MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH
PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD

Chairperson – David Palmer – At Large 4
Vice Chair – Ed Strabel - District 6
Amy O'Connor – District 1
James Gustafson– At Large 1
George Brown – District 2
Kenneth Barber – At Large 2
Sonya Walden - District 3
Lyle Downing – At Large 3
VACANT – District 4
Cindy Bettine - District 5
VACANT - District 7

AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING **October 24, 2016**
Palmer Pool **5:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL – DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

V. MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING

A. May 23, 2016

VI. BOROUGH STAFF REPORT

- Hugh Leslie, Recreation & Library Services Manager

VII. TAB REPORT

VIII. PERSONS TO BE HEARD / AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – 3 minutes per person

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. TAB Joint Meeting – *See June 2016 meeting packet for hard copy*

B. Alaska LNG project - http://ak-lng.com/

X. PUBLIC NOTICES

XI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Frankie Barker – Environmental Planner
Economic Benefits of Trails, Parks and Open Space in the Mat-Su
See April 2016 meeting packet for hard copy

B. Emerson Krueger – Resolution 16-03 Q & A

C. PRTAB Resolution 16-03 - A RESOLUTION OF THE MATANUSKA–SUSITNA BOROUGH PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD SUPPORTING CLEARING ALPINE SKI TRAILS WITHIN THE NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT UNIT AT HATCHER PASS.

D. Legislation prohibiting trapping on borough owned public school property and the borough owned portion of Crevasse Moraine trail system

XII. VOLUNTEER NOMINATIONS

XIII. CORRESPONDENCE

XIV. MEMBER COMMENTS

XV. NEXT MEETING

- November 28, 2016 – Brett Memorial Ice Arena, 746 E. Bogard, Wasilla

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH
PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD

Chairperson - David Palmer – At Large 4	George Brown – District 2	VACANT – District 4
Vice Chair — Ed Strabel - District 6	Kenny Barber – At Large 2	Cindy Bettine - District 5
Amy O'Connor– District 1	Sonya Walden - District 3	VACANT – District 7
James Gustafson – At Large 1	Lyle Downing – At Large 3	

DRAFT MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING **May 23, 2016**
Parks Maintenance Shop **5:00 P.M.**

I. CALL TO ORDER
Meeting called to order by Mr. Palmer at 5:01 P.M.

II. ROLL CALL – DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

A. Members present: David Palmer, Sonya Walden, Kenny Barber, Lyle Downing, Ed Strabel, Gus Gustafson, George Brown, Amy O'Connor
Members Absent:
Members Absent and Excused: Cindy Bettine

B. Staff Present: Hugh Leslie, Recreation Services Manager
Jill Irsik, CD Admin Spec.

C. Guests Present: Butch Shapiro, Division Manager of the Central Landfill

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
MOTION: Mr. Downing moved, Mr. Barber 2nd. Agenda approved as written.

IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Mr. Palmer led the Pledge of Allegiance.

V. MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING

A. March 21, 2016

MOTION: Mr. Barber moved, Mr. Gustafson 2nd. Minutes approved as written.

VI. BOROUGH STAFF REPORTS
Mr. Leslie reported:

- Parks crew staff start this week
- Trails crew is up and running
- Mat River Campground opens Thursday, May 26, 2016
- On June 1, staff, Mayor, and Assemblymember will visit the Deshka to look at the cabin to see about liquidating it
- Legislation was approved for moving up to $1 million from the Land Management Fund to the Park's Shop project.
    - Looking to secure a site at the Alcantra facility for a new parks maintenance shop
- Assembly is going forward with the Recreation bond
    - Legislation will go forward June 7th for the Assembly to approve the bond going on the ballot in October

- Once the new parking area is completed at the West Butte Trailhead, a tow away zone will be signed on either side of the street
- Installation of the auto-gate at GPRA is moving forward

VII. TAB REPORT

Nothing to report

VIII. PERSONS TO BE HEARD / AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Resolution 16-01 – A RESOLUTION OF THE MATANUSKA–SUSITNA BOROUGH PARKS, RECREATION AND TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDING THE ASSEMBLY ADOPT THE UPDATE TO THE BOROUGH RECREATIONAL TRAILS PLAN.
MOTION: Mr. Strabel moved, Mr. Downing 2nd. All in favor. Resolution 16-01 passed with none opposed.

B. Alaska LNG project - http://ak-lng.com/
Nothing new to report

X. PUBLIC NOTICES

None

XI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Crevasse Moraine Trail System – Butch Shapiro, Solid Waste Division Manager
Mr. Shapiro shared with the board the history of the Central Landfill, as well as future plans for the cell sequencing in regards to the Crevasse Moraine Trail System.

B. TAB joint meeting
- Ms. Walden brought forward to the board the Transportation Advisory Board's (TAB) request to have a joint TAB and PRTAB meeting to discuss ATV issues in the Mat-S u Valley.
- The board requested that Ms. Walden ask the TAB for a short list of more specific topics to be discussed at the joint meeting.
- The board asked staff to work with Planning staff and provide a short narrative of the information that has been compiled regarding the topics that the TAB wished to discuss.
- This will be on the agenda for the June 27th PRTAB meeting. It will be determined at that point if a joint meeting will be appropriate, or if

XII. VOLUNTEER NOMINATIONS

None

XIII. CORRESPONDENCE

XIV. MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Strabel:
- New bike trails at GPRA are going in

- Colony JROTC have been working on the Woods/Allen Trail at Government Peak. They have flagged and brushed the trail
- Government Peak Race is June 4th. 200-250 participants are anticipated.

Ms. Walden:

- It was good to hear from Mr. Shapiro on the Central Landfill / Crevasse Moraine issue.
- Liked Mr. Leslie's staff report
- Is looking forward to the next meeting

Ms. O'Conner

- June 4th is National Trails Day

XV. NEXT MEETING

A. Next regularly scheduled meeting is June 27, Jordan Lake Park, 3140 S. Big Lake Rd., Big Lake, AK

XVI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Palmer adjourned the meeting at 6:48 p.m.

_____

David Palmer - Chairperson

ATTEST:

_____

Jill Irsik, Comm. Dev. Admin. Specialist

Summary of TAB ORV Work Session attachments:

1. A listing of TAB resolutions that urge the Assembly to either adopt policy or fund programs/studies that evaluate ORV use and impacts within highway corridors (easements or ROW).

2. March 2012 – First TAB work session on ORV issues produced a list of safety and concerns that the TAB wanted to address.

3. Spreadsheet that was produced from the work sessions listing the scope of work that the TAB was wanting to address and who was to be responsible for gathering the information requested under the issues column.

4. Minutes from the September 17, 2014 TAB ORV Work Session. The minutes reflect the Q & A session with Nick Spiropoulos, MSB Attorney and Allen Kemplen, ADOT&PF, and well as thoughts from the TAB members regarding this issue

5. Email from George Hays, Assistant Borough Manager, regarding the September 17, 2014 meeting. In this email he lays out administration's thoughts concerning the ORV issues that the TAB was trying to undertake.

Action: Adopted October 25, 2006

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
RESOLUTION SERIAL NO. 06-10

A RESOLUTION OF THE MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD URGING THE BOROUGH TO ADOPT A POLICY THAT RESERVES AND DEDICATES EXISTING TRAILS WITHIN RIGHTS-OF-WAY AND SECTION LINE EASEMENTS THAT ARE USED FOR MULTIPLE PURPOSES.

Action: Adopted March 25, 2009

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
RESOLUTION 09-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDING ASSEMBLY PROGRAM FUNDING FOR EVALUATION OF ATV USE IN HIGHWAY CORRIDORS AND REQUESTING ADOT&PF MATCHING PLANNING STUDY FUNDS.

Action: Adopted February 22, 2012

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
RESOLUTION 12-03

A RESOLUTION OF THE MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD RECOMMENDING ASSEMBLY PROVIDE PROGRAM FUNDS FOR EVALUATION OF ATV USE AND IMPACTS WITHIN HIGHWAY CORRIDORS.

Action: Adopted August 22, 2012

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD
RESOLUTION SERIAL NO. 12-12

A RESOLUTION OF THE MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD SUPPORTING FUNDING FOR A STUDY OF OFF ROAD VEHICLE USE IN THE MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH RIGHT OF WAY

Safety and Concerns

Easements and added traffic

Economic advantage

No Corridor or constructed paths

Liability issues

Right of Ways

Respect – Social and Economics

ATV – Classes funded by Manufacturers

Developed trail and a developer want to develop and have to plan around trails

ATV use

Design standards separate from right away

Volume of the traffic

Assembly ATV standards – Study - $ for the budget

SAE

Social Economic Issues

No design standards in right away

Federal will not fund ORVs

Off road exceptions – smog, noise standards

Enforcement, Education, and Engineering

Three wheel, four wheel regulations between states

KGP – Four wheelers in the ditches; making sure tree sap, tree chips, and dust, harden the area

Well-traveled areas problems

ORV traffic and domain – survey for normal use and primary transportation

Willow – build on the RR and did flag stops; using ORVs instead

FOCUS on Borrough right aways

GOALs – Limit to roads in the Matsu Borroughs

SCOPE – Cannot separate Public and state roads

Design and maintenance standards – Three Es

Road right away design

Regulations and enforcement

What are the regulations in place right now and the enforcement (what are they)

Licen*sed* – ATV and snow machines

Training and Education

Public Safety and Rider Safety

Public Participation – user groups and community counsel – Notices, newspaper, letter

User and committee

Break down

Issues and choices that underlie non-motorized facilities throughout the borough; good planning; create a more balanced transportation system

Off road use and safety issues

Mud holes

Summary of the report

Economic and social issues

Funding

Reference material not up to date

Allowing the vehicles on the road ROWs – speed limits and guidelines

Regulations – Driver licensing

Mat-Su Borough TAB - Worksheet on Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use in Road Right-of-Way

Scope of Work & Description Worksheet

Last Revised: 4/18/12

	Issue	Included in Study	Assigned to (TAB) (Staff) (Consult)	Work Description
	Goals/Objectives of Providing for ORV use in ROWs. (See "User Benefits of Accommodating ORV use in Public ROW")		**BETH**	This section is intended to "set the tone" for the entire project, e.g., Executive Summary
AA.01	Provide for and **define** the potential for compatible use of ROWs by ORVs so the use is not banned.	x	C,S,T	Through a combination of research into existing laws, ORV end-user group/ public comment, MSB Staff resources and interviews with SOA DNR Snow Machine Staff person, identify the value, potential obstacles, and resources available and/ or required for supporting ORV use in MSB road right-of-ways.
AA.02	Existing and potential authority(ies)/ resources/ methodologies for resolving conflicts between ORV and non-ORV uses and users	x	C,S,T	Identify how and why ORV use in the road ROW potentially carries more liability than road vehicle use of roads and how this liability might be reduced. Identify existing and potential conflict resolution methodologies.
	Historic and Current Use (by geographical area)			
A.01	Historical/Traditional use.	x	C, S	Map out geographical use areas in the Borough. Give a summary of traditional use of ORV in these areas.
A.02	Rights established through past use.	x	C, S	Using the same "use areas" have any traditional uses established a "right"?
A.03	Current volume, type of user, and type of use (both automobile and ORV traffic)	x	C	Identify roads included in the study/use area. Describe land use patterns, type and volume of traffic, etc. Describe types, uses and volumes of ORV traffic.
A.04	~~Existing routes and traffic patterns,~~	x		
A.05	Relate historical use with access to the road ROW's?	x	C	Are there connection points in the road ROW that should be maintained to preserve access to and off-road trail system?
A.06	Population density	x	S	Create some keys to show population density and address any issues that may relate to ORV use and population density.

	Issue	Included in Study	Assigned to (TAB) (Staff) (Consult)	Work Description
Current State, Borough or other Regulation regarding ORV use w/in Road ROW in the Mat-Su Borough				
B.01	Legislation/Regulation for use within road ROW	x	C	Review the current regulation of ORV use within ROW's.
B.02	Equipment standards/requirements (spark arrester, etc.)	x	C	Review current equipment standards/requirements, if any, for use of ORV's in the ROW. Review other states' standards/requirements. Check with user groups.
B.03	Driver standards/requirements	x	C	Review current driver standards/requirements, if any, for operators of ORV's in the ROW. Review other states' standards/requirements. Check with user groups.
B.04	Requirements for shared use with non-motorized traffic	x	C with Legal	Review existing requirements, if any, governing the shared use of motorized and non-motorized use of space or trails in a ROW. Review what "recommended" practices may exist for shared use.
B.05	Licensure - riders and machines	x	C	Beth: Determine whether or not regulations exist within the State/ Borough/ Cities; if not, research Other State Regulations and/ or appropriateness.
B.06	Insurance Requirements	x	C	Beth: Determine whether or not regulations exist within the State/ Borough/ Cities; if not, research Other State Regulations and/ or appropriateness.
B.07	Controlling ORV/Non-motorized ROW use	x	C	Beth: Determine whether or not regulations exist within the State/ Borough/ Cities; if not, research Other State Regulations and/ or appropriateness.
B.08	Controlling ORV/Car-truck ROW use	x	C	Beth: Determine whether or not regulations exist within the State/ Borough/ Cities; if not, research Other State Regulations and/ or appropriateness.
B.09	Protecting adjacent properties	x	C	Beth: Determine whether or not regulations exist within the State/ Borough/ Cities; if not, research Other State Regulations and/ or appropriateness.
B.10	Design Standards and Use Corridor in the ROW	x	C	Beth: Determine whether or not regulations exist within the State/ Borough/ Cities; if not, research Other State Regulations and/ or appropriateness.

	Issue	Included in Study	Assigned to (TAB) (Staff) (Consult)	Work Description
Public Safety and Enforcement of existing Regulations				
C.01	Enforcement of state regulations	x	C	Who has the authority/responsibility to enforce state regulation of ORV use in the ROW? What is the level of enforcement?
C.02	Enforcement of local regulations	x	C	Who has the authority/responsibility to enforce local (Borough/city/municipality) regulation of ORV use in the ROW? What is the level of enforcement?
C.03	Problems and policy with current enforcement policy	x	C	Review problems and policy with enforcement, what they are, why they exist, and what are the options for correcting the problems?
C.04	What does the public want by way of regulation?	x	C	Conduct a public relations program to obtain public input. Review & evaluate material to develop a policy towards regulation.
C.05	What does the public want by way of enforcement?	x	C	Conduct a public relations program to obtain public input. Review & evaluate material to develop a policy towards enforcement
C.06	Dust, rocks, snow, etc.	x	C, S	Identify the problems that exist with dust, rocks, snow, etc. and provide options for dealing with those problems. Include cost considerations when evaluating the options.
C.07	Headlights (glare)	x	C	Identify problems associated with glare from ORV use in the ROW at night and make recommendations on how to deal with it.
C.08	Speed	x	C	Identify problems associated with speed from ORV use in the ROW and make recommendations on how to deal with speed. What is the level of enforcement?

	Issue	Included in Study	Assigned to (TAB) (Staff) (Consult)	Work Description
Other Issues with ORV use in the Public ROW; Cost & Maintenance Issues				
D.01	Damage from ORV use in the ROW	x	C	What damage is occurring and what can be expected to occur from ORV use in the ROW. Provide recommendations and cost estimates for dealing with it.
	Maintenance of the pavement/dirt interface at crossings	x		
	Repair of damaged ditches, foreslopes, backslopes	x		
	Personal and private property damage	x		
	ORV users pay fuel tax	x		
D.02	Conflicts between motorized and non-motorized (i.e., dog sleds, horses, etc.) use	x	C	What problems currently exist between motorized/non-motorized use? What is the experience in other states? What are the options for minimizing conflicts?
D.03	Conflicts between ORV's and neighboring properties	x	C	What problems currently exist between ORV use and neighboring properties? What is the experience in other states? What are the options for minimizing conflicts?
D.05	Seasonal uses	x	C	Recommended seasonal use (maintenance and safety issues). How do other states set standards?
D.06	Weight limits	x	C	Do vehicle weights or tire pressure limits add to the problem?
D.07	Noise mitigation	x	C	Beth: Identify problems associated with noise from ORV use in the ROW and make recommendations on how to deal with noise. What is the level of enforcement?
D.08	Dust mitigation	x	C	Beth: Identify problems associated with dust from ORV use in the ROW and make recommendations on how to deal with dust. What is the level of enforcement?

	Issue	Included in Study	Assigned to (TAB) (Staff) (Consult)	Work Description
User Benefits of Accommodating ORV use in Public ROW				
E.01	Necessary for access to ORV recreational trails	x	C	Identify points for trail access and a policy for maintaining access
E.02	An important mode of transportation for daily living	x	C	Establish current use and recommend policy.
E.03	A recreational activity similar to other user activity	x		
E.04	Access to ORV support services	x		
Legal & Liability Issues for ORV use under current policy				
G.01	Consequences of trespassing	x	Staff atty	
G.02	(ask Borough attorney for points)	x	Staff atty	
G.03	Utility easements along and in the ROW	x	Staff atty	
Expected legal issues under an expanded ORV use				
H.01	(wait for attorney answers)	x	Staff atty	
ORV use in other states - Table of comparisons				
I.01	Legislation/Regulation	x	C	No description needed
I.02	Driver Standards	x	C	No description needed
I.03	Equipment standards	x	C	No description needed
I.04	Licensure - riders and machines	x	C	No description needed
I.05	Insurance Requirements	x	C	No description needed

	Issue	Included in Study	Assigned to (TAB) (Staff) (Consult)	Work Description
Obligations/Responsibilities to ORV users, General Public				Don
J.01	Obligation to provide safe use area to ORV users	x		
J.02	Obligations to other users of road ROW	x		
J.03	Obligations to adjacent property owners	x		
J.04	Training, Education and Engineering	x		
Goals/Objectives of Providing for ORV use in ROWs. (See "User Benefits of Accommodating ORV use in Public ROW")				Beth
K.01	Provide for and regulate the compatible use of ROWs by ORVs so the use is not banned	x		
Conditions for Prohibiting ORV use in ROWs				Beth
L.01	High volume traffic roads	x	C,S	Identify criteria for specifying and locating high road vehicle count area(s) including speed and/ or congestion where ORV use may not be appropriate.
L.02	High volume intersections	x	C,S	Identify criteria for specifying and locating intersections where vehicle or other use (i.e., cross walks) count, speed and/ or congestion might indicate that ORV use may not be appropriate.
L.03	Safety	x	C,S	Define safe conditions for ORV use in the ROW
L.04	Cost	x	C,S	Identify potential design and existing ROW improvements and their potential cost(s) for ORV use in the ROW

	Issue	Included in Study	Assigned to (TAB) (Staff) (Consult)	Work Description
	ROW width (too narrow, side slope, etc.)	x		Ken
M.01	Constrictions	x		
	Lack of Trail network causing ORVs to use road ROW	x		Ken
O.01				
O.02				
	Mapping of roads and trails	x		Beth
P.01	Existing MSB Roads and connecting or nearby trails and trail heads.			Using existing MSB maps and/ or GIS services to obtain overlays: Identify roads within the MSB and overlay or include any existing trails and/ or trail heads within ?200+/- feet? of those roads. Trails should also be identified as to any currently defined purpose through use of a Legend. NOTE: the TAB recognizes the limitations of existing MSB mapping products and a high degree of accuracy is not required for these exploratory purposes.
P.02	Potential Alternate routes where use of the ROW might be problematic.			Identify and define ORV alternate routes where traffic and/ or construction constraints limit access to the road ROW(s).

Related tasks

Public Participation
Advertising the work sessions

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Off Road Vehicle Work Session of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Transportation Advisory Board was held on Wednesday, September 17, 2014, at the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Assembly Chambers, 350 E. Dahlia Avenue, Palmer, Alaska. The meeting was called to order at 3:00 pm.

II. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUOROM

Transportation Advisory Board members present and establishing a quorum were:

Mr. LaMarr Anderson
Mr. Rick Besse
Mr. Don Carney
Mr. Dan Elliott
Ms. Beth Fread
Mr. John Moosey
Mr. Kenneth Walch
Ms. Sonya Walden – joined at 3:12

Transportation Advisory Board members absent and excused were:

Mr. Jim Rowland

Staff and Agency Representatives in attendance were:

Mr. Brad Sworts, MSB Pre-Design Manager
Mr. Michael Weller, MSB Traffic Technician
Ms. Debbie Passmore, Administrative Secretary

III. AUDIENCE INTRODUCTION

Gregory Nielson
Katherine Hummel
Eugene Haberman

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Ms. Beth Fread moved to approve today's agenda; Mr. Dan Elliott seconded. Discussion. Mr. Ken Walch wants to add an item that will address the work products that will come out of this session. Ms. Beth Fread wants to insert those above the New Business.

VOTE: The agenda was unanimously approved as amended without objection.

V. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Don Carney

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING

A. None

VII. AGENCY AND STAFF REPORTS

A. Nick Spiropoulos, MSB Attorney

- Thinks we should invite someone here from DMV to address the "Alaska's ATV Law" handout in today's information packet. ATV's should be registered @ AS 28.10.011; definition of highway @ 28.90.990(13); roadway @ 28.90.990(23). 28.01.010: all provisions are applicable in all municipalities.
- Brings the question to us: how are we to enforce laws that we may pass. Code Compliance Officers only enforce Planning Department issues.
- Dan asked how snowmachines rate on this issue. Snowmachines must be registered @ AS 28.39.010.
- Sonya responded with an answer. DMV.com says snowmachines are to be registered unless they are operated only on private property.
- Ken, is it correct to think that the vehicle must be registered but the drivers do not have to be licensed? Yes, that's what the statutes say.
- Ken also asked what do the … do they fall under the description of a highway? Nick said not necessarily. Public use trails are not maintained; section line easements are governed by different rules; public use easements, that would depend on the scope of the easement and who the grantor is.
- Subdivision roads are under the Matanuska-Susitna Borough rules.
- Ownership of easements and rights-of-way will be the issue as to who can make the rules. But the Alaska Statutes will still rule.
- Nick again stressed that DMV should be here to share their knowledge and authority to explain the rules and why they are the way they are.
- Rick asked that we include the City of Houston and the City of Wasilla, too. The City of Wasilla would have the power to outlaw ATV's in their City but the Borough can't.
- LaMarr: does the Borough have any rules concerning ATV's? No, only the rules of encroachment because the ATV's are ruining the property. But that is difficult to identify and enforce.
- Beth: discussed the resolutions that the TAB has passed in the past. Also, as the State has recognized the villages that only offer ATV & snowmachine travel. It is a complicated issue and has been brought up and dropped many times in the past.
- Nick: as it pertains to trails – if we say it is no longer a trail …
- Don: who enforces the rule breakers?
- Nick: many times, social media. Then we sue them for the damage.
- Don: we don't see Troopers pulling ATV's or snowmachines over and many times the Troopers just go by them. Agrees that we need to check with DMV to see what their policy is for violators.
- Nick: many times rules are open to interpretation so it would be a good idea to have DMV or the Dept. of Public Safety can explain it differently, he's not going to second guess that.
- Don: what I'm understanding is that we have no enforcement agency except through the Troopers and we have no ordinance addressing ATV's or off road vehicles. It appears that the State doesn't enforce the Statute as it's written. So what is there that the TAB can do to help correct some of the issues that are very prevalent?
- Nick: we have to find out what the problems are, then get the right people from the right agencies to come and explain how issues are handled. We can recommend ideas but they are only recommendations.

- Beth: I think as we get further into these issues we'll see that we've pretty much discussed all of this in the past.

B. Allen Kemplen, ADOT&PF

- The State has designed boardwalks for ATV's to transport sewage.
- On the road system for folks in the Borough, we are guided by 13 AAC 02.455 (it is in our info packet). They are legal within that framework.
- The deputy commissioner states that the dept. will not prepare and maintain a dedicated snowmachine or off highway pathway.
- We place signs when we can to protect our existing assets.
- Don: who enforces those policies?
- Allen: moving vehicles are controlled by DMV, then traffic is controlled by the State Troopers and the local police, depending on the location.
- Beth: how does the dept define "highway"
- Allen: an improvement within the row to move vehicles.
- Beth: does your definition match what Nick said?
- Allen: we have all different definitions depending on location, etc.
- Brad: many of our subdivision roads intersect with state roads. The use of ORV's within the state corridors and cause deteriorations of the pavement. Is the Borough to make improvements to the side slopes to the approaches?
- Allen: it's unofficial.
- Brad: do we need to send an official request to the commissioners' office to protect our approaches within the dot row to solve those problems?
- Allen: that would be one approach. It would be sent to the Public design folks to look at.
- Rick: would the same hold true for a driveway permit? Subdivisions typically go in without a driveway permit. The asphalt gets damaged so we would want to include that in there also.
- Allen: indeed (passed out and discussed 5 photos of damage caused by ATV's.) We are aware of these issues. How do we address them? It's a challenge. The Forest Service has guidelines that they have established. Many others states have these problems, also. Brought forward a booklet from Wisconsin. There has been a lot of work at the Federal level for Alaska rural infrastructure.
- Allen: one of the things that appears to be a regular pattern of how others have dealt with ATV use questions the laws, the uses, etc. We try to look at our framework to see what do we want to establish regarding atv use? What type of design standards and where? Then how do we address that? Engineering, education and enforcement need to be considered. The Borough is so big, there is no one solution. Do we focus on the core area and allow different on the outside?
- Rick: what's the enforcement on the traffic areas on the KGB?
- Allen: the KGB has double traffic fines, enforced by the Troopers. But their priorities are the vehicles. There is a highway safety safety plan that we have to follow. In there, we have had participation from ATV user groups, the health community, etc.
- Rick: if we did something like that, the dust is such a safety issue. Is there some way that we can put an enforcement sign up that there are no ATV's allowed in the Safety Zone? If so, what would we need to do to do that?
- Allen: Yes, I think that is possible. The challenge is that the Troopers are in a vehicle and an ATV is off road; how does he chase him down? When the ATV

takes off, he leaves the Trooper behind. The solution would be that the Troopers need to buy, equip, maintain and ride ATV's.

- Sonya: what about the Troopers on motorcycles?
- Allen: most are on big Harleys but maybe they could be on dirt bikes.
- Rick: the dust is just as dangerous as driving down a dirt roadway.
- Allen: the key is education. Troopers could be on the trails all decked out and it wouldn't take long before people are educated and control their behavior. It comes back again where do we want to establish this?
- Ken: would like to hear what Mr. Moosey has to say.

C. John Moosey, MSB Manager

- John: we got a map showing the accidents.
- Listen to the tape
- What are the purposes for the ATV? It could be much better for residents if the user groups would police themselves.
- The enforcement issues will be a huge challenge. We are the size of West Virginia and we have three enforcement officers. Doesn't see extra time for the Troopers to get involved with ORV's.
- We can't ban them.
- We need to get involved with the ORV community but getting them together is hard.
- Don: The TAB has presented resolutions in the past to support funding for a study for a solution to the ORV use issues. Nothing has ever come from those resolutions. As an advisory group, that's what we're limited to. Other than that, no one seems able to do anything.
- John: How about the TAB pick the resolutions apart and establish our priorities.? He will come up with the funding for the study.
- Beth: wants to discuss this more before we make any decisions.

VIII. PRESENTATIONS *(Ten minutes per presentation)*

A.

IX. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

A. Gregory Nielson, from the Butte. My driveway is two of the pictures that Allen brought us. Roadway damage, dust, speed,

B. Kathy Hummel. Appreciates the TAB taking on this issue but believes this is a State issue.

C. Eugene Haberman. Is concerned about the time that this meeting is being held; thinks it is too early and that's why there's no one from the public is here. Is also concerned that we got information during the presentation that the public did not receive. Is also concerned that the City of Palmer and the City of Wasilla and the Assembly all held meetings at the same time; that makes it impossible for someone to attend each meeting.

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Ken: this is a huge problem that we've tried to tackle before. Thinks that the TAB needs to be realistic with what its expectations are. Is concerned that we're going to be

mired down. Thinks we have two options: we can attempt to solve the issues or we can try to get the information together and put together a summary of what needs to be addressed to solve the problems. Before we get too far down either path, we should have a discussion about what the TAB wants to do.

Beth: Her first meeting with the TAB was an off road vehicle work shop. We spent six-eight months with spreadsheets and lots of people from both sides but this board was not able to address any of the issues. Recommends that we advise the Mayor, Manager and the Assembly to form a Blue Ribbon Task Force to give them some guidance. Especially when we are slated to grow to 450,000 people in the next 30 years.

MOTION: Ms. Beth Fread moved that we ask staff to draft a resolution to send to the Planning Commission that the Mayor, Manager and the Assembly to form a Blue Ribbon Task Force. Seconded by Mr. Dan Elliott. Discussion. Ken would like to see if there are some things that we can accomplish to be part of the solution before we abandon the issue. There are three things: conduct public hearings to gather information; once we have that, we can do a summary of regulations and policy; then we can take a position.

Rick: we should also get the user groups here. Let's see if they agree that there's a problem and discuss how they are going to control and police themselves.

Dan: thinks that the three things Ken is suggesting are the same things Beth wants the Blue Ribbon Task Force to address. We really aren't capable of handling all of the different laws, etc. and would favor Beth's approach.

LaMarr: Dan echoed what he's thinking. Perhaps the funding that John mentioned would support the Blue Ribbon Task Force.

Beth: the idea of a resolution does not need to be limited to one line. The Mayor's task force can be comprised in any way we want it to be comprised and formed by the Mayor. They can determine their own meeting dates and times. Does not believe that the TAB can accomplish any more than we did last time.

Ken: Beth makes some good arguments. Thinks it's important for the Borough administration and the Assembly to know that we're concerned about this. If that can be put together, it sounds like it would be more powerful than the TAB. This is one of the major Borough concerns. I will support Beth's motion but if it falls on deaf ears, hopes it will come back to us.

Beth: The Assembly has been extremely supportive. At this time the administration has expressed an interest in having something like this happen. If we have someone from the TAB speak to the different groups about the resolution, the Assembly will most likely support it.

VOTE: no objections and the motion passes. Mr. Don Carney asked that we get staff's help to write the Resolution, and that it includes that we want two members of the TAB to be on the Task Force and wants a list of volunteers from the TA B

who want to be on the Task Force. Believes this is the best, most effective way to go. Asks that we work with Beth.

John: when it comes to the Assembly, it would be good for some support from the TAB.

Rick: is it possible to have the resolution by our next meeting?

Beth: no, the agenda is already set.

John: the next Assembly meeting is in mid-October.

Beth: not urgent that we have it at the next Assembly meeting.

Discussion about when our next ORV meeting will be held solely to discuss the resolution to create the blue ribbon task force.

MOTION: move that we extend the meeting for 10 minutes.
VOTE: 5 yeses; Ms. Sonya Walden had to leave. The motion to extend the meeting passes.

MOTION: LaMarr moved that we review the ORV resolution at the regular TAB meeting on October 22 before our visit to the Transportation Fair tables; Mr. Dan Elliott seconded.

VOTE: Dan, yes
Rick: yes
LaMarr: yes
Ken: yes
Beth: no, doesn't believe 20 minutes will be enough time. Discussion.
Brad: will draft the resolution and send it to the Board. Don't respond to each other but respond back to me.

MOTION: Ms. Beth Fread moved that we reconsider the motion; Mr. Ken Walch seconded.
VOTE: No objections. The motion that the ORV resolution be considered at the next TAB meeting on October 22 passes.

XI. NEW BUSINESS
A. None

XII. UPCOMING MEETING REMINDERS
A. None scheduled

XIII. MISC. INFORMATIONAL HANDOUTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

A. TAB Resolution 12-12, Supporting Funding for a Study of Off Road Vehicle Use in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Right of Way

B. Proposed Off Road Vehicles Request for Proposals – Scope of Work for Research (Summer 2012)

C. TAB Resolution 12-03, recommending Assembly provide program funds for evaluation of ATV use and impacts within highway corridors

D. TAB Resolution 09-02, recommending Assembly program funding for evaluation of ATV use in highway corridors and requesting ADOT&PF matching planning study funds

E. TAB Resolution 06-10, urging the Borough to adopt a policy that reserves and dedicates existing trails within rights-of-way and section line easements that are used for multiple purposes

F. Statute for Snow Machine and Other Off Highway Vehicles

G. Pictures of damage caused by ATV's

H. Guidelines for Engineering Analysis of Motorized Mixed Use on National Forest System Roads

I. ATV Route Guideline and Suggestions (A Community Official's Handbook)

J. RTCA Rural Infrastructure (10/22/2007)

K. Mat-Su Off-Road Vehicle Crashes 1998-2011

XIV. COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

None.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Mr. Ken Walch moved, Mr. Rick Besse seconded to adjourn.

With no further business at hand, the meeting was adjourned at 5:09 pm.

Don Carney, Chair

ATTEST:

Debbie Passmore, Transportation Advisory Board Clerk

Debbie Passmore

From: Debbie Passmore
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2014 9:13 PM
To: Brad Sworts; Michael Weller
Subject: Fwd: Notes from Last Month's TAB on Off Road Vehicle Use

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S™III, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone

-------- Original message --------
From: DON CARNEY
Date:09/25/2014 3:07 PM (GMT-09:00)
To: Brad Sworts , Debbie Passmore
Subject: FW: Notes from Last Month's TAB on Off Road Vehicle Use

FYI

From: George Hays [mailto:George.Hays@matsugov.us]
Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2014 12:52 PM
To: DON CARNEY; Terry Dolan
Subject: Notes from Last Month's TAB on Off Road Vehicle Use

Don, the TAB yesterday reminded me I did not send you the notes I had last time on off road vehicle use, so here is what I wrote down if you still need it.

Terry, can you send us the slides you presented on this topic as well.

Limiting off-road vehicle use in the Borough:

- The Scope is undefined
- The Problem is undefined
- There is no financing
- There is no enforcement funding, no manpower and no way to enforce any code we passed
- It is the only way for thousands of hunters, fishermen and other outdoor enthusiasts to get to many areas in the Borough
- There are many people who do not have drivers licenses and use these to get to stores or neighbors houses
- The Mayor was looking for planned corridors/routes down ROW or Section Lines which would get people from all the cities in the Borough and throughout the main core area. No funding is established for such a plan.
- The effort to establish some rules or code by the TAB overlaps and perhaps interferes with the Parks and Recreation Board responsibilities as they have the responsibility for trails management as well as for all Parks.
- Community Development has the responsibility for Trails Management on the Borough staff and the big issue you on the TAB seem to be trying to solve is the abuse on the road ROW's, not whether to interfere with riding them everywhere else. This speaks to narrowing the scope of what you are trying to accomplish.
- One suggestion was to ask the ATV user groups to police their users to help solve the problem (whatever the definition of that is). However, the best guess is that less than 10% of ATV owners belong to any kind of ATV user groups and those who do are far less likely to be the problem abusers than some of the other 90%.

Best Regards,
George

George W. Hays
Assistant Borough Manager
Matanuska-Susitna Borough
350 East Dahlia Avenue
Palmer, Alaska 99645
(907) 861-8405
Cell (907) 355-0563

Disclaimer Notice: This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the **Matanuska-Susitna Borough School District.** If you are not an intended recipient for this email, you are hereby notified that this is not a waiver of confidentiality and that you must not take any action based upon its contents, and any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is strictly prohibited.

If you believe you have received this information in error, please notify the sender immediately by reply email and immediately delete this message from your system.

Return On Investment in Mat-Su Lands

Economic benefits of trails, parks, and open space

Growing The Valley, Naturally

To make good decisions about the future and to sustain the character of the valley, we need to understand what our lands do for us and how valuable they are to our communities. In addition to typical stresses that come with industrial, commercial, and residential development, rapid population growth in the Mat-Su has placed added pressure on the region's open spaces. This report, *Economic Benefits of Trails, Parks and Open Space in the Mat-Su Borough*, shows that investing in trails, parks and public open space provides significant goods and services with a high return on investment.

Two Birds, One Stone

What can a trail contribute to the economy of the Mat-Su and the health of its residents? Investing in access to outdoor activities attracts visitors that contribute to the local economy through the purchase of goods and services which in turn supports local jobs. Think of it this way: trails create access to salmon streams, which leads to fishing, which requires the purchase of licenses, gear, and services, like food, gas, and lodging, and local guiding businesses.

Walking, hiking and other physical activity helps prevent obesity, type 2 diabetes, and promotes a healthy outlook. Access to public outdoor spaces can decrease stress, aid in mental fatigue recovery, and reduce levels of depression and anxiety. Call it exercise or call it going fishing, the end result is revenue for the valley and healthier living for residents.

And That's Not All

Agriculture and wild food harvests fill the larder of the locals while also adding to health benefits through the gathering as well as the eating. Open spaces such as fields act as fire buffers. Marshes provide flood protection. Proximity to open spaces, streams and lakes increases property values. Visitors attracted to the great outdoors of the Mat-Su stay the night and pay a bed tax. All of these add up to direct and indirect benefits to the Mat-Su Borough.

Healthy, Wealthy & Wise

So, what do we get back from our trails, parks and open spaces for every dollar we put in? This report estimates that when we spend $1 on the trail to that salmon stream, we can look forward to $5 in return. And that's being conservative. It's something to think about the next time funding for trails, parks and public open spaces shows up on the ballot.

Read the complete report at eartheconomics.org or matsu2050.org.





What will the Mat-Su be like in 2050?

No borough in Alaska has grown at a faster rate in the past 20 years.

Why is everyone moving here?

Here's a hint: it's the character of the valley.

Many people have moved to the Mat-Su for the same reason the native people and later settlers did: the bounty. The first farmers literally carved their fields out of the wilderness. There are no better agricultural lands in the state and the wilderness they "tamed" is 24,000 square miles of natural diversity. Our rivers and streams are home to all five species of salmon. We have healthy populations of moose, caribou, sheep, bear, lynx, wolverine, snowshoe hare, and more. And the lakes and open spaces are pitstops for migratory birds like geese, ducks, cranes, and seabirds.

Some people move here because the Mat-Su Borough is one big outdoor playground. Miles upon miles of public land is open to hunting and fishing, hiking, snow machining, rafting, skiing—the list goes on. The glaciers and mountains are spectacular and a magnet for tourists *and* Alaskans.



Some people are moving to the Mat-Su because you can still afford a five-acre lot with a house and there are few municipal restrictions. Roughly 30 percent of valley residents commute to Anchorage for work. It's handy and unique to have the economic center of the state 50 minutes in one direction and Matanuska Glacier 50 minutes in the other direction.

These things all make up the character of the valley and they are attracting new residents at a clip. The Mat-Su is the fastest growing area in the state – between 2000 and 2010, the borough population increased by 58%! The forecast is for continued, steady growth. With all the people come their needs: schools, roads, waste and water infrastructure, maintenance services, etc. ***Instead of "What will the Mat-Su be like in 2050?" perhaps we should ask this:***

What do we *want* the Mat-Su to be like in 2050?

What do Mat-Su Residents ~~want?~~ VALUE

How do we evaluate our salmon, farms, ... our freedom?

What is a salmon stream worth?

Or a lake, or a forest, or a view?

Growth spurts are awkward for communities. The Mat-Su Borough is big enough to absorb the crowds, but how and at what cost? We're already struggling to build and pay for schools and roads to accommodate the growing population. From Palmer one can see farmland that has been converted into residential neighborhoods. And many of our traditional trails have either been blocked by recent development or have deteriorated from overuse.

To make good decisions about the future and to sustain the character of the valley, we first need to understand what our lands do for us and how valuable they are to our communities. Farms, fish, trails, open space and clean water provide essential benefits to residents. These are some of our ***community assets*** and need to be considered in land use decisions as the borough grows and changes.

So, what is a community asset worth? That's easier to determine for some assets than it is for others. Sportfishing and commercial salmon industries contribute an estimated 8,056 jobs and $865 million to the local economy*, so the economic value of lands with fish habitat can be partly quantified. 66% of Alaska's agricultural production comes from the valley accounting for 2,000+ jobs and bringing in $55 million annually**, so cultivated lands have a dollar value. But, what is the value of a marsh that acts as flood control and wildfire mitigation? The economic impact of tourism and recreation in the Borough has surpassed that of agriculture. Many of us make our living from sightseeing, flightseeing, lodging for tourists, river guiding, and more. How much is a viewshed worth?

We know the value of raw land shouldn't be considered zero, but how do you put a dollar value on it? Recent studies in the Mat-Su have undertaken to do just that.

*2007 Mat-Su Borough Fish and Wildlife Commission report to the Board of Fish
**www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/Online_Highlights/Rankings_of_Market_Value/Alaska/

Some land classification types are:

- Cultivated
- Coniferous Forest
- Rivers & Lakes
- Riparian Forest
- Wetlands
- Deciduous Forest
- Mixed Forest

MATSU 2050.org

Recent Studies in the Mat-Su

Evaluating our community assets and their impact on our quality of life

Baseline Data

GIS Mapping

Where are the assets?

The first step in making informed land use decisions is to know the asset value of different land types. Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping is a computer system that can show data related to physical locations. For example, Great Land Trust, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services, and the Mat-Su Borough have worked to prioritize critical habitat for fish and wildlife, wetlands that are essential to regional water quality, and wildlife and recreation corridors. GIS mapping allows us to visualize where these are located in relation to each other and to communities, farms, and neighborhoods. We can analyze them from a 10,000 foot view or zoom in to a specific parcel. This information is essential to gain a better perspective on the benefits provided by different lands across the valley.



MSB Land Ownership

Wetlands

Lakes, Rivers and Streams



Cultivated

More information is available at www.matsu2050.org or www.greatlandtrust.org.

Local Values

Household Values Survey

What do Mat-Su residents value most?

In 2012, UAA's ISER surveyed Mat-Su residents asking what they would like their community to look like in thirty years. Focus groups in Houston, Palmer, Wasilla, Sutton, and Talkeetna helped identify land use issues for the survey. Survey recipients chose between different land use and development scenarios and were given options about how much they were willing to pay for the future they wanted. Results showed that Mat-Su residents want the future to look like the valley they know, or knew – one with fully restored salmon runs, farmland used for...*farming*, and access to recreation areas. It's what brought many of them here in the first place and it's what they'd like for their kids to experience.

Top 3 actions residents would be willing to pay to achieve

More information is available at www.matsu2050.org or iser.uaa.alaska.edu.

MATSU 2050.org

Recent Studies in the Mat-Su

Evaluating our community assets and their impact on our quality of life

Local Values

Private Property Analysis

Lakes, streams and open spaces

The University of Alaska's Institute of Social and Economic Research (ISER) posed the question: ***do lakes, streams and open space have a positive influence on private property values?*** The short answer is, as you might suspect, yes they do, and the ISER report helps us quantify our assumptions. Bodies of water had the greatest impact: the estimated change in sales value for lakeside property was an increase of 76.4%, for salmon stream frontage it was 69.8%!

On total, the appraised value of residential property and vacant private land was approximately $7 billion in 2011. This report estimates that almost 37% of the total was due to the influence of lakes, streams and open space – that makes Mat-Su lakes, streams and rivers a $2.5 billion community asset!



More information is available at www.matsu2050.org or iser.uaa.alaska.edu.

Local Values

MSB Community Survey

Attitudes toward salmon, land use, and the environment

Since 2006, the University of Alaska's Justice Center and the Mat-Su Borough (MSB) have conducted an annual survey of residents about issues like borough revenue and taxation, perceptions of crime, and use of borough services and facilities, for example. In 2014, a new series of questions was added to guage attitudes about salmon, land use and the impact of the environment on our health.

The survey proves out that salmon are highly valued by the community. 82% of respondents agreed that salmon are important to the Mat-Su economy. The results also showed that residents believe salmon are facing long-term problems and they strongly support the protection of healthy salmon habitat. The salmon section, and indeed the whole report, is an interesting and worthwhile read on local values.



▲ *Survey results are given in tables & bar graphs. Respondents were also asked for their comments.* ▼

"I am very concerned about the loss of farm land, fishing and recreational sites, and conservation of water ways in the Mat-Su Valley. My family and I hunt wild meats and prefer them and catch our own fish every year."

More information is available at www.matsu2050.org or justice.uaa.alaska.edu.

MATSU 2050 .org

Recent Studies in the Mat-Su

Evaluating our community assets and their impact on our quality of life

Asset Values

Our Natural Economy

It's working for us all the time



This report uses accepted economic assessment tools to valuate the benefits we receive from 13 different land types in the Mat-Su Borough. The study looks at our natural resources as economic assets that benefit our community over—time like bridges and roads. For example, wetlands are nurseries for salmon, which provide a tangible boost to our economy. Wetlands also help us avoid costs because they act as sponges to moderate potential flooding, function as "free" waste treatment, and are part of our water supply system. Not only do we sit back and reap the benefits, assets like these are self-maintaining and, when managed sustainably, have longer lifespans than man-made infrastructure. Consider the cost to build, maintain, and ultimately replace, a water-filtration plant as a substitute for naturally filtered groundwater. It's substantial and this example is just one benefit from one land type.

What's it all worth? approximately $35 billion of direct inputs (e.g. salmon) plus avoided costs (e.g. water treatment facilities) to our economy each year, or an estimated $1 trillion over 100 years. When these asset values are considered in land-use decisions by governments, private owners, and organizations, we all benefit.

More information is available at www.matsu2050.org or www.eartheconomics.org.

ROI Analysis

Return On Investment

Economic benefits of trails, parks, and open space

What can a trail contribute to the economy of the Mat-Su? Think of it this way: trails lead to salmon streams, which leads to fishing, which requires the purchase of gear, and services, like food, gas, and lodging, and local guiding businesses. Call it exercise or call it going fishing, the end result is revenue for the valley and healthier living for residents.

And that's not all. Proximity to open spaces, streams and lakes increases property values. Agriculture and wild food harvests fill the larder of the locals while also adding to health benefits through the gathering as well as the eating. Fields act as fire buffers. Marshes provide flood protection. Visitors attracted to the great outdoors of the Mat-Su stay the night and pay a bed tax. All of these add up to direct and indirect benefits to the Mat-Su Borough.

This report quantifies what we get back from our trails, parks and open spaces for every dollar we put in. In simple terms, when we spend $1 on the trail to that salmon stream, we can look forward to $5 in return. And that's being conservative. It's something to think about the next time funding for trails, parks and public open spaces shows up on the ballot.

More information is available at www.matsu2050.org or www.eartheconomics.org.

MATSU 2050 .org

A RETURN ON INVESTMENT ANALYSIS

ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF TRAILS, PARKS, AND OPEN SPACE IN THE MAT-SU BOROUGH

EARTH ECONOMICS

Economic Benefits of Trails, Parks, and Open Space in the Mat-Su Borough

REPORT VERSION 1.0

DATE

December 11, 2015

AUTHORS

Maya Kocian

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Earth Economics would like to thank all who supported this project, including Frankie Barker of the Mat-Su Borough, Kim Sollien of the Great Land Trust, Corinne Smith and James DePasquale of The Nature Conservancy, Louisa Yanes of the Alaska Farmland Trust, and Kim Ryals of the Mat-Su Trails & Parks Foundation.

The Earth Economics team members who contributed to this report include Jessica Hanson, Lola Flores, Nathan Cutler, Aaron Schwartz, Peter Casey, and Gwenael Podesta.

The image on page vi is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 2.0 license by David Weekly.

The author is fully responsible for the content of this report.

PREPARED BY

EARTH ECONOMICS

107 N. Tacoma Avenue
Tacoma, WA 98403
(253) 539-4801
www.eartheconomics.org
info@eartheconomics.org

©2015 by Earth Economics. Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holder provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

Community assets such as trails, parks and public open space provide numerous benefits of both economic and social value. These assets provide recreational opportunities for residents, helping people to stay healthy and happy as access to spaces for exercise increases physical activity and reduces medical expenses. Recreation also stimulates the economy through the purchase of gear for activities, services and guided tours. This economic activity creates jobs in recreational sales, the hotel industry, tourism, and more. Public spaces enable all of these benefits to happen. Without access to trails, parks and open space, these benefits would be greatly diminished. This report summarizes the return on investment for these community assets in the Matanuska-Susitna (Mat-Su) Basin of south-central Alaska. Both social and economic benefits are covered in this report. Social benefits encompass recreation, tourism, human health, public safety, subsistence, and cultural and historical benefits. Economic benefits include those from businesses, tax revenues, and taxpayer savings.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii
CONTENTS iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY v
INTRODUCTION 1
CHAPTER 1. TOURISM AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION INDUSTRY 2
Cultural and Historical Value 4
Economic Impact 4
CHAPTER 2. HEALTH 5
The Impact of Park Access on Health Care Costs 5
Economic value of health benefits provided by open space 7
Economic Impact 9
CHAPTER 3. PUBLIC SAFETY 10
Flood Prevention 10
Fire Protection 11
Economic Impact 12
CHAPTER 4. AGRICULTURE AND WILD FOOD HARVESTING 13
Wild Food Harvesting 14
Economic Impact 15
CHAPTER 5. RETURN ON INVESTMENT 16
Return on Investment of Recreational Lands 16
Successful Open Space Investment 19
CHAPTER 6. TAX REVENUES: A HIDDEN RETURN ON INVESTMENT 20
Bed Tax 20
Property Taxes 21
CONCLUSION 22
Results 22
APPENDIX. GIS ANALYSIS AND REFERENCES 24
REFERENCES 26

TABLES

1. ESTIMATED ANNUAL VISITOR EXPENDITURES, MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2008 2
2. ESTIMATED IMPACTS OF TOTAL DIRECT, INDIRECT AND INDUCED VISITOR-RELATED SPENDING, MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2006-2007 3
3. ANNUAL SAVINGS IN HEALTH CARE COSTS AND IN LOST PRODUCTIVITY 8
4. AGRICULTURAL DATA OF THE REGION OF ANCHORAGE (INCLUDING MAT-SU) COMPARED TO THE REST OF THE STATE 13
5. WILD FOOD HARVESTS OF RURAL RESIDENTS OF ALASKA 15
6. MAP OF PARKS VALUED IN THE ROI ANALYSIS 17
7. COSTS OF RECREATIONAL LAND OPERATIONS IN THE MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2015 17
8. BENEFITS OF RECREATIONAL LAND OPERATIONS IN THE MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2015....18
9. ROI RESULTS FOR RECREATIONAL LANDS IN THE MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2015....18

FIGURES

1. WILD FOOD HARVESTS OF RURAL RESIDENTS OF ALASKA 15
2. MAP OF PARKS VALUED IN THE ROI ANALYSIS 17

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Investing in public open spaces is a wise choice for the people of the Matanuska-Susitna (Mat-Su) Basin. This report finds that for every $1 spent on public open space in the Mat-Su, there is a $5.31 return on investment. Not only is investment in open spaces a fiscally responsible decision; it is also necessary for the survival of ecosystems and all of the Alaskan communities they support.

In 2013, Earth Economics conducted a study of the value of the natural assets, also called natural capital, of the Mat-Su. The study used an analysis of land cover types to identify ecosystem services that natural assets provide, such as water supply, raw materials, and recreational value. In all, the natural assets of the Mat-Su totaled at least $20 billion in annual benefits to the regional economy.

At the same time the ecosystem services study was commissioned, there was a desire from the public for more specific information about the value of public open spaces from the perspective of local people. A 2014 survey revealed that residents prioritize, in order: 1) protecting and restoring healthy salmon runs, 2) retaining and conserving farmland, and 3) expanding access to non-motorized recreation.[1] All three priorities reflect the importance that residents place on protecting the integrity of the lands where their communities are located.

This report, *Economic Benefits of Trails, Parks and Open Space in the Mat-Su Borough*, is the first comprehensive return on investment analysis of the Mat-Su's open space that includes natural capital and health benefits. Using novel techniques and case studies for calculating value and rates of return on investment in natural capital, this report shows that *investing in trails, parks and public open space provides significant goods and services with a high return on investment*.

INTRODUCTION

The Matanuska-Susitna (Mat-Su) region is a diverse and majestic landscape located north of Alaska's largest city and surrounded on all sides by massive mountain ranges, including the renowned Alaska Range. At 24,300 square miles, the Mat-Su contains dense forests, mountain glaciers, rivers full of salmon, and some of the best agricultural land in the state. It is also the fastest growing region of the state, having increased by at least 49.5% each decade beginning with a population of 6,509 in 1970 up to almost 100,000 today.[2]

There are several sectors of the economy that are directly dependent upon healthy open spaces, and there are many other instances where such spaces indirectly impact economic and social well-being. Supporting anything from the Mat-Su's robust tourism industry to the savings of reduced healthcare costs, public open spaces are a crucial component of life and productivity in south-central Alaska. This report specifically examines the benefits to tourism, health, public safety, agriculture, and tax implications of public open spaces.

In addition to the typical stresses that come with industrial, commercial, and residential development, rapid population growth in the Mat-Su places added pressure on the region's open spaces. Since the turn of the century, high migration rates into the Mat-Su have drastically changed the interplay between people and the physical environment. This study is intended to assist residents, communities and local governments as they face the challenges of population growth and land use development in the Mat-Su.

IMPORTANT DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this paper, there are several terms that should be understood to have a specific definition:

- **Public open spaces** refer to parks, trails, and other non-privately owned areas.
- **Natural capital** refers to stocks of natural assets including land, air, water, and all living things.[3]
- **Ecosystem goods and services** are the flow of benefits that people receive from natural capital.

CHAPTER 1

TOURISM AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION INDUSTRY

Rich with beautiful landscapes and diverse natural spaces, the Mat-Su Borough provides ample resources to fuel the tourism industry. Tourism is a significant contributor to the region's economy because the Mat-Su offers numerous free or low-cost outdoor activities that appeal to a variety of users. Fishing, hiking, and hunting are just a few examples of activities that draw year-round visitors who contribute to the local economy. In 2013, the leisure and hospitality sector alone accounted for 9.3% of all jobs in the Borough.[4]

One 2008 study estimated that **roughly 780,000 visitors spend $201.1 million per year in the Mat-Su Borough and support nearly 3,100 jobs**.[5] Both in- and out-of-state visitors support the local economy through food and lodging-related expenditures, recreational expenses, and more.[6] Table 1 shows the distribution of these direct expenditures between in- and out-of-state visitors. Overall, direct expenditures from tourism have a significant impact on the Mat-Su economy. Spending on food and accommodations alone accounts for over half of this revenue, bringing income to restaurants and hotels and providing jobs throughout the community.

TABLE 1 ESTIMATED ANNUAL VISITOR EXPENDITURES, MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2008[7]

OUT-OF-STATE VS IN-STATE VISITORS	US DOLLARS
Out-of-State Visitors	$ 79.8 million
In-State Visitors	$121.3 million
TOTAL TOURISM INDUSTRY SPENDING	$201.1 million

Indirect and induced revenues from tourism also impact the Mat-Su economy. Indirect revenue is generated through intermediate sales made from industry to industry within the supply chain. For example, a grocery store that buys produce grown in the Mat-Su creates an indirect contribution to the economy. Induced revenue, on the other hand, is generated when workers spend their wages in local businesses.

Table 2 illustrates the total impact of all direct, indirect, and induced visitor-related spending. Taken as a whole, these three spending areas provide nearly 4,000 jobs and $282 million each year as a result of tourism. The Mat-Su is also expected to see an increase to about 1,200,000 visitors annually by 2017.[8] This increase will most likely lead to more tourism-related jobs and revenue for businesses.

TABLE 2 ESTIMATED IMPACTS OF TOTAL DIRECT, INDIRECT AND INDUCED VISITOR-RELATED SPENDING, MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2006-2007[9]

	DIRECT	INDIRECT	INDUCED	TOTAL
Employment	3,100	390	430	3,920
Labor Income	$78 million	$12 million	$13 million	$103 million
Output (spending)	$201 million	$38 million	$43 million	$282 million

While in the Mat-Su, visitors engage in a variety of activities, several of which generate additional revenue for the region. Outdoor activities such as wildlife watching, hiking, camping, and fishing are some of the strongest draws for visitors. Hikers can explore 2,117 miles of trail within the Mat-Su, and anglers can fish for the renowned King salmon in the Borough's numerous rivers and streams. Fishing is one activity that generates substantial revenue for the Mat-Su economy. In 2013 alone, 227,000 fishing licenses and 55,000 King salmon stamps (required for fishing King salmon) were issued in south-central Alaska, generating $9.6 million for the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The market for hunting is smaller; however, the 51,500 licenses sold still generated almost $2 million in revenue.[10]

In addition to the license revenue that goes to the state, the economic impact of recreational fishing can be seen on a local scale. Sport fishing represents a huge portion of total tourism-related revenue, with an estimated $118 million in direct spending from anglers operating in the Mat-Su during 2007.[11] This figure represents the middle estimate of expenditures for guides, equipment, food, lodging, and other associated costs. For the same year, sport fishing also contributed to 1,180 jobs and over $40 million of income for residents.[12]

CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL VALUE

The cultural and historical value of public open spaces is an aspect that is frequently overlooked, yet the Mat-Su hosts a wealth of this type of resource. The Borough boasts many units of the national, state, and local park systems, as well as spaces marking important sites or historical periods such as the Independence Mine Historical Park and the Iditarod National Historical Trail.

The Iditarod National Historical Trail runs through the heart of the Mat-Su Basin and is possibly the greatest example of the rich cultural and historical heritage of the area. This 1,000-mile historic route is well known for the sled dog races that take place along its course; however, the trail originally served as a trading route for Alaska natives in past centuries. Both the annual race and various stretches of the historic trail continue to contribute to the rich cultural legacy of Alaska and attract tourists, hikers, and backpackers.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

The input of local and out-of-state visitors to the Mat-Su is incredibly valuable. Resident population growth has been followed by an increase in the number of both in-state and out-of-state visitors. A 2008 study predicted an increase in visitors of more than 50% by 2017 and encouraged investment in the recreational trail system in order to attract outdoor-enthusiast travelers.[13] The return on this type of investment is significant: a $300,000 to $500,000 annual investment in trails enhancement was estimated to spur spending of up to $2 million to $3.9 million annually.[14] With strategic investments, the Mat-Su will not only continue to exert itself as a must-stop destination for cruise-package passengers and independent travelers who want to experience a piece of Alaska's natural wonder, but it may also see new untapped economic gains for residents.

The protection of the Mat-Su's valuable open space for tourism and recreation also results in a great deal of co-benefits that arise from the natural capital of those open spaces. When land is conserved, so too are all of the community assets derived from the land, which in turn magnifies the return on investment in land protection. The value of this investment is analyzed in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 2

HEALTH

In this chapter, we estimate the economic benefits related to physical activity provided by the Borough's public open spaces as they are today. Outdoor physical activity reduces the occurrence of diseases and obesity, increases productivity, and improves mental well-being. Public open spaces are key elements for the Mat-Su residents' health and quality of life. Enhancing access or creating new parks could even potentially increase indirect benefits.[15]

As in the rest of the country, physical inactivity is a concern in Alaska. One out of every three children in the state is obese or overweight.[16] In 2013, the estimated total health-related costs associated with obesity and overweightness in children, adults, and seniors in Alaska was $276 million.[17] If the current trend continues, these costs are expected to increase to $680 million per year by 2018.[18]

The Borough ranks well compared with other counties around the country and has met the national Healthy People 2020 goals in exercise and obesity. However, there is still room for improvement, especially among adults and seniors. Only 39% of adults and 27% of seniors in the Mat-Su are considered to be at a healthy weight.[19]

THE IMPACT OF PARK ACCESS ON HEALTH CARE COSTS

Increased access to parks and trails can help a community meet health goals and reduce medical costs. People living close to public open spaces are more likely to participate in outdoor activities.[20] Physical exercise can reduce the likelihood of acquiring illnesses such as diabetes or arthritis, and, consequently, it can also reduce the associated medical costs.[21] The Mat-Su Borough offers a wealth of outdoor resources that can translate into economic benefits in the form of health savings for residents.

The physical benefits of open spaces are well documented. It is well established that increased access to public outdoor spaces encourages people to exercise more, reducing overall healthcare expenditures.[22] A 2002 study demonstrated that the "creation of or enhanced access to places for physical activity combined with informational outreach produced a 48.4% increase in the frequency of physical activity."[23] The American Journal of Preventative Medicine, as cited by the Trust for Public Lands, quantified an average reduction of $2,200 per person for annual health care costs among those who were able to change from a sedentary to an active lifestyle.[24] Investment in publicly accessible open space encourages behavioral changes that not only reduce obesity and health care costs, but also improve quality of life.[25]

In addition to physical benefits, research indicates that people who have increased exposure to the outdoors show long-term mental health improvements. Several studies have demonstrated that access to public outdoor spaces can decrease stress, aid in mental fatigue recovery, and reduce levels of depression and anxiety.[26]

Exposure to rural or more forested areas provides further benefits. Researchers have found that when compared to walks in urban areas, leisurely forest walks lead to a 12.4% decrease in the stress hormone cortisol.[27] A 2014 study from the University of Michigan found that walking in natural areas is linked to lower depression and perceived stress.[28] In fact, the presence of a nearby urban park can result in the same mental health benefits to a community as a 2% decrease in unemployment.[29]

Public outdoor spaces also provide important benefits to children and childhood development.[30] Research has shown that child's play, playgrounds, and parks are linked to positive development of neural pathways for motor-skills, social skills, cognitive learning, imagination, language, and expression. Outdoor play creates opportunities for children to establish boundaries, negotiate compromises, cooperate, and learn self-control.[31] Parks can also provide additional benefits to children with developmental disorders. For example, one study on the effects of outdoor time on children with ADHD found that a 20-minute walk in the park improves concentration just as effectively as common prescription medications.[32] Similarly, other studies have shown that low access to nature leads to higher rates of ADHD and other mental disorders.[33]

The Mat-Su Community Health Needs Assessment[34] found that Borough residents are demanding more open spaces and exercise opportunities. When asked what they would change to improve their overall health, respondents answered more exercise and/or recreation (19%), healthier food (15%), and better health insurance (5%). Respondents also said the healthiest aspects of living in the Mat-Su Borough are a clean environment (18%), wilderness/nature (13%), and exercise opportunities (10%).

ECONOMIC VALUE OF HEALTH BENEFITS PROVIDED BY OPEN SPACE

The Mat-Su Borough's public outdoor spaces benefit residents by providing them with a place to exercise, helping to improve their overall health, and lowering medical spending. We can conservatively estimate these benefits in economic terms.

We use a similar methodology to the Round Rock City Parks and Recreation Department in Texas, which estimated the benefits to locals visiting parks for exercise, while excluding those who also use health clubs.[35] Our valuation also relied on a physical inactivity health calculator developed by Chenoweth and Bortz,[36] which drew from seven state-wide studies.

In order to determine the medical savings due to public outdoor spaces in the Mat-Su Borough, we estimated the number of people living in urban areas[i] of the Borough who utilize parks to meet the physical activity recommendations of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).[ii] The CDC recommends 30 minutes of moderate exercise five times a week or 20 minutes of vigorous exercise at least three times a week for adults. Once we had estimated the total number of residents who met the requirements, we isolated the residents that exercise just on trails using percentages from a community survey, so that indoor recreation facilities such as swimming pools and ice rinks were not included.[37]

The resulting figure was multiplied by the cost savings per individual due to increased physical activity. The total cost savings included the following:

1. Total health cost expenditures taking into account the cost of medical care
2. Total health cost expenditures taking into account the loss of productivity (indirect costs) due to absenteeism (not working due to health issues) or presenteeism (the proportion of the work load an employee is unable to do due to their compromised health status).

Finally, since medical costs can vary across the country, and Alaska yields average medical costs 33% higher than average national costs, a multiplier (1.33) was used to compensate for the Borough's increased medical costs.[38]

For children and teenagers, the healthcare cost estimate was made by referencing studies that examine the consequences of obesity.[39] Other conditions linked with inactivity such as high cholesterol or high blood pressure were not taken into account, as they are uncommon among children. The proportion of children and teenagers who exercise in parks and trails was divided by two, assuming only half exercise in public outdoor spaces and not in school. However, this number is likely to be an underestimate as eight percent of high school students attend sport classes.[40] Finally, considering that physical activity is only one cause of obesity among others (genetics, diet, psychological environment), but one of the most important,[41] a conservative 40% multiplier was applied.

---

i Urban areas are defined as areas with a mixture of constructed materials and vegetation. Impervious surfaces account for 50% to 79% of the total cover. These areas most commonly include single-family housing units, apartment complexes, row houses and commercial/industrial.

ii CDC national database- Public health data and statistics http://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/data/

Based on these calculations, the estimated average value in medical savings for adults who exercise in public outdoor spaces is $288 per year. This value is consistent with the estimated cost related to obesity in Alaska divided by the population. For the senior population, the healthcare cost was doubled compared to adults ($576), but no loss of productivity was taken into account since they are less likely to work. For children, the estimated average value in medical savings is $127 per year.

The table below demonstrates that even with the conservative assumptions that have been made, public outdoor spaces are very important in terms of health, and the physical activity that takes place in these areas is worth millions of dollars annually.

TABLE 3 ANNUAL SAVINGS IN HEALTH CARE COSTS AND IN LOST PRODUCTIVITY

	CHILDREN (0-17 YEARS)		ADULTS (18-64 YEARS)		SENIORS (65+ YEARS)	
	%	VALUE	%	VALUE	%	VALUE
Population in the borough	27.70%*	26,368	63.20%*	60,161	9.10%*	8,662
Urban population[42]	50.00%*	13,184	50.00%*	30,081	50.00%*	4,331
Number who meet CDC daily activity requirements[43]	20.90%†	2,755	57.90%†	17,417	57.90% †	2,508
Number who exercise in parks and trails[44] [45]	15.00%*	413	15.00%*	2,613	15.00%*	376
Number who exercise at Mat-Su parks/trails	65.40%*	270	65.40%*	1,709	65.40%	246
Cost saving per individual - Healthcare[46]	$127.18†		$288.00†		$576.00†	
Multiplier for AK Cost saving per individual – health care 19	133.90%†	$170.29	133.90%†	$385.60	133.90%†	$771.30
Total annual savings related to health care		**$46,048**		**$658,859**		**$189,735**
Labor Force	0%†	0	80.00%†	5392	22.00%†	214
Unemployment	0%*	0	9.00%*	4907	9.00%*	194
Cost saving per individual – Lost productivity 25		-		$1,186†		$1,186†
Total annual savings related to lost productivity		**-**		**$2,255,066**		**$88,922**
TOTAL COMBINED ANNUAL SAVINGS		**$46,048**		**$2,913,925**		**$278,657**

Scale of the data: ° USA † Alaska * Mat-Su Borough

TOTAL POPULATION
95,192

ANNUAL HEALTH CARE SAVINGS ACROSS ALL GROUPS
$894,641

TOTAL SAVINGS ACROSS ALL GROUPS
$3,238,630

Our economic analysis focuses solely on outdoor physical activity, but public outdoor spaces can also improve the overall health of the population by purifying air and filtering particulate matter. Air pollutants have a direct impact on health.[47] In addition, exposure to neighborhood green spaces has been linked to recovery from mental fatigue, stress reduction, and lower levels of symptoms for depression and anxiety.[48] The economic benefits from these mental health issues have not been calculated in this study; therefore, the total economic value of public outdoor spaces in the Borough could potentially be significantly higher.

Our analysis also focused on the urban population as their physical activity habits are well documented. For rural populations, however, data is scarce,[49] so this population was not included in this study. However, despite its rapid development, the Mat-Su Borough remains largely rural compared to other regions of the US. The next step could involve estimating the benefits of public outdoor spaces for this understudied population, especially because rural communities are more likely to be inactive.[50] The general assumption is often that people are more likely to engage in physical activity when they live close to green spaces, but even in rural areas, access to public outdoor spaces may be limited. This issue could be addressed by improving trails accessibility, preserving walkable streets, and engaging with the public to encourage outdoor recreation.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

The reduced healthcare expenses that result from promoting an active community that takes advantage of its great natural resources has an immediate impact on the wallets of Mat-Su residents. Even small investments in trails enhancement and recreation outreach programs can pay off as the likelihood of healthcare expenses to treat conditions associated with lack of activity decreases. The return on investment analysis in Chapter 5 quantifies this economic factor along with the value of ecosystem services from conserved public open spaces.

CHAPTER 3

PUBLIC SAFETY

Floods, fires, and other natural disasters can disrupt communities and local economies, causing significant expenditures for mitigation and repair, but open space can offer an important buffer against these types of disturbances. By preserving open spaces in strategic locations and pursuing development within the limitations of these buffer zones, the negative social and economic impacts of storms, floods, wildfires, and other natural disasters can be weakened.

Throughout this chapter, **buffer zones** refer to public open spaces that serve a functional role due to their location in protecting developed infrastructure from damage sustained during natural weather events.

FLOOD PREVENTION

Ecosystems such as wetlands and forests can help reduce the risk of flooding and landslides. Natural capital such as headwater forests, wetlands and aquifers provide critical water regulation and storage that reduces flood peaks and duration. When natural capital in a watershed is degraded or converted, however, the land's capacity to absorb disturbances is reduced. Surface water runoff increases and flows into streams and rivers more quickly, contributing to higher peak flows, more frequent flood events, and increased instances of erosion and landslides.

The Mat-Su Borough has certainly experienced the impacts of flooding. In September 2012, the Little Susitna River and its tributaries flooded due to a weeklong rainstorm that pushed water levels over their banks. Flood advisories were issued, and communities were severely impacted. In one incident, ten people were rescued in a flash flood in Wasilla after a creek overflowed on September 20, 2012.[51] Residents near the Talkeetna River reported that it was the worst flooding they had seen in thirty years.[52] According to bulletins from the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, more than 60 roads were disrupted, 14 homes were destroyed, and 823 other structures were damaged due to the flooding. Repairs to the Borough's infrastructure were estimated at $10 million. Clearly, the impacts of flooding have significant effects on the local economy.

Healthy ecosystems can help monitor and ease flood impacts. Healthy riparian buffers are particularly effective in preventing erosion, avoiding water quality degradation, and reducing overall flood damage. Landscape complexity also plays an important role in disturbance prevention. For example, historical river systems were comprised of many channels and floodplains that were regularly inundated with water. This dispersion of water helped to spread the impact of flooding and slow currents.

Currently, there are several hundred thousand acres of open space near rivers within the Mat-Su. If a portion of these acres are maintained as trails and parks, they can continue to provide both recreation and flood risk reduction value.

FIRE PROTECTION

Natural wildland fire is a vital process throughout the forests and tundra of Alaska. Fire regenerates and diversifies landscapes by freeing seeds from their cones, opening space for new growth, and allowing sunlight to reach the forest floor. For millennia, ecosystems like Alaska's boreal forests have depended on the natural disturbance that fire offers. Usually, these fires start when dry vegetation is ignited by a lightning strike; however human-caused ignition events are increasingly to blame for devastating fires close to Alaskan communities. As populations grow and spread throughout the landscape, the interface of humans and wilderness will continue to be a large source of fires.

The 2015 fire season began in a hurry after an unusually dry early spring led into a record-hot May and June, turning forests into huge stores of burnable fuel.[53,54] As of July 14th, a total of 769 fires had burned 5.1 million acres statewide, including 104 fires and well over 7000 acres in the Mat-Su Borough alone.[55] However, 2015 has not been the only intense fire season in recent years. The area burned in the state from 2000 to 2009 was more than twice that of any previous decade, and the average annual acreage burned is expected to double again by 2050.[56] Headlines describing fires as "historic" and "unprecedented" may not be viewed as anomalies moving forward, but instead perhaps the new normal.

When looking towards the prosperous Mat-Su of the future, risks to people, property, and vital resources need to be examined. The immense size of the region can cause difficulties when planning for and responding to fires, but it can also be beneficial. Open space buffers people and property from potentially destructive blazes, and these areas can be categorized in order to most effectively plan for and react to fires. The Alaska Interagency Wildland Fire Management Plan (AIWFMP) outlines four distinct strategies for fire treatment depending on the fire's proximity to communities and vital resources.[57]

The AIWFMP identifies four types of fire zones: densely populated zones deemed *critical*; less populated areas that still contain important resources or properties called *full* zones; more remote areas known as *modified*; and, finally, the most isolated zones called *limited*.[58] In *critical* zones, where fires are immediately and aggressively suppressed in order to protect public safety, mechanical thinning and clearing of trees can be utilized as a preemptive tactic to limit risk. On the other end of the spectrum, the *limited* zones far from communities or infrastructure may be allowed to burn and spread naturally in order to promote the ecological processes of healthy forests and the ecosystem services that people receive from them, such as water filtration, erosion control, and protection from the larger, more intense and less controllable fires that occur when fuel loads build up over time. Additionally, allowing *limited* zone fires to run their natural course provides the benefit of avoiding suppression costs, which are extremely expensive in such hard to reach regions.

Much of the Mat-Su Borough is categorized as *full* or *modified* zones where agencies have the opportunity to manage fires in a way that will enhance the resource and land-use benefits they provide.[59] These zones represent the crucial buffers where sound fire management before and during fires will have the most impact. Strategies that limit the likelihood and scope of dangerous and costly fires later on, such as fuel load reduction and the use of prescribed fires, can be practiced in these buffer zones to provide the most risk mitigation value. In order to maximize the value of these areas when they are not being actively used for fire management, the buffers can be protected as open space for parks, trails, hunting and fishing grounds, and other uses that retain benefits of recreational space, as described in Chapters 1 and 2.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Buffer zones provide invaluable resilience to natural hazards such as floods and wildfires while simultaneously providing water filtration, flood control, storm resilience, and a host of other community assets that support human health and development. This network of co-benefits means that the relatively low investment of protecting public open space results in economic returns as well as providing a buffer against frequent storm and natural disasters. A high risk mitigation capacity also means that the community is likely to suffer fewer losses of businesses and jobs during natural hazards, and that the local economy can respond faster to the issues that do arise.

CHAPTER 4

AGRICULTURE AND WILD FOOD HARVESTING

Agricultural land is a major component of open spaces in the Mat-Su Borough. Home to the most productive agricultural lands in Alaska, the Mat-Su has 19,256 acres[60] of farmland that collectively produce more than half of the total value of the agricultural production of the state on only 2.3% of the land used for crops.[61] The value of crops grown in this area is estimated at more than $15 million.[62] There is a small dairy industry, and several family farms in the Mat-Su take advantage of the climate by specializing in crops that do well in cold soils with a short but intense growing season, such as potatoes, peas or carrots. The majority of these farms are small family farms producing high-value crops thanks to good irrigation systems and long daylight hours. The farms are mostly clustered around Palmer and the Point Mackenzie area.

Table 4 presents agricultural data from the 2012 Census from the United States Department of Agriculture. The "Region of Anchorage" is the smallest unit in the US agricultural census and it includes both the Mat-Su Borough and the Municipality of Anchorage, which has limited farming.

TABLE 4 AGRICULTURAL DATA OF THE REGION OF ANCHORAGE (INCLUDING MAT-SU) COMPARED TO THE REST OF THE STATE

		ANCHORAGE	ALASKA
Farms	Number	291	762
	Acres	36,378	833,861
Market Value of Produce		$30,019,000	$58,925,000
Irrigated Land	Number	98	230
	Acres	1,316	2,450
Farm Jobs Created	Hired Labor	784	1,577
	Payroll	8,697	18,647

In addition to family farming, one third of Mat-Su farms hire farm labor, resulting in 784 jobs.[63] Though farming represents a small proportion of the total number of jobs in the Mat-Su, it is an important part of the region's cultural and historical fabric. The products from farming also serve the local market, resulting in lower prices, higher wages, a cleaner environment and a more stable supply.[64] There is a demand for fresh local food, as can be seen by the number of local farmers markets that have recently popped up. There are now as many as 14 weekly markets in the Anchorage and Mat-Su area, including Palmer's Depot Farm Market, produce sold at Friday Flings, the Wasilla Farmers Market, and the Spenard Farmers Market.

Agriculture has the potential to grow its export industry and return outside dollars to Mat-Su communities. For example, the Mat-Su aims to promote the export of certified seed potatoes to China and Taiwan, a growing market in which Alaska is well positioned due to existing trade relations.[65] The success of farmers markets and a growing exportation industry demonstrate that this is a strategic sector for the economy of the Mat-Su and the welfare of its residents. Thus, agricultural lands are valuable resources that need to be protected. In fact, according to a recent study, preserving existing lands and providing more farmland is the second most important local resource priority on a willingness-to-pay scale.[66] The average household would pay $96.67 annually for agricultural land action, eclipsed only by the value for action on full salmon recovery.[67]

These growing markets may, however, be hindered by loss of agricultural lands. With a rapidly growing Borough population (+57% between 2000 and 2012),[68] agricultural lands have been subject to a series of land use changes that threaten the sustainability of this economic sector. Between 2007 and 2012, for instance, 5% of all agricultural lands in the Mat-Su were converted for industrial or residential purposes.[69] Although the Borough Assembly has reserved funding to assist in the acquisition of development rights to preserve agricultural land,[70] loss of farmland to development remains a challenge.

WILD FOOD HARVESTING

In addition to commercial agricultural activities, subsistence gathering also occurs in the Mat-Su Borough. Although it is a small part of the total harvests in the state, amounting to only 2% of the total resource harvests in Alaska,[71] wild food harvest is an important part of the customs and traditions of many cultural groups in Alaska.

Subsistence harvests are defined as the "customary and traditional uses" of wild resources and food. This type of harvesting can consist of varied natural resources, including fish, plants, and wildlife. Wild food harvesting is conducted by local residents only, and, unlike commercial harvests, the yield is typically used directly by the participant and cannot be sold.

Wild food gathering is particularly present in rural areas of Alaska. In rural areas, 75% to 98% of households harvest fish, and 92% to 100% of households share fish for use. Wildlife harvesting occurs in 48% to 70% of households, with 79% to 92% using shared harvested wildlife.[72] Since most rural households depend to some extent on subsistence harvests, the loss of natural areas where the practice takes place could lead to a greater dependence on food banks and imported food for these families.

FIGURE 1 WILD FOOD HARVESTS OF RURAL RESIDENTS OF ALASKA[73]



*There is an exemption in the federal Marine Mammal Protection Act to allow for the traditional harvest and use of marine mammals by coastal Alaska Natives.

In the Mat-Su Borough, wild food harvesting holds a great deal of value that goes beyond monetary value alone. Some suggest that there are two components of value associated with subsistence activities: the value of the products being harvested and the value of the activity itself.[74] This activity value includes both the value of participation and the value of maintaining cultural traditions associated with subsistence activities. Although the activity value may be difficult to put into actual numbers, the product value can be monetized. A 2010 estimate of wild food harvesting in the Mat-Su calculated [75] the total annual harvest at about 2.4 million pounds of food (27 pounds per person), with a total worth of approximately $8.4 million to $16.9 million.

ECONOMIC IMPACT

The Mat-Su's unique agricultural productivity is an incredible asset that provides affordable, healthy food to local residents. Maintaining strong agricultural production also provides steady jobs and increases the Borough's resiliency when facing unexpected droughts, fuel price increases, or conflicts that may cause food shortages or high prices. Similar to the co-benefits of retaining land for recreation and natural hazard mitigation, conserving quality agricultural and subsistence lands provides a wide variety of co-benefits in the shape of ecosystem services such as water supply and climate regulation. The return on investment analysis, which accounts for community assets in the Mat-Su, is found in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

RETURN ON INVESTMENT

The previous chapters summarized various aspects of the Mat-Su community's interaction with public open spaces. Although not all benefits derived from the area's natural capital can be easily quantified, we have dissected some of the most impactful land use activities. Mindful use and management of public open spaces allows for the most sustainable consumption of community assets, but sustainable consumption also depends on being able to quantify and locate the stores of such natural capital. In this chapter, the worth of these benefits, as measured by ecosystem service values, is paired with the healthcare cost savings figures from Chapter 2.

RETURN ON INVESTMENT OF RECREATIONAL LANDS

Bringing together the analyses from previous chapters allows us to quantify the return on investment (ROI) of public spending on recreational lands. An ROI is a performance measure used to evaluate the efficiency of an investment. In this report, the ROI estimates the efficiency of generating community assets and health benefits relative to the monetary cost of operating Mat-Su parks facilities. The Mat-Su's natural areas provide multiple valuable benefits, as identified in Chapters 1 through 4. Synthesizing these benefits in an ROI framework can demonstrate the effectiveness of investments in natural areas. ROI calculations can aid policymakers, private organizations, and the public in recognizing the importance of protecting, maintaining, and enhancing natural lands.

In this analysis, the costs are the total annual costs of operating all recreational areas owned by the Mat-Su Borough, which consist of 1,496 acres of mapped parcels plus other areas with undefined boundaries.[76] This acreage, however, represents only a small portion of the total 352,000 acres of recreational lands available to residents and visitors, including close to 10,000 acres managed by the Mat-Su Borough but owned by another entity such as the State of Alaska. Costs associated with city, state and federal recreational areas were not included in this analysis. For the Borough-controlled acreage alone, the total operating costs are roughly $950,000 for fiscal year 2015 (Table 5).[77]

TABLE 5	COSTS OF RECREATIONAL LAND OPERATIONS IN THE MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2015
COST DESCRIPTION	VALUE
Mat-Su Borough FY 15 Operating Costs for Parks and Trail Maintenance	$952,350
Total Costs	**$952,350**

FIGURE 2 MAP OF PARKS VALUED IN THE ROI ANALYSIS



Two key types of benefits of recreational lands were quantified in this report: ecosystem services and health care cost savings. Ecosystem services, such as habitat for salmon and water supply, were estimated in economic terms using the per-acre values from the 2013 Earth Economics report "The Natural Economy of Alaska's Matanuska-Susitna Basin." Of the 1,496 acres of Borough-owned recreation land, 1,438 acres have land cover types with applicable ecosystem service values. We estimate the total annual ecosystem services benefits of the 1,438 acres to be over $1.8 million. This value was identified through a GIS analysis of the land cover types within the Borough recreational land (see Appendix A for more information). In Chapter 2, the health care cost savings generated by accessible nature were also quantified. Our estimate for the portion of these savings that can be attributed to Mat-Su Borough lands is over $3 million annually. The combined values of ecosystem services and health savings lead to an estimated $5 million in annual benefits.

TABLE 6 BENEFITS OF RECREATIONAL LAND OPERATIONS IN THE MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2015

BENEFIT DESCRIPTION	VALUE
Annual Health Savings via Exercise	$3,238,630
Ecosystem Service Value of Borough Recreational Lands	$1,817,656
Total Benefits	**$5,056,286**

After quantifying the costs and benefits, the ROI was calculated for 2015. According to the analysis, the Mat-Su Borough lands generate over $5 in benefits for every $1 spent. This type of return presents a great benefit to the community and is common with other open space programs throughout rural areas of the United States. See the following section for more context on return on investment for open space in several separate rural jurisdictions.

TABLE 7 ROI RESULTS FOR RECREATIONAL LANDS IN THE MAT-SU BOROUGH, 2015

Total Costs	$952,350
Total Benefits	$5,056,286
Benefit-Cost Ratio	5.31

SUCCESSFUL OPEN SPACE INVESTMENT

Along with the ROI analysis above, examining similar investments elsewhere is an effective way to gauge feasibility for public spending projects. Jurisdictions of all sizes, from municipalities up to the federal government, have all, to various degrees, invested successfully in public open spaces. The following section describes several examples of successful public space investments in places with relatively similar environments and economies to those of the Mat-Su.

In Pinal County, Arizona, residents benefited from $100 million in direct use value and $672,000 in tax revenue from tourist spending by emphasizing sound land use and conservation through county management plans.[78] Residents also received a boost in real estate values to the tune of $190 million due to the proximity of protected open spaces.[79] Voters in Pinal County recognize the benefit public open spaces have in attracting tourism expenditures, protecting vital agricultural land, and mitigating the danger and costs of wildfires, so they continue to support local initiatives for public open space.[80]

In Kansas, the Johnson County Park and Recreation District, which is operated almost entirely from county-level funding, has been a boon for the economy and a lifeline for the natural environment. The value received from the parks and trails system is realized in the form of tourism revenues, decreased costs of storm water management, health cost savings from improved air quality, and a boost in real estate values. In fact, Johnson County parks are responsible for boosting the value of nearby properties a total of $24.1 million.[81]

There are many other success stories in rural districts that illustrate the benefits of spending money on public open spaces. In New Hampshire, a variety of state land conservation projects produced an incredible return on investment of $11 for every $1 spent.[82] In Wyoming, the Wildlife and Natural Resource Trust leveraged public funds to receive matching contributions from private and other public entities. The agricultural plots and rangeland protection that those contributions enabled have resulted in a return on investment of $4 in economic value for every $1 spent.[83]

Throughout the rural United States, communities, counties, and states are acting to protect open spaces. They do so with the knowledge that keeping those lands natural and open for direct public use and enjoyment also results in additional co-benefits. The provision of ecosystem services, increased property values, and health-related savings work in concert to help ensure that an investment in public open spaces is a good one.

CHAPTER 6

TAX REVENUES: A HIDDEN RETURN ON INVESTMENT

In addition to the return on investment of conserving public open spaces, tax revenues are a significant secondary impact that should be taken into consideration when analyzing costs and benefits. More out-of-area visitors drawn to quality parks and trails creates more spending on hotels and other amenities that can be taxed. It has also been shown that certain natural assets, such as streams and freshwater lakes, provide a large premium to property values for Mat-Su residents.

BED TAX

While local businesses benefit directly from visitors' purchases, these expenditures also bring additional benefits to the region as a whole. For example, not only does an overnight visitor bring revenue to a hotel, but the Borough itself also gains an additional 5% bed tax for overnight accommodations. In FY 2015 alone, this tax brought in an estimated $1,100,000 to the Borough's budget.[84][85] This bed tax is a valuable source of revenue, especially as there is no sales tax in the Borough. Some cities, however, do gain income from sales tax. Palmer and Wasilla, for example, charge 3% and 2.5%, respectively.

The Borough could act to increase its revenue from tourism-related activities. For example, raising the bed tax would increase revenue without placing a greater burden on local taxpayers. Anchorage currently has a 12% bed tax, so there is plenty of room to raise the bed tax rate for the Mat-Su and remain competitive.[86] With hundreds of thousands of visitors coming to the Mat-Su annually, even a small tax raise, if devoted to conserving public open space and park and trails maintenance, would be a wise economic investment.

PROPERTY TAXES

Property taxes are another source of revenue affected by the proximity of open space. Properties are appraised so that the costs of schools, fire protection, and other public benefits are borne in proportion to the value of individual properties.

People are often willing to pay more for real estate if it is located near environmental amenities. An attractive view, for example, raises real estate value. The contribution of natural amenities to property value is significant, as seen in a Mat-Su based study of the premium people are willing to pay to be located near streams. Fronting a salmon stream adds 70% and fronting a lake adds 76% to property values compared to properties not located near water bodies, but otherwise equal in property size and other factors.[87]

In another measure of the interaction of open space and property values, a parcel in the Mat-Su with a sale price of about $75,000 receives $24,000 of its value from its vicinity to a salmon stream, and an average of $12,000 from the impact of lake proximity.[88] Clearly, lakes and streams are important to Mat-Su residents. People are willing to pay a significant amount of money for a share of Mat-Su's natural capital.

Properties adjacent to open space can increase in value, thus increasing property taxes as well. In fact, 37% of the value of the Mat-Su's residential tax base is attributed to natural assets such as parks, lakes, and streams.[89] Protecting open space can reinforce the value of nearby properties and increase Borough revenues, while at the same time maintaining all of the background benefits provided to the community, namely recreation and ecosystem service values.

CONCLUSION

For the Mat-Su, the return on investments in public open spaces is manifold; investing in this land is a safe bet. Maintaining natural spaces that everyone can access enhances the tourism value of the Mat-Su, allows citizens to engage in more physically and mentally healthy lifestyles, improves community resiliency in the face of natural disasters, preserves cultural and nourishing resources, increases public and private land values, and provides the Borough with a steady source of revenue for public services.

RESULTS

Our study shows that:

- Opportunities for physical activity in open spaces can decrease both health care costs and productivity losses, leading to more than $3 million in savings annually.
- The high cost of natural disaster recoveries, not to mention the loss of human life, can be minimized with well-planned open space preservation.
- The estimated annual value of ecosystem services of the 1,438 acres of Mat-Su Borough owned recreational land is over $1.8 million.

While the figures above paint a positive image of Mat-Su public open spaces, the ROI analysis was crucial to determine the actual costs and benefits of spending money to enhance and preserve open space in the Mat-Su. As Chapter 5 details, we reached a result of a 5.31 return on investment for the Mat-Su Borough owned lands alone, meaning that for every dollar that the Borough invests in open spaces, the payoff is more than $5, an astoundingly good return.

However, as straightforward as it may sound, this suite of benefits can only be attained and the full potential of a robust network of outdoor public spaces can only be realized with the will and encouragement of the citizens of the Mat-Su. One possible way for residents to assert their desires for open space preservation is to support a Mat-Su parks bond in order to finance the maintenance and protection necessary to fulfill those goals. Another way to fund an open space initiative would be to increase taxes focused on tourists, such as the bed tax, or land use fees for non-residents so that those who come to the Mat-Su to take advantage of its bounty also bear some of the cost.

Another strategy Mat-Su residents could use to work together to control the future of their public lands is to work with local groups such as the Great Land Trust and the Alaska Farmland Trust in order to leverage private ownership for conservation goals. Land owners and the general public can find mutually beneficial conservation ends through easements that provide sustainable natural resource harvests while still maintaining protected status to keep natural capital healthy. Mat-Su residents could also form coalitions in smaller areas such as specific communities in order to protect the resources that are most important to them at a micro-level. Communities could, for example, follow the model of New England towns that establish community forests in order to protect adjacent watersheds.

A parks bond, tax revenues, or other public and private investments could cover improved accessibility and signage for trails, an increased scope of the trail systems, and public outreach and education materials to improve understanding of the benefits of natural capital. Private land ownership claims and concerns can also be alleviated by collecting and presenting more precise data. A more comprehensive initiative of mapping public open spaces in the Mat-Su would help to delineate where parks and trails conservation should be focused and where private land ownership should be reinforced. In this way, a strong partnership between private residents and the Borough can be established with both public goods and private property in mind.

Investing in the protection of public open spaces is critical to strengthen the places and amenities that make the Mat-Su a great place to live and work. Open spaces contribute to the economic well-being of the area by providing recreational opportunities for residents, attracting visitors who spend money in local communities, supporting local agricultural production and subsistence harvests, and creating opportunities for major savings in health care costs. Continuing financial support for public open spaces is necessary to ensure the quality of life in the Mat-Su now and for decades in the future. The residents and communities of the Mat-Su benefit economically, socially, and physically when public open spaces and the countless community assets they provide are conserved.

GIS ANALYSIS AND REFERENCES

The ecosystem service value component of the Return on Investment was reached using GIS techniques on the following datasets: *NLCD 2011 Land Cover and Recreation - Local Parks*. From the local parks dataset, the 15 parcels owned and managed by the Mat-Su Borough were selected. Then, the NLCD dataset was clipped to the 15 parcels. Finally, the land cover types were summarized overall for the entire 15 parcels, representing 1,438 acres of parkland.

Parks included in the analysis:

- Talkeetna River Park
- Jordan Lake Nature Area
- Lazy Mountain Rec Area
- Niklason Lake Park
- Alcantra Athletic Complex
- Volunteer Park
- John R Nichols Memorial Park
- Jay Nolfi Fish Creek Day Park
- Coyote Lake Rec Area
- Wasilla Lake Access Park (Palmdale Dr)
- Matanuska River Park
- Segalhorst Aquatic Education Park
- Talkeetna Village Park
- Christiansen Lake Park
- Talkeetna Lakes Park

GIS REFERENCES

NLCD 2011 Land Cover (Alaska), Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium

Homer, C.G., Dewitz, J.A., Yang, L., Jin, S., Danielson, P., Xian, G., Coulston, J., Herold, N.D., Wickham, J.D., and Megown, K., 2015, Completion of the 2011 National Land Cover Database for the conterminous United States-Representing a decade of land cover change information. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*, v. 81, no. 5, p. 345-354.

Recreation - Local Parks, Matanuska-Susitna Borough

Recreation - Local Parks, current as of Sep. 27, 2015, was originally obtained from the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Office of Information Technology, Geographic Information Systems Division. -

REFERENCES

1 Schwörer, T. 2014. "Attitudes towards land use and development in the Mat-Su: Empirical evidence on economic values of ecosystem services." Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage. Available at: http://iser.uaa.alaska.edu/Publications/2014_04_25-SchwoererMat-Su2040FuturesSurvey.pdf

2 ADLWD, 2015. Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development: Research and Analysis. Retrieved 15 September, 2015.

3 "What is natural capital." Available at: http://naturalcapitalforum.com/about/

4 Department of Labor and Workforce Department: Matanuska-Susitna Borough. Available at: http://live.laborstats.alaska.gov/alari/details.cfm?yr=2013&dst=01&dst=03&dst=04&dst=02&dst=09&r=1&b=16&p=0

5 Matanuska-Susitna Borough Tourism infrastructure Needs Study, McDowell Group 2008, Anchorage, AK

6 Ibid

7 Ibid

8 Ibid

9 Ibid

10 Ibid

11 Colt, S. and Schwoerer, T. Economic Importance of Sportfishing in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough. Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage. 31 August 2009. Available at: http://www.matsugov.us/MSB_Sportfish_ISERReport_.pdf

12 Ibid

13 Matanuska-Susitna Borough Tourism infrastructure Needs Study, McDowell Group 2008, Anchorage, AK

14 Ibid

15 Kahn et al. 2002. The Effectiveness of Interventions to Increase Physical Activity. A Systematic Review. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 22(4)

16 Alaska department of Health. Available online at: http://dhss.alaska.gov/dph/PlayEveryDay/Pages/facts.aspx (last retrieved Jan 2015)

17 The Future Costs of Obesity: National and State Estimates of the Impact of Obesity on Direct Health Care Expenses - A collaborative report from United Health Foundation, the American Public Health Association and Partnership for Prevention, 2009

18 Ibid

19 Mat Su Health Foundation, 2013. Mat-Su Community Health Need Assessment

20 A.T. Kaczynski, K.A. 2008 Henderson Parks and recreation settings and active living: a review of associations with physical activity function and intensity, Journal of Physical Activity and Health, 5 (4), pp. 619–632

21 Chenoweth and Associates, 2009. The Economic Costs of Overweight, Obesity, And Physical Inactivity Among California Adults — 2006. California Center for Public Health Advocacy. Available at: http://www.publichealthadvocacy.org/PDFs/Costofobesity_BRIEF.pdf

22 Gies, 2006. The health benefits of parks. The Trust for Public Land, SF (CA). Available online at http://www.eastshorepark.org/HealthBenefitsReport_FINAL_010307.pdf (last retrieved Jan 2015)

23 Kahn et al. 2002. The Effectiveness of Interventions to Increase Physical Activity. A Systematic Review. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 22(4)

24 Institute at the Golden Gate, 2010. "Park Prescriptions" Profiles and Resources for Good Health from the Great Outdoors

25 Veugelers, P., Sithole, F., and Zhang, S. 2008. Neighborhood characteristics in relation to diet, physical activity and overweight of Canadian children. International Journal of Pediatric Obesity 3, 152-159>

26 Alcock, Ian et al. 2014 Longitudinal Effects on Mental Health of Moving to Greener and Less Green Urban Areas. Environ. Sci. Technology, 48(2): 1247-1255.

27 Williams, 2012, Physical activity and health, Human Kinetics publishers

28 Marselle, M. R., Irvine, K. N., Warber, S. L., 2014. Examining Group Walks in Nature and Multiple Aspects of Well-Being: A Large-Scale Study. Ecopsychology 6(3), 134-147. Available at: http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/abs/10.1089/eco.2014.0027http://www.uofmhealth.org/news/archive/201409/walking-depression-and-beating-stress-outdoors-nature-group

29 Sturm, Ronald and Deborah Cohen. Proximity to Urban Parks and Mental Health. The Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics, v.17 no.1, 2014: 19-24.

30 Eccles, J., and Gootman, J. 2002. Community programs to promote youth development. Washington: National Academy Press.

31 Duerr Evaluation Resources. The Benefits of Playgrounds for Children Aged 0-5. Shasta Children and Families First Commission. Available at: http://www.imaginationplayground.com/images/content/2/9/2999/The-Benefits-of-Playgrounds-for-Children-Aged-0-5.pdf (last retrieved Jan 2015)

32 Taylor, AF and FE Kuo. 2009 Children with attention deficits concentrate better after walk in the park. J Atten Disord., 12(5): 402-409.l

33 Taylor, A., Kuo, F., and Sullivan, W. 2001. Coping with ADD: The surprising connection to green play settings. Environment and Behavior 33, 54-77.

34 Mat Su Health Foundation, 2013. Mat-Su Community Health Need Assessment

35 Round Rock (Texas) City Parks and Recreation Department, 2010. Parks and Recreation economic benefits analysis,

36 Chenoweth and Bortz, 2003. Physical inactivity cost calculator – How the PICC was developed. Chenoweth and associates Inc. Available online at: http://www.ecu.edu/picostcalc/pdf_file/Methods.pdf (last retrieved Jan 2015)

37 Chamard, S. 2014. A Sourcebook of Community Attitudes: Community Survey, 2014 and Trends, 2009-2014. University of Alaska Anchorage and Matanuska-Susitna Borough. July 2014.

38 Radnofsky, L. 2013. Health-Care Costs: A State-by-State Comparison. The Wall Street Journal, April 8, 2013. Accessed 8/27/14. Available online at: http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424127887323884304578328173966380 06 (last retrieved Jan 2015)

39 Finkelstein, E. A., Trogdon, J. G., 2008. Public Health Interventions for Addressing Childhood Overweight: Analysis of the Business Case. American Journal of Public Health 98(3), 411-415. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2253570/; Trasande, L., Chatterjee, S., 2009. The Impact of Obesity on Health Service Utilization and Costs in Childhood. Obesity 17(9), 1749-1754. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1038/oby.2009.67/abstract

40 Mat-Su Health Foundation. Healthy Weight. Chapter 3 In: 2013 Mat-Su Community Health Needs Assessment. Wasilla, AK.

41 Atlantis E, Barnes EH, Singh MA. Efficacy of exercise for treating overweight in children and adolescents: a systematic review. Int J Obes 2006;30:1027–1040

42 City Data. Advameg Inc. 2013 Available online at: http://www.city-data.com/county/Matanuska-Susitna_Borough-AK.html (last retrieved Jan 2015)

43 CDC Physical Activity Indicator Report 2014. Available online at: http://www.cdc.gov/physicalactivity/downloads/pa_state_indicator_report_2014.pdf (last retrieved Jan 2015)

44 Brownson, R. C., Baker, E. A., Housemann, R. A., Brennan, L. K., Bacak, S. J., 2001. Environmental and policy determinants of physical activity in the United States. American Journal of Public Health 91 (12), 1995-2003. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11726382

45 Ipek N. Sener, Chandra R. Bhat, 2011, Modelling the spatial and temporal dimensions of recreational activity participation with a focus on physical activities. The International Journal of Transportation Research ; 39(3):627-656

46 Chenoweth and Bortz 2007, Physical inactivity health calculator

47 Institut de la Veille Sanitaire, Bulletin épidémiologique hebdomadaire du 06 Janvier 2015, France

48 Beyer, K. M., Kaltenbach, A., Szabo, A., Bogar, S., Nieto, F. J., Malecki, K. M., 2014. Exposure to neighborhood green space and mental health: evidence from the survey of the health of Wisconsin. International Journal of

49 Schwantes 2010. Using Active Living Principles to Promote Physical Activity in Rural Communities. Active Living by Design. Available online at http://activelivingresearch.org/files/2010_EvaluationMeasurement_Schwantes.pdf (last retrieved Jan 2015)

50 Center for disease control and prevention, 1998. Self-Reported Physical Inactivity by Degree of Urbanization -- United States, 1996. Morbidity and mortality weekly reports 1998 / 47(50);1097-1100

51 "Mat-Su Floods, Road Closures: 10 People Rescued in Wasilla." KTUU- TV. 20 September 2012. Web. Accessed 28 July 2015.

52 Mauer, Richard and Casey Grove. "Floodwaters recede in Talkeetna." Alaska Dispatch News. 21 September 2012. Web. Accessed 28 July 2015.

53 Alaska Statewide Climate Summary. May 2015. The Alaska Climate Research Center. Available at: http://akclimate.org/Summary/Statewide/2015/May

54 Alaska Statewide Climate Summary. June 2015. The Alaska Climate Research Center. Available at: http://akclimate.org/Summary/Statewide/2015/Jun

55 Alaska Interagency Coordination Center Report. Monday – 9/14/15. Updated daily, available at: http://fire.ak.blm.gov/content/aicc/sitreport/current.pdf

56 "Wildfires." Alaska Climate Change Adaptation Series. University of Alaska Fairbanks. June 2013. Available at: http://www.uaf.edu/files/ces/publications-db/catalog/cred/ACC-00100.pdf

57 Fire Management Options 2015. Alaska Interagency Coordination Center. 5/4/2015. Available at: http://fire.ak.blm.gov/content/maps/aicc/Alaska_Fire_Management_Options.pdf

58 Ibid

59 Ibid

60 Geist, Marcus. GIS data. The Nature Conservancy. (Personal correspondence, 9 May 2012).

61 USDA Agricultural Census Data, 2012. http://agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Full_Report/Volume_1,_Chapter_1_State_Level/Alaska/st02_1_001_001.pdf

62 Alder B. 2008 Mat-Su Borough All Hazard Mitigation Plan 2008. Available at: http://www.commerce.state.ak.us/dca/planning/nfip/Hazard_Mitigation_Plans/Mat_Su_Boro_HMP.pdf (last retrieved Jan 2015)

63 US Agricultural Census Data, 2012. Hired Farm Labor – Workers and Payrolls: 2012. Available at: http://agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Full_Report/Volume_1,_Chapter_2_County_Level/Alaska/st02_2_007_007.pdf (last retrieved Jan 2015)

64 Ibid

65 Ibid

66 Schwörer, T. 2014. "Attitudes towards land use and development in the Mat-Su: Empirical evidence on economic values of ecosystem services." Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage. Available at: http://iser.uaa.alaska.edu/Publications/2014_04_25-SchwoererMat-Su2040FuturesSurvey.pdf

67 Ibid

68 US Agricultural Census Data, 2012. Hired Farm Labor – Workers and Payrolls: 2012. Available at: http://agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Full_Report/Volume_1,_Chapter_2_County_Level/Alaska/st02_2_007_007.pdf (last retrieved Jan 2015)

69 US agricultural Census Data, 2012. Area Profile: Anchorage Area. Available at http://agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/County_Profiles/Alaska/cp02020.pdf (last retrieved Jan 2015)

70 Metiva M., Hanson D., Mat-Su Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy. December 2008 update. Available at: http://www.matsugov.us/docman/doc_view/842 (last retrieved Jan 2015)

71 Wolfe, R. 2000. Subsistence in Alaska: A Year 2000 Update. Division of Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau.

72 Ibid

73 Wolfe, R. 2000. Subsistence in Alaska: A Year 2000 Update. Division of Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Juneau.

74 Brown, T., and Burch, Jr., E. 1992. Estimating the Economic Value of the Subsistence Harvest of Wildlife in Alaska. In: Valuing Wildlife in Alaska, ed. G. Peterson.

75 ADFG. Subsistence in Alaska: A Year 2010 Update. Division of Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

76 Phillips, Eric. Personal communication, 14 April 2015.

77 Ibid

78 "The Economics Benefits of Open Space and Trails in Pinal County, Arizona." The Trust for Public Land. (2012). Available at: https://www.tpl.org/sites/default/files/cloud.tpl.org/pubs/benefits-az-PinalCountyReport.pdf

79 Ibid

80 Ibid

81 "The Economics Benefits of Johnson County Park and Recreation District, Johnson County, Kansas." The Trust for Public Land. May 2015. Available at: https://www.tpl.org/sites/default/files/files_upload/JohnsonCo.5_15_15finLO.pdf

82 "New Hampshire's Return on Investment in Land Conservation." The Trust for Public Land. June 2014. Available at: https://www.tpl.org/sites/default/files/nh-state-roi-report.pdf

83 Tayor, David; Lovato, Jill; Sargent-Michaud, Jessica; Stevens, Daniel. "Economic Contributions of the Wyoming Wildlife and Natural Resource Trust." December 2011. Available at: https://www.tpl.org/sites/default/files/cloud.tpl.org/pubs/benefits_mt_wwnrt.pdf

84 Annual Budget for the Fiscal Year ending June 30th, 2015, Matanuska-Susitna Borough. Available here: http://www.matsugov.us/component/cck/?task=download&collection=file_upload_x&xi=1&file=file_upload&id=13872

85 ADFG. Subsistence in Alaska: A Year 2010 Update. Division of Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

86 Anchorage Municipal Code Chapter 12.20. Available online here: https://www.municode.com/library/ak/anchorage/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT12TA_CH12.20ROTA

87 Berman M., Armagost J. 2013. Contribution of Land Conservation and Freshwater Resources to Residential Property Values in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough. Institute of Social and Economic Research, University of Alaska Anchorage.

88 Ibid

89 Ibid

EARTH ECONOMICS

eartheconomics.org

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH
PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD
RESOLUTION NO. 16-03

A RESOLUTION OF THE MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS ADVISORY BOARD SUPPORTING CLEARING ALPINE SKI TRAILS WITHIN THE NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT UNIT AT HATCHER PASS.

WHEREAS, the State of Alaska and the Matanuska Susitna Borough collaborated on the Government Peak Unit Asset Management and Development Plan, which was approved by the State and adopted by the Borough Assembly; and

WHEREAS, the borough owns all the land within the Northern Subunit of the Government Peak Unit covered by the Hatcher Pass Management Plan designated for a future alpine ski area; and

WHEREAS, Hatcher Alpine Xperience, a local non-profit corporation, was formed to develop an alpine ski area within the northern subunit of the Government Peak Unit; and

WHEREAS, the conceptual trail alignments proposed to be cleared by Hatcher Alpine Xperience are those identified in the adopted Government Peak Asset Management Plan; and

WHEREAS, clearing the trails will allow for downhill skiers to begin utilizing the alpine ski area for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Parks, Recreation and Trails Advisory Board does hereby support the efforts of Hatcher Alpine Xperience to brush alpine ski trails within the northern subunit of the Government Peak Unit of the Hatcher Pass Area.

ADOPTED by the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Parks, Recreation and Trails Advisory Board this 24th day of October, 2016.

_____
David Palmer, Chair

ATTEST:

_____
Jill Irsik, CD Admin. Spec.

HATCHER PASS - GOVERNMENT PEAK UNIT
Asset Management and Development Plan
MAP 8
GOVERNMENT PEAK MANAGEMENT UNIT
FULL BUILD OUT
OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND TRAILS



HATCHER PASS - GOVERNMENT PEAK UNIT
Asset Management and Development Plan

MAP 5
SUB-UNITS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT AREAS



MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH

Borough Attorney's Office

Nicholas Spiropoulos, Borough Attorney
350 East Dahlia Avenue • Palmer, Alaska 99645-6488
Telephone (907) 861-8677 • Facsimile (907) 861-8559
www.matsugov.us

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: September 22, 2016

TO: Parks, Recreation and Trails Advisory Board

THROUGH: Shannon Bodolay, Assistant Borough Attorney

FROM: Assembly Member Dan Mayfield

SUBJECT: Legislation Prohibiting Trapping on Borough Owned Public School Property and the Borough Owned Portion of Crevasse Moraine Trail System

---

Assembly member Mayfield requested this legislation be presented to this Board to consider and comment upon prior to it being placed on the Assembly's agenda.

CODE ORDINANCE

Sponsored by:
Introduced:
Public Hearing:
Action:

MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH
ORDINANCE SERIAL NO. 16-___

AN ORDINANCE OF THE MATANUSKA-SUSITNA BOROUGH ASSEMBLY AMENDING 24.05, MSB 2.85. AND MSB 19.12 TO PROHIBIT TRAPPING ON BOROUGH OWNED PUBLIC SCHOOL PROPERTY AND THE BOROUGH OWNED PORTION OF CREVASSE MORAINE TRAIL SYSTEM.

WHERREAS, the Matanuska Susitna Borough owns property that has been developed for public schools sites;

WHEREAS, the Matanuska Susitna Borough school sites are heavily utilized by children, teachers, school administrators, and members of the public;

WHEREAS, the Matanuska Susitna Borough also owns property that makes up various trail systems;

WHEREAS, the Matanuska Susitna Borough owns property within the Core Area that serves as part of the Crevasse Moraine Trail system;

WHEREAS, the Matanuska Susitna Borough maintains certain trails on its property in the Crevasse Moraine Trail system;

WHEREAS, people recreate beyond the boundaries of the Borough maintained trails in the Crevasse Moraine Trail system, as there are no requirements or restrictions that recreational use is limited to a particular area or trail;

WHEREAS, there are other "social trails" on the Matanuska

Susitna Borough property in the Crevasse Moraine Trail system that are not Borough maintained;

WHEREAS, the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Recreational Trails Plan ("Trails Plan" evaluated the needs and desires of Borough residents and landowners with regard to recreational trail development;

WHEREAS, one of the goals of the Recreational Trails Plan is to preserve the existing popular recreational trails;

WHEREAS, one of the Trails Plan management recommendation goals is to minimize conflicts between different types of trail users and avoid trail degradation due to improper use;

WHEREAS, the Trails Plan recognizes that trail conflicts between separate user groups are likely to increase as trail use increases;

WHEREAS, the Trails Plan likewise recognizes that it is important for the Borough to take some proactive steps to insure these conflicts are minimized;

WHEREAS, the Trails Plan further recognizes that trails should be managed so as to provide the greatest recreational benefit to those types of recreational trail uses for which the trail is uniquely situated;

WHEREAS, the Trails Plan also recognizes that it may be necessary to limit some uses in certain situations;

WHEREAS, in a survey reported in the Trails Plan, 51% of

the respondents stated that walking or dog walking was the most common trail recreation activity;

WHEREAS, the Crevasse Moraine trail system is included within the Trails Plan,

WHEREAS , the Crevasse Moraine Trail System is described in the Trails Plan as one for which the trails have been "dedicated" or that they have a legal right-of-way or formal landowner permission allowing public access along its entire length;

WHEREAS, the Crevasse Moraine Trail System is described as a regionally significant trail in the Trails Plan;

WHEREAS, in a separate plan called the Crevasse-Moraine Master Plan, the area is described as a "high demand attraction serving diverse non-motorized users, including walkers (often with dogs), runners, equestrians, and mountain bikers;"

WHEREAS, the Crevasse-Moraine Master Plan explains that investment in the site is focused on providing healthy, enjoyable recreation opportunities for a compatible mix of non-motorized uses including family stroll and dog walking among others;

WHEREAS, in the "Desired Future Conditions" of the Crevasse-Moraine Master Plan, it states Crevasse Moraine consists of 360 acres reserved for a permanent, formalized, soft tread trail network for which investment is focused on providing

healthy, enjoyable recreation opportunities for a compatible mixture of non-motorized users including: family stroll/non strenuous walking; dog walking; strenuous walking/hiking; running/cross country training; equestrian; mountain biking; Nordic skiing; snowshoeing; skijoring; geocaching; bird/wildlife watching; orienteering; informal neighborhood picnic and play areas;

WHEREAS, in the "Desired Future Conditions" section of the Crevasse-Moraine Master Plan also notes that Valley Pathways School shares some common infrastructure with Crevasse Moraine, and that the school seeks to instill respect for the Crevasse Moraine area by working with the Borough to create opportunities for student trail use related to their education; community service learning trail maintenance projects, forestry and trail building vocational training; and summer facility use for recreational programing;

WHEREAS, demand for Borough trails increases every year, and is expected to continue as visitors and residents continue to get outside and enjoy the Borough's natural beauty in increasing numbers;

WHEREAS, the Borough has an interest in managing its property to facilitate the intended use of the property, and protect members of the public, their children and their pets;

WHEREAS, there are currently no prohibitions against

trapping in these areas;

WHEREAS, according to the "Trap Safety for Pet Owners" guide that is published by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Wildlife Conservation's and the Alaska Trappers Association, trapping is a popular pastime and a livelihood for some and occurs throughout Alaska, even on some popular recreation trails;

WHEREAS, MSB 23.05.050(A) already prohibits a person from placing personal property upon or making unauthorized use of borough-owned real property without written permission from the manager;

WHEREAS, there are no express trapping restrictions on Borough owned public school sites, or within the Borough owned Crevasse Moraine trails;

WHEREAS, allowing traps to be placed on Borough owned public school sites or within the Borough owned Crevasse Moraine trails or nearby is incompatible with the intended educational and or recreational uses for those areas;

WHEREAS, school site users, including children, may not be able to timely identify the location of traps on public school property and may not be able to successfully avoid them;

WHEREAS, recreational trail users, including children, may not be able to timely identify the location of traps of on Borough owned Crevasse Moraine Trail and may not be able to

successfully avoid them accordingly;

WHEREAS, allowing traps to be placed in these areas could inadvertently, but seriously, injure those using these areas - including children and/or the pets individuals they recreate with;

WHEREAS, at least three dogs have been inadvertently caught in traps in the Matanuska Susitna Borough within the last year and treated by the Animal Care and Regulation shelter;

WHEREAS, dogs in the Matanuska Susitna Borough have suffered significant injuries as a result of being caught in traps;

WHEREAS, AS 29.35.010(8) provides the Borough the power to manage and control real property;

WHEREAS, the Borough has an interest in managing its property to protect the property users;

WHEREAS, the Borough has an interest in managing its trail property to ensure the primary intended uses such as walking, hiking, running, biking etc., with or without pets, is safe from conflicts relating to traps;

WHEREAS, the Borough has an interest in protecting domestic animals and the power to do so pursuant to AS 29.35.210(a)(3);

BE IT ENACTED:

Section 1. Classification. This ordinance is of a general and permanent nature and shall become a part of the Borough

Code.

Section 2. Amendment of section. MSB 24.05.020 is hereby amended as follows:

(A) The borough **generally** has jurisdiction **only** over domestic and domesticated animals. Except for purposes of enforcing MSB 2.85.020, MSB 19.12.015, and MSB 24.05.105, the borough does not have jurisdiction over the following animals:

(1) wild animals; and

(2) game animals, the taking or possession of which is regulated by the state or federal government.

Section 3. Adoption of section. MSB 24.05.105 is hereby adopted as follows:

(A) Except as provided in MSB 24.05.110, no person may engage in trapping, attempting to trap, or aiding and abetting any person in trapping any wild or domesticated animal:

(1) Within any Borough maintained trail, or within 100 feet of such, on Borough owned property which is part of the Crevasse Moraine trail system.

(2) On any part of public school property owned by the Borough.

(B) The Borough will prepare and keep current a map showing areas where trapping is not allowed pursuant to this section. A copy of the map shall be provided to any person upon request.

(C) The Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Alaska Department of Public Safety, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or their authorized agents or designees, may trap animals within the area in which trapping is expressly prohibited by the chapter.

(D) This section shall not apply to the trapping or capturing of rats, mice, shrews, or similar vermin.

(E) Violation of this section shall be punishable as set forth in MSB 24.40.

Section 4. Amendment of section. The fine schedule in MSB 24.40.050 is amended as follows:

24.05.105	**Trapping Prohibited**	**1st Offense $150**
		2nd Offense $300
		3rd and Subsequent $500

Section 5. Adoption of section. The following section is adopted as MSB 24.40.055:

24.40.055 FORFTURE OF TRAPS

Ownership rights of any trap found on public school property owned by the Borough, or within any Borough maintained trail that is part of the Crevasse Moraine Trail system or within 100 feet of such, are forfeited upon conviction of MSB 24.05.105.

Section 6. Amendment of section. MSB 2.85.020 is amended as follows:

(D) [THE MANAGER MAY CLOSE OR RESTRICT TRAILS BECAUSE OF ENVIRONEMNTAL, SEASONAL, SAFETY CONCERNS, or OTHER VALID REASONS AND MAY RESTRICT CERTAIN USES TO AVOID TRAIL CONCLICTS OR SAFETY CONCERNS.]

Except as provided in MSB 24.05.110, **Borough owned property which is part of the Crevasse Moraine trail system is closed to trapping, attempting to trap, or aiding and abetting in trapping any wild or domesticated animal within 10 yards of any such trail to prevent trail conflicts and ensure safety.**

(1) The Borough will prepare and keep current a map showing areas where trapping is not allowed pursuant to this section. A copy of the map shall be provided to any person upon request.

(2) The Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Alaska Department of Public Safety, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or their authorized agents or designees, may trap animals within the area.

(3) This section shall not apply to the trapping or capturing of rats, mice, shrews, or similar vermin.

(4) Violation of this section shall be punishable as set forth in MSB 1.45.

(E) The manager may close or restrict **additional** trails because of environmental, seasonal, safety concerns, or other valid reasons and may restrict certain uses to avoid trail conflicts or safety concerns.

Section 7. Adoption of Section. MSB 2.85.030 is adopted as follows:

2.85.030 DEFINITIONS

"Trap" means any device designed or used to capture or hold an animal and that operates without direct human control. This includes any device for catching and holding wild or domesticated animals including, but not limited to, snares, nets, pitfalls, or clamp-like devices that spring shut suddenly.

"Trapping" means the placing or setting of a trap.

Section 8. Amendment of Chapter Title. Chapter 19:12 Title is amended as follows:

[OPERATION OF MOTOR VEHICLES] **SCHOOL PROPERTY**

Section 9. Amendment of Section. MSB 19.12.020 is amended

19.12.015 TRAPPING PROHIBITED

Except as provided in MSB 24.05.110, no person may engage in trapping, attempting to trap, or aiding and abetting any person in trapping any wild or domesticated animals on any part of public school property owned by the Borough.

(1) The Borough will prepare and keep current a map showing areas where trapping is not allowed pursuant to this section. A copy of the map shall be provided to any person upon request.

(2) The School District, Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Alaska Department of Public Safety, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or their authorized agents or designees, may trap animals within the area.

(3) Violation of this section shall be punishable as set forth in MSB 1.45.

Section 10. Adoption of Section. MSB 19.12.030 is adopted

as follows:

19.12.030 DEFINITIONS

"Trap" means any device designed or used to capture or hold an animal and that operates without direct human control. This includes any device for catching and holding wild or domesticated animals including, but not limited to, snares, nets, pitfalls, or clamp-like devices that spring shut suddenly.

"Trapping" means the placing or setting of a trap.

Section 11. Amendment of Section. The fine schedule in MSB 1.45.100 (C) is amended as follows:

19.12.020	**Trapping on School Property**	**1st Offense $150**
		2nd Offense $300
		3rd and Subsequent $500
23.05.105	**Trapping Prohibited**	
		1st Offense $150
		2nd Offense $300
		3rd and Subsequent $500

Section 12. Adoption of section. MSB 1.45.105 is hereby adopted as follows:

1.45.105 FORFTURE OF TRAPS

Ownership rights of any trap found on public school property owned by the Borough, or any trap found on a Borough maintained trail or within 100 feet of such on Borough owned property which is part of the Crevasse

Moraine trail system, are forfeited upon conviction of MSB 2.85.020(D) or MSB 19.12.020.

Section 13. Effective date. This ordinance shall take effect upon adoption.

ADOPTED by the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Assembly this - day of -, 2016.

_____
VERN HALTER, Borough Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
LONNIE R. McKECHNIE, CMC, Borough Clerk

(SEAL)