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Wisconsin’s Wild Goose State Trail was the 20,000th addition to the RTP Database. Since 1993, this trail has received five RTP grants. With the community’s support, 100 percent matching funds were raised, and 34 miles of multi-use trail were built to join Dodge and Fond du Lac Counties. Photo by Nathan Smith.
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NOTICE
This document is based on work supported by the Federal Highway Administration under contract number DTFH61-12-C-00029 with KMS Enterprises, Inc. This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of information contained in this document.

The U.S. Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers’ names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the objective of this document.

The contents of this report reflect the views of the authors, who are responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

COVER PHOTOS:

Clockwise from upper left:
- San Gabriel River Trail Georgetown, Texas; photo by Stuart Macdonald
- Black Hills Snowmobile Trail System, South Dakota; photo by Chad Coppess, South Dakota Department of Tourism
- Willamette River Water Trail, Oregon; photo from Willamette Riverkeeper
- Iron Range OHV Recreation Area, Minnesota; photo from Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
The purpose of the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) Annual Report is to provide information about the program and the projects funded in Federal fiscal year (FY) 2014. This report serves as a useful guide to the RTP for trail managers and the public. It highlights program funding and administration, the RTP Database, and how States use funds for trail projects. It illustrates eligible project types along with award-winning examples from across the country. It documents the many benefits of the program and national trends and issues affecting trails.

Program Summary
The RTP is a Federal-aid assistance program of the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to help the States provide and maintain recreational trails for both motorized and nonmotorized trail use. Since 1993, the RTP has apportioned over $1 billion in Federal funding to the States for local project funding. The RTP has been responsible for creating and improving over 20,370 trail-related projects nationwide, including urban greenways and horse, hiking, mountain bike, and motorized trails, as well as snow and water routes.

Funding and Administration
The RTP applies the “user-pay/user-benefit” philosophy of the Federal Highway Trust Fund. Trail users pay the Federal motor fuel excise tax for fuel used for nonhighway recreational trail use, and receive the benefit of the RTP through funds provided to the States for trail projects. This program implementation is consistent in practice with other expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund.

Use of Recreational Trails Program Funds
States may use RTP funds for a variety of project types and expenditures which fall under eight categories of Permissible Uses. The RTP legislation identifies these general Permissible Use categories:
• Trail maintenance and restoration
• Trailside and trailhead facilities
• Equipment for construction and maintenance
• Construction of new recreational trails
• Acquisition of trail corridors
• Assessment of trail conditions
• Safety and environmental education
• Administration

RTP Database
The goal of the RTP Database project is to provide a central repository for RTP project data that is usable by the FHWA, Congress, the States, policy makers, RTP administrators, project managers, and the general public. The Database includes over 20,370 projects that have received over $1 billion in funding. These projects have been matched with $733 million. Access the Database at www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org.

As of 2014, the Database has been developed so that data can be searched by State, County, Congressional District, Trail Name, Project Name, Permissible Use Category, and Year Awarded. Reports can be printed from the search results. In addition to the fields that can be searched, users can view a record of the project for more information.

National Trends and Benefits
A review of the RTP Database shows the diversity of local impacts of RTP funding. Like other Highway Trust Fund programs, the RTP provides benefits to virtually every county in the United States. Projects using RTP funds illustrate a variety of trends with trails on public lands and in communities across America. Some key national trends are identified along with benefits and issues of national significance affecting trail use and development.
• Economic Stimulus
• Ladders of Opportunity
• Sustainability
• Youth Service and Conservation Corps
• Accessibility
• Multiple-Use Management
• Safety and Environmental Education
• Climate Change
• Repair and Rehabilitation
• Habitat conservation
• Safe and Livable Communities
• Active Transportation
The RTP is a Federal-aid assistance program of the FHWA with funds provided to each State to provide and maintain recreational trails and related facilities and activities.

Each State:
• Receives funds apportioned by statutory formula.
• Administers its own program, usually through a State resource or park agency.
• Develops its own procedures to solicit and select projects for funding.
• Establishes a State Recreational Trail Advisory Committee (representing both motorized and nonmotorized recreational trail users) to assist with the program.

States are required to use 40 percent of their RTP funds for diverse recreational trail use, 30 percent for motorized recreation, and 30 percent for nonmotorized recreation. (The 40-30-30 calculation takes place after accounting for State administrative costs. A small State exclusion exempts Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, and Rhode Island from 30 percent motorized and nonmotorized requirements.)

The specifics of how to apply this formula to project selection is up to the States, and varies considerably around the country. States with large Federal land ownership sometimes fund backcountry projects with both motorized and nonmotorized use to achieve diversity. Others may fund projects with adjacent paved and unpaved trail surfaces for diverse nonmotorized activities, or trails with winter snowmobiling and summer all-terrain vehicle (ATV) use.

The Federal funds will provide up to 80 percent of the project cost and require project sponsors to provide the remaining amount in matching resources (generally at least 20 percent). In many cases, the actual match from the project partners is 50 percent or more.

An ongoing goal of State administration is efficient use of RTP funds. This includes streamlining required reviews, clarifying financial accountability, improving project selection, and reducing project implementation costs for sponsors.

Managed Uses

Managed Uses include a wide variety of both motorized and nonmotorized trail activities that are appropriate to recreational trails. The RTP legislation defines the term “recreational trail” as “a thoroughfare or track across land or snow, used for recreational purposes,” and includes the following activities:
A. Pedestrian activities, including wheelchair use;
B. Skating or skateboarding;
C. Equestrian activities, including carriage driving;
D. Nonmotorized snow trail activities, including skiing;
E. Bicycling or use of other human powered vehicles;
F. Aquatic or water activities; and
G. Motorized vehicular activities, including all terrain vehicle riding, motorcycling, snowmobiling, use of off-road light trucks, or use of other off road motorized vehicles.
This table shows RTP funding authorized by Congress for use by States each year of the program. Beginning under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), the States return one percent annually to FHWA for program administration: up to $841,600.

The funds were allocations in 1993, 1996, and 1997, but the funds were apportionments for 1998-2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocations (All States)</th>
<th>RTP Funding</th>
<th>Obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993 Allocation</td>
<td>$7,275,000</td>
<td>$5,696,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 Allocation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,581,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 Allocation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 Allocation</td>
<td>$14,688,000</td>
<td>$11,595,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Allocation</td>
<td>$14,688,000</td>
<td>$16,256,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Apportioned</td>
<td>$29,550,000</td>
<td>$14,691,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 Apportioned</td>
<td>$39,400,000</td>
<td>$33,750,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Apportioned</td>
<td>$49,250,000</td>
<td>$44,161,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Apportioned</td>
<td>$49,250,000</td>
<td>$44,826,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Apportioned</td>
<td>$49,250,000</td>
<td>$47,586,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Apportioned</td>
<td>$48,929,875</td>
<td>$44,915,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Apportioned</td>
<td>$57,656,952</td>
<td>$43,957,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Apportioned</td>
<td>$59,160,000</td>
<td>$43,459,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Apportioned</td>
<td>$68,468,400</td>
<td>$57,983,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Apportioned</td>
<td>$74,160,000</td>
<td>$65,913,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Apportioned</td>
<td>$79,160,000</td>
<td>$62,787,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Apportioned</td>
<td>$84,160,000</td>
<td>$81,113,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Apportioned</td>
<td>$84,160,000</td>
<td>$52,908,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Apportioned</td>
<td>$96,570,196</td>
<td>$88,649,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Apportioned</td>
<td>$78,569,033</td>
<td>$68,360,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 Apportioned</td>
<td>$79,212,744</td>
<td>$65,371,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Apportioned</td>
<td>$80,741,889</td>
<td>$64,842,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-2014 Totals</td>
<td>$1,144,300,089</td>
<td>$945,716,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-2014 Obligation Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- NOTES ---

Table 1 (Page 5) and Table 3 (Page 7)
The difference in the totals in Table 1 and Table 3 is due to the different “sources” providing the information (see the notes below) and the manner in which a State obligates its funding (e.g., some States obligate funds every other year). Additionally, the RTP database does not currently have complete data for all States; data collection and validation for the RTP database is an on-going effort. Data will be regularly entered into the database as it is received from the States and the District of Columbia.

The obligation rate represents the percentage of funds committed to projects compared to the funds available. The obligation rate for the overall Federal-aid highway program averages about 95 percent over time. The obligation rate for the RTP has trended in the 80 to 85 percent range. There are many reasons why the RTP has a lower obligation rate. The obligation authority for the Federal-aid highway program is lower than the apportionments, so some States give priority to other Federal-aid highway programs. Some States select projects on two-year cycles (even-numbered years tend to have lower obligation rates). Some States delay project selection and implementation when there is uncertainty about the reauthorization of the program, or take time to implement the program after each new authorization act.

Table 2 (Page 6):
FY 2012 apportionments were reduced from the $85 million authorized because of mandatory rescissions. States also must consider limitations on Federal-aid highway program obligations.

Sources
The source for the data in Tables 1 and 2 is the Federal Highway Administration’s Fiscal Management Information System (FMIS).

The source for the data in Tables 3 and 4 (Page 17) is information provided by the States for the Recreational Trails Program Database (www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org).

ONLINE RESOURCE:
For current apportionments to States and details of year by year apportionments and obligations:
http://goo.gl/hVwBI8
This table shows the number of projects per State for Federal FY 2014. It shows RTP funds apportioned to each State for the most recent year of the program. The funding is based on the amount each State received in FY 2009. In FY 2009, half of the funds were distributed equally among all States, and half were distributed in proportion to the estimated amount of off-road recreational fuel use in each State: fuel used for off-road recreation by snowmobiles, all-terrain vehicles, off-road motorcycles, and off-road light trucks. This table also shows obligations by State. Obligations are the Federal government’s legal commitment (promise) to pay or reimburse the States or other entities for the Federal share of a project’s eligible costs.

1 State has not yet provided a breakdown of the number of FY 2014 projects.
2 Florida opted out in FY 2014.
3 State did not obligate FY 2014 projects.
4 State’s FY 2014 projects are combined with an earlier or later fiscal year.

**ONLINE RESOURCE:** Recreational Trails Program Apportionments and Obligations, FY 2014 by State: [http://tinyurl.com/nvgs7vp](http://tinyurl.com/nvgs7vp)
This table shows the number of projects funded plus the amount of funding by State for Federal FY 1993-2014.

It shows the total RTP funds obligated by each State during the period. In addition the “Total Other Funding” column shows how much additional match was provided by project sponsors. Note that the matching funds are generally higher than the 20 percent minimum required by RTP. In 12 States the match is higher than the total RTP funds apportioned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1993-2014 Projects</th>
<th>Total RTP Funding</th>
<th>Total Other Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>22,982,283</td>
<td>6,888,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>13,022,490</td>
<td>4,523,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>18,413,332</td>
<td>5,249,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>13,195,212</td>
<td>5,230,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>49,958,988</td>
<td>24,702,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>13,914,143</td>
<td>23,622,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>13,357,846</td>
<td>10,466,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6,296,144</td>
<td>4,716,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7,183,185</td>
<td>1,673,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>23,743,486</td>
<td>18,541,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>21,621,840</td>
<td>21,144,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>10,622,009</td>
<td>2,702,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>19,376,861</td>
<td>17,138,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>25,846,993</td>
<td>11,596,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>18,153,821</td>
<td>5,843,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>25,449,251</td>
<td>6,403,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>15,836,380</td>
<td>9,940,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>15,522,299</td>
<td>15,535,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>19,030,061</td>
<td>16,420,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>13,992,942</td>
<td>4,957,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>17,891,064</td>
<td>7,124,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>12,398,778</td>
<td>10,046,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>38,380,501</td>
<td>26,583,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>25,472,654</td>
<td>39,326,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>19,409,852</td>
<td>6,690,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>21,702,275</td>
<td>22,444,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>17,527,882</td>
<td>14,805,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>12,631,027</td>
<td>6,618,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>13,492,158</td>
<td>8,731,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>12,649,914</td>
<td>14,979,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>16,826,488</td>
<td>40,510,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>14,124,852</td>
<td>5,958,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>30,175,698</td>
<td>12,712,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>25,641,272</td>
<td>35,972,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>13,353,657</td>
<td>3,868,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>22,419,910</td>
<td>22,035,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>21,306,712</td>
<td>12,419,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>19,270,538</td>
<td>19,958,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>30,470,082</td>
<td>19,073,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>7,077,499</td>
<td>2,900,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>14,731,795</td>
<td>5,286,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>17,411,733</td>
<td>10,287,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>19,394,996</td>
<td>5,917,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>52,998,698</td>
<td>18,833,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>21,263,395</td>
<td>22,897,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>13,068,070</td>
<td>21,962,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>19,924,288</td>
<td>8,968,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>27,990,738</td>
<td>39,238,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>12,192,422</td>
<td>3,438,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>23,191,575</td>
<td>32,229,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>18,445,504</td>
<td>13,812,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Total:**        | **20,371**         | **$1,000,355,593**| **$732,932,936**   

1 State has not yet provided a breakdown of the number of FY 2014 projects.
2 State’s Governor opted out of the RTP but obligated past funds.
3 State did not obligate FY 2014 projects.
4 State’s FY 2014 projects are combined with an earlier or later fiscal year.
The RTP Database (www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org) includes over 20,370 projects that have received over $1 billion in funding. These projects have been matched with $733 million.

The RTP Database provides a central repository for RTP project data that is usable by the FHWA, Congress, the States, RTP administrators, project managers, and the public. To promote program transparency, FHWA seeks to know how States use RTP funds in a manner that provides sufficient information to the public without undue burden on State program administrators.

In 2012, FHWA contracted with KMS Enterprises, Inc. (which subcontracted with American Trails) to develop, operate, and update a searchable RTP Database to be available on a website, and to provide annual reports on RTP funding. New data is regularly entered into the Database as it is received from the States, District of Columbia, and other sources.

Updating the RTP Database is important because there are over 1,000 new RTP projects each year. American Trails also gathers photographs for the Image Library to provide good examples of permissible uses and managed uses for trails, related facility construction, and other project types.

Database users can search by State, County, Congressional District, Trail Name, Project Name, Permissible Use Category, and Year Awarded. Reports can be printed from the search results. Database users can view a record of the project for more information. A link to a brief webinar on how to navigate and utilize the RTP Database is located on the homepage.

Access the RTP Database at: www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org

The RTP Database Image Library provides good examples of permissible uses of funds for trails, related facility construction, and other project types.
Use of Recreational Trails
Program Funds

The RTP legislation identifies eight categories of permissible uses for how States may use RTP funds. The sections below provide details and examples for each use. The categories are:

A  Trail maintenance and restoration
B  Trailside and trailhead facilities
C  Equipment for construction and maintenance
D  Construction of new recreational trails
E  Acquisition of trail corridors
F  Assessment of trail conditions
G  Education for safety and environmental protection
H  Administration

See the text of the legislation defining the categories: http://goo.gl/C5Z0y

Project Example

Abbott Motocross Park, Nebraska

Abbott Motocross Park is part of Abbott Sports Complex, a sporting venue that includes a soccer and football field complex, a collegiate competitive soccer field, indoor and outdoor tennis courts, and indoor volleyball facilities. The motocross park—which received over $255,000 in RTP funding—complements these traditional sports facilities by providing motocross facilities for athletes of all ages.

The tracks were professionally designed to provide safe and fun riding experiences, and are regularly prepped and maintained. The design also fully accommodates flooding issues associated with a nearby creek. In addition, an avoidance strategy was used to minimize impacts on existing wetlands.

2014 Coalition for Recreational Trails Award Winner
PERMISSIBLE USE

Trail maintenance and restoration

Category A: Maintenance and restoration of existing trails: trail maintenance, restoration, rehabilitation, or relocation. This category may include maintenance and restoration of trail bridges, or provide appropriate signage along a trail.

Project Example

Whistle Stop Multi-Use Rail Trail, Maine

The photos above show before and after pictures of the redecking project on the East Wilton trestle on the 14-mile long Whistle Stop Multi-Use Rail Trail that runs from Farmington to Jay, Maine. This trestle is 350 feet long and is built on a curve. The project was completed by the Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry, Bureau of Parks and Lands, Off Road Recreational Vehicle Office, which provided the photos.

Project Example

Sawyer Trail Project - Russell Sage Wildlife Management Area, Louisiana

This 22,000-acre Wildlife Management Area is a popular destination for approximately 30,000 users annually due to its diverse wildlife populations and habitats. Users range from hunters and fishermen to sightseers, hikers, and birdwatchers. Sawyer Trail is an important trail that provides over two miles of all-terrain vehicle and utility terrain vehicle access on the northern portion of the Wildlife Management Area. Prior to department ownership of this property, this trail was an oilfield road that provided access to oil well locations within the property.
PERMISSIBLE USE

**Category B**: Development and rehabilitation of trailside and trailhead facilities and trail linkages for recreational trails. Typical eligible work includes parking areas, toilets, horse and vehicle unloading facilities, signs, and seating.

---

**Project Example**

**Falling Waters Trailhead, Franconia Notch State Park, New Hampshire**

Interpretive signs welcome visitors at the Falling Waters Trailhead in Franconia Notch State Park. The popular Franconia Ridge Loop uses the Falling Waters Trail and the Old Bridle Path Trail. Partners in RTP-funded work on the trails have included Squam Lakes Association, Student Conservation Association, Appalachian Mountain Club, and the New Hampshire Division of Parks and Recreation. Photo from New Hampshire Bureau of Trails.

---

**Project Example**

**Millersburg Historic Park and Trailhead, Michigan**

Presque Isle County and the Village of Millersburg collaborated with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to design and construct a four-season trailhead along the North Eastern State Trail. The trailhead facility provides parking, restrooms, a drinking fountain, benches, picnic tables, interpretive signs, and other amenities.

The trail extends 70 miles from Alpena to Cheboygan. It has a 10-foot wide packed crushed limestone surface and is open to all nonmotorized users year-round and snowmobiles from December 1 through March 31.

---

*2014 Coalition for Recreational Trails Award Winner*
Equipment for construction and maintenance

Category C: Purchase and lease of recreational trail construction and maintenance equipment. Examples include snow trail grooming equipment, mechanized trailbuilding equipment, vehicles for trail maintenance, and other equipment to help maintain the trail surface, drainage, adjacent vegetation, etc.

Project Example

Alaska Trails Mobile Tool Trailers

Since 2007, Alaska Trails has fielded two mobile tool trailers that are rented by trail constructors or donated for use by nonprofits and volunteer trailbuilders. The trailers, one in Fairbanks and one in Anchorage, have supported trail building by local, State, and Federal agencies, service groups, and Girl and Boy Scouts. Both trailers are equipped with over 50 different hand tools and safety equipment. Alaska Trails was awarded an RTP grant in 2013 to replace the popular tool trailers and purchase new tools and equipment to outfit them.

The trailers have been used by many youth trailbuilders including the Student Conservation Association, the Anchorage Youth Employment in Parks, and the Chugach Children’s Forest—a partnership led by Alaska Geographic and the U.S. Forest Service that provides life-changing expeditions and educational experiences for young Alaskans of all backgrounds. Photos from Alaska Trails.
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Snow trail equipment operated by Western New York Snowmobile Club; photo from NY Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation
Category D: Construction of new recreational trails. This is the largest category of expenditures in most States, and includes paved and unpaved trails, water trails, snow trails, and bridges. The needs of local communities, agencies, and trail users are reflected in the great variety of trail construction that has been accomplished. Urban trails, greenways, natural surface pathways, paddling routes, and recreational vehicle routes are all well represented in RTP funding.

Elkin & Allegheny Railroad Trail Bridge, North Carolina

The Elkin Valley Trails Association (EVTA) two-phase project will add to the existing trail and install a second bridge over the Elkin Creek on the E & A Railroad Trail, a proposed section of the Mountains-to-Sea Trail (MST) route. The project will lay the groundwork to connect 1.5 miles of existing trail to an existing trail that is a key section of the project to build a walking trail from Elkin to Stone Mountain State Park. Photo from EVTA.

San Juan River Access Trail, New Mexico

Fishing enthusiasts from all over the world come to Navajo Lake State Park to fish the waters of the San Juan River below Navajo Dam. A new all-weather trail enables both anglers and hikers to descend the steep slopes from the dam to the wetlands and San Juan River Trail below. More than 2,000 modular retaining wall blocks and 43 pre-formed concrete steps were installed by hand to improve overall safety and sustainability of the trail. Photo from New Mexico State Parks.
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**PERMISSIBLE USE**

**E**

**Acquisition of trail corridors**

Category E: Acquisition of easements and fee simple title to property for recreational trails or recreational trail corridors. This category may include acquisition of old road or railroad bridges to be converted to trail use. Acquisition of any kind of interest in property must be from a willing landowner or seller.

**Project Example**

**Encinitas Recreation Trails Acquisition, California**

This project enabled the acquisition of approximately 2.3 miles of the San Diego Gas & Electric’s easement that bisects the City of Encinitas, California for development of recreational trails under the City’s Recreational Trails Master Plan. Photo by Stuart Macdonald.

**F**

**Assessment of trail conditions**

Category F: Assessment of trail conditions for accessibility and maintenance, authorizes specific projects to assess trails to determine the level of accessibility for people who have disabilities, to develop programs to provide trail access information, and to assess trails for current or future maintenance needs.

**Project Example**

**Trail Assessments in Nevada State Parks**

The lack of accurate information about the level of access on a trail is often the greatest barrier to trail use, especially by people with disabilities. Maps and Trail Access Information signs were developed for installation in 14 Nevada State Parks and Recreation Areas. Trail assessments were performed on the trails to create the signage, which includes allowed and prohibited trail use, distances, typical grades, maximum grades, typical cross slopes, maximum cross slopes, typical and minimum tread widths, surface types, surface categories, typical and maximum firmness, typical and maximum stability, and obstructions. Photo from Beneficial Designs, Inc.
PERMISSIBLE USE

Education for safety and environmental protection

Category G: Development and dissemination of publications and operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection.

A State may use up to five percent of its apportionment each fiscal year for the operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection as those objectives relate to the use of recreational trails.

Project Example

Rutgers EcoPreserve Trails, New Jersey

Rutgers EcoPreserve, on the Livingston Campus at Rutgers University, is used as an outdoor laboratory and teaching area. Part of this project was to develop three trailhead information kiosks, along with signage and trail brochures. The project also purchased trail construction and maintenance tools and materials to restore and reroute the existing 4.5-mile informal trail system. In addition to matching funds from the University, volunteers provided 960 hours of labor for the project. Photo from Rutgers University.

Missouri State Parks Trail Book

In 2012, Missouri State Parks took on the project of creating a guide to help visitors who want to explore the nearly 1,000 miles of trails in Missouri’s State Parks and Historic Sites. An RTP grant funded the creation of “Trails of Missouri State Parks.” The 422-page, full-color book lists trails in 58 State Parks and Historic Sites.

The book is the result of a project begun in 2008 by Missouri’s State Trails Program. The goal was to create a database that would standardize trail information for consistent management, development, and maintenance of the state park trail system.

Staff members visited the parks to collect data on each trail, which was then entered in the database. The extensive field work collected and organized information, including GPS coordinates with a corresponding digital image, for the trails. Maps from the trail book are available online for visitors to print and take with them before embarking on a trail.

The database also is being used as a model to update connecting trail systems throughout the state, including those managed by cities, municipalities and other government entities. The goal of the statewide effort is to have a comprehensive system that shares information on trails available through a website in the next couple of years. Graphic from Missouri State Parks.
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Use of Recreational Trails

Project Example

Vermont State Recreational Trails Program

Strong working partnerships and careful, accountable administration are key to the success that the Vermont Department of Forests, Parks and Recreation has achieved with its RTP. The State RTP administrator serves as liaison with Federal and State officials, regional and local trail organizations, municipalities, and trail enthusiasts and interest groups.

Each year’s projects are widely solicited through public outreach, including grant workshops on interactive TV. RTP-funded projects must address key findings or desired conditions in Vermont’s Trails and Greenways Plan. Grant applications are carefully evaluated, selected, and tracked, even down to their GPS location. Trail design standards are required and documented, promoting trail construction or reconstruction being built to a high level of accessibility. Use of youth-service crews is actively encouraged and Vermont’s RTP is reviewed to ensure ease of process, compliance, and cost effectiveness.

Vermont encourages multiple-use trail development and reconstruction projects to ensure that it addresses its many trail interests effectively. The State gives extra credit in the grant application process to projects designed to minimize or resolve conflict. The Vermont Trails and Greenways Council plays a key role, providing advice and counsel on all trail-related matters, promoting public participation in trail planning, and making sure that all voices are heard within the trails community.

FHWA guidance is available at: http://goo.gl/IM1GDu
Data collection and validation for the RTP database is an ongoing effort. Data will be regularly entered into the database as it is received from the States, District of Columbia, and other sources.

### Table 4 – RTP Database Trail Project Work by Permissible Use
Federal FY 1993-FY 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Maintenance and Restoration</strong></td>
<td>11,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Restoration/Rehabilitation</td>
<td>3,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Relocation</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Grooming</td>
<td>1,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail Maintenance</td>
<td>4,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Restoration/Rehabilitation</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Relocation</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Maintenance</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Trailside and Trailhead Facilities</strong></td>
<td>9,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailhead Work</td>
<td>2,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs</td>
<td>3,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Features</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Ramps</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Trailhead and Trailside Facilities</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Equipment for Construction and Maintenance</strong></td>
<td>2,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Construction of New Recreational Trails</strong></td>
<td>7,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>5,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>1,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Acquisition of Trail Corridors</strong></td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Assessment of Trail Conditions</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Education for Safety and Environmental Protection</strong></td>
<td>2,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications (Maps and Brochures)</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Programs</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Programs</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Educational Programs</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Administration</strong></td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

----- NOTES -----  
RTP funds may be used for projects within eight permissible use categories. The table shows the number of projects funded within each category since the inception of the program. Some categories are broken down further to specify the project type.  
Many projects qualify under more than one category. Maintenance and restoration projects are the most common projects, followed by trail facilities, and new trail construction.  
The source for the date in Tables 3 (page 7) and 4 is information that the States provided for the RTP database (www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org).
National Trends and Benefits

Projects using RTP funds reflect a variety of trends with trails on public lands and in communities across America. Some key national trends are identified along with benefits and issues of national significance affecting trail use and development.

**Economic Stimulus**

Many studies note that trails and greenways promote economic activity through direct spending as well as employment. Increased property values, tourism, and recreation-related spending on equipment, bicycles, food, and lodging are just some of the ways trails positively impact community economies. One major benefit of trail tourism is that visitors spend money in rural towns and in more economically disadvantaged areas.

Communities adjacent to public lands benefit from trails on those lands. Much of the investment in maintaining and creating trail systems comes from volunteers and donations from businesses. Many towns have been successful at identifying the recreation resources, creating systems of trails, and making them more available through maps, signs, marketing, events, and tours.

According to a recent study, *Economic Impacts of River Trail Recreation in Iowa*, “The overall economic impact from river recreation along 73 Iowa river and stream segments supports more than 6,350 jobs with $824 million in sales and $130 million of personal income.”
Ladders of Opportunity

The U.S. Department of Transportation’s “Ladders of Opportunity” initiative is “dedicated to enhancing opportunity for all Americans” by investing in transportation projects that:

- Better connect communities to employment, education, and services (including for non-drivers)
- Hold promise to stimulate long-term job growth, especially in economically distressed areas

Ladders of Opportunity projects typically include Transit Oriented Development, Transit Enhancement, Complete Streets Corridor Improvements, and a variety of public transit solutions.

The Santa Fe Rail Trail (see photo on page 18) is part of the New Mexico Rail Runner Express Corridor. The multi-use paved trail provides access to commuter rail stations and bus transit and direct links to adjacent diverse neighborhoods.

The project increases availability of and access to multiple modes of transportation alternatives. It also contributes to increased transit access and reduces the need for automobile ownership for employment.

The Santa Fe Rail Trail is a true community project, built with funds from local government, State, and Federal sources, including the RTP, as well as private contributions raised by the Santa Fe Conservation Trust. The trail plays a critical role in the “Santa Fe Metropolitan Transportation Plan,” which aims to complete a city-wide network of high quality trails for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Superior Hiking Trail near Duluth, Minnesota; photo by Stuart Macdonald

The Minnesota Conservation Corps (MCC) has worked on the Superior Hiking Trail since 1992, using funds for development and maintenance. MCC projects have included construction and repair of trail tread, bridges, and boardwalks.

Sustainability

FHWA has been promoting sustainability in project development, through context-sensitive solutions, habitat restoration, ecological connectivity, and site vegetation. For trails, sustainability may mean better route planning, mitigation of impacts, using recycled materials, and reducing erosion.

To trail managers, sustainability is key to reducing expenditures on maintenance by better design of trails, and the use of appropriate materials and structures. Sustainable trails should also:

- Protect resources and the environment
- Require minimal maintenance
- Provide satisfying experiences for users
- Reduce conflict between different user groups

Youth Service and Conservation Corps

Youth Service and Conservation Corps are Federal, State, and local programs that engage youth and young adults in service and projects. Corps members receive training and mentoring, a modest stipend, and opportunities for education and career preparation.

Public agencies benefit because Corps provide cost-effective labor, and also provide training for a pool of potential employees to work in conservation and outdoor recreation. Federal transportation law allows States to sole-source contracts and cooperative agreements to qualified youth service and conservation corps for recreational trail projects.
A long-term trend has been to make communities, trails, and recreation facilities more available to all. This means improving trails for persons with disabilities, but also understanding the needs of older people, families with children, and those who are new to trail activities.

The “Final Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas” under the Architectural Barriers Act provide specifications for accessible recreational trails and other components of outdoor developed areas on Federal lands or constructed by a Federal agency. According to FHWA, “Although the guidelines do not necessarily apply to Federal-aid projects (unless on Federal land), they provide best practices that States may adopt to ensure equivalent compliance under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).”

An ongoing challenge faced by trail managers is to provide for a variety of trail users and experiences. Most trail systems can be defined as “multiple-use,” meaning that different modes of travel are allowed.

This project involved resurfacing of the entire 34 miles of the Northern Rail Trail in Merrimack County to make a four-season trail. The previous surface of railroad ballast rock made a trail that could only be used in the winter by snowmobilers and cross-country skiers, because it was so difficult to walk, ride a bike, or use wheelchairs on the rocks.

The designated travel route system was clearly signed and mapped, with 35 miles of nonmotorized trails added to the network. The trails are immensely popular with mountain bikers, trail runners, hikers, and horseback riders. Off-highway vehicle users now safely and accurately navigate the motorized road and trail system, and Sacajawea Motorsports Park.

Multiple-Use Management

The Discovery Hill Community Trails Project is a community-driven trail development project on Bureau of Land Management land near Salmon, Idaho. Discovery Hill had a long history of user-created conflicts and vandalism which were impacting important keystone wildlife species such as sage grouse.

The goals for land managers are maintaining user safety, protecting natural resources, and providing high-quality user experiences. These challenges are interrelated and cannot be effectively addressed in isolation. To address these challenges, managers can employ a wide array of physical and management options such as trail design, information and education, user involvement, and regulations and enforcement.
RTP funding has been used in every State for educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection. OHV safety training and educational materials have been the largest type of RTP expenditures for this category.

New safety issues have emerged with the popularity of boating and designated water trails. Safety is a key part of the training and resources provided by States and organizations for planning, managing, and promoting water trail facilities.

Trails and the natural areas they pass through are outdoor laboratories for schools as well as adults. For children active in natural settings, research indicates a number of benefits in better understanding of the environment as well as improvements in physical and mental health. Trail-related environmental education teaches about economic, social, and ecological interdependence while experiencing nature and the outdoors.

In “Strategic Issues Facing Transportation,” the Transportation Research Board states that “Climate change presents a fundamental challenge to engineering and planning practice given that transportation infrastructure has traditionally been planned and designed based upon historical climate data under the implicit assumption that the climate is static and the future will be like the past. Climate change challenges this assumption and suggests that transportation professionals might need to consider new kinds of risks in facility design and system operations.”

RTP funding can address concerns about climate change by building more durable trails that will withstand extreme weather events. In making efforts toward reducing greenhouse gases, new facilities and improvements to encourage bicycling and walking can reduce driving and emissions.

Trails also address climate change by preserving natural lands which absorb and store carbon dioxide. Trail and greenway corridors provide an opportunity for replanting trees as well as enhancing wetlands and other habitats. Trails often traverse former industrial areas that present opportunities for new plantings to create cooling corridors through our cities.

FHWA provides publications and tools that may help trail managers perform vulnerability assessments and address climate change resilience, see http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/climate_change/.

Our trails and parks are vulnerable to major damage, just as our communities and transportation systems are. Extreme weather events in recent years have provided more visibility of damaged trails and parks. Whether or not these events could be categorized under “Climate Change,” a significant amount of funding is being applied to weather-related repairs:

- Flooded recreation facilities
- Erosion damage and washed-out trails and culverts
- Wind-damaged buildings and campgrounds
- Blown-down trees in parks and forests

As an example, RTP funds were used to repair trails in the Estes Park, Colorado area which were damaged by major flooding. The Homer Rouse Trail provides an important connection from Estes Park to Rocky Mountain National Park, while the Lake Estes Trail is the most popular trail in the area.
National Trends and Benefits

**Habitat conservation**

Trails promote natural resource management strategies that help ensure environmental quality. The positive contributions of trails include restoring degraded stream corridors and other habitats in the process of trail building, and guiding visitors away from sensitive wildlife habitat and into more adaptable settings.

RTP funding is also commonly used for projects involving acquisition of land for protection and reroutes to avoid habitat impacts. Often the environmental mitigation work is done by volunteers and conservation corps crews.

**Safe and Livable Communities**

Trails are an important part of our transportation infrastructure. Cities, suburbs, and towns all benefit from trails and greenways that make our communities more attractive to residents as well as employers. Trails also improve the economy through tourism and civic improvement, and provide opportunities for physical activity to improve fitness and mental health.

In addition, trails help our parks and open space by reducing crime and illegal activity through regular use and high visibility of users. Modest increases in property values near trails have also been documented.

The Metropolitan Branch Trail runs eight miles from Union Station in the District of Columbia to Silver Spring, Maryland. The trail is an important transportation route providing connections to homes, work, and play as well as access to seven Metro stations. The project has received four rounds of RTP funding.

**Active Transportation**

A significant amount of RTP funding is helping build transportation networks in cities across America. The term “active transportation” refers to bicycling, walking, and other nonmotorized transportation modes. Often these trail and sidewalk networks are well integrated with public transit.

Active transportation networks can also enhance recreation, and people will use attractive and safe trails as a way to get to school, work, or shopping instead of driving. Trails can be both efficient modes of transportation as well as linear parks and habitat corridors. The ultimate benefit is in increasing physical activity to reduce the rates of obesity, diabetes, heart disease, stroke, and other chronic health conditions across the United States.
Annual Achievement Awards
for RTP-funded Projects

The Coalition for Recreational Trails (CRT), a federation of national trail-related organizations, hosts an annual achievement awards program to recognize outstanding trail projects funded by the Recreational Trails Program. The winners are recognized each year in Washington, DC during the American Recreation Coalition’s Great Outdoors Week in early June. The awards are part of the Coalition’s ongoing effort to build awareness of RTP accomplishments. Award winners are selected from projects nominated by public agencies, State administrators, organizations, or project sponsors.

### Award Categories

**Maintenance and Rehabilitation:** maintaining, repairing damage to, or upgrading the quality of a trail.

**Construction and Design:** planning and building a trail, portions of a trail, or trail-related facilities.

**Education and Communication:** enhancing trail use and enjoyment through increased environmental awareness, promotion of safety, and encouragement of trail-related outdoor recreation.

**Multiple-Use Management and Corridor Sharing:** facilitating and/or encouraging the use of a trail corridor by more than one type of trail enthusiast, particularly those enthusiasts that do not ordinarily share trails or trail-related facilities.

**Environment and Wildlife Compatibility:** enhancing the protection of wildlife and/or the general environment as part of trail development and use.

**Accessibility Enhancement:** facilitating and/or encouraging increased access to trail-related recreation opportunities for people with disabilities.

**Youth Conservation/Service Corps:** making effective use of the services and skills of qualified youth conservation or service corps to construct and/or maintain trails.

Read more about the CRT Annual Achievement Awards and see details of the projects that have been recognized since 2000: [http://goo.gl/0ts5CQ](http://goo.gl/0ts5CQ)

---

**About the Coalition for Recreational Trails**

The CRT members work together to build awareness and understanding of the RTP. The CRT formed in 1992 following the passage of the ISTEA to ensure that the National Recreational Trails Fund Act (now known as the RTP) established by that legislation received adequate funding. During the six years of ISTEA, CRT worked to ensure that program was continued and strengthened as part of the ISTEA reauthorization process.

Following the enactment of TEA-21 in 1998 and SAFETEA-LU in 2005, both of which increased RTP funding, the CRT focused its efforts on supporting the continued, effective implementation of the RTP. CRT efforts supported continuing the program under MAP-21 with a set-aside of funding up to $84.1 million for fiscal years 2013 and 2014.
Conclusions

RTP funding has been an essential ingredient in creating and improving over 20,370 trail-related projects nationwide, including urban greenways, nature centers, and horse, hiking, mountain bike, and motorized trails, as well as snow and water routes. States continue to add miles of trails as well as needed maintenance and improvements through grants to local project sponsors each year. Like other Highway Trust Fund programs, the RTP provides benefits to virtually every county in the United States.

A review of RTP-funded projects also reveals many benefits to employment, environmental education, health, resource conservation, and community development. The program has encouraged productive cooperation among agencies and jurisdictions, facilitated healthy outdoor recreation, and supported badly needed economic activity in communities as well as rural areas.

The RTP is the foundation for State trail programs across the country. Every State has established its own initiatives with a designated administrator for assistance on trail issues and coordination of trail planning.

RTP funding is highly leveraged by community and State funds, as well as contributions from organizations and businesses. Of the projects completed between 1993 and 2014, total RTP funding was over $1 billion with additional funding of $733 million, showing that RTP dollars were matched by 73 percent in other funds. Further efficiencies are seen by the use of youth conservation and service corps working in cooperation with private contractors, agency or community staff, and volunteers.

In every State, equestrians and cyclists, hikers and snowmobilers, ATV enthusiasts and paddlers have joined in support of local as well as regional efforts to meet the trail needs of all users.

In searching through the RTP Database, it is clear that the variety of projects is highly diverse. Because the funds are distributed for both motorized and nonmotorized trail work, all trail interests have incentives to cooperate and learn from each other.

Photographs of many examples of RTP-funded projects have been gathered in the Image Library which is part of the online RTP Database. Photos from all 50 States and the District of Columbia are included along with examples of permissible uses of RTP funds for trails, related facility construction, and other project types.
Abandoned coal land in Pennsylvania has been redeveloped into the Anthracite Outdoor Adventure Area (AOAA) with a motorized and nonmotorized system. It includes several acres of experimental tree plantings by the American Chestnut Foundation. Photo by AOAA Authority.
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## Resources

For more information on many topics related to RTP funding as well as technical resources on trails of all types, see the following resources.

### Recreational Trails Program

- Recreational Trails Program Database: [http://www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org](http://www.recreationaltrailsinfo.org)
- For policies and funding in every State, see the State RTP Administrators List to find program contacts and websites: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational_trails/rtpstate.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational_trails/rtpstate.cfm)
- The Coalition for Recreational Trails gives awards each year for outstanding projects funded through State RTP grants: [http://www.americantrails.org/awards/CRTawards.html](http://www.americantrails.org/awards/CRTawards.html)

### Accessible trails


### Resources for trail planning, development, and management

- For many resources on trail planning, design, construction, management, accessibility, funding, training, for both motorized and nonmotorized trails, see the National Trails Training Partnership Resources and Library: [http://www.americantrails.org/resources/trailbuilding/index.html](http://www.americantrails.org/resources/trailbuilding/index.html)
- Trail management and maintenance: [http://www.americantrails.org/resources/ManageMaintain/index.html](http://www.americantrails.org/resources/ManageMaintain/index.html)
- Trail user protection, safety, and risk management: [http://www.americantrails.org/resources/safety/index.html](http://www.americantrails.org/resources/safety/index.html)
- Trail training resources: [http://www.americantrails.org/http/default.htm](http://www.americantrails.org/http/default.htm)
- Online calendar of trail training and education opportunities: [http://www.americantrails.org/Calendar.html](http://www.americantrails.org/Calendar.html)

### Youth and Conservation Corps

- MAP-21 Section 1524 - Youth Service and Conservation Corps Questions & Answers: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/qandas/qayscc.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/qandas/qayscc.cfm)
- More about opportunities with Corps nationwide at The Corps Network: [http://www.corpsnetwork.org](http://www.corpsnetwork.org)
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