

**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
NONMOTORIZED ADVISORY WORKGROUP (NAW)**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**December 1, 2011**

Approved March 6, 2012

***Video Conference Call:***

**Stevens T. Mason Building  
530 West Allegan, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Lansing, Michigan 48933**

**Marquette OSC  
1990 US 41S  
Marquette, Michigan 49855**

**PRESENT FOR THE WORKGROUP**

John Gonway, *Chair*  
Carol Fulsher (*via phone*)  
Nancy Krupiarz  
Scott TenBrink

**PRESENT FOR STAFF**

Jim Radabaugh, *State Trails Coordinator, Forest Management Division (FMD)*  
Annamarie Bauer, *Trail Planning Specialist, FMD*  
Brenda Curtis, *Campgrounds and Pathways Planning Specialist, FMD*  
Abby Rubley, *Promotional Agent, FMD*

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**

Ted Welsh, *MMBA*

**WELCOME**

**Chair Gonway** called the meeting to order. He welcomed everyone, followed by introductions of the NAW members and other attendees.

**Chair Gonway presented the December 1, 2011 Agenda and asked for any additions or changes. There were none and the Agenda was unanimously approved.**

**Chair Gonway asked for review and approval of the September 21, 2011 Draft Meeting Minutes. A motion was offered by Nancy Krupiarz supported by Carol Fulsher to approve the Draft Minutes. The Minutes were unanimously approved.**

**BUSINESS ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION****Discussion of the Draft 2011 Recommendations Report of the Equine Trailways Subcommittee for the Michigan Snowmobile and Trails Advisory Council (Report)**

Discussion began by identifying an approach to a response.

**Chair Gonway** indicated that the legislators were looking at the issue, and the NAW was to provide comments back to the Michigan Snowmobile and Trails Advisory Council (MSTAC) for consideration. There was a general concern that the Equine Trailways Subcommittee (ETS) recommendations created a significant amount of work to be done and no funding to pay for implementation. The NAW felt the ETS should take the lead, noting that other recreational user groups find funding for their projects and initiatives. The NAW also pointed out that many of the bullet points in the report were “to do” items for the Department of Natural Resources (DNR).

**Carol Fulsher** stated that any approvals of goals and recommendations can NOT impose any funding requirements on other recreational groups or the DNR.

**Jim Radabaugh** stated that the ETS prepared the recommendations independent of the funding requirements. Funding consideration would be considered later. First define what you want, then prioritize items, and identify required funding.

**Chair Gonway** suggested the group table the funding element from consideration of the NAW recommendations at this time.

The NAW reviewed and discussed each ETS goal and recommendation of the report noting the following:

<b>Goal 1</b>	<b>Support recommendation.</b>
R-1	Collaboration is good.
R-2	Difficult to support no net loss as a universal concept. Several examples were used to illustrate the concern: What if the closure was due to budget reasons or what if it was part of a multiuse trail. There should be no adverse impact on other recreational uses when trying to balance no net loss of equine trail. Each proposal should be evaluated independently.
R-3	Okay
R-4	Need definition of what close proximity means and a better means to measure.
R-5-7	Okay
R-8	Any expansions should be in conjunction with and respective of other recreational and resource interests and concerns. Concern regarding dates and timeline.
R-9-11	Okay
R-12	Collaboration and coordination should be done in conjunction with other trail user groups.
R-13	Change the word “ultimately” to “eventually.”

- R-14 Should be done in conjunction with other trail user groups concern over exclusivity towards equestrians. When campgrounds are on multiuse trails should allow for multiuse camps.
- R-15 Okay
- Goal 2 Okay**
- R-16 Okay; however, rating system should be privately managed. Requires active participation by the equestrian community. Concerning funding, the emphasis should be on equine community taking the lead (should be changed to read Equine recreation community in collaboration with the DNR). This is consistent with all other recreational user groups.
- R-17 Acceptable as long as all other trail users are also given 15 percent expansion. Delete reference to local and country focus on state. What is the baseline for inventory? Need for Demand/Use Analysis. How can you need more when you don't know what you have and whether or not it is enough? Need to demonstrate need for more.
- R-18 Okay
- R-19 Private user group responsibility (budget issue).
- R-20 Needs to happen in coordination with other user groups. Need for opportunity for other user groups to review.
- The following deletions should be made to the recommendations:
- The ETS, equine trail users, ~~and the DNR~~ should work with local units of government and private landowners to secure equine trail easements that make such additional riding and camping opportunities possible.
  - The ETS, equine trail users, ~~and the DNR~~ should identify where there can be more equine use of rails-to-trails and strive to remove barriers to such use. ~~Immediate attention should be focused on the 41 miles of Clinton-Ionia-Shiawassee (CIS) rails-to-trails.~~
- The following addition should be made to the recommendations:
- The ETS and the DNR, in collaboration with riding and packing associations, should periodically survey all user groups ~~equine trail users~~ as to their needs, shifts in use, perceived, economic and environmental impacts, and rider and packer satisfaction as to existing trail, railways, and campground management and opportunities.
- R-21-22 Example of tail wagging the dog, use current practices to provide input on timber harvests.
- R-23 Okay in conjunction with other trail user groups. Michigan Trail Riders Association is the equine model.
- R-24 Okay
- R-25 Yes

R-26	Neutral
R-27	Equine community should consult with the DNR and do it themselves.
<b>Goal 3</b>	<b>Okay</b>
R-28	Suggest that ETS is the process and the representative of the equine voice and perspective.
R-29-30	These ideas should apply to all trail user groups.
R-31-33	Great
<b>Goal 4</b>	<b>Good</b>
R-34-35	Okay
R-36	No; difficult to manage and hard to quantify a value.
R-37	Okay
R-38	Funding issue.
R-39	Equine community should advocate.
R-40	Neutral
R-41	Responsibility should reside with the equine trail riding community not the DNR.
R-42	No
R-43	Reverse roles - as an example the ETS should work with the DNR and MSTAC.
R-44	Okay for the ETS to fund and pursue.
R-45-46	Equine user groups should pay for these tasks

#### **Plan NAW Response to the ETS Draft Report**

General discussion took place concerning the response from the NAW with an emphasis on resource changes being proportionate to the user groups. Response assignments were divided as follows:

John Gonway	General comments and concerns relative to DNR and MSTAC.
Nancy Krupiarz	Comments relative to the various recreation user groups such as impacts and/or inclusion of other.
Carol Fulsher	Comments concerning funding.
Scott TenBrink	Comments relative to no impacts and/or neutral position.

The group set a target date of January 10, 2012 to have comments drafted.

**Department of Natural Resources Updates**

**Jim Radabaugh** reported that the Forest, Mineral and Fire Management Division is being reorganized. The Chief, Assistant Chief, and Recreation and Trails Section Manager positions have been eliminated; therefore the MSTAC no longer has the same staff support. The Recreation and Trails Section will be moving to the Parks and Recreation Division effective January 8, 2012.

**MSTAC Updates**

The October meeting was held in Grand Rapids where the "UP North" Trail model was presented by the NEMCOG. Overall the concept was met with enthusiastic support; however there is no immediate way to fund a similar, larger scale trail project.

**NAW Vacancy and Potential Replacement**

There was general discussion regarding a potential replacement to fill the vacancy. The DNR will provide a list of recommendations.

**PUBLIC APPEARANCE**

None

**NEXT MEETING**

The group discussed and suggested the following dates to meet in 2012:

March 8  
June 7  
September 6  
December 6

Meetings will be held at the Mason Building in Lansing and the Marquette OSC via video conference call.

**A motion offered by Scott TenBrink, supported by Nancy Krupiarz to adjourn. The motion was approved and the meeting was adjourned.**