned they would discuss ASCOT's involved in the conference. [Female Speaker] said she could fill everybody in a little bit. She reported that during the discussion pertaining to the premium trails being used as a promotional tool for the state, Ralley thought it would be an opportunity to get exposure for the state trails system, and she was going to follow up to see what other opportunities were available. Ralley said she offered suggestions of what their group might be able to do serving on the host committee which she planned to do, serve on either the host committee or the program committee. Session proposals to the committee are due by May 10 to advise them on session and mobile workshop topics and locations, helping to promote and advertise conference, ASCOT being a sponsor and helping to identify other potential sponsors and attending the conference. A suggestion was made to move ASCOT's October meeting to November, to be held in Tucson in conjunction with the conference. The proposals should cover three different areas: Telling the organization's story and engaging new partners; preserving special places and protecting the tapestry of the land; and strengthening our trail organizations and communities. Slay said she would think ASCOT would be interested in participating. Chair asked if there was a website to volunteer. Ralley said she believed there is and they're just getting geared up and will start registering for the conference in June. Chair indicated he was inquiring as to whether or not you could volunteer to help. Ralley said not yet. Chair indicated that might be the way for ASCOT members to assist through volunteering, individually, rather than as ASCOT.

Keller indicated that this would be an opportunity to get the face of ASCOT out there since Arizona is known for its trails. [Male Speaker] indicated he would be favor of ASCOT helping, his concern however, being in Tucson with most ASCOT members in Phoenix, that the group not agree to participate in things the members don't fully support and they should be careful not to over commit. Keller responded it might be something to approach like firms do when they're attending conference; identify a few members to represent ASCOT to achieve exposure and visibility instead of committing the whole group. Chair asked about Phyllis' idea of a session proposal, would anyone want to come up with an idea for a session proposal. [Female Speaker] said it would take someone with history on ASCOT. [Male Speaker] asked what the theme would be for the presentation. Ralley said there would be three

possible avenues, telling the ASCOT story, engaging new partners; preserving special places and protecting the tapestry of the land; and strengthening our trail organizations and communities. Ralley asked if they could present a session talking about how ASCOT has helped to strengthen the trail communities and organizations. Chair suggested if ASCOT did something like that a better approach would be a panel discussion with key people around the state who have been involved to make a 15, 20-minute presentation, with a discussion with the audience; like the approach we used at Mormon Lake. Ralley said she would also like to develop something about ASCOT to distribute to people attending the conference who might apply to ASCOT for membership.

Chair summed up the discussion on the conference and said that he thought it would provide good visibility on ASCOT and a flyer about ASCOT to hand out would be a good idea.

E. DISCUSSION –

- 1. ASCOT Will Discuss and Recap Their Involvement in the International Trails Symposium (ITS) –** Members that were active in the symposium may discuss topics related to the recent event.

Chair asked if anyone wanted to comment on the ITS and thanked everyone for participating. Ralley added that the scholarship recipients who attended were identified as emerging leaders.

- 2. ASCOT** members may present a brief summary of current events of interest to the trails community. No questions, discussion, deliberation or legal action will be taken on matters presented during this agenda item.

Chair asked for current events from the various regions. Arndt announced they are almost finished with another trail in the city of Scottsdale known as Brown's Ranch Trailhead, off of Alma School Road and Dynamite. The opening is scheduled for the end of May and the official grand opening in October. It will be another 60 miles of trail in the reserve and they plan to finish the other hundred miles in that area closing down about 150 miles of trail. Chair said the Forest Service is seeking applications for an advisory council for the AZ National Scenic Trails so if anyone is interested, please apply.

F. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETINGS AND CALL FOR FUTURE

AGENDA ITEMS – Proposed meeting dates for 2013 include Saturday, June 29th in Pinetop and Saturday, October 12th in the Verde Valley. ASCOT may consider additional meeting dates and locations for the remainder of 2013.

Chair stated the next meeting is at Game and Fish conference room at the extreme south end of Pinetop on June 29, and the TRACKS Board has invited ASCOT to a luncheon. Members who want to hike or mountain bike before or after the luncheon should let him know. There are a few trails up there you might want to experience.

Chair suggested that the last meeting of the year be Saturday, October 12 in Verde Valley.

G. ADJOURNMENT – 3:10 pm.