VAST Board of Directors Meeting Minutes – 1st Draft to be approved at the March 28, 2016 meeting

Monday, February 22, 2016

OFFICERS PRESENT:
President: Tim Mills
Vice President: Jeff Fay
Treasurer: Tom Baltrus
Secretary – Jim Hill

DIRECTORS PRESENT:
Addison: Lewis Barnes
Bennington: Vacant
Caledonia: Ken Gammell
Chittenden: Pat Poulin
Essex: Stewart Ahearn
Franklin: Mike Burns
Grand Isle: Dave Ladd
Lamoille: Carmin Lemery
Orange: Ron Garvin
Orleans: Roger Gosselin
Rutland: Merritt Budd
Washington: Mark Reaves
Windham: Roone Gibbs
Windsor: Dick Jewett

ALTERNATE DIRECTORS PRESENT: Stewart Ahearn

STAFF PRESENT:
Executive Director: Cindy Locke
Trails Administrator – Matt Tetreault
Trails Manager: Shane Prisby
Cyndy Jones – Office Coordinator

GUESTS PRESENT: Ed Hebebrand, Ross Page and Ken Griswold, Andy Girouard, Matt Goodyear, all from Country Riders Snowmobile Club (Orleans County).

Meeting Called to Order: 6:02 pm

Recognition of Visitors

Approval of Agenda: Lewis Barnes moved to approve the agenda; Pat Poulin seconded, so moved.

Dave Ladd noted that the Awards Committee met and would like to make a comment under Committee Reports.

Jeff Fay – would like a few minutes to address the Board at the end of the meeting.

Secretary's Report: Jim Hill noted that there is a change on page 3 under Snow Trails Conservancy; the 3rd bullet – where I referred to raising funds; it should have read that VAST might consider dedicating $1.00 or $2.00 from each TMA to the Snow Trails Conservancy to raise some funds.

Ron Garvin moved to accept the Secretary's Report as amended; Pat Poulin seconded, so moved.

Treasurer's Report: Tom Baltrus gave a brief overview of the January 2016 month end financials. All of the cash flows are positive – general fund, trails, scholarship, total budget – the revenues exceeded the expenses. If you look at the actual breakouts of the revenue, we exceeded the budget numbers for in-state registrations, but not for out-of-state. We may have pulled some of the out-of-state back into the in-state because of the new TMA structure.

Mark Reaves moved to accept the Treasurer's Report as presented; Roger Gosselin seconded, so moved.

Consent Calendar – Matt Tetreault would like to discuss the Grooming Clubs and Contractors memo regarding financial responsibility.

Pat Poulin moved to accept the Consent Calendar with one addition; Roger Gosselin seconded, so moved.

Old Business – Club Compliance

Cindy Locke - I wasn't sure if I would have a proposal at this time or not from Jeff Graham; I definitely should have something for the next meeting.

New Business

- TMA Sales – TMA report from this year and from last year. The reports in front of you include revenues as well, so you can see the number of TMAs and the revenue. Right now we are off by $1,093,357 from last year.
- Every year the majority of the clubs turn in their early birds on time, but there are always clubs that hold onto them and sell them after December 15th; sometimes way into the regular season. There are about 12-15 clubs that are somewhat late; there are about 5 or 6 clubs that turn them in very late in the season.
- Mark Reaves noted that before the season starts next year, we should send out a very strong letter stating the timeline of when these need to get turned in. How big is the problem?
- Ron Garvin noted that unless we start charging punitive damages, no matter how hard the clubs have it, then they are not going to turn them in on time.
- Pat Poulin – what are the consequences if they don't turn them in on time.
- Cindy Locke - COD for next year and invoiced for any discrepancies. The problem is not huge; we are tracking it well the past couple of years.
- Lewis Barnes – on the TMA for volunteers – we have 556 that have not returned them yet? What clubs are we missing them from? Lewis asked if Cindy could send that information to the county directors. He was approached by someone with a suggestion to take $20.00 off next years' TMA because the clubs haven't had to do much grooming. He explained the situation about the grooming

payments and that the clubs still receive half of their contract so they can make the payment for their groomer loans.

- Carmin Lemery – Are the volunteer TMAs required to be in at the same time as the EB's? On the bottom of the TMA form it states that we can give out volunteer TMAs out at any time, so why do we need to send them in by January 15th?
- Cyndy Jones – Yes, as of right now it does that that they need to be in by January 15th, but it may change going forward. We have to check with Sheila regarding the timing of the return of the volunteer TMAs.

Ice Crossings / H. 308

- H.308 – was basically the Ice Crossing Bill within the confines of VAST. When we brought up the ice crossing issue a couple of months ago, the Governor's Council was going to review it, as they did.
- H.308 states that if someone leaves the trail system and comes back on the trail system, because there was something in the trail or some other reason, that they would be covered as long as they were operating in a reasonable and prudent manner. "Reasonable and prudent manner" was the language we wanted to add to the bill. Last year the Trial Lawyers' Association had an issue with the bill without that language in it, then when we decided to add that language; now they are okay with the bill but they don't like the language.
- The recommendation to the Governor's Council was to just pass it as is. If you read our statute, we are covered. It talks about snowmobiling and accidents and how people need to be riding in a reasonable and prudent manner, so my feeling is to just get this bill passed to protect riders, VAST and landowners and we already have "reasonable and prudent manner" in our state statute covering us.
- The Governor's Council went ahead and approved H.308 as is; we now just need Board approval for that and then we will go ahead and try to get it passed in the House Transportation Committee.

Ron Garvin moved to approve H.308 as presented; Dick Jewett seconded, so moved.

- Cindy Locke – I'm going in Wednesday to testify with the Senate Transportation Committee and I will let them know that this bill is coming to them as well.
- Roger Gosselin – we talked about the Governor's Council looking into our liability once people get on the VAST trails or go across water – did that get brought up?
- Dick Jewett – Yes, it did get brought up, but those same trial lawyers didn't want to have that language in there and they wouldn't approve it if it was.
- Roger Gosselin – so we are approving without the specific notation of water crossings. Is the topic of water crossings dead or is it going to come up later on? I keep getting asked about it.
- Cindy Locke – No, the same water crossings are open, the same signage that we talked about before. There was not a discussion about closing water crossings. It was more about that we have some extra protection when people are crossing bodies of water when they are not on our trails. We already have some protection when they are on our trails, but as much as we can say, not even "at your own risk".
- Roger Gosselin – is the topic of water crossings dead or is that going to come up later for the next session. I keep getting hammered by my county about the fact that it is a state highway, so why would VAST be sued, etc.
- Dick Jewett – right now it is a dead item.
- Tim Mills – It might be a good item to bring up when we get our new Governor.

- Cindy Locke – If someone crosses a body of water and something happens, and it's on a trail that we are saying is open, we are open to _____ _____? .

LVRT Update

- Shane Prisby – working on Act 250 and the lease. The lease expires July 1st of this year, it's on a 10 year cycle. We had a meeting with our lawyer to go through article by article in the lease. We are working on some items to present to VTrans to review; there are some things in there that I wouldn't recommend we sign again. There are some things we can hopefully negotiate with VTrans to have a more reasonable document, and make sure we aren't holding all the liability and none of the control, going forward. We should have a draft coming back from the lawyer soon.

Act 250

- The entire trail as presented with the Management Plan is under the jurisdiction of Act 250 currently, but the only section that is permitted for construction is Phase 1, which includes Bridge 68 and 1C, that have not been built. They are permitted; any changes to that might need to be amended to the Act 250 process, but we are allowed to work on these sections only. Phases 2 and 3, with everything else, is not fully permitted under Act 250, so we will have to go back through the process to get those permitted, which means public hearings, etc.
- I have been working with Ron Garvin and Ken Gammell to talk about where we are with Act 250, what arguments we have to make, what our obligations are currently. We have been looking at this down the line to see what our obligations are, what's the current climate that we are working under and how is that different from when we started on the project; is there any leeway on that. Currently we are on the path where in two years, we will be going back through the Act 250 process for Phase 2. In the meantime, we are getting ready, looking into what legal action do we have going forward, do we have a strong enough argument to get out of Act 250; doing that within the confines of this office.
- VT Trails and Greenways Council – They started to talk about how Act 250 applies to trails, with Lou Borey (correct name?), who is head of Act 250; who is above the district coordinators. Trails don't really fit into Act 250's "boxes"; i.e., what is development, what isn't, particularly that the trail crosses a number of different parcels, etc. They are putting together some information about how it applies to trails now, but what may happen down the road. So in conjunction with select members of the Trail and Greenways Council and Craig Whipple – Director of FP&R, they are starting a discussion, more focused with Lou Borey, about these are the issues we are running into, there isn't any consistency. Lou Borey said that maybe down the road what we do is exempt trails from the Act 250 process, especially if you have very long segments of trail that are going through private land and there is a public section that has Act 250 in there, it could get shut down?
- That is really going to hurt the recreation network in the state. Right now it is looking promising, but its a little ways out.
- Trails & Greenways is putting together documents for recreation and trails, about Act 250 process and how it applies now and looking down the road at the ultimate goal to get trails in general out of Act 250 as far as an exemption; it's in the early stages. Craig Whipple, FP&R, said that if what we are doing is going to put everyone under Act 250, we will stop. They are not trying to go full steam ahead off the cliff, we are trying to move it forward in a way that protects recreation networks in a logical way; still under our different policies with FP&R and the trails manual and how we do things and do it well, but not having that extra layer that would essentially shut down networks.

Website Update

We have a meeting coming up with the website developers, pretty extensive about what we are going through, about what to do about trails conditions, reports, on line TMA. Recently Beth had an online training for clubs; if you missed it, it is recorded and they can do the training anytime they want – we have a link on our website.

New Business

- 2016 budget forecast – Tom explained some issues with the lack of revenue coming in this year. We are off by 8,000 TMAs. The reality is that we are not going to make up the lost TMAs, even with the best of conditions from now to the end of the season. We have to start looking at what we can do to help ourselves and avoid disaster. The other reality is that we need to start on our budget around May 1st in order to meet the deadline for the annual meeting, etc. He explained that we really need TMAs turned in on a monthly basis so we have numbers in hand to work with to look at next years' budget.
- The Finance Committee talked about adjusting grooming, grant in aid changes, as well as some other adjustments. In order to make all of that work and to formulate some kind of plan going forward, we need to have the returns in hand.
- Cindy Locke noted that she has made some notes on the budget report - where we were at on Feb. 1 – overall net is minus $479,000. We are now at the 5% mark. Overall net minus $432,000. We started with $1.4 million in the checkbook. I took $432,000 out of $1.4 million, which would leave us with $967,000 in the bank and there are capital reserves of $79,000 if you decided to take that off, which would then leave us with money in the bank. Right now where we are at, we are projecting, if we don't get any more snow and don't sell any more TMAs, we would have $880,000 in the bank when we end the season.
- Pat Poulin – so you are saying that we've already sold 5% over that Feb. 1st number already?
- Cindy Locke – Yes, we have probably sold more than that, but this is what's been turned in.
- Jim Hill – October 1st is the new fiscal year. We don't get any more money back in until October 1st, there is no income until mid-January at best. What's our operating expenses during that time frame?
- Cindy Locke – probably about half of what we have in reserves. If we have another year like this year, and we don't' do anything about it, we will be in trouble. I wrote notes on the right hand side and adjusted columns, the ones in bold are adjusted either up or down and tried to put reasons in there. I've dropped staff expectation on sales for the magazine for advertising from $250,000 to $125,000. The big guys are still advertising, but the little places don't have money for advertising because of the very slow season. I had to really look responsibly at everything. There are still other areas that we can cut, $500 here and $500 there.
- Tom Baltrus – January 31st we had pre-cash of $2.7 million and $705,000 from the reserve account, which we can always borrow back if we had to, but those are the ones that we established; the grooming contingency, which is $185,000. We can manage our way through this year, but that is why we need the TMAs turned in as soon as possible so we can start working on the budget to avoid disaster next year, in case this happens again.
- Cindy Locke – This is a very important conversation down the road; if we do continue to have the ability to build up funds we should have one years' operating funds for this office to stay open for one year.

- Ken Gammell – Are we going to stick with the grooming / contractors letter that just went out?

We don't know how the season is going to end. The clubs and everyone need to realize that we are in financial trouble.

- Roger Gosselin – what's the number that we need to operate for a year?
- Cindy Locke - $3.88 million. I will keep you updated on numbers as more TMAs come in.

Trails Policy Manual Revisions

- Tim Mills noted - We will need a motion at some point after some discussion, a second and then the discussion will be from the directors after that and then there will be a vote. There will be no discussion from the audience once the motion and second is made. Roberts Rules – only allow after a second a motion is made, that only the directors that vote to make any comment. Do not include the audience comments; we will have an open discussion at first to include them.
- Jim Hill noted that at the annual meeting, the audience is part of the delegation, but at these meetings, that is not the case.
- Matt Tetreault referred to the Trails Policy changes that were presented to the Board and reviewed those changes as shown on the handout. Matt noted that there was a sub-committee made from the Trails Committee and we met three times to go over the changes and then we had a final meeting with the Policy and Bylaws Committee to finalize the changes. We also had our attorney review the manual and suggest some other changes. We came up with the final manual and we got it to the Trails Committee last week and the vote was 9 – yes, 2 – no, and there were 3 counties missing that did not vote. In making these changes we looked at a lot of other states' grant in aid policies. We are not way off base; it is very consistent with what NH, NY and Maine are doing.
- Lewis Barnes – Page 9 – It will be up to the VAST Trails Administrator to determine if the bill of sale reflects the actual fair market value of the equipment being traded /sold? Is this in case someone gets a low ball number?
- Matt Tetreault – Yes. I had one grooming contractor that a Class 4 grooming sled and they put in for a grant. There is no trade in value for the sled that they have. Matt asked about their other sled, but they didn't qualify for additional power units either. The club said that they had sold the other sled for $1,300. Matt noted that this was low for this sled. The club didn't end up getting the grant, he backed out of it. I wanted something in there to look at these issues. There was some concern about the right pricing of trading, selling, etc. There is no Blue Book for Groomers, but Class 4 grooming sleds are in Blue Book, and for Class 1 power units I usually look back in my files for reference, or reach out to get some pricing information.
- Ron Garvin – one of the ways you can eliminate getting a fraudulent value is to have wording that VAST has the last right of refusal for the value; that way it channels it through VAST.
- Roger Gosselin – I presume everyone read my email. My county has decided that they do not want me to vote on the proposed changes for the grant in aid issues.
- Matt Goodyear – I think this grant reduction is a real stepping stage to bring less money into the organization. There has been about $450,000 in USDA grant money brought in in the last 9 years and you are almost going to shut that off because it's not going to be worth it for the clubs to go after that money anymore. My club_____ $10,000 over our VAST Grant and we are spending a few thousand dollars to get that money, so we only look at an increase of $5,000; why even do it. Just take the VAST grant, finance the rest and make the payment. I understand that you are trying to get more money to more clubs, but I think in the end you are going to have less money, because clubs are not going to go after the extra money; it's not going to be worth it to them.
- Tim Mills – the math doesn't work out for me in your explanation. You are thinking is that if you get an outside grant you don't get any VAST grants?

- Matt Goodyear – I read the original version a month ago, we got $77,000 from the USDA grant, so we would lose the $64,000 of VAST grant funding.
- Tim Mills – No, that is not how it works. The USDA grant would also count toward your net cost and then we would just calculate the difference from net and that would change your grant from there.
- Roger Gosselin – our biggest problem is the principle of the fact that the that the clubs have been awarded a certain amount of money based on a certain criteria and they get that money from VAST and it's up to the club to determine how they are going to pay for the remainder of it. That's where the club is coming from. Whether it be that someone donates ($20,000) to the club or they go out and spend hours getting another grant, it's up to the club to fund the rest of the groomer. If Country Riders goes out and they get $10,000 more than they should, it makes sense that VAST should cut it back so they don't get more than their piece of equipment costs. It's the principle of the matter. Our club was a good example, because if we hadn't gotten the USDA Grant or anywhere near it, we would had to have raised our club dues which would have hurt our members and we would have had to cut down on different features on our machines, etc.
- Roger Gosselin – I myself have been personally going back and forth on this. Regardless of how I feel, my county doesn't want me to vote on this.
- Matt Goodyear – The ultimate goal for clubs would be to get 100% funding from _____, and not have to borrow any money.
- Ken Griswold – the club should not be penalized for applying for a grant or raising funds.
- Tim Mills – fundraiser monies are not included in the calculation.
- Pat Poulin – are all counties / clubs eligible for USDA grant monies?
- Roger Gosselin – Yes. I don't want to say all counties are eligible, but more than just Caledonia, Essex and Orleans.
- Cindy Locke – I know that the USDA grant eligibility issues should not be part of the discussion, that these guys are more eligible than others to receive USDA grants, but I think rather than thinking that you are being penalized, think of it as you are helping other clubs. You are not getting less money, you are just getting it from a different source. We are trying to figure out how to do it in a fair way. We looked at other states funding principles and they are all the same. I have never written a grant where they didn't ask for all of our financial information and what other sources of money were, because they would consider that. As well as they consider the time that you put in – in kind things.
- Mike Burns – When you say you looked at other states funding principles, were they actually taking the money away or were they looking to see if the club qualified for a loan? There is a fee requirement for a qualification of a loan, I don't know that I agree with deducting against it.
- Matt Tetreault – NH, ME and NY have very similar principles on grant in aid funding. New Hampshire wording is - any non grant in aid grants received for purchases of equipment shall be deducted from the total cost of a new or used piece of equipment before calculating a grant in aid award. Maine wording – the bureau will subtract the value of any previously sold equipment, trade in or any other grants or funding received from the total cost before calculating the amount of the grant.
- Mike Burns – that says Grant for the equipment on it? So they applied to another source for money for that piece of equipment specifically.
- Lewis Barnes – Every county probably could put in for a grant, but the percentage of us getting one, compared to the formulas and everything that they use, you guys make out a lot better than we do. You are looking at it that they are being penalized, but you are actually helping VAST out. You hear that we are short on monies because of the bad season.

- Merritt Budd – $100,000 loan for a piece of equipment and they get $50,000 and VAST is going to give them $50,000, where is the loss?
- Matt – The net purchase price ($25,000), $50,000 from the USDA grant, the club has to come up with $25,000; so our grant is based on that grant amount so the percentage of that amount instead of $75,000 which it would be based on if it weren't for the USDA grant.
- Ron Garvin – those of us sitting in this room have a fiduciary responsibility to the VAST organization. Not only this year, but every year we are scrambling to come up with funds enough to pay for the requests for grants. Some of the larger clubs have refined the process of grant requests, but some of the smaller clubs, it is unknown or unavailable to them. The larger clubs should help the VAST organization and the smaller clubs by having the funds available in a more equitable manner spread around for the clubs that don't have the sophistication, and in many cases, some of the available grant to some of the areas are not available to all, because in some cases grants are tied to the recreational percentage of the gross production of the area. It is much harder for a large city to get a recreational grant because it is formulated off the total revenue of the city, as opposed to a rural area where a lot of their grant availability is due to the percentage to the gross income of the area. It's going to hurt some of us and our transactions because it will reduce the potential amount, but our responsibility is to the VAST organization as a whole. Those clubs that have had success with various grants, that that be open and shared information and procedure to help the smaller, less experienced clubs.
- Matt Goodyear – In 2003, VAST gave $23,000 to fix a broken groomer. There are a lot of clubs helping other clubs going on.
- Tom Baltrus – when this issue came up a couple of months ago, it was mentioned that there were 4 counties under a special act of the USDA, they were singled out as being able to apply for grants. Can we focus some attention at our level to the state to see what we can do, where we can do it?
- Cindy Locke – That issue came up at the Trails Committee meeting. Shane is often looking for funding for the LVRT and I am always looking for funding. We will put an eblast out there and will post info on our website regarding this; we can give them info on how to get in touch with the USDA, etc. There are 3 counties in the REAP area – northeast kingdom area. Requirements are different in different areas of the state, for different reasons. Other counties can get USDA grants, but there are different set of requirements; maybe not as much. You get points for different things.
- Ron Garvin – Even in counties that are not economic zones, individual events can request USDA funds; there are certain points that you get for certain things. Economic zones are more liberal than in non-economic zones.
- Pat Poulin – Since this policy change will affect 4 of our 7 clubs I don't feel comfortable voting on it tonight without talking to them.
- Matt Tetreault – With regard to Tom's comments, I have reached out to the USDA and they are willing to do a training for clubs in Vermont on these grants. They could maybe do something in White River Jct., and pull people from NH as well.
- Tom Baltrus – How about re-establishing a morning session at the annual meeting and maybe consider having the training done at that time.
- Mark Reaves - I agree and understand with the sentiments in terms of trying to free up money. I don't think we can retroactively fix this. We need education about grant writing, funding sources, etc.., so that everyone is on a level playing field. And that way if a club doesn't go out there for a grant, then it's their own fault.
- Ed Hebebrand – mentioned something about a Homeland Security grant for protecting the border?
- Ron Garvin – how many clubs have we lost in the past 4 or 5 years? If we don't support the smaller clubs, we are going to lose them and we will have voids in areas. We as an organization need to do

what is necessary to keep these smaller clubs viable. If we don't maintain a statewide network, we will lose the power of attracting people to come and ride in Vermont.

- Roger Gosselin – I just want to reiterate, just like Mark, I have been very uncertain about this. It's been tough to bounce back and forth between VAST and the clubs; every time I keep coming back to the fact that every club is responsible for a certain amount of money after the VAST grant has been awarded. How those clubs chose to go out and get the rest of the money is on them, period, and that is what's causing the conflict in my mind.
- Ken Gammell – The problem I have is the wording, "secured by the applicant after approval". I don't think this club knew before that they were going to get the USDA grant. To go and re-evaluate theirs after, that would not be fair. However, if they knew before and didn't add it in, that's a totally different story. We charge pretty good dues in our county. We lost a couple of clubs in our area and our club had to take over grooming some trails so we had to go out and buy a new Pisten Bully with a $10,000 drag to groom the trails. I have been on the board long enough to remember that a number of years ago VAST went out and purchased a number of Pisten Bullys and leased them to the clubs to buy because we wanted to have a grooming fleet that was 10 years or less old. So every time we discourage a club to go out and get approval of stuff and keep their equipment newer, that isn't going to be good. We had old, old junk equipment out there and the trails were not groomed well years ago. If anyone has rode the trails in the last 5 to 10 years, they have been in really great shape. Our trail system is second to none. I would encourage the clubs to go out and get all the funding they can get. To try to take money away from a club after it has already been approved, that's what I have trouble with. Ken questioned the wording –" If a grant or other source of other funding is secured by the applicant after approval, or receives of the VAST grant, VAST reserves the right to re-evaluate the VAST portion of the grant and act upon the decision accordingly."
- Roger Gosselin – Usually the clubs hear about the approval of the VAST grant before we hear about the USDA.
- Matt – This is not retroactive to the grants that we discussed in December. This is if they get another grant from another source, after, then we can look at it again.

Ken – I would like to make a motion to table this item until next month. I'd like to talk to my clubs before I vote on it. Pat Poulin seconded, so moved.

- Matt – I'm concerned that if we keep pushing this down the road; we need to change all the language In the grant in aid paperwork. The Trails Committee voted on this and I thought he Board supported the Trails committee's decision.
- Jim Hill – One thing I will say about grants, USDA or otherwise, the likelihood of them getting a grant, anybody getting a grant and getting the VAST portion of their grant reduced, they are still going to, more than likely, always come out ahead. It is our responsibility to make every dollar go as far as we can.
- Mike Burns – Page 11 and 12 – Can we be the lienholder and sign as such? Yes.

Tim – any further discussion on Ken's vote to table this until next month. The vote was as follows:

Yes – 7

Nay – 6

Personnel Policy Changes

Jeff Fay – Somehow my report didn't get in the packet. Going to have to table until next month. We made some of the corrections that were in progress with the personnel committee, and some other changes. We added a grievance procedure back in. Nothing urgent that needs immediate attention.

Jim Hill – When we talked earlier about the budget and I asked Cindy about the expenses from October 1 to December 31, and what it would cost to run the operation. Tom Baltrus looked at some numbers for the past year and the number is about $800,000; that is everything – salaries, insurance, etc.

Committee Reports

Dave Ladd – I did pass out some information on the Award Committee meeting that we had. We have a number of things in progress, but need another meeting to finalize some of the details. Also, a number of directors are going out with Trailblazer Awards in hand to be awarded to people. This new program is off to a good start.

Annual Meeting

Merritt Budd – no update yet; our county meeting is February 24th. I did get a parlimentarian though.

Long Range Planning

Mark Reaves - Nothing now, but those who are on the committee will be getting an email by the end of this week.

PR & Marketing

Carmin Lemery - Postponed meeting because of inclement weather. Cindy has written a grant to try to get some marketing materials to help with the budget process on the marketing budget next year.

Trails Committee

They did meet and all of that information was in Matt's report.

Governor's Council Meeting

Dick Jewett - Minutes have been done up but I forgot it to provide to the Board.

Steve McLeod had an issue on trails that you may want to read about.

Other

- Jeff Fay – Revisit an article that I wrote a couple of months ago for the magazine regarding social media. If you are an officer, director or prominent member of your club, think before you hit "send". It doesn't look good when you are dragging another club through the mud – stay positive. It's been a tough year; our membership is frustrated.
- Tim Mills – I have received a few emails as well over some things that people have posted on social media. It is disturbing to our membership.
- Cindy Locke – Dave Ladd, thank you so much for what you wrote. Raymond Rodrique wrote something good as well. Any time you can put out fires and educate people about an issue, please do so.
- Pat Poulin – I just remembered something that I read in your packet about the Forest Continuation Bill? This sounds disturbing.
- Lewis Barnes – Do all of us county directors contact our representatives about this bill?
- Cindy Locke – I guess we could write a statement for everyone. I haven't been asked to testify yet. Steve McLeod is keeping an eye on this for us.
- Merritt Budd – There was a guy named Carmi Deuso that played an important role in passing lots of legislation for VAST. I was given an old article and would like to publish the story again.
- Cindy Locke – said she would contact the magazine about the issue and see if we can republish it for the 50 year anniversary.
- Stewart Ahearn – I spoke to my county about the trails conservancy and would like to get info on that.
- Dave Page – has had the operation – 3 stints. Sounded great and will be going home Sunday or Monday.
- Dick Jewett – We have a long standing person in our club who takes care of the groomer, signing, trails work, and we had an event for him and Cindy Locke was nice enough to come down to the event and present _____ to _____. We had this event for him because he was recently diagnosed with lung cancer.

Motion to adjourn by Lewis Barnes, seconded by Roone Gibbs at 7:50 PM.

It is our goal to provide a statewide snowmobile trails system second to none and to provide a quality snowmobiling experience to our members.