

Long Trails

Origins, Governance & Volunteer support in the USA, Canada & UK

- A report with reference to Te Araroa, NZ's Long Pathway -
Based on a Churchill Fellowship of 2000
by Geoff Chapple

Index

Preface	3
Long Trails - Beginnings	4
France -	4
America -	4
Britain -	4
New Zealand -	5
American Trails.....	5
The Appalachian Trail.....	6
1) History -	6
2) AT hiker numbers -	8
3) The Appalachian Trail Conference	8
4) Finance -	9
5) Federal and State Agencies.....	10
6) Volunteers -	10
7) The Clubs -	10
8) The AT and Te Araroa -	11
Canadian Trails.....	12
Bruce Trail	12
1) History.....	12
2) BT hiker numbers -	13
3) The Bruce Trail Association -	14
4) Finance -	14
5) State Agencies -	15
6) Volunteers -	15
7) The Clubs -	16
8) The BT and Te Araroa -	16
Trans Canada Trail.....	17
1) History -	17
2) The Trans Canada Trail Foundation -	18
3) Finance -	19
4) Federal and Provincial Agencies	20
5) Trail Councils.....	20
6) The TCT and Te Araroa	21
British Trails.....	22
Offa's Dyke	23
1) History.....	23
2) OD Hiker numbers -	24
3) The Offa's Dyke Association -	24
4) Finance -	24
5) Public agencies -	25

6) Volunteers -.....	25
Hadrian's Wall Path.....	26
1) History -	26
2) HW Hiker Use	26
3) Public Agencies.....	26
4) Volunteers –.....	28
5) Offa's Dyke, Hadrian's Wall and Te Araroa –.....	28
New Zealand Overview.....	29
1) The Walkways Act, and the NZWC -	29
2) The 1990 Walkways Act and DOC-	30
3) The Walkways Policy –.....	31
New Developments -	32
The Rise of the Volunteer –	32
The Rise of the Partner –.....	33
The NZCA and the Conservation Boards –	33
Conclusion	34

Preface

"Te Araroa - the Long Pathway - will be a leisurely exploration of New Zealand's character, the bush, but also the farmed and cultivated countryside, the coast, but also the interior mountains and rivers, a link to small towns and their people, but also the cities. It should follow the contours of history and the land, and be like nature, unquestionable."

Te Araroa Trust was incorporated in August 1994 to lay in, with whatever groups were willing, a New Zealand-long foot trail. In 1997, after consultation with local authorities, iwi and Department of Conservation conservancies, the Trust published a North Island through route. This proposed trail has since won a place in the budgets of the Wellington and Porirua City Councils, and Rodney District Council. Other councils working on extended trails inside their boundaries - Auckland, North Shore, Waitakere, Manukau City and Hamilton Cities - are effectively contributing to the proposed route. The plan includes many DOC tracks, and the Trust has put in trails of its own - Kerikeri-Waitangi, and Meremere-Rangiriri up the Waikato River. A 120 km Ahipara-Kerikeri "Ocean to Ocean" Trail is underway in the far north.

The Labour Party's Conservation Policy says it will "encourage the completion of Te Araroa - The Long Pathway"¹ but the trail is not primarily a Government enterprise. The Trust therefore seeks to encourage "pearls on a string b" - volunteer management groups along its length - and last year we applied to the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust to help finance a study of successful long trails overseas that were either volunteer led, or had a strong volunteer component. Even the volunteer-led trails often have considerable support from government agencies though, and we set out to define that too. The Churchill Trustees awarded me a year 2000 Fellowship, and I would like to thank them for the opportunity they gave me:

"To investigate voluntary participation by citizens in the financing and maintenance of long foot trails in Canada, the USA, and the United Kingdom , and also the role played by Government agencies in the protection, financing and maintenance of such trails."

Churchill Fellowships are granted for "investigative research overseas which advances the area of expertise of the Churchill Fellow, and which benefits the community as a whole." Last year I visited the Bruce Trail headquarters in Hamilton, Ontario, attended the AGM of the Trans Canada Trail Foundation in Toronto, the Appalachian Trail's Board of Managers meeting in Harpers Ferry West Virginia USA, and met with the management teams of the Offa's Dyke Path on the Welsh-English border, and the new Hadrian's Wall Path in England. Research from these encounters will be of benefit insofar as it advances a New Zealand foot trail. It is therefore applied, in comparative asides throughout this paper, to NZ trail history, to NZ trail legislation, and to Te Araroa itself, for completion of this trail is our purpose and goal.

Geoff Chapple 1/04/01

¹ Labour on Conservation, Policy Paper, October 1999, p.10

Long Trails - Beginnings

The Iceman, discovered frozen on the Otztal Mountain border of Italy and Austria in 1991 after leaving the pastures of Val Venosta 5000 years before was not, despite his back pannier, the first known hiker. He was trekking, relocating himself, like the Voortrekkers of the 1830s who headed for the Veldt to escape British rule in South Africa. The hike or tramp is different. Historically, it awaits an urban crowd that seeks recreation within the countryside.

France -

Ex-Napoleonic soldier Claude Francois Denecourt invented the hiking trail, secretly, for the Fontainebleau Forest outside of Paris where, in the years 1832-37 he marked up routes by lanternlight with a brush and a pot of blue paint, belonged to the King.² Denecourt was the first volunteer track maker, also a hiker, claims Schama. His enterprise gave a foretaste of what was to come: the salon crowds of Paris flocked to the forest with Denecourt's popular printed route maps to hand, to walk trails of 15 kilometres and more.

America -

The Americans pioneered the first truly long hikes. In the 1840s, David Henry Thoreau (1817-62) prepared the way with his woodland philosophy, and his praise of walking in forest - "sauntering." Like Thoreau, the writer and conservationist John Muir (1838-1914), believed that "in wildness is the preservation of the world." Muir became the guardian father of Yosemite Valley, guiding it to National Park status in 1890, and wrote visionary paeans to the Sierra Nevada Range on America's western seaboard. Hiking clubs on America's populous eastern seaboard scouted their wilderness too, developing long trails which culminating in Benton MacKaye's vision - a hiking trail to run south-north of the United States itself, 2,000 (3,400 km) miles from Mt Springer in Georgia, to Mt Katahdin in Maine. At its opening in 1937 the Appalachian Trail was the longest footpath in the world. It was put in by volunteers and - through to 1968 - was not dependent on any legislation nor Government agency.

Britain -

Traditional rights of way had evolved in Britain over centuries, initially as paths for the economic life of the countryside. With the rise of cities the paths became a means of rustic exploration, but no particular body had a responsibility for keeping the rights of way open, and landowners often closed traditional paths. A court challenge to such closures was complex and expensive. Those who wished to traverse the paths had to prove their case, and their only support was an old act, the Highways Act of 1835. Britain's first proposed long trail was the 412-km Pennine Way. Tom Stephenson wrote a newspaper article in 1935 entitled "Wanted : A Long Green Trail." The idea was taken up by the Ramblers' Association whose volunteers

² Pp 546-60, Landscape and Memory by Simon Schama - Alfred A. Knopf 1995

completed much of the field work for the Pennine Way route in the late 1930s, but it awaited some kind of legislative support to be set in place.

New Zealand -

New Zealand's trails, post contact, were a mix of citizen and State effort. Over six years in the 1880s, the explorers Donald Sutherland and Quinton Mackinnon cut New Zealand's most famous trail - the Milford Track. Lands and Survey (1884-1905), the New Zealand Tourist Department (1905-1955), the Tourist Hotel Corporation (1955-1980), the THC with Land and Survey's National Parks Division (1980-87), the South Pacific Hotel Corporation and the Department of Conservation (1987-1991), then DOC alone (1991-2001), have administered and maintained it since then.

It takes a city to raise a volunteer track: the gaze of desk-bound Wellingtonians onto their snow-capped northern skyline gave New Zealand its first volunteer-led trails. The Tararua Tramping Club developed the first tramping tracks and huts in the Tararua Range in the 1920s, and other Tararua tramping clubs joined the effort, establishing a tradition these clubs still honour.

The Wildlife Branch of the Department of Internal Affairs and the New Zealand Forest Service developed many of the other back-country North Island tracks. The track and hut development of the Ruahines, Kawekas and Ureweras was almost entirely a Government effort. Barry Crump's *A Good Keen Man* (AH & AW Reed, 1960) documents the era of Government deer hunters in this backcountry. The hunters killed around 150,000 deer a year, and they tracked the bush for access, and built huts. Trampers later used these same paths and huts.

In 1967 Bob Ussher, then president of the Alpine Sports Club, suggested to his APS executive the idea of a "Scenic Trail" from Cape Reinga to Bluff. The Federated Mountain Club's AGM supported the proposal, and an unpaid National Trails Committee then sketched a possible trail the length of New Zealand, based on local experience of good through routes.

In 1970 the FMC executive passed the route to the Minister of Lands, Duncan MacIntyre. MacIntyre set up a working party that included representatives from the Department of Lands and Survey, the New Zealand Forest Service, Federated Farmers, the Commission for the Environment, the Department of Maori Affairs, and the Council for Recreation and Sport. The working party framed New Zealand's first walkways legislation, the New Zealand Walkways Act 1975. The Act set up the New Zealand Walkways Commission, charged with the development and co-ordination of walkway proposals from its 12 district committees.

Bankrolled by the Lands and Survey vote, the NZWC would put in over 130 walkways. But it never did seriously address the proposal for a New Zealand-long "Scenic Trail."

American Trails

In February 1965, President Johnson called for the development and protection of a balanced system of trails within reach of the nation's metropolitan areas, as well as the wilderness.

The Secretary of the Interior then initiated a nationwide trails study and in December 1966 published "Trails for America." This led directly to the 1968 National Trails Systems Act. That Act recognised two important categories of trail - National Recreation Trails near urban areas and long, outlying, National Scenic Trails. The Appalachian and Pacific Crest trails were named by the Act as the first National Scenic Trails. An amendment of 1978 created another category - National Historic Trails.

America now has eight National Scenic Trails in various stages of completion, eight National Historic Trails, and 770 National Recreation Trails. The National Trails Systems Act recognises 56,000 kilometres of trail. Recognition under the Act means inclusion in regular reports by the Secretary of the Interior that fit the various trails into a nationwide system, and note progress on incomplete trails. It means Federal protection of the route where Scenic or Historic Trails cross Federal lands. It means also - where such trails cross non-Federal land - that the Secretary of the Interior will "encourage"³ states and local governments to enter into agreements with landowners and private groups to provide the necessary rights of way. And it provides, as an alternative, that the Secretary of the Interior or his agents, can simply buy those rights of way.

In short, America has a national programme for trails, with regular reporting of progress and goals, and deliberate dovetailing of all levels of government, and citizens, to achieve those goals. Especially the citizens. American legislation is heavily weighted towards encouraging volunteers. It all began with the Appalachian Trail.

The Appalachian Trail

1) History -

Benton MacKaye, a forester and self-trained planner with occasional Federal employment, first proposed a trail that would follow the ridges of the Appalachian Mountains. New England hiking circles, has talked of a "master trail" for years, and in the months after his suffragette wife killed herself, MacKaye's friends urged him to pursue the trail as a planning project.

In 1921, MacKaye published the proposal in the American Institute of Architects journal. The wilderness trail would run along Appalachian ridges from Georgia in the deep south, to New England. Eastern turbanites needing a break from the tensions of the industrial cities would rusticate in work and study camps along its length.

Volunteers played a dominant role from the start. The New York New Jersey Trail Conference, a hiking organisation, opened the first section of the Appalachian Trail (AT) in October 1923 in Bear Mountain State Park.

In March 1925, MacKaye founded the Appalachian Trail Conference (ATC) - a mix of public and private officials that foreshadowed the trail's later management, but it achieved little beyond disconnected route explorations. At the end of the 1920s, an aggressive young lawyer, Myron H. Avery of Maine, assumed leadership of the ATC. Avery formed more local clubs, recruited like-minded volunteers, and located most of the route himself, lengthening it still further through to Maine. By 1934, with some 100 volunteers, Avery had blazed 1,937 miles of the trail. Hikers, rather than MacKaye's planners, had taken over the trail and in August 1937, a continuous

³ NTS Act 1993: S.7 (2) e

footpath from Maine to Georgia was declared open, extended since, by increments, to its present 2,155 mile length (3,448 km).

The ATC published guidebooks and maps to open the AT to America, but much of the trail was on backroads or sustained by handshake agreements, it was at risk, and the ATC began a long-running campaign to secure protection of the footpath.

By the late 1930s, blowdowns by high winds and road development had destroyed significant parts of the AT and any volunteer effort to fix it was curtailed by World War II. Avery began rebuilding in 1945, and by 1951 the AT was again continuous. Yet it was still threatened. America's post-war boom had begun, and the backroads were becoming highways, the handshakes of through-route consent were now grasping instead at subdivision profits.

The ATC kept pressing for Federal protection of the trail project, and in 1968, the Johnson Administration passed the National Trails System Act. It established "National Scenic Trails" and the Appalachian Trail was the first of them, not only alphabetically but because then it was the only one fully realized.

The Act made the Secretary of the Interior responsible for all "Scenic Trails" and he directed the National Parks Service (NPS) to manage the AT with the US Department of Agriculture Forest Service (USDAFS) as a partner. This was distinctly a watershed - the AT moved from volunteer to Federal control, but the ATC would maintain a strong management role. The Act acknowledged its long volunteer history, and foreshadowed the future in its Short Title, a "Statement of Policy" that read, Section 2 (c):

"The Congress recognises the valuable contributions that volunteers and private non-profit trail groups have made to the development and maintenance of the Nation's trails. In recognition of these contributions, it is further the purpose of this Act to encourage and assist volunteer citizen involvement in the planning, development, maintenance, and management, where appropriate, of trails."

In expectation of a strong role, the ATC hired its first paid staff in 1968. It moved its offices from Washington to Harpers Ferry, W.Va., within walking distance of the trail, and began a membership drive. Volunteers went to work beside the NPS - a pleasing image from the 1970s shows lines of volunteers helping map the permanent route, holding up large white placards while NPS contractors photograph the whitened route from the air.

Once the AT's management agreement was in place, Congress voted \$US90 Million to buy out the trail corridor. The NPS and the USDAFS assigned to the ATC and its affiliated clubs the day-to-day responsibilities for managing the footpath, and put much of their own effort into the most complex land acquisition programme in US history.

To date they have purchased 40,000 hectares of trail corridor land. Ninety percent of some 2,500 transactions were with willing sellers, the remainder used "Eminent Domain" the US equivalent of compulsory purchase similar to the old New Zealand Public Works Act. The land purchase budget went from \$US90 to \$US170 million, and then, for a final buyout of the last 21 miles (1 percent) of the trail corridor, Congress set aside another \$US15 million.

As the land has come in, the 31 clubs that maintain the trail have expanded their role as trail blazers, maintainers, and shelter builders to become land managers. They do so in management agreements with federal government partners, or with state and local governments.

2) AT hiker numbers -

The number of hikers on the AT each year is not accurately known. The standard guess is four million, but those millions are concentrated in such popular recreational mountains as the Presidential Range in New Hampshire, the Smokies in North Carolina, or Mt Greylock in Massachusetts, and include the so-called "Reebok Hikers" who park their cars and walk 400 metres of trail.

During my visit to the ATC though, the preliminary results of a \$US110,000 AT user-survey was just out.⁴ This was the first extensive survey of trail use across all regional sections. The researchers interviewed 2,000-odd hikers in a single summer. They found 36.7% were day users (on the trail for one day only) 32.4% were backpackers and campers (out for more than a day), 15.2% were section hikers (those who hike sections with the intent of gradually compiling a complete traverse), and 15.7 % were through hikers, intent on walking the trail within one calendar year). The median time on the trail - a number adjusted to prevent the statistical distortions of the through hikers, and give a realistic average for the majority - was 3 days.

3) The Appalachian Trail Conference

The ATC has a central office at Harpers Ferry West Virginia, and three regional offices that together employ 35 people. During summer the organisation generally hires, on a casual basis, another 10-15 employees. It is controlled by a Board of Managers drawn from the 31 volunteer trail-maintaining clubs. It is a private, non-profit confederation that assigns trail sections to clubs, acts as a clearing house for trail-wide information, publishes guidebooks, provides technical assistance to clubs and allows them to speak with a united voice on issues affecting the trail. Its manual *Trail Design Construction and Maintenance*, provides a single standard for trail maintenance.

The 31 clubs are the main source of volunteers for the AT, but ATC runs its own volunteer programmes. It sends out four volunteer trail crews each year, and assigns 30 Ridgerunners who talk to the public and keep an eye on the trail.

The ATC predates the convention for brief mission statements. Insofar as it has one, it may be the AT's Board of Managers definition, 1979:

"The Appalachian Trail in its entirety shall be kept forever open, obvious, and narrowly passable for hiking. The treadway shall pass lightly over the land to provide for the least disturbance to the natural setting. The trail shall be marked and cleared to offer passage that may be both enjoyable for the reasonably prepared and in harmony with the natural environment."

In 1981, the Board of Managers added a famous few sentences:

"In practice, the trail is usually a simple footpath, purposeful in direction and concept, favouring the heights of the land, and located for minimum reliance on construction for protecting the resource. The body of the trail is provided by the lands it traverses and its soul is in the living stewardship of the volunteers and workers of the Appalachian Trail Community."

One can explore these definitions further - the "Appalachian Trail Community" for example, is a specific term, defined as "all those with an interest in or relation to the

⁴ Appalachian Trail Visitor Survey 1999. University of Vermont.

Appalachian Trail: hikers, volunteers, landowners, federal and state agency personnel, local officials, and citizens of the towns through which the trail passes".⁵

The ATC is proud of this community. Indeed, when Bob Proudman, Director of Trail Management and an ATC man for 20 years, emailed to suggest my attendance at the year 2000 Board of Managers meeting he wrote: "I think you would be interested in how our board transacts its business, and how it works with US government officials from our NPS and USDA Forest Service. I feel that the AT is a model for our nation, indeed, a model for the world." The trail in these definitions is outside of the market, inclusive, encourages self reliance, is fully appreciative of primitive values and volunteer effort, is inspirational, even mystical.

4) Finance -

The ATC's financial projections for the year 2,000 yield a more analytic picture. All the figures are projected totals at the time of my visit, and will be revised in 2001, but the percentages I have calculated will be accurate to within a few percentage points. The projected income of the ATC for the calendar year of our study - to December 31, 2000 - was \$US3.7 million. The ATC generates 77% of this money. Federal money, mainly from the NPS, but with modest state contributions, made up 23% of the budget.

Income

Membership - 30,820 regular members @ \$30 p.a. - 1720 life members	\$820,000	22%
Major donors/ direct mail campaign/ Workplace giving	\$993,000	27%
Sales - books and merchandise	\$960,000	26%
Federal & state partners (NPS total \$794,500)	\$839,500	23%
Misc	\$ 95,000	2%
	\$3,707,500	

Expenditure

ATC - salaries, travel, training, recruitment	\$1,671,000	43%
Membership - Trailway news & member services	\$ 211,000	5%
Trail management and protection	\$ 612,000	16%
Trust for AT lands	\$ 145,000	4%
Resource Development - Costs associated with direct mailing, major donors and development of donor organisations	\$ 402,000	10 %
Information and Education	\$ 48,000	1 %
Publications	\$ 573,000	15 %
Headquarters Expenses	\$ 138,000	3.5%

⁵ Comprehensive Plan, 1987 ed, p.1

Regional Office Expenses (3)	\$ 55,500	1.5%
Board of Managers Expenses	\$ 42,000	1 %
	\$3,897,500	

source: ATC Revised 2000 operating budget

5) Federal and State Agencies.

The National Park Service assigns 7 full-time staff to the trail. The USDA Forest Service has an unspecified number of people working as part of their jobs on the trail but one full-time AT Land Acquisition team leader.

The NPS and the Forest Service are - if it ever came to it - the ultimate arbiters of AT management. The so-called "Comprehensive Plan for Protection, Management and Development of the Appalachian Trail" is prepared by the NPS in consultation with the ATC, then signed off by the Director of the NPS and the USDA Forest Service Chief. It declares as its first management principle that it will preserve and strengthen the role of the volunteer, secondly that "local partnerships" between trail clubs and agencies - which might be Federal or State - will be the building blocks of trail maintenance and development. The Comprehensive Plan also states that management will be as decentralised as possible.

6) Volunteers -

The 31 clubs affiliated to the ATC have a combined membership of around 70,000. Each club has a defined section of the trail to maintain. Each runs its own volunteer programmes, that includes also land stewardship. The latest available records (calendar year 1999) showed 4,500 volunteers working a total of 180,000 hours on the trail.

Individual volunteer hours vary hugely, but the top level is reckoned to be 200 hours per year. Many volunteers - typically those who look after a particular section of trail and have done so for years - do not record their hours, and ATC officials consider the actual number of volunteer hours is around double the number recorded. NPS statistics show the volunteer hours are equivalent to 90 full-time staff or about \$3 million of labour per year. If actual volunteer hours are indeed double the officially recorded hours, then ATC volunteers form a labour pool equivalent to 180 fulltime workers - worth \$US6 million a year.

7) The Clubs -

The setup of the clubs varies, but a quick look at three of them may indicate that variety.

1.1 The New York - New Jersey Trail Conference - is the AT's biggest club with 10,000 members, and an annual budget of \$600,000. It has an office, three full-time employees, and one half-time. It is a confederation of 85 member clubs from the New York - New Jersey region, some of them environmental, some hiking. It looks after 162 miles of Appalachian Trail, from the Connecticut-New York State border in the north to the Delaware River in the south - but the conference does more than look after the AT. Its mission is "to build and maintain marked hiking trails and protect related open

space in the bi-state region." The member clubs - or combinations of them - get one delegate for every 1,000 members. These delegates manage the conference.

1.2 The Piedmont Appalachian Trail Hikers Club - one of the AT's smallest clubs, has 30 members, each paying fees of \$20 a year. It puts out a newsletter 4 times a year. Most of its volunteers live in North Carolina and drive two hours to get to their AT section, which is 9 miles long.

1.3 The Maine Appalachian Trail Club - is specifically a trail maintainers' club. It always has more per capita volunteer hours than any other club. The 700 members contribute in three distinct ways. One hundred and thirteen of the so-called "Maine maintainers" make a particular section of trail absolutely their own. Dave Field for example, who also happens to be chairman of the ATC's Board of Managers, personally looks after six miles of track. But the 266

AT miles within Maine is also divided into five districts. Each district has an overseer who organises volunteer work within that district. More free ranging yet is the Maine Trail Crew which can go in anywhere. The MATC is of interest to any New Zealand volunteer trail enterprise because Maine itself, northernmost anchor of the AT, has a climate comparable to the southern part of the South Island, and a population distribution - 15 people per sq. km that is as sparse as New Zealand's 14 people per sq. km.

8) The AT and Te Araroa -

New Zealand, in general, does not have the tradition of clubs "taking ownership" of a trail. Tramping clubs may run huts, but seldom take responsibility for a track.

Te Araroa would be about 3,000 km long - 500 km shorter than the Appalachian Trail. Insofar as its linking trails are outside existing DOC, regional authority, or local authority trails it needs a volunteer force to maintain it. If the trail has sufficient mana, volunteers might also assist maintenance on whatever DOC or regional or local government tracks are also en route.

Te Araroa Trust - concerned as a first step to get its trail accepted by DOC, regional and local authorities and iwi - has not yet properly addressed this. It did get support from the Federated Mountain Clubs AGM of June 10, 2000 which resolved: That FMC support in principle Te Araroa Trust in its adoption of a project for a walkway linking the length of New Zealand from North Cape to Sterling Point, a concept originally considered by FMC, with the reservation that it not prejudice maintenance and funding of New Zealand's existing track network and the development of other walkways of value. Some daylight is visible between this statement and tramping club "ownership" of a New Zealand-long trail, but it's a start, the clubs we have talked to are amenable, and we will be casting a wider net than the clubs alone.

A comment sticks in my mind from a chat with Virginian Bill Rogers, AT loyalist and self-styled "pulaskiteer" (the Pulaski, half axe, half mattock, is a particularly useful trail tool):

"Why I'm just a down and dirty, track digging, evil smelling, rock picker."

New Zealand, we are confident, has thousands of those.

The Federal Government took control of the AT to reinforce a massive land-purchase programme. A New Zealand trail needs no big land acquisition programme. The trail's private land crossings are minimal. It uses coastline where the route is secure. It uses DOC land where, if the Trust honours maintenance agreements, the route is secure. It uses paper roads where the route is secure. It uses rivers where DOC or regional authorities administer the banks, or where local councils have

gained continuous esplanade reserve. In the South Island, the greater part of the trail crosses the Conservation Estate, and, if the Trust engages successfully with the Crown Tenure Review process, its route east of the alps, on sheep station land, may also become secure. In short, a Federal-style \$185 million bailout at some future date is inconceivable.

The AT traverses 13 states, whose populations total 79.3 million.⁶ The major cities of New York (urban area pop. 16 million), Philadelphia (4.2 million), Baltimore (1.8 million), Washington (3.3 million), and Atlanta (2.1 million), are all within easy driving distance. This is an enormous catchment area for trail users, and volunteers. Ninety percent of New Zealand's population is within an hour's drive of some part of Te Araroa - but that population, in total, is just 3.8 million. The trail is obviously therefore a challenge, though as we will see, no bigger than that undertaken by Canada. One of the AT's chief analysts is Don Owen, an NPS Environment Specialist who has worked with the ATC since 1988, and lectures on the motivation of volunteers in the ATC.

"Fundamentally there are two things that motivate the volunteers," Owen told us. "The trail is a vision of a recreational and natural resource big enough to capture the imaginations of thousands of people. And secondly there's a belief that the abilities of a partnership between agencies and volunteer organisations can be stronger than the efforts of either working alone."

Te Araroa is such a vision, and we would hope to achieve just such a partnership.

Canadian Trails

Canada has no traditional rights of way and, prior to the pioneering Bruce Trail of the 1960s, no history of access agreements. Canada's Federal Government has no national trails programme or legislation, such as exists in the USA or Britain, to underpin trails.

Any government leadership for trails therefore rests at the provincial or local levels and the commitment to trails varies hugely amongst the provinces. The Ontario Government, for example, has neither a policy nor an act to guide trail development, though it has a long-standing non-profit society, the Ontario Trails Council, which has tried to establish policy. The New Brunswick Government does have a programme, initiated in 1994, for a trails policy using abandoned rail corridors where possible, and emphasizing partnerships with private groups. Quebec's provincial government has an eight-year-old \$88 million plan to develop a 4,000-km network of bicycle trails, in partnership with regional committees and user groups. And so on - each province is different, and long trail development within Canada is difficult.

The Bruce Trail was the pioneer in this difficult environment, and then, in 1994, the country took on something really hard - the crossing of Canada coast to coast with a volunteer-led, 16,000-kilometre, multi-use trail. It would be "The Longest Recreational Trail in the World" - the Trans-Canada Trail.

Bruce Trail

1) History

⁶ US Census Bureau statistics

The Bruce Trail follows the ridgeline of the Niagara Escarpment in Southern Ontario for 769 kilometres. The escarpment is a low but massive landform, the outer rim of a former shallow sea. It's one of Canada's natural wonders, rising to 500 metres in places and with a large number of bird species and special interest flora.

Raymond Lowes of the Hamilton Naturalists Club proposed a trail the length of the escarpment in the early 1960s, directly inspired by the Appalachian Trail. Lowes founded [the Bruce Trail Association with four other core members in 1963, and membership increased rapidly as the BTA became the focus of an ecological crusade within Ontario to save the escarpment from quarrying, subdivision, and intrusive uses in general.

In 1963, when the BTA began the handshake agreements to get the trail through, 80% of the trail route was in private ownership. Enthusiastic recruits put in place 168 voluntary access agreements with escarpment landowners, and the trail was reported finished just four years later. To circumvent those landowners who hadn't signed though, over 30% of the trail remained on public roads, unused except by determined through hikers. The voluntary agreements began to disintegrate within just a few years as land ownership changed, and subdivisions proliferated. In 1971 the BTA set up its Niagara Escarpment Preservation Fund, to buy trail corridor land. The BTA lobbied hard for escarpment protection, and in 1973 the Ontario Provincial Government established the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC).

The NEC sought a cohesive plan for the escarpment, and duly brought that Niagara Escarpment Plan into force in 1985. It was the overarching document to which other planning authorities along the length of the escarpment would, by law, conform. By 1990 the escarpment was a World Biosphere Reserve - a UNESCO designation which does not preclude private ownership but acknowledges a unique geography and ecology.

The NEC plan, land-purchase by local authorities, purchases financed by the provincial government's Natural Area Protection Fund via the Ontario Heritage Foundation, and purchases by the BTA's Niagara Escarpment Preservation Fund have increased public ownership of the land through which the trail now passes to 47%. But according to Jaci Winters, CEO of the Bruce Trail Association, 53% of the Bruce Trail is still not secure, or is on unwanted routes. Twentyseven per cent is on private land, and another 26% is still on roads.

2) BT hiker numbers -

A survey of Ontario Trails by the Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront noted in 1992 that the Bruce Trail provided 1.3 million "user days" of recreation a year, including 50,000 overnight stays.⁷ A common press estimate is that the trail users contribute \$CA30 million to the local economy. But trail statistics of this kind are somewhat rubbery. A 1994 summer study⁸ recorded data from 5,500 hikers passing 34 stations along the length of the trail. This estimated the annual number of visits at 135,311. Annual "Non-Durable" expenditure by these users was calculated at \$CA1.9 million, including food and accommodation within the trail corridor. B&B establishments along the route, had risen from 4 in the trail's early

⁷ P. 180 Regeneration: The Toronto Waterfront and the Sustainable City - Royal Commission 1992

⁸ The Bruce Trail: Use and Economic Impact Study by Alicia Schutt, Trent University 1995

days to 40. A further category of "Durable" expenditure, which included clothing and equipment spending, boosted the estimated dollar spend by Bruce Trail users to \$CA15.7 million per year, though this was largely outside the trail corridor.

Most of the hikers came, as might be expected, from the Toronto metropolitan area, where seven million Canadians live and work.

3) The Bruce Trail Association -

The BTA's mission is "to provide a public footpath along the Niagara Escarpment and promote protection of the escarpment and appreciation of its natural beauty." It has a strategic plan whose primary focus is securing the trail's optimum route. The Association has four permanent, and four contract staff, based in Hamilton, Ontario. Membership fees and profits from merchandise sales fund six of these positions. Other staff positions are variable, dependent on grants. This staff does all the processing and administration of cash on behalf of the nine clubs along the trail length.

The BTA runs nine committees each with a charter: BT News produces the quarterly newsletter; Environment promotes conservation of wildlife and natural resources on and around the trail; Landowner Relations makes sure landowners are happy, and identifies properties for possible purchase en route; Land Stewardship arranges management plans for all BTA land; Publicity and Public Education promotes the trail and administers the website; Risk Management oversees safe hiking practices, and work practices for trail maintenance volunteers; Trail Development and Maintenance organises training workshops for volunteers, including chain saw certifications; Trail Reference looks after all trail data, from B&B lists, and hiking maps, to digital downloads of track sections onto GPS; and there is an Archives Committee.

4) Finance -

A simplified version of the BTA's annual account, to July 31, 2000, is presented here as a quick survey of the strength and activity of the association. The BTA had an income of \$484,810, generated almost entirely by its own efforts, and with a notable absence of government grants.

Income

Membership (8,000 @ \$40 p.a.)	\$314,480	65%
B T Enterprises (guidebooks calendars, clothing etc - net from \$133,583 actual income).	\$78,764	16 %
Donations	\$59,607	12 %
Grants	\$5,853	1 %
Interest & sundries	\$26,105	5 %
	\$484,810	

Expenditure

Salaries, training, benefits	\$186,294	40 %
------------------------------	-----------	------

Clubs share of fees (capitation)	\$ 92,154	20 %
Bruce Trail News	\$ 73,645	16 %
Meeting & Committee expenses	\$ 22,232	5 %
Postage	\$ 14,715	3 %
Office	\$ 11,424	2.5%
12 categories: fundraising, insurance, amortisation, printing, rent, phone etc	\$ 64,890	13.5%
	\$465,354	

In addition to this account, the BTA has a number of other financial categories. The most important is the BTA Escarpment Preservation Fund which accepts donations and grants - \$112,000 in total for the July 2000 year. A new campaign - "Realising the Dream" - seeks private donations to buy the 53% of trail corridor still unsecured, or in need of relocation from roads. The campaign realised \$94,915 in the July 2000 year.

5) State Agencies -

The Niagara Escarpment Commission administers overall planning for the Escarpment, has an ecological bent, and has generally worked in favour of the trail. The provincial government has channelled funds into the BTA Escarpment Preservation Fund, usually by way of the Natural Area Protection Fund, and the Ontario Heritage Foundation. The OHF has an annual operating grant from the Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture. Though it is nominally independent, in New Zealand terms, it is a quango. Until recently, trail-corridor land secured by the BTA was also administered by the BTA, with all that implies in terms of rating, taxation, and administration costs. Under the terms of a 1990s MOU though, this land is steadily being transferred back to the OHF. The BTA however, remains responsible for maintenance and stewardship of the land.

The BTA often sends its track volunteers to a "Safe Woodsman" programme run by Ontario's Ministry of Natural Resources. This programme, set up to support the logging industry, teaches safe management of chain saws and motor-driven equipment. Volunteers cannot handle a chainsaw on the Bruce Trail unless they have completed such a training programme.

6) Volunteers -

A volunteer corps of around 700 does most of the work on the trail - equivalent to a fulltime force of 13. Their labour is worth, on Canadian rates, around \$CA400,000 a year. The volunteers are a highly organised group, each with a job description, a title, and an expected discipline. The BTA's executive director 1980-91, Doug Robertson, developed this structure.

"I assumed we were running a company," Robertson told us, "a serious business that's trying to achieve some organisational goal. We dealt with volunteers as you would staff in a corporate structure - good leadership, good matching of individuals with their skills, a job description, a job title, and training. Training training, training. That may be a cost. You have to send them to training.

"There was no payment - so you needed ways to keep them motivated. We developed comprehensive exercises of volunteer recognition. Little things at first - a letter, a little card in the mail, then plaques and walking sticks, right up to honorary memberships in the BTA - a whole spectrum of ways of saying thank you to your volunteers."

Robertson also developed a method of rewarding volunteers with tax rebates. "We couldn't pay salaries but we could help offset some of their costs - a tank of gas say, or the the cost of putting a crew up in a hotel. I'd say - you send me a bill - your mileage claim or whatever - I'll send you a cheque, you send me back a donation of that amount, and I'll send you a tax deductible receipt." This scheme, looked over by Canada Revenue, Taxation, was judged legal.

7) The Clubs -

The Bruce Trail has nine clubs along its length. They are not legal entities. They have no clubrooms, short of someone's house. They are totally volunteer, and they each maintain a defined section of trail. All membership fees go to the BTA, which gives \$11 of the \$40 fee back to the clubs by a capitation formula. The clubs use up to 50% of these amounts for trail maintenance, though maintenance costs on the trail total only about \$50,000 a year. This dollar amount does not measure the true worth of club maintenance - the \$10,000s of donated timber and tools, or the \$100,000s of free labour. The remainder of the club's capitation payments go to general administration, newsletters, and training.

Club members fill the positions, wherever possible, on the nine committees of the BTA. Some of the BTA committees are deemed critical to the trail's success, and when they are, each club will have a titled position that exactly mirrors the role of the parent committee. Each of the nine clubs, for example, has at least one "Landowner Relations Director" whose job it is to ensure that the existing landowners within the trail length overseen by that club are happy, and who is on the lookout for local land-sales that could benefit the trail. This person is the club representative on the BTA's Land Owner Relations Committee.

The clubs are not just - as many of the AT clubs are - only maintaining clubs. They serve also as hiking clubs, and advertise organised tramps with trail leaders.

8) The BT and Te Araroa -

Unlike the initial autocratic determinations on the AT, the Bruce Trail was always decentralised. According to Jaci Winters: "When the trail got underway 35 years ago we recognised the need for local people to speak to local people. We were seeking a trail on private land, and someone from Toronto can't go speak to someone up in Gray County - they'd just say Here's a suit from Toronto - why should I agree with that?"

Te Araroa Trust faces a similar choice. It has been quite autocratic and is just now decentralising. The Labour Department's Community Employment Group made \$40,000 available in the 2000-2001 July year for eight part-time Te Araroa Regional Co-ordinators, the first step in our decentralisation. These co-ordinators work locally to secure status for the trail in local authority annual plans, DOC CMS documents, and consents from landholders on the trail route. On February 23, 2001, Te Araroa Trust took a second decentralising step. It voted to encourage voluntary

chapters in Northland and the Waikato, and to produce a reference manual on goals and procedures for these and any other regional chapters, or trusts, that might arise. It is reassuring to note that the Bruce Trail was completed in just four years. No legislative support existed, but landowner goodwill did. Te Araroa Trust is also without legislative support, but the goodwill has been pervasive.

Doug Robertson warned Te Araroa Trust to stay clear of land ownership on the trail route.

"The BTA was never intended or set up as a land ownership organisation and its an onerous responsibility. Once you buy the land you have to manage it - even if you never actually touch it - you have to pay taxes annually, you have to process the land acquisition forms, you have to make sure there are fences where adjacent farmers want fences, and then you have to make sure no-one is having bush parties on your land. It's better to have a public body own the lands and for you to have a management agreement."

Trans Canada Trail

1) History -

Plans for a coast to coast hiking trail across Canada began in the 1970s, influenced by the success of the Bruce Trail. A countrywide association of hiking clubs, the National Trail Association had, by the early 1990s, marked up 1,800 km of the route, but it was low profile, and soon overtaken by a more highly-charged enterprise.

In 1992, the Federal Government granted finance to a one-off group, the Canada 125 Corporation. The Corporation's brief was to envisage fitting celebrations for Canada's 125th year of confederation.

The Corporation had one big and enchanting idea - a multi-use trail, open to horse and bicycle riders, cross-country skiers and snow mobilers as well as hikers. It would cross every Canadian province and territory, a distance of 16,000 kilometres. In 1992, the Corporation commissioned a national telephone survey to gauge grassroots attitude to this idea, and 82% of Canadians said they liked it. The survey measured the potential for citizen funding. It posed a simple question: "If asked to buy a \$30, symbolic, "Metre of Trail" would you contribute?" Thirty per cent of the survey sample said they would do at least that - the average purchase of that 30% came out at 1.4 metres. Canada 125 therefore calculated it could raise \$150 million from the Canadian population. Even cutting the figure in half, a \$75 million pool of finance was available.

The Corporation founded the Trans Canada Trail Foundation (TCTF). Its first general manager was Bill Pratt, a former executive director of the Calgary Exhibition and Stampede who had been, in 1983, president of the 15th Winter Olympics. In 1993, TCTF officers travelled to every Canadian province and territory to form, in those parts of the country where they did not exist, provincial and territorial trail councils. The councils were drawn, in general, from the main trail user groups - existing horserider, hiker, snowmobiler and hiker clubs. Their collective membership totalled some 1,500,000 volunteers across Canada.

The deal was this: The TCTF would not own, operate, or maintain the trail - the trail councils, in alliance with local communities, municipalities, and provincial governments where they could be persuaded, would do this. But the TCTF would

market the trail, do the publicity countrywide, and bring in donations and corporate help. It would also help finance the trail. The TCTF charter restricted its administrative spending to 20% of charity donations, and when the "Build a Metre of Trail" scheme brought in its expected millions of dollars, 80% of these, or other private donations, would be dispensed to trail builders.

In June 1994 the Foundation launched "The Longest Recreational Trail in the World." By then it had four major corporate sponsors, and set about a huge campaign. It used free air time on television, put ten-page "tabloid" inserts in the major newspapers, and broadcast on radio. It launched the "Build a Metre of Trail" campaign - the cost of a metre by then set at \$36, and later raised to \$40. The TCTF undertook to have every donor's name - or a name designated by the donor as a gift to someone else - laser-etched onto an acrylic panel in one of hundreds of pavilions that would be erected en route.

In the five years to the end of 1999, the TCTF raised around \$5 million from the "Metre of Trail" campaign, and the names of 160,000 people awaited laser-etching onto pavilions. It reported that 53% of the trail was registered, and published charts showed province vying, percentage wise, against province.

2) The Trans Canada Trail Foundation -

The Trans Canada Trail Foundation's mission is "to promote and co-ordinate the planning, design and building of a continuous shared-use recreation trail that winds through the territories and provinces of Canada in partnership with provincial and territorial councils."

The TCTF has offices in Montreal, and employs 23 people. Its executive consults with provincial and territorial trail councils every month by conference call, and all trail councils are present for the AGM, that lasts 3 days. When any council registers a section of trail the TCTF pays that council \$50 per kilometre. Construction money must then be raised locally, or sought directly from the TCTF's "Build a Metre of Trail" fund.

"Registration" is a term which can mean either that the trail route is a legal thoroughfare and awaits development, or that it is actually in place. TCTF officers estimate that some 35% is actually in place. These developed sections may be trails, but can also be back-roads. The developed sections are typically in city or peri-urban areas, and are within easy reach of 70% of Canada's population.

The TCTF is the keeper of the vision, the high view. As CEO John Bellini told me: "We provide the air attack, but we know that the war is won on the ground, by the trail councils." In keeping with its sweeping reach, the TCTF last year announced a \$CA4.5m plan for 5,000 interpretative panels along the trail route, to be completed within three years. The Stephen R Bronfman Foundation had committed \$CA1.5 million, and further partners were being sought.

To celebrate the millennium year, the TCTF also organised a 5,000-person relay along the trail route. Dignitaries, including Inuits, drew water from Canada's three oceans, and over seven months, runners relayed the ceremonial containers along the trail route to converge at a commemorative fountain at Hull, adjacent to the capital city, Ottawa. There they poured the waters in.

The relay was a huge event, and the TCTF did not finance it directly. The Federal Canadian Millennium Partnership Programme granted \$CA4.4 million, but the TCTF

arranged the route, and most of the "services in kind" - volunteer hours, sponsor vehicles, and publicity - by which the \$CA4.4 million, and other cash contributions, were leveraged to an assessed value of \$CA17 million.

3) Finance -

The TCTF accounts for the calendar year 1999 were the latest available at the time of our visit.

Income

Donations	\$1,826,726	82 %
Merchandising	\$ 303,338	14 %
Sponsorships/corporate	\$ 25,346	1 %
Licensing royalties	\$ 28,321	1.2%
Investment income	\$ 2,279	1.2%
Projects	\$ (29,632)	
	\$ 2,156,378	

Expenditure

Trail Construction	\$2,518,348	69 %
Administrative	\$ 831,003	23 %
Merchandise	\$ 202,474	5.5%
Promotion (Metre of Trail and Merchandising)	\$ 61,343	2 %
Amortisation of capital assets	\$ 26,242	.5%
	\$3,639,410	

Source: TCTF audited accounts 2000

The TCTF sold \$1.4 millions worth of securities, accrued from donations in previous years, to cover the \$CA1.5 million shortfall between income and expenditure. This left it with net assets worth \$CA410,775. The TCTF has one vaster asset. In December 1998, Canadian Pacific Railway gifted it 1,600 kilometres of old railway corridor in six provinces, complete with trestle bridges, subject only to the value of this donation being recognised by Revenue Canada, Taxation at \$CA 37 million, and so becoming a CPR tax writeoff. The ex-railway land has no dollar value as an asset though, being held simply for transfer to provincial and territorial councils.

John Bellini told delegates at the year 2000 AGM: "It is clear that the metre sale programme will never yield all the funds required for the trail. A big injection of funding from the Federal Government will be required to move the trail forward." The annual accounts showed the TCTF was absorbing in administrative and general costs more than its 20% of donated money, and that trail councils with trail projects ready to go were getting less than their 80%. At the AGM, angry delegates flayed the executive on the matter. The trail relay also caused grumbling. The relay had spent \$CA17 million, while construction budgets remained unfunded. A number of delegates had strong opinions on how much of the trail should be sizzle, and how much sausage.

The TCTF executive argued that much of the cost that swelled its percentage share of donated monies was actually pavilion costs, and costs for laser-writing thousands of names within the pavilions. They argued the pavilions - nine had been erected in Ontario alone - were in fact "soft" trail costs. If the "soft" costs were added to payments made to trail councils as "hard" trail costs, the percentages came out about right. And the executive pointed out the relay was a separate enterprise that did not call out funds donated to trail construction. The relay, they argued, would pay large dividends in exposure for the Trans Canada Trail, in sale of trail metres and merchandise, and might soften the Federal Government's stand-off attitude. The TCTF promised, nonetheless, a closer liaison with the trail councils.

4) Federal and Provincial Agencies

The Federal Government provided seed money for the Canada 125 Corporation in 1992, and its Federal Millennium Project gave the major cash grant for the relay. The Canadian Tourism Commission agreed in March 2000 to be part of a partnership that would mould the trail into a cohesive tourism product, but its contribution was undecided - certainly less than the TCTF's requested \$CA333,000.

Provincial and municipal help has been more substantial, but too various to list here. The TCTF and its 12 trail committees have acted, at the least, as a catalyst to provincial governments and municipalities. In a country without federal trail legislation, and with manifold differences in provincial government structure and legal frameworks, this is a considerable achievement. In a few provinces, the TCT meshes with existing policy - for example, with the \$88 million project for bike routes in Quebec. In others, like the New Brunswick Government the TCT proposal helped initiate a government-supported programme for developing one of Canada's best trail resources - hundreds of kilometres of abandoned rail corridor. In some provinces, like Ontario, the provincial government has done little, but municipalities have participated eagerly - the existing long waterfront trail at the edge of Toronto, for example, is now an assigned part of the Trans Canada Trail.

The British Columbia Provincial Government is one of the TCT's most active supporters. It has used its own agencies to help mould Trails BC - a combination of private organisations and Government planners. The province's Transportation Financing Authority last year allocated \$CA5 million for a three-year boost to the trail. The minister responsible for the TFA said: "Trails are becoming a key part of our plans to provide alternative transportation infrastructure across the province."⁹

5) Trail Councils

The structure of the trail councils varies across Canada. As a case study we will deal with the British Columbia organisation - Trails BC. It is one of the most successful trail councils, and the province itself has some parallel with New Zealand. It has a population of 4 million, and the length of its main TCT leg, westward from the city of Victoria on Vancouver Island, through Vancouver city itself to Princeton, and on across the Rockies to the Alberta border, is 1,750 km.

Trails BC was set up in 1995 "to facilitate the development of shared use and sustainable trail networks, including the Trans Canada Trail." Trails BC held a series

⁹ Press Release BC Ministry of Environment Lands and Parks 15/2/2000

of public meetings and consultations with the provincial government, and much of the founding energy came from within the Provincial Government itself. Trails BC lobbied the Provincial Government's Land Use Coordination Office, and LUCO got government permission to participate. LUCO officers then helped plan a trail across the province, 80% of it on Crown Land. Trails BC has registered 53% of this trail, 60% of it has still to be laid in, but much of what has been laid - including railway trestle routes I visited that spanned deep river chasms - is wonderful even in isolation.

In 1999, twenty so-called "e-teams" - mainly youths between the ages of 16 and 29 - swung to work under a Memorandum of Understanding that listed Trails BC, the Canadian Youth Service, and the Provincial Ministry of Environment Lands and Parks as equal partners in the construction enterprise, each putting in \$320,000 that year. The \$5 million assigned by BC's Transportation Financing Authority for the trail is earmarked for engineering reports on 30 (mainly ex-railway) trestles and bridges, for stabilising 15 major ex-railway trestles, for spanning with modern light-weight bridges five river crossings, and for laying 100 kilometres of multiuse trail and improving road shoulders for trail bypasses.

Trails BC solicits members and publishes a quarterly magazine. It is divided into six councils that scout the Trans Canada Trail route and cajole municipalities and communities into joining the effort. Its membership totals 152 individuals, and 15 clubs with a combined membership of 1,100. Its six councils have a total of 140 on-the-ground volunteers, who last year put in 2000 hours. It also has 13 directors who estimate their voluntary time at 15 hours a week, leading up to four yearly directors' meetings and one two-day AGM.

6) The TCT and Te Araroa

The Trans Canada Trail is a vision driven by patriotism. The other trails studied have a geographic logic - a mountain range, an escarpment. The TCT does not. It connects instead the cities and communities, the landscapes, and the people. The last railroad spike of the first trans-Canadian railway in the 19th century was a huge national event. The TCT trail has a similar emotional tug. North-south features like the Rockies suggest Canada's natural unity with the North American continent, the United States itself. That makes Canadians uncomfortable. East-west railways, or roads, across the grain of the landscape have always been a cause of great celebration in Canada, somewhat nervous of its unity. The Trans Canada Trail fits that pattern.

We may also have reached a century where a more active population is simply more interested in distance, fitness, nature, and the variations and quirks of its own people. The American Discovery Trail, a non-motorised recreation route across America that connects 5 National Scenic trails, 10 National Historic trails, and 23 National Recreation Trails, is currently seeking Congressional recognition under the National Trails Systems Act. Both it and the Trans Canada Trail are obviously similar to Te Araroa.

The TCT is a more ambitious undertaking than Te Araroa. While Te Araroa would accept multi-use - horses and bikes in some places - it is primarily a hiking trail, and far cheaper to accomplish. The Canadian multi-use trail is 3.5 metres wide, and must have a surface suitable for bikes and horses. The pricing of a Metre of Trail at \$40 for example, is based on a cost of \$40,000 per kilometre, with special gates to "keep ATVs off the trail etc. Te Araroa aims at 800 mm width, and usually need not, as a

hiking trail, modify natural surfaces. The Trust completed 18 kilometres of trail up the Waikato recently for \$70,000, or \$3,888 a kilometre.

The TCT's estimated 16,000 km reach is roughly five times the length of our own trail, though the Canadian population of 30 million is nearly 8 times larger than New Zealand's. The Canadian trail cleaves mainly to latitude 47° S - a latitude that would place it, in this hemisphere, south of Invercargill. It is more rigorous.

The TCTF set out to finance the trail by donation from individual Canadians. This was over-optimistic, but it's worth reviewing what such a "Build a Metre of Trail" programme might achieve in New Zealand. The TCF's surveys indicated they could raise, from what was then proposed as a \$30-per-metre appeal, \$CA150 million. Doing the sums for New Zealand, which has only 7.8% of the Canadians 30 million, that same response would yield \$11.7 million.

The "Build a Metre of Trail" revenues however, have not come close to that projected amount. The actual figures, totalling \$CA7.4 million, with the year 2000 result included as an estimate only, are listed below. The column alongside indicates what TAT might raise with a similarly big trail launch, major publicity, and an appeal. The TAT figures are arrived at by calculating 7.8% of the Canadian totals.

	Donations to TCTF (mainly sale of trail metres)	If TAT did as well
1997	\$1.8m	\$140,400
1998	\$1.7m	\$132,600
1999	\$1.8m	\$140,400
2000	\$2.1 (est)	\$163,800
	\$7.4m	\$577,200

The British Columbian Government's \$CA5 million contribution to the TCT from its roading budget is part of a distinct trend to include non-motorised transport - including hiking - as part of the overall responsibility of transport funding agencies. In 1991, for example, the American Congress passed the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act which established a funding source for rail trails and other types of bicycle and pedestrian routes. Funding levels for trail enhancement from US Department of Transportation allocations have now reached over \$US50 million a year.¹⁰

We wrote a letter to Transfund New Zealand asking if trails might be eligible for funding, as horses, bikes, and the soles of the feet, can all now be considered useful locomotive alternatives. Transfund's chief executive, Martin Gummer replied that the relevant clause for consideration of this question was S.3D of the Transit New Zealand Act where Transfund is "to achieve a safe and efficient roading system" and to fund "efficient alternatives to roading."

Mr Gummer, said Transfund saw its role in regard to these "efficient alternatives" as a mandate to fund projects that contributed benefits to the roading system. He instanced a log-barging scheme that Transfund had put money into, and said: "It (Transfund) is not mandated, for example, to contribute toward the recreational value that users would derive from a foot trail."¹⁰

British Trails

¹⁰ Trails Systems Planning - Public Policy Development and Initiation, by R.J. Irvine, report to LUCO, 1999

The pressure for countryside recreation grew at about the same speed as Britain's industrial cities. Rights of way existed, but were expensive to prove in court and demands for clear legislation to preserve them in perpetuity increased through the 1930s. The war-time Government appointed a committee under Sir Arthur Hobhouse to draw up a blueprint for new legislation. This report - *Footpaths and Access to the Countryside* - published in 1947, resulted in the Atlee Government's National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949.

The Act required every Highway Authority - legally identical to the corresponding County Council or Metropolitan District - to map out its rights of way, and to assert and protect the public's right of passage. Once established, the status of these rights of way would be upheld by the courts in perpetuity. The Act also empowered county councils or metropolitan districts, as highway authorities, to create entirely new paths for the purpose of adding to people's convenience or enjoyment. They could use this power to cobble together the traditional but disconnected rights of way into a continuous long-distance path.

The National Parks Commission - since 1968 the Countryside Commission and renamed the Countryside Agency in 1999 - could, under the Act, designate long-distance paths, and arrange their planning. It opened the Pennine Way, which had served as a focus throughout, in 1965, and more of the long distance 'National Trails' quickly followed. England and Wales now have 14, Scotland has 3, and the combined length of all of them is 4,375 kilometres. The Countryside Agency has surveyed six of the National Trails over the past 10 years and estimates three million visits a year for those six, mostly day-users, with 39,000 (1.3%) long distance users.

English and Welsh National Trails are distinctively marked on trail signage by an acorn. The Scottish trails are marked out with a symbolic thistle. The Countryside Agency promotes the English and Welsh trails, funds most of the the actual laying in of the trails, and provides Trail Officers. Where National Trails cross into County Council, or Metropolitan District jurisdictions, these bodies (as Highway Authorities) must maintain the track. Where the National Trails cross National Parks, National Park Authorities must maintain them. Britain major long distance paths are therefore entirely funded by various levels of government, and though many have voluntary wardens, few have a strong volunteer structure.

The first trail we consider, the Offa's Dyke Path or Llwybr Clawdd Offa, was nominated by the Countryside Agency as the best example of a volunteer organisation working successfully within the National Trail management structure. The Agency suggested also that the Hadrian's Wall Path, which was still under construction, would provide a stark snapshot of a trail still, as it were, getting its act together.

Offa's Dyke

1) History

The 285 km Offa's Dyke Trail runs from the Severn Estuary in the south, to the North Wales Coast in the north. It cleaves to the English-Welsh border, staying close to, and sometimes running along, the historic bank and ditch defence thrown up over 12 years by the overlord of southern England, Offa, King of Mercia (757-769), to defend his border against the Welsh.

A path along this earthwork was one of six long-distance walking routes proposed in the Hobhouse report of 1947, and it received a Ministerial approval in 1955. The

trail proposal then languished, but local pressure persisted. Knighton resident, Frank Noble founded the Offa's Dyke Path Association in 1969. The Association drew its membership from local people interested in both the path and the preservation of the dyke as an ancient monument.

Under pressure from the ODA, the Countryside Commission duly organised the participating councils en route, and in 1971, Lord Hunt opened the path - the same John Hunt who'd led the British Everest expedition of 1954 which climaxed with Sir Edmund Hillary's first ascent to the summit.

2) OD Hiker numbers -

The first user survey of Offa's Dyke, commissioned by the Countryside Council for Wales, came out in 1996. This survey was thorough, with five automatic people-counters installed on the track, face to face interviews at 16 locations, self-registration boxes at six locations with a simple questionnaire, and for those who registered, a more complex postal questionnaire. The survey showed 240,012 user days on the path from May 1994 - April 1995. Long distance walkers totalled 82,541 of those days, the rest were day walkers. These walkers spent, in total, £2,142,354 in the local economy. This is more than £20, the survey notes, for every £1 spent on management of the trail. Using research previously carried out on the Pennine Way, which calculated one job sustained for every £14,000 of visitor spend, the survey concluded that the Offa's Dyke path sustains 153 jobs within the path corridor area.

¹¹

3) The Offa's Dyke Association -

The ODA is far smaller than the organisations studied so far. From its early days as a ginger group to state agencies, it has now quietly niched itself at Knighton, a Welsh town halfway along the trail. The ODA's 1.5 employees manage the Offa's Dyke Centre, built in 1998 by the Powys County Council. They handle all enquiries on the trail, sell the trail maps, the B&B-style accommodation guides, and history books which turn a tidy profit for the Association each year.

The ODA is concerned not just with the path, but the whole of Offa's Dyke - its protection, but also research which bears on Offa's era. The Offa's Dyke Centre opened in 1998, and the ODA worked for a year to produce the display that now graces the main room, giving a history of Mercia, and a tableaux, with suitably clad mannequins, of the king, the court clothing and artefacts of the time. ODA enthusiasts give occasional educational lectures in the building.

The ODA employees serve a second function. Like our own Visitor Information Centres, they handle all tourism enquiries in the region. The Powys County Council, gives the ODA an annual grant for this regional service. The Association is relatively well-off and when aroused is a formidable lobbyist. It has fought a number of battles to keep two Welsh Countryside Council staffers on the trail fulltime, and it gives careful scrutiny to any planning applications which might impact on the path.

4) Finance -

Income (1999)

Profit on Sales	£12,351	31%
Membership fees (948 @ £12)	£ 9,328	23%
Interest (the General Fund has a surplus of £95,354)	£ 6,609	16%

¹¹ Offa's Dyke Path: National Trail User Survey 1994-95 - The Countryside Commission.

Powys County Council	£ 6,500	16%
Donations	£ 2,684	7%
Services	£ 786	2%
Path Management		
Service Support	£ 609	1.5%
Income tax rebate	£ 499	1.25%
Life membership	£ 443	1.25%
	£39,809	
Expenditure		
Staff	£27,857	73%
Administration costs	£ 4,271	11%
Members services	£ 3,153	8%
Accommodation costs	£ 2,368	8%
Sundries	£ 111	
	£37, 760	

Source: Annual report of ODA, 1999.

5) Public agencies -

The Offa's Dyke Path Management Committee comprises representatives from the Countryside Agency, the Countryside Council for Wales, the Gloucester County Council, the Gwent County Council, the Powys County Council, the Hereford and Worcester County Council, the Shropshire County Council, the Clwyd County Council, the Flintshire County Council, the Brecon Beacons National Park, English Heritage, Cawd (Welsh Historic Monuments) and the Offa's Dyke Association.

The various county councils on the Management Committee are there because they have legal responsibility for public rights of way on the trail. They, and English Heritage and Cawd, who are on the committee because Offa's Dyke is an scheduled Ancient Monument under the 1983 National Heritage Act, contribute to trail maintenance costs.

The Countryside Commission for Wales funds the Offa's Dyke Path Officer, who is in charge of the trail, and an Assistant Offa's Dyke Path Officer.

The Offa's Dyke Association has no statutory function within the trail management, and the relationship between ODA and the rest of the trail managers has simply bedded in over time. The Offa's Dyke Path Officer, for example, sits in on ODA meetings as an "active observer."

6) Volunteers -

The ODA runs the so-called Lengthsmen. Each of the 28 lengthsmen walks a specified section of the trail every few months with a blank ODA "State of the Path" sheet. The Lengthsman notes any repairs needed on stiles, gates, fingerposts, waymarks footbridges and steps - each one has a number for easy identification. The Lengthsman is on the lookout for any evidence of mountain bikes, or horses, both illegal uses. When inspection is complete the Lengthsman fills in the form and sends it back to the Offa's Dyke Centre. It is then passed along to the OD Path Officer, or his assistant.

Hadrian's Wall Path

1) History -

One thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine years ago, the Roman Emperor Hadrian ordered a wall built, from side to side of Britain, to defend his northern boundary against the troublesome Picts. The wall stretched from side to side of Britain with a deep earthen bank and ditch defence - the "Vallum" - running alongside. By that sheer length, and depth, and by the wall's 5 to 7 metre height, with watchtowers rising higher yet, it became the most famous frontier in the Roman empire.

After the empire collapsed, a dogged migration of hand-crafted stone took place - to farmhouses, pig sties, drystone fences, and one entire village, appropriately named "Wall" - but the remaining foundation, close to two metres high in places, and continuous for tens of kilometres at a time, is still the most famous Roman monument in Britain.

The Pennine Way already tracks beside the wall in Northumberland, excavated Roman forts en route are already tourist attractions, and side-trails exist down to Roman river-bridge abutments, but the Countryside Commission (as it then was) decided in 1996 to proceed with a new National Trail along the length of the wall. The new trail would stretch from Newcastle on Britain's eastern coast, to Bowness-on-Solway on the western coast. It would stay alongside Hadrian's Wall, or at least, where it has vanished, its route, for some 128 kilometres. It would cost £5 million, be developed over 5 years, and would open in the summer of 2002.

2) HW Hiker Use

The Countryside Agency believes 10-20,000 walkers a year will complete the full length of the Hadrian's Wall Path (HWP) every year, Many more will walk sections. These figures are based on existing use of the Pennine Way, for where the northern extremity of this trail crosses Northumberland National Park, it tracks for a considerable distance beside Hadrian's Wall. Stile counters record 45,000 people a year on these sections.

3) Public Agencies

Before describing the Countryside Agency's lead role in the HWP, it may be useful to describe its general responsibilities. The Agency monitors the English countryside. It advises on public policies which affect the countryside and tries to preserve English charm, and the dignity of the rural villages and hamlets. It seeks also to ensure "that everyone can enjoy the physical, educational and spiritual benefits of recreation and tourism in the countryside in ways which conserve the environment, provide jobs, strengthen the economy, and improve the health of the nation."

In support of this last aim, the Agency urges Highway Authorities to advance their mapping of, and responsibilities for, England's famous 169,000 kilometres of rights of way. The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 specified these authorities must produce a "Definitive Map and Statement" of all rights of way in their area. They're still at it.¹²

The Agency is also in charge of National Trails. The Commission's overall budget is surprisingly small - some £50 million a year - but its National Trail costs, at least, are

¹² The Countryside Agency - pamphlet, September 1999.

mostly borne elsewhere. Highway Authorities are legally bound to maintain any National Trail that passes within their boundaries, and the Commission usually only funds one or at most two National Trail Officers per trail. The NTO's main job is to co-ordinate, as between the Highway Authorities, and Park Boards where they exist, maintenance.

The Agency can also initiate new National Trails. The 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act called for "long-distance routes" - "along which the public should be allowed to make extensive journeys on foot, bike or horseback . . ." The Agency as a first step provides the British Secretary of State with a scoping report that sets out route, costs, the land issues involved and which must even detail accommodation, meals and refreshments en route. The Secretary of State then decides to approve - or not - the laying in of the new National Trail.

The Agency is then the project manager for the new trail, but a substantial part of the costs here too are usually borne by outside funders. The Heritage Lottery Fund, for example, is expected to bear 75% of the HWP's projected £5 million cost. The Agency will pick up only around 17% of the total, and the Highway Authorities - there are four main implementing authorities en route - bear the final 8%.

As to Highway Authority duties on the HWP, the Countryside Agency has summarised the law with distinctly English precision¹³ noting the statutory (the italics are the Agency's own) duties of the Highway Authorities, which must:

- Assert and protect the public's right to use and enjoy rights of way
- Maintain the surface - to a depth of two spade lengths
- Prevent the stopping up or obstruction of any right of way
- Ensure that farmers restore any paths disrupted by ploughing
- Prepare and keep up to date a 'Definitive Map and Statement' which is the legal record of rights of way
- Signpost rights of way where they meet a metalled highway
- Provide additional signs and waymarks along any path wherever they are necessary

Highway Authorities also have discretionary powers to:

- Create new paths by agreement with the landowner, and to pay an appropriate amount to compensate the landowner for the loss of land involved.
- Improve rights of way - for example by providing and maintaining fences along a route, constructing gates, stiles, bridges and improving the surface of a path or its drainage.

Critical parts of the HWP are obviously discretionary - for example negotiated compensation for trail links that are not existing rights of way. But once a trail has been approved at Secretary of State level, it's not a question of if it happens, only when, and in order that the work proceed smoothly, the Countryside Agency's budget for the HWP makes clear that the Heritage Lottery, and the Agency itself, will pick up all legal and land compensation costs to landowners - an amount estimated at £380,000.

¹³ Hadrian's Wall Path - Phases 2 and 3 Application to the Heritage Lottery Fund, Appendix 1.

Most agreements with private landowners on the trail corridor are amicable. Often a landowner will simply dedicate the land. Or a Highway Authority will pay an agreed amount for loss of production. But the Authority can also force passage against the wishes of a landowner, by a Creation Order. The landowner can then claim, at arbitration, compensation for loss of land. That claim never yields more than £7,000 a mile, and is usually closer to £1,000.

The landowner can also claim for "injurious affection" a generic term for abstract injury - loss of privacy perhaps, as hikers pass a farmhouse window. Injurious affection claims are uncommon, and the compensation is variable. They are the last-ditch stand of the hostile landowner, who, compensated finally even for feelings of impotent rage, cannot then stop the trail.

The HWP project is headed by a Trail Development Group with representatives from the Countryside Agency (chair), English Heritage, Northumberland County Council, Cumbria County Council, Newcastle City Council, North Tyneside Council, Northumberland National Park, National Trust, English Nature and the Hadrian's Wall Tourism Partnership.

Below this management board, the Agency has two officers working fulltime on the HWP - the Trail Development Officer, and a Finance and Progress Officer. The Northumberland County Council and the Cumbria County Council have also each engaged a full time Alignment Officer and a Project Officer. Once significant parts of the trail are legally clear, field teams lay the trail in, with signage, to the National Trail standard.

4) Volunteers –

The Countryside Commission's strategy document for the Hadrian's Wall trail notes: "The provision of a trained and motivated volunteer service is an invaluable aid to the efficient management of a National Trail, as demonstrated by the Offa's Dyke Path. Experience has shown they can support the professional trail managers and achieve the following:

- help to maintain standards by patrolling, identifying and reporting minor problems before they become acute.
- provide a presence on the ground that can reassure both farmers and trail users.
- help to promote to a wider audience a positive image of the trail."¹⁴

The document proposes training the volunteers, equipping them with protective clothing bringing them together under one umbrella organisation and and complying with all health and safety requirements. Each locally-based volunteer will be responsible, "as per the Offa's Dyke model," for their own stretch of trail and will report their findings to the Trail Development Officer. The document envisages employing a "Volunteer Coordinator" to establish the service under the guidance of the Trail Development Officer.

5) Offa's Dyke, Hadrian's Wall and Te Araroa –

¹⁴ Ibid - S.5 Information and Interpretation 'Volunteer Service'

The most striking thing about the English long trail system is the amount of money available for development and maintenance. During my visit to Hadrian's Wall I walked five kilometres of path, patting the wall en route, to the Roman fort at Birdoswald. Countryside Agency officer, Amanda Earnshaw, gave an accompanying commentary, and as we came to a new steel footbridge across the River Irving, she enthused at the budget cost of the bridge. Much pro bono effort had yielded a beautiful bridge - indeed it was - for a mere £225,000. I did the sums - \$NZ675,000 - looked at the river, which admittedly was not in spate, and judged it, in New Zealand terms, distinctly wadeable.

Enviably also is the efficient cost-spreading achieved by English legislation. The 1949 Act made Highway Authorities responsible for rights of way. Those rights of way form a major part of any National Trail. Further linkages are usually required to achieve a National Trail, and as we have seen, the Highway Authorities en route have no more than a discretionary responsibility to complete those. Nonetheless, the overall dynamic for a National Trail, once approved at Secretary of State level, is unstoppable. As with the Americans, if local government proves reluctant, the Federal agencies, or in Britain's case the Countryside Agency, will mobilise the funds themselves.

The essential thing is a considered declaration. In America's case it is a designation by Congress to admit a trail to the National Trails System. In Britain's case it is an approval by the Secretary of State. Either one puts a long trail powerfully on the map.

New Zealand Overview

1) The Walkways Act, and the NZWC -

We have examined long trail legislation, long trail governance, and long trail volunteer organisations in three countries. In all three, the trails are the product of an particular history and culture. The New Zealand story is similarly unique. The New Zealand Walkways Act of 1975 was our first trail legislation, born from a 1967 proposal by the Federated Mountain Clubs for a New Zealand-long "Scenic Trail." The Act set up the New Zealand Walkways Commission (1976-1989), with appointees from Lands and Survey, Forest Service, Local Government, Federated Farmers, and the Federated Mountain Clubs. Typically, this combination was mirrored in the NZWC's 12 district committees and seemed an effective alliance for crossing New Zealand's various types of land-holdings.

Yet despite its genesis in a long trail proposal, the NZWC did not pursue the goal. The trail from Cape Reinga to Bluff was listed as a number two objective, but the NZWC was also the first body with a specific warrant to lay in walkways, and it strove firstly and almost exclusively to put in walks where it felt they were most lacking - near population centres.

Within a year of the NZWC's March startup, Brian Hunt, the Commission's FMC representative and the keeper, if any existed, of the FMC's vision of a long New Zealand trail would state publicly: "Initially the concept was for a series of connecting walkways from Cape Reinga to Bluff. However, it soon became apparent that it was more important to concentrate on shorter walkways adjacent to large centres of

population with the idea that these shorter walks would ultimately become part of the overall trail network."¹⁵

In NZWC publicity, the key word was "network." It seemed to suggest an interlinking of access across the countryside, much as the British had developed their rights of way, but in retrospect the phrasing seems more a sop to those who sought a long trail. The Commission stated often that its "network" would expand sufficiently over time to achieve a through route the length of the country. Yet "network" is not adequately descriptive of New Zealand circumstances or what can be realistically achieved.

No significant pattern of public easements, bridle paths or footpaths has ever made its way into New Zealand legislation, as it has in Britain. We do have Crown Land, the Queens Chain, paper roads and, under the Resource Management Act 1990, esplanade reserves - usually dependent on sub-division. But all of these - aside from paper roads and Crown land (now mostly subsumed as Conservation Estate) - tend to be a tracery, often interrupted, along and around coastlines, rivers, and lakes. Much of the the countryside remained, under its long-established Land Transfer system, impervious.

The 1975 Walkways Act did not unify control of important tracks. The showcase Milford and Heaphy tracks, for example, were not under NZWC control. Nor did it establish track categories such as existed in America and Britain - defining short or long, national or local, periurban or wilderness, with weightings assigned and national, provincial or local government responsibilities outlined.

The Act did try to lock in other agencies. The NZWC was, by default, the Controlling Authority of any walkway it put in. But where a walkway traversed a National Park, a State Forest or local authority jurisdictions, the Act gave the Minister power to appoint the existing administering body as a "Controlling Authority" responsible for control and maintenance of that walkway.

So far, so good - one might even build a long trail this way, with each administering body taking its share of the costs. But there was no legal compulsion, and such administering bodies - particularly local authorities - usually did not respond. Why would they, when no compulsion existed, when the NZWC rather than themselves had put in the track, and when the NZWC itself had an open-ended claim for trail budgets from the Lands and Survey vote?

We should note in passing that aside from State agencies, and local bodies, the Act allowed the Minister to appoint a "statutory body" as a Controlling Authority. A statutory body is an agency whose accounts are audited by the Audit Office. This effectively excluded any voluntary organisation, including any incorporated society, from becoming a Controlling Authority. The Act did not encourage volunteers.

Through the late 1980s, the NZWC's activity slowed, and gradually stopped. In 1987, the Lands and Survey Department was abolished and its work divided up - some of it going to the new Department of Conservation. The NZWC was formally abolished when a new Act, the New Zealand Walkways Act 1990, gave control of all existing walkways and established tracks to DOC. The Act still sought to open the countryside to walkers. But the responsibility for reporting on track opportunities now went to 14 Conservation Boards, as well as DOC itself, which, presumably, would end up paying for them.

2) The 1990 Walkways Act and DOC-

¹⁵ Brian Hunt - address to Environment '77 Seminar' 10/02/77

At a stroke in 1990 DOC became a victim of New Zealand's unintegrated track system. It inherited both little-known back-country tracks from the Forest and Wildlife Services and well-known ones like the Milford Track. It also inherited - almost in their entirety, because so few had been hived off to "Controlling Authorities" - the 130-odd tracks put in by the NZWC.

Indeed, the 1975 Act's requirements for installing a Walkway had been so rigorous - with surveys, easements, and final gazettal by the Minister - that DOC inherited many ungazetted NZWC trails, and legal tangles that are still being sorted.

The 1990 Walkways Act simply recycled many of the 1975 Act's clauses. Fifteen years had passed, but still no trails policy emerged that put tracks into effective categories, or, for any long trail, spliced a lead Government agency with the various levels of regional and local government. The Minister could still appoint local authorities and other statutory bodies to be Controlling Authorities - but again, the Minister needed these bodies to agree, and the unspoken question still was - why would they take it on?

Walkway crossings of private land still relied on the full consent of landowners. The NZWC had had no budget for land purchase, nor power of compulsory acquisition, and neither did DOC. A walkway route could be secured only by easement or lease, a complex and expensive legal procedure, and the Act did not even specify that DOC should pick up those costs. Some, at least, could fall back on the landowner. To further reinforce the impasse, the Health and Safety in Employment Act 1993 brought New Zealand farms within the ambit of strict industrial-style safety regulations, with big fines attending any breach. No case law existed to clarify this legislation and farmers were unsure of their liability if unwatched visitors to the farm - trampers, hunters or anglers - suffered an accident.

Despite all this, DOC did, in 1995, produce a Walkways policy.

3) The Walkways Policy –

The Walkways Policy stated that sufficient walks existed on public land, and that emphasis would now be on crossing private land. The 1990 Act specified the goal of walking tracks "over public and private land" but DOC deftly chose to emphasize private land crossings which, for budgetary reasons alone, were unlikely to occur. Under section 8.2 'Factors to be considered in establishing or extending a walkway' the policy gave an order of priorities. It put peri-urban walks at the top. This was regional, district and city councils territory and DOC was under no pressure here. Second priority was walks that penetrated private land with significant recreational, scenic, historic, cultural and natural values. Given that no budget existed for purchase of private land, that even the costs of an easement could fall back on the landowner, and that the HSE Act had spooked farmers, this priority was also moot. Third priority was loop tracks - small forays into the bush on high quality tracks to see a kauri grove, or hear a tui. DOC was to pursue the loops with some success. Number four priority was : "The establishment of walkways where they will form a link in the national walkway from North Cape to Bluff and any east/west links." The 1990 Act was probably moribund even as it reached the statute books. As an underpinning structure for long trails it was particularly deficient. Long trails need to yoke together the various levels of government and provide for volunteer participation. The old idea remained, in vestigial form, but Walkways in general had come to a dead stop - had even begun to shrink.

New Developments -

The Rise of the Volunteer –

DOC's equivalent of Britain's National Trails or America's Scenic Trails are the seven Great Walks - Lake Waikaremoana, Tongariro - Northern Circuit, Abel Tasman, Heaphy, Kepler, Routeburn and Milford. These total only around 270 kilometres of track, but generate, at least, a sufficient income stream for maintenance and improvement.

Yet DOC maintains altogether 930 huts and 11,000 km of track. Many of those tracks are very high standard, others are not, most leach money from the Department, and as is by now well-known, DOC is "reducing departmental effort and expenditure on providing and maintaining the existing level of facilities."¹⁶

This policy has caused some uproar in a country where access into wilderness is regarded as a basic human right. Yet even as the tracks shrank, DOC began an outreach to volunteers that might serve the track system well as it develops. The programmes differ from place to place, but we will note some.

The Tararua Aorangi Huts Committee, with 13 tramping and deer stalking club representatives, and one DOC representative, is the Department's most successful tramping club model. The TAHC has existed for 13 years, is responsible for maintenance of the 40-odd huts in the Tararuas, and handles the annual \$50,000 of hut revenue. It has a long-term programme to reduce the 40 huts to a core of 25. It meets two times a year and can call on 150 volunteers. DOC maintains the tracks, but puts no money into the huts. It provides accounting and other services for the TAHC budget, and also recruits the wardens who collect hut fees. The chair of this committee, Ron Pynenburg, believes more people are tramping, but less are tramping club members, and so, are harder to organise. He believes the average age of the TAHC volunteers is going up year by year - in effect, that his volunteer pool is dwindling. Nonetheless, this model is obviously an excellent one, founded as it is on a volunteer history that dates from the 1920s. DOC's difficulty, in replicating it elsewhere, is that no other part of the country has such a dense structure of clubs, nor such a long volunteer history.

At a more individual level, DOC seeks legal agreements with the tramping clubs. Of the 1000-odd huts on the Conservation Estate around 70 are entirely owned and managed by clubs or other private owners. Volunteer effort occurs in some of the remaining 930 huts but it remains unassessed, and, in general terms, is still regarded as insufficient. DOC wants more of it, and it wants the volunteer input to be better specified. The legal agreements spell out the maintenance responsibilities. The reaction of clubs has been cautious.

Each year DOC puts wardens into 70 huts to collect fees, and the total warden days in these huts is 3,500-4000. Of these, over half, 2200, are voluntary. DOC supplies the voluntary wardens with food, boat transport where necessary, and a radio when required. This is a successful programme.

DOC also recruits volunteers directly for track work and hut maintenance. The size of this force is not exactly known, for conservancies develop their own programmes, but Southland Conservancy's joint programme with the adjoining Otago Conservancy is one of the best. Over twelve years, the programme has involved

¹⁶ DOC Visitor Strategy, p.34

1,550 volunteers in 340-odd projects. Roughly a third of these projects involve hut or track maintenance. In August-September last year, the conservancies ran a 10-day hut maintenance and track-clearing project at the Martins Bay terminus of the Hollyford track. In March 2001 volunteers completed a similar project at the Hidden Falls end of the track. All in, over the year to March 2001, 42 volunteers did 320 work days on 11 hut or track maintenance projects.

Regular maintenance work taken on by institutions is also evolving - Outward Bound courses regularly work on the Queen Charlotte Walkway, and Tai Poutini Polytechnic's Tourism and Outdoor Recreation students regularly tend West Coast DOC's trails.

The Rise of the Partner -

DOC is also encouraging partnerships with local authorities and others for track development work. The Queen Charlotte Walkway began in 1993 as a \$600,000 proposal between Nelson DOC and the Marlborough District Council. Tourist operators, also contributed, and the Havelock Lions Club brought in Lottery Grants Board money. The track is now maintained by Nelson DOC alone, though tourist operators occasionally make some small contributions.

In 1993, the scoping work on the 150 km Otago Central Rail Trail was paid for privately. The trail then developed as a partnership between the Otago Central Rail Trail Trust and DOC. The Trust brought in around \$300,000 for development, and DOC put in about \$550,000, excluding staff time. The trail is now managed and maintained by DOC, but a few communities have undertaken beautification en route. One local authority regularly mows a stretch of the trail but beyond that the co-operation from local councils is not significant. The Trust continues to bring in money for the trail.

The NZCA and the Conservation Boards -

The New Zealand Conservation Authority has a duty under the Conservation Act "To advise the Minister or Director General, as appropriate, on any matter relating to or affecting walkways."

The 14 Conservation Boards countrywide have a responsibility under the Conservation Act "To advise the Conservation Authority and the Director General on proposals for new walkways in any area within the jurisdiction of the board." The conservation boards can also, under sections (6) and (8) of the Walkways Act initiate walkways over public or private land.

Given these powers, the boards have not been particularly active. The NZCA's annual report of 1999/2000, listed just three boards that had a walkway proposal of some kind: Wellington for an easement access to an existing track, Canterbury Aoraki for an upgrade into legal walkway status of a section of an existing walk, and Taranaki/Wanganui for a 12-km track down the coast from Wanganui to the Whangaehu River. This proposal, which is on Te Araroa's route and was partly inspired by Te Araroa, was reportedly "very much at a preliminary stage."

The overall lack of action has caused some concern. The New Zealand Conservation Authority resolved in June 1998 that due to its statutory responsibilities under the Conservation Act, and evidence that walkways were diminishing under the Act there was a need to establish and fund a Walkway Committee of the NZCA.

This did not occur. As noted in the NZCA's annual report to July 2000, the Department of Conservation did agree to provide secretarial assistance for 3 to 4 meetings of a walkways committee, which was not, however, an NZCA sub-committee. This committee's first meeting, in March 2000, was attended by representatives of the New Zealand Conservation Authority, the Outdoors Assembly, the Council for Outdoors Recreation Associations, the Federated Mountain Clubs, and DOC. Those invited, but who did not attend, were the Tourism Industry Association, Local Government New Zealand, the Hillary Commission, and the New Zealand Recreation Association.

The second meeting of the committee - by now called the Walkways Coordinating Group - took place on November 1, 2000, and had a better attendance, with all but Local Government New Zealand turning up, and with a Te Araroa Trust person also present.

The committee aims to co-ordinate bodies with walkways responsibilities, define common issues, and advise on the implementation of the NZ Walkways policy. It is an informal group, with considerable expertise, but without statutory power. Its existence is an acknowledgement that New Zealand trails are now widely dispersed as between DOC, local authorities, and various private groups, that a significant amount of trail development has moved outside of the Walkways Act, and DOC oversight. It is an acknowledgement of insufficient coordination.

The recent Ministerial Taskforce on Sport Fitness and Leisure sensed the same thing. Its report proposed that a new Crown entity - Active New Zealand - would, among other tasks, "advocate and facilitate integrated planning between DOC, Regional Councils, local government, and outdoor recreation groups for the provision and protection of open spaces e.g. urban parks, cycleways and walkways."¹⁷

The Taskforce also recorded as a strategy worthy of further consideration : "That opportunities be offered to schools, families, whanau and community groups to sponsor specific sections of walkway or areas for public use."¹⁸

There is an echo here of DOC's Walkways Policy which states (8.10.3): "Local people, tangata whenua and voluntary organisations, including tramping clubs, local community

groups, and service organisations, will be encouraged to become involved in the establishment and maintenance of walkways."

These are straws in the wind, but the emerging consensus on walkways is clear enough - they need to be better coordinated as between regional and local government, and DOC. They should also involve community organisations and volunteers. A long New Zealand trail would need to accomplish exactly these conjunctions.

Conclusion

This paper has explored the dynamics of long trails. Te Araroa is most obviously similar to the Canadian models, though Canada has no federal trail legislation. New Zealand does have the Walkways Act, but it is a relatively weak instrument, regional and local authorities tend not to use it, and if DOC itself were to pursue a long trail using the Act it seems certain the Department would bear most of the cost.

¹⁷ Getting Set - For An Active Nation p.73

¹⁸ Ibid. p.111

Should Te Araroa Trust, seeking to yoke together the various levels of government in favour of a long trail, therefore press for trail law which is as powerful as America's National Trails Systems Act, or Britain's Access to the Countryside Act? The answer is no. New Zealand has for some time been subtracting Government, in the capital 'G' sense, and emphasizing governance, a light-handed regime which may do no more - outside of the essential services at least - than assist civil society to organise for, enter into, and improve the public realm. This is Te Araroa Trust's manifesto too.

We can though suggest some key assistance.

- A report on New Zealand's track 'system'.
New Zealand tracks have spilled beyond the Walkways Act in ways that are obscure. Every body responsible for walkways would benefit from a summary of (1) trends, (2) track categories and track standards that should prevail across DOC, regional authority, local authority, and privately-administered trails, (3) areas of possible co-operation between the administering bodies and (4) funding opportunities. We would like to see Te Araroa embedded in such a report. The New Zealand Conservation Authority would be the right body to produce it. The Walkways Co-ordinating Group could, with a paid researcher, provide the data.
- Protection for Te Araroa Trust.
Where no Government body, nor regional nor local council agrees to administer a track that is part of Te Araroa, the Trust must administer this track itself. This task, though light at present, will increase. The Trust cannot, under the definitions of the Walkways Act, be appointed a Controlling Authority and so have the Government underwrite any compensation claims by landholders. It is important for the success of the Trust's continued negotiation with landholders that Government provides this backup, perhaps by way of a Memorandum of Agreement.

Te Araroa Trust's task meantime, is to accomplish by persuasion exactly what is provided for by trail legislation overseas - the co-ordination of levels of Government to a project larger than any one of them could bear, and the encouragement of volunteers.

The conditions of its success are four-fold

- Regional and local government, and iwi participation.
- Funding from New Zealand corporates, and other private funders.
- Funding from Government sources, and help in kind from DOC.
- New Zealanders who can organise locally to advance the trail and guarantee maintenance - volunteers.