

Subcommittee Meetings

Agendas

Meeting Notes

Public Comments

Girdwood Multi-Use Trail Subcommittee Agenda April 27, 2018, 2 - 4 p.m. Girdwood Community Room

Agenda Revisions and Approval

April 27, 2018 Agenda Approval

Introductions

Chair-Eryn Boone

Subcommittee members: Jim Braham, Paul Crews, Deb Essex, Julie Jonas, Ron Tenny, Peter Zug

Public Comment:

Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes per person with a maximum of 12 minutes of public comment total.

Develop Ground Rules/Processes

1. Respect each other's thinking and value everyone's contributions.
2. Listen with an open mind.
3. Limit side conversations.
4. Other
5. Meeting minutes
6. Identify alternate chair or co-chair in case chair is absent?

Define Goals and Objectives

From Trails Committee motion to form subcommittee:

The subcommittee is charged with making a preliminary plan for the alignment, design and construction of the trail. The group will present this plan to the GTC as new business no later than the August GTC meeting.

Discuss Paul's Preliminary Draft of Goals & Objectives:

Goal: Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail.

Objectives: 1. Select a final trail route plan that protects existing trail alignments while utilizing terrain wisely in order to provide trail users with an enjoyable experience within a natural setting on a trail that has been constructed with minimal impact to the forest.

2. Develop basic trail cross section plans to assure that trail construction will remain within agreed upon clearing limits. Develop a plan to select off trail gravel sources if needed.

3. Develop trail specifications and construction requirements that trail construction contractors and volunteers must follow.

Discuss Timeline/Meeting Frequency for Completing Goals & Objectives

Review Specifications from Trails Committee Motion in June, 2017

- 1) New Arlberg parking lot and Our Lady of the Snows are dual access options to the trail.
- 2) Trail is maximum 10' wide, hardened surface, with targeted maximum width of 14' clearing.
- 3) Design minimized visual impact on existing trails
- 4) Design minimized environmental impacts

Discuss Details of Trail Alignment, Design, and Construction (if time allows)

Review Action Items

Set Next Meeting Date (May 7th?)

Trail Subcommittee Meeting April 27, 2018 - Summary

Attending: Eryn Boone(EB), Peter Zug(PZ), Paul Crews(PC), Julie Jonas(JJ), Ron Tenny(RT), Deb Essex(DE).
Absent: Jim Braham(JB)

*Note: Review these notes in conjunction with 1) **Agenda** for 4/27/18 meeting and 2) **Document** that Paul Crews handed out at the meeting (Goals, Objectives, Strategies, Specifications).*

Public Comment:

Brenden and Julie Raymond-Yakoubian each submitted 3 minutes of comments. See their written comments that Eryn subsequently emailed to us after the meeting.

Develop Ground Rules / Processes

All agreed that subcommittee meetings would have a format of casual discussion. Listen, respect, limit side conversations. Julie will take notes and attempt to summarize the meeting (in other words, not be held to Margaret's standards with producing minutes). In Eryn's absence, Julie will chair meetings and Jim will take notes.

Define Goals and Objectives

We reviewed the task at hand: The subcommittee is charged with making a preliminary plan for the alignment, design and construction of the trail. The group will present this plan to the GTC as new business no later than the August GTC meeting.

Paul Crews handed out a document titled "Girdwood Forest Loop Planning Subcommittee" that he had prepared with Goals, Objectives, Strategies, Specifications.

Subcommittee added to Goal: "by August Girdwood Trails Committee Meeting."

Subcommittee added to Objectives: Develop a draft Trail Management Objective (TMO). The worksheet that is currently in the Girdwood Trail Management Plan will be used as a guiding document.

Strategies: No changes

For Trail Specifications A-Q, we will each review and mark up (homework) prior to next meeting (May 24, 2018).

Discussion continued around Goals and Objectives as well as history of current 5K loop.

- Eryn raised comment by Diana Livingston about "Consider limiting wording in goals and objectives and other substantive working statements to what can be *quantified*." The subcommittee was not really clear on how that could be accomplished.
- GNSC recommends having a project manager on site (Jim Galanes was designated for 5K); Deb (DE) stated GNSC would like to have Bill Spencer be project manager for this new trail.
- Girdwood 2020 initiated concept of 5K loop; HLB pursued it; Deb stepped in, then GNSC was formed
- GNSC, not the HLB, is initiating the multi-use loop.
- GNSC originally proposed new trail to be a Class 5 trail...after public comment, it would now likely be a class 4 with modifications
- There needs to be a balance with grooming equipment vs. utilizing 14' piston bully.

- DE believes it will be short sighted not to use grooming equipment 'donated' by CPG and Alyeska Resort. "#1 killer of trails is maintenance."
- RT believes we must consider the long term; what if a future CPG or Resort owner does not want to provide grooming?
- PC states that the 14' width is a good target and is adamant that we stay within that.

Another topic discussed in some length, with reference to the black and white map (same one used by Bill Spencer in April 2018 GTC meeting) was the issue of trail access to begin at new parking lot OR Moose Meadows (as it is now on the map).

- DE: Cost, dog poop, salmon, building bridges are all obstacles to starting trail from new parking lot. RT: It's a good idea to start from new parking lot (minimize trails from 3 to 2 on the opening stretch; can be built in dryer ground west (?). DE: Road in to current 5K "sunk" and they had to mitigate that situation. PC: There is an approximate 300' stretch where it is problematic/too close to Stumpy's Trail. RT: By the church, it also seems to be too close. PC: trail can be located further downhill...this is an item we will have to come back to.
- DE: Procedure is to figure out design (i.e, alignment) before ticking off the items on the TMO checklist/chart

Action Items

Immediate:

1. Read Brenden and Julie Raymond-Yakoubian/s comments and respond appropriately
2. Review and familiarize ourselves with preliminary Trail Management Objectives chart currently in the Girdwood Trails Management Plan
3. Study the Trail Specifications (in Paul's document) and mark it up! (JJ note: consider using one document and use Track Changes/Mark up feature in MS Word). Paul will email doc to us.
4. Talk to engineers re: sinkage (PC).
5. Produce agenda for May 24 meeting (EB)

Ongoing:

1. Define the CLASS of trail that this new trail shall be
2. Confirm the width/capacity of CPG/Resort grooming equipment (DE). Define long term grooming strategy (ALL).
3. Make decision on access route (from Arlberg or Church?)

Submitted by Julie Jonas, 4/30/2018

Date: March 30, 2018

To: Girdwood Nordic Ski Club (via info@skigirdwood.org)
 Girdwood Trails Committee (via carolyn_brodin@hotmail.com, kesandberg@gmail.com,
barbaracrews@alaska.net)

Cc: Girdwood Municipality staff (via KelleyKT@ci.anchorage.ak.us, TylerMS@ci.anchorage.ak.us)

From: Julie Raymond-Yakoubian
 PO Box 924
 Girdwood, AK 99587

Re: Comments on Girdwood Nordic Ski Club proposed 'Forest Loop' trail alignment

GSNC and GTC.

This letter contains my comments on the current flagged alignment for the Girdwood Nordic Ski Club's (GNSC) proposed 'Forest Loop', as well as general comments on the proposed trail itself. My understanding from the last Girdwood Trails Committee (GTC) meeting (March 6, 2018) was that the GNSC is soliciting comments, but is making no commitments to either 1) make adjustments to the alignment prior to a vote at GTC or 2) to ever do anything with the comments at all other than 'hold on to them.' This was communicated to the GTC at the March meeting by the GNSC President. This is not consistent with the GBOS resolution regarding this project that indicates that the GTC will be involved in the design and construction of this proposed trail.

My comments are based on traveling the proposed alignment several times, and using this area of the forest for many years.

- The values that Stumpy's trail and the surrounding forest currently embody, and the experiences it provides in its current state, are of far more value than an unnecessary spider web of trails that would be constructed under the GNSC's plan.
- The proposed alignment is visible from Stumpy's trail in many locations.
 - From multiple locations on Stumpy's trail you can see the flagging of the alignment for the proposed trail. This is totally unacceptable. If the proposed trail is constructed, it will diminish both the view shed from Stumpy's and the trail user experience on Stumpy's. Stumpy's is a primitive trail with wilderness-like, forested qualities. That trail, and this forest area in general, currently provide users with solitude, and a forest-dominated experience. This will be destroyed if the proposed trail is built.
- I've heard it proposed that portions of Stumpy's trail could be relocated to accommodate the proposed trail. This is unacceptable. An existing trail, which has been in existence roughly in its current form for many decades, and possibly prior to that for much, much longer, should not be relocated to accommodate a trail that is not even necessary.
- The proposed trail alignment is clearly designed to use as much of this forested area as possible, which has resulted in way too much trail packed into this area. The design has not taken into consideration any of the values and qualities of the area that users currently value.
 - When following the proposed alignment it is possible to see *at least* 4 sections of the proposed trail at one time and, in some places, to also see Stumpy's and/or the meadows trail. Again, this is without even cutting trees to construct the trail. This type of sight line, with the addition of cutting, will be a

completely opposite type of experience than currently exists. It will essentially make it potentially possible to view trail user and/or trail cuts from one 'side' of the forest to the other.

- Many portions of the trail run parallel to the meadows and in very close proximity. The beginning of the proposed trail alignment runs exclusively parallel to the meadows trail. There is no reason for this to be the case. The forest should be kept as intact as possible. There is no justifiable reason to create new trails literally feet from other, existing trails.
- If the trail was to be built, the trailhead should be further north and should utilize the existing meadows trails. GNSC not wanting to deal with Corps of Engineers permitting does not justify unnecessary destruction of other parts of the forest.
- The filling of natural features (and potentially wetlands), such as the kettle ponds and swales, is just gratuitous and for one type of user (skate skiers) who wants the thrill of terrain changes. not even to enjoy the feature for its geological qualities.
- There is massive amounts of flagging out there. This should all be removed as soon as possible so that people who use this forest regularly can do so without having to see the flagging.
- One of the GNSC justifications for this proposed trail is that existing trails are 'bursting at the seams'. There is no actual evidence for this – for example, no actual trail use study for the valley has ever been conducted, to my knowledge (nor has one ever been cited). In my personal trail use experiences I have never experienced anything that I would consider 'bursting at the seams'. Most days, I encounter a handful of people on any given trail in the valley, often it is just one or two other people and, not infrequently, no one else. This is during all seasons. The one exception to this might be Winner Creek Trail, in the height of summer, on a holiday weekend. But this is just one trail, and not during the winter season. Nordic 5K trail users have even commented that if you want to 'get away from the crowds on the mountain' you should go out to the 5K and you'll have the trails to yourself...
- There is also no evidence that the proposed trails will have any positive economic impact on our community. For example, to my knowledge, there have been no studies conducted on the economic contributions of any Girdwood trails – existing or proposed. Without these. any such claims are pure conjecture and should also not be used to justify new trail construction.
- The GNSC has not proven to the public that they can be responsible trail builders or managers. They overbuilt the existing 5K and have done very little to remedy their mistakes and have also made it clear that they have no intention of doing anything additional to fix their mistakes. Given their history, there is no reason why we should trust GNSC with additional public lands.

The proposed trail alignment, as currently designed, is completely inadequate to protect existing forest qualities and will be highly damaging to current users of this part of the valley. I hope these comments will be seriously considered and discussed. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Julie Raymond-Yakoubian

Public Comment for first Forest Loop Trail Alignment/Design/Construction Subcommittee (27 April 2018)

My name is Brenden Raymond-Yakoubian. My address is 164 Virgin Creek Road in Girdwood.

I submitted comments on this on April 1st and 6th to the Nordic Club and Trails Committee. My first request is that those comments be considered in this Subcommittee's discussions. If you need me to re-send those, just let me know.

I will get through as many comments as I can in my 3 minutes, and I'll pass around these written comments which I probably won't have time to get through but I request that you consider:

- 1) The trailbed and clearing width should be reduced. The impact on the forest with a 10 foot trail and total 14 foot clearing is going to be massive. The Nordic Club stated at the last Trails Committee meeting that the driving consideration for the width was grooming. As I have confirmed with the Anchorage Nordic Club, a 5 to 6 foot trail is groomable. This can be done with grooming machines or self-built tow-behind grooming apparatuses. Equipment limitations should be no excuse to create a larger scar on the forest than is minimally necessary, as this will be a lasting effect on the valley's forest. This trail will likely cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to build, and the fabrication of smaller trail width equipment would be a tiny drop in that bucket.**
- 2) There is way too much trail currently proposed for this small area. A forested viewshed should be maintained throughout, and this is not possible with this much trail. If you lay a straight edge across the latest proposed alignment for the trail, in many places it will cut across a number of segments - up to 8 by my count in some places. The visual impact of that would be substantial, especially in a small patch of relatively mature forest like this. The clearing widths will in all likelihood appear to be multiple orders higher than just whatever segment the person is on. Even now - with the forest intact - you can easily see to other segment centerline areas. **And the area with the loops converging - that's just going to look absolutely terrible from a visual-impact-on-the-forest perspective if it isn't changed. So this all needs to be changed to address that problem.****
- 3) Whatever the final trailbed and clearing widths are that are agreed upon, they should be absolutely be held to – for both development and long-term maintenance. Holding to this includes into the future, during the post-construction phase i.e. long-term maintenance (e.g. trail widths should be not be widened in the future such as during the long-term trail maintenance phase).**
- 4) There use of kettle, swale, and ravine features should be dramatically reduced or eliminated. These are beautiful natural features, and it's disturbing to see people think of them as little more than terrain features to run a trailbed through. Additionally, at least some of these would be considered transient wetlands. **Additionally, a wetlands analysis should be conducted with regard to the kettle/ravine/swale features.****
- 5) The northern dogleg should be officially abandoned; Paul has discussed some of the rationale for this previously.**
- 6) There should be rigorous external monitoring/inspection during trail construction, with simple**

and clear stop-work and reporting provisions built-in in the event of problems occurring.

7) The long straightish line in seems pretty pointless to me, and it unnecessarily increases the visual and forest impact of the trail. There is a trail already in existence in the meadows just to the east, and people can get into the loops from further northeast where a stub from the south loop pokes out into the meadows (closer up to where the loops centrally come together). As such, there's no need to add this additional scar to the forest, one which also happens to be a stone's throw away from the meadows trails to the east at its beginning and Stumpy's to the west towards its terminus.

8) There should be no assumptions built into the design of the trail of connections to the north and east, for which there is strong opposition to future trail building activities.

9) Stumpy's is still visible from the proposed alignment at a number of locations, and that should be addressed. This would not include rerouting Stumpy's, which in my mind is a total no-go.

10) There should be strict oversight to ensure that "view-impeding" trees which are outside the alignment aren't felled by overly zealous trail builders to help facilitate mountain views. There are a bunch of areas where the mountains are peeking through the trees.

11) The public should receive ample notification and public comment opportunities regarding any DOT permitting and public review processes. The southern portion of this area is actually on DOT lands, not HLB lands.

12) A historic properties/cultural resources inventory survey should be conducted in this area, including archival research, local research, and on-the-ground field survey components. Stumpy's is a historical trail which utilized, among other things, previous historical trails. Impacts to these properties/resources should be avoided.

Girdwood Multi-Use Trail Subcommittee Agenda May 24, 2018, 3-5:30 p.m. Girdwood Community Room

Agenda Revisions and Approval

May 24, 2018 Agenda Approval

Public Comment:

Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes per person with a maximum of 12 minutes of public comment total.

Review Subcommittee Goal:

Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail by August, 2018.

Review Action items from last meeting:

Immediate:

1. Subcommittee members to read comments submitted by the public and respond *appropriately*
2. Review and familiarize ourselves with preliminary Trail Management Objectives chart currently in the Girdwood Trails Management Plan
3. Study the Trail Specifications (in Paul's document) and mark it up! Paul will email doc to us.
4. Talk to engineers re: sinkage (PC).
5. Produce agenda for May 24 meeting (EB)

Ongoing:

1. Define the CLASS of trail that this new trail shall be
2. Confirm the width/capacity of CPG/Resort grooming equipment (DE). Define long term grooming strategy (ALL).
3. Make decision on access route (from Arlberg or Church?)

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Verify subcommittee consensus on trail hardened surface/clearing width considering planned trail uses.
2. Trail Density – There seems to be consensus that the trail is too dense, how do we go about making adjustments to this and does it need to be done on paper prior to August?
3. Gain consensus on access Route (from Arlberg or Church)
4. Define the CLASS of trail that this new trail shall be
5. Discuss comments on the Trail Specifications (Paul's document)

Review Action Items

Set Next Meeting Date (May 31st, 3-5 PM)

Trail Subcommittee Meeting May 24, 2018 - Summary

Attending: Eryn Boone(EB), Justin Thomas (JT) Paul Crews(PC), Julie Jonas(JJ), Ron Tenny(RT), Deb Essex(DE).
Absent: Peter Zug

Note: Review these notes in conjunction with 1) Agenda for 5/24/18 meeting

Brenden Y-K submitted public comment; see his written version that was emailed to us 5/23/18. Julie Y-K attended later in meeting.

Eryn clarified her stance on public comment; she welcomes comments, emailed as well. We have a limited time frame to complete a specific task.

We reviewed Action Items from last meeting; discussion focused briefly on the Trail Management Objectives form.

Paul has spoken to an Army corps engineer re sinkage. Soil Samples will be necessary. A National Wetland Permit / Category 42 should be relatively easy to obtain.

Deb reported that the CPG piston bully is actually approximately 16'3" wide, not 14' as previously reported.

Lengthy discussion followed re: trail width and trail construction techniques. Deb explained the technique that Nick Georgelos has suggested, that varied from Paul's described procedure(s), but consensus was that both techniques seem feasible/appropriate (Paul's Specifications were for the most part all acceptable, so there was not much feedback given via email prior to this meeting). Paul asked if we could do a test construction sample on the current trail; Deb was not in favor of this; too much going on now on the 5k loop.

Further discussion centered around WIDTH necessary with Nick's procedure. Concerns: exceeding the 14' maximum will not be appropriate, given that 14' is what has been approved by broader community (vs) trail grooming equipment and capability is currently being offered/donated by Resort/CPG, and that should be embraced, so building a wider trail will be necessary.

GNSC members are trying to listen to a wide array of interests / concerns and figure out how to build a year round, multi-use trail. GTC members are concerned about changing course at this point by being asked to consider a wider trail.

Secondary topic discussion centered on ACCESS POINT.

Future Action Items:

1. Consider idea of a wider clearing yet narrower trail bed (coupled with shorter overall length of trail, which would also be further from Stumpy's). This is a new proposal being brought forward from GNSC.
2. Consider holding a July Girdwood Trails Committee meeting to discuss a possible new option (from item #1).
3. Continue discussing access point to trail.

Some members requested our meetings be held later in the day/evening so as to not interfere with the work day.



From: brenden@jbr-y.net
Subject: RE: Proposed Multi-Use Trail Comments
Date: May 23, 2018 at 5:28 PM
To: Eryn Boone eboone007@yahoo.com, julie@jbr-y.net
Cc: Julie Jonas juliejonas57@gmail.com, Ron_"Cupcake"_Tenny ron10e@gmail.com, Deb Essex deb@skigirdwood.org, Paul Crews pbcrews@alaska.net, Jim Braham & Kathy Peters jbraham@alaska.net, Peterzug peterzug@acsalaska.net

Hello,

Thank you for your email.

Below is my public comment for the upcoming May 24, 2018 subcommittee meeting:

I will begin with the now-obvious statement that I am opposed to this proposed trail. However, if it is going to be built, it needs to be done in the least environmentally damaging way possible, which my comments below are directed towards, with the exception of my very last comment (#7), which is a plea to not build this trail at all.

1) I look forward to hearing discussion of the points raised in public comments made for the last subcommittee meeting.

2) I was surprised to not hear more last time about learning from mistakes of the past. There are some mistakes it seems clear to me that happened in the past that should be learned from, which provide some lessons. There are more than these below, but here are some important ones I think:

a) Do not take gravel from in and near the project site. The impacts on the environment - perhaps unless they are taken from exactly under the trailbed - are far too great.

b) Do not exceed the size of the trail that has been agreed upon. A related lesson is this: If your trail design seems to be necessitating violating an agreed-upon width, then you are designing it wrong, and should change the siting or the design so it complies with the agreed-upon max width. This is a clear and obvious lesson, but the subcommittee seems to potentially be abandoning this lesson with talk of possibly exceeding the 14 foot clearing width in some areas. It is odd that there is discussion of going against this aspect of the TC resolution but insufficient talk of shrinking the trail and clearing to a smaller size, which is clearly permitted by the resolution (as it only listed max widths).

c) Do not site the trail near other high value environmental treasures, and do not impact those treasures. While there is still a chance to address this related to the experience directly on Stumpy's trail itself, unfortunately as a whole this lesson is being ignored, since the entire forest area itself in this area is exactly that kind of special place, and there's no amount of development in here that will not negatively impact it.

3) I'm glad there is willingness to cut down the amount of trail proposed in here from what Bill Spencer had previously mapped out, to rethink the trail design so as to address the problem of the massive impact area where the loops meet, to rethink the design to address the problem of multiple clearings in a line with each other, and hopefully there also will be a great reduction in the use of kettle/swale/ravine features, and hopefully the northern dogleg will be cut out as well.

4) While I stand behind my comments made previously and don't need to repeat them here, there is one I wanted to somewhat reiterate again here: I think this trail can be built narrower and still be multi-use and groomable. This trail is going to cost a lot of money. Surely the one piece of grooming equipment we have now in the valley isn't

money, safety, and the price of grooming equipment. It will be here for decades, but this trail will be. A 10-foot trailbed and a 14-foot clearing width isn't a trail, it really is more like a road, and that is what it will look like. I don't see why there can't also be fundraising that goes alongside the trail fundraising to get better, narrower grooming equipment so as to minimize the size of the trail.

5) I am against the stated idea of using naturally fallen material to fill in excavation areas. If part of the goal of this is to make this a nature trail and preserve a forested experience, then taking fallen and low lying material from the area goes against that goal. Fallen and low lying material provides ecosystem services (e.g. habitat), and is a big part of what makes Girdwood's forests look like what they look like. Removing this material throughout the forest will have a 'sanitizing' effect on the forest from both an ecosystem and an aesthetic perspective.

6) It should be written into the plan design that all efforts should be made to protect the Stumpy's viewshed and the experience on Stumpy's. There are multiple places - including ones that were not flagged, so I don't think were recognized earlier - where this proposed trail and Stumpy's (and people on them) are easily visible from each other. I noticed this when out there on Stumpy's while others were on the proposed Forest Loop alignment - there were places that were not marked on Stumpy's but where I could still see the other alignment and people on it. So this needs to be thought out more carefully when the alignment itself is specified, and put down as a guiding condition for the trail's development.

7) For this last comment I would like to talk about the forest in general.

I think this trail is going to go down as one of the biggest failures in terms of environmental stewardship in southcentral Alaska's history. Specifically, our failure to permanently protect this, one of the last pieces of wild forest near the community, just the way it is. We should have permanently protected this area.

Girdwood's natural environment has always been very important to me for as long as I have visited and lived here. Its beauty is why I chose to permanently live here, particularly that of the forest. I vividly remember the first time I came to Girdwood in the winter, and as a person who grew up on the East Coast with real winters who saw them vanishing to climate change, it was very impactful. I thought - this place is a winter wonderland, these enormous trees covered in snow, this is something magical, like I had stepped into a dream.

We had a real chance in Girdwood to basically have it all - and to be unique in doing so - a small walkable community, a resort, an amazing arts and festivals scene, and an unparalleled natural environment from the ocean to rivers to forest to mountains all at various levels of wilderness or development. We had areas right next to our community in easy walking distance that were essentially wild, where you could go to, get solitude, and sit and just be at peace in the environment. And then we had other areas also, representing a wide variety of levels of development, where you could cross-country and skate ski, mountain bike, alpine, or whatever. I used to access near-community wild areas probably most often out of the nearby meadows, going to the 'left' into the now-so-called 'Forest Loop' area or the 'right' before the 5K got put in, where you could poke in with your skis and disappear for hours and just experience the forest. It was a wonderful experience - for quiet, solitude, being in touch with nature, and even for a sense of adventure and discovery, no matter how small and imagined.

I honestly wish we could all work together - to fix problems of the past, and to have parts

of this valley for everyone. But that requires honesty, a recognition of the value in other peoples' experiences, and sacrifice, and people seem just unwilling to do those things. I hear a lot about compromise and go-along-to-get-along, but there are just two things in this community that are really doing all the real sacrificing - the forest, and people who want just a little of it to be preserved the way it is. There is never any compromise for them, for them it is all sacrifice all the time, and no recognition of their values and the value of their experiences. It's always been very upsetting to me to sit at meetings about this trail and hear how cavalierly people, some of whom seem to have never really much used this 'Forest Loop' area previously, who appear to have just become bored with the bounty they already had and looked left and said 'Mine', how they feel so comfortable completely ruining the experience of those who love it as it is and who have used it for years, for whom it is an important part of their well-being and sense of place and belonging in Girdwood.

So, here we are now. This, one of the last pieces of Girdwood's easily reachable wilderness heritage, is going to be gone forever. We are taking one more step - but this time right up to and maybe even across a bright red line - to becoming a place that looks a lot more like everywhere else, that failed to muster its collective courage to do something differently, to say let's have some real genuine diversity in this place in terms of how we approach our relationship with the environment, let's save some wilderness near our community that isn't an hour away or involves walking up a mountainside. And that is a tragedy for myself, and I think also for our community and our collective futures, even if we all don't recognize it yet.

Please consider this a pitch to save this area for how it is now.

Sincerely,
Brenden Raymond-Yakoubian
PO Box 924
Girdwood, AK 99587
(907) 434-1413

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Proposed Multi-Use Trail Comments

From: Eryn Boone <eboone007@yahoo.com>

Date: Tue, May 22, 2018 10:46 am

To: ""brenden@jbr-y.net"" <brenden@jbr-y.net>, "julie@jbr-y.net" <julie@jbr-y.net>

Cc: Julie Jonas <juliejonas57@gmail.com>, Ron_ "Cupcake" Tenny <ron10e@gmail.com>, Deb Essex <deb@skigirdwood.org>, Paul Crews <pbcrews@alaska.net>, Jim Braham & Kathy Peters <jbraham@alaska.net>, Peterzug <peterzug@acsalaska.net>

Hi Brenden & Julie,

Thank you for your comments at our last meeting on the proposed multi-use trail. Your emailed comments have been distributed to the subcommittee for consideration. We value your input; it helps us to reach a more detailed consensus on the alignment, design, and construction of the proposed multi-use trail. While we cannot respond to every detail in writing, we will take your individual comments in to consideration as we contemplate and discuss the trail specifications and construction moving forward.

Sincerely,

Eryn Boone (on behalf of the Proposed Multi-Use Trail Subcommittee)

Date: May 23, 2018

To: Trails Subcommittee
(sent via email to the Subcommittee)

From: Julie Raymond-Yakoubian
PO Box 924
Girdwood, AK 99587

Re: Comments to the Subcommittee about the Proposed Forest Loop and subcommittee process

Subcommittee,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional comments to the subcommittee about the Forest Loop trail, proposed by the Girdwood Nordic Ski Club (GNSC), and about the subcommittee process. I will miss most of this meeting due to work travel – I hope that you will accept these comments and that they will be considered in your deliberations.

This subcommittee is part of the Girdwood Trails Committee and is part of the public process. The proposed trail is being developed on public lands. I was really disappointed to hear, at the April 27 Subcommittee meeting, that public comment at your meetings is being limited to 12 minutes per meeting (3 minutes per person, so 4 people total) because there is 'a lot of work to do' and you didn't want to 'waste time.' I hope that this subcommittee values public input; I definitely don't attend public meetings or spend time developing comments to waste my own time, or anyone else's. I was glad to hear that the subcommittee decided to consider all public comment. **I look forward to your responses to and discussion about my questions, concerns and suggestions – as previously submitted and in this comment letter.**

I can certainly see the need to put some kind of limit on the time allotted to public comment on any given agenda. **However, it is also common practice at 'informal' meetings (i.e. ones that don't follow Roberts Rules) to allow the public to ask questions and make brief comments throughout the course of the meeting.** Since this subcommittee has decided to be informal, or casual, I recommend that you follow such practices at your future meetings.

One of the subcommittee members asked about when objectives for the trail would be determined. I realize this was in the context of the 'Trail Management Objectives' document – but I think it also raises **important, broader points, which I think this subcommittee needs to address. For example:**

- What are the values that this proposed trail will embody?
- What kind of trail experience is being created, and for what profile of users?
- Who are the current users of this area?

- What are the values and experiences being compromised, altered, or destroyed by developing a trail in this part of the valley?
- What will you do to mitigate or minimize impacts to those characteristics? What will be done to mitigate the loss of this area to people that currently use and appreciate it?

I don't feel like there was any resolution to the question about what can be done 'this time around' to prevent another debacle like the 5K. How will it be ensured that an effective project manager will be hired and be on-site during construction? If the GNSC's top choice for a project manager (Bill Spencer) isn't available, who will be hired? How will it be ensured that trail design is appropriate for Girdwood and isn't 'designed for Anchorage conditions'? How will it be ensured that any 'on-site' changes to the trail specifications are made with the correct perspective and trail objectives in mind?

The issue of gravel for the trail bed has been raised several times. **I am requesting that you do not take gravel from this forest for trail construction.** The only exception to this would be, potentially, removing gravel from directly under the alignment (as Paul Crews has previously discussed). It shouldn't be assumed that gravel can be found on-site, directly under the trail alignment, however. The cost of purchasing gravel should be included in the project budget. Removing gravel from barrow sites will cause additional unnecessary destruction of the forest. A lesson should be learned from the 5K – that gravel removal along the trail alignment disturbs the forest more than is necessary and also negatively impacts user experiences.

Additionally, it was mentioned at the last subcommittee meeting that dead, downed trees may be used to fill in pits created by gravel extraction. **First, the gravel should not be extracted from the trail alignment. I am also requesting that you do not include in any trail construction plans the use of dead or downed trees to fill in any areas of excavation (excavations for any reason).** Dead and downed trees are an important part of the ecosystem. Removing them, in the case of this forest, is not 'cleaning up' the forest – it is causing additional damage and disruption. It is also changing the nature of the forest visually and aesthetically, in a negative way.

I also ask that you to revisit the issue of using kettle and other similar features as part of the proposed trail, and reduce their usage, as well as reducing the trail, or altogether eliminating it, in the northern part of the proposed trail area (the 'dog leg'). The kettles are very beautiful and should not have a trail running through them. Additionally, the kettles and other parts of the forest in this area - while not as wet as the meadows - do in some places retain water. My husband just hiked in the proposed trail area the night before this evening, and even passing through some of the alignment very quickly and not even looking for this issue, he spotted 3 distinct areas with standing water, two of them in the northern loop area and one in a kettle in the south loop area with flagging running through it. Again, this was without even intentionally or systematically looking for this.

Trail width still isn't determined, as far as I am concerned. The GTC resolution only states that the trail bed can't be more than 10 feet, and total clearing shouldn't be more than 14 feet. This

means the trail bed and clearing width can both be less. The subcommittee has seriously considered the possibility of ignoring the maximum widths, but has not seriously considered the possibility of reducing the width. I encourage the subcommittee to think about what a 10 foot wide trail really looks like, and to think about what the other nature trails you have been on in your life look like - 10 feet wide is a road, not a trail.

It is completely unjustified to be determining the trail width based on the existence of a piece of grooming equipment in the valley that isn't going to last forever. Smaller grooming equipment is available and can be easily manufactured. Yes, larger equipment will pack harder, but that also shouldn't be the only consideration, especially because smaller equipment will make a trail ski-able, it will be snowsho-able regardless, and no one will be walking on it in the winter. I have not heard an estimate for the total cost of constructing this proposed trail, but I assume it will be hundreds of thousands of dollars. There is absolutely no reason why a new, narrower piece of grooming equipment can't be purchased or manufactured as part of this process. **The cost of obtaining narrower grooming equipment would be several thousand dollars, at most, and only a tiny fraction of the overall project budget. This would also address the major concern of much of the community – that the proposed trail is too wide.**

Related to this – I really think there needs to be more consideration and discussion about the intended users of this trail. Who are the anticipated users of this trail? What trail characteristics do they value? What type of trail experience do they want? Do you even know? I don't think there are known answers to any of those questions.

Supposedly, this trail was never intended as 'nordic ski trail'. This was confirmed by a GNSC officer at the April GTC meeting, also. At the previous subcommittee meeting, one member noted that the average Girdwood skier would likely be 'freaked out' by the 'hills' along the proposed Forest Loop trail (e.g. those that kettle ponds or other features create). Another subcommittee member noted that most skiers in Moose Meadows are just 'toodling around' and just want any place to go skiing. It has been repeatedly commented that Bill Spencer did a 'great job' designing this trail. While I don't question his skills and experience – it could certainly be argued that **the trail was only designed with a particular set of values, and users, in mind. These values and assumptions should be made explicit, if you want to be transparent.**

Similarly, you need to admit that you are absolutely ruining this place for a whole group of people. This includes people who know and are familiar with this area, as well as those who haven't had, and now won't have, the chance to discover it in its current state. I and others have spoken about the need for diversity in outdoor experiences in and near our community. We currently have that – there are formal and informal trails available for virtually every kind of trail user out there: groomed Nordic trails, classic ski trails, mountain bike trails (and more to come), highly maintained hiking trails, minimally maintained trails, multi-use trails, social trails, paved trails, and – in the case of this section of forest – a wild and mostly primitive area with direct access to backcountry wilderness. Disturbing this area will make it more difficult to access wild and primitive areas and further remove them from town because this development

will absolutely make extinct the last piece of wild/primitive area directly adjacent to the community that is within immediate walking distance and doesn't involve climbing up a mountainside. That should be considered seriously - this development will forever alter the landscape of the Girdwood environment by completely eliminating one type of forest area we have near the community (wild/primitive areas) - which was something that currently makes Girdwood unique. Users who value this type of experience, close at hand, will have no other immediately accessible place to go in the valley. **This is a severe and negative impact to the well-being of a whole group of people. This has yet to be acknowledged and, since this subcommittee has become responsible for determining the fate of this area of forest, it is up to you to recognize that, acknowledge that, and justify it.**

There was a lot of discussion about curves on the proposed trail, clearing widths at the curves, and the need for curves wider than 14 feet to decrease the danger of collisions. This would be against the resolution and the general sentiment that this trail should be as narrow as possible. Additionally, this doesn't really track with discussions about most users being 'toddlers' and not being interested in or able to handle small landscape features on the trail. (Or, honestly, with 'new' or contradictory information that is presented at every meeting regarding this trail.) **Again, clarity on who you expect to use this trail, and doing what activities – and what kind of experiences those users want and value – is a necessary first step in determining how a trail should be designed. This work remains to be done. Additionally, if building into a particular landscape feature is going to require building the trail wider than 14', don't build the trail there, build it someplace else. If sharp curves require clearing wider than 14', don't build sharp curves.**

At the last subcommittee meeting there was also a lot of discussion about wetlands and about dogs and dog owners. Bad behavior on the part of dog owners is not a reason to take or not take any particular action. If the GNSC is so concerned about dog waste in wetlands, then do more outreach and education events. Additionally, the expense and complicated regulatory nature of working in wetlands should not be a reason to destroy more of this forest than is necessary to accomplish your trail. The 'goal' of multiuse trails isn't to keep trails out of wetlands, as was stated at the last meeting – it is to have trails with multiple uses. The argument has been made that the beginning 'straight' portion of the trail is needed to get irresponsible dog owners out of the wetlands and move those irresponsible dog owners somewhere else, then it must be recognized that apparently this plan involves intentionally trying to move those irresponsible dog owners to this patch of forest so they can be irresponsible there - i.e. having their off leash dogs running around attacking people and other dogs - and pooping - in this part of the forest, where it is currently used by the community for peace and quiet - so basically completely altering the experience there in yet another negative way.

There should not be an access point for this proposed trail from the easement behind the church (i.e. the 'straight' section of the proposed trail), and other portions of the proposed trail that run close to the meadows, should also be eliminated from the plan. It makes no sense to have trails so close together. If you want access to this forest, you should use existing trail

routes, even if that means hardening trails across the wetlands. At the last meeting Deb said, if you 'teach' people to use wetlands, they will use wetlands. According to that logic you should just as easily be able to 'teach' people to stay on a hardened trail and to pick up their dog waste. If you build trails a certain way to accommodate poor behavior (i.e. going through the forest, rather than on existing trails), what is it that you are valuing?

The discussion of values is primary. It should be required for any new project and it is frankly really disturbing that it hasn't been completed at this point in the process. Not only will it help those that want to build a trail to do it better, but it will also make it transparent to the public about what you are doing and why, and what values and experiences you are prioritizing at the expense of others.

Thank you for your consideration-

Julie

Girdwood Multi-Use Trail Subcommittee Agenda June 8, 2018, 5:30-7 p.m. Girdwood Community Room

Agenda Revisions and Approval

June 8, 2018 Agenda Approval

Public Comment:

Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes per person with a maximum of 12 minutes of public comment total.

Review Subcommittee Goal:

Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail by August, 2018.

Review Main Ideas from Last Meeting:

1. GNSC Subcommittee members propose reducing trail bed width from 10' to 8', increasing clearing width from 14' to 18', shortening trail route (eliminating loop trail portions near Stumpy's).

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Access Route (from Arlberg or Church or both)
2. Determine path forward considering width changes (Does subcommittee or GNSC take this back to Trails to vote on? Do we need to schedule a July Trails meeting?)

Future Work:

1. Trail Density –How do we go about making adjustments to trail routing and does it need to be done on paper prior to August?
2. Discuss comments on the Trail Specifications (Paul's document)
3. Define the CLASS of trail that this new trail shall be
4. Complete TMO form

Review Action Items

Set Next Meeting Date (June 12, 2018, 6-8 PM)

Trail Subcommittee Meeting June 8, 2018 - Summary

Attending: Eryn Boone(EB), Paul Crews(PC), Julie Jonas(JJ), Ron Tenny(RT), Deb Essex(DE), Jim Braham, Peter Zug and Justin Thomas (JT) sitting in for Peter Zug

Public: Julie and Brendan Raymond-Yacoubian, Debra Croghan, Steve Halverson, Laura Harris, Brianna Sullivan.

Note: Review these notes in conjunction with 1) Agenda for 6/8/18 meeting

Agenda Revisions and Approval

June 8, 2018 Agenda Approved

Public Comment:

Brendan and Julie R-Y both gave verbal comments, following their written comments submitted today also.

Debra Croghan echoed Brendan and Julie's comments

Justin Thomas states that GNSC is looking for compromise but doesn't think he's seeing room for it.

Eryn read a letter from Chapel Our Lady of the Snows to the subcommittee regarding use of the land around the church for trail access. Upshot: Alyeska Resort will need to be consulted regarding this. Peter Zug offered to speak with Brian Burnett about this.

Review Subcommittee Goal:

Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail by August, 2018.

Review Main Ideas from Last Meeting:

1. *GNSC Subcommittee members propose reducing trail bed width from 10' to 8', increasing clearing width from 14' to 18', shortening trail route (eliminating loop trail portions near Stumpy's).*

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Access Route (from Arlberg or Church or both)

Julie asked if GNSC has had any conversations with the Resort or Girdwood 2020 re the land zoned GRST-2 that is located to the north of the GA (airport) zoned land, where Deb indicated in a May 30, 2018 email she was adamant of putting the access route? Deb said no. Julie trying to avoid a similar scenario where the public was repeatedly told that what is now the Arlberg Road extension was to be a "temporary access road for construction" of the 5K loop trail. There are differing opinions on the chronology and strategy of the temporary road becoming a permanent one....

Ron clarified his opinion that the access should come from the Arlberg parking lot.

Paul questioned of "what the meat of the need" was; feels the trail can come in on a hardened surface trail from Arlberg. Paul asked if GNSC has permission from resort to put access route from church area. Deb responded yes, and they have that in writing.

Eryn asked if the GNSC members would consider walking the access routes. Jim B. offered to walk the options with Paul on Sunday, June 10. Deb E. stated this access route from church area was needed for connectivity.

Subcommittee seemingly split on access route.

1. *Determine path forward considering width changes (Does subcommittee or GNSC take this back to Trails to vote on? Do we need to schedule a July Trails meeting?)*

Much discussion followed re: strategy from here...take it back to larger Trails Committee? Justin and Julie J think subcommittee should continue to try and hammer out a solution; larger Trails Committee will probably not be effective. Others think taking issue(s) back to larger meeting is appropriate.

Paul described his informal trail survey taken June 2, 2018 at the Crow Creek Trailhead and at the 5K Loop Kiosk. Three of the 60 people he interviewed favored a 20 foot clearing; 57 of the 60 favored a 14 foot clearing.

Paul also described, through a handout, that he dug 15 holes on 5/26/2018 to gain info on soil quality and gravel content.

Paul and Nick Georgelos have spoken since the last meeting, and Paul reports that Nick is not interested in Paul's methods.

Deb explained that Nick Georgelos does not favor a "flip-flop" method of trail building, as it makes an uneven trail and it will sink.

Paul again explained the procedure and math behind building a 14 foot trail vs. what he says will become a 24 foot trail with Nick's technique.

More discussion followed regarding whether the subcommittee should go back to broader Trails Committee with idea of a wider trail as GNSC members have proposed. Paul, Ron, and Julie believe we need to stick with 14 foot trail. Jim questions if we are getting hung up on numbers; he wants to see a good trail. Justin stated we need a wider trail for grooming equipment to get through. Deb E. states the primary user group is for the skiers. Julie asks Julie R-Y to forward information on how to determine what the user groups and the values are.

Responding to Julie J's question, Eryn states she intends to report about the 18 month+ public process to date regarding this trail at the June 14, 2018 HLB Commissioners meeting. Deb E. states she was invited by HLB to make a presentation.

Running out of time; **Next meeting set for June 12 at 6-8 pm.**

Future Work:

2. *Trail Density –How do we go about making adjustments to trail routing and does it need to be done on paper prior to August?*
3. *Discuss comments on the Trail Specifications (Paul's document)*
4. *Define the CLASS of trail that this new trail shall be*
5. *Complete TMO form*

6/8/18

From: julie@jbr-y.net
Subject: 8June2018: Proposed GNSC trail comments
Date: June 8, 2018 at 4:43 PM
To: Eryn Boone eboone007@yahoo.com, ron10e@gmail.com, deb@skigirdwood.org, juliejonas57@gmail.com, pbcrews@alaska.net, jbraham@alaska.net, peterzug@acsalaska.net
Cc: brenden@jbr-y.net

Hi,

Please find, attached, my comments to the subcommittee for your June 8 meeting. I hope these will be discussed and considered during the meeting - along with my previously submitted comments.

Thank you,
Julie

Date: June 8, 2018
To: Trails Subcommittee
(sent via email to the Subcommittee)
From: Julie Raymond-Yakoubian
PO Box 924
Girdwood, AK 99587
Re: Comments to the Subcommittee about the Proposed Forest Loop and subcommittee process

Subcommittee,

Thanks for the chance to provide additional comments to the subcommittee about the Forest Loop trail, proposed by the Girdwood Nordic Ski Club (GNSC), and about subcommittee discussions at previous meetings.

I think that there are still many unresolved or unaddressed things that I, and others, have raised in previous comments to the subcommittee. I encourage you to revisit those comment letters and notes from public testimony and to give further consideration to the issues raised. For example: being explicit about values and tradeoffs related to this trail, gravel use, dead and downed trees, negative impacts to current users of the area where development is proposed, mitigation for ruining one area of the valley for a whole group of people, defining users of proposed trail, addressing the implication of a "phase 2" against community wishes, and concerns about GNSC transparency, ability and honesty - among other things.

I remain opposed to this trail. At the May subcommittee meeting I was, however, very happy to hear GNSC and other subcommittee members discuss removing sections of the loop trail near Stumpy's Trail to avoid physical and visual impacts. I encourage you to do this and to focus future discussions on the eastern portion of the proposed trail.

Following from the above, I was also really happy to hear serious discussion about also reducing the total amount of trail being proposed. I hope that you move forward with these actions (i.e. moving as far away from Stumpy's as possible, focusing on the eastern portion of the trail, and reducing overall amount of trail) and encourage you to concretize them.

On the other hand, it was really disappointing, and also confusing, to hear that GNSC wants to increase the trail clearing width well beyond the maximum of 14 feet. This is totally unacceptable. The GTC resolution was a promise to the public and any deviation from it requires renewed discussion and review at the Girdwood Trails Committee and beyond.

Additionally, I see on the agenda that you want to complete a TMO today. Given the discussion and numerous unresolved issues related to this proposed trail, I don't think you should be discussing a TMO at this juncture. You haven't figured out alignment or access or some of the big details regarding construction. And, most recent discussions were going in the direction of disregarding the GTC resolution regarding clearing width. If you are proposing to go forward with a wider clearing, this needs to go back to GTC, LUC, GBOS, HLB. Only then - it

approval for wider clearing is given - should the subcommittee have further discussions.

Thank you for your consideration-

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Julie Raymond-Yakoubian".

Julie Raymond-Yakoubian

6/10/18

From: brenden@jbr-y.net
Subject: 8 June 2018 Proposed Forest Loop Trail Subcommittee - public comments
Date: June 8, 2018 at 4:19 PM
To: eboone007@yahoo.com
Cc: ron10e@gmail.com, deb@skigirdwood.org, juliejonas57@gmail.com, pbcrews@alaska.net, jbraham@alaska.net, peterzug@acsalaska.net

Hello,

Please find below my public comments regarding the Subcommittee's work on the proposed "Forest Loop" trail. Thank you for your consideration of these comments, and of previous comments I have submitted. I apologize for submitting these so close to the meeting time; I will deliver a condensed version of this verbally later today at the meeting to assist in the consideration of my comments during the meeting.

I will again state my probably-now-familiar caveat that I am opposed to this trail, but that if it is to be built, I would like to see it done in the most environmentally-friendly way possible.

I'll number my comments below for ease of reference:

1) I would like to recap what I understand are some of the positive developments towards minimizing environmental effect which there seems to be a consensus building on in the subcommittee:

a) Concern about the use of gravel from the project area. I would like to see gravel not being extracted at all from the project area. This should be a lesson from past trail building activities.

b) The sentiment that there is too much proposed trail in this area, and that the layout was not done well in the previously suggested alignment (e.g. segments in a line with each other, massive trail segment convergence with the loops meeting, and overuse of kettle/swale/ravine features)

c) Stated desire to completely avoid impacting the Stumpy's experience.

d) Concern about trail width (though this was a subject of debate and is a big outstanding issue to resolve)

e) Concern about access (e.g. the straight-line in vs. another access e.g. from Arlberg - though again this is a subject of debate and a big outstanding issue to resolve)

2) With regard to the trail width, I would like to state a few things.

It was positive that there was concern expressed at the last meeting from some subcommittee members about width and there was discussion about a smaller trail - which is permitted under the Trails resolution.

However, there was the 'big surprise' at the last meeting about trail width from the Nordic Club. To be more specific, a number of issues were brought to the subcommittee's attention - one member stated they'd like to see the trail wider than the Trails resolution. Then there was the biggest surprise - we discovered that the Club wants - and in fact needs - larger than a 14 foot trail clearing, as it's grooming equipment requires an 18 foot or even larger clearing. Additionally, we discovered that the Club solicited trail

or even larger clearing. Additionally, the discovery that the Club generated their construction ideas which would meet that requirement from a local trail builder.

I am very concerned that, after 18 months of public process and a Trails resolution that has made its way through various public bodies, that we are now presented with this surprise discovery about the Club's grooming equipment and the width they state is needed to accommodate it. I don't want to seem needlessly confrontational, but I think this all raises again the uncomfortable specter of a lot of the concerns expressed at public meetings regarding this trail - about past history, the Club's competence and ability to build a trail properly this time, and about honesty issues. Regardless, I do think the Trails resolution's max widths must not be exceeded; they were what was promised as the outer limits through a long public process. Larger than that is certainly approaching "freak out" width for many people I suspect. This would entail going over half of the entire designated easement width for this trail, and total trail width (including clearing) was clearly a top concern of the public in the extensive review of this proposal, and avoiding excessive clearing is a major lesson I think we all want to learn from in terms of learning from past experiences.

The effect of a larger clearing on the forest and the experience in it is a big problem - simply put, more clearing is not a good thing. The trail construction idea the Club proposed to accomplish this 8 foot trail/18 foot clearing design - while it reduces using large gravel barrow areas in the project area, in the process it increases clearing width, and thus cuts a wider swath of trees - thus, environmentally, it seems at best a wash.

Therefore, I think the concern expressed by Subcommittee members at the last meeting about the idea of exceeding the Trails resolution's max widths was very warranted.

As was mentioned by Subcommittee members, there is an issue of public credibility and trust, as the TC resolution, based on 18 months or so of public work on this issue, came up with a 10 foot trailbed/14 foot clearing proposal for maximums. So the sentiments expressed by Subcommittee members about those issues related to the public's trust were spot-on, and at a minimum I also agree that this does require bringing the public back into the discussion, which looks like the plan now (e.g. at the Trails Committee), if this were to be proposed. Along those lines, looking at the agenda for today's meeting, I don't think there should even be any discussion of a TMO at this juncture. My understanding is that working within the existing resolution was the purview of this subcommittee, and if there's a change to that - like expansion to a wider clearing - that has to go through all the various public approvals again - Trails, Land Use, GBOS, HLB, etc. - before being re-taken up by this subcommittee - as that resolution is what all of this was predicated upon.

Now, the Nordic Club did suggest at the last meeting - and I had heard a similar sentiment expressed by the Club at the GBOS special meeting that happened recently - that they were willing to say this just isn't going to work and were willing to just pull the proposal and not do this trails project. I do think we should respect that possibility as the Club has offered it. There are many ways that it does seem like this just isn't a feasible or wise project and that it makes more sense to abandon it.

3) The Nordic Club did also suggest an alternative plan towards the end of the meeting. Many of the same concerns apply, though the plan should be discussed. Here's some of my take on that.

If my understanding is correct, this plan would do the following. It would eliminate most of the southern loop area - or at least the westerly aspects of it - and condense that loop

significantly to the east, far away from Stumpy's. It would also eliminate the westerly portion of the northern loop area as well, and result in a northern line that went up and had a small loop at the top for a turnaround. The total guess-timated trail that remained would be something like 1K - 2.5K. I assume this incorporated using the 8 foot trail/18 foot clearing model for what remains in that 1K - 2.5K.

There are still many of the same outstanding issues - trail width, access, use of kettle features, areas that retain water, gravel use, the need to re-engage the public if the Trails Committee resolution's trail widths are exceeded, the conflict with Stumpy's coming from the proposed "straight line in", and so on. But aside from those important issues, from just the perspective of significantly shrinking the amount of trail, moving it away from Stumpy's, and the benefits that accrue from all that, that is an improvement on earlier ideas. It was also good to hear via this plan consideration from the Club of the level of consideration of the importance of Stumpy's.

There was another surprise though, at the meeting. Deb Essex brought up the idea though that the northern line would facilitate a connection to the much-earlier proposed "Phase 2" or "River View" idea. I believe this has to be categorically excluded. The community drew a bright red line in the sand there and said no to the idea of moving north and east with trails development. That area to the north and east has what could almost be called sacred qualities to the community. It was very disappointing to hear this mentioned by the Club, as the community was clear in its opposition to this and we were previously told the Club was not currently considering this "Stage 2" idea.

So, to my mind, if the new proposal for the trail in the "Forest Loop" area were to be moved forward, the other existing issues would still have to be addressed, as well as some additional measures would have to be implemented at the same time and somehow set in stone. These are as follows:

a) There needs to be hardened, formal protections built in to protect against future expansion of this trail in the "Forest Loop" area, including against more trail development that would impact Stumpy's, which is now largely being protected in the new plan. For example, this plan can't just be blown back out to the original size at some point in the future (with the added problem of it then also being even larger in terms of clearing width than the existing Trails resolution maximums).

b) There needs to be hardened, formal protections built in to ward against expansion of trail development further to the north and east - i.e., no "Phase 2/River View".

(If this idea moved forward, making a tiny turnaround loop at the top of the "northern line" would be a good idea rather than a dead-end line which really implies to everyone that the idea is to move onward elsewhere.)

Without those two conditions noted above set in stone in some meaningful way, we would just potentially be walking into a situation where this new plan serves as a seed for an even larger version of the original trail plans that will eventually metastasize at a later date in the Forest Loop and beyond, meaning we'd eventually just get a "super-sized" 18-foot-clearing version of the original trail, which is the opposite of the direction we should be going. That can't happen.

Thank you for consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,
Brendan Raymond Yekoubian

Брендэн Кэйтлин-Таркович
PO Box 924
Girdwood, AK 99587
brenden@jbr-y.net
907-434-1413

Girdwood Multi-Use Trail Subcommittee Agenda June 12, 2018, 6-8 p.m. Girdwood Community Room

Agenda Revisions and Approval

June 12, 2018 Agenda Approval

Public Comment:

Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes per person with a maximum of 12 minutes of public comment total.

Review Subcommittee Goal:

Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail by August, 2018.

Review Main Ideas from Last Meeting:

1. Discussion about staying with 14' clearing/10' trail surface as stated in the resolution, or changing to 18' clearing/8' trail surface. Subcommittee is split 50/50 in their opinion on this.
2. Discussion about whether this change should go back to Trails committee for vote since it is different than what was stated in the resolution. Some members think subcommittee should keep working to see if we can come to resolution.

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Access Route (from Arlberg or Church or both)
2. Trail width
3. Determine path forward considering width changes (Does subcommittee or GNSC take this back to Trails to vote on? Do we need to schedule a July Trails meeting?)

Future Work:

1. Trail Density –How do we go about making adjustments to trail routing and does it need to be done on paper prior to August?
2. Discuss comments on the Trail Specifications (Paul's document)
3. Define the CLASS of trail that this new trail shall be
4. Complete TMO form

Review Action Items

Set Next Meeting Date

Trail Subcommittee Meeting June 12, 2018 - Notes

Attending: Eryn Boone(EB), Paul Crews(PC), Julie Jonas(JJ), Ron Tenny(RT), Deb Essex(DE), Jim Braham, Peter Zug and Justin Thomas (JT) sitting in for Peter Zug

Public: Julie and Brendan Raymond-Yacoubian, Debra Croghan, Steve Halverson

*Note: Review these notes in conjunction with 1) **Agenda** for 6/12/18 meeting*

Agenda Revisions and Approval

June 12, 2018 Agenda Approved

Public Comment:

Steve Halverson, Brendan and Julie R-Y both gave verbal comments. See emailed comments. General consensus – keep with the 14 wide width for the trail.

Eryn read a letter submitted by Alison Vail-Perea. Eryn will scan and send it out to subcommittee members.

Discussion Focus:

Trail Access: Jim, Peter and Paul went on a walk 6/10/2018 to view access route from OLOS church and from Arlberg Road. JB stated the Arlberg Rd. route did seem more appealing. PZ thinks either route would be OK; perhaps more engineering soils study, necessary cost analysis should be done (bring in the professionals?) JB thinks Arlberg route may only be feasible for winter use.

RT: Citing 2006 Feasibility study, notes that trail system has changed a lot since then. We need to be looking in to the future; Winner Creek should branch out from Arlberg Road hub area. Thanks Paul for his work and efforts. In favor of Arlberg Road access; not sold on piece from Church to the loop.

DE: A 10' wide trail was never envisioned from Arlberg; connectivity is super important.

RT: Is Nick Georgelos the sole proprietor? JT: There is not a plan approved yet.

PC: Has talked to 4 contractors: Paul Ingram, Casey Smith, Andy Hehnlín, and Bob Redmond – with unanimous consensus that the Arlberg route is the way to go. *NOTE: PC corrected notes on July 10, 2018 to say that he has only walked/discussed the route with Bob Redmond. jj*

DE: It is not the only way. Additional note: the road to the current 5k loop was in the (Resort?) plan before the 5k trail was built. There is a reason they didn't want to use numbers; now GNSC is proposing going back to 14' trail with 10' trail.

JB: Rescinded his suggestion to have the trail be wider than 14'

More discussion followed with PC outlining techniques, specifically flip flop method with pits being OK.

EB: Would GNSC consider only one access route, from Arlberg?

DE: Suggests we go through both options and leave it up to the contractor. PC believes it is not correct for Trails representatives to let the contractor decide.

Discussion followed regarding access and alignment, using the big map.

JJ: Why is it necessary to have both access options? According to DE, the letter they have from resort is predicated on the access route being from the church if Resort was going to donate grooming. Bill Spencer has indicated that the church access area is not designated wetland.

PC: Perhaps if we were to go toward dual access, there could be a smaller, 4' wide trail from the church, with the major construction coming from Arlberg.

DE: Won't commit to Arlberg until the contractor and Corps walk the route(s) – and all subcommittee members should walk them.

Trail Density and Class: DE: There have been 6 loops and the leg next to Stumpy's removed from the alignment. It will be a class 4 trail.

RT: Use the resources from town (trail building specs). RT also trusts Paul's methods.

Next meeting(s):

July 10, 6-8pm

July 17, 6-8pm

July 25, 6-8pm

To whom it may concern,

I understand that the size of the proposed Forest Loop is still being considered I want to state my position regarding its development. I strongly oppose any possibility of widening the trail through this area of Girdwood Valley.

I do not believe it is possible to create a trail of the width and depth proposed without severe and permanent damage to the fragile ground. It is unreasonable to believe it possible to bring in the amount of fill to the area without more damage to surrounding forest growth as the equipment needed would eventually exceed the actual width of this trail. Single track width trails would be acceptable but unlikely.

Here are my reasons for requesting that the trail not be widened;

- the construction will cause irreversible damage to that area as it seems impossible to create this trail without doing so
- having solitude and open areas to explore is one of Girdwood's charms and will be lost amount of fill needed to create such a trail will bring more damage to the area (big trucks, invasive plants and animals...)
- the area is full of bogs and bottomless ponds, really difficult to work on
- the loss of forests where the trail is to be cannot be "hidden" from those who prefer not to see it as we enjoy it as it is

Besides the damage to the immediate area, surrounding recreational areas will likely be impacted. I have enjoyed the area in the back valley since 1975 and the charm and quality of life for me included, in a big way, the fact that the area was undeveloped, un-groomed and ready to be explored on skis in the winter and some areas by foot in summer. These opportunities should not disappear from the life many of us cherish here in the valley. Enjoying the peaceful wilderness so close to home offers a special and unique opportunity to the residents and visitors in Girdwood. I request the committee to consider what we have and what we have to lose forever. So much of what was available when I first explored the back valley has been changed with the addition of Hamre's snowcat route, the new hotel construction, the nordic ski trail and the grooming of the meadows once left untouched. Each of these additions has benefitted certain groups and added to local commerce, yet there are those who feel the wilderness experience once available becoming less and less so. The wilderness of Girdwood has value as well. My request to the committee is to look carefully at what is important to the quality of life in Girdwood Valley like me and those who also value the wilderness. Consider all of the recreational activities that are valued. I ask that the wilderness continues to be protected by preventing the trail from devastating the land, possibly introducing new species of plants, and to keep development from reaching further and further into the upper valley.

Thank you for your attention and consideration,

Alison Vail Perea

Date: June 12, 2018

To: Trails Subcommittee
(sent via email to the Subcommittee)

From: Julie Raymond-Yakoubian
PO Box 924
Girdwood, AK 99587

Re: Comments to the Subcommittee about the Proposed Forest Loop and subcommittee process

Subcommittee.

Thanks for the chance to provide additional comments to the subcommittee about the Forest Loop trail, proposed by the Girdwood Nordic Ski Club (GNSC), and about subcommittee discussions at previous meetings.

I just want to reiterate some previous comments I've made (via comment letters and public comment). As I noted at last week's meeting, there are still a lot of unresolved or unaddressed points for the subcommittee to consider such as: being explicit about values and tradeoffs related to this trail, gravel use, dead and downed trees, how the wetlands in the area will be dealt with, negative impacts to current users of the area where development is proposed, mitigation for ruining one area of the valley for a whole group of people, defining users of proposed trail, addressing the implication of a 'phase 2' against community wishes, and concerns about GNSC transparency, competence and honesty – among other things. And, again, I was happy to hear discussion about moving as far away from Stumpy's as possible, focusing on the eastern portion of the trail, and reducing overall amount of trail.

Last week one of the subcommittee members asked me for more information about how an assessment of trail user groups and values might be done. In the few days since that last meeting I have not had a chance to write up information on that topic – but will do so as soon as possible and then share it with the subcommittee.

Other points that I wanted to comment on for this current subcommittee meeting:

- At the last meeting the question was raised by a subcommittee member about why the public wasn't willing to compromise with GNSC regarding the new information about GNSC's desire for a wider trail clearing. I had already given public comment so was not able to respond. Here's my response: the 'public' has compromised already. GNSC originally proposed a much wider trail and, through the public process, it was determined that 14 feet should be the targeted maximum clearing width and 10 feet the maximum trail bed width. That *was* the compromise. Trailbed and trail clearing width have been one of the major concerns of the public since the beginning and the resolution was the way to concretize that concern by limiting trail and clearing widths. There are many people out there who want this trail much narrower than 14 feet, and many who don't want this trail at all. All the real compromises are being done on the backs of those people, who would lose this piece of forest - which is sad because by and large they are the ones who have actually used it in the past - their uses and values are the ones we can point to for sure as being a real thing in Girdwood.
- While the resolution outlining maximum trail and clearing widths called for 'targeting' 14 feet as the maximum, that was definitely not license to expand clearing to 18 feet - or more - for the length of the trail. If using grooming equipment requires a clearing of 18 feet, then you are

now changing the 'targeted maximum' to 18 feet, at minimum. Everyone knows that the word 'targeted' was included in the resolution only to provide GNSC with a small amount of flexibility if physical conditions absolutely prevented them from staying within 14 feet at particular locations. It was only included in an attempt to accommodate exceeding 14 feet of clearing, potentially, at a handful of locations along the trail, if absolutely necessary, and if changing the trail design for some reason couldn't alleviate the issue.

- If the subcommittee decides to consider a clearing width wider than 14 feet, that will then need to go back through ALL the public bodies, because the permissions at Land Use, GBOS, HLB and the Assembly are all predicated upon Trails approval, and going over the width violates the existing Trails resolution.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments-

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Julie Raymond-Yakoubian".

Julie Raymond-Yakoubian

Brenden Raymond-Yakoubian

Public Comments for Fourth “Forest Loop” Subcommittee meeting: 12 June 2018

Thank you for taking my comments.

I wanted to first recap some Subcommittee events that are illustrative to me of the size of the problems this trail proposal has.

- There seems to be agreement about learning from mistakes of the past, however I feel like we're on the edge of repeating them, especially if a wider trail moves forward. For example, we see this in last minute information calling for expanding the trail, surprise discoveries about important environmental conditions, and so on.
- The Club has agreed there was way too much proposed trail to begin with, that the design overused certain terrain features and created a large blowout zone where trails converged, and that it's important to protect the Stumpy's experience. The Club proposed a reduced alignment which eliminated the western portions of both the north and south loops; from the perspective of minimizing the impacts of length of trail in this part of the forest, this is good – however ...
- At the same time we also had the revelations about needing an even wider trail clearing. I can't say enough how surprising this is. I'm stunned by the idea that the Club didn't know how wide its grooming equipment was, and that the agreed-upon trail max widths and discussion in a variety of public bodies spanning over 18 months isn't doable and was based on inaccurate information. It seems most reasonable to not expand beyond the maximums the public already approved, but if for some reason expansion is suggested by this subcommittee, that should have to go back through every public body all over again. Also, the Club said explicitly in the April Trails meeting (see the minutes) that the driver behind the 14 foot clearing width was grooming, not accommodating any style of skiing. Since we shouldn't be expanding beyond that to accommodate this “new” information about grooming equipment being even larger, then this raises the issue again of whether we should be actually considering a much narrower trail, which is allowed under the Trails resolution, especially since there's no reason anymore to go all the way out to 10 foot trail/14 foot clearing if that size won't even accommodate the grooming equipment. To stay at that width would create a needless extra impact on the forest.
- Also, the new proposed alignment was made in the same breath of new mention from the Club of wanting to do a Phase 2 further to the north and east into areas that the community said “No” to, that are frankly sacred to many people in Girdwood just the way they are, and which we were all previously told explicitly were not under consideration.
- Another issue: Wetlands concerns. The full magnitude of this problem is now being realized. In the north there are regularly areas of standing water – especially in the northern dogleg. There are intermittent wetland areas all over the place in the north and south, including kettle/swale/ravine features, some of which do hold water. In the southern area there can be seen almost bog-like conditions. I will harken back to the promise made to the public by the Club through Bill Spencer at the April Trails meeting – if the Club got to a point where it was obvious the project would be bogged down in water, muck, etc. – they'd quit. Well, that appears to be exactly where we are.
- And then there are the access problems. In terms of access issues, the two options are now clearly either wetlands here or wetlands there, and one of those options, the one the Club appears wedded to for some reason – the 'straightish-line-in' approach – involves not only an alignment that hooks into wetlands, but it also is the one option that still involves impacting the Stumpy's experience. and it also clusters three trails right next to each other, which seems not only pointless, but also obviously harmful to a goal of preserving the forested feel of the valley and trails within it.

After all that – and that's not even an inclusive list of the problem issues – I don't think you even have to have started out with being opposed to this trail to now question the wisdom of moving forward with it at this point – especially if we're all committed to learning from the past.

My last two comments pertain to potential future stages of discussion, if the subcommittee's work goes there:

First, what has become clear is that if specs. design and construction parameters, etc. are laid out, they need to be as absolutely rigid as possible.

Secondly, if the Club's proposal for a reduced-kilometer/increased width trail proposal does end up getting suggested by this subcommittee, I wanted to reiterate my strong belief that this must be accompanied with additional considerations set in stone. Those conditions are:

1. There will be no more expansion of this trail into other parts of the so-called “Forest Loop area” at a later date, and
2. There will be no additional trail being put in in the future to the north and east connecting up with this trail. As part of this, any “Forest Loop” northern line should include a small turnaround loop at the top if it is to be built.

Without somehow setting these prohibitions in stone now, I don't see how such a proposal could proceed, as this smaller-kilometer/larger-clearing trail could become a seed that is just blown out later, laying groundwork now for a future super-sized version of the original trail plans.

Again, thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Brenden Raymond-Yakoubian
PO Box 924
Girdwood, AK 99587
Email: brenden@jbr-y.net
Phone: 907-434-1413

Girdwood Multi-Use Trail Subcommittee Agenda July 10, 2018, 6-8 p.m. Girdwood Community Room

Agenda Revisions and Approval

July 10, 2018 Agenda Approval

Public Comment:

Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes per person with a maximum of 12 minutes of public comment total.

Procedural Review

Review highlights of Open Meetings Act to ensure subcommittee is following it.

Review Subcommittee Goal:

Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail by August, 2018.

Review Main Ideas from Last Meeting:

1. Subcommittee discussed and once again agreed upon 14' clearing/10' trail bed.
2. Much discussion about access points for the trail: Behind the church access versus Arlberg or both. Need more input from contractors and Army Corp of Engineers on feasibility/cost of each route.
3. GNSC determined proposed trail will be a Class 4 trail.

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Access Route (from Arlberg or Church or both). Discuss findings from Paul's meeting with contractors.
2. Subcommittee to review definition of Class 4 Trail and confirm suitability for the proposed trail.
3. Work through and agree upon Trail Specifications (Paul's document)

Future Action Items:

1. Complete TMO form

Review Action Items

Set Next Meeting Date

Next meeting dates set for July 18, 6-8 PM and July 27, 6-8 PM. Do we need to schedule a special Trails meeting in July or August to present findings?

Trail Subcommittee Meeting July 10, 2018 - Notes

Attending: Eryn Boone(EB), Paul Crews(PC), Julie Jonas(JJ), Ron Tenny(RT), Deb Essex(DE), Jim Braham, Brianna Sullivan (BS) sitting in for Peter Zug/Justin Thomas

Public: Brendan Raymond-Yacoubian, Debra Croghan

Note: Review these notes in conjunction with 1) Agenda for 7/10/18 meeting

Agenda Revisions and Approval

June 12, 2018 Agenda Approved with modification noted by PC: Bob Redmond was the only contractor with whom Paul Crews has walked the routes to date. He plans to walk routes with Paul Ingram and Casey Smith. Paul will let Erin know if he has 24 hours notice in order to do so, and so perhaps Jim Braham could then join (in order to follow OMA rules; see below).

Public Comment:

Brendan R-Y spoke (see his emailed comments from July 10, 2018). He and Julie R-K are requesting a strict document, considering previous comments. They oppose use of onsite gravel. They see some procedural and compliance issues. Request that mandates in GAP and CAT (Commercial Areas and Transportation Master Plan) are followed. Notes that at the April 2018 GTC meeting, Bill Spencer said the GNSC would abandon this project if the area was located in wetlands.

Procedural Review

Review highlights of Open Meetings Act. Eryn reviewed specifics of the OMA, as it related to this subcommittee as an advisory body. It is a good refresher and all members are committed to complying. (Brendan stated he believed Eryn was deliberately ignoring the OMA). Subcommittee unanimously supported Eryn in her quest to be objective and transparent with posting notices, etc.

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Access Route (from Arlberg or Church or both). Discuss findings from Paul's meeting with contractors. Subcommittee opted to postpone discussion on this until Paul (and others???) walk the routes with additional contractors.
2. Subcommittee to review definition of Class 4 Trail and confirm suitability for the proposed trail.
 - a. Subcommittee all agreed that going forward, the width of the trail will be 10', with a targeted 14' maximum. JJ asks about ongoing oversight as construction ensues (not to micromanage, but for the public to have continuing input) JB notes we should put in the planning document that GNSC will give updates at GTC meetings.
 - b. Eryn went through the Trail Matrices as outlined in the current draft of the Girdwood Trails Management Plan.
 - c. DE will send us/bring copies to next meeting of the current 5K loop trail profile, as an example for comparison purposes in designing this new trail.
 - d. DE: This trail is designed as a ski trail that allows multi-use (*note: please confirm if I captured this correctly – jj*)
 - e. Subcommittee agrees that a Class 4 trail is the appropriate designation for this proposed trail.

3. Work through and agree upon Trail Specifications (Paul's document)

- a. Eryn read through each item from previously distributed Trails Specifications document authored by Paul, and subcommittee made revisions, edits, etc. Paul will make revisions on the original document as discussed, for approval at next meeting. We may need to come back to item F (after input from contractors, and to consider financial impacts) and item P (after we see trail cross sections).

Future action items:

1. Access route
2. Trail specifications final review, with any additional specifications
3. Typical cross sections review
4. Alignment
5. Review concerns from public

Next Meeting(s):

July 18, 6-8pm

July 27, 6-8pm

7/19/18

Brenden and Julie Raymond-Yakoubian
Public Comment for 10 July 2018 "Forest Loop" Subcommittee meeting

Subcommittee,

Our names are Brenden and Julie Raymond-Yakoubian. We live in Girdwood.

We request that our previous comments be considered by the Subcommittee, in addition to the comments below.

1. We request that this body detail all of its guidance and decisions in a **binding public document (or documents) regarding design, alignment, and construction – in addition to the TMO**. Unfortunately, past experience has showed that the Nordic Club is more than willing to break promises and agreements made with the public and public bodies. Nonetheless, the requirements and parameters you create need to be strict, rigorous, and also clearly spelled out in formal binding guidance documents, if for no other reason than to create a paper trail in an attempt to ensure accountability down the line. Again, **please also consider our previous public comments for things to be included in such a document**, such as provisions for strict external oversight of trail-building activities, clear stop-work orders in the case of violations, and strict requirements about adherence to trail design parameters during both the construction and long-term maintenance phases.
2. We request that Subcommittee oppose the use of any on-site gravel, including subsurface, from within the project area, for the development of this trail. One major lesson from the building of the 5K Nordic Loop should be that allowing the use of on-site gravel was a complete disaster. Years after the completion of that trail, areas used for those materials are still a significant environmental problem.
3. There are a variety of procedural and compliance related problems and concerns, related to Girdwood planning and guidance documents, which have arisen as a result of developments within the Subcommittee on this trail which now require additional and special attention.
 - a. Re: the discussion about settling on a 10 foot trail/14 foot clearing width: Per the April 2018 Trails Committee meeting (and reflected as such in the minutes), the Nordic Club stated that grooming was the reason behind trail and clearing sizes - and that it was explicitly NOT to accommodate any particular kind of skiing. It has now been established that with a 14 foot clearing, the Club will not be able to use their groomer in this width of trail clearing, and thus will have to use tow-behind snowmachine groomers (which can groom at a narrow width). Additionally, remember that the Trails resolution sets 10/14 as maximums. A multi-use trail can be smaller than these widths - and in fact is permitted to be so per the resolution. (Additionally, it is worth remembering that even a skate ski trail can be built on a smaller trailbed than 10 feet.) **Thus, to come to the point, designing the trail with a 10/14 width is actually exceeding necessary environmental impacts, because the rationale for that width trail (per the Club themselves, on the record, in public) was accommodating grooming with a particular size groomer, and that groomer cannot fit in that width, meaning the trail should be designed much narrower because the rationale for 10/14 is no longer relevant.**

- b. The access issues. Prior to the last meeting there was discussion of trail access either being from behind the church (the 'straight-ish line in') or Arlberg. The problem with both is they involve crossing wetlands, and the problems around choosing which of the options involved also considering other problems (like impacts to Stumpy's) as well as the wetlands problem. Yet somehow the Subcommittee seems to now be talking about doing BOTH accesses. **By building two access routes, you would be maximizing environmental impacts rather than minimizing them, and without any necessary reason, as one access is obviously sufficient.** (It is also unclear whether the previous resolution language was even meant to allow two forms of access or a choice between alternatives.) **Additionally, it still makes absolutely no sense to build the 'straight-ish line in' access route; like the other access route (from Arlberg), it involves a significant wetland crossing, but with the added negatives of clustering three trails within throwing distance of each other, and also negatively visually impacting the Stumpy's Trail viewshed (this last point involving failing to learn again from past mistakes of siting new trail too close to another trail and damaging its viewshed).**
- c. **The intentional use of kettle/swale/ravine features, as well as any proposed development in the project area which are wet, are in contradiction to an ethic of minimizing environmental impacts.** Regarding the kettle/swale/ravine features, even aside from the wetlands issues, from an ecosystem perspective the density of these features in this area is rather unique and offers the public a rare glimpse of this beautiful type of rainforest terrain. It is incomprehensible that they are being considered not in terms of their unique intrinsic ecosystem and aesthetic values (e.g. to walk next to, observe and appreciate) but rather as a something to build trail through to create a terrain feature to screw around in on skis. Regarding the wetlands issues: as members of the public have been pointing out for quite some time now, there are wetlands areas found all over this proposed project area. They include features and areas which are currently for some reason still on the table for proposed development (e.g. southeastern creek/bog area, water-holding kettle/swale/ravine features, the creek and nearby wetlands in the northern area, and the areas of standing water near the 'northern dogleg').
- d. **It has been discussed that part of the goal and ethic of the subcommittee is to minimize environmental impacts from this trail. Additionally, there is language in a number of Girdwood's management and planning documents which speak to, or flatly state, that development (including trails) must be done in the vein of minimizing environmental impacts.** See for example the sustainable trails framework in the Trails Plan (e.g. language about insuring trails have minimal impacts on the ecosystem, minimizing resource degradation, etc.). The Girdwood Area Plan talks about the value of open spaces, the natural environment, and minimizing environmental impacts during development in a number of spots. The Girdwood Commercial Areas and Transportation Master Plan also discusses the key importance of the natural and forested character of the community, including preserving it. The Turnagain Arm Management Plan (which pertains to State lands, which is relevant here because the southern portion of this proposed trail is on DOT lands) states this as well, e.g. that land use activities must minimize environmental impacts and avoid them when anticipated in advance (which is clearly the case here, e.g. with wetlands). **The proposed developments outlined in 3a), 3b), and 3c) above are in clear contradiction to these mandates, visions, and principles because they are well beyond what is necessary to achieve the aims of the trail. As such, the Subcommittee should, given the now-currently-known facts, adjust the alignment, design, and construction**

parameters to come into compliance with these mandates, visions, and principles, and to minimize the environmental impacts of this trail by, for example, narrowing the trail and its clearing as much as possible, only allowing one access to be built, not building through kettle/swale/ravine features, not allowing on-site gravel use, and not building in wetlands.

4. The Subcommittee needs to hold the Club accountable to past statements. There are many relevant examples that unbiased members of the Subcommittee are surely aware of, but perhaps most important in terms of the future of this proposal is this one: **remember the promise made by the Club in April at the Trails Committee (through their trail designer Bill Spencer): that if it was discovered that this project would be mired in water, muck, etc., that they would abandon the project.** Well, the Subcommittee has now come to the realization, we would hope, that there are wetland concerns all over the project area. And yet somehow that promise made in April by the Club has just blown into the wind. **There are wetland areas throughout the north and south portions of this area; the northern dogleg has water on the surface (probably because of the substrate and surrounding terrain), there is a creek and associated wetland areas in the north/northeastern portions of the area, there are kettle/ravine/swale features throughout the area some of which hold water, and the south/southeastern portion is a mix of creek/bogland. Per the public promises of the Club itself, this project should be abandoned.**

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,
Brenden and Julie Raymond-Yakoubian

Girdwood Multi-Use Trail Subcommittee Agenda July 18, 2018, 6-8 p.m. Girdwood Community Room

Agenda Revisions and Approval

July 18, 2018 Agenda Approval

Public Comment:

Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes per person with a maximum of 12 minutes of public comment total.

Review Subcommittee Goal:

Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail by August, 2018.

Review Main Ideas from Last Meeting:

1. Subcommittee reviewed applicable sections of Open Meetings Act.
2. Subcommittee reviewed definition of Class 4 trail and agreed that is appropriate for proposed trail. Designed use is Cross-country skiing.
3. First-pass review of Trail Specification document.

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Continue working on Trail Specification document. Additions/changes to current version?
2. Access Route (from Arlberg or Church or both). Discuss findings from Paul's meeting with contractors.
3. Review/finalize trail alignment per latest version drawn on area photo.
4. Complete TMO form
5. Discuss #5 from the June 2017 resolution: "GTC has ongoing input on trail design and construction, with specific review and approval once the centerline is set."
6. Discuss how we will present this to the Trails Committee in August (August 7th). Will need to give history of resolutions, summary of subcommittee discussions, review of trail specification document and TMO and how these documents will be used in planning & construction.

Future Action Items:

Review Action Items

Set Next Meeting Date

Next meeting dates set for July 27, 6-8 PM. Do we need to schedule an additional meeting prior to August 7th Trails Committee meeting?

7/18

Trail Subcommittee Meeting July 18, 2018 - Notes

Attending: Eryn Boone(EB), Paul Crews(PC), Julie Jonas(JJ), Carolyn Brodin (SB) for Ron Tenny, Deb Essex(DE), Jim Braham(JB), Peter Zug(PZ)
Public: Kate Sandberg, Shirley Durtschi (until 7:15pm)

Note: Review these notes in conjunction with 1) Agenda for 7/18/18 meeting

Agenda Revisions and Approval

July 18, 2018 Agenda Approved with addition: consideration of public comments.

Public Comment:

EB read written comments sent by Debra Croghan (see letter). Debra referenced Meeting notes not being made available, as well as other copies of other docs. EB had copies/handouts available of all meeting notes and docs at this meeting. Decision was made to email same to Brendan and Julie R-Y since they were not at this meeting, as they had requested copies too. PC read a document he had authored (see document) regarding response to public comments (specifically regarding issues of width, gravel sourcing, use of kettle features, etc.). JJ noted items from her list she has kept regarding public comments and highlighted some that PC had not: GAP/CAT plans (she believes this type of trail DOES fit in to the vision laid out in those plans, as she was especially active during the production of the CAT plan); she has drafted a document for subcommittee to review which will outline ongoing oversight of the trail construction; we are still waiting to hear back from Julie R-Y on information as to how to assess trail users values. EB asked Kyle Kelley to consult with MOA attorney regarding Subcommittee sharing emails regarding alignment, design and construction for the purposes of gathering information. PZ recalls only talking about alignment while in Subcommittee public meetings while looking at a map. CB asked for clarification re: Open Meetings Act. EB and JJ noted that we will be going "by the book."

Discussion:

1. Continue working on Trail Specification document. Additions/changes to current version?
 - a. We reviewed Trail Spec document that Paul had revised based on previous input. JJ asked re: onsite gravel vs imported advantages: Less costly, less invasive species, less travel time and fuel cost/use of fuel. PC also explained about clearing techniques for gravel. Subcommittee committed to not widening trail, but allow techniques that have minimal impact in order to build trail with the least amount of imported gravel necessary. Add to Trail Spec (currently item F): "There may be areas where adequate gravel is not available beneath the targeted clearing limit/trail corridor. In such situations, gravel may be obtained in a manner that shall minimize forest disturbance. These areas must be approved by the Project Manager, with oversight provisions as dictated in the (future) planning document."
 - b. GNSC shall monitor and/or assign a third party to oversee construction activities. (See written explanation authored by PC) to assure compliance with job plans and approved construction methods. There shall be authority to issue stop work order in the case of non-compliance.
 - c. Regarding long term maintenance of trail, GNSC members pointed out that current membership dues help to pay for ongoing maintenance of current 5K trail, and that model would continue with proposed trail. Target for maintenance frequency shall be listed in the TMO.
 - d. EB noted that the selected trail builder will have ongoing oversight, as directed in the (future) trail plan document. Only qualified and experienced contractors shall be considered for this project.
 - e. Additional items that can/should be included in the Trail Specs document:
 - i. **Project Manager will be designated by ____? Project manager will be on site ____? (number of times/ daily/weekly, etc).**
 - ii. **Flagging will be removed by ____ (date). DONE**
 - iii. **Use of kettle and ravine features in forest should be minimized and a wetland analysis conducted prior to construction. DONE; DE will provide information.**

- iv. Archaeologist may be hired to conduct a historic properties/cultural resources inventory survey. **DE will make a phone call.**
- v. Abandon northern dogleg section. **Discuss re trail alignment conversation.**
- vi. Public permitting notices (HLB and DOT) will be posted in timely manner(s).
- vii. Grooming equipment specifications for near and long term use will be determined prior to construction. DE: Grooming will be done by a snowmobile until such time GNSC can afford an appropriate size PistenBully.

2. Access Route (from Arlberg or Church or both). Discuss findings from Paul's meeting with contractors.

- a. Paul has not been able to go out with any other contractors. Review: Bob Redmond thought coming from Arlberg is possible with road construction fabric on ground surface and can put 1 ½ to 2' of material on top of that to carry load. Access route from church would be "goeey."
- b. Re: Dual access options as stated in June 2017 Motion, subcommittee interprets this as access can either be from either Arlberg or church, or BOTH. PZ: Need a hardened trail from 4 corners area to join up with other trail. Subcommittee recommends a cost analysis to be done to assess whether route from Arlberg is indeed less expensive (as Paul thinks it would be). Because connectivity to other trails is important, the club will have to determine which route is best, comparing cost and connectivity. PC fears church route will require importing and hauling in extra materials, which increases cost and environmental damage.
- c. CB suggests all committee members go and look at new work on Iditarod trail that Andy Hehlin has done (across from USFS office and down to CA Creek bridge).
- d. EB summarized that we need more information to make decision about exact access route(s).
- e. PC requested we have something in writing from DOT regarding ability to access their land for access route; DE states they already know about this project.
- f. JJ requested GNSC provide a copy of the letter from Alyeska Resort regarding right of access through resort property (the one that Deb confirmed in previous meeting that also had to do with Resort donating grooming time and equipment). CB read aloud a letter from OLOS Parish President, Maggie Donnelly regarding access along the church building. CB explained the Girdwood Trails Committee had approached John Byrne several years ago about accessing current meadows ski trail on the other side of the church that would entail cutting a few alders. Answer was NO; it has to do with Resort lease and amount of required parking allowed for big events that cannot be "given away" to certain entities.
- g. POSSIBLE subcommittee recommendation: We recommend access from Arlberg, yet access from the Church may be possible, pending cost analysis and other factors (wetlands, materials extraction, gravel sources, impact minimization, etc all meet Trail Specs).
- h. DE still recommends access from church as well as Arlberg for connectivity.

3. Review/finalize trail alignment per latest version drawn on area photo.

Postponed until next meeting.

4. Complete TMO form

Postponed until next meeting.

5. Discuss #5 from the June 2017 resolution: "GTC has ongoing input on trail design and construction, with specific review and approval once the centerline is set."

- a. See #6 below and incorporate comments from PC's document he read earlier in meeting.

6. Discuss how we will present this to the Trails Committee in August (August 7th). Will need to give history of resolutions, summary of subcommittee discussions, review of trail specification document and TMO and how these documents will be used in planning & construction.

- a. JJ distributed first draft of outline she authored of proposed planning document, including these headings and more. To be continued/finalized:

Subcommittee Report to Trails Committee (August, 2018).....DRAFT by J. Jonas 7/15/2018

Items in blue added verbally at meeting 7/18/2018

Task: Give history of resolutions, summary of subcommittee discussions, review of trail specification document and TMO and how these documents will be used in planning & construction.

History of Resolutions:

1. June 6, 2017 – Girdwood Trails Committee moves to approve, in concept, Forest Loop Trail with the following conditions:
 - 1) New Arlberg parking lot and Our Lady of the Snows are dual access options to the trail.
 - 2) Trail is maximum 10' wide, hardened surface, with targeted maximum width of 14' clearing.
 - 3) Design minimized visual impact on existing trails
 - 4) Design minimized environmental impacts
 - 5) Girdwood Trails Committee has ongoing input on trail design and construction, with specific review and approval once the center line is set.
2. June 23, 2017 – GBOS votes unanimously to approve Resolution 2017-08
3. March 27, 2018 – GBOS Special Meeting. GBOS moves to clarify resolution 2017-08 to state that the GTC will vote on the proposed GNSC trail centerline at the April 2018 GTC meeting. The GTC and GNSC are to produce a preliminary trail plan that is recommended by GTC not later than the September 2018 GBOS meeting.
4. April 3, 2018 - Girdwood Trails Committee moves to approve the proposed approximate alignment as presented by the Girdwood Nordic Ski Club. Approval of the motion is contingent upon an agreement with GNSC to create an appointed subcommittee of GTC and GNSC members. The subcommittee is charged with making a preliminary plan for the alignment, design and construction of the trail. The group will present this plan to the GTC as new business no later than the August GTC meeting.

Summary of subcommittee discussions meetings: 4/27/2018, 5/24/2018, 6/8/2018, 6/12/2018, 7/10/2018, 7/18/2018,

1. X meetings to date, covering agenda topics
 - a. Public Comments
 - b. Alignment
 - c. Width
 - d. Access route(s)
 - e. OMA
 - f. Trail building techniques and specifications
 - g. TMO
 - h. Copies of handouts, subcommittee written responses
 - i. Other

Review of trail specification document:

1. See document originally authored by Paul and amended by entire subcommittee

Trail Management Objectives (TMO) document:

1. See TMO....

Implementation; How the documents will be used in planning and construction:

JJ highlighted her ideas re: this report, including handling public concerns, GNSC/GTC partnership, hiring of Project Manager and ongoing oversight; GNSC reporting monthly to GTC (including but not limited to: timetable, trail alignment modifications notification/decision making process, hiring of contractor, funding efforts, grooming plans and/or purchase of grooming equipment, adherence to Trail Specifications); intention for GNSC and GTC to hold joint meetings with contractor to iron out potential current and ongoing issues; stop work orders; requirement for Trail Designer and contractor to have good track record, etc.

Action Items:

1. DE: send current 5K loop profile AND copy of letter from Resort referencing right of access for a trail to Subcommittee members. DE make phone call to Archeologist for survey of resources. Provide Wetlands Analysis information. DE also talk to Andy about access route/current work on Iditarod Trail.
2. EB: Email notes and all other docs to Brendan and Julie R-Y.
3. PB: Consult with Paul Ingrim and Casey Smith.
4. All subcommittee members: Check out new work on Iditarod trail across from USFS building.
5. JJ revise/finetune planning document to be used as report to GTC/GBOS.
6. Complete TMO and include: Targeted frequency for maintenance of trail.
7. Determine Alignment (northern dogleg section?)
8. Consider postponing report to GTC until Aug. 14 or other, vs. Aug. 7 because JJ reported she may not be available Aug. 7. CB also reported she will not be at Aug. 7 GTC meeting.

Next meeting:

July 27, 2018, 6-8 pm

From: Debra
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 8:46 PM
To: 'eboone007@yahoo.com'
Subject: subcommittee

Hello Eryn,

These are my comments for the next subcommittee meeting, please read them out loud.

1st , I am disappointed with the way this subcommittee's process has been occurring. For example; minutes aren't being kept, documents have not been made available at meetings, meetings held in private, inconsistency regarding when meetings are cancelled, rotating sub committee representatives and not incorporating public commits into subcommittee's discussions.

2nd, current plans to clear out to 20 feet for gravel I believe is not consistent with the resolution that this subcommittee is working within.

Thank you,
Debra Croghan

Date: July 15, 2018

To: Trails Subcommittee
(sent via email to the Subcommittee)

From: Julie Raymond-Yakoubian
Girdwood

Re: Comments to the Subcommittee about the Proposed Forest Loop and subcommittee process

Subcommittee,

Please consider these comments for the upcoming July 18 meeting. I request that the subcommittee please also review all of the previous comments I have submitted to you. I do not feel as though my previous comments have been discussed or adequately considered by you.

- *Environmental impacts:* Many of the decisions being made or considered by this subcommittee are maximizing the environmental impacts of this trail – for example, use of gravel from the project area, having two access routes, excessive trail width, excessive amount of trail for the area.
- *Gravel:* Gravel should not be extracted from within the project area.
 - Any gravel needed should be sourced elsewhere and brought to the project area. Gravel extraction in the proposed project area would be highly damaging, increase the environmental impact of this trail, and is unnecessary since gravel can be purchased elsewhere. The cost of gravel should not outweigh the environmental, aesthetic, or other concerns. Trail-building is expensive and the cost of purchasing gravel should be built into the budget if this trail goes forward.
- *Access routes:* This trail should not have two access routes.
 - To reduce impacts, the shorter Arlberg Road access route should be used. This is feasible, construction-wise, according to subcommittee members experienced in road and trail building. The behind-the-church access route will not just disturb a larger area of forest and involve wetlands, but will also be placed between two other existing trails (all of which will be within a several hundred foot wide area of forest), and has previously been identified by the Nordic Club as the less-ideal access route.
- *Trail width:* The trail bed and clearing widths should be less than 10³/14'.
 - Now that it has been made clear that the 10³/14' widths do not work for the Nordic Club's preferred grooming gear, no justification has been articulated by the subcommittee for why the *maximum* widths are necessary. This trail should be made as narrow as possible to minimize the impacts to the forest itself, to the existing trails, and to users of this area that value solitude and a forested-experience.
 - The subcommittee has indicated that a significant portion of the trail – 10% or so – will exceed 20' in clearing. This is unacceptable, violates the Trails Committee resolution, and thus requires the proposal to go back to the Trails Committee and all other public bodies for review and approval.
 - Exceeding the approved maximum trail/clearing widths has been discussed at multiple meetings and I'm not clear why this is something you are still considering. If trail

design requires you to exceed 14' of clearing, then re-design is required. If extracting gravel from the project area will make you exceed the 14' clearing width, then don't extract gravel from the area.

- *Amount of trail:* Too much trail is proposed within the project area.
 - While the total amount of trail has been reduced from initial proposals, there is still far too much trail within this area. As has been stated before, this amount of trail is not suitable for the characteristics of this area (i.e. a mature forest and a narrow-width area).
 - Additionally, while some of the visual impacts to Stumpy's Trail have been eliminated, there are other areas where visual impacts remain. This needs to be fixed.
- *Meeting Minutes:* Where are subcommittee meeting minutes located? These should be accessible to the public and I would like to see the minutes from each meeting.
- *Meeting documents:* Not all documents that the subcommittee is reviewing or working with have been made available to the public. They should all be made part of the public record and should be accessible, including during meetings. I would like to see all the documents and communications that the subcommittee has been working with, including side communications (e.g. emails and notes from side meetings) sent between subcommittee members related to design, construction, and alignment details.

Thank you -

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Julie Raymond-Yakoubian". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Julie Raymond-Yakoubian

Brenden Raymond-Yakoubian
Public Comments for 18 July 2019 Forest Loop Subcommittee meeting

Subcommittee,

I am sharing these comments with you as early as possible in the, if history has been any guide, most likely vain hopes that they will be incorporated (as opposed to just received/heard) into the discussions at this upcoming Subcommittee meeting.

It was, to me, at first simply very frustrating and then also quite disappointing to hear sentiments of excuse-making and disinterest related to adherence to public process at the last meeting. It was, once again as so clearly in the past with this Subcommittee, frustrating and disheartening to hear from a public body a lack of recognition of the full value of public comment and the realization that process is actually part of substance. But then, after thinking about it more, I realized it is exactly reflective of how this Subcommittee has treated public comment – which is, essentially, almost not at all. You have received it, but not really done anything with it; you hear it, but then by and large don't discuss it or use it in deliberations. This is despite the fact that – whether or not you agree with it – one would be hard pressed to state that the public comment has not been substantive, relevant, rigorous, detailed, and often presenting original and important viewpoints on old and new information under consideration. In fact, as an example, in some cases it was clear that the commenting public was far more aware of the relevant conditions of the proposed project area than members of the Subcommittee.

It is telling that added to the checklist of things to do towards the end of this Subcommittee's process is an examination of public comments made in light of your deliberations, placed in a perfectly perfunctory and thus inherently ineffectual position after the decisions have been made. To be honest, perhaps you should even just save yourself the time of doing that now-meaningless gesture, because in grand total really only 1 public comment has been incorporated and meaningfully deliberated out of the dozens of comments and ideas presented to you over the course of these meetings. And that was decreasing the amount of trail in this area – and this was only done to a very small degree, and let's be frank it was going to happen anyway, because the original amount of trail proposed for this area would have looked like such a disaster if it were actually built that the entire town would have been in an uproar 5 years down the road. (Additionally, however, we can't even say this small amount of consideration has officially even been really done yet, as alignment has not even been formally re-addressed after its early brief discussion (and then apparently refined on the side).)

So, I will review for you some of the many public comments you have essentially ignored along the way. This is only a partial list, because it is unfair to expect me to have to keep repeating an ever-growing laundry list of extensive public comments that have not been considered over the course of these meetings.

There was no legitimate discussion of why the actual trail width is being set at 10 feet trailbed and 14 foot clearing. The resolution stated these as the maximums, yet that just morphed quietly but surely (after weeks of deliberations about exceeding the Trails resolution to go out to an 18-or-more-foot-wide clearing to accommodate the groomer) into not 'maximum' but rather 'actual' widths. This doesn't make sense because we now know those widths can't accommodate the big groomer, which was the official, explicitly stated, on-the-record reason that width was chosen (see the April Trails Committee meeting minutes). So why not narrower, which the Trails Resolution explicitly allows? There has been no discussion of why these 'maximums' have transformed into and been settled on as 'actuals' in light of the fact that the guiding rationale for even those wide widths no longer even applies (the groomer). If you were familiar with this forested area – truly familiar with it, through the seasons – you would be able to be in it and realize just how substantial the impact, visual and otherwise, of a 10 foot trailbed/14 foot clearing – multiplied many times over by segments in a row with each other – would look in this relatively mature forest that is also not very wide in total forested width. A four-season multi-use trail – heck, even a trail that allows for skate skiing – can be built narrower than this 10/14. There has been zero discussion of why not, despite that being an obvious question of logic, consistency with public statements, and minimizing environmental impacts – yet amazingly there were weeks of discussion of having a width beyond the resolution at 18 or possibly even more feet wide.

There has been zero discussion of whether the aspects of the design, construction, and alignment match up with the various Girdwood-related planning and guidance documents, e.g. the Trails Management Plan, Girdwood Area Plan, and so on. This is despite the fact that there are clear indications in these documents that certain aspects of the trail proposal as currently configured are clearly not in line with these principles and guidance. I discussed this in greater detail in my previous public comments. As members of a Girdwood public body, it's common sense you would use these documents in your deliberations, but you have not. For goodness sakes, you are a Subcommittee of the Trails Committee, and the only real discussion of the Trails Management Plan happened just last week when deciding trail class.

There has been no practical instantiation of incorporating learning from past mistakes into the design, construction, and alignment. Several key lessons in this vein:

- Do not build the trail larger than it needs to be (current status: not discussed, and disregarded; see above)
- Do not build the trail in a way that impacts viewsheds of other trails (current status: some movement away from Stumpy's in the original siting and possibly in the shrinking of trail length, but major impacts still from one access route option and anticipated impacts elsewhere especially from multiple segments of trail placed in a row)
- Do not use on-site gravel because it just isn't possible to do it right environmentally here (current status: not discussed, and not only disregarded but actually part of plans to have an extreme amount of disturbance from this)
- Minimize environmental impacts (current status: largely not a consideration in the design as it is actually implemented as opposed to just rhetoric. Wetlands concerns throughout the project area have been barely a consideration other than practicality issues. Kettle/swale/ravine features, despite being rather uniquely concentrated in this area, are still incorporated as terrain features to build trail through rather than e.g. natural features to site the trail occasionally near to for observation and display to the public as part of e.g. a nature trail)

There has been no discussion of why the Club's key promise through trail designer Bill Spencer, regarding project abandonment conditions (that if the project was going to get bogged down in the water, muck, and so on, the project would be abandoned) has not been held to. I have repeated it numerous times, and the Subcommittee was unfortunately unaware of this for a long time, but there are wetlands concerns all over the project area. Water near the northern dogleg sits on the surface, there is a creek in the north/northeast of the project area with beautiful wetland terrain around it and huge numbers of fiddlehead ferns in the area, a staggering number of kettle/ravine/swale features throughout the project area some of which hold water, and parts of the south/southeast area is a mix of creek and bogland. And yet, despite this clear evidence of serious wetland issues pervasive in the area, there is not even a mention of one of the Club's key design-related promises made to the public.

Several very important aspects for trail construction were completely left out of the construction document (the "Draft Preliminary Trail Specifications" document) and never discussed. For example, there is nothing about clear stop-work orders in the case of violation of the provisions of the document, there isn't sufficient discussion regarding a long-term maintenance plan for sticking to the original guidelines, and there is nothing about external monitoring. Another reasonable stipulation not mentioned before but worth having is that the selected trail designer and trail builder have a good track record of successful experience building this kind and size of trail in these types of conditions, have the equipment necessary to do the job, and weren't involved in any previous cases of trail-building-gone-wrong.

While the problems of access have been discussed, they have taken a strange turn where instead of considering one access route of the two options, which is all that would be needed (and beyond which is maximizing environmental impacts), the Subcommittee is currently considering developing both, despite Subcommittee members from all sides seeing huge concerns with the suite of currently available options. The Arlberg option involves going across designated wetlands, but is the one that best realizes the type of connectivity the Club is always talking about, links in to existing resources, appears to be more practical, and has less compounded downsides than the behind-the-church option. The behind-the-church option involves going across wetlands that are even wetter than their designated counterpart to the east, and regardless of its width it involves compounding that problem with other huge problems – such as unavoidably impacting the Stumpy's viewshed and experience, involving another landowner in the process (DOT), and clustering three trails within spitting distance of each other.

This is just a small list of some such considerations that have been essentially ignored by this Subcommittee, which mostly appears to be just 'winging it', disregarding public opinion, and unfortunately all against the backdrop of deciding the fate of this area while simultaneously making new discoveries all the time that are frankly fairly rudimentary and were known to members of the commenting and concerned public for years. If there was ever a good example and rationale of why public comment should be more valued and attended to, that's a pretty good one. It's also a pretty good example of why the strong and realized opposition to having a true diversity of voices on this Subcommittee, including opponents of the trail, was a real shame for our civic process in this town.

As a final note, I want to point out that the current plans approved at the last meeting clearly are in contradiction to the approved Trails Resolution of maximums/targeted maximums of 10' trailbed/14' clearing. This is because the plan now calls for expanding out to 20 feet a significant number of times to accommodate for materials extraction (around 10 percent of the trail length according to previous discussion at the Subcommittee). That in no way can be reasonably understood as targeting a 14 foot maximum clearing. (And is even worse when it's coupled with permissive language in the construction guidance document – and perhaps even the trails class selection, which was not made entirely clear last time regarding this – which allows for exceptions for even more and wider clearing.) This is why I am making to you now – and have formally also already made to the Trails Committee – a formal request that if this design is adopted by this Subcommittee, it should go back through the stages of public review again (Trails, Land Use, GBOS, HLB) because it is 'violating' (for lack of a better word) that foundational resolution. We are again back at another version of the same broader issue that was present with the idea for an 18 foot clearing introduced at the second and third meetings, which is a change beyond the scope of the resolution, and it requires going to back through the public process in order to honor the public trust and the key Trails Committee resolution language.

Sincerely,
Brenden Raymond-Yakoubian

7/18/18

Paul Crews, Trail subcommittee member
Review of previously submitted written public comments 7/17/18

As a preface to this review I wish to state the following:

1 These are my personal comments and do not necessarily reflect the feelings or ideas of other individuals.

2 More than a year ago the Girdwood community collectively decided through a long public process that it desired to have a new multiuse summer and winter skate ski trail within the area in question. I was named to this subcommittee to help align conceptual differences between the GNSC and certain GTC members. The community has said that it wants this trail. I believe that as a subcommittee member I am charged to work through questions about alignment, design and trail specifications that will be accepted by the majority of our Trails Committee members.

My comments on review of printed comment submittals.

We have received extensive written comments each meeting from several individuals. I wish to commend those individuals for their personal concerns and for the many hours that they have contributed to outline and enunciate their suggestions and concerns.

I am disappointed, however, that as a subcommittee member I have been accused in writing of excuse making, not being interested in a public process, or not using public comments in discussion or in my deliberations. This is not true. I have listened to, read and reviewed every public comment that has been submitted to the subcommittee. Many of the ideas that have been submitted to this subcommittee have been previously enunciated at previous full Trails Committee meetings. I have advocated for some of the ideas that have been submitted both orally and in writing. As a subcommittee we are not required to respond directly to every comment that is submitted but we must accept all comments and utilize those that we think are appropriate or pertinent.

Some of the public comments that have been submitted have been repeated more than once by the same individuals over the course of several meetings, perhaps because the subcommittee has not incorporated the desires of those individuals into the trail plan. I wish to address several of these concerns from a personal perspective as to why certain aspects of the Submitted comments do not necessarily align with my decision making.

WIDTH OF THE TRAIL The proposed trail width was discussed by any member of the public who wished to comment at multiple full Trails Committee meetings over a duration of several months more than a year ago. Following exhaustive public comment and debate, the public reduced the width of the proposed hardened surface of the proposed trail from the originally

asked for clearing width of 20 feet to the currently approved width of ten feet, the minimum width that was agreed to be acceptable for a multiuse ski trail that allowed for a skate zone plus space for a traditional diagonal stride track to be set. The targeted clearing width was set at 14 feet.

Recent public comments concerning trail width advanced to this subcommittee by the authors of these comments are in repetition to public comments received by the full Trails Committee during the previous 16 months. Although the authors of these written comments were not present during the original public deliberation of trail alignment, the concerns authored within recent written comments were fully debated by the full Trails Committee preceding a formal decision by majority vote of the full Trails Committee to establish the current proposed trail width.

TRAIL ALIGNMENT The proposed trail alignment was discussed by any member of the public who wished to comment at multiple full Trails Committee meetings over a duration of several months more than a year ago. Following exhaustive public comment and debate, the public, through the required public process of majority vote by its Trails Committee, approved the currently mapped trail alignment.

Recent public comments concerning alignment advanced to this subcommittee by the authors of these comments are in repetition to public comments received by the full Trails Committee during the previous 16 months. Although the authors of these written comments were not present during the original public deliberation of trail alignment, the concerns authored within recent written comments were fully debated by the full Trails Committee preceding a formal decision by majority vote of the full Trails Committee to establish the current proposed trail alignment.

GRAVEL EXTRACTION It appears to me that certain written comments submitted contain certain personal opinions and may not be entirely factual. Gravel sourcing and use has been vigorously discussed within the subcommittee and was debated at length by the full Trails Committee.

The trail proposal calls for a hardened surface. A minimum quantity of gravel must be obtained from some location. The author of comments does not address the fact that importing gravel from a distant location for use on the proposed trail alternatively moves ecological damage to a different location. Importing gravel also adds the unseen impact of extreme expense and consumption of a large quantity of fossil fuels required by a round trip haul route of forty miles. And, the quantity of gravel to build the trail would increase because the gravel would be required to be hauled over the average of $\frac{1}{2}$ the length of the trail. Transporting gravel over trail sections with that many "haul cycles" would require that a much deeper layer of gravel be used in order for the trail to "hold up" to that many haul loads.

I have authored certain clauses in the subcommittee's proposed trail specifications draft that require as much gravel as possible to be extracted from beneath the trail bed. Utilization of

gravel from beneath the trail contains forest floor disturbance to within the trail corridor and reduces the movement of gravel from 20 miles to only a few feet or otherwise short distances.

It is assumed that the HLB will allow limited off trail extraction if necessary, however, widening the trail extraction foot print to three feet beyond each side of the proposed clearing limit for short distances in specified areas in order to obtain gravel material would greatly reduce a need to develop off trail extraction sites, the removal of additional trees and access trail damage associated with off trail extraction sites.

OTHER COMMENTS

Commenting individuals object to use of the kettle terrain. I remember from public discussion at full Trails Committee meetings that the public wanted this trail and that the utilization of the kettle terrain for variety as ski terrain was desired. At a previous subcommittee meeting the ski club stated that they would reroute the trail utilizing fewer kettle terrain features as well as moving the trail alignment further away from Stumpy's trail to further mitigate view shed conflicts. I personally agree with this. Further, the ski club stated that it was no longer interested in construction of the northern most portion of the existing mapped route. I agree with this decision because deletion of that portion mitigates potential wetland conflicts.

I agree that we should add to the specification document clauses that allow the property owner to monitor or assign the responsibility of monitoring trail construction to a third party that would have the authority to stop construction work in the case of divergence from construction guidelines. Asking for a long term maintenance plan is also a good idea.

Finally, in agreement with an author of comments, I agree that summer trail and construction equipment access should be from the Arlberg trailhead only. The Arlberg route has guaranteed public access as required by the Girdwood Trails Plan. The proposed church trail route traverses terrain that imposes ground and water problems that far exceed those from the Arlberg trailhead. There is no gravel on the church route, all gravel would need to be imported. The church route is three times as long. Walkers wishing to go to the church can intercept Stumpy's trail. As of now there are no long term access agreements as required by the Girdwood Trails plan from either Alyeska Resort or the Department of Transportation to allow access or construction.

Girdwood Multi-Use Trail Subcommittee Agenda July 27, 2018, 6-8 p.m. Girdwood Community Room

Agenda Revisions and Approval

July 27, 2018 Agenda Approval

Public Comment:

Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes per person with a maximum of 12 minutes of public comment total.

Review Subcommittee Goal:

Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail by August, 2018.

Review Main Ideas from Last Meeting:

1. Subcommittee discussed and responded to public comments.
2. Subcommittee continued working on Trail Specification document. Document is complete unless anyone wants to add more to it or change anything.
3. Discussed access route. Some subcommittee members would prefer primary access from Arlberg, some want to keep both Arlberg and church as main access points. Need more input from contractors on which is more feasible/preferable. Paul to try to meet with contractors before next meeting.
4. Julie outlined what we will need to gather to present to Trails committee in August and introduced proposed planning document for design and construction.

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Access Route (from Arlberg or Church or both). Discuss findings from Paul's meeting with contractors.
2. Review/finalize trail alignment per latest version drawn on area photo.
3. Complete TMO form.
4. Discuss #5 from the June 2017 resolution: "GTC has ongoing input on trail design and construction, with specific review and approval once the centerline is set."
5. Discuss how we will present this to the Trails Committee in August (August 7th). Will need to give history of resolutions, summary of subcommittee discussions, review of trail specification document and TMO and how these documents will be used in planning & construction. Refer to Julie Jonas' draft from last meeting.

Review Action Items

Set Next Meeting Date

Do we need to schedule an additional meeting prior to August 7th Trails Committee meeting? Do we need to ask to postpone August Trails meeting?

Trail Subcommittee Meeting July 27, 2018 - Notes

Attending: Eryn Boone(EB), Paul Crews(PC), Julie Jonas(JJ), Ron Tenny, Deb Essex(DE), Jim Braham(JB), Brianna Sullivan(BS) for Peter Zug(PZ)

Public: Julie Raymond-Yacobian (R-Y), Eryn Boone's parents

Note: Review these notes in conjunction with 1) Agenda for 7/27/18 meeting. ALSO NOTE from JJ: these meetings are not taped and these notes and all previous meeting notes are not claimed to be "official minutes."

Agenda Revisions and Approval

July 27, 2018 Agenda Approved with addition: Gravel source added as item # 2 ½.

EB reported on information she received from MOA attorney: please forward any / all email correspondence to Eryn regarding the design, alignment and construction of the proposed trail so she can forward it to the requester, Julie R-Y.

Public Comment:

Julie Raymond R-Y read from her written comments she emailed just prior to this meeting. Concerns: user values, gravel source, fossil fuel cost, long term carbon sequestration, invasive species....see written comments.

EB read the written comments from Brendan R-Y that he emailed prior to meeting as he was not able to attend. She also read a letter from Kate Sandberg which highlighted 4 concerns: easement width, gravel source, oversight (recommends Christina Hendrickson, current GBOS P& R and a GTC member be appointed as Oversight during construction of trail), and Alignment specificity.

JJ responded to Julie R-Y – Truly sorry that she and Brendan they are “not listened to”, but we are doing our very best as volunteers to complete the task given us. JJ feels personally attacked even though she is trying to guide the planning and construction of this trail in ways that are minimally impactful. PC knows a certain part of the community enjoys nature with no change to it but that may exclude some who cannot access it without a trail to guide them. PC believes it is good for the community to get out and recreate in a healthy manner. J R-Y comments that if he is talking about the Americans with Disability Act, that is a whole other topic altogether, and believes that it is disingenuous to state that the (entire) community approved this trail.

RT states that he hikes and uses trails a lot and sees two major issues: Viewshed and gravel pits.

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

- 1. Access Route (from Arlberg or Church or both). Discuss findings from Paul's meeting with contractors.**
 - a. PC distributed handout (see doc) which summarizes his contact with 3 contractors (Bob Redmond, KC Smith, and Andy Hehnlin).
 - b. PC suggests that best access route is from Arlberg, and perhaps the GNSC can phase the project and access is determined after cost and effort known.

- c. DE states that on a wetland you can't have anything that mixes. Need a rubber mat first then then a hardened trail.
- d. DE and Andy Hehnlín also talked – a lot about wood chips (in Girdwood it saturates and freezes). There are ways to use the area in winter to minimize impact. Walking with Andy was very interesting and intriguing. Both accesses have pros and cons.
- e. PC suggested that snow cats could plow snow to bridge the creek in the winter and if that did not make the snow firm enough mats could be used to get a pile driver across the creek , and that the bridge could be constructed during the winter
- f. DE: Goal is to connect both routes.
- g. PC lays out an idea that is like the elephant in the room: why not utilize Stumpy's trail for connectivity as it is already an established trail, eliminating the need to build another trail (at greater expense and greater impact)? Understands Stumpy's is sacred to many. DE states that GNSC is not going to touch Stumpy's. Also notes that the historical ski trail in that area (Stumpy's Winter Trail) that is typically groomed in winter for skiing) is a route, not a trail.
- h. DE: the GNSC is proposing to build a full season recreational trail that can handle use for more of the winter, and the goal is to get in on a hardened surface.
- i. Discussion continued re: access route and phasing in the church route vs building a bridge over wetlands.
- j. Discussion also revolved around what "dual access options" meant in the original June 2017 motion passed at the GTC meeting. Some believe this can mean ONE access route OR the Other; OR both; some believe it means BOTH.
- k. EB asked if the subcommittee recommends one access route over the other? Without a clear consensus, it is suggested the subcommittee leaves the wording as it is in the June 2017 motion, and to forward to GTC and GBOS all of the information and comments we have offered. JB states that GNSC appreciates and is listening to all of Paul's work and opinion on the best access route being the one from Arlberg.
- l. DE mentioned GNSC can dovetail with other projects coming in (none in mind) as there is a possibility to have gravel donated.
- m. PC reiterates that the most important connections is from Arlberg.

2. Review/finalize trail alignment per latest version drawn on area photo.

- a. DE presents map with revised alignment, primarily delineated with yellow marker. It is now about 4k in length, with several loops eliminated, including the NE dogleg that was requested by Brendan R-Y to be eliminated. Subcommittee makes minor adjustments to alignment on map, to move around some of the wetter areas and noting the desire to not impact viewshed from Stumpy's and not to have trail intersect as much (in order to not be able to see others on trail as much). JJ notes that if new proposed trail is built, it may eliminate need to groom traditional route along Stumpy's Winter trail, which is often not groomable in wet and/or low snow years.

2 1/2. Gravel source

- b. Subcommittee discussed where gravel could and should come from. General consensus is that it should come from site as much as possible.
- c. DE reports that importing gravel is not as economically feasible.
- d. JJ reports on her conversation with USFS Ecologist Betty Channon that the USFS has gravel pits in Portage (they pulled and /or tarped invasive weeds) before using that gravel for the new Iditarod trail work across from Monarch Mine Rd here in Girdwood. There are some certified invasive weed free pits on the Kenai P. Betty prefers for

minimal impact that gravel be sourced from the trail site. JJ sees the logic of use of on-site gravel as well imported gravel.

- e. PC believes there is nothing in the resolution that would deny HLB from authorizing pits, however, all along has promoted extracting gravel from beneath the trail so pits are not necessary. He is NOT a proponent of pits unless they can absolutely be not avoided.
3. **Complete TMO form.** Postponed
 4. **Discuss #5 from the June 2017 resolution: "GTC has ongoing input on trail design and construction, with specific review and approval once the centerline is set."**
 5. **Discuss how we will present this to the Trails Committee in August (August 7th). Will need to give history of resolutions, summary of subcommittee discussions, review of trail specification document and TMO and how these documents will be used in planning & construction. Refer to Julie Jonas' draft from last meeting.**
 - a. JJ presented a revised draft of the outline (see doc dated 7/27/2018) that can be presented to GTC/GBOS that included some wording on how the GNSC can work with the public (GTC) throughout the entire construction process. Asked other subcommittee members to review/edit/offer comments at next meeting.
 - b. August GTC meeting has been postponed until August 14, 2018.
 - c. DE provided current 5K loop trail profile as requested at last meeting, as well as a handout providing an image of trail building technique. JJ inquired about the letter from resort granting access through resort property; DE says it came in an email and she doesn't forward emails unless she has permission, which she has yet to obtain.

Review Action Items

Complete TMO

Revise and finalize summary of report to GTC

Schedule another subcommittee meeting for late in week of Aug. 6, via email.

Subcommittee Report to Trails Committee (August, 2018)

DRAFT by J. Jonas 7/26/2018

A subcommittee consisting of Eryne Boone (chair), Deb Essex, Peter Zug, Jim Braham, Julie Jonas, Ron Tenny and Paul Crews was appointed in April, 2018 to make a preliminary plan for the alignment, design and construction of a new multi-use trail ("Forest Loop"), proposed by the Girdwood Nordic Ski Club (GNSC).

History of Actions and Resolutions:

1. **June 6, 2017** – Girdwood Trails Committee moves to approve, in concept, Forest Loop Trail with the following conditions:
 - 1) New Arlberg parking lot and Our Lady of the Snows are dual access options to the trail.
 - 2) Trail is maximum 10' wide, hardened surface, with targeted maximum width of 14' clearing.
 - 3) Design minimized visual impact on existing trails
 - 4) Design minimized environmental impacts
 - 5) Girdwood Trails Committee has ongoing input on trail design and construction, with specific review and approval once the center line is set.
2. **June 23, 2017** – GBOS votes unanimously to approve Resolution 2017-08
3. **March 27, 2018** – GBOS Special Meeting. GBOS moves to clarify resolution 2017-08 to state that the GTC will vote on the proposed GNSC trail centerline at the April 2018 GTC meeting. The GTC and GNSC are to produce a preliminary trail plan that is recommended by GTC not later than the September 2018 GBOS meeting.
4. **April 3, 2018** - Girdwood Trails Committee moves to approve the proposed approximate alignment as presented by the Girdwood Nordic Ski Club. Approval of the motion is contingent upon an agreement with GNSC to create an appointed subcommittee of GTC and GNSC members. The subcommittee is charged with making a preliminary plan for the alignment, design and construction of the trail. The group will present this plan to the GTC as new business no later than the August GTC meeting.

Summary of subcommittee meetings: See Agenda and Notes from 4/27/2018, 5/24/2018, 6/8/2018, 6/12/2018, 7/10/2018, 7/18/2018, 7/27/2018 (each meeting was 2 hours long).

1. Seven (7) meetings to date, covering agenda topics
 - a. Public Comments
 - b. Alignment
 - c. Width
 - d. Access route(s)
 - e. Open Meetings Act (OMA)
 - f. Trail building techniques and specifications
 - g. Trail Management Objectives (TMO)
 - h. See copies of handouts, subcommittee written responses
 - i. Other

Trail Specifications:

1. See document originally authored by Paul Crews and amended by entire subcommittee

Trail Management Objectives (TMO):

1. See TMO

Implementation:

1. All subcommittee meetings were publically noticed and held in the Girdwood Community Room and were open to the public. There was a period set aside at each meeting when public comments were taken (three minutes maximum per person). Emailed comments were accepted and read aloud.
2. The Subcommittee's recommendations were arrived at after a long period of time in which many concerns were aired. This trail is being proposed to be built on public land, and the public has requested to be involved – due to the history of GNSC's construction of the 5K Loop. We have learned and worked together to develop this new trail as a welcomed and usable community asset.
3. The Subcommittee presents to the Girdwood Trails Committee (GTC) and the Girdwood Board of Supervisors (GBOS) all documents relevant to their task, including agendas and meeting notes, handouts, Trail Specifications, TMO, and an agreement/statement that outlines how GNSC and GTC will work in partnership on this project.
4. The subcommittee recommends the Access Route for the proposed trail shall be: _____
5. The Trail Alignment agreed upon consists of a trail _____ K in length, and follows the route outlined on MAP _____ dated _____.

Subcommittee's recommendation/proposed agreement for how GTC and GNSC shall move forward in a collaborative manner:

1. GNSC will hire a Project Manager, who will oversee the project, who shall adhere to the guidelines set out in the documents produced by the subcommittee (and approved by the GTC/GBOS).
2. GTC shall receive monthly updates from GNSC throughout the entirety of the project. Topics shall include but not limited to: Timetable, project manager status, trail alignment (and any modifications pending), funding efforts; hiring of contractor (who shall have a good track record, qualifications and experience); trail specifications adherence; stop work orders (if necessary); purchase plans for grooming equipment.
3. If requested by either, GNSC and GTC shall hold joint meetings with the contractor and Project Manager to iron out potential current, ongoing and future issues.
4. GNSC shall allow members of the Subcommittee (and/or those designated by GTC) to monitor progress in the field, and have an open dialogue with Project Manager.

7/24/18

Dear Subcommittee:

Thank you for your summer's work on the Forest Loop construction and design; it has been a major commitment for all of you. I have four points for your consideration.

First, easement--what easement width is GNSC going to ask for? The Trails Plan says easements cannot be less than 20 feet. It could be 20, 25, or 30, based on the width of the clearing and the TMO of the trail. *This should be in the report to Trails Committee.*

Second, gravel--When the subcommittee's plan is presented to the Trails Committee and GBOS, it needs to state clearly where GNSC will find the gravel for this trail.

With Paul's calculations for a 10 foot hardened trail, 14 foot clearing, the gravel is going to have come from under the trail or a borrow pit. However, the area is deeply organic and wet with no available rock nearby and no known, dependable source under the trail. As well, the test holes for the church access show discouraging results for gravel. To bring gravel from the Nordic Loop is problematic because of the Arlberg wetland.

If it will cost two million dollars to build the trail with Portage gravel, is the GNSC ready to raise that money before they start digging? If this is the case, how will the gravel be brought in with little impact to the area and still keep the 14-foot clearing?

I believe this is all vital information for the final report to the Trails Committee.

Third, oversight--I suggest that Christina Hendrickson, GBOS Parks and Recreation Supervisor, be the neutral overseer of the project. A Trails Committee member should also be with her for history and trail expertise.

Fourth, the alignment. The alignment was approved in concept; however, if the GNSC plans to deviate markedly from the last alignment map, *this should be in the report.*

Thank you --

Kate Sandberg

Date: July 27, 2018

To: Trails Subcommittee
(sent via email to the Subcommittee)

From: Julie Raymond-Yakoubian
Girdwood

Re: Comments to the Subcommittee about the Proposed Forest Loop and subcommittee process

Subcommittee,

I was not able to attend the last subcommittee meeting, but I have read the minutes from that meeting and the other documents that were emailed to me. In regard to the written comments from individual subcommittee members (I don't think these are to be interpreted as 'subcommittee' comments?), I'll limit my response to the following because I think the below are most relevant to the public process being carried out here.

- My comments and those of others submitted to this subcommittee have been received as repetitive and motivated by unmet desires. I was very clear about why I brought up certain issues multiple times - I did not believe that they had been addressed adequately or fully considered. I believe that to still be the case for some issues. Regardless, the public can comment on any related issue whenever they want to, even if subcommittee members find it tiresome or valueless.
- Additionally, in case it is unclear - members of the public don't have to attend every single public meeting about an issue in order to request issues be discussed or considered or to simply make people aware of them. Between my husband and me, we've attended many public meetings on this trail issue, including previous meetings about alignment. We've also consulted all meeting minutes and spoke to others who attended meetings we were not able to. But, even if we had not, the public has the right to raise issues for consideration at any time.

During a previous meeting a subcommittee member requested that I provide information about how to assess and understand trail and forest users' values. I have brought up the issue of 'values' in relation to this proposed trail many times. The essence of some of my comments on this topic have been that:

- this subcommittee (and the GTC) has not had a discussion about what kinds of values people associate with the existing trails in the proposed project area, or what values they associate with the forest, in its current condition, in the proposed project area. Nor has there been a discussion of what values will be promoted through construction of the proposed trail.
- that it is impossible to appropriately design and construct a trail until values have been discussed
- this subcommittee is flailing forward either assuming that you understand these values, or not caring that you don't understand these values
- every decision you make here is based on valuing one 'thing' or idea over another – even if you choose to remain unaware of that. In your failure to acknowledge that, you are not taking full consideration of this issue.
- This trail and this subcommittee's work further skews an imbalance in Girdwood in terms of prioritized values and land uses, away from those who value having wild areas near their community.

As it stands, as of this 7th subcommittee meeting, this group remains to have a discussion about forest and trail values. This is something that should have been done a long time ago but, regardless, still has not happened.

I have not pulled any information together for this subcommittee. I don't believe that you will do anything with it and it is absolutely not a prerequisite for you to have at least begun discussions about values. There is a large amount of publically available academic and other literature that both discusses what kinds of values may be associated with the natural environment and with recreation, and which discusses various methods for doing formal assessments of values and impacts to users. (Suggested internet searches would include: value of open space, value of natural environment, place attachment theory, wellbeing and the environment, how to assess/measure recreational values/natural environment/solitude/view sheds/wilderness/etc.)

Gravel remains a huge concern of mine, despite the discussion that seems to have happened in the meeting notes and as presented in written subcommittee member comments. Yes, there are impacts to be considered from both using gravel from the project area and from bringing gravel in, but since this trail and associated clearing/construction/access will *forever* be in our community, the impacts to our community should certainly receive a privileged place in your decision making. This is not to say that I am personally unconcerned about impacts outside our community, but I do value our intact, existing forest at a higher level than an existing gravel pit, for example. Since arguments seem to have been made for arguments sake - here are some more for your consideration:

- It is clearly and obviously less damaging to the forest to import gravel.
- Gravel pits already exist. They are damaging to the environment, yes. But I highly doubt that a new gravel source will be created solely for this trail project - so an existing gravel pit is the most likely source. More ecological damage will be caused by taking gravel from our forest than by using an existing gravel source. The 5k is a good example of this.
- Fossil fuel use: If someone has calculated how much gas will be needed to bring in gravel for this project, please let me know. I am personally willing to forego multiple trips to Anchorage or elsewhere in order to offset the fuel that would be required to import gravel for this project. Also, don't forget about the fuel that is needed to cut down more trees outside 14' to get to on-site gravel. And to cut them up, and to haul them away. Or perhaps this argument is more about climate? The subcommittee seems not to have taken into consideration the long term carbon sequestration of the trees that will be cut for the trail, the trail clearing, and any gravel extraction outside the trail clearing. This is significant.
- I trust that the requirement for more gravel, if imported, and a deeper trail bed, are accurate. Again - this goes to where we would rather see impacts. If this subcommittee *truly* would rather see more and worse impacts to the forest in our community, than to have an existing gravel pit slightly expanded, that is seriously concerning to me. I would rather see the offsite existing gravel pit expanded.
- Invasive species concerns. Like many of the others listed here, this is just a red herring. The amount of gravel that is trucked into this community every year just for house construction is huge. This is already happening, so I expect that this subcommittee should be speaking elsewhere on the dangers of this.
- Also, don't forget jobs. Importing gravel will at least in some part sustain existing jobs or give more business to local companies.

- The expense of imported gravel should not be a consideration of this subcommittee. The expense of this project is the problem of the project proposer. People propose projects all the time, then determine that they are too expensive and either abandon them, or find additional funding.

I would like clarification about whether the subcommittee plans to take your expanded clearing widths back to the GTC and the other public bodies that have previously reviewed something different? You are currently planning to exceed the targeted maximum clearing width of 14' for a significant portion of the length of the trail. The minutes from the last meeting state:

“Subcommittee committed to not widening trail, but allow techniques that have minimal impact in order to build trail with the least amount of imported gravel necessary. Add to Trail Spec (currently item F): “There may be areas where adequate gravel is not available beneath the targeted clearing limit/trail corridor. In such situations, gravel may be obtained in a manner that shall minimize forest disturbance. These areas must be approved by the Project Manager, with oversight provisions as dictated in the (future) planning document.”

This statement is contradictory. “Trail” includes both the trail bed and the trail clearing width. You say that you won’t widen the trail, but you approve of the trail being widened to get gravel? This doesn’t make sense and should be clarified. Also, you appear to have removed the word ‘maximum’ from this language. Fourteen feet is the MAXIMUM TARGETED, not TARGETED, clearing limit, according to the GTC resolution. Why was this language not used? What is the “future” planning document? When will this be created? By whom?

This subcommittee received no guidance regarding the cost of various construction methods or access options. This subcommittee should be focusing on what will make the best trail for this community - and if that means a more expensive option for something, that is what the subcommittee should recommend. Then it will be up to the GNSC to decide if they can afford it.

This subcommittee had the opportunity to design a trail that met the desires of the nordic ski community, and which addressed (at least to some degree) the concerns of those who don't want this trail or who wanted a much smaller, lower impact trail. You had the ability to do that, but instead you have decided to do the opposite. You have unnecessarily decided to stay at the maximum allowed widths without having any substantive discussion of a narrower trail bed and clearing width, you are allowing visual impacts to Stumpy's trail, you are allowing two wetlands-impacting access routes, you are intentionally using sensitive environmental features for skiing thrills, you are allowing more trail than is reasonable into this area, and are not taking a stand against gravel extraction, which necessarily requires additional forest disturbance and additional clearing along a significant portion of the trail.

Thank you -



Julie Raymond-Yakoubian

Girdwood Multi-Use Trail Subcommittee Agenda August 10, 2018, 6-8 p.m. Girdwood Community Room

Agenda Revisions and Approval

August 10, 2018 Agenda Approval

Public Comment:

Public Comment is limited to 3 minutes per person with a maximum of 12 minutes of public comment total.

Review Subcommittee Goal:

Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail by August, 2018.

Review Main Ideas from Last Meeting:

1. Subcommittee discussed and responded to public comments.
2. Discussed access route. Some subcommittee members would prefer primary access from Arlberg, some want to keep both Arlberg and church as main access points. Without a clear consensus, it is suggested the subcommittee leaves the wording as it is in the June 2017 motion, and to forward to GTC and GBOS all of the information and comments we have offered.
3. Reviewed trail alignment on map. Subcommittee makes minor adjustments to alignment on map, to move around some of the wetter areas and noting the desire to not impact viewshed from Stumpy's and not to have trail intersect as much (in order to not be able to see others on trail as much). It is now about 4k in length, with several loops eliminated, including the NE dogleg that was requested by Brendan R-Y to be eliminated.
4. Discussed gravel source. General consensus is that it should come from site as much as possible.
5. Julie shared a revised draft of what we will need to gather to present to Trails committee in August that included some wording on how the GNSC can work with the public (GTC) throughout the entire construction process.

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Complete TMO form. 1 ½ Trail Specifications
2. Discuss #5 from the June 2017 resolution: "GTC has ongoing input on trail design and construction, with specific review and approval once the centerline is set."
3. Discuss how we will present this to the Trails Committee in August (August 14th). Will need to give history of resolutions, summary of subcommittee discussions, review of trail specification document and TMO and how these documents will be used in planning & construction. Refer to Julie Jonas' draft from last meeting. Review Kate Sandberg's comments from previous meeting.

Review Action Items

Set Next Meeting Date

Do we need to schedule an additional special meeting prior to August 14th Trails Committee meeting?

9 August 2018
Brenden and Julie Raymond-Yakoubian
“Forest Loop” Subcommittee Public Comments

Subcommittee,

We request you not finish your work as a Subcommittee at this meeting. It would be wise for the public to have an opportunity to fully review the final version of this Subcommittee's products and information (e.g. TMO, construction plan document, correspondence related to private meetings, etc.) and be able to inquire directly about that to the Subcommittee itself, before this moves to another and larger body (e.g. Trails Committee).

We would also like to address some problematic comments which were raised at the Subcommittee during recent meetings.

First: an idea was forwarded that the forest is, as it is, inherently exclusionary. This is not a reasonable argument and we hope not one that is informing deliberations here. No one is currently prevented from going into this part of the forest. Some people may be more or less capable of getting in there, but that is true of literally anywhere, regardless of a place's level of development. This argument strangely ignores the fact that there is actually a flat, easy to walk trail already in this area – Stumpy's. This type of argumentation is also the sort of language that has a long history of use in this country to justify and excuse widespread destruction of wilderness and the paving-over of as many natural places as possible. The argument is, however, a fallacy. Nature, as it is, is not inherently exclusive. The argument also runs contrary to known realities in Girdwood and elsewhere. Just look at two recent trail projects in Girdwood – the 5K and the new mountain bike trails slated to be built soon. Both of those trails actually created exclusions in the forest that did not exist before: non-skiers in the winter on the 5K, and non-bikers on the mountain bike trails. Or, for a famous example outside Girdwood, consider Deadhorse and Prudhoe Bay on the one hand – an environmental disaster of a place, lots of 'roads', and connected to the rest of the state by one of our few highways – but take a look at the conditions of access if you aren't working in the oil industry. Then, on the other hand, look to the east, the Arctic Refuge – designated and *de facto* wilderness, beautiful, accessed all the time by Alaska Native people for subsistence, and visited by many every year from around the world for adventures. So much for the wilds being exclusionary and trailed/roaded areas being inclusive. Examples abound from around Alaska and the world disproving this myth.

Comments like the one we just addressed also beg the question of values. It was stated at a recent Subcommittee meeting, in an almost derogatory way, that (just) 50 people use that “Forest Loop” area. Even if this were true – and it is assuredly an understatement – well, what about the values for, and of, those 50 people? Do they not count? Does their regular use of that area, sometimes for decades, not count? What about their ability to recreate in areas they enjoy and value? Why is it acceptable to unnecessarily diminish that? In land, recreation, and community management and planning, a fundamental goal is to ensure a balance of uses and recreational types. As we've said before, one thing we always thought was great about Girdwood was that our community was lucky in that it had the opportunity to have it all – from undeveloped to highly developed lands all close to the community. There are huge amounts of recreation opportunities of all kinds and various levels of development in Girdwood – including trails. But there are only one or two areas left that are undeveloped or 'wild' near the community, and don't involve a person having to walk up a mountainside to get to them – and the

proposed-“Forest Loop” area is one of them. That's an imbalance, that's devaluing certain peoples' experiences and what they need for their well-being, and that's screwing up our legacy as a community.

We have three other points to make in this letter, which we will enumerate below.

Point 1: The current plan you are discussing violates the Trails resolution in both letter and spirit, and no wordsmithing will get around that. If you are committed to honoring the public will, you need to either change this plan or take your plan back through every public body all over again for full reconsideration.

The current plans that allow the trail to be blown out to 20 feet for on-site gravel usage absolutely violate the targeted max 14 foot clearing width language in the resolution. This will occur regularly along the length of the trail. It was the expressed will of the public that this trail not exceed that width. Width was one of the top concerns of the public.

This is now a different plan than that which was approved, and as such should go through all of the public bodies again – e.g. Trails, Land Use, GBOS, and HLB – for full reconsideration – as it violates the foundational Trails resolution. It would be a betrayal of the public trust not to. The fact that the Subcommittee appears to have been engaged in wordsmithing and massaging of the language seemingly to get around this is very disappointing.

If this current proposal goes through, here is what will probably happen. Within a matter of a few years of completion, it is very likely that the Club will be operating the big groomer on this trail, despite the fact that it is supposed to be physically impossible for a 10' bed/14' clearing width trail. Why? Because the trail will end up having a 20 foot clearing for its entire length. How? Here is what the Club will likely do – and what your current plan now allows them to do, unless you fix it: Whenever the clearing is hitting the 14 foot clearing limit, they will simply 'time' their gravel extraction to magically coincide at those areas, and clear the trees and blow the width from 14' out to 20' in those places. Then in other areas, they will align the trail where the forest is naturally more cleared than 14 feet – including by using kettle features which are high-value environmentally but are often low-density in terms of trees. And for any remaining areas, we wouldn't be surprised if those trees are just removed as 'problem trees' that supposedly posed some sort of hazard. Make no mistake, this is now a 10' trailbed / 20' clearing proposal – almost 50 percent wider than the maximum that the public would tolerate for the clearing.

All of that is unnecessary and could have been completely avoided. Here are several ways:

One way: You could have recommended a small 2-3 foot nature trail with a 4-5 foot clearing through this area which entirely avoided the kettles, had signage telling the public about the features of the forest and the history of Stumpy's and so on. That could be done without cutting practically any trees. We describe this in more detail further below. Such a trail would be allowable under the Trails resolution. It would follow the Trails Plan. And it would serve literally everyone except skate skiers – in other words, it would serve the majority of the community, by far – and it would do a lot more to respect those who are concerned with the wild integrity of this forest.

Or, you could have even stuck to your current trail plan (which we feel is overblown and damaging) but insisted on the use of off-site gravel. With off-site gravel, there would be no need for exceeding the 14

foot clearing width. We'd then also actually, finally, see this Subcommittee learn from at least one lesson of the past – the damage of on-site gravel sourcing. This insistence could – and should – have at least been done indirectly through not crafting a plan which entailed on-site gravel usage, such as the one you are currently endorsing which involves expanding the trail to 20 feet regularly for gravel sourcing.

Instead of ideas like those outlined above, which are assuredly improvements compared to the current plan, this Subcommittee went for, and beyond, the max widths, and in so doing has gone against the will of the public.

It's also been troubling to hear and read about the predominance of economic considerations to the Subcommittee's undertakings. Economic considerations were not part of the mandate for this Subcommittee. Yet it has been a significant consideration in the deliberations – moreso in fact than taking concrete steps to minimize environmental impacts.

Again, we ask, think about all this. We think this Subcommittee can do better.

Point 2: A 10 foot trailbed with a 14 or 20 foot clearing is simply not appropriately-sized for this particular area.

We think you really should go out there to the forest and think about this issue specifically (e.g. bring a measuring tape, flag out widths, etc.). This problem can actually even be seen on a map. This patch of forest is small. There are places where a 10 foot trailbed and 14 to 20 foot clearing would be appropriate – but this is not one of them. It is completely outsized for this area, and will not look like a trail, but rather a road. The name “Forest Loop” will be reduced to pure irony.

Added to that, you will have areas where you can see multiple segments – other parts of the trail – from where you are standing. This has been brought up before, and it appeared the Subcommittee recognized it as a problem, but just sort of threw up its hands about what to do. In some cases now, there will be 4 or 5 segments in a row in various places. From those areas, it will look more like 60 or more feet are cleared (in fact, up to even 100 feet given the current plans), not just the 10-20 feet you are standing on. It will not look like the forest anymore; it will unquestionably destroy the character of this area, and will not be in keeping with the aesthetic of Girdwood.

To say, "Yeah, but it was originally a 20 foot trailbed proposal" or "Yeah, but the Club took out 16 percent of the trail length" or "Yeah, but there used to be 8 segments in a line and now there's just 5" does not really make it better. Put another way: So what if earlier ideas were very, very bad? Now it's just plain-old very bad.

The community will be very displeased by the result when this is all said and done, if you continue down the current path. It will look like nothing but trail-trail-trail and clearing-clearing-clearing in there, with so many less trees. The Club may end up being thought of as a group that, with every trail project, can do nothing but damage the forested character of our community time and time again. That is not good for anyone, including the Club.

We see now a plan that is at and even beyond the maximum widths the public wanted, and not right-sized for the forest, which isn't a result that seems creative or wise. In other words, you didn't do what

the public tasked or hoped for. Remember, you have nearly full rein here. You have a Resolution which allows you to, for example, go down to 2-3 foot trailbed and still achieve the same goals. Don't think you are powerless. Be creative. Be responsible to this area of the valley's forest. Be respectful of all the people who use it. Don't feel like a bad proposal has to go through because you are 8 meetings and 20+ months in. The public process takes time, sometimes a lot of time. Sometimes you learn new things or make new realizations. Also, don't assume that a certain number of votes at a public meeting mean you have to build a bad trail – most of those voters likely didn't have the requisite familiarity with this part of the forest – like width of the area, density of trees, geographical features, etc. – to figure out design details, they just had what it took to cast a vote for or against a trail at all. You have the call on design. Do what is right – and this current design and plan is absolutely not right.

As a side note – it's strange that, with all the side meetings and communications that have happened, not once did the Subcommittee think to go out to the forest as a group, for a public meeting, with people who are truly intimately familiar with this part of the forest. Yes, a private entity was – wrongly – allowed to prohibit from serving on the Subcommittee, a public body, several of the community's most knowledgeable experts on this area, people with decades of experience hiking and skiing in it. But that doesn't mean you couldn't have used their expertise on-the-ground in public open meetings out there where you could interact with them as members of the public. Some of these people, despite strong opposition to a trail at all here, have (seemingly pointlessly) devoted countless hours and pages of ideas to helping you design a better trail. That was a waste of an opportunity on your part to not engage those decades of experience on the ground.

Point 3: Your current plan is not in accord with important guidance in the Girdwood Trails Management Plan.

We are particularly sensitive to this issue as members of both the Girdwood Area Plan update committee and the Trails Management Plan update committee, having seen in our review of these documents how the guidance and mandates in them have failed to have been followed in a number of cases over the years in Girdwood.

The Trails Plan is very explicit in the Sustainable Trails Framework that a guiding principle in developing sustainable trails is minimizing environmental impacts and minimizing resource degradation (stated in several places), and involves trails that conform to their “terrain and environment.”

We have detailed previously in public comment a number of the ways this trail proposal currently exceeds minimal necessary impacts and does not conform to this part of the forest, and will not rehash all of that here. We want to focus here on just one of those issues – trail width. There were specific requirements for this trail which were laid out in public process and testimony. The purpose of the trail was for it to be a multi-use four-season trail. The width was only set by the grooming issue, not to accommodate any type of skiing e.g. skate skiing (reference: April Trails minutes). That latter issue has now changed because of the revelations about the big groomer's size, and thus the change is that this consideration regarding grooming is no longer pertinent. Thus we are just left with this: a multi-use four-season trail as the “intended use” for the trail, and with nothing official dictating the width other than 10 feet bed and 14 foot clearing as being set as maximums. To achieve a multi-use four-season trail, we unquestionably do not need to even go as far as those maximums of 10 foot trailbed and 14 feet of clearing. We do not need to go through project area wetlands, we do not need to go

through kettles, we do not need to pile up the visual effect of numerous large trail segments in a line with each other, and we do not need to damage the Stumpy's viewshed.

A 2-3 foot 'nature trail' with a 4-5 foot total clearing which snaked through the area, and even had educational signage about the forest, the history of Stumpy's, and so on, would meet those requirements, and even add the multi-use component of education. It could be done without felling almost any trees. The only user it would not accommodate is skate skiers, but as noted above, the public was told explicitly by the Club at a recent key public meeting that this trail is not to be designed to serve any particular kind of skiing, including skate skiing. Also, skate skiers are a small segment of the trail-using population, so this narrower trail would unquestionably still serve the majority of the community, even moreso given that it would respect the desires of small-trail advocates and give at least some consideration to those who are concerned with the integrity of this now wild forest. The point is: such a nature trail is a trail that actually accomplishes the stated purpose, the "intended use" of the trail, and also serves a broader audience, and is more in-tune with the goals of minimizing environmental impacts and fitting in with the character of that forest in particular and Girdwood in general. Going bigger than that is adding unnecessary environmental impacts as well as social ones (i.e. on users whose well-being and recreation is connected to such areas).

However, so far, going beyond the minimum necessary environmental impacts is the route the Subcommittee is going with its current plan. But it is not too late to change that. Do not go against that important guidance in the Trails Plan, our guiding structure for how trails are to be built. Do not disrespect those people who put so much time into thinking through that plan, or the other user groups who are totally disenfranchised by this current proposal – especially when you can serve them too while also following the Trails Resolution, fulfilling the "intended use" for the trail, and following the key environmental mandate of the Trails Plan.

And, please, do not simply say that this bad idea is what the public wanted. The public votes for this trail were for you to find the best fit for design, alignment, and construction in this part of the forest with the constraints and rules provided by the parameters of the Trails resolution, the need for proper public process, and any other pertinent rules (e.g. the Trails Management Plan). The ship has sailed on doing the public process right, but the other goals don't have to be given up on. A nature trail as we have described above would be much better towards meeting those requirements, and serves the majority of the community; your current plan does not accomplish those goals.

Please, do better. We think you can.

Sincerely,
Brenden and Julie Raymond-Yakoubian

Trail Subcommittee Meeting Aug. 10, 2018 – Notes

Attending: Eryn Boone(EB), Paul Crews(PC), Julie Jonas(JJ), Ron Tenny, Deb Essex(DE), Jim Braham(JB), Justin Thomas (JT) for Peter Zug (PZ)

Public: Julie Raymond-Yacoubian (R-Y), Kate Sandberg, Steve Halverson

Note: Review these notes in conjunction with 1) Agenda for 7/10/2018 meeting. ALSO NOTE from JJ: these meetings are not taped and these notes and all previous meeting notes are not claimed to be "official minutes."

Agenda Revisions and Approval

Aug. 10, 2018 Agenda Approved with additional item 1 ½: Trail Specifications additional edits/

Public Comment:

Julie R-Y referred us to hers and Brendan R-Y's comments sent the day prior via email. They are disappointed and feel the subcommittee could have made more progress regarding plans for a less damaging trail that didn't violate the Trails resolution. This trail will have lasting scars. PC responded that he takes some things personally, but appreciates the well thought out comments and we as a subcommittee have modified the proposal to mitigate concerns; commenters' desires have been accepted and discussed. His mom taught him, "Live in the now but think of the future." RT believes the sticking points have been the 20' vs. 14' wide trail – subcommittee decides we will come back to that later (see item 1 ½ b.).

Review Subcommittee Goal:

Develop a document that will guide the final routing, planning and construction of the Forest Loop Multiuse Trail by August, 2018.

Review Main Ideas from Last Meeting:

EB reviewed/read items listed on the 8/10/2018 agenda.

Discussion Focus (as much as time allows):

1. Complete TMO form.
 - a. See draft and final versions of TMO that Eryn completed.
- 1 ½. Trail Specifications.
 - a. See completed and final draft of "Forest Park Loop Trail Specifications."
 - b. Discussion revolved around item C (rocks) and item E (gravel source). Also all subcommittee members agreed we are sticking to the 10'/14' trail / clearing limit. Julie R-Y noted that financial consideration is not the purview of this subcommittee (subcommittee did consider financial issues); Kate Sandberg reiterated that GNSC must look imported gravel if the contractor cannot find gravel right under the flagged trail - what will GNSC do? JJ will finish wordsmithing the intent of the subcommittee regarding gravel in item E and send it to PC for inclusion in final edit of Trail

- Specifications. RT reiterates that he believes if GNSC will build a smaller/narrower trail from the church, they would have to find less gravel.
- c. Subcommittee looked at the latest iteration of the alignment on the map handed out by Deb. This map with the red lines was drawn in conjunction with Bill Spencer. Okayed by subcommittee, with acknowledgement that final alignment will be determined in the field WITH OVERSIGHT by Project Manager and a third party overseer designated by HLB and/or a GTC representative.
 - d. Subcommittee recommends referring to this proposed trail as the "Forest Park Loop", in order to ease dedication of this area as a park in the future.
2. Discuss #5 from the June 2017 resolution: "GTC has ongoing input on trail design and construction, with specific review and approval once the centerline is set."
 - a. Subcommittee recommends to the GTC to move forward with the information produced by the subcommittee; the Goals and Objectives, the Trail Specifications, the Alignment on the map dated 8/10/2018, and the Agreement on the Subcommittee Report to the Trails Committee as edited on 8/10/2018. JJ captured the edits and will revise this report summary by Monday, Aug. 13, 2018 in order for Margaret Tyler to copy and/or upload to GBOS web page.
 3. Discuss how we will present this to the Trails Committee in August (August 14th). Will need to give history of resolutions, summary of subcommittee discussions, review of trail specification document and TMO and how these documents will be used in planning & construction. Refer to Julie Jonas' draft from last meeting. Review Kate Sandberg's comments from previous meeting.
 - a. Subcommittee asked Eryn to present the subcommittee's findings to the Girdwood Trails Committee on August 14, 2018.

Review Action Items

EB: Make a clean and final copy of the TMO and send to JJ for inclusion in the Subcommittee Report packet.

JJ: Wordsmith intent for gravel sourcing for item E in Trails Specifications and send to PC.

PC: Make a clean and final copy of the Trails Specifications and send to JJ for inclusion in the Subcommittee Report packet.

JJ: Compile all Subcommittee Agendas, Meeting Notes, Public Comments, Proposed Trail motions and Resolution(s), Handouts, etc. in to the Subcommittee Report Packet and submit to Margaret on Aug. 13, 2018 in order to make copies and/or upload to web.

EB: Prepare presentation for Aug. 14, 2018 Trails Committee Meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:10 pm and Subcommittee was "disbanded"!