

MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

#0.4

CONFIDENTIAL

ATTORNEY/CLIENT

COMMUNICATION

TO: Bill McMullen
DOT & PF
Northern District

DATE: December 15, 1986

FILE NO: 2-162
1:30 PM

FROM: Ronald W. Lorensen
Acting Attorney General

SUBJECT: Fairbanks-Nenana Road

By: Linda L. Walton
Assistant Attorney General

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
REGISTRATION DIVISION

DATE: December 15, 1986
FILE NO: 2-162
1:30 PM

REGISTRATION DIVISION
DIRECTOR
TECH. SERV.
DESIGN
CONSTRUCTION
NEW CONSTRUCTION
ROADWAY CONTROL

REG. COMMISSIONER
ADMIN. SERV.
PLANNING
M & O
RETURN

As we discussed I have been asked by Juneau to write an Attorney General opinion in response to Mike Davis' request to Ron Lorensen regarding the width of the Fairbanks-Nenana Road.

I have reviewed the Borough's position in the December 10, 1986 "Staff Report Platting Board" memo, regarding merger of the dominant and servient estates. If DOT & PF and DNR are considered legally the same "person", or if the State of Alaska in general rather than the DOT & PF held title to the PLO right of way on the state's behalf, the Borough's position would be correct.

Although the Commerce Deed itself is to the "State of Alaska," rather than a specific department, under Alaska law, DNR and DOT & PF are each recognized as having the power to hold title to land. As argument could be made that DOT & PF as administrator of all roads received title to the PLO right of way from the Department of Commerce and that therefore DNR had no power to convey DOT & PF's interest. (The patent issued by DNR has the legal effect of a quitclaim deed, rather than a warranty of title.) However this argument would, I believe, be viewed by a court with some skepticism, given the fact that most members of the public would probably assume that a deed from the state conveyed all the state's interest.

The State of Alaska has always taken the position that the Commerce deed transferred to the state, all the federal government's interest in the road. (See McGee Attorney General Opinion dated May 20, 1985.) BLM has over the years disputed this analysis arguing that the Department of Commerce held only an easement for the road use, and therefore could not convey a broader interest, i.e. the fee simple or the right to permit encroachments which BLM claims are rights it held as the primary custodian of federal lands. If in this case the state were to adapt an argument similar to BLM's argument, i.e. that one department cannot convey another department's interest, as an

FILE	RETURN TO:	RELOCATIONS	APPRAISALS	NEGOTIATIONS	TITLE	ENGINEERING	PLANS	MATERIALS	DPF AUDIT	CHIEF R/W AGENT

RECEIVED W/W
DEC 17 1986
NORTHERN DISTRICT

official Attorney General opinion, that could be used against the state later by the BLM.

I have not done sufficient research to tell you exactly which position I would take in a formal Attorney General opinion, however there would be strong policy reasons for concluding that DNR did give up all the state's rights to the 100 feet in question, when it patented the property to the Borough. It is my recommendation that unless this particular 100 feet is of great practical importance to DOT & PF, the state avoid this issue by DOT & PF's vacation of the 100 feet in question. However if you would prefer that more legal research be done before DOT & PF makes that decision, or that the matter be decided by a formal Attorney General opinion or ultimately by the court's if the Attorney General opinion is that DOT & PF still owns the 300 foot right of way, I am prepared to do more research. (Given our current understaffing other projects may be delayed if I give this matter priority, as instructed by Juneau.) Please let me know DOT & PF's decision as soon as possible.

LLW/dat

we did not receive fee simple rights we received easement one which we retain management (via Statute) until we no longer need the easement for roadway purposes. BLM has somewhat negated their own argument by requesting a permit to place signs on the easement right of way.

DNR accidentally
linguished 100' of PLO
o.w due to errors in
mapping the PLO's
then this makes a stronger
case for the mapping of
or ROW whenever there is
vehicle to fund it. i.e.
State Hwy, Circle Hot Springs.

A3

Strong policy reason for the
Conclusion that DNR did not
give up all the State's rights
there could be a significant
precedent set at the other
Conclusion: there are many
State subdivisions through which
PLO rights of way exist. It would
not be in DOT's best interest
to allow DNR, via the
dominant / servient easement
merger issue, to have the
ability to set our ROW width
which, in essence is what
happened @ Ester Hts. And if
the merger did occur by
virtue of both DOT + DNR being
the State - a vacation is not
the appropriate transfer

vehicle - DOT's interest in
the outer 100' (50' @ side of
C) was already taken
care of. Perhaps a little of
resection? would be more
appropriate. I'd recommend
more research to see ~~what~~
the long term ramifications
could be. DOT should protect its
interests

*John -
Please review
and copy to John
Athens@ALG for
review of language
THX
A*

DPOs sent
Opposed:
Favor:
Undeliverable:

STAFF REPORT
PLATTING BOARD
RP 040-87

Location: Old Wood Road, Old Nenana Hwy
 Legal Description: Lots 4A and B, Ester Heights (SW¼, Section 7, T. 1 S., R. 2 W., F.M.)
 Specific Request: To resubdivide two lots totaling 2.7 acres into two lots of 1.26 and 1.46 acres

Applicant: Bonnie F. Friedman
 P.O. Box 81110
 Fairbanks, AK 99708

Owner: Same

Surveyor: Stutzmann Engineering Assoc., INC.
 P.O. Box 1429
 Fairbanks, AK 99707

<input type="checkbox"/>	ENGINEER/AGENT
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DESIGN
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ENGINEERING
<input type="checkbox"/>	TITLE
<input type="checkbox"/>	PLANS
<input type="checkbox"/>	MATERIALS
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPRAISALS
<input type="checkbox"/>	NEGOTIATIONS
<input type="checkbox"/>	RELOCATION/PROP. MGMT.
<input type="checkbox"/>	RETURN TO:
<input type="checkbox"/>	FILE

Adjacent Subdivisions: Ester Estates
 Adjoining Parcel Sizes: Range from 2.3 to 40 acres

Existing Land Use: 2 SFR and shed on proposed north lot
 Proposed south lot vacant

Current Zoning: Unrestricted Use - UU

Comprehensive Plan: Outskirt Area - primarily open space, mining, and residential uses

Soils: Predominantly Fairbanks silt loam

Flood Zone: Zone C

Road Service Area: None

Analysis: This replat will move the lot line common to Lots 4A and 4B (created by RP 050-86) by adding 7063 sq ft from 4B to 4A to place the hexagonal house within the new Lot 4-A-1.

GVEA requests specific easements and review of the final plat. MUS-T has no objection. DEC has no objection. DOT/PF has no objection but comments that access onto the Old Nenana Highway required a driveway permit, and right-of-way for Old Nenana Highway should be shown as 150' either side of centerline.

Staff research shows a PLO 601 withdrawal for the Old Nenana Highway (aka Fairbanks-Nenana Highway) was established in September 1956 by Amendment #2 to Secretarial Order #2665. PLO 1613 modified that right-of-way reservation whereby adjacent owners of land could acquire those reserved lands subject to certain specified highway easements.

DEC 9 1988
 NORTHERN REGION DOT/PF

PL0 1613 designated the Fairbanks-Nenana Highway as a "through road" with a 150' right-of-way both sides of centerline. When the State of Alaska platted the Ester Heights Subdivision in 1966, only 200' of right-of-way (100' both sides of centerline) was dedicated for the Fairbanks-Nenana Highway. An examination of the preliminary file for that subdivision showed no requirement by the Dept of Highways for more right-of-way.


When the FNSB acquired the Ester Heights Subdivision property from the State in July 1969, the patent was subject to "platted easements within Ester Heights Alaska Subdivision, located in Section seven (7), and the Fairbanks-Nenana Highway right-of-way 200 feet in width." The only other exception made was for a 100' right-of-way for an electric transmission line.

Staff's position is that the appropriate time for the reservation of the right-of-way for the Old Nenana Highway was on the plat of Ester Heights Subdivision when the State had patent and designated the right-of-way. DOT asserts that there is more right-of-way than is indicated on the plat and that the lots are still encumbered by the PLO easement. This position is not supported by a legal tenet called "merger of dominant and servient estates." This principle states that, "When the right to an easement and fee title to the servient tenement become vested in the same person, the easement is extinguished, since all rights are merged in the title in fee. Thus, as a general rule, an easement is extinguished when the ownership of the dominant and servient tenements becomes vested in the same person."

Recommendation: Staff recommends preliminary approval with the following conditions:

- 1 DEC stamp the final plat.
2. GVEA review and comment on the final plat.

RP040-87



7 800
(FNSB)

TL-1807

TL-1812

TL-1811

TL-1808

TL-1809

TL-1815

TL-1813

TL-1814

TL-1816

TL-1817

TL-1818

TL-1819

TL-1820

TL-1821

TL-1822

TL-1823

TL-1824

TL-1825

TL-1826

TL-1827

TL-1828

TL-1829

TL-1830

TL-1831

TL-1832

TL-1833

TL-1834

TL-1835

TL-1836

TL-1837

TL-1838

TL-1839

TL-1840

TL-1841

TL-1842

TL-1843

TL-1844

TL-1845

TL-1846

TL-1847

TL-1848

TL-1849

TL-1850

TL-1851

TL-1852

TL-1853

TL-1854

TL-1855

TL-1856

TL-1857

TL-1858

TL-1859

TL-1860

TL-1861

TL-1862

TL-1863

TL-1864

TL-1865

TL-1866

TL-1867

TL-1868

TL-1869

TL-1870

TL-1871

TL-1872

TL-1873

TL-1874

TL-1875

TL-1876

TL-1877

TL-1878

TL-1879

TL-1880

TL-1881

TL-1882

TL-1883

TL-1884

TL-1885

TL-1886

TL-1887

TL-1888

TL-1889

TL-1890

TL-1891

TL-1892

TL-1893

TL-1894

TL-1895

TL-1896

TL-1897

TL-1898

TL-1899

TL-1900

TL-1901

TL-1902

TL-1903

TL-1904

TL-1905

TL-1906

TL-1907

TL-1908

TL-1909

TL-1910

TL-1911

TL-1912

TL-1913

TL-1914

TL-1915

TL-1916

TL-1917

TL-1918

TL-1919

TL-1920

TL-1921

TL-1922

TL-1923

TL-1924

TL-1925

TL-1926

TL-1927

TL-1928

TL-1929

TL-1930

TL-1931

TL-1932

TL-1933

TL-1934

TL-1935

TL-1936

TL-1937

TL-1938

TL-1939

TL-1940

TL-1941

TL-1942

TL-1943

TL-1944

TL-1945

TL-1946

TL-1947

TL-1948

TL-1949

TL-1950

TL-1951

TL-1952

TL-1953

TL-1954

TL-1955

TL-1956

TL-1957

TL-1958

TL-1959

TL-1960

TL-1961

TL-1962

TL-1963

TL-1964

TL-1965

TL-1966

TL-1967

TL-1968

TL-1969

TL-1970

TL-1971

TL-1972

TL-1973

TL-1974

TL-1975

TL-1976

TL-1977

TL-1978

TL-1979

TL-1980

TL-1981

TL-1982

TL-1983

TL-1984

TL-1985

TL-1986

TL-1987

TL-1988

TL-1989

TL-1990

TL-1991

TL-1992

TL-1993

TL-1994

TL-1995

TL-1996

TL-1997

TL-1998

TL-1999

TL-2000

TL-2001

TL-2002

TL-2003

TL-2004

TL-2005

TL-2006

TL-2007

TL-2008

TL-2009

TL-2010

TL-2011

TL-2012

TL-2013

TL-2014

TL-2015

TL-2016

TL-2017

TL-2018

TL-2019

TL-2020

TL-2021

TL-2022

TL-2023

TL-2024

TL-2025

TL-2026

TL-2027

TL-2028

TL-2029

TL-2030

TL-2031

TL-2032

TL-2033

TL-2034

TL-2035

TL-2036

TL-2037

TL-2038

TL-2039

TL-2040

TL-2041

TL-2042

TL-2043

TL-2044

TL-2045

TL-2046

TL-2047

TL-2048

TL-2049

TL-2050

TL-2051

TL-2052

TL-2053

TL-2054

TL-2055

TL-2056

TL-2057

TL-2058

TL-2059

TL-2060

TL-2061

TL-2062

TL-2063

TL-2064

TL-2065

TL-2066

TL-2067

OLD WOOD ROAD

N 81° 15' 57" E

207.58'

ALUMINUM MONUMENT WITH MAGNETS ("BERNTSEN"), RECOVERED (TYPICAL)

15' PUBLIC UTILITIES EASEMENTS

5/8" REBAR WITH ALUMINUM SURVEY CAP, RECOVERED

LOT 4-A-1

146 ac. (proposed)

EASTERLY 1/2 LOT 4

BASIS OF BEARINGS

310.00' N 20° 36' 05" W

250.00'

S 20° 11' 58" E

is, anchors, and
monuments it grants
is and said, with
vicinity of the
for granting of

LOT 5-A

FORMER LOT LINE
N 64° 29' 01" E
202.14'

5/8" REBAR WITH ALUMINUM SURVEY CAP, SET THIS SURVEY (TYPICAL)

219' (PROPOSED) NEW LOT LINE

LOT 4-B-1

126 ac. (proposed)

521.94'
271.94'

LOT 5-B

70.2'

657.37'

277.37'

220.00'


N 44° 27' 41" E

HIGHWAY

OLD

SCALE: 1" = 100' APPROX

is and is
subject to



I, NEIL K. EKLUND, a Registered Land Surveyor, hereby certify that I am familiar with the above described property and that the improvements located thereon lie wholly within the property lines and do not overlap onto the property adjacent thereto and that no improvements on the adjacent property encroach onto the property in question and that there are no roadways, transmission lines or other visible easements except as indicated hereon.

Date: 10/25/85

Neil K. Eklund

FOR TITLE INSURANCE PURPOSES ONLY

This As-Built survey was prepared from an actual

