

### 2020-21 Snowmobile Funding Summary

<u>Category</u>	<u>To Be Updated...</u>	<u>Amount Requested</u>	<u>Amount Funded</u>	<u>Balance</u>
Funds Available	\$ 9,000,000			\$ 9,000,000
Maintenance	(18,528 @ \$300/mile)	\$ 5,700,264	\$ 5,700,264	\$ 3,299,736
Club Signs		\$ -		\$ 3,299,736
Storm Damage		\$ 50,826	\$ 50,827	\$ 3,137,608
Cost Increase Requests		\$ 111,301	\$ 111,301	\$ 3,188,435
Snow Bridge Rehab		\$ 1,170,877	\$ -	\$ 3,299,736
Snow Trail Rehab		\$ 55,744	\$ -	\$ 3,299,736
Snow Relocation Mandatory		\$ 226,127	\$ -	\$ 3,299,736
Snow Relocation Discretionary		\$ 144,085	\$ -	\$ 3,299,736
Snow Bridge New		\$ 288,260	\$ -	\$ 3,299,736
New Miles	(715 @ \$300/mile)	\$ 242,500	\$ -	\$ 3,299,736
Snow Acquisition		\$ 17,900	\$ -	\$ 3,299,736
Snow Non-Trail Development		\$ 13,347		\$ 3,299,736
Supplemental Transfer				\$ 3,299,736
				\$ 3,299,736
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 8,021,231</b>	<b>\$ 5,862,392</b>	

Prelim. Supplemental (10-20): NOT AVAILABLE

2018-19 Supplemental Final: \$ 3,438,188.62

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE STORM DAMAGE REQUESTS

Region	County	Description	Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Comments
<b>#90</b>	WCR La Crosse	Trail repair, culvert replacement on several trails damaged in storms in Fall of 2019. Submitted and reviewed in February, but deferred pending additional information. Revised info provided for this request.	Misc	\$40,322	\$40,322	\$40,322	Motion to recommend funding by Sam, 2nd by Mike, passed unanimously.
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>			After Cost Share: <b>\$40,322</b>		
		<b>Yes or No:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> No				<b>Amount:</b> <input type="text"/>	
		Gov Declared Emergency? <b>NO</b>					
FEMA Eligible? <input type="checkbox"/> No		FEMA Applied For? <input type="checkbox"/> No		\$40,322			
<b>#91</b>	WCR Adams	Bridge approach and abutment, a corner along a hillside and a large bend in the creek washed out on Corridor 21, and a small culvert was lost. Damage in March, Gov. declared #16, repairs completed in December.	Bridges Culverts Equip & Labor Other	\$10,505	\$10,505	\$10,505	Motion to recommend funding by Andy, 2nd by Lee, passed unanimously.
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>			After Cost Share: <b>\$10,505</b>		
		<b>Yes or No:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>				<b>Amount:</b> <input type="text"/>	
		Gov Declared Emergency? <b>YES</b>					
FEMA Eligible? <input type="checkbox"/>		FEMA Applied For? <input type="checkbox"/>		\$10,505			
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$50,826</b>	<b>\$50,827</b>	

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE COST INCREASE REQUESTS

Region	County		New/Increase Component	New Costs	Total	Approved	Comments
<b>#95</b>	Polk	Polk County is seeking additional funding to complete the Cattail Bridge in the City of Amery. The project is grants S-5409 and ATV-4096.	<b>NEW EXPENSES</b>		\$37,502	\$18,751	Motion to recommend funding by Dale, 2nd by Andy, passed unanimously.
			materials	\$32,502	After Cost Share:		
			engineering	\$5,000	<b>\$18,751</b>		
			Other funds received, requested, or committed?				
			Yes or No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> yes	Amount: <b>\$ 18,751</b>			
<b>Original Grant #</b>	<b>S-5409</b>	<b>Funding Category</b>	<b>Bridge</b>				
<b>Previous Grant Amt</b>	<b>\$31,298</b>	<b>New Grant Amt (After)</b>		<b>\$50,049</b>	\$18,751		
<b>#96</b>	Forest	Cost increase request for <b>\$92,550</b> for Camp 8 Bridge Replacement on the Nicolet State Trail incoming. Original cost estimate was provided by previous trail manager but was based on linear foot estimates for structure and failed to include installation, site prep, etc. County also has funding from ATV (with a pending increase request) and RTP (capped at max grant amt).	<b>OVERALL BUDGET</b>		\$467,099	\$92,550	Motion to recommend funding by Dave, 2nd by Dale, passed unanimously.
			Structure	\$211,710	After Cost Share:		
			Site Prep	\$51,177	<b>\$211,049</b>		
			engineering	\$80,300			
			materials	\$5,763			
Misc	\$8,049						
Project Manage	\$74,000						
Remove Old St	\$36,100						
Other funds received, requested, or committed?							
Yes or No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	Amount: <b>256,050</b>						
<b>Original Grant #</b>	<b>S-5314</b>	<b>Funding Category</b>	<b>Rehab</b>				
<b>Prev Grant Amt</b>	<b>\$ 118,500.00</b>	<b>New Grant Amt (After)</b>		<b>\$211,050</b>	\$92,550		
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$111,301</b>	<b>\$111,301</b>	

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE BRIDGE REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County		Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Q & A
<b>#1</b>	Green Lake	Green Lake County proposes to rehab an existing bridge that has failed. The project consists of moving two 'I' beams and adding another in addition to new decking and railing. <b>Revised cost estimate will be submitted after engineering consultation.</b>	*Structure	\$4,550	\$7,730		Is this a funded trail? <b>Yes.</b> 12k bridge but have a 25k groomer? Recommend longitudinal wear deck, not just perpendicular decking. Bridge permitted? Upstream & downstream pix?
		Engineer					
		Permits					
		Site prep					
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b> No <b>Amount:</b>							
Variance or Exception?		Public or Private: private	Bridge Inventory #:				
		Old Culvert Size: 12' X 25'	New Culvert Size: 12' X 25'				
		Water Body: Grand River trib	Labor Source: contractor				
		Years in System: 18	Design Weight Load: 25000?	# of New Mi	0	\$7,730	
<b>#2</b>	Waupaca	Waupaca County is proposing to rehab the decking, railing and support beams on an old railroad bridge on the Tomorrow River State Trail.	*Structure	\$6,000	\$54,000		Does Co have MOU with DNR Parks? Easement that includes maintenance responsibilities dated 1999. Upstream, downstream pix?
		Engineer					
		Permits					
		Site prep					
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b> No <b>Amount:</b>							
Variance or Exception?		Public or Private: Public	Bridge Inventory #: 39				
		Old Bridge Size: 45' X 12'	New Bridge Size: 45' X 12'				
		Water Body: Spring Creek	Labor Source: contractor				
		Years in System: 15+	Design Weight Load: 25,000	# of New Mi	0	\$54,000	
<b>#3</b>	Calumet	Calumet County proposes to replace bridge Calumet-2 over Plum Creek on the Friendship State Trail. <b>Applied for RTP.</b>	*Structure	\$500	\$27,200		Does Co have MOU with DNR Parks? Upstream, downstream pix?
		Engineer					
		Permits					
		Site prep					
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b> yes <b>Amount:</b> 13600							
Variance or Exception?		Public or Private: public	Bridge Inventory #: Culvert-2				
		Old Bridge Size: 12' X 15'	New Bridge Size: 12' X 24'				
		Water Body: Plum Creek	Labor Source: contractor				
		Years in System: 50	Design Weight Load: 25,000	# of New Mi	0	\$13,600	

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE BRIDGE REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County		Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Q & A	
<b>#4</b>	Calumet	Calumet County proposes to replace a bridge on Trail 3-6 that failed in 2014. The current reroute is not a good alternative.	*Structure	\$25,800	\$32,600 After Cost Share: <b>\$32,600</b>		<i>Is this a funded trail? Why different bridge lengths, will this be clearspan?</i>	
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>		Engineer				
		<b>Yes or No:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>		Permits				
		<b>Amount:</b> <input type="text"/>		Site prep				
Variance or Exception?		Public or Private: public	Bridge Inventory #:					
		Old Bridge Size: 12' X 26'	New Bridge Size: 12' X 32'					
		Water Body: unnamed	Labor Source: contractor					
		Years in System: 20	Design Weight Load: 25,000					
			Culverts					
			Riprap					
			Labor	\$6,000				
			Equip Rental					
			delivery	\$800				
			# of New Mi	0	\$32,600			
<b>#5</b>	Calumet	Calumet County proposes to replace the concrete Kiel Culvert-1 on trail 6-8 with a plastic culvert. The collapsed culvert has a temporary patch.	*Structure	\$350	\$1,350 After Cost Share: <b>\$1,350</b>		<i>Funded trail? Why not using mainteannce? Plastic culverts should have 12" coverage, will they? If not, consider elliptical culvert?</i>	
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>		Engineer				
		<b>Yes or No:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>		Permits				
		<b>Amount:</b> <input type="text"/>		Site prep				
Variance or Exception?		Public or Private: private	Bridge Inventory #:					
		Old Bridge Size: 24" X 20'	New Bridge Size: 24" X 20'					
		Water Body: drainage ditch	Labor Source: contractor					
		Years in System:	Design Weight Load: 25,000					
			Culverts					
			Riprap					
			Labor	\$750				
			Equip Rental					
			Other					
			# of New Mi	0	\$1,350			
<b>#6</b>	Calumet	Calumet County proposes to replace an undersized steel Culvert- 2 with a plastic culvert on Trail 6-8.	*Structure	\$350	\$1,350 After Cost Share: <b>\$1,350</b>		<i>Funded trail? Why not using mainteannce? Plastic culverts should have 12" coverage on top, will they?</i>	
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>		Engineer				
		<b>Yes or No:</b> <input type="checkbox"/>		Permits				
		<b>Amount:</b> <input type="text"/>		Site prep				
Variance or Exception?		Public or Private: private	Bridge Inventory #:					
		Old Bridge Size: 12" by 8'	New Bridge Size: 24" X 20'					
		Water Body: drainage ditch	Labor Source: contractor					
		Years in System:	Design Weight Load: 25,000					
			Culverts					
			Riprap					
			Labor	\$750				
			Equip Rental					
			wetland delin.					
			# of New Mi	0	\$1,350			

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE BRIDGE REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County		Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Q & A
<b>#7</b>	Oneida	Oneida County proposes to replace an older, undersized bridge with a new bridge (Gilmore Creek Bridge). The existing bridge is believed to be over 30+ years old. The bridge is undersized for the length of crossing needed and has had a wooden extension put on. However, the extension is rated at only 5,000 lbs at best. Given the age of the overall structure, the County proposes to replace it with a new bridge, rated for 25,000 lbs, and salvage the parts for other crossings.	*Structure	\$64,700	\$140,050 After Cost Share: <b>\$140,050</b>		<i>Is bridge failing, or attempting to accomidate a groomer? Were the extensions grant funded? Was original construction grant funded? Do not place salvaged bridge on snowmobile trails, not suitable.</i>
		Engineer	\$2,000				
		Permits					
		Site prep	\$5,000				
Materials							
Abutments	\$14,900						
Pilings/Piers	\$12,000						
Approaches	\$6,125						
Culverts							
Riprap	\$2,000						
Labor	\$30,000						
Equip Rental							
Other	\$3,325						
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b>			<b>No</b>	<b>Amount:</b>			
Public or Private:		Public	Bridge Inventory #:	<b>Oneida-10</b>			
Variance or Exception?	Old Bridge Size: 42		New Bridge Size: 65				
	Water Body: Gilmore Creek		Labor Source: <b>Contract</b>				
	Years in System: 32		Design Weight Load: <b>25,000</b>				
					<b># of New Mi</b>	0	\$140,050
<b>#8</b>	Taylor	Taylor County proposes to replace the decking and railings on the Pine Line Bridge #4 on the Pine Line Trail. This multi-use bridge is open to snowmobile, winter ATV and summer silent sports. The bridge last received grant funding in 1989. Taylor County has submitted an application for RTP funds for 50% costs, as well as to the ATV program for 25% of the remaining costs. RTP and ATV SHARE NOT YET CONFIRMED.	*Structure		\$8,397 After Cost Share: <b>\$3,149</b>		<i>Is it possible to expand the interior width to 12'?</i>
		Engineer	\$297				
		Permits					
		Site prep					
Materials	\$4,725						
Abutments							
Pilings/Piers							
Approaches							
Culverts							
Riprap							
Labor	\$2,430						
Equip Rental	\$945						
Other							
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b>			<b>Yes</b>	<b>Amount:</b>	<b>5248.5</b>		
Public or Private:		Public	Bridge Inventory #:	PL 4			
Variance or Exception?	Old Bridge Size: 27		New Bridge Size:				
	Water Body: Unnamed		Labor Source: <b>Contract</b>				
	Years in System: 31		Design Weight Load:				
					<b># of New Mi</b>	0	\$3,149
<b>#9</b>	Taylor	Taylor County proposes to replace the decking and railings on the Pine Line Bridge #5 on the Pine Line Trail. This multi-use bridge is open to snowmobile, winter ATV and summer silent sports. The bridge last received grant funding in 1989. Taylor County has submitted an application for RTP funds for 50% costs, as well as to the ATV program for 25% of the remaining costs. RTP and ATV SHARE NOT YET CONFIRMED.	*Structure		\$17,105 After Cost Share: <b>\$6,415</b>		<i>Is it possible to expand the interior width to 12'?</i>
		Engineer	\$605				
		Permits					
		Site prep					
Materials	\$9,625						
Abutments							
Pilings/Piers							
Approaches							
Culverts							
Riprap							
Labor	\$4,950						
Equip Rental	\$1,925						
bridge removal							
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b>			<b>Yes</b>	<b>Amount:</b>	<b>10690.5</b>		
Public or Private:		Public	Bridge Inventory #:	<b>PL 5</b>			
Variance or Exception?	Old Bridge Size: 55		New Bridge Size:				
	Water Body: Unnamed		Labor Source: <b>Contract</b>				
	Years in System: 31		Design Weight Load:				
					<b># of New Mi</b>	0	\$6,415

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE BRIDGE REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County		Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Q & A
<b>#10</b>	NOR-R Langlade	Langlade County proposes to replace an undersized culvert to address trail flooding issues. Culvert was installed in 1965 and is no longer able to handle water flows at all times of the year. It is also too short for the trail surface. Trail is used by snowmobilers and winter ATVs. County has applied for RTP funds for 50% of the costs, remaindersplit between Snow and ATV. RTP and ATV SHARE NOT YET CONFIRMED.	*Structure	\$10,358	\$43,395 After Cost Share: <b>\$10,849</b>		Photos needed. Fill out Page 3 of application (Appendix A) for bridges rather than trails.
		Engineer					
		Permits	\$400				
		Site prep					
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b> Yes <b>Amount:</b> 32546							
Public or Private: Public Bridge Inventory #: 32546			Riprap	\$3,000			
Old Bridge Size: 117"x79"x45'			Labor	\$27,484			
Water Body: Eau Claire River Labor Source: Contract			Equip Rental				
Years in System: 55 Design Weight Load:			Other				
			# of New Mi	0	\$10,849		
<b>#11</b>	NOR-R Iron	Iron County proposes a rehab project for the "Ledvina's Bridge" on Trail 12 over Swamp Creek. Project will include rebuilding the north approach ramp (12'x30'), redecking and replacing railings on the bridge (12'x38') and the north approach. The south approach was replaced with maint. funds in 2016. Winter only trail and the bridge is located on private property. County has maintained land use agreements for this trail for over 30 years.	*Structure	\$4,825	\$30,614 After Cost Share: <b>\$30,614</b>		Need LUA info, and more photos (Upstream, downstream, bridge). Can ATV cost share? No, not open to ATVs
		Engineer	\$125				
		Permits					
		Site prep	\$300				
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b> No <b>Amount:</b>							
Public or Private: Private Bridge Inventory #: Ref# 7			Labor	\$6,919			
Old Bridge Size: 12'x38' New Bridge Size:			Equip Rental	\$3,911			
Water Body: Swamp Creek Labor Source: Force			Other	\$2,300			
Years in System: Design Weight Load: 25,000			# of New Mi	0	\$30,614		
<b>#13</b>	WC Dunn	A 5' culvert has been present for about 20 years allowing crossing an unnamed stream that is a tributary to the Red Cedar River. The stream is very flashy and the county suspects the culvert is restricting water flow during heavy rain events causing erosion on the downstream side of the culvert. Due to the area being a wetland replacing the culvert is not an option. A bridge (Waldbuesser) is proposed to replace the culvert.	*Structure	\$27,000	\$40,000 After Cost Share: <b>\$40,000</b>		Why such a long bridge replacing a culvert? (need to span wetlands?)
		Engineer	\$3,000				
		Permits					
		Site prep	\$1,000				
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b> No <b>Amount:</b>							
Public or Private: Private Bridge Inventory #:			Riprap	\$2,000			
Old Culvert Size: 5' New Bridge Size: 12'x 30'			Labor	\$5,000			
Water Body: Unnamed tributa Labor Source:			Equip Rental				
Years in System: 20+ Design Weight Load: 25,000			Other				
			# of New Mi	0	\$40,000		





## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE BRIDGE REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County		Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Q & A
<b>#17</b>	Dunn	<p>Neubauer #20 is over a tributary to the Middle Branch of Gilbert Creek. The 40" X 48" made up of wooden pallets. There was an accident at this site this past year.</p>	*Structure	\$27,000	\$40,000 After Cost Share: <b>\$40,000</b>		<p><i>Could a culvert be used instead? Narrative indicates 50' bridge but quote is for 30', what is the plan?</i></p>
			Engineer	\$3,000			
			Permits				
			Site prep	\$1,000			
			Materials				
Abutments	\$2,000						
Pilings/Piers							
Approaches							
Culverts							
Riprap	\$2,000						
Labor	\$5,000						
Equip Rental							
Other							
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b>			<b>Amount:</b>				
Public or Private: Private		Bridge Inventory #: 20					
Variance or Exception?	Old Bridge Size: 40" x 48"		New Bridge Size: 12' x 50'				
	Water Body: Unnamed tributa		Labor Source:				
	Years in System: Unknown		Design Weight Load: 25,000				
					# of New Mi	0	\$40,000
<b>#18</b>	Pierce	<p>County proposes to remove and replace the decking/railings on the Burkhardt Creek #9 bridge near Spring Valley. I discussed with the coordinator replacing the bridge, he said the bridge structure is sound and just needs new decking and railing. He was reminded it would be 10 years before they could ask for another grant for this bridge. This is their choice at this time. He did send photos of underneath the structure.</p>	*Structure		\$5,000 After Cost Share: <b>\$5,000</b>		<p><i>Able to use maint.? Load limit is 12k but groomer is 15.5k? What work is the \$50/hr admin for? Is a chain link fence suitable? Provide cost estimate for wood railings. 12' interior width? Recommend wear deck.</i></p>
			Engineer				
			Permits				
			Site prep				
			Materials	\$5,000			
Abutments							
Pilings/Piers							
Approaches							
Culverts							
Riprap							
Labor							
Equip Rental							
wetland delin.							
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b>			<b>Amount:</b>				
Public or Private: private		Bridge Inventory #: 9					
Variance or Exception?	Old Bridge Size: 11.5' x 40'		New Bridge Size:				
	Water Body: Burkhardt Creek		Labor Source: Club				
	Years in System: 34		Design Weight Load: 15,500				
					# of New Mi	0	\$5,000
<b>#19</b>	Trempealeau	<p>This bridge in Arcadia is rather unique. It is on the golf course and was built originally for golf cart traffic. It has become a part of the snowmobile trail that runs through Arcadia. The plan is to replace this bridge with a 25,000 lb bridge that both the golf course and the club would use and jointly maintain. <b>Needs 2nd quote.</b></p>	*Structure	\$54,000	\$77,000 After Cost Share: <b>\$77,000</b>		<p><i>Lots of missing info. LUA? Need 2nd quote. Will golf course contribute to the cost? Is the bridge safe and sound for snowmobiles? Is replacement only needed to accommodate groomer?</i></p>
			Engineer	\$3,000			
			Permits				
			Site prep	\$1,000			
			Materials				
Abutments	\$12,000						
Pilings/Piers							
Approaches							
Culverts							
Riprap	\$2,000						
Labor	\$5,000						
Equip Rental							
Other							
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>							
<b>Yes or No:</b>			<b>Amount:</b>				
Public or Private: Private		Bridge Inventory #: 12' x 60'					
Variance or Exception?	Old Bridge Size:		New Bridge Size:				
	Water Body:		Labor Source:				
	Years in System:		Design Weight Load: 25,000				
					# of New Mi	0	\$77,000

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE BRIDGE REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County		Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Q & A	
<b>#20</b>	NOR-S Douglas	Douglas County proposes to replace three culverts on the Wild River Trail. The project will be split between snowmobile and ATV. Wild River Trail Culvert Replacement	*Structure	\$21,070	\$21,070 After Cost Share: <b>\$10,535</b>		<i>What was the 2019 grant for? What is causing the failure, will new culverts just fail &amp; trail wash out quickly again?</i>	
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>		Engineer				
		<b>Yes or No:</b>	yes	<b>Amount:</b>				10535
		Public or Private:	public	Bridge Inventory #:				
Variance or Exception?		Old Culvert Size:	New Culvert Size:	Riprap				
		Water Body:	Labor Source:	Labor				
		Years in System:	Design Weight Load:	Equip Rental				
				Other				
			# of New Mi	0	\$10,535			
<b>#21</b>	NOR-S Barron	Barron County proposes to replace 3 failing culverts and add 1 additional culvert on Trail 18. <b>Trail 18 Culverts</b>	*Structure		\$9,648 After Cost Share: <b>\$9,648</b>		<i>Recommend 20' culvert. What were the old culvert sizes?</i>	
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>		Engineer				
		<b>Yes or No:</b>	no	<b>Amount:</b>				
		Public or Private:	private	Bridge Inventory #:				
Variance or Exception?		Old Bridge Size:	New Bridge Size:	Materials	\$3,600			
		Water Body:	Labor Source:	Abutments				
		Years in System:	Design Weight Load:	Pilings/Piers				
				Approaches				
			Culverts	\$4,000				
			Riprap					
			Labor	\$512				
			Equip Rental	\$1,536				
			Other					
			# of New Mi	0	\$9,648			
<b>#22</b>	NOR-S Burnett	Burnett County proposes to replace a boardwalk bridge that has frost heaved and shifted since it was built in 2007. A new design will be incorporated to prevent the frost damage. <b>This project is proposed to be split between RTP and ATV.</b>	*Structure	\$150,000	\$152,500 After Cost Share: <b>\$53,750</b>		<i>Make sure pilings are below the frost line.</i>	
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>		Engineer				
		<b>Yes or No:</b>	yes	<b>Amount:</b>				98750
		Public or Private:	public	Bridge Inventory #:				17
Variance or Exception?		Old Bridge Size:	New Bridge Size:	Materials	\$2,500			
		Water Body:	Labor Source:	Abutments				
		Years in System:	Design Weight Load:	Pilings/Piers				
				Approaches				
			Culverts					
			Riprap					
			Labor					
			Equip Rental					
			bridge removal					
			# of New Mi	0	\$53,750			



## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE BRIDGE REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County		Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Q & A	
<b>#26</b>	Columbia	Rowan Creek Bridge Replacement - Replace the existing failing bridge to accommodate the new GVW requirements. This bridge covers Rowan Creek, the main structure is deteriorating and does not comply with the new guidelines. The only other alternate route would be the highway to go around the bridge being unusable.	*Structure	\$77,500	\$77,500		<i>2nd quote? Is this the installed price? Is bridge actually failing or is application just to bring it up to 25K?</i>	
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>		Engineer				After Cost Share:
		<b>Yes or No:</b>	No	<b>Amount:</b>				<b>\$77,500</b>
		Public or Private:	Public	Bridge Inventory #:				
Variance or Exception?		Old Culvert Size:		New Culvert Size:				
		Water Body:	Rowan Creek	Labor Source:				
		Years in System:	30	Design Weight Load:	28,000			
<b>#27</b>	Dane	Dane County proposes replacing the MTV 7 - Martinson Spring Valley Bridge. Current bridge is over an unnamed ditch adjacent to Spring Valley Creek on State Corridor #21 in Green County. Dane County has asked that the bridge be removed and abandoned. Recent flooding has compromised the stream banks and the structure and footings have deteriorated to the point of being unuseable	*Structure	\$38,700	\$38,700		<i>2nd quote? LUA needed.</i>	
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>		Engineer				After Cost Share:
		<b>Yes or No:</b>		<b>Amount:</b>				<b>\$38,700</b>
		Public or Private:	Private	Bridge Inventory #:	Dane 13			
Variance or Exception?		Old Bridge Size:	12.5x25	New Bridge Size:	12x30			
		Water Body:	Spring Valley	Labor Source:				
		Years in System:	20	Design Weight Load:	25,000			
<b>#28</b>	Dane	Dane County proposes replacing the MTV 9 - Spring Valley Creek Bridge. Current bridge is over Spring Valley Creek on State Corridor #21 in Green County. Dane County has asked that the bridge be removed and abandoned. Recent flooding has compromised the stream banks and the structure and footings have deteriorated to the point of being unuseable	*Structure	\$50,600	\$50,600		<i>No questions</i>	
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>		Engineer				After Cost Share:
		<b>Yes or No:</b>		<b>Amount:</b>				<b>\$50,600</b>
		Public or Private:	Private	Bridge Inventory #:	Dane 15			
Variance or Exception?		Old Bridge Size:	12X31	New Bridge Size:	12X40			
		Water Body:	Spring Valley	Labor Source:				
		Years in System:	20	Design Weight Load:	25,000			

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE BRIDGE REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County		Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Q & A		
<b>#29</b>	SCR	Dane	Dane County proposes replacing the MTV 11 - Brewery ditch Bridge. Current bridge is over an unnamed ditch on State Corridor #21 in Green County. Dane County has asked that the bridge be removed and abandoned. Recent flooding has compromised the stream banks and the structure and footings have deteriorated to the point of being unuseable	*Structure Engineer Permits Site prep Materials Abutments Pilings/Piers Approaches Culverts Riprap Labor Equip Rental Other	\$45,700	\$45,700 After Cost Share: <b>\$45,700</b>		No questions	
			<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>						
			<b>Yes or No:</b>	<b>Amount:</b>					
	Variance or Exception?	Public or Private: Private	Bridge Inventory #: Dane 17	Old Bridge Size: 12x24	New Bridge Size: 12x34	Water Body: n/a	Labor Source:		Years in System:
				# of New Mi	0	\$45,700			
<b>#30</b>	SCR	Jefferson	Watertown airport trail bridge replacement. Club built bridge washed out in 2019 and will be replaced with a new club built bridge of slightly longer span. <b>(NOTE - Grants can only be awarded for bridges with stamped, engineered plans. In order to receive grant funds, that will be a requirement of the new structure, so budget and scope may need to change to remain eligible for grant funds).</b>	*Structure Engineer Permits Site prep Materials Abutments Pilings/Piers Approaches Culverts Riprap Labor Equip Rental Other	\$20,000	\$20,000 After Cost Share: <b>\$20,000</b>		Not eligible as a club built new construction. New proposal, estimates needed with engineered bridge.	
			<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>						
			<b>Yes or No:</b>	<b>Amount:</b>					
	Variance or Exception?	Public or Private: Public	Bridge Inventory #: 8x16	Old Bridge Size: 8x14	New Bridge Size: 8x16	Water Body: n/a	Labor Source:		Years in System: 15+
				# of New Mi	0	\$20,000			
<b>#31</b>	WCR	Wood	Request to replace a failing railroad bridge that has been repurposed for snowmobile use. New bridge will be steel span. <b>DQ Farms</b>	*Structure Engineer Permits Site prep Materials Abutments Pilings/Piers Approaches Culverts Riprap Labor Equip Rental Other	\$79,900  \$11,900  \$1,125  \$56,975	\$149,900 After Cost Share: <b>\$149,900</b>		2nd quote? Length of LUA? Check with county zoning?	
			<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>						
			<b>Yes or No:</b>	<b>Amount:</b>					
	Variance or Exception?	Public or Private: Private	Bridge Inventory #: 12x75	Old Bridge Size: 12x65	New Bridge Size: 12x75	Water Body: Hemlock Creek	Labor Source:		Years in System: 50+
				# of New Mi	0	\$149,900			

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE BRIDGE REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County		Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Q & A
WCR	Wood	Request to repair/rehab the abutment on the north end of the bridge of the East Ford of the Yellow River. Abutment is washing out and needs to be shored up. - <b>Needs estimates, etc</b>	*Structure		\$25,000		<i>LUA? Need pictures. Contact county zoning?</i>
<b>#32</b>			Engineer		After Cost Share:		
			Permits		<b>\$25,000</b>		
			Site prep				
			Materials				
			Abutments				
			Pilings/Piers				
			Approaches				
			Culverts				
			Riprap				
			Labor				
			Equip Rental				
			Other	\$25,000			
			# of New Mi	0	\$25,000		
			<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$1,170,877</b>	
						<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE TRAIL REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County	Description	Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Comments	
<b>#33</b>	Oneida	Oneida County proposes to rehab a portion of Trail 5 west of the Willow Flowage in the Town of Lynne, that crosses over the Willow Spillway coming out of Willow Lake. This trail portion was last rehabbed in 2002-03, where rock was added to the spillway trail. Over time and use, this rock has washed away, creating a deeper depth that does not freeze over in winter. This project would add rock to approximately 225 feet of existing trail to raise the depth and allow freezing in winter. The County has applied for RTP funds for half the project costs.	*Structure		\$25,800		<i>Breaker run seems expensive - why so high? Will this solve the problem?</i>	
			Engineer			After Cost Share:		
			Permits			<b>\$12,900</b>		
			Site prep					
			Materials	\$18,249				
			Abutments					
			Pilings/Piers					
			Approaches					
			Culverts					
			Riprap					
			Labor	\$7,551				
			Equip Rental					
			Other					
			# of New Mi	0		\$12,900		
			<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>					
			<b>Yes or No:</b>	Yes				
				<b>Amount:</b>	<b>12900</b>			
			Public or Private:	Public				
			Old Bridge Size:					
			Water Body:	Willow River				
			Years in System:					
			Bridge Inventory #:					
			New Bridge Size:					
			Labor Source:					
			Design Weight Load:					
<b>#34</b>	Oneida	Oneida County proposes to rehab a portion of NWP Trail 8 in the Town of Woodboro. Due to poor drainage and wetlands, as well as warmer winter temperatures, a 20-ft stretch of the trail was under water resulting in closure of about 3.5 miles of trail for several weeks. This project would raise approximately 225 feet of existing trail higher than the surrounding landscape and install a culvert to allow water flow to not impact the trail in the future. This trail was added to Oneida's funded trail system last year.	*Structure		\$25,000		<i>Trail has been in the system &lt;10 years (code says rehab only avail to trails 10+ years in the system). Why was work not disclosed last year? Did they take a scoring deduction?</i>	
			Engineer		\$6,000			After Cost Share:
			Permits		\$3,000			<b>\$25,000</b>
			Site prep					
			Materials	\$3,200				
			Abutments					
			Pilings/Piers					
			Approaches					
			Culverts	\$800				
			Riprap					
			Labor	\$12,000				
			Equip Rental					
			Other					
			# of New Mi	0		\$25,000		
			<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>					
			<b>Yes or No:</b>	No				
				<b>Amount:</b>				
			Public or Private:	Public				
			Old Bridge Size:					
			Water Body:					
			Years in System:	<1yr				
			Bridge Inventory #:					
			New Bridge Size:					
			Labor Source:	Contract				
			Design Weight Load:					
<b>#35</b>	Lincoln	Lincoln County is proposing to rehab 2.5 miles of the Scenic Loop Trail to resurface and level rough areas and to provide better water control for sustainability. Work will include replacing several failing and undersized culverts as well as installing 2 new culverts and about 400 feet of ditching along the trail to improve drainage. Material will be added to low areas and potholes along the trail, and several broad dip areas will be reduced in steepness for improved visibility and riding experience. Repairs will also be completed on a rock ford that has silted in. As this trail is open to ATVs and snowmobiles, the County is also requesting ATV funds (\$16,687).	*Structure		\$25,031		<i>Has Co reached out to permitting folks yet to determine what will be needed?</i>	
			Engineer					After Cost Share:
			Permits			<b>\$8,344</b>		
			Site prep					
			Materials	\$3,383				
			Abutments					
			Pilings/Piers					
			Approaches					
			Culverts	\$3,356				
			Riprap					
			Labor	\$7,864				
			Equip Rental	\$10,427				
			Other					
			# of New Mi	0		\$8,344		
			<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>					
			<b>Yes or No:</b>	Yes				
				<b>Amount:</b>	<b>\$ 16,687.00</b>			
			Public or Private:	Public				
			Old Bridge Size:					
			Water Body:					
			Years in System:					
			Bridge Inventory #:					
			New Bridge Size:					
			Labor Source:	Force and Contract				
			Design Weight Load:					

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE TRAIL REHABILITATION REQUESTS

Region	County	Description	Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Comments
#36	Vernon	Coulee Track n Trails trail stabilization - Excessive flooding has compromised the trail and will lead to it's closuer. This project will stabilize the trail for future use	*Structure		\$9,500		<i>Can they use mainteannce? Cost break down? Who is doing the work? Can trail be reloc away from creek? More pix, including opposite bank.</i>
			Engineer		After Cost Share:		
			Permits		<b>\$9,500</b>		
			Site prep				
			Materials				
			Abutments				
			Pilings/Piers				
			Approaches				
			Culverts				
			Riprap				
Labor							
Equip Rental							
Other	\$9,500						
# of New Mi	0	\$9,500					
				<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$55,744</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>





## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE MANDATORY TRAIL RELOCATION REQUESTS

Region	County	Description	Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Reason	LUA Length	Safety	Trail Type	Miles Lost	Other Funds	Snowfall	County Pts.	Deduct: Multi-grants	Ded: RR Xing	Ded: Incomplete App.	TOTAL	Questions/Comments		
NOR-S	Barron	Barron County has rerouted a section of trail due to land owner changes. The reroute is complete but the trail will need a 12'x30' bridge placed over an unnamed creek. The club already has the bridge so this project is for site prep, installation of the bridge and railing material. <b>Trail 30 Bridge Install.</b>  <b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b> <b>Yes or No:</b> <input type="text" value="no"/> <b>Amount:</b> <input type="text"/> Public or Private: <input type="text" value="private"/> Bridge Inventory #: <b>12402</b> Old Bridge Size: <input type="text"/> New Bridge Size: 12x30 Water Body: <input type="text" value="unnamed"/> Labor Source: Years in System: <input type="text"/> Design Weight Load: 25,000	*Structure		\$7,127															0 OK w/ no more rehab grants for 10 years?	
			Engineer			After Cost Share:															
			Permits			<b>\$7,127</b>															
			Site prep		\$3,135																
			Materials		\$1,500																
			Abutments																		
			Pilings/Piers																		
			Approaches																		
			Culverts		\$800																
			Riprap																		
		Labor		\$320																	
		Equip		\$1,372																	
		Other																			
		# of New Mi		0	\$7,127																
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$226,127</b>	<b>\$0</b>															

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE DISCRETIONARY TRAIL RELOCATION REQUESTS

Reg	County	Description	Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Reason	LUA Length	Safety	Trail Type	Miles Lost	Other Funds	Snowfall	County Pts	Deduct: Multi-grants	Ded: RR Xing	Ded: Incomplete App.	TOTAL	Q&A			
NER	Manitowoc	Manitowoc proposes to move a section of funded trail to a club trail due to landowner request. No development funds are needed. The reroute would decrease the number of road crossings and eliminate a highway bridge crossing, but would add 1.2 miles to the system.	*Structure		\$0		5	15	5	10	10	10	5	10*	-10	-10	-10					
			Engineer		After Cost		3	15	5	10				2	10					45	No Q's	
			Permits		\$0																	
			Site prep																			
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>																				
		Public or Private:	Bridge Inventory #:																			
	Variance or Exception?	Old Bridge Size:	New Bridge Size:																			
		Water Body:	Labor Source:																			
		Years in System:	Design Weight Load:	# of New Mi	1	\$360																
NOR-R	Langlade	Langlade County proposes to install a recreation wing on the County Hwy T Bridge over the Wolf River. The Co Highway Dept will be replacing the bridge in 2022, with bids likely to go out 2021. Currently snowmobiles and winter ATVs cross the bridge with the other traffic. In an effort to provide safer crossing, the timing of the new bridge construction would allow an additional 12-ft wide wing to be developed, incl. concrete and light barrier separating vehicles from the trail. <span style="color: red;">Co requesting \$45k from RTP, remainder would be split between Snow and ATV. RTP and ATV SHARE NOT YET CONFIRMED</span>	*Structure	\$250,000	\$310,500		5	17	5	10	5	5	2	10								
			Engineer	\$10,000	After Cost																59	No Q's
			Permits		\$132,750																	
			Site prep																			
		<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>																				
		Public or Private:	Public	Bridge Inventory #:																		
	Variance or Exception?	Old Bridge Size:	Hwy Bridge	New Bridge Size:	12x110ft																	
		Water Body:	Wolf River	Labor Source:	Contract																	
		Years in System:	Design Weight Load:	# of New Mi	0	\$132,750																

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE DISCRETIONARY TRAIL RELOCATION REQUESTS

Reg	County	Description	Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Reason	LUA Length	Safety	Trail Type	Miles Lost	Other Funds	Snowfall	County Pts	Deduct: Multi-grants	Deduct: RR Xing	Deduct: Incomplete App.	TOTAL	Q&A		
NOR-S	Bayfield	Bayfield County proposes to re-route a portion of Wildcat trail due to a large pond of water that will not freeze. <b>Wildcat Re-Route</b>  <b>#43</b>	*Structure		\$7,230		5	15	5	10	10	10	5	10*	-10	-10	-10				
			Engineer			After Cost		5	17	0	10	5	2	3	10				52	<i>Maps &amp; photos? Break down expenses?</i>	
			Permits		\$7,230	<b>\$7,230</b>															
			Site prep																		
Materials																					
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>																					
<b>Yes or No:</b> no <b>Amount:</b>																					
Public or Private: public			Bridge Inventory #:																		
Variance or Exception? Old Bridge Size:			New Bridge Size:																		
Water Body:			Labor Source:																		
Years in System:			Design Weight Load:																		
			# of New Mi	0	\$7,230																
NOR-S	Burnett	Burnett County proposes to re-route a portion of Trail 925 to straighten the trail for the approach to the boardwalk bridge. The project will involve constructing 400 ft of new trail. The project is proposed to be split with snow and RTP. ATV \$3745 and RTP \$7490. <b>Trail 925W Reroute</b>  <b>#44</b>	*Structure		\$14,980		5	17	5	5	5	10	2	10							
			Engineer			After Cost															
			Permits		\$14,980	<b>\$3,745</b>															
			Site prep																		
<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>																					
<b>Yes or No:</b> yes <b>Amount:</b> \$11,235																					
Public or Private: public			Bridge Inventory #:																		
Variance or Exception? Old Bridge Size:			New Bridge Size:																		
Water Body:			Labor Source:																		
Years in System:			Design Weight Load:																		
			# of New Mi	0	\$3,745																
<b>TOTAL</b>						\$144,085	\$0														

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE NEW BRIDGE REQUESTS

Region	County	Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Permits	Location	Funding	Easement	Type	Impact	LT Cost	Active	Incomplete	County	Total	Q & A			
<b>#45</b>	NER	Door	Door County proposes to install 2 bridges over Whitefish Bay Creek. One will be repurposed from a 2018 reroute and one will be constructed. The 2018 reroute moved the trail to this location. <b>Needs work*</b>	Bridge 1 Bridge 2 Permits Site prep Materials Abutments Pilings/Piers Approaches Culverts Riprap Labor Equip Rental Other	\$15,935 \$60,000	\$75,935 After Cost Share: <b>\$75,935</b>	5	5	0	12	10	5	15	-10	-10	10	72	Will 12k bridge be sufficient? 2nd quote? Better maps - which bridge goes where? Is reloc an option to get down to 1 bridge? Site pix?		
			<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>																	
			<b>Yes or No:</b>	no	<b>Amount:</b>															
	Variance or Exception?		Public or Private:	private	Bridge Inventory #:															
			Old Bridge Size:		New Bridge Size:	12' X50'														
		Water Body:	Whitefish Bay	Labor Source:	contractor															
		Years in System:		Design Weight	12K & 25K*	# of New Mi	0													
<b>#46</b>	WC	Clark	Cloverdale Avenue and River Avenue Bridge is a new bridge that will be installed on an existing trail. The current crossing is being completed as an ice bridge crossing which doesn't work well. This portion of the trail usually must close early for safety reasons.	*Structure Engineer Permits Site prep Materials Abutments Pilings/Piers Approaches Culverts Riprap Labor Equip Rental Other	\$30,000 \$4,000 \$5,000 \$4,000 \$1,500	\$51,500 After Cost Share: <b>\$51,500</b>	5	5	0	15	8	5	5	0	0	6	49	LUA?		
			<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>																	
			<b>Yes or No:</b>	No	<b>Amount:</b>															
	Variance or Exception?		Public or Private:	Private	Bridge Inventory #:															
			Old Bridge Size:		New Bridge Size:	12' x 40'														
		Water Body:	Unnamed	Labor Source:																
		Years in System:		Design Weight	25,000	# of New Mi	0													
<b>#47</b>	WC	Clark	CTH K and 153 is a new bridge is proposed on a previously mandatory relocated trail due to Maple Syrup production interference with the traditional trail location. The club did the work. This is a dangerous ice crossing the club has tried to maintain. Asking 50-50 funding from Snowmobile and ATV.	*Structure Engineer Permits Site prep Materials Abutments Pilings/Piers Approaches Culverts Riprap Labor Equip Rental Other	\$65,000	\$83,000 After Cost Share: <b>\$41,500</b>	5	5	0	15	10	#	10	0	0	4	59	LUA?		
			<b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b>																	
			<b>Yes or No:</b>	Yes	<b>Amount:</b>	41,500														
	Variance or Exception?		Public or Private:	private	Bridge Inventory #:															
			Old Bridge Size:		New Bridge Size:	12' x 80'														
		Water Body:	Unnamed	Labor Source:																
		Years in System:		Design Weight	25,000	# of New Mi	0													

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE NEW BRIDGE REQUESTS

Region	County	Component	Costs	Total	Approved	5	#	5	17	10	#	25	-10	-10	10	72	Q & A			
NOR-S	Burnett	Burnett County proposes to install a 12'x380' boardwalk over a wetland area that does not freeze and has open water. <b>Trail 130 Bridge</b>  <b>#48</b>  <b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b> <b>Yes or No:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <b>Amount:</b> <b>119,125</b> Public or Private: public Bridge Inventory #: Old Bridge Size: New Bridge Size: 12'x380' Water Body: Labor Source: Years in System: Design Weight	*Structure \$190,000 Engineer Permits Site prep \$3,250 Materials Abutments Pilings/Piers Approaches Culverts Riprap Labor Equip Rental Other	\$190,000  \$3,250          0	\$193,250 After Cost Share: \$74,125          \$74,125		5	#	0	17	8	5	5	0	0	10	60	No Q's		
NOR-S	Rusk	Rusk County proposes to place a new bridge on a Tributary to the Flambeau River. Prior to 94 there was a bridge at this site but was lost during a flood event. Erosion of the banks have made it difficult to cross the stream necessitating the bridge. <b>Corridor 12 Felix Bridge</b>  <b>#49</b>  <b>Other funds received, requested, or committed?</b> <b>Yes or No:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no <b>Amount:</b> Public or Private: public Bridge Inventory #: Old Bridge Size: New Bridge Size: 12'x36' Water Body: Trib Flambeau Labor Source: Years in System: Design Weight 25,000	*Structure \$42,000 Engineer Permits Site prep Materials Abutments Pilings/Piers \$3,000 Approaches Culverts Riprap Labor Equip Rental Other \$200	\$42,000          0	\$45,200 After Cost Share: \$45,200          \$45,200		0	#	0	17	10	0	5	0	0	10	52	No Q's		
<b>TOTAL</b>																			\$288,260	\$0

## 2020-21 NEW MILES

1. Columns E, F, & G are gateway questions and one of the columns needs to be marked for the application to be eligible.
2. Column H indicates if the required map was submitted.
3. Column I indicates if the certification statement was signed.
4. Columns J through R are the actual ratings and rankings with point value.
5. Column P thru R should be entered as negative numbers. "-1"

PROJ #	REGION	COUNTY	TRAIL NAME	MILES											TOT	\$ DEV	\$ TOTAL	FUNDED			
					Gateway-Primary Access	Gateway-Population Access	Gateway-High Use	Map attached Y/N	Certification attached Y/N	Public Lands 0-3 pts	Connect Counties/States 0-3 pts	Mean Snowfall 1-3 pts	Trail Ratio 1-3 pts	Trail segment groomed 0-2 pts					County Coordinator 0-2 pts	Deduct Bridge/Trail needs 3 pts	Deduct parallel trails 3 pts
	NER	Brown	#2 Trail to Village Park	0.8	x	x	x	x	x	2	1	1	2	2	1			9	\$0	\$240	
	NER	Brown	#3 Trail to Gas/Food	0.83		x	x	x	x	2	1	1	2	2	1			9	\$0	\$249	
	NER	Calumet	Deer Run	3.3	x	x	x	x	x	2	2	1	0	2	2			9	\$0	\$990	
	NER	Door	Corridor 1 West Jacksonport	3.15	x	x	x	x	x	1	2	1	1	1	2			8	\$0	\$945	
	NER	Fond du Lac	Silver Creek	6.1	x			x	x	0	1	1	1	2	2			7	\$0	\$1,830	
	NER	Fond du Lac	Twin Oaks Wonser/Goose	2.9	x		x	x	x	0	1	1	0	2				4	\$0	\$870	
	NER	Fond du Lac	Kiekhaefer Park to Peebles Shell	2.78		x	x	x	x	0	2	1	1	2				6	\$0	\$834	
	NER	Fond du Lac	St Peter South	5.6		x	x	x	x	0	2	1	1	2				6	\$0	\$1,680	
	NER	Green Lake	Trail GLC 44	7		x	x	x	x	2	1	1	2		2			8	\$0	\$2,100	
	NER	Kewaunee	L-ELL	8.1			x	x	x	0	2	1	0	1	2	-3		3	\$0	\$2,430	
	NER	Kewaunee	SU-SLN	2.1			x	x	x	0	1	1	0	2	0	-3		1	\$0	\$630	
	NER	Kewaunee	DU-LL	1.3			x	x	x	0	1	1	0	2	0	-3		1	\$0	\$390	
	NER	Manitowoc	D-2-2,D-2-1, B-2 Pigeon	11.5			x	x	x	2	1	1	2	2	0	-3		5	\$0	\$3,450	
	NER	Manitowoc	D-2-3 Badger Creek	2.5	x		x	x	x	2	3	1	2	2	2	-3		9	\$0	\$750	
	NER	Manitowoc	G-2	0.5		x		x	x	2	1	1	2	2	0			8	\$0	\$150	
	NER	Manitowoc	M-2	1.2	x			x	x	2	1	1	2	2	0	-3		5	\$0	\$360	
	NER	Marinette	Corridor #3	13.3	x	x	x	x	x	0	3	2	2	2	2			11	\$0	\$3,990	
	NER	Oconto	#1 Oconto Falls to Gillett	11.8		x		x	x	2	2	2	1	2	2			11	\$0	\$3,540	
	NER	Oconto	#2 Chase	1.1		x		x	x	1	1	2	1	2				7	\$0	\$330	
	NER	Oconto	#3 Gillett	2	x			x	x	1	3	2	1	2				9	\$0	\$600	
	NER	Outagamie	Z6-1-NPR	1.4	x	x		x	x	0	3	1	1	1				6	\$0	\$420	
	NER	Outagamie	Z1-1-NG	1.7	x	x	x	x	x	0	3	1	1	2	1	-3		5	\$0	\$510	
	NER	Outagamie	Z5-6-PB/Z5-7-GK	3.2		x	x	x	x	0	1	1	1	2	1	-3		3	\$0	\$960	
	NER	Outagamie	Z5-4-DT	2.7	x	x	x	x	x	0	1	1	1	2		-3		2	\$0	\$810	
	NER	Outagamie	Z5-3-DT	2.4		x	x	x	x	0	1	1	1	2		-3		2	\$0	\$720	
	NER	Shawano	Tigerton to Caroline	13.6	x			x	x	0	2	2	1	2	2	-3		6	\$0	\$4,080	
	NER	Shawano	Outagamie	4.6	x			x	x	0	3	2	1	2		-3		5	\$0	\$1,380	
	NER	Shawano	Docs	5.6			x	x	x	0	2	2	0	2				6	\$0	\$1,680	
	NER	Shawano	Mattoon to Langlade	3.5	x			x	x	0	3	2	0	1				6	\$0	\$1,050	

## 2020-21 NEW MILES

1. Columns E, F, & G are gateway questions and one of the columns needs to be marked for the application to be eligible.
2. Column H indicates if the required map was submitted.
3. Column I indicates if the certification statement was signed.
4. Columns J through R are the actual ratings and rankings with point value.
5. Column P thru R should be entered as negative numbers. "-1"

PROJ #	REGION	COUNTY	TRAIL NAME	MILES											TOT	\$ DEV	\$ TOTAL	FUNDED				
					1	2	3				1	2	3	4					5	6	7	7
	NER	Shawano	Shortcut	1.9		x		x	x	0	1	2	0	2					5	\$0	\$570	
	NER	Shawano	Tilleda Loop	7.5			x	x	x	0	1	2	0	2					5	\$0	\$2,250	
	NER	Waupaca	#1 Trails VE & CL Cty Ln-Embarra	1.7	x	x	x	x	x	0	3	1	1	1					6	\$0	\$510	
	NER	Waupaca	#2 Trail T-Int #38-New London	4.7	x	x	x	x	x	0	3	1	1	1					6	\$0	\$1,410	
	NER	Waupaca	#4 Trail AA-Int #69-Waushara	2.1	x		x	x	x	0	3	1	1	1					6	\$0	\$630	
	NER	Waupaca	#5 Trail A/310-Int #24A-Portage	10.1	x	x	x	x	x	0	3	1	1	1	2				8	\$0	\$3,030	
	NER	Waupaca	#6 Trails O/6A&B/FF6C	10.5		x	x	x	x	0	2	1	1	2					6	\$0	\$3,150	
	NER	Waupaca	#7 Trail HH Int #71-Winnebago	1.5	x		x	x	x	0	3	1	1	2					7	\$0	\$450	
	NER	Waupaca	#8 Rail Trail-Parking Corridor 9	0.6		x	x	x	x	0	1	1	1	1					4	\$0	\$180	
	NER	Waupaca	#9 Trail QQ Int #47a-Hwy 10	2.5		x	x	x	x	0	1	1	1	1					4	\$0	\$750	
	NER	Waupaca	#10 Trail SE	6.4	x	x	x	x	x	0	3	1	1	2					7	\$0	\$1,920	
	NER	Waushara	6A-5	3.8	x	x	x	x	x	2	1	1	1	2	2				9	\$0	\$1,140	
	NER	Waushara	26-30A	8.5	x	x	x	x	x	0	1	1	1	2			-3		2	\$0	\$2,550	
	NER	Winnebago	C11	6.9		x		x	x	0	1	1	2	2	2		-3		5	\$0	\$2,070	
	SER	Kenosha	East Twin Lakes Trail	8.1	x	x	x	x	x	3	3	1	3	2	1				13	\$0	\$2,430	
	SER	Kenosha	West Twin Lakes Trail	4.5		x	x	x	x	1	1	1	3	2	1				9	\$0	\$1,350	
	SER	Racine	Snowhawks	6.9		x	x	x	x	0	2	1	1	2	1				7	\$0	\$2,070	
	SER	Racine	Burlington-Saller Woods	2.4	x			x	x	3	1	1	1	2	1				9	\$0	\$720	
	SER	Sheboygan	I-43 Park & Ride	6.25		x	x	x	x	0	1	1	1	2	2				7	\$0	\$1,875	
	SER	Sheboygan	RL Club-4	3.35	x		x	x	x	2	1	1	1	2					7	\$0	\$1,005	
	SER	Sheboygan	7TSF2 & PSR Club-2	5.59	x	x	x	x	x	3	1	1	1	2					8	\$0	\$1,677	
	SER	Sheboygan	NF Club 1	3.24	x			x	x	0	3	1	1	1					6	\$0	\$972	
	SER	Sheboygan	HG Club-2	3.7	x		x	x	x	2	1	1	1	2					7	\$0	\$1,110	
	SER	Sheboygan	AY Club-1	2.6		x	x	x	x	2	1	1	1	2			-3		4	\$0	\$780	
	SER	Walworth	Elkhorn-new	25.4	x	x	x	x	x	2	2	1	2	2	2				11	\$0	\$7,620	
	SER	Walworth	Interstate	6.8	x	x	x	x	x	2	3	1	2	2					10	\$0	\$2,040	
	SER	Walworth	Lyons	7.3		x	x	x	x	2	1	1	2	2			-3		5	\$0	\$2,190	
	SER	Washington	Corridor 7 to Corridor 34	12		x	x		x	2	2	1	1	2	2				10	\$0	\$3,600	
	NOR-R	Forest	6a -- Waters Edge to LMT	1.1															0	\$0	\$330	





## 2020-21 NEW MILES

1. Columns E, F, & G are gateway questions and one of the columns needs to be marked for the application to be eligible.
2. Column H indicates if the required map was submitted.
3. Column I indicates if the certification statement was signed.
4. Columns J through R are the actual ratings and rankings with point value.
5. Column P thru R should be entered as negative numbers. "-1"

PROJ #	REGION	COUNTY	TRAIL NAME	MILES	Gateway-Primary Access										TOT	\$ DEV	\$ TOTAL	FUNDED				
					1	2	3				1	2	3	4					5	6	7	7
	NOR-R	Vilas	Lanny's Trail	1.2															0	\$0	\$360	
	NOR-R	Vilas	Trail 8a	0.7															0	\$0	\$210	
	NOR-R	Vilas	Trail 17b Lac du Flambeau	1.4															0	\$0	\$420	
	WC	Chippewa	Buckhorn	4.7			x	x	x	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	-3	0	7	\$0	\$1,410	
	WC	Chippewa	Flambeau River Trail North	8.1		x	x	x	x	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	-2	9	\$0	\$2,430	
	WC	Chippewa	Flambeau River Trail South	3.5		x	x	x	x	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	9	\$0	\$1,050	
	WC	Chippewa	High Rider Trail	3		x	x	x	x	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	-3	0	6	\$0	\$900	
	WC	Chippewa	Rough Rider Trail	11			x	x	x	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	-3	0	7	\$0	\$3,300	
	WC	Chippewa	Weiser Trail	4.05			x	x	x	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	-3	0	6	\$0	\$1,215	
	WC	Clark	Colby CM Trail	4.93			x	x	x	1	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	WC	\$0	\$1,479	
	WC	Pierce	E Prescott Trail	5.3		x		x		1	2	1	2	2	1	0	-3	0	6	\$0	\$1,590	
	WC	Pierce	Plum City North	5.7		x	x	x	x	1	2	1	2	2	1	0	-3	0	6	\$0	\$1,710	
	WC	St Croix	Co Rd C (Trail A)	3.5	x	x	x	x	x	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$1,050	
	WC	St Croix	Erin Corner to Emerald Trail 9B	11	x	x	x	x	x	0	2	1	2	2	2	0	-3	0	6	\$0	\$3,300	
	WCR	Adams	Grand Marsh Link - GMS	7.95			Y	Y		1	2	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	10	\$0	\$2,385	
	WCR	Adams	Rome area access - R4, R5, R6	6.92			Y	Y		0	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	6	\$0	\$2,076	
	WCR	Adams	Grand Marsh link - GM6	1.00		Y		Y		1	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	7	\$0	\$300	
	WCR	Marathon	Hatley	5.72		Y	Y	Y	Y	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$1,716	
	WCR	Marathon	Kelly	2.96			Y	Y	Y	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$888	
	WCR	Marathon	Memories	5.02		Y	Y	Y	Y	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$1,506	
	WCR	Marathon	Pine Lane	1.35			Y	Y	Y	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$405	
	WCR	Marathon	Poniatowski	1.29			Y	Y	Y	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$387	
	WCR	Marathon	Stratford	6.38		Y	Y	Y	Y	0	1	2	1	2	2	0	-3	0	5	\$0	\$1,914	
	WCR	Marathon	Wiowash	0.68		Y		Y	Y	0	3	2	1	2	0	0	-3	0	5	\$0	\$204	
	WCR	Portage	Trail 413	3.90		Y	Y	Y	Y	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$1,170	
	WCR	Portage	Trail 404	2.40		Y	Y	Y	Y	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$720	
	WCR	Portage	Trail 406	8.60			Y	Y	Y	0	2	1	2	2	2	0	-3	0	6	\$0	\$2,580	
	NOR-S	Bayfield	Trail 33	4.2			y	y	y	3	1	3	3	2	1	0	-3	0	10	\$0	\$1,260	
	NOR-S	Bayfield	Trail 31	1.5			y	y	y	3	1	3	3	2	1	0	-3	0	10	\$0	\$450	

## 2020-21 NEW MILES

1. Columns E, F, & G are gateway questions and one of the columns needs to be marked for the application to be eligible.
2. Column H indicates if the required map was submitted.
3. Column I indicates if the certification statement was signed.
4. Columns J through R are the actual ratings and rankings with point value.
5. Column P thru R should be entered as negative numbers. "-1"

PROJ #	REGION	COUNTY	TRAIL NAME	MILES														TOT	\$ DEV	\$ TOTAL	FUNDED	
					1	2	3				1	2	3	4	5	6	7					7
	NOR-S	Bayfield	Trail 29	1			y	y	y	3	1	3	3	2	0	0	-3	0	9	\$0	\$300	
	NOR-S	Burnett	Trail 80	7.7			y	y	y	0	2	2	3	1	1	0	-3	0	6	\$0	\$2,310	
	NOR-S	Burnett	Trail 22	5.3			y	y	y	0	1	2	3	1	1	0	-3	0	5	\$0	\$1,590	
	NOR-S	Douglas	Trail 6	4.8		y		y	y	0	1	3	3	2	0	0	-3	0	6	\$0	\$1,440	
	NOR-S	Douglas	Trail 727	5			y	y	y	3	1	3	3	2	2	0	0	0	14	\$0	\$1,500	
	NOR-S	Polk	West Sweden	6.34	y		y	y	y	2	3	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	11	\$0	\$1,902	
	NOR-S	Polk	Burnett Co Roosevelt	1.34	y		y	y	y	3	3	1	2	1	0	0	-3	0	7	\$27,869	\$28,271	
	SCR	Columbia	Trail 48 - Trail 43-35 connector	6.00	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	0	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	9	\$0	\$1,800	
	SCR	Columbia	Trail 61 - Connector to Dane Co	1.96	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	8	\$0	\$588	
	SCR	Columbia	Trail 68	3.88	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$1,163	
	SCR	Columbia	Trail 70 - Otsego to Casino	3.99	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	3	\$0	\$1,197	
	SCR	Columbia	Trail 71 - Keyser	6.00	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	5	\$0	\$1,800	
	SCR	Columbia	Trail 86	2.06	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	8	\$0	\$618	
	SCR	Dane	Trail 27 - Marshall/Utica	14.80	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	2	2	1	2	2	2	0	-3	0	8	\$0	\$4,440	
	SCR	Dane	Trail 61 - Yellow Thunder	1.96	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	9	\$0	\$588	
	SCR	Dane	Trail 18/86 - White Lightening	3.93	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	9	\$0	\$1,179	
	SCR	Dane	Trail 51 - Ashton	2.20	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	2	1	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	5	\$0	\$660	
	SCR	Dane	Trail 73 - Golden Triangle	2.10	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2	3	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	7	\$0	\$630	
	SCR	Dane	Trail 75	3.80	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	2	3	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	7	\$0	\$1,140	
	SCR	Dodge	Segment 1	11.00	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	1	3	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	11	\$0	\$3,300	
	SCR	Dodge	Segment 2	6.50	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	8	\$0	\$1,950	
	SCR	Dodge	Segment 3	9.90	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	1	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	8	\$0	\$2,970	
	SCR	Dodge	Segment 4	2.54	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2	3	1	2	2	0	0	-3	0	7	\$0	\$762	
	SCR	Grant	Cuba City	9.62	Y	N	N	Y	Y	0	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	\$0	\$2,886	
	SCR	Grant	Dickyville	11.31	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	8	\$0	\$3,393	
	SCR	Iowa	Snow drifters	5.00	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2	3	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	11	\$0	\$1,500	
	SCR	Iowa	Trail Eagles	7.50	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2	2	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	10	\$0	\$2,250	
	SCR	Jefferson	Palmyra Hebron	5.28	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	7	\$0	\$1,584	
	SCR	Jefferson	Concord		Y	N	Y	N	Y	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	7	\$0	\$0	

2020-21 NEW MILES

1. Columns E, F, & G are gateway questions and one of the columns needs to be marked for the application to be eligible.
2. Column H indicates if the required map was submitted.
3. Column I indicates if the certification statement was signed.
4. Columns J through R are the actual ratings and rankings with point value.
5. Column P thru R should be entered as negative numbers. "-1"

PROJ #	REGION	COUNTY	TRAIL NAME	MILES	Gateway-Primary Access					Gateway-Population Access					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	7	TOT	\$ DEV	\$ TOTAL	FUNDED
					1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5													
	SCR	Jefferson	Driftskippers		Y	N	N	N	Y	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	\$0	\$0		
	SCR	Jefferson	Snow Stormers		N	Y	Y	N	Y	0	2	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	\$0	\$0			
	SCR	Sauk	H3	6.97	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	0	1	1	3	2	2	0	-3	0	6	\$0	\$2,091						
																							0				
																							0				
				715.44																				\$27,869	\$242,500	\$0	

## 2020-21 SNOWMOBILE NON-TRAIL REQUESTS

Region	County	Description	Component	Costs	Total	Approved	Comments
NOR-S	Douglas	Douglas County proposes to build a Privy at the Junction of Trails 4,41, and 9. This is the location of a warming shack that is in a rather remote location of the County. This will be split between Snow and ATV. <b>Trail 4/41 Privy.</b>	*Structure	\$15,900	\$26,693	\$0.00	<i>This funding category is a lower priority, given trends of available funds it is unlikely we will be awarding funds in this category</i>
<b>#50</b>			Engineer		After Cost Share:		
			Permits		<b>\$13,347</b>		
			Site prep	\$10,793			
			Materials				
			Abutments				
			Pilings/Piers				
			Approaches				
			Culverts				
			Riprap				
			Labor				
		Equip Rental					
		Other					
		<b># of New Mi</b>	0		\$13,347		
					<b>\$13,346.50</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	

Other funds received, requested, or committed?	
<b>Yes or No:</b>	<b>yes</b>
<b>Amount:</b>	<b>13346.5</b>

Public or Private:	public	Bridge Inventory #:	
Variance or Exception?		New Bridge Size:	
		Labor Source:	
		Design Weight Load:	

