



## Greater Minnesota Regional Parks and Trail Commission

Sartell Community Center

**Minutes for January 26, 2022**

**APPROVED**

### **Commissioners Present:**

Rick Anderson, Ted Suss, Jonathan Wolf, Bryan Pike, Barry Wendorf, Beth Pierce, Jen Foley, Brad Bonk, Tim Engrav, Tom Ryan and Tom Stoa (virtual)

**Commissioners Absent:** Peg Furshong

**Consultants Present:** Renee Mattson - Executive Director, Joe Czapiewski – System Plan Coordinator

### **1. Meeting Called to Order by Chair Anderson at 10:05am**

We are fortunate to have Raven McKnight here to present the Streetlight Research data project.

### **2. Acknowledge Members of the Public in Attendance**

No one outside Commission members in attendance at the start of the meeting. Margy Hughes joined the meeting at 11:15am.

### **3. Approval of Agenda for January 26, Minutes from November 24, 2021 and Treasurer's Report through December 2021**

Mattson noted more was spent in the budget on research than planned. Suggested that since we are under budget in planning initiatives and ETeam expenses we move a commensurate amount to make up the shortfall in planning. Mattson also noted we have more than \$166,000 in reserve from the previous years allocation.

**Motion** by Wendorf to approve the minutes, agenda and the changes in the financials.

**Second** by Pike

**Motion Approved**

#### **4. Streetlight Research Project – Raven McKnight**

Raven joined the meeting at 10:15 and Commissioners and consultants introduced themselves. Raven provided an overview of the Streetlight Research and responded to questions from Commissioners. The research project is being funded through the Coordination Among Partners fund.

The goal of the project is to provide park and trail level visitation data through Streetlight data. This is a collaboration between DNR Parks and Trails Division, Metropolitan Regional Parks and Greater Minnesota. There are two other data scientists on the team from Metropolitan Council that have been instrumental in moving the project forward, Ellen Esch and Liz Roten and Joel Hutting is the Research Manager.

Streetlight Data is the company that is providing the data for this analysis. They provide anonymized and aggregated location based services data from cell phones. Smart phone users generate a huge amount of information as they carry their cell phones with them. The data cannot identify an individual but can use it to identify broader patterns of travel.

Raven reviewed data collected for parks and how the boundaries were set for the parks. Raven suggested that everyone review the GM information carefully and send any comments that might contain corrections.

Suss – commented that Lake of the Isles has a driving lane close to the sidewalk. How is that information separated? Raven noted this is a challenge and they are working on ensuring the boundaries are tight.

Ryan – does the National Park Service have information for us from research they've conducted? Raven noted the NPS does not do this level of research, to the best of her knowledge. She will check and report back.

Pierce – where do we go to check on park boundaries? It is in the information link that was sent previously.

Pike – is there any data that identifies the speed of the signals coming through the facility? Would the speed of the signal traveling through have a data set that is looked at? Raven commented that yes, speed is a factor taken into consideration.

Stoa – what about park users who do not have a cell phone with them? Do you have an estimate for how many people that would encompass? Raven – we do not have any information directly related to Minnesota, but a study done in California indicates that 70-80% of park visitors had their phones with them and turned on. Though they did not ask specifically if their location services were turned on. Streetlight is good at showing broad patterns, not what an individual is doing.

Raven – we have an agile approach, so rather than waiting until the end of the project in 2023 for a full report, information will be shared out as it's completed. Still to come is

more demographic information and an interactive data portal to access the information as it becomes available.

Some of the frequently asked questions –

- What exactly are we measuring? Vehicle counts right now, but we know that vehicles do not account for all visitors. There is also a pedestrian component.
- Streetlight is not making claims about the number of people in each vehicle.
- How do we count the number of people in a vehicle? We are using an average multiplier of 2.5 based on previous work from Met Council and NSP. We know that the multiplier is very accurate for some parks and not very accurate for other parks. We want to provide better information as we continue the work in 2022.
- Streetlight is very good at showing broad patterns but is not a replacement for the qualitative data we learn in visitor surveys.

Wendorf – is the demographic information based on the cell phone number? How do you get the demographics? Raven, they estimate where people live based on where the phone spends the night. The demographics are based on the distribution of demographics within the census block.

Pierce – how do you go from a cell phone to a vehicle count? Raven, Streetlight gets the information based on data pings. If a string of pings is moving at 60mph they interpret that you are in a car. Same can be said for walking on sidewalks, the pings snap you to a sidewalk rather than a road.

Suss – a state park near where he visits often park on private property across the road and walk into the park. If there were six people in a car that drove into a park they would be counted as 2.5 visitors, but if they parked across the road and walked in, they would be counted as six? Raven, we are reporting now on just vehicle traffic. When we start reporting on pedestrians and bicyclists, we will be reporting that traffic.

Mattson – all this information is preliminary, and you will provide updates as Streetlight continues to evolve.

Raven – yes, they continue to improve, and we expect continuous improvement.

Ryan – we ask a lot of questions about multiplier because we've had disagreement on multipliers before. Counting is a significant matter of discussion among the three partners. Raven, yes, very aware of concerns about vehicle multipliers. In 2022 there will be different multipliers based on different types and locations of parks. These are exploratory numbers and would not be used to determine funding splits.

Raven – we are looking at more than 200 parks across the state. We are looking at 44 Greater Minnesota parks as well as the eligible for designation parks in the GM system.

Raven reviewed the preliminary report with the Commissioners. Please let her know via the feedback form at the bottom of the report.

## **5. Executive Director's Report**

### **5.1 Policy and Planning Report for 2021**

The report was sent electronically on January 13 and the hard copies that were mailed via USPS arrived on January 14, in advance of the January 15 deadline. Commissioner Anderson and Mattson will be meeting with Rep. Lille and Senator Ruud on February 2. Commissioner Stoa commented that the Winona newspaper picked up the story on the grant awards and ran it verbatim from the news release we provided.

### **5.2 Mountain Bike Count and User Survey Report**

The report is well done by the Parks and Trails Council. They were excellent partners in the project.

## **6. System Plan Coordinator's Report**

### **6.1 Jillian Reiner Consulting Agreement**

Question from Stoa about allowing Jillian to work for the Commission after leaving her employment at Hagstrom Engineering. Czapiewski stated he has talked with her previous employer, and they do not have any issues with her working for the Commission.

**Motion** by Engrav

**Second** by Ryan

**Motion Approved**

### **6.2 2021 Strategic Plan Evaluation Standards**

Joe discussed the need to move from the current Master Plan guidelines to the new standards that were adopted by the Strategic Plan update. For the plans that have been in the system for some time we can allow the scoring portion of the evaluation to be more lenient and use the previous standards.

Bonk asked how many facilities may fall into the previous standards. He's comfortable with the number as described.

Engrav is comfortable being flexible as well. Mattson questioned whether we should notify those with plans in the works that there will be a deadline for submission. Suss asked for a definition of how long some of these plans have been in the works. Both Bonk and Wendorf would like to see a list of who this change would apply to. Ryan said local considerations should be considered. There are changes among staff and administrators that may delay the completion of plans. Suss understands that issue and that some areas may be short staffed and simply haven't been able to complete them in a short time frame. Ryan, should we ask them what the holdup has been? We tell them the plan needs to be updated by a particular date. July 1, 2022. Wendorf is one of the applicants working on a Master Plan and is very close to completion and feels his information is sufficient to meet the new standards. Suss asked for an example of the

changes that is of a higher standard. Czapiewski noted the operations and maintenance update is more stringent.

**Motion** by Suss those applicants that have made continuous progress to complete or update their plan have until July 1, 2022, to complete their plan. At the discretion of the commission.

**Second** by Pierce

**Motion Approved**

### **6.3 Spring Workshop Schedule**

Czapiewski noted we are going to go back to in person meetings for our spring workshops, with one workshop done online. It will be beneficial to be out face to face with our constituents. We will take COVID protocols into consideration of course.

Pierce noted that the Trails Task Force would be a good place to have a workshop.

Wendorf asked if all the workshops would have a virtual component as well. No, but we will have one that will be virtual.

## **7. Items from Members and Letters to the Commission**

*Stoa* – again noted for the record that the Winona paper ran the press release in its entirety about the grant for Winona Bluffs Traverse.

*Engrav* – nothing

*Suss* – Continues to work with the folks in Sibley County. Was in Lake Benton shortly after the Hole in the Mountain Park release was in the newspaper and people were very excited about the park funding.

*Wendorf* – Joe Tart contacted him about doing a Master Plan for Fish Lake Park in Chisago County. They have an old Master Plan that would not meet the current standards. Wendorf suggested he contact Czapiewski for more information and he indicated he will. Springvale Park Master Plan is almost complete. Fat Bike race at Springvale Park is coming up. They usually have 60 riders participate, they come from throughout the region.

*Bonk* – Talked to Otter Tail County Parks about Phelps Mill Park. He does not think they communicated the work they've done with the Historical Society, but that was not included in the application. He expects them to come back in the spring with an improved application.

*Pike* – nothing

*Wolf* – nothing

*Pierce* – nothing

*Foley* - nothing

*Ryan* – good to be back. He's had some family needs that has kept him away.

*Anderson* – still working on the Casey Jones Regional Trail Plan. Looking at trying to get a few counties together to come in for an application for designation for a possible trail from Blue Mounds State Park to Casey Jones Trail and Pipestone. A Commissioner from

Sherburne County is excited to have the Commission visit Big Elk Lake Park during the Commission meeting held there in May.

Suss – noted that Darby Nelson passed away. Wrote “For Love of Lakes” as well as “For Love of a River”. Nelson was very involved in the 25-Year Legacy Plan.

## **8. New Business:**

### **8.1 North Country Trail**

For the Minnesota portion they have long wanted to be designated. We’ve talked to them for some time. Part of the National Park System. Operated by a non-profit association out of Michigan. Matt Davis manages North Dakota, Minnesota, and Michigan. Trail maintenance is done by volunteers. Trail realignment in Itasca County as they want to get them off the Mesabi Trail. We originally thought this would fit under a Supportive Partnership, but they don’t require that type of facility built along the trail. They really need to be able to build, maintain trail. Discussion about how the designation would work, the maintenance agreements that would need to be in place. Discussion about how this trail is similar to the Superior Hiking Trail. Many sections are on road right of way.

### **8.2 Funding Criteria Update**

Several parts to the update that happened. Much of what was done was better aligning the sections so there is less grey area. Suss questioned some of the phrases used in the application and criteria that may not mean something to an application. Example, “completes a regionally significant component of the Master Plan”. Do we have a breakout session at some time in the year to walk everyone through the reasoning of how applications are scored? Czapiewski noted that we did provide the criteria committee an overview of applications we scored both similar and different, to try to help the committee understand our individual scoring. We could certainly do a session for everyone if that would be helpful. Ryan asked if it would be helpful if he (Suss) audited the ETeam process when they’re discussing designations and applications. Anderson noted that the ETeam does not provide scoring for Funding Applications, that is the work of the consultants. Stoa, under Consideration for Funding should we add in #2 “Takes advantage of one time opportunities...” should it be expanded to include “to create a new park or trail or expand or enhance an existing park or trail”? Mattson noted that aspect is somewhat covered in acquisition, but could be clearer there. Pike, is one time opportunities also an ongoing project and if we do not take advantage of something in relation to that project we will lose an opportunity. Versus just having it as a new park. A new facility would be a one time opportunity and all new facilities could be included here. Rather, we should note it’s a one time opportunity and it may be gone, i.e. an acquisition that needs to be acted on now or it will be gone, that type of activity. Not just new development which would occur over time as funding becomes available. Stoa agreed with that assessment that one time opportunities could include the initial land acquisition, not just enhancing or expanding. Czapiewski offered the edit

“one time opportunities to create, expand or enhance a park or trail”. Remove existing.  
Stoa agreed with that edit.

Add to the designation application a note about having SHPO and THPO review the site not so that the paperwork is complete when the funding application is submitted. Should we keep the \$750,000 carve out for CPO in FY24? The likelihood of having an additional \$200,000 any other year for CPO is highly unlikely. Discussion around this topic continued. It was agreed that the \$750,000 to encourage CPO projects will continue in FY24. Pike asked everyone to look at the “Qualified Resolution” language. Is it clear to the applicants this is required? Yes, this is the resolution that needs to be used.

**Motion** by Pike to accept the funding criteria updates as presented, with suggested edits.

**Second** by Engrav

**Motion Approved**

#### *Small Grant Funding Application and Criteria*

The \$212,000 will be split evenly among the six districts, roughly \$35,000 per district. Commissioners will help vet the projects in their district. Discussion about how the vetting would work with the Commissioners doing so much of the decision making about the projects themselves. Much discussion about how this would be an ongoing program rather than a one-time program. Pointed out this is preferred, but not required. Note about not supplant but supplement when using Legacy funds.

**Motion** by Bonk to approve the document but remove the work “direct” from the application.

**Second** by Engrav

**Motion Approved**

### **8.3 2022 Research Projects**

Mountain Bike research for summer 2022.

Winona Bluffs Traverse

Lake County Mountain Bike System

Tioga Recreation Area

**Motion** by Engrav

**Second** by Ryan

**Motion Approved**

#### Campgrounds for summer 2022:

Lyon County Garvin Park

Lyon County Twin Lakes Park

Lincoln County Hole in the Mountain Park

Redwood Falls Ramsey Park

Granite Falls Memorial Park  
Le Sueur County Lake Washington Park  
Redwood County Plum Creek Park

**Motion** by Suss

**Second** by Foley

**Motion Approved**

#### **8.4 Review of 2022 Meeting Locations/PTLAC Meeting Dates**

Mattson handed out the list of 2022 Commission meeting and PTLAC meeting locations and dates. We plan for the Commission meetings to be held in person with a virtual component. All are invited to attend PTLAC meetings if there is an interest. Please review these locations and plan to make the tour of the designated park or trail in that area. There may be overnights for many of you but hearing first hand from those facility manager is very helpful. It's also good information for when a funding application for that facility comes before us.

#### **9. Old Business**

#### **10. Approval of December 2021 and January 2022 Expenses**

December Expenses

Consultants	\$21,051.56
-------------	-------------

January Expenses

Consultants	\$50,116.60	this includes the Parks and Trails Council payment for the survey work.
-------------	-------------	---

Commission	\$1,673.62
------------	------------

**Motion** by Wendorf to approve the expenses for December 2021 and January 2022

**Second** by Bonk

**Motion Approved**

#### **11. Next Meeting and Agenda Items**

No meeting in February. Next meeting will be held on March 23 at the Jay C. Hormel Nature Center in Austin.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:45 pm

**Greater Minnesota Regional Parks and Trails Commission**  
**Director's Report for January 2022**

Partner Meetings

- GMPT article for monthly newsletter
- GMPT Membership Committee
- GMPT Communications Committee
- PTLAC Liaison's Call
- PTLAC Liaison review of PTLAC applicants
- Streetlight Research Updates
- Call with Liaisons and MN State Arts Board

Minnesota State Arts Board

Liaisons with DNR, Met Council and GM had a second exploratory call with Sue Gens from the MN State Arts Board to further discuss a possible working relationship. Previous to the follow up call Liaisons talked in more detail about what could be accomplished in a partnership if not a granting relationship at this time. Ideas being explored and that were discussed with Sue were taking an inventory of existing art in Minnesota parks, Sue has information that can help, and creating a manual that outlines how to care for art in an outdoor setting. Funding for both these initiatives would come out of the Coordinating Among Partners fund and would be a priority for completion in the next year.

St. Louis County Reimbursement Call

Another follow up call with St. Louis County IT staff to work through issues related to the new system for reimbursement. We've been given another grace month to use the old system, hopefully the technology side of things has been resolved. Another call is scheduled for the week of January 24.

Funding Criteria Committee

Along with Joe, working on reviewing and updating the funding criteria for both the current funding application as well as addressing the new CPO Small Grant Fund. Thanks to Commissioners Pierce, Engrav, Foley and Bonk for their work on this committee and the thoughtful review they've done.

Legislative Meetings/Activities

- Emailed all Legacy committee members the PDF of the Policy and Planning Report for 2021, as well as the Legislative Library. Mailed hard copies of the report to all Legacy Committee members.
- Scheduled meetings with Senator Ruud and Representative Lillie for February 2 for Commissioner Anderson and myself. Working to schedule future meetings with Legacy committee members.

### Mountain Bike Trail Count and User Survey

Wrote introductory for survey report and worked with printer to create 3-ring binders with the survey information. 50 copies will be printed and distributed to Commissioners and select legislators. This information will be helpful in supporting the Streetlight Research.

### MN IT / MN Great Outdoors Website

Joined a meeting with MN IT staff and PTLAC staffer Lars Erdahl to discuss updates to the MN Great Outdoors website. The site launched 3-4 years ago and hasn't had any significant updates in that time. We hired Karen Umphress to contact the GM designated facilities to ensure all the information and shape files were updated on the MN Great Outdoors website. The next step is a 2.0 reboot to the site. This work also paid for out of the Coordinate Among Partners Fund.

**GMRPTC**  
**System Plan Coordinators Report**  
**January 2022**

**CPO Small Grant Fund**

The appointed funding committee met to review and improve a proposed announcement, guidelines and applicant resolution for the Connecting People to the Outdoors Small Grant Fund that I drafted. Their proposal will be presented at this month's Commission meeting. The goal of the documents was to keep the program as simple as possible, but also fairly goal oriented. A key consideration for the Commission as you review the documents is the review process for the applications, as well as the goal for distribution of funds among all six districts.

A small project like this is a perfect venue for trying something new. So instead of just a press release, Renee and I have drafted a video script and have asked the committee to star in a 2:30 minute promo that will go out with the project guidelines and application. It seems that a personal appeal may be more effective in expressing what we want than a simple paper announcement, so we thought we'd try it!

**FY24 Funding Application Guidance**

The funding committee also met to review updates to the regular funding application guidelines for FY2024. Their primary direction to me for this draft was to keep everything that worked last year. My contribution was to go through our entire application workflow and streamline the guidance, criteria, and application. The draft we are presenting this month attempts to smooth out language variation and establish clear linkages between our goals and what we are evaluating.

**On-Site Reviews and Technical Assistance**

We did not conduct any formal site visits this past month. A significant amount of time has been spent on a few applications and master plans, as a few facilities are gearing up for this year's funding cycle. The ETeam is conducting a review of the following, which will be brought to you for discussion and approval at your next meeting:

Designation Application 21-019D, Sibley County Henderson Trail  
Designation Application 21-021D, Hubbard County Deep Lake Park  
Master Plan 14-086D, Swift County Appleton OHV Park

This will be the last round of applications and master plans reviewed under the 2015 Strategic Plan criteria, as a policy. Future submissions will be reviewed on a case by case basis as to where they have been at in their development cycle for the appropriate criteria. We hope to have a discussion with you as to what that might mean, as a few other long-lingering Master Plans are moving forward for review this summer.

**Partnerships and Outreach**

I attended a GMPT workshop on DNR grants. Our DNR partners were all there and did a great job highlighting the purpose and goals of each grant opportunity. It was also great to see so many of our local partners exploring other funding sources for their parks and trails projects. There were a few non-designated facilities in attendance as well, which is great to see, as those facilities often don't quite achieve regional status but are still deserving of some form of state funding. Renee and I are also working through a list of statewide and regional outreach partners. We will work with you to further develop and establish regular outreach to those groups over the next couple of meetings.

### **Data Management System Phase V Updates**

There are several components of this phase of DMS development coming together.

The nearly complete survey tool is going to provide us an easier way to update our records as facilities develop over time. It's also a way for us to query our partners about their success in certain areas, or collect user metrics for tracking. It's also going to provide a convenient, easy and new way for funding applicants to submit regular reports on their project progress. I'm sure we'll find other uses for this tool as well.

We are testing the re-alignment of the Master Plan portal that corresponds with the updated Strategic Plan Section IV Content Standards. Our consultants at Full Circle Group are also making progress on creating the Track 2 evaluation structure in the ETeam portal. The final step in that process will be aligning the designation application and all export/report functions to match the updates. Once that is done, we'll be in a position to train the ETeam on the new system and begin evaluating applications and master plans as they are received.

### **Contract Projects**

Our GIS and Landscape Architecture consultant, Jillian Reiner, has recently left the company she worked for, Hagstrom Engineering. Luckily for us, Jillian is now working independently and will be staying with us in her role. A new contract is required for her to continue her work for the Commission, which has been busy lately updating GIS records and creating regional context analysis maps for new Designation Applications. That contract proposal is on this month's agenda.

**Greater Minnesota Regional Parks and Trails Commission**  
**Director's Report for February 2022**

Partner Meetings

- GMPT article for monthly newsletter
- GMPT Membership Committee
- GMPT Legislative Action Day Presentation
- PTLAC Liaison's Call
- PTLAC February Committee Meeting
- Streetlight Research Updates

Mountain Bike Design Standards Update

This well delayed project is back on track and the draft will be ready for committee review in the next week or two. Because it's been so long since we contracted for this work (spring 2019) many of you won't be familiar with the project.

We issued an RFP and hired Rock Solid Contracting to write a mountain bike design and construction standards manual geared to people with no or little experience building mountain bike trails. After a great start and two committee reviews the project ground to a halt in 2020, gained ground for a time in 2021 and will now finally be complete.

The author is excellent, but work commitments at Rock Solid followed by a series of health problems created this delay. The author will be leaving Rock Solid after he completes this project and the company has told me we will not be billed beyond the last invoice which was paid in October 2019. The original cost was estimated at \$35,200 and we've paid \$15,048.32. The savings is obviously significant, and we can direct the savings toward printing costs. They have also provided a designer to create the final version which was an expense we had expected to pay.

I think in the end we have a useful resource for trail building and construction standards and it will be extremely helpful to anyone looking to build a mountain bike trail or system.

Fiscal Year 2023 DNR Grant Applications

I worked with the DNR grant managers to get information out to our FY23 grantees so they are ready for the DNR application process. With delays at SHPO getting an early start on the process will help. The FY22 holdover funds were directed to Sherburne County Big Elk Lake Park acquisition and the Wright County Stanley Eddy Park acquisition, as well as a portion of the Beaver Island Trail project. The acquisition projects will be able to access their funding as soon as the applications with the DNR are complete.

Legislative Meetings/Activities

On February 2 Commissioner Anderson and I met with Rep. Lillie and Senator Ruud to talk about the Commission activities in 2021 and thank them for their support. We were able to meet with Rep. Lillie in person for an hour, which was much longer than expected and very

beneficial. He was complimentary of the work we do, loved the Policy and Planning Report for 2021 and was really interested in the Mountain Bike Research report.

The meeting with Senator Ruud was virtual as she was not at the capital that day, but again, was very beneficial and it's good to be able to report on the work we're doing.

The Parks and Trails Legacy partners testified in Rep. Lillie's committee on February 23. We were scheduled for 15 minutes of testimony for all three partners and 20 minutes of Q&A. We ended up with almost an hour of the committee's time. There were a number of questions and it's always good to have the opportunity to interact with the Committee. This year not being a budget year we focused on sharing stories about how the funds are used, backed up with pictures of people enjoying our parks and trails.

We haven't been scheduled yet for Senator Ruud's committee but I would expect we'll be slated for a presentation in the near future.

#### *Mountain Bike Research RFP*

The 2022 Mountain Bike Research RFP was updated and published. Response deadline is March 11.

#### *PTLAC Liaisons Joint Project*

As mentioned in previous reports, the PTLAC Liaisons continue to meet with Sue Gens at the Minnesota State Arts Board to discuss a possible joint grant project in the future. While those discussions continue, we (liaisons) are working with the Forecast Group to inventory public art across the three systems and develop a maintenance guide for outdoor art installations.

Forecast is a nonprofit organization for artists working in public spaces. They have a robust slate of training opportunities that we may utilize in a future project, but we want to start with the basics and build into that. The work they do will be paid for out of the Coordination Among Partners Fund.

#### *Minnesota Council on Disability*

The Governor's Director of Boards and Commissions connected me with David Dively, the Executive Director of the Minnesota Council on Disability. David and I discussed the possibility of finding someone to represent the disability community on the Commission from District 2. He's been sent the information about what comprises District 2 and what the time commitments would be.

#### *Appleton OHV Site Visit*

Joe and I had a very informative, and rather chilly site visit to Appleton to visit the OHV park which is seeking designation. It's a large park and the Master Plan, once implemented, will be a huge benefit for the area.

**GMRPTC**  
**System Plan Coordinators Report**  
**February 2022**

**CPO Small Grant Fund**

The CPO Small Grant Fund application and materials were finalized and released on February 1. We've already had one contact from a potential applicant about a multi-agency collaborative project. As the date comes closer, we expect to hear from more applicants. Additional marketing will be completed by the end of the month.

**FY24 Funding Application**

Now that the FY24 Funding Application Guidelines and Criteria has been completed and approved, we are working on updating the rest of the material in the Application Toolbox. In addition to refreshing our document look with a new header that matches our Strategic Plan, we will be updating our content/instructions document, resolution form and launching a new tutorial video sometime in March. We know several applicants who are already working on their project application materials, including some relatively new folks.

**On-Site Reviews and Technical Assistance**

The ETeam has completed a review meeting on the following, which will be brought to you for discussion and approval at your next meeting:

Designation Application 21-019D, Sibley County Henderson Trail

Designation Application 21-021D, Hubbard County Deep Lake Park

Master Plan 14-086D, Swift County Appleton OHV Park

Renee and I are conducting the site visit for the Appleton OHV Park later this week. Both Hubbard and Henderson have stayed in touch with us, as they are working hard on completing their Master Plans in time to apply for funding this cycle. While we can't give them any official guidance from the evaluation process until you approve it, I did give them some "tips" based on ETeam feedback that can be useful to their planning processes.

Other facilities that are working on applications or master plans that have reached out to us recently include the Great Northern Trail, The Waabizheshikana Trail in Duluth, the Northland Arboretum in Brainerd, the Northfield park, and the North Country Trail.

**Partnerships and Outreach**

Most of our marketing this month has related to Mountain Bike trails, particularly the report from last summer's survey and the Request for Proposals for this coming summer's round of surveys. This has provided a great reason to reach out to many of our consultant partners, as well as other facilities that feature mountain bike trails in their parks.

**Data Management System Phase V Updates**

Building on last month's report, we continue to make great progress on our DMS updates. The Master Plan realignment with the Strategic Plan is nearly done with testing, and the design for the Track 2 ETeam evaluation is nearly complete and ready for testing. We are also doing updates to the Designation Application and Administrative review panels for the Designation Application and Master Plan to match everything, as well as updating the exports for all of these tools. It's a lot of parts, but has been going fairly smoothly with the system we have in place to manage it. The survey tool document will also be ready soon, hopefully this week.