

Snowmobile Trails Funding In Maine, 2011

Introduction and Background

Snowmobiling is a popular recreational activity in Maine. Many residents participate in the activity each year and many non-residents are attracted to the state to take advantage of its excellent trail system and usually abundant snowfall. During years with adequate snowfall, snowmobile registrations in Maine have been in the range of 100,000 sleds in recent years. This is greater than any other state in New England. Furthermore, snowmobiling has continued to grow in Maine over the last decade. For example, there were 78,574 snowmobiles registered in Maine in 1996, compared to 98,167 in 2009. This represents about a 25 percent increase over the time period. Over the same period, resident snowmobile registrations increased about eight percent, while non-resident snowmobile registrations increased 156 percent.

Snowmobiling also makes an important contribution to the economy of Maine. For example, during the 1995-96 season, the total economic impact (direct and indirect) of snowmobiling was estimated to be \$226 million. The economic impact is believed to be even greater today. As noted above, much of the growth in snowmobile registrations has occurred among non-resident snowmobilers, who traditionally spend more money during their snowmobile excursions than residents. Non-residents spend more for lodging, food and other goods and services. They also often purchase, maintain and store their snowmobiles in Maine. Overall, it is estimated that snowmobiling **currently** contributes about \$350 million to the Maine economy during years of adequate snowfall. A large part of this economic activity

takes place in rural areas of Maine, thus providing an important source of economic activity in areas with limited economic development opportunities.

One of the major attractions for both resident and non-resident snowmobilers is the excellent snowmobile trail system in Maine. The system encompasses over 13,500 miles of trails. Both the quality and quantity of trails provide opportunities for residents and non-residents to enjoy snowmobiling in a safe, uncrowded and picturesque environment. While the trail system is unrivaled in New England, there are problems that need to be addressed to insure the quality of the trails system is maintained into the future.

Construction and maintenance of snowmobile trails is an expensive and time-consuming activity. Some trails have to be constructed, which involves the clearing of trees, brush and large boulders from the trail. Culverts have to be installed to manage water flow and bridges need to be constructed at stream crossings. Once constructed, the trails have to be maintained, which includes removing brush that grows in along the trails and maintaining culverts and bridges.

During the snowmobile season, trails must be packed and then groomed on a regular basis. Trails that receive heavy use may be groomed several times a week. Furthermore, the equipment used to groom trails is becoming more expensive each year. For example, a new trail groomer can cost as much as \$200,000.

The work associated with the construction/maintenance of trails during the off season and during the snowmobiling season is performed by 290 organized snowmobile clubs located in communities throughout the state, and by 115 municipalities. In addition, the Bureau of Parks and Lands in the Maine Department

of Conservation maintains three sections of trail. However, clubs and municipalities perform most of the work on the trail system. The work performed by clubs is usually accomplished through volunteer club members, and it is becoming more difficult to accomplish the necessary tasks with volunteers.

The state has two funding programs to help the clubs and municipalities cover part of the cost of maintenance and grooming of the trails system. These programs are administered by the Bureau of Parks and Lands within the Maine Department of Conservation (DOC). One is a capital equipment fund that assists clubs and municipalities with the purchase of trail groomers and other equipment. Part of the snowmobile registration fee that residents and non-residents pay annually goes into the capital equipment fund. When clubs and municipalities purchase new equipment, they can submit a grant request to the Bureau of Parks and Lands for partial reimbursement of the cost of the equipment. The level of reimbursement varies from year to year with the amount of money in the capital equipment fund and the level of requests for reimbursement from the municipalities and snowmobile clubs. For example, if there is \$500,000 in the capital equipment fund and clubs/municipalities submit requests totaling \$1,000,000, the level of reimbursement to the clubs/municipalities is 50 percent of the equipment costs. In recent years the percentage of costs reimbursed by the Bureau of Parks and Lands to the clubs/municipalities has been between 16 and 42 percent. Uncertainty about the level of reimbursement the clubs and municipalities will receive in a given year makes it more difficult for them to make capital equipment purchase decisions.

The Bureau of Parks and Lands also maintains a trails fund to partially reimburse clubs and municipalities for trail maintenance/grooming expenses. Funding for the trail maintenance program comes from the resident and non-resident snowmobile annual registration fees, and a share of the gasoline tax collected by the State of Maine that is allocated to the Bureau of Parks and Lands for snowmobile trail maintenance activities. Although the rules for reimbursement of costs differ for snowmobile clubs and municipalities, they have received similar levels of reimbursement in recent years. For example, over the last five years, the rate of reimbursement of trail maintenance costs for snowmobile clubs has varied from 45 to 70 percent of reported costs. In comparison, municipality reimbursement rates over the same time period ranged from 58 to 67 percent of reported costs.

Objectives of the Study

The future of snowmobiling in Maine is directly linked to the snowmobile clubs and municipalities that develop and maintain the excellent trail system. The two grants programs have been very helpful to the clubs and municipalities. However, many believe that changes must be made to insure that the trails system is maintained in the future. Some people believe that additional funding is necessary for both grants programs to provide greater assistance to clubs and municipalities as the cost of developing and maintaining the trails system continues to increase. Providing additional funding would require an increase in the snowmobile registration fees paid by both resident and non-resident snowmobilers or another new source of funding, such as trail passes. Other people believe that the

resident and non-resident registration fees should not be increased and that the existing grants programs should be restructured to eliminate the uncertainty that snowmobile clubs and municipalities face with regard to the level of reimbursement they will receive on capital expenditures and trail grooming costs. However, there has been no effort in the past to systematically determine the views of the snowmobile clubs or municipalities about future courses of action that could be implemented to help them continue to provide the excellent trails system that has been developed over the years.

The objective of this study is to elicit the views and opinions of snowmobile clubs and municipalities who use the Bureau of Parks and Lands programs to partially fund snowmobile trail maintenance and capital equipment purchases. Strengths and weaknesses of the current programs will be determined, along with the critical funding issues facing the clubs and municipalities, and options to address the critical issues. The clubs and municipalities know firsthand the types of problems they are facing. Consequently, their views are important in determining the types of changes that should be made in the capital equipment and trail grants programs.

Procedures

The Maine Snowmobile Association provided a list of all snowmobile clubs in Maine and the Bureau of Parks and Lands provided a list of the municipalities that submit trail and capital equipment grants. A survey was developed to collect the views and opinions of both groups regarding the trail grants and capital equipment grants programs. Because of the specialized nature of the issues, an advisory

committee was formed to assist in the development of the survey. The advisory committee was formed by the Maine Snowmobile Association (MSA) and consisted of experienced members of the MSA Trails Committee. The committee met three times and was very helpful in identifying issues to be addressed in the survey. Personnel in the DOC also submitted potential questions to be included in the survey.

The final survey consists of four sections. In the first, respondents are asked to provide some background information regarding their involvement in snowmobiling in Maine over the years, and the length of time they have been involved in the submission of grant requests to the Department of Conservation. The second section contains general questions about the funding of snowmobiling in Maine, such as the current level of snowmobile registrations fees in Maine, the possibility of implementing a trail pass system, in addition to the registration of snowmobiles, and higher snowmobile registration fees for residents and non-resident snowmobilers who are not members of a Maine snowmobile club.

The third section contains questions directly related to the snowmobile trail grant programs, including the adequacy of the current programs, the need to increase funding for the trails programs, and options to reduce the costs incurred by club and municipalities to maintain trails, including a moratorium on the development of new trails and even reducing the number of miles of trails maintained so that the reimbursement rate paid through the trail grants program would be higher on the remaining trails maintained by the clubs and municipalities.

Finally, the last section of the survey addresses issues related to the current capital equipment grants program. Questions range from the adequacy of the current program to a revised system whereby capital equipment requests are submitted and prioritized prior to the purchase of the equipment. The survey is included in Appendix A of this publication.

To reduce survey costs, the survey was conducted through the internet, rather than through the traditional mail survey process. This had the advantage of avoiding the cost of printing the survey and mailing it to each club and municipality. Although there are advantages to a traditional mail survey, the internet survey approach was chosen due to the limited budget available for the study.

Introductory letters were sent by traditional mail to the 290 snowmobile clubs and the 115 municipalities that have submitted trail grants and/or capital equipment grants to the Bureau of Parks and Lands. The letter informed them of the survey and its objectives, the importance of the survey for the future, and recipients were encouraged to complete the survey once they received the second letter containing the website for the survey. About two weeks later, a second letter was sent to all potential respondents that included the address for the website and an access code for each club and municipality. The access code was included to keep track of the clubs and municipalities who completed the survey and to prevent one club/municipality from submitting multiple copies of the completed survey. Finally, a reminder letter was sent to all potential respondents who had not yet filled out the survey three weeks after the letter that contained the website address of the survey. Access to the survey began in mid-February and was terminated on April 11 of

2011. It should be noted that that the access codes for each club and municipality were deleted after the survey closed to insure confidentiality of respondents.

Results

A total of 240 surveys were submitted by the 405 snowmobile clubs and municipalities included in the study. This represents a response rate of 59 percent. However, 26 of the respondents provided very little or no information and were, therefore, deleted. Therefore, the response rate based only on completed and useable questionnaires is 53 percent.

A question in the first section of the survey asked respondents the type of organization for which they submitted trail grants and/or capital equipment grants to the Maine Department of Conservation (DOC). A total of 123 indicated that they submitted grants on behalf of a snowmobile club, and 13 respondents indicated they submitted grants for a municipality. In addition another 77 respondents replied that they submitted grants for both a snowmobile club and a municipality. One respondent did not answer the question. While it was known that there would be some respondents that submitted grants for both a snowmobile club and a municipality, the number was higher than expected, and it helps explain the low number of respondents that indicated that they only submitted grants for a municipality.

The fact that 77 respondents submit grants for both a club and a municipality also has implications for the response rate for the subgroups. For example, in addition to the 123 clubs that responded, the 77 responses representing both a municipality and a club suggest that a total of 200 clubs are represented in the

responses (123 + 77). Since there are a total of 290 clubs in the population, the effective response rate for snowmobile clubs is 69 percent. Likewise, the response rate for municipalities is 78 percent $[(13 + 77)/ 115]$. Hence, the percent of snowmobile clubs and municipalities whose views are reflected in the results presented below is greater than that indicated by the 53 percent overall response rate.

The original plan for presenting the results of the study was to present results for all respondents combined and for the subgroups of snowmobile clubs, municipalities, and both clubs and municipalities. However, to avoid confidentiality and disclosure issues associated with the small number of respondents in the “municipality only” subgroup, the “municipality only” respondents were combined with the “both municipality and snowmobile club” respondents. This eliminates the possibility of unintentionally disclosing the responses of individual municipalities. Therefore, results will be reported for three categories: All respondents who returned a complete survey, snowmobile clubs only responses, and the combined category of both snowmobile club/municipality and municipality only responses. However, it will be noted in the text when the responses of the municipality only group are significantly different from the responses of the other subgroups. We now turn to the presentation of the results of the survey.

Section I Survey Results

As described above, the questionnaire used to collect the data has four sections. The first section is designed to collect information about the background of the person completing the survey and the organization that he/she represents.

Table 1. Experience of Survey Respondents.

Characteristic	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Both Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
Average number of years spent snowmobiling in Maine	18.7	18.7	18.9
Average number of years as member of a Maine snowmobile club	15.7	14.9	16.8
Average number of years involved in submitting grants for your snowmobile club/municipality?	9.3	7.8	11.5

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they have been snowmobiling in Maine, the length of time they have been a member of a snowmobile club and the number of years they have been involved in submitting grants for their snowmobile club or municipality. The results are reported in Table 1. On average, all groups have been snowmobiling in Maine for almost 19 years, and at least 70 percent of the respondents have been snowmobiling in the state for more than 20 years. Furthermore, all respondents combined have been members of snowmobile clubs for an average of 15.7 years. Those people who indicated they are responding for a municipality or both a club and municipality have been members of clubs for almost 17 years. These data reflect the level of dedication and commitment that respondents have for snowmobiling.

In terms of the number of years that respondents had been submitting grant applications, the average for all respondents is 9.3 years. Those submitting grants for snowmobile clubs have 7.8 years experience, while those that submit grants for both clubs and municipalities/municipalities have even more years of experience submitting grants (11.5 years). For all groups, more than two-thirds of respondents have been submitting grants for more than 5 years. This suggests that respondents have the experience and knowledge to evaluate the grants programs offered by the Department of Conservation.

Table 2 shows the geographic distribution, by county, of the respondents' snowmobile club and/or municipality. Based on all respondents, Aroostook County accounts for the highest percentage of respondents with about 14 percent, followed by Penobscot and Oxford Counties, with 13.2 and 12.2 percent, respectively. The counties with the lowest percentage of respondents is Sagadahoc with 0.5 percent of respondents, followed by Hancock County (1.41 percent), and Knox and Lincoln Counties with 1.88 percent of respondents in each of these counties.

The last column of data illustrates that municipal involvement in submission of snowmobile grants is heavily weighted in the northern and western counties. The six counties of Aroostook, Franklin, Oxford, Penobscot, Piscataquis and Somerset account for over 80 percent of the responses provided by respondents representing both clubs and municipalities or municipalities only.

One of the reasons respondents were asked to identify the county in which their snowmobile club is situated is to determine whether the distribution of clubs who responded to the survey is similar to or different than the distribution of all

Table 2. Geographic Distribution of Responding Snowmobile Clubs and Municipalities by County, in Percent.

County	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Both Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
Androscoggin	4.69	6.61	2.22
Aroostook	14.04	4.13	27.78
Cumberland	6.1	8.26	3.33
Franklin	7.51	4.96	11.11
Hancock	1.41	2.48	0
Kennebec	10.33	15.7	3.33
Knox	1.88	3.31	0
Lincoln	1.88	2.48	0
Oxford	12.2	12.4	11.11
Penobscot	13.2	13.22	13.33
Piscataquis	5.2	2.48	8.89
Sagadahoc	0.5	0.83	0
Somerset	8.5	8.26	8.89
Waldo	3.8	4.96	0
Washington	5.6	4.96	6.67
York	3.3	4.96	1.11

snowmobile clubs in Maine. This comparison makes it possible to determine whether there is a geographical bias in the responding snowmobile clubs. For example if a given county contains ten percent of all snowmobile clubs in Maine, but accounts for 20 percent of all responding clubs, it would signify that the clubs in that county are over represented in the responses.

Comparing the county distribution of responding clubs with the geographic distribution of all snowmobile clubs in Maine (Table 3) indicates that there is very little geographical bias in the responding clubs. That is, the geographical distribution of responding clubs is very similar to the geographical distribution of all clubs in Maine. Therefore, it can be concluded that the views of the responding clubs are geographically representative of all clubs in Maine. No region or county is

Table 3. Geographic Distribution of Responding Snowmobile Clubs and All Snowmobile Clubs in Maine, by County, in Percent.

County	All Responding Snowmobile Clubs	All Snowmobile Clubs in Maine
Androscoggin	5.05	5.72
Aroostook	14.14	12.12
Cumberland	6.57	5.72
Franklin	6.57	5.39
Hancock	1.52	2.02
Kennebec	10.10	9.76
Knox	2.02	2.02
Lincoln	1.52	2.36
Oxford	12.63	9.76
Penobscot	13.64	13.13
Piscataquis	4.55	6.06
Sagadahoc	0.51	1.68
Somerset	8.59	10.10
Waldo	4.04	5.05
Washington	5.05	4.38
York	3.54	4.71

substantially over represented or under represented in the responses provided by the snowmobile clubs.

Before presenting the results for Sections II through IV, it is helpful to discuss the nature of the questions asked in those sections and how respondents were asked to respond. In each of the three remaining sections, a series of statements related to snowmobiling and its funding were presented and respondents were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with each statement. For example, one of the statements in section II was: "Maintenance expenses for all ITS/Connector trails should be reimbursed by the municipal grants program". Respondents had five choices to express their opinion about the statement: Strongly Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Neutral, Somewhat Agree and Strongly

Agree. This five-point likert scale allows respondents to not only indicate whether they agree or disagree with the statement, but also the strength of their agreement or disagreement. This provides more information than simply asking whether respondents agree or disagree with the statement. This format was used for all of the statements in Sections II through IV.

The following codes were used to prepare the responses for analysis. A response of Strongly Disagree was coded with a 1, and a Somewhat Disagree response was coded as a 2. A Neutral response was coded as 3 and Somewhat Agree and Strongly Agree responses received codes of 4 and 5, respectively. In reporting the results below, the mean or average score is reported for all respondents and for the two subcategories of “Snowmobile Clubs” only and “Both Clubs and Municipalities/Municipalities Only”.

Note that a mean score of 3 for a statement indicates that, on average, respondents are neutral about the statement. A score of less than 3 indicates they disagree with the statement, and closer the mean score is to 1, the stronger the level of disagreement. On the other hand, a mean score greater than 3 indicates that respondents, on average, agree with the statement and the closer the mean score is to 5, the stronger their agreement with the statement.

Finally, it should be noted that there are situations when the mean score does not tell the whole story about respondents’ opinions. To illustrate, consider the case where a statement receives a mean score of 3. This could occur if all respondents were neutral about the statement, or it could occur if half of the respondents Strongly Disagree with the statement while the other half Strongly

Agree with the statement. In those situations where the mean score does not reflect important information about the distribution of responses, it will be pointed out in the text and additional information about the distribution of responses will be reported. We now turn to the results for Section II survey responses.

Section II Survey Results

Two statements in Section II were “warm-up” questions to get respondents thinking about snowmobiling and related issues. They also provide an indication of respondents’ opinions about the quality and adequacy of the current trails system. The two statements and the responses are shown in Table 4. The first statement refers to the quality of the trail maintenance and grooming activities of clubs and municipalities and the second relates the adequacy of the trail system in linking snowmobile destinations throughout the State. Respondents strongly agree that clubs and municipalities do a good job of maintaining and grooming the trails

Table 4. Mean Responses to Statements Related to the Quality and Quantity of Maine’s Snowmobile Trails System.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
In general, snowmobile clubs and municipalities do a good job of maintaining and grooming trails	4.48	4.39	4.61
The current ITS and Connector trails adequately link all important snowmobile destinations in the State	4.00	3.93	4.11

system in Maine, as reflected by a mean score of 4.48 for all respondents. Over 90 percent of all respondents either strongly agree or somewhat agree with the statement, and less than 5 percent of all respondents strongly disagree or somewhat disagree with the statement. The respondents in the subgroup Clubs and Municipalities/Municipalities Only rate the quality of trail maintenance and grooming slightly higher than the Snowmobile Clubs subgroup.

Respondents also agree that the current trails system adequately links the important snowmobile destination in Maine. However, the means score 4.00 overall indicates that respondents do not agree as strongly with this statement as the previous statement. Roughly 80 percent of respondents either strongly or somewhat agree with the statement, while about 12 percent either strongly or somewhat disagree with the statement. Again, the Clubs and Municipalities/Municipalities Only rate the adequacy of the trails system to link destinations slightly higher than the subgroup of Snowmobile Clubs.

The results for a set of procedural statements pertaining to the grants programs and buying and selling capital equipment are reported in Table 5. Respondents generally agree that maintenance expenses for all ITS/connector trails should be reimbursed by the municipal grants program. Only about ten percent of all respondents disagree with this statement. Respondents also agree that clubs and municipalities that do not honor grant contract obligations should be penalized. No form of penalty was suggested in the statement, so opinions may vary with the type of penalty. However, most agree that some kind of penalty is warranted. Respondents do not agree that clubs and municipalities should purchase their trail

Table 5. Mean Results for Statements Related to Procedural Issues for Grants Programs and Capital Equipment Purchases and Sales.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
Maintenance expenses for all ITS/Connector trails should be reimbursed by the municipal grants program	3.96	3.86	4.12
Clubs and municipalities that do not honor their grant contract obligations should be penalized	3.86	3.86	3.84
Clubs and municipalities should pay for their trail signs using the money they receive from the trail grants fund	1.71	1.63	1.84
A website should be developed for clubs and municipalities to list grooming equipment that is for sale and for clubs and municipalities to list the type of grooming equipment they want to purchase	4.15	4.32	3.96
DOC should maintain a list of "preferred" grooming equipment based upon the history of the reliability, maintenance, and operating costs of the various makes and models of grooming equipment	3.42	3.55	3.25

signs from money received from the trail grants fund. The seem to favor the current practice of DOC purchasing the signs with trail fund money and distributing the signs and the remaining trail fund money to the clubs and municipalities. The

Snowmobile Clubs subgroup disagree more strongly (mean of 1.63) with this statement than respondents in the Both Clubs and Municipalities/Municipalities Only subgroup (mean of 1.84).

Respondents also favor the development of a website to facilitate the buying and selling of used grooming equipment. Roughly 75-80 percent of all respondents favor such a website. Overall, respondents also slightly favor DOC providing a listing of “preferred” equipment based on historical reliability and maintenance costs. However, about 20-25 percent of respondents disagree with this statement. In comments, some respondents feel this could cause problems with certain manufacturers and dealers who are not on the “preferred” list. Furthermore, some small clubs who use smaller grooming equipment feel the list of preferred equipment may not include the smaller grooming equipment they use.

Section II also contains a series of statements about snowmobile registration fees and options that could be used to increase revenue for the trails grant and capital equipment grant funds. The results for the first two of these statements are shown in Table 6. The first stated: “The current Maine resident snowmobile registration fee of \$40 is too low to adequately finance snowmobile trail maintenance and capital equipment”. The second statement is the same as the first, except it refers to the non-resident snowmobile registration fee of \$88. On average, respondents agree with both statements. For all respondents, the mean score for the two statements are almost identical (3.56 and 3.57, respectively). Those responding in the subgroup that includes clubs and municipalities and municipalities only more strongly agree with the statement on resident fees than

Table 6. Results for Statements Indicating Resident and Non-Resident Fees are too Low to Adequately Fund Trail Maintenance and Capital Equipment Expenses.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
The current Maine resident snowmobile registration fee of \$40 per year is too low to adequately finance snowmobile trail maintenance and capital equipment expenses	3.56	3.43	3.73
The current Maine non-resident snowmobile registration fee of \$88 per year is too low to adequately finance snowmobile trail maintenance and capital equipment expenses	3.57	3.61	3.53

the subgroup representing clubs only. In contrast, the subgroup of clubs and municipalities/municipalities only do not feel as strongly as the snowmobile clubs subgroup regarding the non-resident registration fee. Overall, the data support the belief that current registration fees are too low to adequately fund the maintenance of the trail system and the capital equipment needs of clubs and municipalities. However, about 22 percent of respondents indicated that they either strongly or somewhat disagree with each of the statements, and an additional 20 percent indicated they have a neutral opinion toward both statements.

The second pair of questions related to registration fees in Section II stated that residents and non-residents who do not show proof of membership in a Maine snowmobile club should pay a higher registration fee than those who do show proof

Table 7. Results for Statements Indicating Higher Registration Fees for People who do not Provide Proof of Membership in a Maine Snowmobile Club.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
Maine resident snowmobile registration fees should be higher for residents who do not present proof of membership in a Maine snowmobile club	4.49	4.55	4.40
Maine non-resident snowmobile registration fees should be higher for non-residents who do not present proof of membership in a Maine snowmobile club	4.20	4.25	4.12

of membership in a Maine snowmobile club (Table 7). The rationale for this option is that people who join a club contribute to the activities of the club, including trail maintenance and grooming, fundraising, etc., whereas those that do not belong to a club do not contribute to club activities. The mean score for charging residents more if they do not present proof on membership in a Maine snowmobile club is 4.49, which is the highest mean score of any statement in the survey. Fully 88 percent of all respondents either somewhat or strongly agree with the statement pertaining to residents. Only about 6.5 percent of all respondents strongly or somewhat disagree with the statement for residents.

In terms of non-residents, the mean score is slightly lower (4.20) than that for residents, but is still above 4.0. About 79 percent strongly or somewhat agree

with the statement, and only 12.7 percent strongly/somewhat disagree with the statement for non-residents. Hence, the data indicate a high degree of agreement with the statements for both residents and non-residents.

The final pair of statements designed to enhance revenues for the DOC grants programs involved the implementation of a trail pass system. Currently, resident and non-residents can ride on the Maine trails system by registering their snowmobile in Maine. No other fees are required. An option that has been discussed is the implementation of a trail pass that would be required (in addition to the snowmobile registration) for all snowmobilers who ride on Maine trails. People who use their snowmobiles for ice fishing and other off-trail activities would not be required to purchase the trail pass. The revenue raised through the sale of trail passes would be used to supplement the trail grants and capital equipment grants programs. The results associated with the option of implementing a trail-pass system in Maine are reported in Table 8.

Respondents are generally negative about implementing a trail-pass system for residents of Maine. The mean score of 2.1 is quite low and 52 percent of all respondents strongly disagree with the statement. Two-thirds of respondents either strongly or somewhat disagree with the implementation of a resident trail-pass system.

Overall, respondents disagree with the implementation of a trail-pass system for non-residents as well. However, they were less negative toward this statement than the comparable statement for residents. The mean score for the non-resident trail pass is 2.80, which is approaching the “neutral” range of responses. About 48

Table 8. Respondents' Views Regarding the Implementation of a Trail Pass System in Maine.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
In addition to the snowmobile registration fee, resident snowmobilers should be required to purchase an annual trail pass to ride in Maine	2.13	2.09	2.21
In addition to the snowmobile registration fee, non-resident snowmobilers should be required to purchase a trail pass to ride in Maine	2.80	2.69	2.91

percent of respondents strongly or somewhat disagree with the non-resident statement, but 35 percent either strongly or somewhat agree with the statement. Hence, respondents are more inclined to implement the trail-pass system for non-residents than for residents.

The results for the trail-pass system and the option to provide proof of membership in a snowmobile club probably reflect the real difference between residents and non-residents. It is difficult for non-residents to be actively involved in a Maine snowmobile club. Hence, respondents were less inclined to force non-residents to show proof of membership in a Maine snowmobile club to qualify for a lower registration fee. This option works better for Maine residents. On the other hand, imposing a trail pass fee on non-residents may be a better option because non-residents have very limited opportunities to join and be active in a snowmobile

club. Hence, the best option for residents and non-residents may differ, and the responses reflect this fact.

Section II contained one other statement related to fees. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the statement: “Maine resident and non-resident snowmobile registration fees should be similar to the fees charged in nearby states”. Respondents generally agreed with this statement, perhaps recognizing the need to be “price competitive” with other states. The mean score for this statement is 3.44 and 50 percent of respondents either strongly or somewhat agree with the statement. While the need to be price competitive is important, it is also important to consider the quality of the snowmobiling experience in Maine, relative to other states. Many have argued that Maine, by virtue of its excellent trail system and abundant snow conditions in most years, offers a better snowmobiling experience than many nearby states. If this is an accurate view of the current situation, the need to be price competitive with other states needs to be balanced with the quality of the snowmobiling experience Maine offers.

Finally, Section II contains three questions that address the other side of the revenue/expense equation. These statements suggest that, based on the current financial conditions, moratoria should be placed on the authorization of new grant projects, and on the expansion of club trails and ITS/connector trails. The three statements and the results are shown in Table 9. Respondents slightly disagree with a moratorium on new grant projects (new club or municipality applying for trail or capital equipment grants). They also disagree with the idea of a moratorium on expansion of club trails. As expected, snowmobiles club respondents disagree

Table 9. Results for Statements Restricting the Authorization of New Grant Projects, and Expansion of Club Trails and ITS/Connector Trails.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
Because of the current financial conditions, a moratorium should be placed on the authorization of new grant projects	2.73	2.77	2.69
Because of the current financial conditions, a moratorium should be placed on the expansion of existing club trails	2.67	2.51	2.89
Because of the current financial conditions, a moratorium should be placed on the expansion of existing ITS and Connector trails	2.94	2.74	3.20

with the club-trail moratorium more strongly than the respondents representing both clubs and municipalities/municipalities only. Overall, respondents were nearly neutral on the proposed moratorium on expansion of ITS/connector trails. Respondents from snowmobile clubs slightly disagree with the ITS/connector trails moratorium, whereas respondents representing clubs and municipalities and municipalities only slightly favor the moratorium on ITS/connector trails.

Section III Survey Results

Statements in Section III of the survey addressed issues directly related to the trail-grants programs offered by the Maine Department of Conservation. The DOC actually operates two separate trail grants programs: one for snowmobile clubs and the other for municipalities. Although similar in nature, the rules for

Table 10. Results for Statements Related to the Administration of the Snowmobile Club and Municipality Trail Grants Programs.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
The current DOC trail grants program for snowmobile clubs is administered fairly and effectively	3.25	3.04	3.55
The current DOC trail grants program for municipalities is administered fairly and effectively	3.09	2.81	3.53

reimbursement of expenses differ, and the reimbursement rates paid to clubs and municipalities also differ. For example, over the last five years, the rate of reimbursement of trail maintenance costs for snowmobile clubs has varied from 45 to 70 percent of reported costs, while the municipality reimbursement rates over the same time period ranged from 58 to 67 percent of reported costs.

Two of the statements in Section III address the fairness and effectiveness of the administration of the club and municipal trail grants programs. The results for those statements are reported in Table 10. Overall, respondents only slightly agree with the statements that the club and municipality trail grants programs were administered fairly and effectively. The mean score for the club grants program is 3.25, while the mean score for the municipal trail grants program is 3.09. Respondents representing both clubs and municipalities/municipalities only have a higher level of agreement with the two statements than the respondents representing only snowmobile clubs. Overall, 30 percent of all respondents disagree with the statements, while about 50 percent agree with the statements.

Table 11. Results for Statements Related to the Adequacy of Current Trail Funds Reimbursement Rates and the need for Additional Revenue for the Trail Fund Programs.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
Current trail grant reimbursements to snowmobile clubs for trail maintenance are adequate	2.08	2.21	1.88
Current trail grant reimbursements to municipalities for trail maintenance are adequate	2.37	2.57	2.09
Additional revenue is needed for the trail grants program so DOC can reimburse a higher percentage of club and municipality trail maintenance costs	4.35	4.34	4.37

Another pair of questions addressed the adequacy of the level of reimbursement received by clubs and municipalities through the trail grants programs. The two statements and the mean score for the responses are shown in Table 11. In both cases, respondents clearly disagree with the contention that the levels of reimbursement from the trail grants program are adequate for both clubs and municipalities. The mean score for the snowmobile club statement (2.08) is lower than the mean score for the municipalities (2.37). However, both means are well below the “neutral” mean score of 3.0. Seventy percent of respondents disagree with the adequacy of reimbursement for snowmobile clubs, and about 60 percent disagree with the adequacy of reimbursement for municipalities. In

addition, respondents representing both clubs and municipalities/municipalities only more strongly disagree with the two statements than did their counterparts that only represented snowmobile clubs.

The third statement in Table 11 states specifically that additional revenue is needed for the trail grants programs so DOC can increase the rate of reimbursement to clubs and municipalities. Respondents have a high degree of agreement with this statement, which is consistent with the high level of disagreement with the two previous questions. The overall mean score for the additional revenue statement is 4.35, which is among the highest mean scores in the survey. Over 80 percent of respondents agree with the statement, and over 60 percent strongly agree with the statement. Only about six percent disagree with the statement.

Two statements related to multi-use trails are presented in this section of the survey. Multi-use trails are used for both snowmobiling in the winter and ATV riding in the summer. The DOC also has a trails fund for ATV clubs. Hence, two sources of funding are available for maintenance of multi-use trails. One of the statements suggests that the maintenance costs for multi-use trails should be funded in proportion to the amount and duration of use of the trails for the two activities. The second statement suggests that DOC should fund 100 percent of maintenance costs for multi-use trails (through some combination of snowmobile trail funds and ATV trail funds). The results for these statements are reported in Table 12.

The mean score for the statement suggesting proportional funding based on duration of use is 3.02 for all respondents. This is equivalent to a neutral opinion

Table 12. Results for Statements Related to Multi-Use (Snowmobile and ATV) Trails.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
Multi-use trails (used for both snowmobiles and ATVs) should be funded proportionally based on the amount and duration of use for the two activities	3.02	3.17	2.80
The DOC should fund multi-use trails (used for both snowmobiles and ATVs) at 100% of maintenance costs	3.44	3.40	3.54

for the statement, but respondents have wide-ranging opinions. Forty percent of respondents disagree with the statement and 37 percent agree with the statement. The remaining 23 percent have a neutral opinion. Representatives of snowmobile clubs have a slightly more positive opinion about the statement than respondents representing both clubs & municipalities/ municipalities only.

Respondents express a higher level of agreement with the statement that DOC should fund 100 percent of maintenance costs for multi-use trails. About 56 percent of respondents agree with the statement, compared to about 28 percent who disagree. In contrast to the previous statement, respondents from the clubs & municipalities/municipalities only subgroup agree with this statement slightly more than respondents representing the snowmobile clubs subgroup.

There were also two questions related to the number of miles clubs and municipalities are reimbursed for maintaining. Currently, clubs and municipalities

are only reimbursed for a maximum of 30 miles of trails, even if they maintain and groom more than 30 miles of trails. One statement addresses the idea of decreasing the number of miles for which clubs and municipalities are reimbursed, and the second suggests increasing the number of miles for which clubs and municipalities are reimbursed. The results for the two statements are contained in Table 13.

Table 13. Results for Statements Related to the Number of Miles for which Clubs and Municipalities are Reimbursed.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
The number of miles of trails currently funded by the DOC trails fund should be decreased so that the per-mile funding level can be increased on the remaining miles of trails	2.10	2.22	1.97
The maximum funded miles should be increased from 30 to 40 miles on club grants, even though the DOC cost per mile reimbursement rate may decrease	2.51	2.63	2.33
Given the limited resources available in the trail grants program, reducing the number of miles clubs are reimbursed for maintaining is better than raising resident and nonresident snowmobile registration fees	1.72	1.78	1.66

Respondents generally disagree with the idea to decrease the number of miles currently funded by DOC, even if this change would result in an increase in the level of funding on the remaining miles of trails. The mean score for all respondents is 2.10, with the subgroup of respondents representing the clubs and municipalities/municipalities only expressing a higher level of disagreement than those representing snowmobile clubs only.

Overall, respondents also disagree with the idea that the maximum funded miles be increased from 30 to 40 miles, with the DOC cost per mile reimbursement rate potentially decreasing. The mean score for this statement is 2.51 and, again, the subgroup representing both clubs and municipalities/municipalities only is more negative toward the statement than respondents for snowmobile clubs only. Given the earlier results indicating that respondents feel the current level of funding is too low to adequately support trail maintenance and grooming, it is interesting to note that respondents are more favorable toward increasing the maximum funded miles than they are toward decreasing the maximum funded miles. About two-thirds of respondents disagree with reducing the number of miles of trails funded through the trail grants program, while only 50 percent disagree with increasing the number of funded miles from 30 to 40 miles.

The last statement in Table 13 is designed to determine respondents' opinions regarding the relative merits of reducing costs by reducing the number of miles of trail for which the clubs and municipalities are reimbursed and increasing revenues for the trail funds by increasing the resident and non-resident snowmobile registration fees. The results clearly indicate that respondents strongly prefer an

increase in resident and non-resident registration fees over the cost savings associated with reducing the number of miles of trails for which clubs and municipalities are reimbursed through the trail funds. Over 80 percent of all respondents strongly or somewhat disagree with the statement that reducing the number of miles for which clubs are reimbursed is preferable to increasing resident and non-resident registration fees. Furthermore, almost 60 percent of respondents strongly disagree with the statement. Hence, respondents strongly favor actions that increase revenues for the trail fund over attempts to control the costs that are reimbursed through the trail fund.

Two other statements included in Section III of the survey are shown in Table 14. The first suggests that ITS/Connector trails should have a higher priority for DOC trail grant funding than local club trails. ITS/Connector trails link the various regions of the state and are used quite heavily. The second statement in Table 13 goes a step further by stating that clubs and municipalities should only be reimbursed for the ITS/Connector trails they maintain, and not for club trails.

Based on all respondents, the statement suggesting that ITS/Connector trails should have a higher priority for DOC trail grant funding than local club trails has a mean score very close to neutral (2.94). However, respondents are not indifferent about the statement. Almost 23 percent of respondents strongly disagree with the statement, but about 16 percent strongly agree with it. Furthermore, 43 percent either strongly or somewhat disagree with the statement, and 44 percent state they either strongly or somewhat agree with the statement. Hence, respondents are almost equally divided on this statement. Comments provided by respondents

Table 14. Results for Statements Related to Reimbursement of Trail Maintenance Costs for ITS/Connector Trails Versus Club Trails.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
ITS/Connector trails should have a higher priority for DOC trail grant funding than local club trails	2.94	2.62	3.40
Clubs and municipalities should only be reimbursed for the ITS/Connector trails they maintain, and not for club trails	1.41	1.35	1.50

give some insight into the reasons behind the divergent views on this statement.

Some clubs and municipalities do not have ITS/Connector trails in their communities. Therefore, giving priority to those trails for DOC trail grant funding could disadvantage those clubs and municipalities in terms of the level of funding they could obtain through the trail grant programs.

As expected, based on the responses to the previous statement, respondents disagree even more strongly with the statement that clubs and municipalities should only be reimbursed for the ITS/Connector trails they maintain, and not for club trails. The mean score for this statement is 1.41 and 90 percent of all the respondents either strongly or somewhat disagree with the statement. Again, the comments of respondents indicate that the second statement would eliminate trail grant funding for those clubs and municipalities that do not have ITS/Connector trails in their communities.

Table 15. Results for Statements Related to the Operation and Administration of the DOC Trail Grant Programs.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
Trails maintained under the municipal grants program should have the option of being covered by a set reimbursement per mile rather than submitting a listing of all costs/expenses	2.97	3.12	2.80
Trails maintained under the club trail grants program should have the option of being covered by a set reimbursement per mile rather than submitting a listing of all costs/expenses	3.14	3.25	2.98
DOC should pay 100% of the cost of materials on trail grants, but no labor cost for club volunteers	2.30	2.52	2.10
In those communities where both the municipality and the snowmobile club submit separate trail grant requests, the club and municipality should work together and submit only one trail grant request	3.30	3.31	3.34

Finally, four statements in Section III of the survey address issues related to the operation and administration of the municipal and club trail grants programs.

Those statements are shown in Table 15. The first two statements would allow clubs and municipalities to accept a set reimbursement per mile of trails

maintained, instead of submitting a detailed listing of all costs and expenses. This option would reduce the paper work for clubs and municipalities. It would also reduce the paper work that the DOC would have to review in determining the reimbursement rates that would be paid to clubs and municipalities. Respondents are fairly neutral toward both of these statements, although they agree slightly more with the statement pertaining to snowmobile clubs. For the first statement pertaining to municipalities, about 40 percent of respondents disagree with the statement, while 43 percent agree with the statement. These data indicate divergent views about the statement. For the statement pertaining to clubs, 37 percent disagree with the statement and slightly over 50 percent agree with the statement.

The third statement in Table 15 addresses the type of expenses that are reimbursed by the DOC trail fund programs. Currently, both materials and labor are eligible expenses for reimbursement by DOC. However, a significant part of the labor cost is returned to the clubs because many workers volunteer their time to work on the trails. Therefore, it has been suggested that DOC pay 100 percent of the cost of materials but no labor costs for the people performing the trail maintenance work. However, respondents do not agree with this option. The mean score for the statement is 2.3 and over 50 percent of respondents disagree with the statement. Respondents seem to prefer the current policy of both labor costs and material costs being eligible for reimbursement.

The last statement in Table 15 suggests that, in those communities where both the municipality and the snowmobile club submit separate trail grant requests,

the club and municipality should work together and submit only one trail grant request. This change in procedures would reduce the workload on municipalities, snowmobile clubs and the DOC staff that processes the grants. Overall, respondents slightly agree with this statement, with a mean score of 3.3. Over 50 percent of respondents agree with the statement and only about 30 percent disagree with it. It would seem that the snowmobiling community is well positioned to adopt this change in policy since over one-third of the individuals submitting grant requests for snowmobile clubs are also submitting grant requests for their municipality. Consequently, they could simply submit one grant request for both the club and the municipality. The remainder of the clubs would need to coordinate with their municipality to submit one grant request.

Section IV Survey Results

The results for Section IV of the survey are reported below. Section IV addresses issues related to the capital equipment fund program administered by the Maine Department of Conservation. As noted earlier, the capital equipment fund provides partial reimbursement to snowmobile clubs and municipalities who purchase new equipment, such as trail groomers. The level of reimbursement in a given year depends on amount of money available in the fund and the dollar amount of requests for reimbursement submitted by clubs and municipalities during that year. Currently, clubs and municipalities do not know the level of reimbursement they will receive until after they have purchased the equipment. This arrangement adds to the uncertainty facing clubs as they consider capital equipment purchases.

Table 16. Results for Statements Related to the Adequacy and Administration of the Capital Equipment Grant Fund.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
Current DOC capital equipment fund reimbursements to municipalities and snowmobile clubs are adequate	2.44	2.60	2.22
The current DOC capital equipment fund program for snowmobile clubs and municipalities is administered fairly and effectively	3.14	3.07	3.25

As reported in Table 16, respondents disagree with the statement that current capital equipment fund reimbursements to clubs and municipalities are adequate. As with other responses related to the level of revenue available to support the activities and expenses of clubs and municipalities, respondents to this statement again reflect the opinion that additional revenue is needed to support the capital equipment grants program. Respondents representing both clubs and municipalities/municipalities only more strongly disagree with the adequacy of the current reimbursement rates than respondents representing only snowmobile clubs.

All respondents slightly agree that the current capital equipment fund program is administered fairly and effectively. Respondents for club and municipalities/municipalities only more strongly agree with this statement than respondents representing snowmobile clubs. However, almost 30 percent of all

respondents either strongly or somewhat disagree with the fairness and effectiveness of the administration of the capital grants program.

Table 17 contains a series of statements about the types of capital expenditures that should be eligible for reimbursement and the responsibilities that clubs and municipalities must accept to be eligible for capital equipment grant reimbursements. Respondents slightly agree that DOC should not provide reimbursement for equipment that is more than 20 years old. Again, club and municipalities/municipalities only respondents express a higher level of agreement with the statement than respondents representing only snowmobile clubs. However, based on the comments provided by respondents, there is a clear difference of opinion on this statement based on the size of the snowmobile club/municipality. Respondents from small clubs indicated that not providing reimbursement for groomers more than 20 years old would eliminate their access to the capital equipment fund program. Many of these clubs regularly purchase older equipment because it is all they can afford. Hence, one should keep this in mind when interpreting the results for this statement.

Respondents are more strongly in agreement with the statement that one-time major overhaul expenses on groomers should be eligible for reimbursement from the capital equipment fund. The mean score for this statement is 3.9 and almost 75 percent of respondents either strongly or somewhat agree with the statement. Respondents see two advantages with this arrangement. First, major overhauls can be very expensive and clubs and municipalities need help covering those repair costs. Second, some respondents felt that allowing reimbursement for

Table 17. Results for Statements that Represent Potential Changes in How the Capital Equipment Grant Fund is Administered.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
DOC should not provide any reimbursement for the purchase of trail groomers that are more than 20 years old	3.21	3.09	3.39
One-time major overhaul expenses for trail groomers should be eligible for reimbursement from the DOC capital equipment fund	3.89	3.75	4.09
DOC should require that groomers be stored under cover/out of the weather year-round as a condition for receiving funding from the capital equipment fund	3.18	3.08	3.33
Snowmobile clubs and municipalities should have to guarantee that groomers and other equipment will be properly maintained by a qualified service provider before they receive funding from the capital equipment fund	2.66	2.61	2.72

major overhaul expenses may result in fewer requests for reimbursement for the purchase of new groomers. Clubs may overhaul existing groomers rather than buy new ones if major overhaul expenses are eligible for partial reimbursement through the capital equipment fund.

Overall, respondents only slightly agree with the statement that groomers should be stored under cover/out of the weather year-round as a condition for receiving funding from the capital equipment fund. Again, respondents representing both clubs and municipalities/municipalities only more strongly agree with the statement than respondents representing only snowmobile clubs. Overall, about 48 percent of respondents either strongly or somewhat agree with the statement. On the other hand, about 35 percent of respondents either strongly or somewhat disagree with the statement. Once again, based on comments provided by respondents, those representing smaller clubs were more likely to disagree with the statement. They indicated that the need to build a garage or other facility to store groomers would be burdensome and could force some of the clubs to go out of existence. So once again, one cannot just simply look at the mean score for the statement to get a clear view of the impact associated with requirement to store groomers under cover year round.

The last statement in Table 17 states that clubs and municipalities should have to guarantee that groomers and other equipment will be properly maintained by a qualified service provider to receive funding from the capital equipment fund. While the reason for imposing this requirement is obvious, respondents, overall, disagree with the statement, as reflected by the mean score of 2.66. About 55 percent of all respondents either strongly or somewhat disagree with this requirement. Respondents raised two concerns about this requirement. First, requiring equipment be maintained by a “qualified service provider” would result in much higher maintenance costs, as a lot of the maintenance is currently performed

by volunteer members of clubs. Second, respondents strongly objected to the suggestion that the people currently maintaining the groomers are not qualified to perform the tasks. They believe that most of the people maintaining the equipment have both the knowledge and skills required to perform the work. Once again, respondents from small clubs indicated that such a requirement would jeopardize the existence of their clubs.

Statements contained in Table 18 represent some additional possible changes in how the capital equipment fund is operated to determine whether respondents agree or disagree with the potential changes. The first statement suggests placing a cap on the maximum amount a club/municipality will receive in reimbursement, regardless of the amount requested by the organization. Respondents slightly agree with the idea of placing a cap on reimbursement. The mean score for the statement is 3.44, and there is very little difference in the views of the two subgroups. About 60 percent of all respondents either strongly or somewhat agree with the statement and about 24 percent disagree with it.

Respondents also slightly agree with the proposition that the capital equipment fund pay a guaranteed minimum percent of approved capital equipment fund requests, even if it means some grant requests are delayed to following years. Overall, the mean score for this statement is 3.28 and 55 percent of respondents either strongly or somewhat agree with the statement. About 28 percent of respondents either strongly or somewhat disagree with the guaranteed minimum. Again, the responses of the two subgroups are very similar.

Table 18. Results for Additional Statements that Reflect Potential Changes in How the Capital Equipment Fund is Administered.

Statement	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs	Clubs & Municipalities/Municipalities Only
The capital equipment fund should have a cap that sets the maximum amount the club/municipality will receive, regardless of the amount requested	3.44	3.45	3.43
The capital equipment fund should pay a guaranteed minimum percent of club and municipal capital equipment fund requests that are approved, even if it means some capital equipment grant requests are delayed to following years	3.28	3.26	3.31
Capital equipment grants submitted by municipalities and clubs should be prioritized so that a higher level of reimbursement can be made on approved grant requests, even if it means some capital equipment grant requests are delayed to following years	3.03	2.91	3.23
DOC should establish a committee to evaluate, prioritize and approve capital equipment purchase requests submitted by clubs and municipalities before the purchases are made	3.51	3.43	3.61

The final two statements in Table 18 are similar in that both require prioritizing capital equipment requests so a higher reimbursement rate can be achieved on approved grants. They differ in that the second statement prioritizes the requests **before** the purchase is made, so the clubs and municipalities will know the reimbursement rate before they actually make the purchase. Respondents are essentially indifferent about the first statement (mean score of 3.03) and generally agree with second statement (mean score of 3.51). Respondents representing both clubs and municipalities/municipalities only more strongly agree with both statements than their counterparts who represent only clubs. Overall, respondents favor prioritizing grant requests before the purchase is made than prioritizing the grant requests after the purchases are made. However about 35 percent of respondents either strongly or somewhat disagree with both statements. Comments suggest that respondents believe that clubs and municipalities do a thorough job of researching their equipment needs, and see no reason for another “bureaucratic” layer to prioritize equipment grant requests. They also feel that requiring prior approval before purchasing the equipment would make it more difficult to negotiate with sellers, and would prevent clubs and municipalities from moving quickly if a “good deal” comes along. Obviously, those that receive a high priority will like the process while those that receive a low priority will not like the process. Small clubs and those clubs/municipalities that do not have any ITS/Connector trails in their area expressed concerns that they would receive a low priority and would, therefore, no longer have access to the capital equipment fund.

Summary of Major Findings

Finally, this section represents a summary of the major findings of the survey. One obvious conclusion is that respondents believe that additional funding is needed to support the work of clubs and municipalities. All statements related to the adequacy of funding for both the trail funds and the capital equipment fund clearly indicate that current levels of funding are inadequate. For example, the statements indicating that the current resident and non-resident snowmobile registration fees are too low to adequately finance the trail maintenance and capital equipment funds received mean scores of over 3.5, which indicates a fairly high level of agreement with the statements.

Furthermore, respondents also favor additional revenue over other changes that would attempt to lower costs or at least decrease the rate of increase in costs incurred by the clubs and municipalities. Several statements were included to suggest ways to reduce costs (a moratorium on new projects, a moratorium on expansion of club trails, a moratorium on expansion of ITS/Connector trails, reducing the number of miles clubs are reimbursed for maintaining, etc.), and all of these received a mean score of less than 3.0. When it was suggested that reducing the number of miles for which clubs are reimbursed is better than increasing the resident and non-resident snowmobile registration fee, the statement received a mean score of 1.72, indicating a very low level of agreement with the statement.

In terms of the method used to raise additional revenue, survey respondents strongly favor higher registration fees for snowmobilers who do not present proof of membership in a Maine snowmobile club. Some respondents even went so far as

requiring that the club certify that the snowmobiler was active and involved in club activities before they would qualify for the lower registration fee. Of course, the reasoning behind this result is that additional active membership in clubs would alleviate their other problem, which is a lack of club volunteers to work on trails and other club activities. However, implementing a method to determine who deserves the discounted registration fee and who does not would be problematic and should be avoided. However, just requiring membership in a club to qualify for a lower registration fee is a very popular option among respondents to increase revenues for the grants programs.

Respondents were less favorably disposed to the implementation of a trail pass system, in addition to the registration system. The mean score for the statement requiring residents to purchase a trail pass is 2.13, which is quite low. The mean score for statement requiring non-residents to purchase a trail pass is higher at 2.80, but is still below 3.0.

Respondents also expressed caution about statements that they considered to be “unfunded mandates”. For example, the mean scores for the statements requiring the storage of groomers under cover and out of the weather (3.14), and requiring that servicing of groomers be performed by “qualified service providers” (2.66), do not reflect the range of opinions offered by respondents through comments. Several smaller clubs indicated that these types of requirements would place a severe financial strain on them, and could force the clubs to dissolve. Other statements that were viewed as a disadvantage for small clubs include only reimbursing trail expenses for ITS/Connector trails (and not club trails), and not

providing reimbursement for groomers and other equipment that is more than 20 years old. Small clubs often purchase older equipment because it is all they can afford.

Finally, some of the statements in the survey suggest that all parties need to be mindful of unintended consequences. The statements mentioned above to require “qualified service providers” and to store groomers under cover and out of the weather can also serve as examples. While these statements are reasonable and should add to the years of useful life for the equipment, their impact on small clubs serves a reminder that there may be a significant downside associated with the implementation of the policies reflected in the statements. As another example, the statement to only reimburse expenses for ITS/Connector trails and not club trails, could have a major impact on the trail system in Maine. These potential consequences need to be anticipated and considered prior to making major changes in the operation and administration of the trail maintenance funds and the capital equipment fund.

While the purpose of this survey was to elicit input from clubs and municipalities regarding the funding and administration of the state-operated trail maintenance and capital equipment funds, the survey responses neither answer all questions nor provide mechanisms through which to implement changes in the programs. As with many things in life, the more you know, the more you realize how much more there is to know. We suggest that additional information and discussion on specific topics will be helpful in developing specific plans to change the funding and administration of these vital programs.

Appendix
Distribution of Responses for the
Maine Snowmobile Trails Survey

Appendix

Distribution of Responses for the Maine Snowmobile Trails Survey 2011

SECTION ONE

Thank you for agreeing to complete the survey. In this section, we are interested in some general information about your involvement in snowmobiling in Maine.

About how many years have you been snowmobiling in Maine?

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
None-don't snowmobile	1.88	0	4.49
Less than 5 years	1.41	1.65	0
6 to 10 years	4.69	5.79	3.37
11 to 20 years	16.9	19.33	11.24
More than 20 years	75.1	72.73	80.9

About how many years have you been a member of a Maine snowmobile club?

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
None-Not a Member	2.82	0.83	5.56
Less than 5 years	4.23	6.61	1.11
6 to 10 years	18.31	23.97	11.11
11 to 20 years	25.82	26.45	23.33
More than 20 years	48.83	42.15	58.89

About how many years have you been involved in submitting grants for your snowmobile club or municipality?

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Less than 5 years	31.1	38.02	21.35
6 to 10 years	32.08	33.06	30.34
11 to 20 years	21.7	16.53	29.21
More than 20 years	12.26	7.44	19.1

SECTION TWO

In this section we want to ask you some general questions about snowmobiling in Maine and the sources of funding available to support the activity.

In general, snowmobile clubs and municipalities do a good job of maintaining and grooming trails.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	2.4	3.3	1.1
Somewhat Disagree	2.8	3.3	2.2
Neutral	1.8	1.65	2.2
Somewhat Agree	30.5	34.7	23.3
Strongly Agree	62.4	57.0	71.1

The current Maine resident snowmobile registration fee of \$40 per year is too low to adequately finance snowmobile trail maintenance and capital equipment expenses.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	8.0	5.8	11.1
Somewhat Disagree	14.0	18.3	7.8
Neutral	20.3	25.0	14.4
Somewhat Agree	28.7	28.3	30.0
Strongly Agree	28.7	22.5	36.7

The current Maine non-resident snowmobile registration fee of \$88 per year is too low to adequately finance snowmobile trail maintenance and capital equipment expenses.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	5.2	3.3	7.8
Somewhat Disagree	17.5	17.5	16.7
Neutral	22.6	25.0	18.9
Somewhat Agree	25.0	23.3	27.8
Strongly Agree	29.7	30.8	28.8

Maintenance expenses for all ITS/Connector trails should be reimbursed by the municipal grants program.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	5.2	4.13	6.7
Somewhat Disagree	6.6	7.4	4.4
Neutral	15.0	16.5	12.2
Somewhat Agree	33.8	42.2	23.3
Strongly Agree	39.4	29.8	53.3

Maine resident snowmobile registration fees should be higher for residents who do not present proof of membership in a Maine snowmobile club.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	3.8	2.5	5.6
Somewhat Disagree	2.8	3.3	2.2
Neutral	4.7	2.5	7.8
Somewhat Agree	17.8	19.8	15.6
Strongly Agree	70.9	71.9	68.9

Maine non-resident snowmobile registration fees should be higher for non-residents who do not present proof of membership in a Maine snowmobile club.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	6.6	4.96	8.9
Somewhat Disagree	6.1	6.6	5.6
Neutral	7.0	5.8	8.9
Somewhat Agree	21.6	24.0	17.8
Strongly Agree	58.7	58.6	58.9

In addition to the snowmobile registration fee, resident snowmobilers should be required to purchase an annual trail pass to ride in Maine.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	52.1	52.9	50.0
Somewhat Disagree	15.0	15.7	14.4
Neutral	11.3	10.7	12.2
Somewhat Agree	10.8	10.7	11.1
Strongly Agree	10.8	9.9	12.2

Maine resident and non-resident snowmobile registration fees should be similar to the fees charged in nearby states.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	12.2	9.1	16.7
Somewhat Disagree	7.0	9.1	4.4
Neutral	28.2	31.4	24.4
Somewhat Agree	29.6	28.1	31.1
Strongly Agree	23.0	22.3	23.3

In addition to the snowmobile registration fee, non-resident snowmobilers should be required to purchase a trail pass to ride in Maine.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	30.5	30.6	30.0
Somewhat Disagree	17.4	19.8	14.4
Neutral	12.7	14.1	10.0
Somewhat Agree	22.5	20.7	25.6
Strongly Agree	16.9	14.9	20.0

Clubs and municipalities that do not honor their grant contract obligations should be penalized.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	4.7	5.0	4.5
Somewhat Disagree	6.6	5.0	9.0
Neutral	17.0	21.0	12.4
Somewhat Agree	41.5	38.0	46.1
Strongly Agree	30.2	31.4	23.1

Clubs and municipalities should pay for their trail signs using the money they receive from the trail grants fund

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	61.5	59.5	63.3
Somewhat Disagree	19.3	26.5	10.0
Neutral	9.4	6.6	13.3
Somewhat Agree	6.1	6.6	5.6
Strongly Agree	3.8	0.8	7.8

A website should be developed for clubs and municipalities to list grooming equipment that is for sale and for clubs and municipalities to list the type of grooming equipment they want to purchase.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	3.8	0.8	6.7
Somewhat Disagree	3.3	3.3	3.4
Neutral	17.0	14.9	20.2
Somewhat Agree	26.0	24.8	27.0
Strongly Agree	50.0	56.2	42.7

DOC should maintain a list of “preferred” grooming equipment based upon the history of the reliability, maintenance, and operating costs of the various makes and models of grooming equipment.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	12.7	10.7	15.7
Somewhat Disagree	10.9	9.1	13.5
Neutral	23.1	24.0	20.2
Somewhat Agree	28.8	27.0	31.5
Strongly Agree	24.5	29.0	19.1

Because of the current financial conditions, a moratorium should be placed on the authorization of new grant projects

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	20.9	19.8	21.6
Somewhat Disagree	26.1	22.3	31.8
Neutral	19.9	25.5	11.4
Somewhat Agree	25.6	25.6	26.1
Strongly Agree	8.0	6.6	9.1

The current ITS and Connector trails adequately link all important snowmobile destinations in the State.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	5.2	6.6	3.4
Somewhat Disagree	7.1	6.6	7.9
Neutral	6.1	6.6	4.5
Somewhat Agree	45.8	47.9	42.7
Strongly Agree	35.8	32.3	41.6

Because of the current financial conditions, a moratorium should be placed on the expansion of existing club trails.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	23.6	26.5	20.2
Somewhat Disagree	28.8	32.2	23.6
Neutral	13.3	13.2	13.5
Somewhat Agree	25.0	19.8	32.6
Strongly Agree	9.0	8.3	10.1

Because of the current financial conditions, a moratorium should be placed on the expansion of existing ITS and Connector trails.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	18.3	22.3	13.3
Somewhat Disagree	25.4	28.9	21.1
Neutral	14.1	12.4	15.6
Somewhat Agree	28.2	25.6	32.2
Strongly Agree	14.1	10.7	17.8

Section Three

In this section, we are interested in your opinion about Municipal and Snowmobile Club Trail Grants provided by the Maine Department of Conservation (DOC).

Current trail grant reimbursements to municipalities for trail maintenance are adequate.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	31.5	24.8	41.1
Somewhat Disagree	28.2	24.8	33.3
Neutral	18.3	24.8	7.8
Somewhat Agree	16.4	19.0	13.3
Strongly Agree	5.6	6.6	4.4

Current trail grant reimbursements to snowmobile clubs for trail maintenance are adequate.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	44.8	42.2	49.4
Somewhat Disagree	27.8	26.5	29.2
Neutral	5.2	4.1	6.7
Somewhat Agree	19.3	23.2	13.5
Strongly Agree	2.8	4.13	1.1

The current DOC trail grants program for snowmobile clubs is administered fairly and effectively.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	14.2	15.7	11.2
Somewhat Disagree	16.0	19.0	12.4
Neutral	19.8	21.5	18.0
Somewhat Agree	31.3	33.1	29.2
Strongly Agree	18.9	10.7	29.2

The current DOC trail grants program for municipalities is administered fairly and effectively.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	13.7	15.8	10.1
Somewhat Disagree	16.6	19.2	13.5
Neutral	30.3	39.2	18.0
Somewhat Agree	25.1	20.0	32.6
Strongly Agree	14.2	5.8	25.8

The number of miles of trails currently funded by the DOC trails fund should be decreased so that the per-mile funding level can be increased on the remaining miles of trails.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	36.5	33.1	40.9
Somewhat Disagree	30.3	29.8	30.7
Neutral	20.4	21.5	19.3
Somewhat Agree	11.9	14.4	9.1
Strongly Agree	0.95	1.7	0.0

Multi-use trails (used for both snowmobiles and ATVs) should be funded proportionally based on the amount and duration of use for the two activities.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	19.1	13.3	27.3
Somewhat Disagree	16.2	19.2	12.5
Neutral	21.4	20.8	22.7
Somewhat Agree	30.5	30.8	28.4
Strongly Agree	12.9	15.8	9.1

The DOC should fund multi-use trails (used for both snowmobiles and ATVs) at 100% of maintenance costs.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	9.0	8.3	9.0
Somewhat Disagree	18.4	18.2	19.1
Neutral	16.5	20.8	11.2
Somewhat Agree	31.6	30.8	30.3
Strongly Agree	24.5	15.8	30.3

Trails maintained under the municipal grants program should have the option of being covered by a set reimbursement per mile rather than submitting a listing of all costs/expenses

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	19.4	17.5	22.5
Somewhat Disagree	21.3	16.7	27.0
Neutral	16.1	19.2	11.2
Somewhat Agree	28.9	30.8	27.0
Strongly Agree	14.2	15.8	12.4

Trails maintained under the club trail grants program should have the option of being covered by a set reimbursement per mile rather than submitting a listing of all costs/expenses.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	17.5	16.5	19.1
Somewhat Disagree	19.5	18.2	22.5
Neutral	10.9	8.3	14.6
Somewhat Agree	34.9	38.0	29.4
Strongly Agree	17.0	19.0	14.6

Clubs and municipalities should only be reimbursed for the ITS/Connector trails they maintain, and not for club trails.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	77.9	79.3	75.6
Somewhat Disagree	12.2	13.2	11.1
Neutral	3.3	2.5	4.4
Somewhat Agree	4.2	3.3	5.6
Strongly Agree	2.4	1.7	3.3

Given the limited resources available in the trail grants program, reducing the number of miles clubs are reimbursed for maintaining is better than raising resident and nonresident snowmobile registration fees.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	58.7	57.0	61.1
Somewhat Disagree	23.0	21.5	24.4
Neutral	7.9	9.9	5.6
Somewhat Agree	7.9	9.9	5.6
Strongly Agree	2.4	1.7	3.3

In those communities where both the municipality and the snowmobile club submit separate trail grant requests, the club and municipality should work together and submit only one trail grant request.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	17.8	17.4	18.9
Somewhat Disagree	13.2	12.4	14.4
Neutral	16.9	20.7	12.2
Somewhat Agree	22.1	21.5	22.2
Strongly Agree	30.1	28.1	32.2

ITS/Connector trails should have a higher priority for DOC trail grant funding than local club trails.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	22.8	28.3	14.6
Somewhat Disagree	20.9	25.0	14.6
Neutral	11.9	13.3	10.1
Somewhat Agree	28.9	23.3	37.1
Strongly Agree	15.6	10.0	23.6

The maximum funded miles should be increased from 30 to 40 miles on club grants, even though the DOC cost per mile reimbursement rate may decrease.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	24.2	21.5	28.4
Somewhat Disagree	27.0	23.1	31.8
Neutral	27.9	31.4	23.9
Somewhat Agree	15.6	19.0	10.2
Strongly Agree	5.2	5.0	5.7

DOC should pay 100% of the cost of materials on trail grants, but no labor cost for club volunteers.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	39.0	31.4	48.9
Somewhat Disagree	24.4	26.5	22.2
Neutral	9.4	12.4	5.6
Somewhat Agree	17.4	18.2	16.7
Strongly Agree	9.9	11.6	6.7

Additional revenue is needed for the trail grants program so DOC can reimburse a higher percentage of club and municipality trail maintenance costs.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	2.8	2.5	3.4
Somewhat Disagree	3.3	3.3	3.4
Neutral	10.0	9.9	10.1
Somewhat Agree	23.1	26.5	19.1
Strongly Agree	60.4	57.9	64.0

Section Four

In this section of the questionnaire, we are interested in your views and opinions about the Capital Equipment Fund provided by the Maine Department of Conservation. This fund is used to partially reimburse snowmobile clubs and municipalities for the cost of equipment used to maintain and groom snowmobile trails.

Current DOC capital equipment fund reimbursements to municipalities and snowmobile clubs are adequate

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	27.6	27.5	28.4
Somewhat Disagree	31.9	23.3	43.2
Neutral	13.3	15.0	10.2
Somewhat Agree	23.3	30.0	14.8
Strongly Agree	3.8	4.2	3.4

DOC should not provide any reimbursement for the purchase of trail groomers that are more than 20 years old.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	17.5	15.8	21.1
Somewhat Disagree	20.4	25.0	15.8
Neutral	9.5	10.8	5.3
Somewhat Agree	28.4	30.8	26.3
Strongly Agree	24.2	17.5	31.6

The current DOC capital equipment fund program for snowmobile clubs and municipalities is administered fairly and effectively.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	12.9	16.0	9.0
Somewhat Disagree	17.6	14.3	22.5
Neutral	21.4	25.2	15.7
Somewhat Agree	38.1	36.2	40.5
Strongly Agree	10.0	8.4	12.4

One-time major overhaul expenses for trail groomers should be eligible for reimbursement from the DOC capital equipment fund.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	3.8	5.1	2.3
Somewhat Disagree	9.6	11.9	5.6
Neutral	11.9	9.3	15.7
Somewhat Agree	43.1	50.0	33.7
Strongly Agree	31.6	23.7	42.7

Capital equipment grants submitted by municipalities and clubs should be prioritized so that a higher level of reimbursement can be made on approved grant requests, even if it means some capital equipment grant requests are delayed to following years.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	13.5	14.4	11.4
Somewhat Disagree	19.7	23.7	14.8
Neutral	24.0	25.4	22.7
Somewhat Agree	35.1	29.7	42.9
Strongly Agree	7.7	6.8	9.1

The capital equipment fund should have a cap that sets the maximum amount the club/municipality will receive, regardless of the amount requested by the club/municipality.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	7.6	7.5	7.9
Somewhat Disagree	16.6	16.7	16.9
Neutral	15.2	15.0	15.7
Somewhat Agree	45.0	45.0	43.8
Strongly Agree	15.8	15.8	15.7

The capital equipment fund should pay a guaranteed minimum percent of club and municipal capital equipment fund requests that are approved, even if it means some capital equipment grant requests are delayed to following years.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	9.6	7.6	12.5
Somewhat Disagree	18.2	21.0	14.8
Neutral	17.2	19.3	13.6
Somewhat Agree	44.5	42.0	47.7
Strongly Agree	10.5	10.1	11.4

(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER)

DOC should require that groomers be stored under cover/out of the weather year-round as a condition for receiving funding from the capital equipment fund.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	16.1	16.7	15.7
Somewhat Disagree	19.4	20.0	18.0
Neutral	16.6	19.2	13.5
Somewhat Agree	26.1	27.5	23.6
Strongly Agree	21.8	16.7	29.2

DOC should establish a committee to evaluate, prioritize and approve capital equipment purchase requests submitted by clubs and municipalities **before** the purchases are made.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	12.4	14.3	10.1
Somewhat Disagree	12.9	13.5	12.4
Neutral	12.9	11.8	13.5
Somewhat Agree	35.2	36.1	34.8
Strongly Agree	26.7	24.4	29.2

Snowmobile clubs and municipalities should have to guarantee that groomers and other equipment will be properly maintained by a qualified service provider before they receive funding from the capital equipment fund.

Responses	All Respondents	Snowmobile Clubs Only	Both Clubs & Municipalities/ Municipalities Only
Strongly Disagree	24.5	24.5	25.0
Somewhat Disagree	30.8	32.2	28.4
Neutral	11.1	11.0	11.4
Somewhat Agree	21.6	22.0	20.5
Strongly Agree	12.0	10.2	14.8