A. ROLL CALL

B. MESSAGES
   1. Citizen’s Comment – limited to three (3) minutes
   2. Disclosure & Statement of Conflict of Interest

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. MINUTES
   1. Minutes from November 13, 2018

E. PRESENTATIONS
   None.

F. COMMUNICATIONS FROM BOROUGH

G. ACTION ITEMS
   None.

H. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
   1. Proposed North College Road Subdivision & Easement Dedication for Jeff Studdert Sleddog Trails
   2. Discuss TAC priorities for FNSB Trails Program

I. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   1. Report from Trail Plan Revision Working Group—Jamie Hansen

J. COMMISSIONER’S COMMENTS

K. AGENDA SETTING / NEXT MEETING
   To be determined.

L. ADJOURNMENT
A regular meeting of the Fairbanks North Star Borough (Borough) Trails Advisory Commission (TAC) was held in the Blue Room on the third floor of the Centennial Center for the Arts at Pioneer Park, 2300 Airport Way, Fairbanks, Alaska. The meeting was called to order at 6:11pm by Chair Carol Kaynor.

A. ROLL CALL
MEMBERS PRESENT: Brian Accola   Carol Kaynor
Richard Shideler   Helyn Lefgren
Jamie Hansen   John Morack

MEMBERS ABSENT:  Jerry Rafson  Geoffrey Orth
Seth Adams  Leslie Kitchin

OTHERS PRESENT: Bryant Wright, Trails Coordinator, FNSB Parks & Recreation
Melissa Kellner, Planner, FNSB Community Planning
Chris Beck, Principal Planner, Agnew::Beck
Wende Wilbur, Principal Planner, Kittelson & Associates

B. MESSAGES
1. Citizen’s Comments – limited to three (3) minutes
• None.

2. Disclosure and Statement of Conflict of Interest
• None.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
MOTION to amend the agenda moving item E. Presentation: Trails, Parks & Recreational Needs in the Salcha-Badger Road Planning Area—Chris Beck & Wende Wilber, Agnew::Beck & Kittelson to the end of the meeting made by Chair Kaynor and seconded by Commissioner Lefgren. Motion carried without objection.

MOTION ADOPTED

D. MINUTES
Minutes from October 9, 2018.
MOTION to approve minutes made by Commissioner Hansen and seconded by Commissioner Shideler.
Discussion: Commissioner Kaynor provided minor edits. Motion to approve the amended minutes carried without objection.

MOTION ADOPTED
E. COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE BOROUGH

Mr. Wright provided updates on the following topics:

1. Skyline Ridge Trail Restoration
   Construction is complete at Skyline Ridge for Phase II of trail restoration and staff is pleased with the finished product.

2. Recreational Trails Program Grants
   Staff submitted the application to improve the east-west multiuse trail in Isberg Rec area. The Skyline to Goldstream Connector application was not submitted because staff ran out of time. They will work over the winter to secure an easement across state land so an application will be ready for next year.

3. Creamer’s Refuge/Jeff Studdert Sled Dog Trails
   The process for UAF to convey lands to ADF&G is moving forward through the Borough’s Title 17 subdivision process. An anticipated concern will be inconsistencies about allowable trail uses between the Borough’s Trail Plan and the ADF&G Creamer’s Refuge Master Plan. Staff intends to discuss possibilities with the Refuge staff.

4. FMATS Transportation Improvements Program
   Staff alerted the Commission about the opportunity to submit comments on proposed projects in the TIP program by November 21.

F. ACTION ITEMS

1. New Business
   a. Election of TAC Officers for 2019—TAC Commissioners

   Discussion & Nominations:
   Chair: Commissioner Lefgren nominated Commissioner Kaynor.
   Vice Chair: Commissioner Morack nominated Commissioner Shideler.
   Secretary: Commissioner Shideler nominated Commissioner Morack.
   All nominations were accepted by the nominees.

   MOTION to elect Commissioner Kaynor (Chair), Commissioner Shideler (Vice Chair), and Commissioner Morack (Secretary) as the 2019 TAC officers made by Commissioner Hansen and seconded by Commissioner Accola.
   Vote: All in favor.
   MOTION ADOPTED

   b. Approval of a draft letter of support for Interior Alaska Land Trust’s application to the Recreational Trails Program for grant funds to develop the Chinook Conservation Park—Seth Adams & Carol Kaynor

   MOTION to approve, sign and send this recommendation made by Commissioner Shideler and seconded by Commissioner Morack.
   Discussion: None.
   Vote: All in favor.
   MOTION ADOPTED

G. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS
1. Discuss TAC priorities for FNSB Trails Program—TAC Commissioners

Discussion: Commissioner Hansen gave some background on the need to have a list of priorities. She mentioned high-priority issues might be accompanied by a working group. Commissioners chimed in with ideas for priorities which included updating the easement acquisition process, Adopt-a-Trail program, trail nomination process, outreach, and establishing a trail management process and objectives. Chair Kaynor volunteered to compile a list to discuss in depth at the next meeting. She also mentioned different topics could be fleshed out with more detail in different companion documents outlining policies and procedures.

H. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Report from Trail Plan Rewrite Working Group—Jamie Hansen

Discussion: Commissioner Hansen reported that the group met on November 8. Chair Kaynor reviewed draft edits by past Trails Coordinator Tom Hancock and has a nice draft introductory section. They will now move forward and look at the policies and procedures section before submitting any kind of draft plan to the TAC. The next working group meeting will be December 6 at 5pm.

I. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Commissioner Lefgren thought the Trail Plan working group was doing well.
Commissioner Morack had no comment.
Commissioner Accola said he is unlikely to participate in a working group. He highlighted the risks of losing participants and experiencing burnout if the Commission goes primarily to meeting as many small working groups. He also wanted to be cautious not to take on too much at once and choose realistic issues to work on.
Commissioner Hansen appreciated Commissioner Accola’s comments and agreed the TAC needs to be realistic about which topics to address. She clarified that the goal of prioritizing and working more frequently in smaller groups would be to make sure the TAC is focused on issues that stand a chance of progressing and to avoid spinning circles around the same frustrations at regular TAC meetings. She does not want to remove content from regular meetings; rather, she wants to organize their efforts in a way that they are more likely to bring action and content to the regular meetings.
Commissioner Shideler had no comment.
Chair Kaynor agreed with Commissioner Hansen that working on detailed issues in smaller groups would be more productive, but that they would rely on the TAC regular meetings to review the work. She said she would like to get an appointment with the new Mayor to discuss priorities and also invite the new Assembly liaison to attend a meeting soon.

J. AGENDA SETTING

TBD February 12, 2018 Meeting.
• Presentations: Possible presentation on Trail Management Objectives by Brooks Ludwig of State Parks (Commissioner Orth will make contact). If possible, the commissioners would like someone from Community Planning to attend.
• Informational Items:
  • 1. Discuss TAC priorities for Trails Program
• Committee Meetings: Report from Trail Plan Revision Working Group. Next working group meeting December 6, 2018. [Note: the working group was unable to meet on that date and rescheduled for January 8, 2019.]

K. Presentations

a. Trails, Parks & Recreational Needs in the Salcha-Badger Road Planning Area—Chris Beck & Wende Wilber, Agnew::Beck & Kittelson

Chris Beck, Wende Wilbur and Melissa Kellner provided background on the Salcha-Badger Rd area plan and current progress. They have heard consistently that trails, recreation and access to open space is an important resource and attraction to living in this area. They were very appreciative to the TAC for referring them to Karen Tilton who has been very involved and helpful in the planning process. They are now focused on planning to resolve transportation and recreation connectivity issues, incompatible use conflicts, road crossing safety problems, serving a variety of users, and protecting important recreation corridors. Everyone hovered around a large printed map in order to draw and write notes on specific locations. They asked for input on specific recreation needs from the TAC commissioners and recorded notes throughout the discussion. Commissioner Lefgren commented on the need for recreation access in close proximity to home, where people don’t have to drive in order to access their destination. Chair Kaynor suggested that access needs to be built in whenever a subdivision is developed. Commissioner Lefgren spoke to conflicts between motorized and nonmotorized uses due to displacing motorized users and Commissioner Accola suggested that if motorized uses are not considered in planning, there will continue to be conflicts. Commissioner Shideler added that the sustainability, suitability and durability of the area to support trails should be considered. Chair Kaynor noted past problems with a dichotomous “motorized/nonmotorized” use designation and how it doesn’t account for seasonal variations. Commissioner Accola and others agreed that rough trails would be attractive to off-roaders and a dedicated, suitable place that can sustain associated damage without environmental consequences or user conflicts would be an asset to this community. Mr. Wright mentioned that an agreement between the FNSB and the Fairbanks Offroad Lions to build an off-road vehicle park at Tanana Lakes is under development. Everyone brainstormed potential locations for additional off-road parks in the North Pole area and came up with the “9 Mile Richardson” area south of the Tanana River levy, the trails at the end of Peede Road, and the Chena Flood Control area. Ms. Wilbur asked about other recreation needs and issues. Commissioners identified that, due to the lack of access to the trails on Eielson Air Force Base, there is a potential need for access along the Richardson Highway through this planning area. They spoke to the barriers to protecting trails, particularly lack of funding and rights-of-way. Mr. Beck suggested that identifying trail needs and potential in this planning area could provide support for adding key trails to the Trail Plan. Commissioner Shideler mentioned the Haines-Valdez Pipeline as a potential trail in this area to add to the Plan. Ms. Wilbur said this plan could also help to establish design standards for trails. Commissioners spoke to the need for standards to emphasize sustainability of trails and for corridors to provide multiple and separated uses.

L. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Submitted by,

R. Bryant Wright, Trails Coordinator
FNSB Parks & Recreation
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TRAILS ADVISORY COMMISSION
TRAIL PLAN REWRITE WORKING GROUP MEETING
January 8, 2019

The Fairbanks North Star Borough (Borough) Trails Advisory Commission (TAC)’s Trail Plan Rewrite Working Group Meeting held a meeting in the West Conference Room, 2nd Floor, Big Dipper Ice Arena 1920 Lathrop Street, Fairbanks, Alaska.

The Working Group Chair Helyn Lefgren called the meeting to order at 5:09 p.m. on Jan 8, 2018.

A. Roll Call

Members Present: Leslie Kitchin, Jamie Hansen, Carol Kaynor (over the phone), Helyn Lefgren, Geoff Orth not present.

Borough Staff Attending: Bryant Wright

B. Messages

1. Citizen’s Comment – None

2. Commissioner’s Comments – None

C. Approval of Agenda

Jamie moved to approve, Leslie seconded.

D. New Business

1. Address Issues with and Procedure for a Comprehensive Rewrite of the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan.

Discussion of CRTP Issues, Goals, Policies, Objectives - Edits p. 12:

Issue 1, Policy 1: The Borough will focus the primary efforts of its recreational trail plan program toward trails which are of community wide importance, and which are identified as proposed components of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Recreational Trail System in the Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan.

C. Kaynor raised a question on whether it is appropriate for the plan, at this point in time, to refer to “proposed components of ...” B. Wright responded - Yes, that’s appropriate this is an aspirational plan. Need to keep the proposed elements because not all components mentioned in the plan are formalized as part of the trail system and they may never be. C. Kaynor as written now one would think that none of the trails are actually components. It appears they have not been formally adopted. Where are we at and where are we going in terms of FNSB’s formal adoption of trails? B. Wright responded that there are complexities when it comes to the definition of dedication in the Borough code and what that means. For example, Point A is proposed and Point B is part of FNSB’s trail system and therefore FNSB is responsible.
The criteria for formal adoption as opposed to dedication is not entirely clear or agreed upon at this point. We know that right of way for entire trail, fully linked trail of easements, must be in place but few trails in trail plan fit that definition. For a few trails, dedication has happened, but formal adoption has not happened. What does this mean for trails? B. Wright has a memo from code enforcement. C. Kaynor noted that this topic is important, and additional work needs to be done with FNSB to clarify this. A description and discussion of this would be appropriate for a companion document. This may include where we are in terms of dedication and formal adoption and descriptions/instructions for how to codify particular sections of trail as “park”.

**Issue 1, Policy 1, Objective a:** Establish a defined policy and procedure which delineates the responsibilities of all departments or divisions of the Borough with regard to developing the Fairbanks North Star Borough Recreational Trail Plan.

C. Kaynor questioned the use of “developing” in this objective. B. Wright suggested this is to show this is an iterative process and that changes/updates are continual. J. Hansen suggested removing “developing” to “updating and implementing.”

**Issue 1, Policy 3, Objective a –** Update the Long Range Bicycle Facilities Plan on a periodic basis in cooperation with ADOT/PF.

C. Kaynor suggested deleting this objective. It seems like a planning objective rather than a CRTP objective.

**Issue 2 Right-of-Way Acquisition**

The first essential step in establishing a permanent recreational trail network within the Fairbanks North Star Borough is to acquire legal public rights-of-way which protect recreational uses. The need for acquisition of trail rights-of-way must be balanced with other public needs such as road and land development. There must be some rights-of-way acquisition authorities or mechanisms available in order to develop a recreational trail system based primarily on existing trails.

C. Kaynor there must be some right-of-way acquisition authorities or mechanisms available already. Which trails are already in the recreational trail system? Does this only refer to trails on FNSB property? This needs to be discussed further in a companion document.

**Issue 2, Policy 3 & 4**

*Policy 3: Easements granting public use only during certain portions of the year and for particular uses are acceptable for particular trail requirements.*

*Policy 4: When trails included in categories A or B of the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan lie on land undergoing the subdivision process, public rights-of-way shall be dedicated for the trail as part of the subdivision requirements. At the time of initial subdivision design, trail alignment shall be adjusted, if necessary, and in so far as possible to coincide with property boundaries in order to minimize impact on subdivision design and maintain property use with the provision that the continuity, safety, and utility of the trail is maintained. When it is necessary to realign...*
a trail, the subdivider shall be required to clear a new path. Any grooming of the new trail which is necessary to meet particular Trail needs will be accomplished by trail users.

C. Kaynor noted this is an opportunity to use/introduce TMOs. There is not enough specificity in our guidelines. As with TMOs, this needs to be laid out on a trail by trail basis.

**Issue 2, Policy 4, Objective 4: Incorporate a review of the Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan requirements into the Division of Community Planning Subdivision review process.**

B. Wright Issue 2 is the real meat and potatoes of what the Borough does on trails. Honing in on what the TAC likes and does not like is important. Another important step is to compare all of Issue 2 with Title 17. That may be a separate subject that is taken apart and dissected in a companion document.

C. Kaynor said this is within the Planning Commission’s purview so there is work to do with the Planning Commission on TMOs and all other issues that come out of Issue 2. That may be a problem, we haven’t had any discussion with the Planning Commission, and they need to know what we are doing. TAC needs a working group with Planning Commission.

B. Wright agrees, when Right of Way acquisition is considered this section of plan tells us what is happening in Borough code, legal, platting, code enforcement, planning, mayor. Modifying Issue 2 would require detailed coordination with all these Borough agencies. C. Kaynor and J. Hansen maybe we don’t want to tackle changes in this section, but we do want to clarify what we can do and who we need to work with. Right now, it seems to be an important aspect to focus on process of how to make such changes.

C. Kaynor on p16. What is the legal constraints paper? B. Wright it’s a background paper from when the CRTP was originally put together. H. Lefgren made point that the state is not currently actively pursuing or investigating RS2477. C. Kaynor suggested removing mention of the legal constraints paper from CRTP.

**ISSUE 3: Recreational Trail Use Designations**

C. Kaynor noted that Issue 3 is an appropriate place to address seasonal use. TAC should focus on this issue and add content.

**Issue 3, Policy 2, Recreational trails which are established in rural areas as part of the Borough trail System should generally remain available for multiple recreational uses. Exceptions to this rule can be made if a particular type of trail designation is needed to fulfill an identified need or demand.**

**Objectives:**

a. Work with state and federal agencies and local residents to ensure recreational trails established in rural areas of the Borough are available for a variety of recreational uses to the greatest extent practical.

b. Work with state and federal agencies to establish non-motorized trails in rural areas where
significant demand is identified.

C. Kaynor recommended adding an objective C that calls for the development of TMOs. She questioned the motorized versus non-motorized language in objective B. Why is there only mention of establishing non-motorized trails?

**Issue 4, Policy 3 - Prior to formal acceptance of right-of-way dedications by the Borough Assembly or identification of a trail for public use, a cooperative maintenance agreement or commitment for Borough maintenance shall be made.**

**Objective:**

**a.** Identify future maintenance provisions prior to formal acceptance of dedicated recreational trail rights-of-way.

C. Kaynor this needs to be seriously addressed. J. Hansen agreed and this has been brought up before. Lack of maintenance provisions should not prevent trails from being dedicated as part of the FNSB trail plan, especially with the current questionable status of the Adopt-a-Trail program.

**ISSUE 5: Ensuring Legal Use of Recreational Trail Rights-of-Way**

When property owners are approached for trail right-of-way negotiations, they may often be concerned with the ability of themselves or the Borough to control unauthorized uses of the easement, if it is granted. When easements are established for specific purposes, those uses are the only legal uses of the easement and other, non-specified uses can be trespass. It can often be difficult or impossible to identify and report violations when they occur. If private landowners are expected to be willing to negotiate trail easements, they must be aware that the Borough will help to ensure the easements are used for their specified purposes. Many times illegal trail use occurs because of uncertainty by trail users about the trail’s proper uses. Once trails are identified for their intended uses, unauthorized trail use can be greatly reduced.

C. Kaynor – Issue 5 is the same way. What are the processes currently in place? How does someone interact with FNSB on this issue? Recommended flagging this for the companion document to go into more detail about how to address trail misuse through blockage or whatever.

Regarding law enforcement and blockages, the Borough currently is not willing to do anything about violations of trail easements.

B. Wright has a memo on this. Not sure to what degree this plan has an effect, but it would be nice to understand that better. FNSB is limited on its ability to exercise powers on roads, and thus on trails. When it comes to dedicated easements, the Borough can if it wishes enforce encroachments on certain dedicated easements. B. Wright noted there are very few code enforcers for all Borough codes. B. Wright will look at the memo in more detail and send to TAC. J. Hansen noted it that any criteria the Borough uses to act on code enforcement would need to be tested on a trail-by-trail basis. C. Kaynor agreed,
noting that the companion document should at least lay out the general criteria for enforcement and the process for bringing complaints to the Borough.

**Trail Descriptions**

J. Hansen said based on the discussion from the last working group meeting she tried to identify the elements to include in the trail descriptions. This is for trail descriptions to be included in the CRTP. Longer, detailed descriptions with TMOs and maps would be appropriate for the companion document. J. Hansen suggested the following trail elements be included in the CRTP: Trail name and Comprehensive Rec Trail Plan designation number and description including length, start, end points, use, and legal status. For the companion document, trail descriptions could include the above elements plus TMOs.

J. Hansen reviewed 3 trail descriptions in the current version of the CRTP - Chena Hot Springs Winter Trail, Ester Community Trail System, and Gilmore Trail-Fairbanks Creek Connector Trail. J. Hansen mentioned that the trail descriptions currently available made it simple to create a short description for the CRTP and a longer description for the companion document for the Chena Hot Springs Winter Trail. It also made it clear that some of the trails listed in the CRTP are not single trails, asking what exactly is included in the Ester Community Trail System. To have useful descriptions (and TMOs) work will be needed to further define trails and avoid general terms like “Ester Community Trail System.” J. Hanse said it would be useful to discuss a process for accomplishing this at the next working group meeting.

For the next meeting which was set for 5pm on Feb 7, working group members will review the Issues and Goals section again and bring additional edits/concerns. A point of discussion for the next meeting will be how/when to start presenting suggested changes to the full TAC. Also need to recruit other TAC members to work on certain sections of the CRTP.

---

(FROM Sept.to January Meetings) Priorities and areas of focus moving forward:

- **Raise priority of TMOs** in TAC, Parks Dept, and Planning Commission. Talk with Planning Commission members and/or invite to TAC. Show examples of use in FNSB and how implementing this system is valuable EVEN at a time when FNSB cannot/will not manage non-FNSB owned trails. Single Track and Chena Rec area are examples of TMOs working very well. Brooks Ludwig, has been trained and is superintendent for northern region DNR Parks and Outdoor Recreation. All state parks have TMOs. Request presentation from him or working group meeting.

- **Conservation easement** is not in the trail plan.

- **Dedication of Trails** DNR has a simple and inexpensive way to dedicate - file warranty deed with state recorder, becomes part of chain of title, file a plat goes through Borough accepted and then voted on by assembly. It should be in there. Borough acquired all platting authority and management of right of way. If Borough is not able to use DNR method as an alternative to the costly Borough dedication process, then a change is needed in the Borough’s requirements for trail dedication. **This should be easier!**

- **Continue CRTP re-write.** Identify edits and finish up policies and procedures re-write in next 4 months.
• **Discuss trail list and descriptions in CRTP.** Recruit help from other TAC members and community-based meetings to do this.

• **Adding trails to CRTP:** Many category A trails are not in CRTP. Geoff mentioned TAC would need to work with DNR and BLM on name and description updates. Geoff then raised larger question of why Category A trails need to have Borough Assembly approve? Why isn’t this automatic? “Borough Assembly will not formally accept dedication of right-of-way. Rights-of-way remain available for public use; however, the Borough does not assume responsibility.” How does this work? Why is there this extra level of effort needed for no responsibility? Need to talk to Planning to better understand the reason Category A trails are in the CRTP. Consider having this simply as a Category B plan? What would that mean?

• **Identify clear goals for TAC not simply legislative or funding goals but programmatic goals.** Review memos sent to Mayor in past 2 years. Refresh and request response from new mayor/assembly.

• **Continue discussion of making trails more central to visitors and residents.** Set-up meeting with Explore Fairbanks – how to raise profile of trails. How to incorporate existing on FNSB mapping websites – trailmapper.org.

• With clear programmatic goals, **start requesting meetings with trail user groups** at TAC meeting or at user group Board/executive meetings.

• **Request a working group meeting with Parks Dept.** to address certain issues. Identify and detail those issues for discussion at next working group meeting.

**F. Agenda Setting/Next Meeting**

• Meeting set for Feb 7 at 5pm.

**F. Adjournment**

Submitted by,

R. Bryant Wright, Trails Coordinator
FNSB Parks & Recreation
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I. INTRODUCTION

The Fairbanks North Star Borough (Borough) Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan (Trail Plan) assists the Borough and other public agencies in identifying and preserving recreational trail corridors within the Borough. and is an element of the Borough’s Comprehensive Plan.

Trail related to outdoor recreation activities are particularly important to residents of interior Alaska. Some historic trails, originally used for hunting and mining, are now primarily used for recreation. Although the purposes and uses of some trail corridors may have changed over the years, the basic concept of traveling from one point to another in a relatively natural setting remains much the same. Trail recreation provides Alaska residents and visitors the opportunity to experience the outdoors as well as our frontier history.

The recreational trails program is a cost-effective recreation investment for the Borough. By working with both public and private land developers to reserve existing trails and establishing an active volunteer program, costs of the program are minimal. As the recreational trails program continues to see more trails dedicated and identified for public use, the program increases year-round recreational benefits for the community.

The Trail Plan has three key elements: a three-category system of trails, an “Adopt-a-Trail Program,” and trail right-of-way dedication as provided by the Borough’s subdivision development ordinance. The Trail Plan also identifies priority trail corridors and a process by which additional trails can be added to the Trail Plan at the request of citizen groups. At the same time, because Eminent Domain powers cannot be used per Borough ordinance and circumstances surrounding trails may change with time, there is no guarantee that all trails included in the Trail Plan will become dedicated to the public in their entirety. For this reason the Trail Plan should be considered a dynamic document which may change due to changing circumstances.

Trail systems such as the existing Birch Hill Recreation Area that lie on dedicated public park land are included primarily to document existing available public trail systems. For any trails within the Trail Plan that have been adjudicated by the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities as RS 2477 trails, the Borough will continue to secure agreements that recognize recreation and access as a co-use.

II. BACKGROUND AND TRAIL PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Trail-oriented recreation in interior Alaska embodies the history and spirit of the Alaskan lifestyle and is well suited to the arctic environment. Trails that were originally established for mining access, logging roads, traplines, and other purposes have become natural corridors for trail recreation. Many of these routes remain cleared and useable because of their continued recreational use.1

During the planning process, trail recreation was continually identified in public meetings as a major concern. The public involvement processes for the Trail Plan, the Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Plan, and the State of Alaska Tanana Basin Area Plan all indicated very strong support for the preservation of recreational trails.

---

1 Tom’s comment: Note: See Dr Fix / SCORP for statistics.
The Borough’s recreational trails program was formally initiated in February 1980 with the adoption of Resolution 80-9. This resolution established the policy for creation and management of a recreational trail system within the Borough. The adoption of this resolution was partly the result of continued public concern that recreational trails were continually being displaced in State and Borough land disposals. In the fall of 1981, a temporary trails planner was hired under a grant from the State of Alaska to work on the Circle–Fairbanks Trail project. In addition, a report was prepared that strongly recommended the creation of a comprehensive recreational trail plan to focus efforts on trails of community-wide importance and to more clearly define mechanisms needed to make the trails program effective. The Borough Planning Commission, Plating Board, Parks and Recreation Commission, and Trails Advisory Commission all submitted resolutions to the Mayor and Assembly stating their support for preparation of a trail plan.

In May 1983, the Borough Assembly adopted an ordinance that provided funding for the Borough to prepare a comprehensive trail plan. The Trail Plan was prepared in-house with the assistance of the Borough Trails Advisory Commission and various Borough departments. The Trails Advisory Commission acted as the principal review committee throughout the planning process.

Many public agencies and trail organizations participated in the Trail Plan review; see Table 1 for participating agencies and organizations.

The Trail Plan is closely related to several other land-use plans and studies conducted with the Borough and is consistent with these plans; see Table 2 for related plans. Compatibility of the Trail Plan with other planning projects is key to its long-range success.

The development of this plan included public review through the Borough’s Trails Advisory Commission, Parks and Recreation Advisory Commission, Planning Commission, and Borough Assembly.

In June 1985 the Borough Assembly adopted Ordinance 85-053 approving the “Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan.” Since the adoption of the Trail Plan there have been eight (8) adopted ordinances amending the Trails Plan by adding new trails through the trail nomination process.

TABLE 1
Agencies and organizations that provided comments in the development of the comprehensive recreational trail plan

1. Alaska Division of Land and Water Management
2. Alaska Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation
3. Alaska Division of Forestry
4. Alaska Division of Agriculture
5. Alaska Division of Minerals and Energy Management
6. Fairbanks North Star Borough School District
7. Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
8. Alaska Department of Fish and Game
10. Federal Bureau of Land Management
11. Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
12. Facilities Engineer, Ft. Wainwright
13. Civil Engineering Squadron, Eielson Air Force Base
14. Golden Valley Electric Association
15. Glacier State Telephone Company
16. Alaska Railroad
17. Alaska Dog Mushers Association
18. Alaska Miners Association
19. Alaska Trappers Association
20. Fairbanks Motorcycle Racing Association
21. Interior Alaska Trail Riders Association
22. Interior Farmers Association
23. Interior River Users Group
24. Nordic Ski Club of Fairbanks
25. Northern Alaska Environment Center
26. Runner’s Club of Fairbanks
27. Salcha Ski Club
28. Senior Citizens of Interior Alaska, Inc.
29. Tanana–Yukon Historical Society
30. Two Rivers Ski Club

In addition, the following groups attended Trails Advisory Commission meetings and trails workshops and presentations, and received newsletters: Nordic Ski Club of Fairbanks, Interior Trail Riders Association, Alaskan Malamute Club, Tanana-Yukon Historical Society, International Right-of-Way Association, Alaska Society of Professional Engineers, and the Golden Heart Council of Campfire.2

TABLE 2
List of plans related to the Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan

1. Borough Comprehensive Plan
2. Borough Long Range Bicycle Facilities Plan
3. Borough Comprehensive Parks & Recreation Plan
4. Borough Industrial Siting Study
5. State of Alaska Tanana Basin Area Plan
7. State of Alaska Division of Land and Water Local Management Plans
8. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Chena Flood Control Project Master Plan

III. THE RECREATIONAL TRAIL PROGRAM

The Recreational Trail Program has three main functions: (1) to work with Borough departments and other government agencies to establish trail priorities and responsibilities; (2) to develop and maintain an active volunteer program that allows trail users and user groups to assume certain responsibilities for specific trails to minimize maintenance and operation costs to the Borough; and (3) to continue using the Borough’s Title 17 Subdivision ordinance to dedicate recreational trail rights-of-way for Trail Plan Category A and B trails.

---

2 What is this organization? Name does not look correct.
A. MAJOR COMPONENTS OF THE TRAIL PROGRAM

1. Three-Category System of Trails

The three categories of trails in this system are: Category A, major federal and state recreational trails; Category B, recreational trails described in the Trail Plan; and Category C, neighborhood trail networks. Responsibilities of the Borough, other public agencies and trail user groups are shown in Figure 1.
## Figure 1 Summary of Recreational Trail Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Primary Management Responsibility</th>
<th>Primary Maintenance Responsibility</th>
<th>Funding Mechanism</th>
<th>Rights-of-Way Acquisition Procedures</th>
<th>Borough Acceptance of Rights-of-Way Dedication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Federal and State Recreational Trail Systems</td>
<td>Federal or state agency. May include a cooperative agreement with the Borough.</td>
<td>Maintenance provided through managing agency, agreements, or recreational trail user groups.</td>
<td>Funding provided by federal or state agency.</td>
<td>Borough rights-of-way acquisition procedures apply where these trails cross private lands.</td>
<td>Borough Assembly is not required to formally accept these dedications of rights-of-way unless crossing private lands. Rights-of-way remain available for public use. Borough does not assume primary responsibility for trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Borough Recreational Trail Systems</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>Maintenance agreements established between Borough and recreational trail user groups.</td>
<td>Funding derived from federal or state grant sources and/or Borough Assembly appropriations.</td>
<td>All Borough rights-of-way acquisition procedures apply.</td>
<td>Rights-of-way dedication are formally accepted by the Borough Assembly. Borough assumes primary responsibility for trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Neighborhood Recreational Trail Systems</td>
<td>Recreational trail user groups or neighborhood associations.</td>
<td>Maintenance provided by trail user groups.</td>
<td>Funding derived through a service area, user group, or recreational trail user group grant applications.</td>
<td>Rights-of-way are established on a cooperative voluntary basis.</td>
<td>Rights-of-way dedication is not required to be formally accepted by the Borough Assembly. Rights-of-way which are established remain available for noted uses. Borough does not assume primary responsibility for trails.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category A. Federal and State Recreational Trail Systems

These trails cross primarily state and federal lands. The agency having authority over the land holds primary management authority and maintenance responsibility for these trails. These agencies will normally be the Federal Bureau of Land Management or the State of Alaska Department of Natural Resources. Maintenance for these trails may include assistance from recreational trail user groups and the Borough by agreement. Trails in this category that cross private lands are subject to Borough trail rights-of-way dedication procedures.

Category B. Borough Recreational Trail Systems

This category comprises those trails for which the Borough has primary management authority and responsibility. Some of these trails may exist within a designated Borough park. Once complete rights-of-way are acquired for these trails, they should be identified and managed as public recreational facilities. When possible, trailheads and parking should be considered as additions to these trails. Primary maintenance responsibility of these trails may be through cooperative agreements with trail user groups through the Adopt-A-Trail Program, described later in this plan. Trails in this category are subject to Borough trail rights-of-dedication procedures.

Category C: Neighborhood Recreational Trail Systems

This category includes trails that may be used by a local neighborhood. Neighborhood recreational trail systems can be added to the Category B recreational trail systems if nominated. The Borough will direct only minimal efforts toward trails in this category. Neighborhoods, use groups, service areas, and homeowner associations are responsible for primary management and maintenance responsibilities. The Borough may assist in identifying these trails in new subdivisions and establishing communication between the land developers and trail users.

2. Adopt-A-Trail Program

The second major component of the Trail Plan is to establish and maintain an active, coordinated volunteer program. Within this program, trail user groups, service areas, homeowners associations, and others assume specified responsibilities by “adopting” certain trails or segments of trails. These organizations enter into cooperative agreements with the Borough that define the organization’s and Borough’s responsibilities. Having agreements in place as part of a formal acceptance and rights-of-way dedication, or when identifying and nominating a new trail for public use, is encouraged. Depending on the conditions and use of a particular trail, cooperative agreements should provide for a level of management and care to help ensure that the recreational trail is in a reasonably safe condition for its intended use. Agreements can range from minimal safety inspections of recreational trail conditions to regular grooming and/or track setting. This program will assist the Borough in minimizing Borough maintenance and operations costs.
3. Trail Dedication Authority

The third major component of the Trail Plan is the use of the Borough’s Title 17, Subdivision, ordinance. Title 17.56.040, Trail Easements, requires Category A and B trails be platted to the public as part of any subdivision development application submitted to the Borough. On private lands not undergoing the subdivision process, recreational trail rights-of-way will continue to be acquired on a cooperative basis with trail realignment being required if an easement cannot be negotiated.

Any new or relocated portions of a trail must maintain connectivity with the existing trail or trail system and should be located on suitable terrain capable of providing for a sustainable trail tread.

For recreational trails that cross public lands, the Borough should seek rights-of-way permits, licenses, use agreements, non-objections, or other formal documents from the public managing agency.