

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Anchorage Park Foundation	3/25/2026	Beth Nordlund	Project Support	1, 2, 47, 60	We strongly support these voter-approved projects to connect the Ship Creek Trail to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail (Project 1), the Fish Creek Trail to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail (Project 2), and the Campbell Creek Trail crossing at Lake Otis Parkway (Project 47). Other federally funded projects include Far North Bicentennial Park's (FNBP) bridge and trail upgrades (Project 60).	Thank you for the support of these important projects with existing or partial funding sources.	No change
Anchorage Park Foundation	3/25/2026	Beth Nordlund	Project Support	8, 35, 36, 60	We appreciate your broad inclusion of projects that range from those that can realistically be done in the next few years, like Russian Jack Springs Park trail repavement and lighting (Projects 35 and 36), and Kincaid Park Master Planning (Project 8 - which we hope will allow for a trailside winter center for food and beverages) to those that will require more community engagement and long-term funding, like the Muldoon (JBER) Perimeter Trail, providing continuous north-south access between the Glenn Highway Trail, Muldoon neighborhoods, FNBP, and Chugach State Park.	The department appreciates APF's support for projects in Northeast Anchorage and for projects that enhance trail connectivity, such as the Muldoon Perimeter Trail. We'd like to point out that JBER has requested removal of the Perimeter Trail from their property boundary, but the project team has opted to keep a north-south trail alignment through Muldoon neighborhoods in the Plan. We look forward to working with you and other stewardship partners on the Kincaid Park Master Plan update and diving into how park buildings can better	No change
Anchorage Park Foundation	3/25/2026	Beth Nordlund	Project Support	39,40,31, Non Motorized 8	Cheney Lake is Anchorage Park Foundation's community-approved Park of the Year. We look forward to three projects for pavement and soft-surface trail rehabilitation on the lake, a new trail connection east to Chester Valley Park trail for bridge and trails to Patterson Street (Projects 39-41). We dream about a bridge over Tudor Road somewhere along the Muldoon Curve near Patterson Street to access the Chugach Foothills Connector Trail (Non-Motorized Project 8).	Thank you for attention to projects in this area.	No change
Anchorage Park Foundation	3/25/2026	Beth Nordlund	Project Support	5,6	We strongly support the introduction of a new type of trail standard (Trail Class 6) that provides separation for bicyclists, pedestrians, and skiers on a wider or parallel multi-use path. The Tony Knowles Coastal Trail desperately needs this new standard from Elderberry Park to Earthquake Park at a minimum (Project 5), along with a complete rehabilitation of the trail for erosion control and drainage (Project 6).	We are excited about community support for the Trail Class 6. Based on a number of supportive comments received and a reevaluation of the project, we have advanced the priority of Project 5 at Earthquake Park to High.	No change
Anchorage Park Foundation	3/25/2026	Beth Nordlund	Project Support	10	We are also strong supporters of the south extension of the coastal trail to Potter Marsh. (Project 10).	Thank you for support of this connectivity project.	No change
Anchorage Park Foundation	3/25/2026	Beth Nordlund	Project Support	Non Motorized 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 21	Thank you for including Non-Motorized/Active Transportation Projects from the 2021 Non-Motorized Plan that are part of our trail network. Non-Motorized (NM) projects that we continue to advocate for include:	Thank you for your continued advocacy of the listed projects listed in our Non-Motorized Needs map.	No change
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Document Edit		Correction: Organization Name	This will be updated.	Correct "Chugiak" to "Chugach Mountain Bike Riders" on p 11, 21, 23, 44 and check throughout.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Recommendation Concern		The new Class 6 trail designation — separating cyclists and pedestrians on wider or parallel paths — is a welcome addition. However, the Plan should also introduce Class 4-B and 5-B designations to recognize the model of a parallel soft-surface singletrack alongside a hardened multi-use path. The Chester Creek Singletrack is the best existing example of this in Anchorage. A similar approach is proposed for the Coastal Trail Singletrack (Project ID 7). Formalizing 4-B and 5-B classifications in the Design Criteria Manual would provide flexibility to achieve Class 6 capacity with less environmental impact and greater adaptability where full-width widening is not feasible.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Review Class 6 for adaptability and minimum widths Add narrative about how parallell track design can adapt to different contexts and mitigate environmental impacts.
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Recommendation Concern		CMBR recommends the Plan call for consistent mapping themes and symbology developed in coordination with user groups, rather than specifying a particular standard at this time.	Universal standards for trail difficulty are recommended (green, blue, and black to reflect trail difficulty) to provide an easy way to communicate what trails are suited for different users.	No action.
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Document Edit		The Plan’s reference to “fully motorized bikes” may cause confusion among trail users. We recommend using “electric bicycle (e-bike)” and “pedal assist electric bicycle” to distinguish from electric dirt bikes/e-motos.	The project team will review and update in document where necessary.	Use clearer language about e-bikes throughout plan (i.e. “pedal assist”).
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Project Concern	12,16,25	References to “novice skill building” should be updated to “progressive skill building” to reflect this standard.	We recognize that progressive is more inclusive of all skill levels, but intent of these projects is to ensure there are beginner resources rather than only serving advanced users.	No action
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		New Proposed Project		Project ID 63 (Eagle River High School Nordic Ski Trail Expansion) should also include mountain bike trail development.	Based on consistency with the Chugach State Park management plan, this project can be added. We recommend a separate project for the different user groups.	Add project to reflect mountain bike development in the area, consistent with Chugach State Park management plan.
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Document Edit		Throughout the Plan, consider replacing “Edmonds Lake” with “Mirror Lake” or “Mirror/Edmonds Lake.”	We will review for clarity.	Use consistent name for Mirror/Edmonds Lake.
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Document Edit		CMBR supports all Chugiak-Eagle River projects included in the Plan and urges the project team to also add the following missing trails and access points: Carol Creek Trail Corridor, Fire Creek Trail easement, Ptarmigan Valley Trailhead, Old Glenn Highway Trail, and North Bank Lower Eagle River Trail to existing conditions map.	We will review maps for accurate representation of existing trails and trailheads.	Confirm that Ptarmigan Valley Trailhead and Eagle River Greenbelt trails are consistent with Chugach State Park Maps. Show Glenn Hwy paths on maps if possible
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Project Support	61,62, 63,64, 68, low.	Confirmed support for Projects 64 and 68 as high priority, 62 as medium, and 61 and 63 as	Thank you for support of these project’s priority categories.	No action
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Project Prioritization		Change Project 69 (Coastal Trail North: Mirror Lake to Thunderbird Falls) from Medium to High Priority.	This segment received a medium priority rather than high, because it does not contribute to connectivity goals as much as other projects. For example, the North Coastal Trail segment described in Project 68 achieves connectivity between existing trail systems/parks and would cross a number of neighborhoods.	No action
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Project Prioritization		Change Project 70 (Mirror Lake Master Plan Implementation) from High to Medium Priority.	This project received high priority because of the recently completed Master Plan documenting community support for projects and the wide variety of user groups served at Mirror Lake Park.	No action

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Project Prioritization		Change Project 71 (Coastal Trail North: Thunderbird Falls to Knik River) from Low to Medium Priority.	This segment received a lower priority because it would primarily serve regional recreationalists rather than serve local connectivity (i.e. Project 68 between Beach and Mirror Lakes).	No action
Chugach Mountain Bike Riders	3/27/2026		Project Prioritization		Change Project 72 (Chugach State Park Connection Improvements) from Low to Medium Priority; and correct CASA to CBERRRSA as implementing partner.	In this Plan, Chugach State Park Connection projects fall into the lower priority category partly due to the lack of municipal land ownership and the lack of urgent/severe need. We will be correcting the use of CASA as it relates to Eagle River Chugach State Park access projects throughout the document.	Remove CASA as implementation tool for Eagle River/Chugiak projects (Project 72 description and elsewhere in narrative).
Chugiak Community Council	3/27/2026		New Proposed Project		We urge the project team to add the Carol Creek Trail corridor as a named project and to include McDonald Center as an access point on the Eagle River project maps	Being consistent with other adopted plans and recent platting actions, this project can be added.	Add Carol Creek corridor trail as new project
Chugiak Community Council	3/27/2026		Project Support	68	The Plan includes Project ID 68, extending the coastal trail from Beach Lake to Mirror/Edmonds Lake. This project is consistent with long-standing community priorities, follows the historic Iditarod National Historic Trail corridor, and is identified in existing community plans. We support its inclusion and priority.	Thank you for support of this connectivity project.	No action
Chugiak Community Council	3/27/2026		Document Edit		The Eklutna Compromise established a recreational easement for the Fire Creek Trail corridor through the Chugiak area. Despite this existing legal access, the Fire Creek Trail does not appear on the Plan's Chugiak project maps. We ask that it be added consistent with the easement already in place.	Easements across the AMATS area are not comprehensively documented or mapped. This Plan recommends a comprehensive inventory of easements to help with the goals outlined in this plan, but all easements are not shown in the maps.	Reference this easement (and indicate application to other streams) in the plan narrative, specifically about the North Coastal Trail extension.
Chugiak Community Council	3/27/2026		Document Edit		The Ptarmigan Valley Trailhead (across from Loretta French Park) is a municipally-owned parking area and trailhead providing access to Chugach State Park. It is not shown on existing trail maps in the Plan. We recommend adding it as an existing facility and identifying it as a connection point for the regional trail network.	Confirmed that it is shown on existing condition maps.	No action.
Chugiak Community Council	3/27/2026		Document Edit		The Plan references the Glenn Highway Trail as the primary paved route between Eagle River and Chugiak. However, the Old Glenn Highway Trail is a more popular and quieter alternative for this corridor, particularly for residents traveling north from Eagle River toward Peters Creek and Chugiak. The Old Glenn Highway Trail should be named alongside the Glenn Highway Trail in the Plan and shown on the relevant project maps.	Thank you for helping update the narrative about existing trails in the area.	Page 40-44: Update descriptions of existing conditions to include Old Glenn Highway Trail as part of the Glenn Highway regional system
Eagle River Nordic Ski Club	2/11/2026	Alan Brown, ERCPRD via email	New Proposed Project	63	Expand the Project 63 (ERHS Nordic Ski Trail System Expansion) description to include a trail overpass/underpass across Wolf Den Dr.	We recognize this proposal would increase connectivity for recreation but recommend it be a separate effort due to the fact that it would likely fall outside the scope of the Department alone. Your comment is documented and will be carried forward into future updates of the Non-Motorized Plan.	No action.
Colin Singleton	4/1/2026		Document Edit		I didn't understand how the trail classifications show up in the actual document. When I reviewed the plan the first time I couldn't find the specs on the different classes and just now saw the link to the separate classification document.	Thank you for the note.	Integrate Trail Classifications better into the document and link the full descriptions.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Colin Singleton			Recommendation Concern		On the classes themselves, I'm a little concerned that the trail and clearing widths aren't capturing the real width of tread or clearing necessary to construct trails and it might give the public an unreasonable expectation for how small impacts can be. I get that Classes 1-2 generally describe existing trails, but some members of the public will push to have minimums constructed for other trail classifications, like on Fish Creek Trail. Summer Class 3: These are designed trails. As such, I think there should be some discussion about the accessibility requirements similar to US Forest Service Accessibility Guidelines. Just because these are dirt trails doesn't mean we're off the hook for accessibility considerations. The Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) has jurisdiction for recreational facilities constructed with federal funds and requires a tread width of 3'. Also, I think it would be valuable to have a separate subclass specific to MTB use since IMBAs Mountain Bike Trail Development Guidelines highlight how trails designed for bikes differ from those designed for hiking (banked turns, varying grades, features, etc.). It's worth noting that the photos of modern designed MTB trails show much wider clearing limits than 1-2' beyond the trail.	Thank you for the observations. Trail Classifications will be modified to better reflect these standards in a recreational setting, and to match the intended trail character.	Revisions will be reflected to Trail Classifications cut sheets:
							Added text throughout to better explain the class intent.
							Modified Summer Class 1-5 trail widths.
							Modified Summer Class 1-6 trail clearance.
							Throughout "trail clearance" table, consistently use the total clearing width rather than refer to each side (winter and summer)
Colin Singleton			Recommendation Concern		Summer Class 4: If the intent is that this class corresponds with designed double-track trail offering more accessibility it seems appropriate to say that explicitly and modify trail widths accordingly. The AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities discusses how cyclists and pedestrians have an operating width between 4-5'. When planning for bi-directional facilities or passing comfortably I would recommend 8-10' where bikes are anticipated and only narrower if passing is very infrequent. Both the photos depict facilities 8-14' wide and significantly wider clearing.	Thank you for the observations. Trail Classifications will be modified to better reflect these standards in a recreational setting, and to match the intended trail character.	Revisions will be reflected to Trail Classifications cut sheets:
							Added text throughout to better explain the class intent.
							Modified Summer Class 1-5 trail widths.
							Modified Summer Class 1-6 trail clearance.
							Throughout "trail clearance" table, consistently use the total clearing width rather than refer to each side (winter and summer)
							Modified all winter class clearances to make sure they are consistent.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Colin Singleton			Recommendation Concern		Summer Class 5 (and Class 6 as applicable): Similar to above, I recommend that these facilities reflect the best practice guidance from AASHTO Bike Guide which recommends the following: AASHTO Bike Guide recommends 2-3' clearance to vertical obstructions. It's also nice to not have prescriptive widths for running shoulders since these are sometimes omitted or less than 2'.	Thank you for the observations. Trail Classifications will be modified to better reflect these standards in a recreational setting, and to match the intended trail character.	Revisions will be reflected to Trail Classifications cut sheets: Added text throughout to better explain the class intent. Modified Summer Class 1-5 trail widths. Modified Summer Class 1-6 trail clearance. Throughout "trail clearance" table, consistently use the total clearing width rather than refer to each side (winter and summer) Modified all winter class clearances to make sure they are consistent.
Colin Singleton			Recommendation Concern		Shifting on to the rest of the plan, I have questions about how projects are listed and prioritized. How many nominations for a project does it take for it to be included? Do low priority projects mean that there's no public support? Will low priority projects that are short-term be constructed before high priority long term? That distinction is valuable for practitioners who are designing these recommended projects and trying to defend the purpose and need to the public.	There was no minimum project nomination to be considered. The project team carried over some projects from the 1997 plan, along with new projects that had multiple requests or mentions of support along with departmental support. Priority and timeframe are provided as general categories in the plan but there is not a prescriptive order for completion. This is because of the influence of many factors affecting the Parks Department workplan, including severity of need, availability of bonds, administrative priorities, partnership opportunities, CIP survey rankings, among many other avenues that projects become elevated.	No action.
Colin Singleton			Recommendation Concern		Under policy>resource allocation, I think a lot of the goals are important, but I'm curious how they relate to each other. I don't get a clear sense whether the overall plan recommendations emphasis is on taking care of existing resources or expanding new opportunities. An example of that is that Tikishla Park Trail improvements is listed as low and underpass improvements are listed as medium, but the Muldoon Perimeter Trail is listed as High. Personally, I'd love to see deteriorating pavement and substandard underpasses prioritized above most new connections or Class 6 facilities.	The Plan discovered public support for both taking care of existing resources and connecting existing trail systems (implying building new trails for that purpose). The priorities are intended to put municipal resources first toward existing assets while not precluding partner agencies from pursuing purpose-built trails or partnership opportunities to connect and improve trails.	No action
Colin Singleton			Project Concern		I am concerned about the lengthening of Eagle River Road Pathway under the same project name. There's some support for the existing project limits (Hilcrest to Mile Hi), but that may change if lumped in with the more controversial extension (Mile Hi to Nature Center). Personally, I don't support the longer extension to the Nature Center because I think it detracts from other meaningful projects connecting the Glenn Highway Trail and think the ROW issues and grades dont reflect a "defined" project.	Thank you for the feedback.	Revise project description to distinguish between the funded/scoped project (Hilcrest to Mile High) and the remaining portion (Mile Hi to Nature Center).

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Colin Singleton			New Proposed Project		I don't know if this fits with this plan since it's on ASD property, but I see value in establishing a separate multi-use trailhead at Service to the Hillside trails or parallel facilities to separate different users (kids and novices learning how to ski vs bikers and dogs). This is the main location on Anchorage's nordic-specific trails where those uses are not delineated.	Thank you for the note. Use at these trailheads has definitely changed since the last update of the 2011 Far North Bicentennial Trail Improvements Plan. A wayfinding/plan update effort can be recommended to align modern use with wayfinding and access.	Add a targeted plan update to 2011 FNBP TIP in the Park Master Plan Update recommendations in chapter 6.
Rick Sinnott	3/31/2026		Project Concern	10	Although I appreciate and frequently use recreational trails, and the draft 2026 Recreational Trails Plan does a good job promoting and planning for such trails in almost every aspect, there is one proposed trail that I do not support: a Coastal Trail sited below the coastal bluff between Kincaid Park and Potter Marsh. That location is demonstrably unsuitable due to many persuasive issues related to conservation of critical natural resources, hunting and other existing recreational activities, and construction costs – a litany of issues exhaustively explored in a still-pertinent final environmental impact statement published in 2006. In addition, a trail located in the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge and adjacent coastal mudflats and tidal marsh properties appears to be inconsistent with the mission of AMATS.	We appreciate your concern about the potential impacts of this project and contextual barriers to its location.	No action.
Rick Sinnott	3/31/2026		Document Edit		The problematic portion of the wildlife refuge, where the South Extension of the Coastal Trail was deemed inappropriate, is located in a seaward bulge in the AMATS boundary in the exact area where proponents of the Coastal Trail have long desired to site the trail (Figure 1). Figure 1 illustrates, in blue, where the AMATS and expanded urbanized boundaries extend well below the coastal bluff and high tide line. This is an unprecedented and unacceptable expansion of the two AMATS boundaries beyond what might justifiably be called an “urbanized” area.	This portion of the AMATS boundary is determined by the federal requirement to include the Urbanized Area as defined by the U.S. Census, regardless of development potential of specific properties within the urbanized area. However, inclusion in the boundary does not override other requirements for specific properties, such as park dedications, conservation easements, Section 6(f) restrictions, and deed restrictions, all of which would guide any potential trail development in the area.	No action
Rick Sinnott	3/31/2026		Document Edit	10	Gaps Analysis (p. 48): “Extending the Coastal Trail from Kincaid Park to Potter Marsh remains a long-standing community priority, though environmental and political constraints have delayed implementation.” That's one way of putting it. Although connecting the existing Coastal Trail with the Seward Highway is indeed a long-standing community priority, the devil is in the details. More than one alternate route can satisfy this objective and it isn't quite telling the whole story to claim that “environmental and political constraints have delayed implementation.” The route that most people think of when they advocate for a Coastal Trail connection is through the refuge, but that route was deemed unsuitable way back in 2006. It's time to start considering another alternative and to stop pretending like the refuge route is still on the table. Nowhere in the draft trails plan is the final environmental impact statement that dealt a death blow to the unsuitable alternative mentioned. It	We received many supportive public comments for a contiguous route connecting Kincaid Park to Potter Marsh, but this Plan does not intend to determine an exact route. The project team will update the document to include a reference to the 2006 Environmental Impact Study (EIS) regarding a southern Coastal Trail extension.	Include formal reference to the 2006 Southern Coastal Trail EIS in a narrative about Project 10 under subheading "Major Connectivity Projects"

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Rick Sinnott			Project Concern	10	Trail Project Recommendations – Coastal Trail: South Extension (p. 93): “Support and participate in the evaluation of alternatives and development of a continuous nonmotorized extension of the Coastal Trail from Kincaid to Potters [sic] Marsh Watershed Park. Alternatives should consider seasonal variations and braided routes to continue the experience and access to viewshed offered by the existing on-coast alignment of Coastal Trail.” The existing Coastal Trail took advantage of a string of large and small municipal parks – Margaret Eagan Sullivan, Lyn Ary, Telequana, Earthquake, Point Woronzof Overlook, Point Woronzof, and Kincaid – and undeveloped areas in between. The reference to an “existing on-coast alignment” is an exaggeration. Much of the existing Coastal Trail was constructed in forested habitat with, at best, limited views of the coast. Furthermore, there are few comparable municipal parks between Kincaid and Potter Marsh, with the notable exception of CCENA and Johns Park, both of which restrict trail development in their mission statements or acquisition agreements. When the Coastal Trail was initially planned and constructed, in the early to mid-1980s, the coastal bluff between Kincaid Park and Potter Marsh was relatively lightly developed. Forty years later, houses have been built on most of the private properties lining the coastal bluff. Whereas the “existing on-coast alignment” of the Coastal Trail was facilitated by municipal park land and large tracts of undeveloped land, there is no comparable opportunity left south of Kincaid Park. The opportunity for an “on-coast alignment” outside of the wildlife refuge has been lost. At best, trail planners can use existing inland parks, greenbelts, multi-use trails, and low-traffic neighborhood streets to connect with a few dedicated overlooks, like the ones at Carr-Gottstein Park and Oceanview Bluff Park. The two lines from the draft trails plan quoted above give trail proponents false hope for a trail, like the existing Coastal Trail, which might have been built 40 years ago but is no longer viable. I recommend revising the project description for the South Extension of the Coastal Trail to reflect a more realistic objective, e.g., connecting Kincaid Park and Potter Marsh via existing municipal parks, greenbelts, multi-use trails, and low-traffic neighborhood streets outside of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge and CCENA.	Project description intends to leave open ended exploration of routes and was shaped by specific public interest in a coastal alignment. Narrative can be developed to better reflect reasonable expectations of a future route study that would prioritize existing park land, greenbelts, and low-traffic road corridors.	Add "Major Connectivity Projects" narrative to describe challenges and considerations of this project proposal.
Rick Sinnott			Project Concern		Trail Project Recommendations (maps entitled Anchorage Central, Anchorage North, and Anchorage South): All three of these maps (Figures 5, 6 and 7) depict the South Extension of the Coastal Trail as a conceptual trail route (#10) envisioned between Dimond Boulevard (near Jewel Lake) and Potter Marsh. Earlier alternatives for the South Extension once proposed to be located below the coastal bluff from Point Campbell to CCENA have apparently been replaced by conceptual routes sited inland and labeled “08” and “09.” That’s a good start, although be aware that the conservation easement, mission statement, and master plan of CCENA will not support a multi-use trail as large and environmentally incompatible as the Coastal Trail.	Route 10 will be amended to avoid CCENA based on the Conservation Easement and Master Plan.	Amend route 10 to avoid CCENA.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
John Weddleton (CASA Advisory Board)	3/25/2026		Recommendation Concern		1) p.90 Regarding recommendations from the public for CSP access trails ‘... in road rights-of-way (see Non-Motorized Projects above) or require acquisition which is inconsistent with community priorities identified through this planning process.’ The plan said 43% were ok with acquiring trail connections which is not insubstantial support. Access to CSP could require buying parcels or easements so I hope this bolded statement does not impede that. In the choice between ‘fix what we have ’ vs ‘ acquire more,’ you found that ‘fix what we have won out.’ In the case of CSP access there isn’t much to fix but there is plenty to acquire. Public voting in support of creating CASA and the CASA bonds shows real support for acquiring more access. I suggest deleting the comment regarding acquisition in the context of CASA. ‘... in road rights-of-way (see Non-Motorized Projects above) or require acquisition which is inconsistent with community priorities identified through this planning process.’	The survey asked people about “connecting the missing links between existing trail systems” and did not specify acquisition, so it is not entirely accurate to measure community support for acquisition with this data. Workshop and survey results also clearly demonstrate the public’s concern about a lack of maintenance funding for existing trails. The intent of this section of the Plan was to highlight the public desire to take care of existing assets. However, there is definitely support for connectivity of trails and acquisition is one way to achieve those goals. This language is potentially conflicting and will be updated.	On Page 90, rephrase this section " ... in road rights-of-way (see Non Motorized Projects) or require acquisition which is inconsistent with community priorities identified through this planning process"
John Weddleton (CASA Advisory Board)			Document Edit		2) p. 90 ‘Additionally, the new Chugach Access Service Area (CASA)’ Should be ‘Chugach State Park Access Service Area.’ This change also makes it consistent with the CASA discussion on p120	Correction will be updated throughout document.	Correct all reference to CASA: Chugach State Park Access Service Area.
John Weddleton (CASA Advisory Board)			Document Edit		3) p .104 Project table Project #72 ‘Chugach State Park Connection Improvements: C-ER’ ‘Coordinate with neighboring landowners, recreation area managers, and municipal departments implementing CASA funded projects to improve and expand access to Chugach State Park, including Ram Valley, Mt. Baldy, and Eagle River Greenbelt’ CASA does not include these project areas. AO 2023-8 says ‘all areas of the Municipality north of McHugh Creek, but: excluding Fire Island, excluding areas currently contained within the Eagle River–Chugiak Parks and Recreation and Girdwood Valley Service Areas, and excluding areas of the Municipality within Tax District 15 (which contains Rainbow, Indian, Bird Creek and Portage).’	Service area maps will be provided for APRSA, ERCPRSA, and CASA for clarity and project descriptions updated.	Include service area maps for APRSA, ERCPRSA, and CASA in Chapter 2.
John Weddleton (CASA Advisory Board)			Document Edit		4) p. 120 CHUGACH STATE PARK ACCESS SERVICE AREA (CASA) Please add the words underlined and in red. These provide a more full presentation of CASA. ‘In April 2023, Anchorage voters approved the establishment of the Chugach State Park Access Service Area (CASA) (see AMC 27.30.085). CASA is a mechanism by which voters can decide to fund infrastructure like <u>road</u>, parking and trailhead improvements that will improve access to Chugach State Park. Specific project bonds <u>or tax levies</u> can now appear on yearly ballots for voters to consider. ’	Language will be updated on page 120.	Page 120, update language: "In April 2023...infrastructure like road, parking, and trailhead improvements...Specific project bonds or tax levies..."
John Weddleton (CASA Advisory Board)			Document Edit		P 90 ‘These trail opportunities are generally mapped and the support for them are represented in Trail Project Recommendations 13 and 7472.’	Project 72 will be replaced with 75.	Page 90, update: "Recommendations 13 and 74 72."

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
			Project Concern		On behalf of Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge (FAR), I write to oppose a trail through any part of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge (ACWR) and the adjacent Campbell Creek Estuary Natural Area (CCENA), which is legally bound by a Conservation Easement. We also object in advance to the taking of private property for a recreational trail. FAR supports a trail system that helps citizens and visitors safely access their destinations. We also support reasonable segments like including a route behind and adjacent to Potter Marsh, sent previously. Reasonable segments could conceivably include pop-outs to areas with views of the coast from a more inland route	Thank you for the thoughtful and important comments about conservation, stewardship, and protection of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge.	No action.
Friends of the ACWR			Document Edit	10	The CCENA Master Plan should be included on page 25 of this draft plan. FAR was part of the working group with the MOA and GLT to develop the rules and interpretive signage and guidance for appropriate use of the natural area. Because winter routes are suggested in the draft Anchorage Recreational Trails Plan we point out that the CCENA Master Plan specifically recommended that there be no winter access advertised or maintained at the advice of professional agency biologists because people might access the area during nesting and migrating seasons. It further states that creating new access points for winter use will leave a construction footprint that could be abused in the summer [which they found to be a frequent occurrence in their experience]. (p 18)	Thank you for the thoughtful and important comments about conservation, stewardship, and protection of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge.	Page 25: Include CCENA Master Plan and add language about Conservation Easements as a legal guiding document affecting allowable trail development
Friends of the ACWR			Document Edit		At some point, AMATS erroneously changed the boundaries to include part of the ACWR (Map, p 8, 31, 32, 33, 34, 45 ...) which is managed as a wildlife refuge by the State of Alaska under the auspices of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The purposes and regulations are different than those for recreational trails. This is a narrow refuge with distinct habitats that are vitally important to the species that use it during specific parts of their life cycles. The explanation given when we pointed out this error numerous times was that AMATS had to follow the census boundaries. No one lives in this refuge and it is not developable for human habitation. That makes zero sense. The boundary for AMATS should be removed as we have stipulated before. We see that the current boundary is labeled Census/AMATS Boundary. This is wrong.	This portion of the AMATS boundary is determined by the federal requirement to include the Urbanized Area as defined by the U.S. Census, regardless of development potential of specific properties within the urbanized area. However, inclusion in the boundary does not override other requirements for specific properties, such as park dedications, conservation easements, Section 6(f) restrictions, and deed restrictions, all of which would guide any potential trail development in the area. The Project Team is happy to add language about Conservation Easements, Park Dedication, Section 6(f), and other legal protections that ultimately guide and limit the types of development allowed on park land.	Add language about Conservation Easements, Park Dedication, Section 6(f), and other legal protections that ultimately guide and limit the types of development allowed on park land.
Friends of the ACWR			Project Concern	8,9,10	We assert that trail planning and construction must avoid the ACWR, CCENA, and take a more inland route. A potential solution to this dilemma is to select a more reasonable route that will avoid constructive use of both the ACWR and CCENA. Here is one that could work that helps connect both the Campbell Creek Trail and the coast: Our recommended routing of segment 10 (see plan markup attached), 1. REMOVE all segments of what are labeled "Project 10: Coastal Trail: South Extension," that go into the physical refuge, CCENA, or private property. 2. Use the 09 segment of the trail to connect from Dimond Blvd down 88th Ave. to the Campbell Creek trailhead/Victor Road. 3. Improve the existing sidewalks/trail on Victor Road from the Campbell Creek Trailhead to W 100th Ave 4. Utilize the existing trails along Bayshore Drive to Carr Gottstein Park (AKA the Peat Point) where it connects to the inland route 10	While it is outside the scope of this Plan to determine an actual route, the Plan documented support for a contiguous recreational route between Kincaid Park and Potter Marsh. However, this Plan acknowledges the various barriers and challenges of the shown routing, and acknowledge the restrictions of the Conservation Easement in this area and will amend the route to avoid CCENA.	Project 10: adjust linework to avoid CCENA, take 10 to Victor Rd. and Southport Dr. Extend the line to match the inland route described connecting to Potter Marsh.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
			Recommendation Concern		Page 69: 4. Wellness, Objective D. 2. states the “Trail design enhances or protects wildlife habitat and sensitive natural resources like wetlands and creeks.” Note Well: a trail can displace wildlife when routed through habitats important to said wildlife. A trail can also alter the health of connected habitats by interrupting the flow of ground water, so care must be taken to consider these things in design. Trails DO NOT in and of themselves “enhance or protect wildlife habitat and sensitive natural resources like wetlands and creeks.”	These are goal and objective statements. The purpose of these statements is to show that we strive for trail design that protects wildlife habitat and natural resources, not that we are stating that as a fact.	No action
			Document Edit		Page 81: Personnel, Engagement, Recommendation or Implementation Action. ID 65: Note Well: Natural Areas such as the Campbell Creek Estuary Natural Area are managed differently than Parks. For example, it is important to work with whomever holds the Conservation Easement for such property to ensure that trees or brush are not removed that should stay. In these areas leaving natural habitat undisturbed to the extent that is possible are often specifically in their Management Plans. This is to provide the requisite hiding, nesting, and specific foraging areas for wildlife for which the land was planned. Maintenance that is routine in Municipal parks might inadvertently wipe out entire species of flowers or native plants on the site. That would degrade the resource unnecessarily for wildlife and deny visitors the chances to see, learn about, and appreciate them.	We will add language about Conservation Easements as a legal guiding document affecting park management.	Add language about Conservation Easements, Park Dedication, Section 6(f), and other legal protections that ultimately guide and limit the types of development allowed on park land.
			Recommendation Concern		ID 69: To support and enhance the Ambassador Program it could be helpful to connect them with the Conservation Easement holder AND any stewardship group that helps take care of the area.	The Ambassador Program is focused on safely closing and opening up park gates. No action There is not an identified need at this time to connect these staff with Conservation Easement holders.	No action
			Recommendation Concern		ID 70: To support, enhance, and prevent inadvertent damage to the natural resource it is useful to connect with the Conservation Easement holder and any stewardship group that helps take care of the area. For example, several times that YEP crews came to work at CCENA, Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge was able to provide educational talks with local experts, question/answer sessions, and general encouragement of the leaders and crews. One crew actually was privileged to save a patch of wild chocolate lilies that were right in the place to be covered with gravel for the Meadow Loop Trail. It was delightful to work with the young people who were impressed that someone even noticed these little beauties were in harm’s way. Many of those same leaders and the youth with whom they worked are some of the same citizens we see visiting CCENA and automatically helping to be good stewards when they come, picking up trash, or volunteering to share information about the wildlife or vegetation, geographic features, or history that they learned from our local experts and stewards while working there. They bring their friends and families to visit and are so proud to be able to share what they helped carefully develop.	We agree that the Youth Employment in Parks program is a positive way to enhance stewardship in our community.	No action
			Recommendation Concern		Page 85: Wayfinding and Signage: Regarding “North-up maps on kiosk maps instead of “heads-up” orientation: I understand the rationale, but I have seen a number of people be very confused by those maps in parks. For example, a revered local scholar visiting a park came back to said park several times and never found what he was looking for until I explained it to him. He did not find North-up maps to be very user-friendly. I have similarly noticed quite a few people confused by such maps.	Thank you for the feedback.	No action

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Friends of the ACWR			Recommendation Concern		Page 86: Winter-Only Trail Management: Add Recommendation: In the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge damage to fragile saltmarsh habitat can be a concern when there is insufficient snow and ice to protect it from traffic. Many bicycle or ski routes have gone right over the top of nesting habitat. This does not generally cause damage when there is adequate snow and ice cover. During low snow and ice years managers must be prepared to close the refuge to heavy traffic, so the Municipality should be aware of this possibility at the decision of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game who manage the refuge	This can be expanded on in narrative about winter trail management.	Page 86: add considerations for the ACWR in winter-only trail management
Friends of the ACWR			Document Edit		Page 93: It is Potter Marsh, not Potters Marsh.	This has been corrected.	Potter Marsh to replace Potters.
Friends of the ACWR			Document Edit		Question: Map in Hard Copy that says “Anchorage” near end: What is the defined segment that is labeled 16? Maybe it is page 117--it is not numbered and I do not see it in the online version.	This is the Map of Non Motorized Project needs which is shown on the project website.	No action.
Friends of the ACWR			Project Concern	10	Connect Last Segment Close to Potter Marsh: One additional comment is that the draft plan does not show a connection between the inland route 10 and Potter Marsh, and we believe it is critically important to include said connection to continue this beautiful city's collaborative work to help people safely reach their destinations.	We agree that the linework should be better updated to reflect the project description.	Extend route of project 10 to Potter Marsh to match the project's description.
Great Land Trust	3/30/2026		Document Edit		We request that the Project Team please show the existing trails and boardwalk located within Tanglewood Park on the Trails Plan maps.	These can be added.	Add Tanglewood Park trails.
Great Land Trust			Document Edit		We request that the Project Team please show the existing trails located within Campbell Creek Estuary Natural Area on the Trails Plan maps.	These can be added.	Add CCENA trails.
Great Land Trust			Project Concern	10	Trail Project Recommendation 10: The Trails Plan appears to show a portion of the proposed conceptual trail alignment for project ID 10 crossing the Campbell Creek Estuary Natural Area (CCENA) property. GLT acquired and conserved this property utilizing numerous mitigation funding sources before donating it to the Municipality of Anchorage. The property is perpetually protected by a conservation easement held by GLT to protect the property's natural resource assets consistent with the intent of the funding sources. The conservation easement retired all development rights for the property, except what is explicitly allowed in this legal agreement. All proposed infrastructure and activities must be consistent with the intent of the conservation of the property and not impact the protected assets. In addition to being consistent with the conservation easement, any proposed infrastructure and use needs to be consistent with the CCENA Master Plan (2012). There was strong community preference that a coastal trail extension does not cross the protected property and that is reflected in the Master Plan. We recommend that the conceptual trail alignment avoid the CCENA property and request communication with GLT before initiating any trail planning efforts for project ID 10 that may occur on the protected property.	Project 10: There is a record of strong public support for the Southern Coastal Trail Extension Concept, and while it is outside the scope of this Plan to determine an actual route, the conceptual project documents support for a contiguous recreational route between Kincaid Park and Potter Marsh. This plan acknowledges the legal restrictions of the Conservation Easement in CCENA and the approved Master Plan which documents preference for a Southern Coastal Trail to avoid CCENA.	Project 10 route to avoid CCENA.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Great Land Trust			Project Concern	68,71	Trail Project Recommendation 68 & 71: The Trails Plan appears to show a portion of the proposed conceptual trail alignment for project IDs 68 and 71 crossing Eklutna Inc. properties that are perpetually protected by conservation easements held by GLT. GLT conserved these coastal properties utilizing compensatory wetland mitigation funds. The conservation easements retired all development rights for these properties in perpetuity and prohibit the conveyance of any interest in the land to a third party, including the granting of a trail easement. The conservation easements apply to the entirety of the property(s) and any activity or development that would reduce or negatively impact any portion of the property's conservation purposes is considered a negative impact on the conservation easement(s) as a whole and is therefore prohibited to protect the properties' natural resource assets. We recommend that the conceptual coastal trail alignment avoid the Eklutna Inc. protected properties along the coast and surrounding Fire Creek Estuary to Eklutna (see attached map) and request communication with GLT before initiating any trail planning efforts for project ID 68 & 71 that may occur on the protected property.	Project 68 will be converted to a hatched line between Beach and Mirror Lake. This is due to culturally sensitive resources managed by Eklutna Inc. and uncertainty of best alignment to protect natural and cultural resources. The linework for Project 71 (Thunderbird Falls to Knik River) is consistent with the proposed findings in the Long Trail Reconnaissance Study.	Project 68 shown as conceptual hatched to replace solid line.
Great Land Trust			Recommendation Concern		We request that the Project Team reconsider the inclusion of the negative language on page 90 under the Coordinating and Connecting with Chugach State Park section. Additionally, there appears to be no Trail Project Recommendation 74 referenced in this section.	We will revise language on page 90 to more clearly reflect 1) that the survey and workshops demonstrated public support to maintain and improve existing multi-use trail infrastructure and 2) that there was also strong community support for connecting existing trail systems. The incorrect project number has also been corrected.	On Page 90, rephrase " ... in road rights-of-way (see Non Motorized Projects) or require acquisition which is inconsistent with community priorirites identified through this planning process"
Nancy Pease	3/31/2026		Project Support	10,14,37,60	Good mix of visionary and practical projects. Kudos to the Project Team for including several inspirational trail corridors: the South Extension of the Coastal Trail, with a possible coastal alignment (10); the Rabbit Creek Corridor to Chugach State Park(14), the Muldoon perimeter to Far North Bicentennial Park corridor (projects 37 and 60), and the Coastal Trail north extension from Thunderbird Falls to Knik River.	Thank you for the support for these connectivity projects.	No action.
Nancy Pease			New Proposed Project		I would suggest one more short corridor: the connection from the intersection of Elmore Road and Rabbit Creek south along the section line easement and then west through Little Rabbit Creek Bluff Park to the Old Seward Highway Spur. These trails will benefit and connect neighborhoods that are currently not on the recreational trail network, while also becoming destination trails for the whole community. These new corridors will inspire community, in the spirit of famous planner Daniel Burnham: "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood."	Thank you for the project nomination. It will not be incorporated into the project list at this time but we would recommend nominating this during future Park Plan update since it requires significant access considerations.	No action.
Nancy Pease			Project Concern		The cumulative expense of upgrading bridges and intersections seems excessive. One theme of this RTP is to spend public money deliberately and effectively. Under that theme, I encourage the Project Team to consider the percentage of future spending that might go to upgrading bridges and intersections that are functional although not optimal. For example, there are four proposed upgrades to Campbell Creek Trail under-crossings that are all very expensive (\$\$\$\$)(45, 46, 48, 49). None improves the connectivity of the trail, but they may compete for funding with the most-needed crossing, at Lake Otis (47).	Thank you for the comment. One theme of this Plan is to ensure the Department is planning ahead for maintenance costs of existing assets, so not every project will go toward new connectivity, but maintaining our existing corridors in safe condition.	No action.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Nancy Pease			Recommendation Support		Support for a trails inventory that includes easements, and a trail development process. Page 123. Thank you for recommending a comprehensive inventory of existing easements and rights-of-way. Thank you also for recommending thatMunicipal staff develop a process for partner-initiated development of trails on those easements and ROW. Give these ideas greater support by including them in the Systemwide Recommendations on pages 72-73, and in the Implementation Projects under Project 58 (page 80). Currently, they are mentioned under Implementation at the very end of the document, but they are not identified as an enumerated project that staff will take responsibility for tracking. There are currently nine Systemwide Recommendations: make the inventory and the community-initiatives process the 10th and 11th enumerated projects.	The project team opted to describe this process in more detail on page 123 rather than within the table of Systemwide Recommendations, which is less project specific. A comprehensive easement mapping effort is recommended as a standalone project requiring dedicated funding and staff support from multiple agencies. It is too large of an effort to be managed internally by staff in the Parks and Recreation Department alone.	No action.
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		Edit the grammar and spelling. The RTP has a choppy writing style. My guess is that someone used an AI editing program to simplify the sentences to about sixth-grade level. If that is the standard for MOA planning documents, I guess we must live with that. However, there are many grammatical errors that reflect poorly even on simplified writing. A few sentences border on nonsense. I suggest that several intelligent humans proof-read the final version.	Thank you for the close revision of the plan and grammatical edits. Staff did write the plan intentionally at an accessible reading level so that it could be read and understood by a non-technical audience. We strived to have a strong public process that used clear language, hoping to have participation from Anchorage residents regardless of their knowledge of technical jargon.	Page 11, Public Engagement: Grammatical edits.
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		Page 48 Gaps Analysis For Northeast Anchorage, mention the restricted access to JBER land, which limits access to both Chugach State Park and FNBP.	Thank you for the comment.	Page 48, Gaps Analysis: Add JBER boundary in Northeast Anchorage section

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Nancy Pease			Recommendation Concern		Page 90, section on Coordinating and connecting with Chugach State Park There is a negative phrase (page 90) regarding acquisition that could be quoted out of context and thwart community efforts to fill the gaps in trails and trailheads leading to Chugach State Park. . Delete the words at the end of the following sentence: "...trail connections may need...to await a platting process and may likely be within road rights-of-way or require acquisition,which is inconsistent with community priorities identified through this planning process" • First, those words could be quoted without context, and could thwart community-led efforts to acquire trailheads or trails connecting to CSP. Don't use the words inconsistent. 'Consistency with an adopted plan and with community priorities' is an important threshold for grant applications, partner agencies, and supportive landowners. • Second, the RTP on page 90 acknowledges that recreational trail connections to CSP "have strong documented support" and can be led by groups other than Parks. • Third, this RTP presents no evidence of public opposition to acquisitions that would improve access to Chugach State Park. To the contrary, the graphics on pages 64-66 show strong evidence (40 to70 percent) of the public wanting to make connections with the trail system or build new trails in the Municipality. The public's support for trail connectivity and new trails may imply support for acquisitions, and at the very least says nothing against land or easement acquisition for Chugach State Park access. If the above words are deleted from the draft, the rest of the language on page 90 leaves the door open for the public to pursue trail connections to Chugach State Park, which may logically include acquisitions.	Thank you for your comment. We will revise language on page 90 to more clearly reflect 1) that the survey and workshops demonstrated public support to maintain and improve existing multi-use trail infrastructure and 2) that there was also strong community support for connecting existing trail systems. We did not explicitly measure public opinion on property acquisitions, but acquisition can be identified as an implementation tool.	On Page 90, rephrase " ... in road rights-of-way (see Non Motorized Projects) or require acquisition which is inconsistent with community priorities identified through this planning process"
Nancy Pease			Recommendation Support		Page 90: thank you for the language on page 90 that supports future connections to CSP via trails and trailheads:	Thank you for the supportive comment.	No action.
Nancy Pease			Project Prioritization		Page 88, Project Selection and Prioritization Chart. Award points for existing public easements . Currently, the prioritization criteria don't allow any points for public easements that already exist on private property. MOA or the State created these easements specifically for public access. Existing easements and ROW do not require acquisition. Revise the Scoring Description, page 88, under MOA Land Ownership as follows: Criteria: MOA Land Ownership of Land, ROW or Easement	This plan acknowledges that connections between neighborhoods in the ROW are desired by the public, but not comprehensively mapped. While this plan makes recommendations at a larger scale focused on parkland, it also recommends a study specifically on ROW to address the more detailed level understanding of improving neighborhood connectivity. Since we do not have a comprehensive inventory of established legal public access, we cannot adequately use it in the project scoring and prioritization criteria. It should also be noted that not all easements are directly comparable. Many have unique requirements or restrictions on what can be developed within them, or who can maintain or manage infrastructure within them, further underscoring the need for a comprehensive inventory.	No action
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		Page 89: Delete negative statement on page 89. "However, the public's desired travel paths may span private property and lack the necessary public rights-of-way or access easements to support a trail connection." This wording adds nothing to any policy recommendations. This RTP does not propose ways to acquire missing easements and ROW, so this statement is superfluous. It makes the public sound uninformed or unreasonable.	The statement is not meant to add to policy recommendations. It shows the reality that members of the public may sometimes want trail connections on/through land that the MOA does not own.	No action.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Nancy Pease			Recommendation Concern		Page 80,Project Recommendations, ID 58. Expand the stated intent to “update MOA GIS Inventory regularly to track amenities, such as trail maintenance and lighting, and public easements, and share data with the public.” Reason: public easements are hidden in various plat maps on the GIS data basis and are unknown to most planners and the public. They amount to stranded assets. Make it a routine data task to add easements to a single data base where the public and staff can easily find them.	We would not recommend Parks and Recreation staff maintain a public easement layer at this time. We expect this would be explored as part of a comprehensive easement inventory.	No action
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		Page 89. The Flowchart is still byzantine. Simplify it. The chart needs a start and a finish point. The curvy connecting lines are visually distracting.	We will review the graphic and edit for clarity.	Project Management Flowchart: Fix typo where it says "yes" to "start;" straighten lines where possible to add clarity.
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		Anchorage South map of current trails – 1a. Stewart Homestead Trail should be added to this map, showing contiguous connection all the way to Chugach State Park. The legal easement and ROW currently reach the parcels transferred to CSP by Great Land Trust in 2025. 1b. Show existing trails within Rabbit Creek Greenbelt (labeled as Old Rabbit Creek Park but currently not showing 2 miles of existing trails). These are part of the proposed greenbelt corridor that could connect from DeArmoun Road multi-use trail all the way to CSP along Rabbit Creek. 1c. Label Potter Creek Ravine Park, which otherwise is almost invisible, but is a greenbelt corridor with trail potential to connect to Chugach State Park both to the west, to the east via future acquisitions or the Stewart Homestead Trail 1d. Adjust the CSP boundary to show that Chugach State Park extends up Potter Creek Ravine. Again, this is a greenbelt corridor with trail potential.	The team will review and edit as possible. We recognize that the existing trails are still of value to the area, even if not managed formally by the Department. Not all unmanaged (social) trails will show up on the MOA database (haven't been mapped; need review for accuracy, etc). Because of the volume of data managed by planning staff in the department, we expect there to be some discrepancies throughout all maps and linework. The scale of the static (printed) maps also makes it difficult to display all linework and labels. We recommend using the online versions of the maps for most accurate data.	Review these edits for addition to maps; add Stewart Homestead Trail linework
Nancy Pease			Project Prioritization		Trail Project Recommendations – chart on pages 91-104 and unnumbered maps of Recommended Projects a. In the Table, Project 14 Rabbit Creek Greenbelt connection to Chugach State Park should be shown as a midterm, not a long-term project. Contiguous easements and parkland already exist from Municipal parkland near Hillside Drive along the creek corridor to the CSP boundary. The cost should be show as \$\$ not \$\$\$\$\$. This greenbelt trail does not require the expensive bridges and paving and grade-separated crossings that push trails like Fish Creek into the \$\$\$\$ range.	Thank you for the comment. We are recommending maintaing this as a long-term project.	No action
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		On the map, Stewart Homestead Trail should show contiguous connection all the way to Chugach State Park. This connection exists, legally and physically, through lands transferred by Great Land Trust to CSP in 2025.	Thank you for the edit.	Add Stewart Homestead Trail
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		c. On the map, show a conceptual CSP trailhead in Stuckagain Heights, corresponding to the chart recommendation 13. Draw and label Basher Road to make the map more understandable.	Thank you for the recommendation to expand Project 13, since there are existing projects happening in the area we can add another conceptual area. We recommend referencing the online project maps for best clarity and interactivity level.	Include Basher/Stuckagain Trailheads in Project 13

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		d. Draw and label the main access roads to CSP to help readers understand the locations of conceptual access points (shown by hatched circles) : Basher Road on the Anchorage-Central map and Upper DeArmoun/Canyon Road, Clarks Road, Brewster Drive and Potter Valley Road on the Anchorage – South map	We recommend referencing the online project maps for best clarity and interactivity level.	No action
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		e. Show existing, platted public trail easement on HLB parcel 144 in Upper Potter Valley. This is a segment intended to eventually connect to Chugach State Park.	Displaying all existing easements is not part of the scope of this plan, as the municipality does not maintain an accurate database at this time. This further emphasizes the recommendation and need for a comprehensive inventory.	No action
Nancy Pease			Project Prioritization		f. For the Muldoon (JBER) perimeter trail, change the timeframe to medium. This project would reach more underserved trail users than any other project, in terms of both lower socio-economic demographics and current lack of recreational trail access.	We agree this project is important based on the population it serves and potential recreational value. JBER requested to remove this perimeter trail from their boundary in this Plan, but the final draft of this plan maintains a broad concept for north-south trail connectivity in the Muldoon area.	No change
Nancy Pease			Project Concern		3. Non-motorized Recommendations – chart on pages 105-109 a. Old Seward Highway Spur. The MOA has already identified the importance of non-motorized travel along the Old Seward Highway Spur. This is a priority connection in the Non-motorized network in the Non-motorized Plan. Change the name of this to: Old Seward Highway/Potter Marsh Recreation Corridor, not a study corridor. Change the project description to: Provide speed management and design features between Rabbit Creek Road and Potter Valley Road to create a safe non-motorized recreation corridor that provides access to surrounding park and refuge lands. This is corridor is flanked by Little Rabbit Creek Bluff Park, the new Potter Marsh Watershed Park, and the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge. Planned DOT&PF work includes pavement preservation with consideration for non-motorized travel.	The Old Seward Highway Spur project description will remain to match what is included in other AMATS plans, and Parks and Recreation will continue to support these community-driven effort as possible when implementing the Potter Marsh Watershed Park Master Plan.	No action.
Nancy Pease			New Proposed Project		b. Show a trail extension along Elmore Road north to Rabbit Creek with a proposed non-motorized bridge and then connecting to multi-use trails on DeArmoun Road and Elmore Road, and describe this in the text.	We recommend bringing this forward to nomination in future updates to the Non Motorized Plan and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, due to its potential to better connect neighborhoods.	No action.
Nancy Pease			New Proposed Project		c. Show a trail connection along the existing Undeveloped ROW from Rabbit Creek Road at Golden View Bridge Subdivision to connect with Buffalo Drive. This will connect the existing separated pathway in the Golden View Bridge Subdivision to a route to the DeArmoun multi-use path. It will connect numerous neighborhoods to both Golden View Middle School and to South High School.	We recommend bringing this forward to nomination in future updates to the Non Motorized Plan and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, due to its potential to better connect neighborhoods.	No action.
Nancy Pease			Document Edit		4. Implementation Page 125 The last paragraph should specifically identify the Park Plan update as a process to identify acquisition of easements, ROW or acreage to fill the geographic gaps in the trail system that lack park property to support a trail connection.	Thank you for the comment, this will be added.	Page 125, Park Plan: Describe property acquisition, land swaps, and other tools that should be explored in the Park Plan.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Rabbit Creek Community Council	3/31/2026		Document Edit		1. Add more excitement to the vision statement. Rather than emphasize the budgeting function of this plan. The subtitle is “an updated community vision for trails”. We love the idea of a grand vision, and would like this RTP to add some inspirational, aspirational description of that vision. Currently, the statement of purpose, repeated numerous times, is “a tool that helps the community decide how to spend public dollars on trails” (first sentence of the plan, page 6) Recommended change: add an exciting vision statement that includes trails will connect all neighborhoods and connect to the natural setting of coastline, mountains, forests and creek greenbelts. Proclaim that our trail system will be designed and promoted to strengthen community cohesion and boost physical and mental health. Recognize the economic benefits from tourism and fom new residents drawn here to ride, run, roll, ski and ramble on our great variety of well-designed trails.	While it is difficult to capture all the functions of our great trail system in one statement, the project team worked through multiple revisions of the Vision Statement on page 67 with the Plan's Advisory Groups and will keep this as is for the final draft.	No action.
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Recommendation Support		2. Continued importance of neighborhood and district plans. Thank you for clarifying that “The intent of this plan is to complement rather than supersede trail specific recommendations in neighborhood, district or park-specific master plans. (Page 24)	Thank you for the support.	No action.
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Recommendation Concern		3. Support for a trails inventory that includes easements, and a trail development process. (Page 123). Thank you for recommending a comprehensive inventory of existing easements and rights-of-way, as well as coordination with Municipal staff to develop a process for partner-initiated development of trails on those easements and ROW. Lack of a process has in recent years stalled our community council’s initiatives to use existing easements. We would like these ideas to be given greater support by including them in the Systemwide Recommendations on pages 72-73, and in the ImplementationProjects under Project 58 (page 80). Currently, they are mentioned under Implementation at the very end of the document, but they are not identified as an enumerated project that staff will take responsibility for tracking. There are currently nine Systemwide Recommendations: make the inventory and the community-initiatives process the 10th and 11th enumerated projects.	The project team opted to describe this process in more detail on page 123 rather than within the table of Systemwide Recommendations, which is less project specific. A comprehensive easement mapping effort is recommended as a standalone project requiring dedicated funding and staff support from multiple agencies. It is too large of an effort to be managed internally by staff in the Parks and Recreation Department alone.	No action.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Recommendation Concern		4. Revise proposed language that could create roadblocks to acquisitions that could bridge geographical gaps. RCCC especially wants to avoid the potential wrong implication that CSP connections are inconsistent with the RTP. Delete unnecessary negative statement on page 89. "However, the public’s desired travel paths may span private property and lack the necessary public rights-of-way or access easements to support a trail connection." This wording adds nothing to any policy recommendations. This RTP does not propose ways to acquire missing easements and ROW, so this statement is superfluous. It makes the public sound uninformed or unreasonable. Revise negative wording on page 90. Delete the words: “or require acquisition, which is inconsistent with community priorities identified through this planning process.” This RTP acknowledges on page 125 that there are geographical gaps in the trail system that lack parkland to support trail connectivity and the future update to the Park Plan should play a role. “The Park Plan should further analyze level of service and future resource needs that would support trail connections recommended by this Plan.” Add a sentence: This may include parkland acquisitions or use agreements that bridge the geographical gaps in the recreational trail system or trail connections into Chugach State Park	We will revise language on page 90 to more clearly reflect 1) that the survey and workshops demonstrated public support to maintain and improve existing multi-use trail infrastructure and 2) that there was also strong community support for connecting existing trail systems.	Language edited on page 90.
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Document Edit		5. Add page numbers to all the maps.	Page numbers on maps can be added to final draft	Add page numbers to static maps in document
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Document Edit		6. Revise shading for clarity. For the demographic data maps, remove all shading from Chugach State Park, Kincaid Park, Far North Bicentennial Park, the airports, and JBER lands that are not residential housing. No one lives there. The shading gives false impressions that these are populated areas.	Shading will be updated due to provide more clarity on inhabited vs. uninhabited areas.	Demographic Maps: add page numbers, adjust shading to better represent populated vs. unpopulated areas.
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Document Edit		7. Trail Project Management Flowchart is confusing. Add start and finish arrows. Straighten the lines. The language of this plan has been reduced to sixth-grade level, so simplify the chart to sixth-grade level as well.	Project team will review and edit for clarity.	Project Management Flowchart: Fix typo where it says “yes” to “start;” straighten lines where possible to add clarity.
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Document Edit		A. Today’s Trails description of Greenbelt Trails, page 29. a. Add another trail category in addition to the 5 paved greenbelt trails in midtown and downtown.: Rabbit Creek Greenbelt Trail and Potter Creek Park offer opportunities for two greenbelt trails in South Anchorage, with a different wilder character, likely not paved but offering an immersive experience along our valued creek corridors. The current RTP should recognize the geographical imbalance in greenbelt access (lacking in South Anchorage) that can be recognized and remedied with existing municipal parkland and public trail easements. b. Page 25. List of Park and Trail Master Plans. Add Section 36 Master Plan and Potter Marsh Watershed Park Master Plan	The Greenbelt Trails section on page 29 focuses on the paved multi-use trails followed by a description of parks that serve as trail destinations with multiple access points, developed facilities, and parking areas. While the plan does not detail every park in the area, more context can be added into the gaps analysis (page 48) about differences in park land density and trail connectivity in Southeast Anchorage versus more populated areas of the Anchorage Bowl.	Page 48: Add note about Southeast Anchorage park land and how park access is less connected without links to greenbelt trail system.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Document Edit		B. Scoring Criteria – page 88 needs to recognize existing public easements in the scoring criteria. Currently, the criteria don't allow any points for public easements that already exist on private property. MOA or the State created these specifically for public access. Existing easements and ROW do not require acquisition	Easements across the AMATS area have a variety of stipulations, permissions, and permitted uses. Because of the lack of comprehensive inventory of public easements, this Plan does not show easements on map nor consider it as part of this scoring criteria.	No action
					Revise the Scoring Description, page 88, under MOA Land Ownership as follows: Criteria: MOA Land Ownership of Land, ROW or Easement Description: 5 points: Project falls within MOA Real Estate Ownership or other public land ownership (BLM/Chugach State Park) or a future roadway/pathway improvement project, or a public ROW or non-motorized easement 0 points: Project falls within private land and would require property or easement acquisition		
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Document Edit		C. Anchorage South map of current trails – a. Stewart Homestead Trail should show connection all the way to Chugach State Park: the legal easement and ROW currently reach the parcels transferred to CSP by Great Land Trust in 2025.	Mapping team will consider this list of edits and add missing trails/correct labels where possible -- some are defaults of the MOA GIS database (for example, HLB parcels would be shaded differently than park parcels at Section 36). It is beyond to scope of this Plan to show all platted easements and all social trails across the AMATS area. There are more details about Project 13 and the tools used to advance the public interest in State Park connectivity on page 90.	Update labels to Moen Park, Potter Creek Ravine Park, Stewart Homestead Trail, Little Rabbit Creek Bluff Park. Shade in HLB parcels at Section 36 and label as HLB parcels.
					b. Show existing, platted public trail easement on HLB parcel 144. This is a segmentintended to eventually connect to Chugach State Park. c. Include more description of the circular hubs for future access to CSP in Upper Potter Valley and Bear Valley. d. Show Ggu Bentnu trail that connects RC Road to Potter Marsh Boardwalk e. Show existing social trail on old roadbed in Little Rabbit Creek Bluff Park, and label that park, since it is referenced in the project tables. f. Show existing trails within Rabbit Creek Greenbelt ((Old Rabbit Creek Park)). g. Show all 600 acres of Section 36: the portion in Heritage Land Bank management is part of Section 36 Park Master Plan, and trail connectivity is shown. h. Label Potter Creek Ravine Park, which otherwise is almost invisible, but is a greenbelt corridor with trail potential. i. Adjust the CSP boundary to show that Chugach State Park extends up Potter Creek Ravine. Again, this is a greenbelt corridor with trail potential. j. Label Moen Park.		

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Rabbit Creek Community Council			Project Concern	11	D. Trail Project Recommendations – chart on pages 91-104	The Potter Marsh Watershed Park Master Plan (Project 11) description can be updated as the Master Plan has developed alongside the development of this Trails Plan. The complexity of Project 14, including environmental considerations, are part of the factors making it a longer-term effort.	Update Project 11 description to match status of MP.
					a. Project 12 Potter Marsh Watershed Park Master Plan. Change the project description to extend beyond identifying trail development priorities because short term trail projects are already identified in the draft Master Plan (2026).		
					Therefore, Project 12 should recommend trail implementation: install trailhead signage and improve trails identified in the Short Term Development Plan.		
Rabbit Creek Community Council			New Proposed Project, Project Concern		b. Project 14 Rabbit Creek Greenbelt connection to Chugach State Park should be shown as a midterm, not a long-term project. Contiguous easements and parkland already exist. The cost should be show as \$\$ not \$\$\$\$\$. This greenbelt trail does not require the expensive bridges and paving and grade-separated crossings that push trails like Fish Creek into the \$\$\$\$ range.		
					c. Thank you for including multiple possible alignments for the South Coastal Trail Extension, and for acknowledging the public value in a trail alignment that extends the coastal views and natural setting and free-flow experience of the existing trail.		
Rabbit Creek Community Council			New Proposed Project, Project Concern		Non-motorized Recommendations – chart on pages 105-109	Priorities are not assigned to any items on the Non Motorized Project Needs map and were not scored using the Trail Project Scoring Criteria.	No action.
					a. Golden View Drive separated bikeway – the Recommendations currently don’t assign a priority. Rate this as a high priority, given the MOA efforts toward funding a near-term road upgrade that will connect Golden View Drive to Potter Valley Road via Romania and Finland Streets, plus the need for safe student access to Golden View Middle School.		
					b. Old Seward Highway Spur – this is included as a Study Corridor. The MOA has already identified the importance of non-motorized travel here. Change the name of this to: Old Seward Highway/Potter Marsh Recreation Corridor, not a study corridor. Change the project description to: Provide speed management and design features between Rabbit Creek Road and Potter Valley Road to create a safe non-motorized recreation corridor that provides access to surrounding park and refuge lands. This is corridor is flanked by Little Rabbit Creek Bluff Park, the new Potter Marsh Watershed Park, and the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge. Planned DOT&PF work includes pavement preservation with consideration for non-motorized travel.	The Old Seward Highway Spur description will remain to match what is included in other AMATS plans, and Parks and Recreation will continue to support the community-driven effort as possible when implementing the Potter Marsh Watershed Park Master Plan. Thank you for the comment about an additional non-motorized project, this will be documented and shared with AMATS for update of the non-motorized plan.	
Rabbit Creek Community Council			New Proposed Project, Project Concern		c. List the extension of a non-motorized trail along Elmore from DeArmoun Road south and across Rabbit Creek Road and along the Section Line easement to Little Rabbit Creek Bluff Park andn Old Seward Highway Spur. This Is a connection of two major multi-use trails/corridors.		

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Rabbit Creek Community Council			New Proposed Project		Non-Motorized Projects map a. Show the recommended trail extension described along the easement from Elmore Road south to Little Rabbit Creek Park. Also show a trail extension along Elmore Road north to Rabbit Creek with a proposed non-motorized bridge and then connecting to multi use trails on DeArmoun Road and Elmore Road, and describe this in the text. b. Show the Birch Road trail connection to DeArmoun Road (there is a gap on the map)’ and a non-motorized connection at Bainbridge Drive and DeArmoun road. c. Show a potential trailhead at RC Road intersection of OSH Spur. This is a remnant parcel reserved for public use by BLM. It is important to show trail access to inform the current ADOT&PF re-design of Rabbit Creek Road, which will include a non-motorized trail on one side. Otherwise, the public may end up with no safe places to get across Rabbit Creek Road. There will need to be more trailhead parking for the future Potter Marsh Recreation Corridor. This remnant public parcel may serve as a future trail access hub for the Ggu Bentnu trail and trails into municipal parkland at Rabbit Creek and Davison streets.	It is outside the scope of this plan to map all easements. The Plan recommends a comprehensive, muni-wide inventory of easements as a step toward better trail connectivity and planning of new trail connections.	No action.
Fairview Community Council 2026-04			New Proposed Project		Per FVCC Resolution: "include development of the Fairview Greenway, a "regional trail connection" along Hyder Street, using the information gathered during the Reconnecting Fairview initiative and related workshops.	Thank you for the supportive resolution and suggestion to include this project.	Add Hyder Street to Non Motorized Project Needs list and map, as it is being spearheaded by agencies outside of Parks, has significant community support, and would connect recreational assets such as Chester Creek Trail, Ship Creek Trail, and Delaney Park Strip.
South Addition CC			Document Edit		1) Expand Project 24 to include trail safety in congested areas all directions from Westchester Lagoon	1) The description can be updated to reflect community priorities.	Add to project 24 description: "Develop a Westchester Lagoon Master Plan to examine recreation facilities, trail safety/congestion, and feasibility of design interventions including Trail Class 6"
South Addition CC			Project Prioritization		2) Change Project 24 to High Priority and Short Timeframe.	2) Based on comments received and high community interest, the timeline will be reframed as short.	Change timeframe to short (project 24).

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
South Addition CC			Document Edit		3) Apply Class 6 standard to the Westchester Lagoon area.	3) This plan does not make specific recommendations to where Trail Classes should be applied. However, this can be reflected in the Project Description of Project 24.	Add to project 24 description: "Develop a Westchester Lagoon Master Plan to examine recreation facilities, trail safety/congestion, and feasibility of design interventions including Trail Class 6"
South Addition CC			Document Edit		4) Rehabilitate trails in this area maintaining the gravel shoulders.	4) Trail rehabilitation is implied throughout this area and can be incorporated into the description of Project 24.	Add to project 24 description: "Develop a Westchester Lagoon Master Plan to examine recreation facilities, trail safety/congestion, and feasibility of design interventions including Trail Class 6"
South Addition CC			New Proposed Project		5) Add lighting to west and north portions of trail.	5) This consideration of lighting should be explored in the Master Plan update, as many members of the community have expressed support for DarkSky standards to be met along the Coastal Trail.	
North Star CC			Document Edit		1) Expand Project 24 to include trail safety in congested areas all directions from Westchester Lagoon	1) The description can be updated to reflect community priorities.	Add to project 24 description: "Develop a Westchester Lagoon Master Plan to examine recreation facilities, trail safety/congestion, and feasibility of design interventions including Trail Class 6"
North Star CC			Project Prioritization		2) Change Project 24 to High Priority and Short Timeframe.	2) Based on comments received and high community interest, the timeline will be reframed as short.	Change timeframe to short (project 24).
North Star CC			Document Edit		3) Apply Class 6 standard to the Westchester Lagoon area.	3) This plan does not make specific recommendations to where Trail Classes should be applied. However, this can be reflected in the Project Description of Project 24.	Add to project 24 description: "Develop a Westchester Lagoon Master Plan to examine recreation facilities, trail safety/congestion, and feasibility of design interventions including Trail Class 6"

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
North Star CC			Document Edit		4) Rehabilitate trails in this area maintaining the gravel shoulders.	4) Trail rehabilitation is implied throughout this area and can be incorporated into the description of Project 24.	Add to project 24 description: "Develop a Westchester Lagoon Master Plan to examine recreation facilities, trail safety/congestion, and feasibility of design interventions including Trail Class 6"
North Star CC			New Proposed Project		5) Add lighting to west and north portions of trail.	5) This consideration of lighting should be explored in the Master Plan update, as many members of the community have expressed support for DarkSky standards to be met along the Coastal Trail.	
Turnagain Community Council Resolution 2026-03-05			Document Edit		1) Expand Project 24 to include trail safety in congested areas all directions from Westchester Lagoon	1) The description can be updated to reflect community priorities.	Add to project 24 description: "Develop a Westchester Lagoon Master Plan to examine recreation facilities, trail safety/congestion, and feasibility of design interventions including Trail Class 6"
Turnagain Community Council Resolution 2026-03-06			Project Prioritization		2) Change Project 24 to High Priority and Short Timeframe.	2) Based on comments received and high community interest, the timeline will be reframed as short.	
Turnagain Community Council Resolution 2026-03-07			Document Edit		3) Apply Class 6 standard to the Westchester Lagoon area.	3) This plan does not make specific recommendations to where Trail Classes should be applied. However, this can be reflected in the Project Description of Project 24.	Add to project 24 description: "Develop a Westchester Lagoon Master Plan to examine recreation facilities, trail safety/congestion, and feasibility of design interventions including Trail Class 6"
Turnagain Community Council Resolution 2026-03-08			Document Edit		4) Rehabilitate trails in this area maintaining the gravel shoulders.	4) Trail rehabilitation is implied throughout this area and can be incorporated into the description of Project 24.	Add to project 24 description: "Develop a Westchester Lagoon Master Plan to examine recreation facilities, trail safety/congestion, and feasibility of design interventions including Trail Class 6"
Turnagain Community Council Resolution 2026-03-09			New Proposed Project		5) Add lighting to west and north portions of trail.	5) This consideration of lighting should be explored in the Master Plan update, as many members of the community have expressed support for DarkSky standards to be met along the Coastal Trail.	No action.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Document Edit		Pg. 24 – Under Neighborhood and District Plans, West Anchorage District Plan needs to be added.	Thank you for the edit.	Add on Page 24.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Recommendation Support		CHAPTER 5 RECOMMENDATIONS Support – Pg. 72 PARK MASTER PLAN: ID 3 Support – Pg. 75 DESIGN: ID 31 Support – Pg. 78 MAINTENANCE: ID 45, 46, 47 and 48	Thank you for the supportive comments on specific recommendations regarding natural resources, context-specific vegetation management, and maintenance, and for supportive comments related to the Westchester Lagoon Master Plan update.	No action.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Recommendation Support		Support – Pg. 82 MAINTENANCE RECOMMENDATIONS > PAVEMENT REPAIR: “Requests to repair cracked and crumbling pavement faster and more frequently on multi-use trails are consistently received by Parks. This Plan confirmed that improved summer trail conditions are a top community priority. The backlog of needed repairs is substantial and the traditional packaging of repair efforts with larger bond-funded projects is not keeping up.”	Thank you for the supportive feedback.	No action.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Recommendation Support		Support – Pg. 84, TRAIL CLASSIFICATIONS AND DESIGN > TRAIL CLASSIFICATIONS: TCC generally supports the concept of Class 6 Trail Design Options where appropriate, based on context-sensitive, site-specific conditions (i.e., taking into consideration potential impacts on): Environmental conditions (i.e., wetlands, wildlife habitat), Property ownership and easements, Existing park amenities, Clearing of existing vegetation, Altering erosion remedies placed along trails along waterbodies	Agree on incorporating all of this context as part of trail planning.	No action.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Recommendation Support		Support – Pg. 85 TRAIL STRIPING: [...] This could reduce the need to clear vegetation to achieve same safety concerns. TCC has repeatedly recommended centerline trail striping along busier sections of the TK Coastal Trail.	Thank you for the supportive feedback.	No action.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Recommendation Support		Support – Pg. 86 EMERGING TRAIL USES: E-BIKES TCC strongly supports appropriately located speed limit and allowed trail-use signage, along with design strategies to address the ever-increasing use of e-bikes and mixed-use trail conditions.	Thank you for the supportive feedback.	No action.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Project Support		Project 2: Fish Creek Trail to the Ocean/Fish Creek Trail Connection TCC continues to collaborate with other entities on this trail project to ensure appropriate compatibility and function.	Thank you for continued collaboration on this project.	No action.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Project Prioritization		Project 4: Earthquake Park Spur Trail Rehabilitation/Nathaniel Court Connection TCC Requests Change from Medium to High Priority	Based on comments received and re-evaluation, Project 04 Earthquake Park Spur will be recategorized as a high priority.	High priority assigned to Project 04.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Turnagain Community Council Written Comments			Project Prioritization		Project 5: Tony Knowles Coastal Trail Widening.	Based on comments received and high community interest, Project 05 timeframe remains a high priority. Due to the complexity of land ownership in the area and the scope of Project 05 including better access to Downtown, the timeframe is categorized as long.	No action.
					TCC Requests Change from Short to Medium Priority — with the exception of the Westchester Lagoon area, per our previously-submitted resolution.		
					As stated on pages 1-2, TCC generally supports the concept of Class 6 Trail Design Options where appropriate, based on context-sensitive, site-specific conditions		
Turnagain Community Council Written Comments			Project Support		Project 6: Tony Knowles Coastal Trail Rehabilitation	Agree, the Department strives to reduce impacts to vegetation and maintain trail character whenever possible.	No action.
Turnagain Community Council Written Comments			Project Concern		Project 7: Coastal Trail Singletrack	Thank you for the thoughtful comments about the potential for singletrack along the Coastal Trail and considerations about management, speeds, and protecting natural resources in the area.	No action.
					Keep priority level low, change from short timeframe to long timeframe — with reevaluation of the appropriateness of this proposal before any singletrack project is considered.		
					Between Earthquake Park/Point Woronzof and Kincaid Park, Coastal Trail use slows considerably, allowing trail users a more relaxed, natural experience — an undulating ‘speed’ track parallel to the scenic, wooded section of the CT would require extensive vegetation removal and could compromise the trail user experience that has been enjoyed for decades in this area.		
					This area is also identified in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan and the 2040 Land Use Plan as a wildlife corridor and natural area; development and use of a high-speed trail would be an incompatible use. We believe the following needs to be considered:		
					Singletrack Trail not compatible with hydrology, wildlife corridors, and environmental constraints.		
Turnagain Community Council Written Comments			Project Support	23	Project 23: Chester Creek Widening	Thank you for the supportive feedback.	No action.
					TCC supports widening and Class 6 where appropriate, based on context-sensitive, site-specific conditions		

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		New Proposed Project		PROPOSED TRAIL REHABILITATION REQUEST: Romig Hill Trails Improvements This area has a history of trail use; Turnagain residents are proposing an improvement project for this multi-use trail system and has submitted a Grant Application to the Anchorage Parks Foundation for 2026. TCC has previously passed a resolution of support for this request.	The Parks Department is happy to be a supportive partner in the rehabilitation of these trails. It will not be added as a project in the plan since it is relatively small scale, but this does not indicate lack of support (see page 122 for other ways projects become part of the workplan).	No action.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Project Support	24	Project 24: Westchester Lagoon Master Plan TCC previously submitted comments/resolution in support of this, along with South Addition and Northstar Community Councils.	Thank you for the supportive feedback	No action.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Recommendation Support		Pg. 123: “Development of a comprehensive inventory of existing easements and rights-of-way within the AMATS area is recommended,” especially as it relates to Coastal Trail easements on private property.” TCC strongly endorses this effort.	Thank you for the supportive feedback	No action.
Turnagain Community Council	Written Comments		Recommendation Concern		Plan should place a high priority for ALL trails is managing bike speed and unleashed dogs. Suggestions include: On highest use trail areas, implement more enforcement of both of these activities, especially during summer months. Use Park and Recreational Personnel (maybe season employees) for enforcement to reduce burden on APD.	While the Parks Department does not have enforcement authority, design interventions are being explored to better manage bike speeds, provide more accurate signage about allowable e-bikes on trails, and encourage better etiquette amongst shared trails.	No action.
JBER	3/13/2026		Document Edit		Request the installation boundary be clearly defined and added to the map and map legend on page 41 (figure 14-15), page 42 (figure 14-15), page 43 (figure 16), page 46 (map of Iditarod Trail)), page 115; trails that cross the installation boundary are not public	Boundary can be added to figures 14-16. Map of Iditarod National Historic Trail is sourced from the program, but a caption can clarify that it is showing the National Historic Trail Corridor.	Add JBER boundary to figures 14-16
JBER			Document Edit		The demographic maps on pages 50 to 63 inconsistently characterize data for JBER. For example, the percentage of population under 18 on page 54 (figure 23) which includes the southern extreme of JBER shows 21%-30% while the demographic on page 55 (figure 24) for the installation’s northern extreme indicates 41% or greater. The data for the installation should be consistent regardless of geographic section. Additionally, there are no military housing areas on the Eagle River/Chugiak maps; perhaps demographics should be greyed out on these maps.	We will correct shading where possible on maps. Because they are drawing from data downloaded from Census.gov, there may be some discrepancy.	Eliminate shading of JBER census areas and replace with narrative description of JBER population numbers.
JBER			Document Edit	37	C. Page 77 refers to partnership agencies; request Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson be added to the landowners listed in the “Recommendation or Implementation Action” for ID 37. The landowners listed is not all inclusive, but because JBER is responsible for nearly 74,000 acres in the Municipality, it is appropriate to be added.	Yes, this can be added	Added JBER to partnership agencies in Systemwide Recommendation 37.

Letter Org or Name	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Trail Project ID	Comments	Staff Response	Proposed Action
JBER			Document Edit	44	D. On page 78, ID 44 recommends posting signage on the trails system. JBER would like to collaborate with the Municipality by co-locating signs about how to safely and legally recreate on military lands using the JBER recreation access website (https://jber.recaccess.com)	Yes, this can be added	Add JBER signage language to Systemwide Recommendation 44.
JBER			Project Concern	37	Page 98, ID 37, Muldoon (JBER) Perimeter Trail; several JBER Installation Commanders have responded to State Legislator inquiries about this subject and repeatedly indicated the proposal's incompatibility with military mission. This section of the installation border is mostly unsecured, easily accessible by the public, and has a high incidence of trespassing resulting in delayed and cancelled training opportunities impacting Soldier readiness. Recommend this project be removed from the Trails Plan.	While we recognize and acknowledge the concerns, the project team with support from the department has opted to keep a north-south trail concept in the plan in the area. The project has decades of history of inclusion in municipal planning documents. It continues to receive positive feedback from the public due to the lack of trail opportunity in the area. The solid line can be shown as a hatched concept to reflect the concerns of the agency. We also have added a narrative section titled "Major Connectivity Projects" to explain the long history of these projects and the challenges faced to	Remove JBER from title of Project 37. Replace solid line with hatched fill.
JBER			Document Edit	NoMo Project 07	On page 107, the Glenn Highway Pathway Connection at JBER D Street Gate project is described as improving the intersection to improve safety for non-motorized users. JBER requests more information about this proposal.	Because this plan addresses trail projects and not vehicle improvements, the project description was focused on the non-motorized users. The project description can be clarified.	"In coordination with effort to improve safety for all users at this intersection, integrate non-motorized pathway intersection of the Glenn Hwy Pathway and roadways at JBER D Street Gate"
JBER			Project Concern		Page 121 lists a Basher Drive Trailhead Design project. JBER requests an opportunity to review the project design as trails starting at this location cross onto military training lands. In conjunction with comment d above, signage about entering military land and the JBER recreation access website also need to be included in this project.	The project team connected JBER with the Basher Parking Lot team for comment.	No action.
			Landowner		JBER is experiencing an increase in operations tempo and training evolutions while also increasing the military-controlled acreage used for training. These factors increase risk in military training lands for Soldiers and the recreating public that fail to use established tools to deconflict from military operations. To facilitate partnership and communication, JBER requests a non-voting liaison from the installation be added to the Trails Committee. JBER is identified as a stakeholder on page 10 of the plan and should have a liaison participate in this and future development plans.	The Advisory Group/Working Group were stood up for this plan in 2024 to provide feedback on plan recommendations, but these groups will not be meeting after the plan concludes. The Deaprtment does have an Anchorage Parks and Recreation Commission and an Eagle River Chugiak Parks and Recreation Board of Supervisors (these are advisory boards and non-voting). We encourage JBER planners/representatives to apply to serve on these commissions if they are interested.	No action

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
1	3/2/2026	Kyle Smith	Landowner, Land Management		Eklutna, Inc. appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft Recreational Trails Plan (Plan). As the largest private landowner in Anchorage, Eklutna, Inc. may have direct impacts to its land – both positive and negative. Eklutna, Inc. is no stranger to the pressures of Anchorage’s growth on our land resources. We have recently opened more of our land to a permits-based system to allow access for biking, ice climbing, and other recreational purposes. While we are accommodating requests to access our lands, there is still rampant illegal dumping, tree cutting, arson, and other nefarious activities from trespassers. We are charged with protecting our ancestral lands, and we take this charge very seriously. The Plan proposes trail routes through Eklutna lands in several places from Eagle River to Birchwood. Below are our comments on each of the proposed trails:	We will incorporate this into the existing conditions section on recreational land owners.	Incorporate information on Eklutna Inc. in the recreational landowners section of Existing Conditions in the Plan.
2	3/2/2026	Kyle Smith	Project Support	61, 62, 63	Sites 61, 62, and 63 – These sites are rank as low to medium in the Plan. This is an area where Eklutna owns land east of Eagle River High School. The Plan identifies this proposed recreational area as a connection point for State Park lands. Eklutna, Inc. has no future plans for the acreage where this trail is proposed. We would encourage the Municipality to consider a land trade for Eklutna’s land in this area.	Great, we plan to expand on land swaps as a tool in the narrative of the plan and will encourage its use to implement these projects.	Add land swaps to implementation chapter of the Plan.
3	3/2/2026	Kyle Smith	Project Concern	68, 69, 71	Sites 68, 69, and 71 – The proposed trails through these Eklutna lands pose several concerns. First, the lower part of Site 68 runs through the Fire Creek Conservation Easement. Eklutna has set aside these lands in perpetuity with the Great Land Trust to preserve the area and protect the coastal estuary. There is already significant illegal hunting occurring in the area and annual cleanup efforts from trespassing. Second, the proposed trail is routed through Eklutna lands where there are already two thoroughfares along utility easements where motorized trespassers access Eklutna land. The addition of another access point in the 1100-acre parcel is problematic from an enforcement and cleanup standpoint. Third, Site 71 is not favored by Eklutna, Inc. as it has been noted previously. The northern stretch of Site 71 runs along an industrial area where Eklutna owns and leases land to industrial users and the route proposes to enter areas where we have not previously experienced trespass. New access typically equals new trespass opportunities. Finally, the Site 68 trail would route users pass an airport, two shooting ranges, another area with trespass hunting occurring, a railroad crossing, and Eklutna cultural site. It seems this route is fraught with potential dangers for the users. We question why these routes are deemed high importance trails with what would seem to be lightly used by locals and hosts many potential negative impacts for users.	Thank you for the comments. Rather than commit specific routes that would conflict with existing conservation easements, the purpose of the Plan is to provide a basis for the department and its partners to move forward on trail development that is consistent with those overlays. Due to landowner concerns about cultural sites and trespass, this segment can be displayed with a hatched fill rather than a solid line to reflect a more conceptual route. Project 71 (Coastal Trail North Extension, Thunderbird Falls to Knik River) referenced the Reconnaissance Engineering Study completed in 2025 and used the two preferred options previously reviewed by Eklutna Inc. The roadway parallel alternative is north of the indusrial areas and is within existing DOT&PF or AARC right-of way. The front country alignment (southern alignment) is removed from the industrial areas and as discussed during the RE Study would require significant coordination with Eklutna Inc. to determine appropriate land management and maintenance practices to actualize the trail and deter potential trespass. Project 68 (Coastal Trail North Extension, Beach Lake Park to Mirror/Edmonds Lake) reflects high priority because it connects two parks and residents to recreation which is an otherwise isolated area. Project 69 (Mirror Lake Park to Thunderbird Falls Connection) is medium priority because it connects a municipal park to a state park to the Thunderbird Falls neighborhood, which would otherwise be isolated from local park land. Project 71 remains low priority, as it does not connect public park lands nor existing residential areas but has been in demand for regional recreation for decades.	Change Trail Project 68 Coastal Trail North Ext. Beach Lake Park to Mirror/Edmonds Lake from a solid line to a hatch on the Recommendations Map. Confirm Trail Project 71 roadway parallel alternative is mapped according to the Reconnaissance Engineering Study alignment which uses existing ROW and not on Eklutna Inc. industrial property.
4	3/2/2026	Kyle Smith	Project Concern	NM 4	Site 4 (Non-motorized) – Again, the proposed routing along the Eagle River Road is likely to run along stretches of Eklutna, Inc. land. We are generally supportive of a non-motorized trail connecting State Park points along the road if Eklutna interests are not negatively impacted such as creating more challenges for driveway permits off a DOT road, hampering residential or commercial development, and disrupting subdivisions where we sell lots.	Thank you for expressing your cocnern. We will add language to the plan that emphasizes the need to closely coordinate trail planning/routing and design with Eklutna Inc. and other adjacent landowners to ensure future development potential isn’t limited by a trail.	Add language emphasizing the need for close coordination during trail planning and design, to include management and maintenance responsibilities, to Trail Project Recommendations 68, 69, and 71
5	3/2/2026	Kyle Smith	Landowner, Land Management		Conclusion If any of the routes through Eklutna lands are built, it is unlikely Eklutna will provide more easements through its lands to accommodate more trails. The general disregard for our permitting system means Eklutna will shoulder the added expense of attempting to regulate use and enforce permits along dozens of miles of trails. This is unappealing. The MOA will need to find practical solutions for these issues if Eklutna were to accept this Plan as stated.	We interpret this to mean that Eklutna Inc. would be open to a land swap or purchase for development of trails and are less interested in establishing trail easements.	Add land swaps to implementation chapter of the Plan.
6	1/30/26		Project Prioritization	72	I would like to see Ram Valley access listed as a higher priority than “low”. Shouldn’t there be some sort of public access easement corridor there anyhow?	Access projects to Chugach State Park may fall into the low priority category due to the fact that it is not municipal park land. The Plan recommends that these types of projects would be coordinated with landowners, State Parks, other public entities, and Road Service Areas.	Add Road Service Areas to the discussion of Chugach Assess and CASA in recommendation and implementation chapters, and amend Project Description 72
7	1/31/26		Project Support, Recommendation Support	2, 3, 70, 73	I like the planned new trails – Fish Creek and Coastal Trail North (from Beach Lake area). Great additions to the Anchorage trail system. I also like the planned maintenance/upgrade of existing trails. Good work.	Thank you for your supportive comment.	No action.

Comment		Date			Project				
ID	Received	Submitted by	Topic	ID	Comment	Staff Response		Proposed Action	
8	2/2/26	Rebecca Kurtz	Project Concern	35	I was at the meeting last week at Russian Jack and I forgot to add this comment concerning Russian Jack Ski trails: Either close off the entrance off Boniface to the park or cut down all the trees in front the trails so the parking lot is visible. There can be some creepy cars parked there making me feel unsafe. Thank you for your time.	Improvement to the Boniface Rd. parking area is included in the 2022 Russian Jack Springs Park Master Plan due to maintenance and safety considerations identified by the community. This will continue to be prioritized as funds are available to improve the park.		No action.	
9	2/4/26		Recommendation Support, Project Support	26,29, 30, 31, 32, 70, 73	I appreciate the time and detail put into this plan. It's a great vision for the future of Anchorage parks and trails and captures the need for increased safety and connectivity well. I especially appreciate the projects that highlight maintenance, improvements and creating a new class of trail for the Coastal and Chester Creek trails.	Thank you for the supportive comment.		No action	
10	2/7/26		Project Support	39	So grateful to see Patterson Street/Chester Valley Park Trail & Bridge Rehabilitation - It's a wonderful location but not safe for anyone not VERY steady on the feet! Even with a walking stick it's risky. Thank you to those responsible for its inclusion!	Thank you for the supportive comment.		No action.	
11	2/8/26		Project Prioritization	37, 38, 39, 41	East Side needs more access to the trail system! These projects should be prioritized: 1) Project 37: Muldoon (JBER) Perimeter Trail 2) Project 38: Chanshtnu Muldoon Park Connectivity 3)Project 39: Patterson Street/ Chester Valley Park Trail & Bridge Rehabilitation 4) Project 41: Cheney Lake Pavement Rehabilitation Thanks!	The plan places all four of these projects into the high priority category. Thank you for the support and confirmation that the scoring criteria are aligning with community vision!		No action.	
12	2/10/26		Project Prioritization	4	Project #04 (Earthquake Park Spur Trail Rehabilitation) is ranked as medium priority with a medium timeframe in this plan. This spur serves as an access point to the Coastal Trail for a huge swath of neighborhoods in and should be prioritized higher and on a shorter timeline as it is a relatively minor fix. The trail is currently very difficult to traverse by stroller, bicycle, chariot, etc. Its narrow, very bumpy/rooty with hidden obstacles (especially when leaves fall on the trail in autumn) and has troughs that form puddles. There is zero shoulder on this section of Northern Lights Blvd. so this trail connector is the only option for non-motorized users. The main need is only on the section from Nathaniel Court to the Earthquake Park parking lot, the section from the parking lot to Coastal Trail is fine. If shortening the reach proposed for rehab makes the project more feasible or able to be completed sooner, I would recommend that. The section with the most need is only about 0.3 miles long.	The score was reevaluated based on comments received. We have elevated the priority to high based on the severity of need and the lack of other access points onto the Coastal Trail in this area.		Change prioritization of Trail Project #4 from Medium to High	
13	2/11/26	Joanie Havenner	Project Support	4	Hello, I have lived off Wendy's Way for over 32 years. I very much appreciate being so close to the trail that connects to Earthquake Park and the Coastal trail. Over the past several years, the connector trail that runs from Nathaniel Court to Earthquake Park has degraded to the point of being dangerous. It's lumpy and bumpy- so much so that it's difficult to walk and ride bikes on. It's a trail that is used by so many, and so many of us would like to continue using it. I'm respectfully requesting that the connector trail between Nathaniel Court to the parking lot of Earthquake Park be repaved so we can continue to enjoy it for many years to come. Sincerely, Joanie Havenner	The score was reevaluated based on comments received. We have elevated the priority to high based on the severity of need and the lack of other access points onto the Coastal Trail in this area.		Change prioritization of Trail Project #4 from Medium to High	
14	2/11/26		Project Concern	71	Trails #71 should Start from Thunderbird Falls to Eklutna Lake. Every May, the Bikeathon Group Hugged the very NARROW ROAD of Eklutna Lake Rd. Drivers from The Lake often Drive very Fast -over the Speed Limit and Accidents had happened. Widening the Road with Trail Extension BENEFITS the Public.	This comment will be documented for the next update of the AMATS Non-Motorized Plan, due to the fact that it relates to roadway infrastructure and linkage to state park land.		No action	
15	2/11/26		Recommendation Concern		Until you clean up the bums and criminal encampments from the existing trails it does not not make sense to make new trails, which will become pathways for encampments, criminals and bums. As a former frequent user of Chester Creek Trail, it is simply too dangerous due to the municipalities non enforcement of camping, open drug use rules for people to use. Currently criminals, drug users and alcoholics are the primary user of the trails in Anchorage	Safety is a priority of this plan. The plan addresses the multi-agency response required to address the housing crisis in Anchorage and continue supporting camp cleanup efforts. The Municipality recently expanded the Healthy Spaces Divison of Parks and Recreation with funding made available from a Solid Waste Services fee structure.		No action	
16	2/11/26		Project Support	4	Project 04: Earthquake Park Spur Trail Rehabilitation - I am in support of this Rehabilitation! The Coastal Trail is one of the most important assets and attractions to our city. This connector trail has become very hard to navigate and would be nearly impossible for someone in a wheelchair, walker or with mobility issues. Thank you for adding this to the final plan!	The score was reevaluated based on comments received. We have elevated the priority to high based on the severity of need and the lack of other access points onto the Coastal Trail in this area.		Change prioritization of Trail Project #4 from Medium to High	
17	2/11/26		Recommendation Support		I support increasing accessibility to our public trailheads. Parking is an issue and while some trailheads will stay small due to their location in neighborhoods, where it is possible increasing parking options would be good. Also creating more options for people to recreate in town may decrease the pressure on the foothills.	Thank you for the comment. More information about how Parks and Recreation determines parking lot size and expansion is now available on our website.		No action	

Comment		Date		Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
ID	Received	Submitted by	Topic				
18	2/11/26		Project Concern, Maintenance	36	I regularly ride to work (UAA) from my home in Nunaka Valley. It is a fantastic commute, however, there are often people in the tunnel under Boniface having a fire, leaving garbage etc. I don't know how to prevent this other than police presence, but maybe there are simple measures that Parks can take to help (even signs). Additionally, the snow in this tunnel is often removed in the winter, making it impossible to ski through. Given there is snow on either side and it connects the neighbourhood to the Russian Jack ski trails, it would be great if snow was spread through the tunnel to allow us to ski through.	Safety is a priority of this plan. The plan addresses the multi-agency response required to address the housing crisis in Anchorage and continue supporting camp cleanup efforts. The Municipality recently expanded the Healthy Spaces Division of Parks and Recreation with funding made available from a Solid Waste Services fee structure. Parks is not currently maintaining snow in this corridor -- only west of the Boniface tunnel. The section from Perry to East 20th is being maintained by the MOA Street Maintenance crew this winter due to operational swaps (which may be affected by equipment availability/repair status).	
19	2/11/26	Maddie Halloran	Recommendation Support, Project Support	26,29, 30, 31, 32, 9, 70, 73	Hello, I am a frequent trail user, who grew up in Anchorage. Thank you so much for the opportunity to provide public comment on this process. I'm so happy the ADN covered this in an article today, as otherwise I had not heard about this effort. I am a fairly engaged community member, and so am surprised I missed all of the previous public event notices. I currently use the trails primarily to: - bike or ski commute from home in Airport Heights to Downtown or Midtown (Chester Creek Trail) - access longer bike routes (Moose Loop, etc.) - fat biking single track - dog walking I support the new trail classification to widen popular trails that allows for a greater diversity of users. The biggest bottleneck I have experienced is around Westchester Lagoon, where it is difficult both as a biker to get through all the pedestrians, but also scary as a pedestrian to constantly have bikes (or skiers) passing so quickly without warning. A wider trail will really improve the experience here I think. I would recommend widening the trail all around the lagoon and continuing until Fish Creek, as the coastal trail section has a lot of turns that are especially difficult to navigate (especially with increased eBike traffic from summer tourists). Based on my personal experience, I think the trail counts on Page 34 might be very low compared to the actual usage. I previously lived near Lore + Petersburg. It was VERY difficult to access the trail system from this location, and required either crossing Lake Otis or going under the highway. I bike so much more now that I live in a neighborhood with direct trail access to Chester Creek Trail. Something that would have really helped me in my old location is a better North/South connector route (for both safety and speed/less road crossings). The only way to bike downtown was take Lake Otis to join the Chester Creek trail. I do not feel safe biking in the roadway on Lake Otis, and the sidewalk is VERY narrow in many places, making it nearly impossible to pass pedestrians without walking my bike. I think there should be consideration given to either widen the sidewalks with a buffer space between sidewalk and the street, or a dedicated bike lane on Lake Otis. Similarly, it is really unpleasant to bike on Dimond to connect the full Moose Loop (Campbell Creek Trail to Jewel Lake). I usually cut through the neighborhoods, but the route is confusing. A more clear connection here, or a dedicated neighborhood route with road (paint moose footprints on the road?) and sign markings would be great. The Campbell Creek Trail crossing at Lake Otis has been a source of concern my entire life! I have never seen anyone choose to detour to cross at the Tudor or 50th Ave intersections with lights, all bikers and pedestrians just always scurry across Lake Otis when there is a break in traffic, which feels so dangerous. In the near term, could we maybe get some flashing lights to warn cars there might be pedestrians? Crossing from east to west also doesn't line up well, and as a biker I usually have to wait in the turn lane. I would love to see a better connection built, either under or over Lake Otis. I agree with the survey responses highlighted in the report that advocated for connecting trails as a top priority. I think people in Anchorage would use less motorized transport if better connections were available. I would also love to help with these projects if possible! I know the biggest need is probably money, but I wonder if there is a way to coordinate with Alaska Trails to leverage volunteers somehow? If we are going to expand bike infrastructure in Anchorage, I would also love to see some education given to drivers around sharing space with bikes. Even in areas with decent shoulders or bike lanes, I frequently feel unsafe from cars not seeing me, or even harassed by cars driving so closely to me. Is it possible to advocate for pedestrian/bike sharing education in the driver's license test procedures, driver's ed, and additional roadway signage around town? Bikers and walkers also should get education around proper safety gear to be visible to cars, and bikers should be encouraged to use audible cues (voice or bells) when passing pedestrians. Thanks for reading this long comment, and for all you do to make Anchorage an amazing place to live! Maddie Halloran	Thank you for your supportive comments. The trail widening projects around Westchester Lagoon are driven by community interest in safety upgrades. In addition to upgrading the trails to the proposed new Trail Class 6 in these areas, development of a Westchester Master Plan is also recommended to consider how best to protect natural resources in the area while providing a better user experience. The trail counts in the area are Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) counts, which provide a "daily average" for the location for comparison purposes. In day to day counts, the counts would be higher in summer and lower in winter and shoulder seasons. Your comments about improving Lake Otis Parkway are documented for the future updates to the Non-Motorized Plan. Trail Project 9 is to improve routing, wayfinding, and connectivity between the Coastal Trail and Campbell Creek Trail to provide a more comfortable experience (the gap in the Moose Loop along Dimond), and improving the Campbell Creek Trail Crossing at Lake Otis (Trail Project 47) is labeled as a high priority. Thank you for your interest in safety and educational campaigns. AMATS is actively implementing educational campaigns and your comment is documented for their consideration.	No action.

Comment		Date	Project		Comment		Staff Response		Proposed Action
ID	Received	Submitted by	Topic	ID					
20	2/11/26		Recommendation Support		Projects that expand trail miles and connectivity around town should be the highest priority, and anything that provides basic maintenance to the existing trails. Basically spending dollars that meet the largest number of users and expand the number of users by reaching underserved areas, like the Fish Creek connection in Spenard. By getting more people to use the trail systems year-round, more momentum and buy-in can be built to support more niche projects in the future. It's worth a small sales tax to fund this: Anchorage needs to improve its quality of life, and everyday access to 'nature' within the city will go a long way towards that.		Thank you for the supportive comment. We agree that the main priorities of this plan are connectivity and taking care of what is already here. The scoring criteria for projects are also informed by the population analysis (maps available in Chapter 3) to direct public resources toward projects that would reach the most users in places with less trail access.		Update Implementation chapter to include content around funding trails through a potential tax and other sources, as included in the community survey report.
21	2/11/26		New Proposed Project		One route that would help with connectivity on the Campbell Tract to Chester Creek trail, would be to route bicycle and foot traffic to cross Tudor at Tudor Center Drive, and have the pedestrian end up on the east side of Tudor Center Drive, and cut behind the dumpsters in the doctor's office (there's already a trail there) and connects right to the easternmost part of the Lanie Fischer Trail. Crossing Tudor at the light and one stop sign after that are the impediments, but you don't have to get sucked in the hospital traffic.		Due to existing elevated crossing and two access points onto the Chester Creek Trail from the ANTHC campus, this project is not a priority at this time.		No action
22	2/11/26		Project Prioritization	72	Please make Ram Valley CSP access a higher priority than it is currently shown (low). The access issue there needs to be solved so we can move on		Ram Valley Access is included in the Chugach State Park Connection Improvements, Project 72. Access projects to Chugach State Park may show up lower in the priority categories due to the fact that it is not municipal park land. The Plan recommends these types of projects are coordinated with landowners, State Parks, other public entities, and Road Service Areas.		Add Road Service Areas to the discussion of Chugach Assess and CASA in recommendation and implementation chapters, and amend <u>Project Description 72</u>
23	2/11/26		Recommendation Support, New Proposed Project, Project Support	47	I love the idea of trails with designated pedestrian and bike lanes. I am a runner and a commuter cyclist, I and I have seen trail conflict as a result of trails that are too narrow. I also think the intersection of Dowling and Elmore needs work to become safer for commuter cyclists and pedestrians. The right turn onto Dowling (coming southward on Elmore) is unsafe because many vehicles do not stop for pedestrians even when the walk signal is on and the pedestrian has the right of way--it is designed to make drivers think that the vehicle has the right of way. I also agree that the Lake Otis crossing to get to Campbell Creek Park is extremely problematic and unsafe for pedestrians. Thank you for all the work you are doing to improve our trail system!		Thank you for the supportive comment. The comment about the Dowling and Elmore intersection will be documented for future updates of the Non-Motorized Plan.		No action
24	2/12/26		Recommendation Support, Recommendation Concern		Overall I support the main focuses of the plan. I appreciate the emphasis on connection. I would appreciate seeing more connections, especially for non-motorized use from Muldoon to further into Anchorage. The largest concern I have with future trail development is the lack of ease for mobility limited people. In particular when looking at over-passes/bridges that might be used as connection points. Anyone with mobility issues will not be able to utilize these and therefore, will continue to be forced to take the longer, and often much more dangerous (and in the winter often not plowed) route on the road/sidewalks. Please reconsider the use of these bridges to more accessible options. Thank you for the time and effort to making Anchorage's trails functionable to all.		Many older styles of overpasses are no longer used. Current design standards and best practices for overpasses/elevated crossings and bridges would need to meet ADA design standards.		No action
25	2/12/26		New Proposed Project		Better trail access is needed between downtown Anchorage and Government Hill area.		Government Hill connectivity projects are also documented in approved neighborhood and park plans. We will add these projects into the Non-Motorized Needs list that is included in this Plan effort. The Non-Motorized Needs list recognizes important recreational connections and are intended to carry over into the next update of the AMATS Non-Motorized Plan.		Add two Non-Motorized Project Recommendations to the List/Map: (1) Government Hill to Ship Creek Connection: Implement the Government Hill Parks & Trails Plan to improve connectivity to Ship Creek (2) Government Hill East to West Bluff Trail Connection: Implement the Government Hill Parks & Trails Plan to provide a trail connection from E Bluff to W Bluff park with an improved
26	2/12/26		Recommendation Concern, Project Concern	19	Please keep the trails nonmotorized, which means no e-bikes, certainly no e-motorcycles, which is what many "e-bikes" are becoming. This will become a huge problem unless you address it now. Also, please, no new lights in Tikisla Park. It's great as it is. No safety concerns here because of high use and good neighbors.		E-bike regulation was most recently determined at the Assembly level. This Plan intends to address concerns about speed and safety of e-bikes through design intervention. Additionally, the Department will be working on updated signage to educate users about the allowable types of e-bikes. Trails throughout the Parks and Recreation system remain closed to motorized vehicles. New lighting will be considered with future efforts to rehabilitate the pavement along spur trails in Tikishla Park. This is because of documented community support in the park's Master Plan. Community concerns about protecting dark sky standards when possible are also noted.		No action

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
27	2/12/26		New Proposed Project		This plan should include a project improve Barbara St. between Northern Lights and 32nd Ave. it is a missing link between the existing Fish Creek trail sections and the proposed extension to the coastal trail. The street is marked as a bike boulevard, but local parking often impede travel. The crossing at 30th is dangers for bikers because cars do not stop at that intersection and sight lines are poor. A narrowed street with a dedicated bike lane/path would make this trail section complete once the section to the coastal trail is installed.	We will incorporate this recommendation into the Non-Motorized Needs list, as it is a gap for trail users to reach the proposed Fish Creek Trail connector to the Coastal Trail.	Add a Non-Motorized Project to improve Barbara St. between Northern Lights and 32nd Ave.
28	2/13/26		Project Support	09, 47	As an avid trail user (biker, runner, skier, etc etc), I especially support projects 47 and 09. I'd love to see the Campbell Creek trail connect in a safer way to the Coastal Trail. Right now the abrupt crossing at Lake Otis and confusing connection near Kincaid at the end of Campbell Creek makes it difficult to feel safe traversing it, and near impossible in the winter on skis. Our trail system is impressive and amazing, and would love to see it continue to improve!	Thank you for the supportive comment.	No action
29	2/13/26		Recommendation Support		For me connectivity and winter maintenance are the most important issues. It would be lovely to have more north-south trails: for example connecting Chester Creek trail to Cuddy Park.	Thank you for the supportive comment. The upcoming effort to update the Cuddy Family Midtown Park Master Plan should include opportunties to improve connectivity to Midtown and your comment will be documented for future updates to the Non-Motorized Plan.	No action.
30	2/14/26		Project Prioritization	4	This is a very comprehensive Trails plan. Well done. I'd like to see the Project ID #4 (Earthquake Trail Spur Rehabilitation) moved from Medium to High priority, and Time Frame from Mid to Short, but limit the rehab to only Nathaniel Court to Earthquake Park parking lot; parking lot to Coastal Trail section is in reasonably good condition. The cost is much lower than many other priorities; many people use this spur daily; the rough surface of this part of the trail creates a safety issue for walkers and bikers.	The score was reevaluated based on comments received. We have elevated the priority to high based on the severity of need and the lack of other access points onto the Coastal Trail in this area.	Change prioritization of Trail Project #4 from Medium to High
31	2/23/26	Mark Erickson	Recommendation Support		I'm a frequent trail user and recently retired member of the construction community. Some thoughts I'd like to add to the discussion include looking for the numerous short connections that can be established between neighborhoods. I ride my mountain/fat tire bike all over town and my construction insight lets me pick up on what I call "urban portages" that connect from one neighborhood to the adjacent one along a short right-of-way typically that could be improved to make them safer and also allow a traverse without needing to back track or ride along heavier arterials with more vehicle traffic. These connections make it safer to move through town. The second thought I would share is along the idea of widening trails to make them safer, something I whole-heartedly agree with. Road bikes and strollers and many people want paved trails, but many runners and mountain/fat tire/gravel bike people do not need paved trails. An idea to expand more capacity would be to develop additional trails/widths but not necessarily pave them, thus allowing money to stretch for more trails and if paving is necessitated, it can be done later with future funding. Just a thought. Sincerely, Mark Erickson	This plan acknowledges that connections between neighborhoods in rights-of-way (ROW) are desired by the public, however are not comprehensively mapped. While this plan makes recommendations at a larger scale focused on parkland, it also recommends a study specifically on ROW to address the more detailed level understanding of improving neighborhood connectivity.	No action
32	2/25/26		New Proposed Project	3	Love the idea of a connector between Fish Creek and Campbell Creek. But can we also get lighting on the existing Fish Creek trail, between Spenard and Northwood?	Thank you for the supportive comment. This request will be documented but there is no action at this time.	No action
33	2/25/26		New Proposed Project		The section of existing fish creek trail between Northwood and spenard was put in without lighting. It turned into a place to camp very quickly, and I think lights would help deter people, and make the trail feel safer. I live right by this and often skip this part of the trail. Thanks.	Thank you for the supportive comment. This request will be documented but there is no action at this time.	No action
34	2/25/26		New Proposed Project		I believe that making a short walkway/bicycle path (>100 meters) on the east side of Elmore, from the light at 68th street to BLM Road (Smokejumper Trailhead) would alleviate some of the pressure that hits Abbott Loop every day of the year. The stoplight is a great place to cross Abbott, and it was designed for pedestrians, with both 68th and Dowling offering a good thoroughfare. But once you cross Elmore at 68th to get to the Campbell Tract side the sidewalk or path just disappears into a rough mess in the summer. There is space for a small bike lane or side walk or some sort of walkway to get you to BLM Road, where there is a decent shoulder to get into Campbell Tract.	We recommend directing this comment to the landowner of the area described (Bureau of Land Management).	No action.
35	2/27/26		Project Support	47	I would like to see a safer trail connection across Lake Otis for Campbell Creek bike/pedestrian path. I very much appreciated the improvements made several years ago along the section of trail underneath the Seward Hwy now if we can just get the last link across Lake Otis completed we'd be golden!	This plan recommends continued investment in Project 47 (Campbell Creek Crossing).	No action.

Comment		Date		Project		Comment		Staff Response		Proposed Action	
ID	Received	Submitted by	Topic	ID							
36	3/9/2026	Lucy Wittlinger	Recommendation Support, Project Support	18, 03, 37		I am loving the class 6 a/b options for Anchorage! This is much needed and has been needed for years. This will greatly improve the quality of the trail experience on our greenbelts and higher-use areas.		Thank you for the supportive comment!		No action.	
						Project 18 is also much needed to have that trail connection to Sitka Street Park from the Chester Creek trail.					
						LOVE project 3, this would provide so many great options for the southwest side of Anchorage to connect to the larger network.					
						Project 37 is also much needed for the larger network connectivity. LOVE THIS.					
37	3/10/2026		Recommendation Support, Project Support	02, 03		I am an all-season, pretty much daily user of the Anchorage trail systems. We chose where to live based on proximity to trails and the ability to bike year round to work (I live in a limited car household). Having so many miles of groomed multi-use trails in winter is such a unique and wonderful resource for an urban area. I appreciate all the thought this plan made for trail connectivity - especially North-South connector trails. Unfortunately, the streets often do not feel like a safe place to bike (especially in winter when plowing is inconsistent and drivers cannot be trusted to have appropriate tires), so having separated trails is the best way to encourage less dependence on cars and get more people walking/biking/skiing to their destinations. In particular, I am a proponent of the Fish Creek extensions to connect the Coastal trail to the Campbell Creek Trail. Connecting these two major trail systems with a more central N-S connector would be a boon for the whole community.		Thank you for the supportive comment!		No action.	
38	3/10/2026		Project Concern	47		I live on E 47th Ct by the proposed crossing for the Campbell creek crossing (project 47). I am concerned that the elevated crossing will obstruct the sight lines making it even harder to turn left out of our street. This is my typical commute to work and many of the other homeowners take a left hand turn across Lake Otis. Trail users do make it hard to turn across the intersection especially in the summer when there are many bike users. I'm all for improving the trail access. If you restrict us to right turn only I encourage you to consider a close place on Lake Otis where a U-turn could be safely made.		In March 2026, the AMATS Policy Committee approved an updated project description for the Campbell Creek Crossing project. It now reads "Project would construct a non-motorized crossing at Lake Otis Blvd" rather than limit scope to a grade-separated crossing. This allows the project to explore alternatives such as an at-grade crossing and the related traffic impacts.		No action.	
39	3/13/2026		Project Support	37		Project 37 would be awesome to expand the trail system from Far North Bicentennial Park and would allow all those people living on the east side more trail access!		Thank you for the supportive comment.		No action.	
40	3/13/2026		Recommendation Support			It's great to see projects that people have be asking and talk about on the plan! I hope they go through!		Thank you for the supportive comment.		No action.	
41	3/22/2026		Project Concern	56		Project of improving bridge between Campbell Airstrip road and gas line trail should include widening and weight baring of vehicles despite designation for recreational use. It should serve as emergency evacuation route in case of fire. Fires are yearly danger and with the amount of spruce beetle killed trees as well as illegal homeless camps, in various locations that are now being accessed by bikes and are spotted by users of the trails, danger increased exponentially to adjoin neighborhoods. Upper Campbell Airstrip neighborhood has no escape route. Having ability of using that bridge as evacuation or for Fire dept it should be priority.		Trail Project 56 is for an upgraded bridge supporting the dog mushing trails, which are not improved to a degree that would accommodate vehicles. In the event trails would need to be used in an emergency evacuation, it is anticipated other trails would serve as alternate routes given sufficient width and connect to nearby roadways, such as Science Center Dr.		No action.	
42	3/23/2026		Project Support, Recommendation Support			Appreciate the work on this plan. Love the addition of 6b trails to accommodate all types of users in the best way possible. Greenbelt connections in Eagle River and Coastal Trail North extension looks great. Looks like comprehensive vision to continue connecting Anchorage's wonderful trails while maintaining existing trails. Thank you!		Thank you for the supportive comment.		No action.	
43	3/23/2026	Matthew Nyholm, Rogers Park Resident	Project Support, Recommendation Support			I am an avid trails user both for bike, ski, and pedestrian recreation and bike commuting, primarily using the Chester Creek Trail. As such, I strongly support the Coastal Trail to Campbell Creek Trail Connection Improvements, Sitka Street Park Pathway Rehab, Sitka Street to Eastchester Park, Goose Lake Park Trail Rehabilitation, Chester Creek Trail Lighting Improvements, Chester Creek Trail Tunnel Improvements , Russian Jack Springs Park Trail Lighting, Chanshtnu Muldoon Park Connectivity, Campbell creek crossing at lake Otis , Campbell Creek underpass improvements, and Jodhpur St trailhead to Dimond blvd connectivity. More than anything, I support moving to a shared winter maintenance plan, such as the Chester Creek Trail Widening to a class 6b, that allows for both ski grooming and snow clearing for bike commuter and pedestrian winter trail access.		Thank you for the supportive comment.		No action.	

Comment		Date	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
ID	Received	Submitted by				
44	3/23/2026	Hope Meyn, Rogers Park Resident		Project Support, Recommendation Support I am an avid trails user both for bike, ski, and pedestrian recreation and bike commuting, primarily using the Chester Creek Trail. As such, I strongly support the Coastal Trail to Campbell Creek Trail Connection Improvements, Sitka Street Park Pathway Rehab, Sitka Street to Eastchester Park, Goose Lake Park Trail Rehabilitation, Chester Creek Trail Lighting Improvements, Chester Creek Trail Tunnel Improvements , Russian Jack Springs Park Trail Lighting, Chanshtnu Muldoon Park Connectivity, Campbell creek crossing at lake Otis , Campbell Creek underpass improvements, and Jodhpur St trailhead to Dimond blvd connectivity. More than anything, I support moving to a shared winter maintenance plan, such as the Chester Creek Trail Widening to a class 6b, that allows for both ski grooming and snow clearing for bike commuter and pedestrian winter trail access.	Thank you for the supportive comment.	No action.
45	3/24/2026			Project Concern, Project Prioritization, New Proposed Project I generally agree with the expansion of trail systems in the Eagle River/Chugiak area however with the current proposals we are spending a great deal of time and MONEY on a select group of individuals with the mass of money being put toward the dog sled trails near Birchwood. The dog sled community is very small but is gobbling up a massive amount of money to expend trail systems that they want exclusive to their group/sport. A better use of money would be to have the trail systems expansion and upkeep benefit a wider population. An example would be to put better access around the lakes in the area including Fire Lake, Mirror Lake and the river access points for Eagle River (up Eagle River valley).	Thank you for your comment. The survey and workshops found a majority of public interest toward multi-use trails over user-specific trails. One of the two projects related to dog mushing trails in the Eagle River/Chugiak area, Project 66, is to improve the trails for expanded use in shoulder-season and to support multi-use dryland events (such as skijor, bikejor, etc.). Multi-use trail recommendations are prioritized at Beach Lake, in the Mirror Lake area, and to provide neighborhood and regional connections.	No action.
46	3/24/2026			New Proposed Project Additionally, Birchwood Loop is considered a dangerous roadway and the Anchorage School District is not able to have students walk to their neighborhood schools or even combine bus pick up and drop zones due to the danger on the road. Putting a sidewalk system the full length of North and South Birchwood would open up access to walkers, bikers, children walking to their neighborhood schools, and general recreation. Birchwood ABC and Chugiak High School would be able to allow walkers to their schools and the neighborhoods would be more welcoming to families interested in moving to the area. A sidewalk system similar to what we have adjacent to the Old Glenn Highway could be connected to a new trailsystem through the Birchwoods and create a safe loop for runners, walkers, and cyclists. I have lived in the area of 50 years and this would seem much more beneficial to the neighborhood as a whole RATHER than spending money exclusive to trail development for dog mushers. In addition to the recreational benefit this would make the overall community SAFER and create access for a wide variety of ages and uses.	Thank you for your comment, we agree improvements to Birchwood Loop Road would provide a new recreational experience and better neighborhood connectivity. Recommended Non-Motorized Project 3 is to provide a roadside non-motorized pathway along S Birchwood Loop Road between Hidden Hill Ct, Birchwood Spur Rd, and Old Glenn Hwy.	No action.
47	3/24/2026			New Proposed Project My biggest priority would be to find North to South Connecters for the Chester Creek Trial and the Campbell Creek Trail. Specifically, I think there should be a connection that originates where Chester Creek touches Eagle Street, meets up with Denali Street and follows it all the way to Tudor and has a well designed and managed crossing set up, then designated biking streets through the neighborhood there until the route hits International Airport Road. Another street crossing set up would be needed but then there is a neighborhood access to Campbell Creek Trail. It would also be nice to see connectors or better navigation for biking/recreation from the University/UMED area to Campbell Creek Trails. I am less familiar with the trails the farther east you go but again more connectors.	A combination of recreational trail projects and non-motorized improvements within ROW are recommended in this Plan to increase connectivity. Your suggested connection would rely primarily on improvements within ROW, as public land along the connection limited. Your comment is documented for the future update of hte Non-Motorized Plan. System-wide improvements to wayfinding are recommended in this Plan.	No action.
48	3/24/2026			Recommendation Support, Design Standards Trail class 6a will not prevent walkers from going three to four abreast, nor bicyclists from doing the same. Please focus on Trail Plan 6b - separating them.	Thank you for your comment to support Trail Class 6b.	No action.
49	3/25/2026			Project Prioritization I live across the street from Ruth Arcand Park and am pleased to see safer access to the park is on your list. Unfortunately, it's listed as a low priority. When ADOT was holding public meetings for the Abbott Road widening project, I commented that a pedestrian crossing to Ruth Arcand Park was needed. I was told there hadn't been any fatalities near the park entrance so they didn't think it was warranted. By itself an interesting standard for determining safety; however, now that traffic speed and volume has increased as a result of the widened road, it is even less safe. I now drive to the trailhead but many people with dogs still dart back and forth across Abbott road from the bike path and various neighborhoods across the street. It's not safe for pedestrians and drivers alike. Please increase the priority level for accessing this park before someone gets hurt, or worse. Thank you.	Thank you for the feedback. Low priority does not indicate a lack of support for the project, but reflects the result of scoring criteria (land ownership, connectivity, severity of need). While the Department would like to support better access to this park from neighborhoods, it is not categorized as an urgent need when compared to projects with failing assets (trail surface, bridge replacement, etc) nor does it fall into an area of demographic need (higher rates of car ownership, more resources on a household basis, etc.).	No action.
50	3/25/2026			Recommendation Concern I fully disagree with continuing to build more trails around Anchorage while we have people struggling to make ends meet and have a net outmigration over the last 10 years. Young people don't want to live here anymore, and a couple more trails that won't get maintained while wrecking our fiscal capabilities is not a good idea in my opinion. Spend this money to attract MORE people and add more to our economy. What exactly is the return on investment of MORE trails without more amenities to keep people in Alaska, or attract people to move here, and paying taxes?	Thank you for the comment.	

Comment		Date		Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
ID	Received	Submitted by	Topic				
51	3/25/2026		Project Concern	43	Hello! I'm really excited about this project because I use the trials multiple times per day! I have a suggestion for castle heights park. I saw that it is listed as high priority to fix the 2 walking paths. While the team is in the area Id like to suggest considering adding a east west paved path on the north side of the park connecting the 2 north to south paths. If you look at the walking paths in the snow it is clear how many people use that route. The one challenge is during the summer and spring that north area of the park can get soggy and muddy (possible water drainage issues) so I'm not sure if it would need to be a gravel path that is built up a bit. Thank you for your consideration on this matter.	Thank you for your comment and suggested improvement to Trail Project 43. We will modify the project description to clarify that the intent is to not just improve but connect the two existing trails with a new connection.	Amend Project 43 description to: Improve the connector trail from the Chester Creek trail to Castel Heights Park and connect existing neighborhood connector trails within the park.
52	3/26/2026		New Proposed Project, Project Support		Single track mountain bike trails at Eagle River High School, connecting Briggs Bridge and Eagle River Campground would be great for all Eagle River residents. Currently to mountain bike in the summer in the Chugiak/Eagle River area requires a long drive to Mirror Lake. Additionally, the bike path along Eagle River Road needs to be expanded all the way to the Eagle River Nature Center. This will reduce a major safety issue will cyclists on the road but also allow several stranded neighborhoods to connect to other area trails and playgrounds via a safe bike path.	Based on consistency with the Chugach State Park recreation plan, a project to add mountain bike trails in the area at Eagle River High School connecting to the Eagle River Campground area is supported. We recommend adding it as separate project for the different user groups. Non-Motorized Project 4 recommends expanded recreational and transportation opportunity along Eagle River Road that extends to the Nature Center. We agree it would be a significant safety and recreational asset.	Add a new project to reflect mountain bike development in the area of Eagle River High School and the Eagle River Campground, consistent with Chugach State Park recreation plan.
53	3/27/2026	Judy Caminer	Document Edit		Dear Project Manager, I found the maps challenging to use. I also noticed you do not show the Stewart Homestead Trail that starts on Steamboat Drive and goes to Chugach State Park thanks to lands acquired by the Greatland Trust recently. This is a new, legal access to the park and should be highlighted. CASA is frequently mentioned but I believe not fully described in the document. CASA includes roads and on page 90 and other places it seems to only say parking and trailheads. The CASA ordinance also states that projects may only proceed if the municipality first enters cooperative agreements with all parties when the project is within the boundaries of a service area that provides roads and or drainages services or roads owned by the State of Alaska. The document needs to mention the role of road service areas more. Page 94, project 13, mention Glen Alps Service Area, Bear Valley LRSA, South Goldenview Rural Road Service Area as part of the coordination. Same with project 14, name appropriate Service Areas. Page 104, Project 72 Chugiak and Eagle River are not part of CASA. You should delete the word. You might mention the Road Service areas however. Page 120, CASA, first paragraph add the word Roads in describing infrastructure. 2nd paragraph, CSP is not managing the projects. In the case of Canyon Road it is the Muni with some consultation with the Service Area. For the Basher Project, CSP is involved but the project is going forward because of the Muni planning.	Thank you for your review and comments. The Stewart Homestead Trail was not included in the municipality's official trail data at the time the draft plan was published but will be added to final plan. Thank you for the feedback on CASA and inclusion of the Road Service Areas in the document, we will revise as appropriate. CASA was mistakenly included in Project 72 and will be removed.	Add Stewart Homestead Trail to the existing trails map (it is shown as existing on the Recommendation maps). Amend description of Project 72 to remove CASA reference and include references to applicable Road Service Areas.
54	3/27/2026		Document Edit		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Anchorage Trails Plan. On Page 90, the section on Coordinating and connecting with Chugach State Park. Revise negative wording: "...trail connections may need...to await a platting process and may likely be within road rights-of-way...or require acquisition, which is inconsistent with community priorities identified through this planning process" Don't use the word "inconsistent." Consistency with an adopted plan and with community priorities is an important threshold for grant applications or supportive landowners. Also this trails plan does not show public opposition to acquisitions that would improve access to Chugach State Park. Public support for access to the state park implies support for acquisitions and does not indicate opposition to the state park.	Thank you for your comment. We will revise language on page 90 to more clearly reflect 1) that the survey and workshops demonstrated public support to maintain and improve existing multi-use trail infrastructure and 2) that there was also strong community support for connecting existing trail systems. We did not explicitly measure public opinion on property acquisitions, but acquisition can be identified as an implementation tool.	Amend language on page 90 to be more neutral and clarify resource allocation priorities defined through this planning process. Add land acquisition as an implementation strategy in Chapter 6, associated with Trail Easements and Rights-of-Way (legal access discussion)

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
55	3/27/2026		Prioritization Criteria		Page 88, Project Selection and Prioritization Chart. Award points for existing public easements. Currently, the prioritization criteria don't allow any points for public easements that already exist on private property. MOA or the State created these easements specifically for public access. Existing easements and ROW's don't require acquisition. Revise the Scoring Description, page 88, under MOA Land Ownership as follows: Criteria: MOA Land Ownership of Land, ROW or Easement “Description: 10 points: Project falls within MOA Parks and Recreation managed property “5 points: Project falls within MOA Real Estate Ownership or other public land ownership (BLM/Chugach State Park) or a future roadway/pathway improvement project, or a public ROW or non-motorized easement “0 points: Project falls within private land and would require property or easement acquisition”	This plan acknowledges that connections between neighborhoods in the ROW are desired by the public; however, they are not comprehensively mapped. While this plan makes recommendations at a larger scale focused on parkland, it also recommends a study specifically on ROW to address the more detailed level understanding of improving neighborhood connectivity. Since we do not have a comprehensive inventory of established legal public access, we cannot adequately use it in the project scoring and prioritization criteria. It should also be noted that not all easements are directly comparable. Many have unique requirements or restrictions on what can be developed within them and who can maintainin or manage any infrastructre within them, further underscoring the need for a comprehensive inventory.	No action.
56	3/27/2026		Project Concern, Project Support		Page 100, The proposed Campbell Airstrip firebreak trails should be revised to describe it only as between the BLM parking area and North (or South) Bivouac Trailhead. The eastern connection between the bivouac trailheads and the Basher trailhead is about 300' in elevation. This easterly section increases the cost of the entire trail considerably because of the number of switchbacks and cut/fill needed for a gradient to meet ADA standards. The shorter western trail segment would cost less and should be raised in priority on the chart. Initially a class 4 trail would be great but a class 5 would be even better. If it was Class 5, it would be a continuation of the existing paved trail between Tudor Road and the BLM trailhead and could accommodate roller skiers and road bikes that are currently using the roadway now. Alternatively, project 55 could be broken into two projects. The eastern and more expensive project connecting the Bivouac trailheads and the Basher trailhead could be noted for future construction and be a 2 or 3 project which would cost considerably less.. Note that since the firebreaks were cleared along the Campbell Airstrip Road in summer 2025, there has been considerable bike, ski, and pedestrian traffic through the cleared woods parallel to this section of road. Social trails are rapidly developing along these alignments on both the north and south side of the road.	Thank you for your supportive comment. Trail Project 55 Campbell Airstrip firebreak trail is inclusive of the full length of the aspired trail. As the project moves into planning and design with funding, breaking the effort into phases is likely and the Bivouac trailheads would be a logical phase termini.	No action.
57	3/27/2026		Project Support	54-60	On pages 101 and 102 I support projects 54-60 which will improve accessibility and safety in Far North Bicentennial Park.	Thank you for your supportive comment.	No action.
58	3/27/2026		Document Edit, Project Concern	13	On page 121 the “Basher Trailhead Design description should reflect whether or not Anchorage voters approve Proposition 8 on April 7: the bond to fund the construction of the trailhead. If they do not, funding the construction of this project should be reflected as a high priority in the trails plan. On the map, show a conceptual CSP trailhead in Stuckagain Heights, corresponding to the chart recommendation 13. Draw and label Basher Road to make the map more understandable. Draw and label the main access roads to CSP to help readers understand the locations of conceptual access points (shown by hatched circles) : Basher Road on the Anchorage-Central map and Upper DeArmoun/Canyon Road, Clarks Road, Brewster Drive and Potter Valley Road on the Anchorage – South map.	Thank you for your comment, we will consider revisions for clarity and will include Stuckagain Heights as part of Project 13, both in the description and on the map.	Add Project 13 circle to the Stuckagain Heights Basher Trailhead location. Revise road name map labeling for clarity.
59	3/27/2026		Document Edit		Page 89: Delete negative statement on page 89. However, the public’s desired travel paths may span private property and lack the necessary public rights-of-way or access easements to support a trail connection. This wording adds nothing to any policy recommendations. This RTP does not propose ways to acquire missing easements and ROW, so this statement is superfluous. It makes the public sound uninformed or unreasonable.	Thank you for the feedback.	No action.
60	3/27/2026		Project Support	13	Page 90: Thank you for the language on page 90 that supports future connections to CSP via trails and trailheads: Support project 13 on page 94 for Chugach State Park Connection Improvements “Trail projects between the [municipal] Parks Service Areas and Chugach State Park are not detailed in this Plan. However, there is strong documented support for these recreational trail connections, and while not led by Parks, other trail development groups and partnering agencies can lead their planning, design and development. These trail opportunities are generally mapped and the support for them are represented in Trail Project Recommendations 13 and 74.”	Thank you for your supportive comment.	No action.
61	3/28/2026		Design Standards		Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack. Anytime a mountain bike trail/design can be incorporated into the design plan will benefit the community. Biking is growing and a wonderful activity for all ages. I recently took a trip to Bentonville, Arkansas and they have built trails of all different types and levels throughout the community. One can ride straight from your home to any of the different types of trails. It would also be a starting point to help Anchorage become a Mountain biking destination in the future, as well as to continue building an active community.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise. The design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
62	3/28/2026		Design Standards		Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
63	3/28/2026		Recommendation Support		We need trails in ANC. Look at Bentonville AR as a great model of what urban trails can be, eg not just multimodal transportation infrastructure but real recreational opportunities that attract tourists and people who may consider relocating this adding real value to communities. They're not "costs, they're investments!	Thank you for your comment and support for recreational trails as lasting community investments.	No action.
64	3/28/2026		Recommendation Concern		No more "Rec" infrastructure allowing "e-bikes" No more "Rec" infrastructure until all deferred maintenance on existing assets resolved and all transportation requirements of persons not using motors are adequately addressed	Thank you for the feedback.	
65	3/28/2026	Mike Michener	Project Support, New Proposed Project, Design Standards	NM 4	Hi I'm a frequent bike trail user. I ride mountain bikes, fat bikes and gravel bikes. I would like to voice my support for new mountain bike trails at Eagle River high school. I would also like more progressive parallel single track trails along the existing paved trails around town. We also need a good multiuse trail along Eagle River Road all the way to the nature center. This is a very dangerous stretch of road to try to bike along as it currently stands. Thank you for your consideration.	Thank you for your supportive comment. Based on consistency with the Chugach State Park recreation plan, a project to add mountain bike trails in the area at Eagle River High School connecting to the Eagle River Campground area is supported. We recommend adding it as separate project for the different user groups. Non-Motorized Project 4 recommends expanded recreational and transportation opportunity along Eagle River Road that extends to the Nature Center. We agree it would be a significant safety and recreational asset.	Add a new project to reflect mountain bike development in the area of Eagle River High School and the Eagle River Campground, consistent with Chugach State Park recreation plan.
66	3/28/2026		Design Standards		Please include parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack...BUT please make signs, directional, and clearer visibility - the new parallel single track along the chester creek trail are very enjoyable but seem like they were just halfway complete - often have trash, people camping, blown out trails, overgrowth/down trees, or blind spots where bikers can go head on with walkers/other cyclists going in the opposite direction. I am excited for developing more and more trails but feel like we can polish up and make what we currently have better.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
67	3/28/2026		Design Standards		I'd like to request that parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack. Thanks!	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
68	3/28/2026		Design Standards, Project Concern	63	1) Please include parallel, progressive, soft surface singletrack as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek singletrack. 2) Please add mountain bike singletrack to Project ID 63 at Eagle River High School, consistent with Chugach State Park's singletrack plans at the adjacent Eagle River campground.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack. Based on consistency with the Chugach State Park recreation plan, a project to add mountain bike trails in the area at Eagle River High School connecting to the Eagle River Campground area is supported. We recommend adding it as separate project for the different user groups.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails. Add a new project to reflect mountain bike development in the area of Eagle River High School and the Eagle River Campground, consistent with Chugach State Park recreation plan.
69	3/28/2026		Design Standards		parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
70	3/28/2026	Austin	Design Standards		Please include parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
71	3/28/2026		New Proposed Recommendation		ACCESS ACCESS ACCESS the muni dropped the ball so many times providing access and parking. More Trails of all types! Dedicated uphill downhill trails. Prioritize Views and trails that make people want to go. ALSO very important. THE COASTAL trail is loosing all its AMAZING views. Please start thinning along the coastal trail! (job creation) Thank you and get er done!	Thank you for the feedback.	No action.
72	3/28/2026		Project Support, Recommendation Support	2, 3	I have lived in Anchorage since 1998 and have enjoyed the Trail systems here for recreation and for commuting back-and-forth to work. I used to commute down the railroad track when it was open for pedestrians before the rich people seem to have blocked it for no other reason then they don't want us there even though it's a land that we should be able to access! I am all for the fish Creek connector. It will allow so many people to safely travel to the coastal trail rather than relying on Wisconsin, which has a bike trail, but is definitely not safe based on Anchorage's desire to not be pedestrian based on the road systems! As far as recreation, I feel that as many trails that we can get in our city, the better for tourism for mental health of the people who live here, etc., etc. No more or should we think of ourselves as isolated and keep everyone else out We are not Colorado. We cherish that she got State Park and all the offers and all areas around it. They connect us to it should be open and accessible without feeling unsafe traveling down Anchorage's roads. Speaking of I ride the road system on my road bike every year and I fear for my life. I also think it would be time for Anchorage to pass different laws governing pedestrian vehicle interactions. I think the trails should be built responsibly so they all can enjoy not one particular group.	Thank you for your supportive commenets, specifically for Trail Projects 2 and 3. Your comment about pedestrian vehicle interactions is documented and will be directed to AMATS staff for future planning efforts, such as the Non-Motorized Plan.	No action.
73	3/28/2026		Design Standards		Please add parallel progressive soft-surface single track as a standard design option alongside multiuse paths consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
74	3/28/2026		Design Standards		Safe biking is important. Safe running is important. Safe stroller paths are important. Safe leashed dog walks are important. Adding parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack is a safe fun choice for users.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
75	3/29/2026		Design Standards		Recommend that parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
76	3/29/2026		Design Standards		Would love to have even more biking options in town. It's already great, but let's make it even greater for our kids and community. Can we add more parallel progressive routes next to our regular sidewalks? The idea is that people can ride interesting fun paths that along side the flat trails that we currently have. Can you imagine many more kids will be out exercise with fun trails to ride? I teach a biking class at Stream Acandey - an ASD school and would get my students on these types of trails as often as I can. I am always searching for hidden gems within Anchorage. Would love even more gems in plain sight!	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
77	3/29/2026		Design Standards		I would like to see parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack. I think Anchorage has a budding bike community that needs to be fostered with ideas like this, in order to levy this areas natural beauty to gain the economic benefit of cycle tourism.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
78	3/29/2026		Design Standards		parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack should be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
79	3/29/2026	Diana Sisemore	Design Standards		Anchorage needs parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
80	3/29/2026		Design Standards		Anchorage needs progressive singletrack along multiuse trails! Please make parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack to be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
81	3/29/2026		Project Support, Project Prioritization, Project Concern	Support: 72, 1, 58, 60, 37, 62, 68, 69, 71 Do Not Support: 5, 55	Hello, I would like to add my opinion to many of the proposed projects. I used the interactive map to research the projects. I didn't add my viewpoint on all projects; just the projects that I feel strongly about. I am in favor of Project 72 (Chugach State Park Connection Improvements: C-ER). This proposed project is the one I am most passionate about on your list. PLEASE HELP US HAVE ACCESS TO USE RAM VALLEY! Please make this a higher priority project. I am not in favor of Project 05 (Tony Knowles Coastal Trail Widening). I think it is a lot of construction time, expense, and future cost to groom more surface area in future winters, and it is not worth the resources to widen the trail. I am in favor of Project 01 (Downtown Trail Connection). I think this trail connector makes sense and would be a valuable and safe addition to the Coastal trail/moose loop. I am not in favor of Project 55 (FNBP Campbell Airstrip Rd. Fire Break Trail). It is pretty much the same trail as Rover's run, and I've seen rover's run get shut down for the entire summer due to bear activity. Since this proposal is so close to S Fork Campbell Creek it would be a shame to spend all of the resources to build the trail and only have it safely open during hibernation season. Is this connector needed with the new Basher trailhead parking lot? With that much extra parking, people can drive to Basher and start their activities there. People who don't want to drive there and are trying to connect the 2 trailheads can cross the road and take a trail to North Bivouac, and then cross the road again to get to Basher. (Less bear activity with this method). Perhaps better road crossing between North to South Bivouc trail heads should be investigated instead of this new trail.	Thank you for the comments on proposed projects.	No action.

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
82	3/29/2026		Design Standards		Anchorage needs a parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester creek single track	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
83	3/29/2026		Project Support	72	Please restore access to ram valley in via eagle vista drive in eagle river.	Ram Valley Access is included in the Chugach State Park Connection Improvements Recommendation 72. Access projects to Chugach State Park may show up lower in the priority categories due to the fact that it is not municipal park land. The Plan recommends these types of projects are coordinated with landowners, State Parks, and other public entities, and Road Service Areas.	Add Road Service Areas to the discussion of Chugach Assess and CASA in recommendation and implementation chapters, and amend Project Description 72
84	3/29/2026		Design Standards		Investing in parallel, progressive soft-surface singletrack alongside paved multi-use paths is a strategic and forward-thinking approach to supporting youth development and long-term community well-being. This design—already implemented successfully on existing Anchorage trails—provides an inclusive, developmentally appropriate option for young riders while preserving the accessibility and functionality of paved routes. Youth today are navigating an environment increasingly dominated by screen-based engagement, where apps and digital platforms are intentionally designed to capture and hold attention. While technology has its place, excessive screen time is linked to decreased physical activity, reduced social interaction, and increased mental health challenges. Communities that proactively create spaces for outdoor recreation offer a critical counterbalance to these trends. Incorporating soft-surface singletrack adjacent to paved trails directly addresses this need. These natural-surface paths invite exploration, skill-building, and progression in a way that is engaging and motivating for youth. Unlike paved trails, which often serve primarily as transportation corridors, singletrack trails provide an element of challenge, creativity, and connection to nature that encourages repeated use. This keeps young people physically active, socially connected, and meaningfully engaged in their environment. Moreover, this investment yields long-term economic benefits. Supporting youth mental and physical health reduces downstream costs associated with healthcare, absenteeism, and social services. Healthy, active youth are more likely to become healthy, productive adults who contribute positively to the community and local economy. Importantly, designing these trails as parallel features ensures that all user groups are accommodated. Paved paths remain accessible for pedestrians, families, and individuals with mobility needs, while singletrack options provide an alternative experience without creating conflict between users. This thoughtful design enhances safety, usability, and overall satisfaction for the entire community. By incorporating progressive soft-surface singletrack into multi-use trail systems, we are not simply building trails—we are investing in resilient, healthy, and connected youth. This is a practical, evidence-informed step toward strengthening both our community and its future.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
85	3/30/2026		Design Standards, Project Concern	63	Please include parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack. Please add mountain bike singletrack to Project ID 63 at Eagle River High School, consistent with Chugach State Park's singletrack plans at the adjacent Eagle River Campground.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack. Based on consistency with the Chugach State Park recreation plan, a project to add mountain bike trails in the area at Eagle River High School connecting to the Eagle River Campground area is supported. We recommend adding it as separate project for the different user groups.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails. Add a new project to reflect mountain bike development in the area of Eagle River High School and the Eagle River Campground, consistent with Chugach State Park recreation plan.

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
86	3/30/2026		Design Standards		Please include parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
87	3/30/2026		Project Concern		Please add mountain bike singletrack to Project ID 63 at Eagle River High School, consistent with Chugach State Park's singletrack plans at the adjacent Eagle River Campground.	Based on consistency with the Chugach State Park recreation plan, a project to add mountain bike trails in the area at Eagle River High School connecting to the Eagle River Campground area is supported. We recommend adding it as separate project for the different user groups.	Add a new project to reflect mountain bike development in the area of Eagle River High School and the Eagle River Campground, consistent with Chugach State Park recreation plan.
88	3/30/2026		Design Standards		Hi, I'd like to request that parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack. This would allow bike riders that travel at higher speeds to have a "lane" that would not interfere with walkers or slower, casual riders.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
89	3/30/2026		Project Support, New Proposed Project	2, 3	I strongly support the Fish Creek Trail to the Ocean connection, and the Fish Creek Trail to Campbell Creek Trail connection. I would also like to see an off road path along W Intl Airport Rd, between Spenard and Northwood. There is space to redo the main road and the frontage road along with adding a separated multi-use pathway.	Thank you for your support of Recommended Trail Projects 2 and 3. Your request for a pathway along W International Airport Road will be documented for future updates of the Non-Motorized Plan.	No action.
90	3/30/2026		Project Support	47, 27, 2, 1	It is difficult to comment on what I think the priorities should be since there are so many needed improvements. The trail system is the only redeeming feature of Anchorage that makes our city livable. The rest of Anchorage is way too deadly to bike and walk through. Please improve upon the neighborhood and trail connections like #47, and pinch points like the narrow and dark tunnel #27 that runs under the Seward Hwy. It is so dimly lit in there that I have nearly run over people sheltering, and it is not wide enough for two cyclists to pass. Fish Creek Trail #02 would be a huge help in connecting to the nearest grocery store and businesses in Spenard. The Ship Creek Trail Connection #01 would open up our underutilized water front for tourism as well provide an easily accessible place for residence to enjoy our world class sunsets and scenery. I am hopeful that some of these options will be addressed. I will give Anchorage another year to see if changes are happening quickly enough to make it worth sticking around for. Thank you for allowing public comments to be considered.	Thank you for your supportive comments and appreciation for our recreational trail system.	No action.
91	3/31/2026		Design Standards		Please include parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack. These hard-trail adjacent features allow progressing riders to engage in more technical mountain biking skills.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
92	3/31/2026		New Proposed Project		What seems to be missing from this trails plan is the visionary goal of creating a lower hillside connector trail (from the 1977 trails plan?) which would connect the hillside to the front range and increase access for all residents. Conceptually this trail would connect Potter Marsh with the ridge leading to McHugh Peak. It would also link to Bear Valley Elementary, Section 36, and finally over to Glenn Alps effectively linking every front range peak with every other parking area in the front range. This would increase recreational opportunities and spread the parking pressure at each site. It is hard to imagine in totality but, even sections linking Potter Marsh to McHugh meet the definition of a worthy regional draw.	We agree more connectivity is a priority. A combination of recreational trail projects and non-motorized improvements within ROW are recommended in this Plan to increase connectivity within the Hillside area and to increase connectivity to CSP. Non-Motorized projects 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 support this concept as well as Trail projects 13 and 14.	No action
93	3/31/2026		New Proposed Project		There are no mentions of negotiating with JBER to try and extend the Ship Creek Trail beyond Tyson Elementary by following the perimeter of the base, similar to the Muldoon Perimeter trail. This would provide a direct access from the Glenn Highway bike path to the rest of the trail system, while avoiding transit on roads.	JBER was consulted twice during the Plan development process, during which JBER requested trails adjacent to their boundary be removed from recommendations in the Plan. However, your request for an extension or connection from the trail network to the Glenn Hwy bike path is documented for the future update of the Non-Motorized Plan.	No action, Ship Creek Trail to Glenn Highway pathway is currently served by Bike Boulevard along 10th Ave.

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
94	3/31/2026		New Proposed Project		A recreational trail connecting Huffman to Hillside via an (almost) continuous section of greenbelts would increase trail connectivity and access to/for South Anchorage. This area is not easy to access from other parts of the city via bike or non-motorized transportation. A new trail (crossing major roads: Seward Highway, O'Malley, Lake Otis) could connect the greenbelt from Huffman Business park, through the Tanglewood golf course to Hanshew and into Ruth Arcand, ending at the intersection of Elmore and Abbott Road. Call it the moose leg	A combination of recreational trail projects and non-motorized improvements within ROW are recommended in this Plan to increase connectivity. Your suggested connection would rely primarily on improvements within rights-of-way, as public land along the connection limited. Your comment is documented for the future update of the Non-Motorized Plan.	No action
95	3/31/2026		New Proposed Project		A recreational trail leading from the Huffman Business Park (under the Old Seward Highway) to the south along Furrow Creek would connect the Oceanview neighborhood with to the business area, but it would also link to the existing trail along Johns Park. Even with the southern coastal trail extension, this would provide a meaningful access point or alternative route for recreational users.	Thank you for your comment and desire to further connect our community through trails. While challenging given the needed railroad crossing, limited space outside the creek iteself for trail development, and anticipated need to use exsiting rights-of-way, your suggestion would provide significant neighborhood connectivity and new connections to exsting recreational assets. We support adding this project to the list of Non-Motorized Recommendations.	Add new Non-Motorized Project: Huffman Road to Coast Connection along Furrow Creek.
96	3/31/2026		New Proposed Project		Connecting the few remaining green spaces in Anchorage before they are fully developed should be a goal of this plan. To that end, an extension or branch of the Campbell Creek Trail to the South Anchorage Ball fields off of Klatt would be a great addition to the trail system. It could branch from Dimond Estates (existing underpass) south through the bog, over 100th Ave, through the CIRI owned land and jump Minnesota into the Klatt bog. From here it could conceivably offer an connection to a future South coastal trail extension by connecting to the Carr Gottstein Bluff Park or a perimeter trail around the Klatt Bog. At a minimum, it would increase access to the rest of the trail system for Bayshore and Oceanview, and vice versa.	Thank you for your comment and desire to further connect our community through trails. As described, the conceptual trail would cross private property, require sigificant development within Class A wetlands, and an additional grade-separated crossing of O'Malley/Minnesota. Currently, the north-south connection can be made using the pathway along C Street and the east-west connection can be made using the pathway along 100th Ave or W Klatt Rd. While the existing connection using ROW may not meet the desired recreational experieince, the existing non-motorized network provides a connection and so this project is not a priority at this time.	No action, given Class A wetlands, existing pathway access north-south along C Street, and east-west pathway along W 100th Ave or W Klatt Rd.
97	3/31/2026		New Proposed Project		Connecting the existing Chester creek trail segments from Dale Street by linking the trail through the Providence campus to UAA and Goose Lake would create a functional loop around/through the UMED district accessible to both of these user groups and the surrounding neighborhoods.	The majority of the property referenced is not MOA-owned (Providence, University of Alaska) so will not be considered as a park project. However, there has been substantial progress in this area to improve wayfinding between landowners. A Goose Lake Master Plan is underway which will also discuss access and connectivity in the UMED district.	No action
98	3/31/2026		New Proposed Project		Thank for working on this extensive project. I see a lot of great recommendations with the parks and trails. I know I have mentioned this before, but it would be great to have a mountain bike skills park at Kincaid Park. This would be a great addition to the existing trails. Kincaid Park has been great because that's where you will get a lot of first time mountain bikers. It does not have the super technicals trail at hillside and a sustain climbs to achieve the downhills. I know many people who have learned how to mountain bike on these trail. I think having a skill bike park next to the trails people are already riding makes perfect sense. It will be a place folks can learn skills in a designated area. I've been to a few bike parks and it is somuch fun to take a break from a lap to mess around the bike park. Then you can immediately apply what you learn to the trails. I would love to see this at Jodphur trailhead but I know parking is an issue. That space is the best with fun terrain south of the parking lot. That's all I have for now. Thank you for time Parks and Rec team!	Thank you for your comment and support. Trail Project Recommendation 8 is to update the Kincaid Park Master Plan. This project is being kicked off this spring and will include consideration of expanded mountain bike opportunities within Kindaid Park. Your comment and others will be carried forward into that effort.	No action
99	3/31/2026		Project Support, Recommendation Support		-I like the extension of the Chester creek trail to Sitka St. park. - I appreciate the focus on maintenance! -I like the Trail section 6 which separates fat tire bikes and skis. Do the widths work with grooming equipment? -I like the northern coastal trail extension. If Eklutna Corp doesn't like, would they consider a permit system for users, like JBER does?	Thank you for your supportive comment. There are multiple agreements or tools for implementing trails across private property and employing a type of permitting system may be a consideration by the land manager. Eklutna Inc. currently has a Land Access Permit program.	No action
100	3/31/2026		Project Support		-The tunnel under Seward Hwy on Chester Creek (by eastchester) is too long and dark, I have had some scary situations in there with people hiding in there. -Can tunnels start to be upgraded so we can have bigger equipment groom the trails?	Thank you for your comment. There are numerous underpass improvement projects recommended in the Plan, including an upgrade for the Chester Creek Trail crossing of the Seward Hwy. Upgrades are encouraged to include widening from culverts to open-air underpasses where possible to promote user comfort and safety.	No action

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
101	3/31/2026		Project Support, New Proposed Project	12, 13, 14, NM 21	Griffin Park / Project 14 / Project 12 / Project 13: There is a lack of trail connections and recreational opportunities on the middle hillside south of Dearmoun. The Municipality owns park land at Griffin Park located at 140th ave/Buffalo. There is a great opportunity to provide locals in this area with trails and park infrastructure that could be developed at this location. Project 14 of the trails plan would connect the Rabbit Creek greenbelt trails to this park and would provide a great connection point for accessing a network of trails. This project coupled with Project 12 (Section 36 Master Plan) and 13 (chugach park access point) would significantly improve recreational opportunities for the area. The rabbit creek greenbelt trails have been considered for many years now and were part of a Rabbit Creek Greenbelt master plan. This previous master plan included construction of a trail down to the Elmore road crossing and even below that down to Old Seward where the muni owns park land with the Rabbit Creek Greenbelt park, not to be confused with the Rabbit Creek Greenbelt Trails further east up the hill. If the entire vision for project 14 is not a near term project due to ROW complexities and cost, a first phase of that for a near-term project could be to develop Griffin Park. Currently, the Rabbit Creek greenbelt trails are not within walking distance for most folks who live below Goldenview. Developing Griffin Park to some extent could open up a great opportunity and could fill a gap in access for the area. Pedestrian Bridge at rabbit creek: Additionally, there is a huge need for a pedestrian crossing of rabbit creek at Elmore Road south of Dearmoun. A bridge at this location would provide access to the Dearmoun and Elmore roadside paths and would provide a route for kids to walk to South High School. This has been needed for a long time and could help fill some of the gaps in pedestrian facilities within the area. This could also help to provide a link to the new Rabbit Creek Road roadside pedestrian path that is planned. Old Seward Highway/Potters Marsh Park Ped/Bike Access: With the development of the Potters Marsh Watershed park, there will be a desire for residents along Dearmoun and Rabbit creek to have ped/bike access to the location. It would be a huge benefit for residents to have some form of pedestrian access routes along the Old Seward Highway section that runs North to South from Rabbit Creek Road to Potter Valley. The Rabbit Creek Road project pedestrian facilities could tie into improvements along Old Seward.	Project 14: Thank you for your comment and support. There are significant access and natural resource concerns (sightlines, private driveway crossings, lack of parking/access from roadways, topography, creek setbacks, etc.) regarding Griffin Park and other sections of the greenbelt that put this into a long-term category. A combination of recreational trail projects and non-motorized improvements within ROW are recommneded in this Plan to increase connectivity within the Hillside area. Your comment for a pedestrian crossing of Rabbit Creek at Elmore Road is documented for future updates to the Non-Motorized Plan. The Department's support of community efforts to reduce speeds and improve non-motorized recreational opportunity along the Old Seward Highway (ADOT) corridor has been documented during the Master Plan process for Potter Marsh Watershed Park.	No action. The Rabbit Creek Greenbelt concepts are documented in Project 14 and documented in more detail by complementary plans such as the Hillside District Plan.
102	3/31/2026	Allen Kemplen	Recommendation Support, New Proposed Project		I strongly support the inclusion of a new hybrid urban trail category to allow for connecting Chester Creek and Ship Creek Trails using the Hyder Street alignment. This will create a bike/pedestrian beltway around the urban core of Anchorage, greatly strengthen the attractiveness of using non-motorized transportation for our tourism industry and serve as a key piece of green infrastructure investment to allow for revitalization of the Gambell-Ingra Corridor.	Public land along this connection limited, but we recognize substantial community support around the effort to better connect the Chester Creek Trail and Ship Creek Trails. We have added Hyder Street improvements to the Non-Motorized Project recommendation list.	Add Hyder Street to Non Motorized Project Needs list and map, as it is being spearheaded by agencies outside of Parks, has significant community support, and would connect recreational assets such as Chester Creek Trail, Ship Creek Trail, and Delaney Park Strip.
103	3/31/2026	Allen Kemplen	Project Support	17, 18	I support the proposed trail connection from Sitka Park southward to the Chester Creek Trail along the North Fork of Chester Creek west of Sitka Street and improvements to the trail between Sitka Park westward to 15th Avenue and the Fairview neighborhood.	Thank you for your supportive comment.	No action.
104	3/31/2026	Allen Kemplen	Design Standards (Non-Motorized)		I strongly suggest the Anchorage Trails Plan to provide guidance on allowing innovation in how our community develops bike lanes on streets. The current approach focuses on design solutions that work for only half of our subarctic year. Winter bike lanes need a different design solution such as shown in a pdf that I will send to the Project Manager(s). Basically it involves extending a lighting arm from existing light poles directing light down toward the ground while illuminating a "Bike Lane" sign hanging from the mast arm. This approach allows for multi-seasonal lane identification and more accurately reflects the realities of our subarctic environment with its extremes of light and dark.	Thank you for your comment. The Recreational Trails Plan is focused on recreational trail development and does not propose design standards for on-street facilities. Your comment is documented for future updates to the Non-Motorized Plan.	No action.

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
105	3/31/2026	STA Steering Committee	Design Standards		Singletrack Advocates supports the addition of parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack to be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack. In addition, Singletrack Advocates supports mountain bike skills parks at both Hillside and Kincaid parks. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, STA Steering Committee	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack. Recommended Trail Project 8 to update the Kincaid Park Master Plan will include consideration of mountain biking opportunities within the park. Your comment will be carried forward into that planning process.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
106	3/31/2026		Design Standards		I like the idea of parallel “play” trails along sidewalks and paved pathways, enticing bikers to ride there. Makes for safer walking and riding both.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
107	3/31/2026		Design Standards		As a frequent trail user (skiing, biking, walking, running) I look forward to improvements to our local trails. I would like to add support for parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack to be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack. I also support mountain bike skills parks at both Hillside and Kincaid Park. Biking is growing in Anchorage and supporting skill development is important.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack. Recommended Trail Project 8 to update the Kincaid Park Master Plan will include consideration of expanding mountain biking opportunities within the park. Your comment will be carried forward into that planning process.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
108	3/31/2026	Jon Eppard	Design Standards, Project Support		Hello Anchorage Parks team, I wanted to take a minute to voice my support for incorporating progressive single track into the renovations that will take place along the Chester Creek Trail near the Seward Highway in the coming years. This would be an amazing upgrade to that park area and I know I would use it with my family frequently (I also know that many of our family friends who live in the area would use it frequently as well). Thanks for your consideration.	Thank you for support of the recommendations included in the Eastchester Park Master Plan. Voters approved additional funds for Eastchester Park in 2026, which will allow us to start working on projects identified in the Master Plan.	No action.
109	3/31/2026		Design Standards		Request parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
110	4/1/2026		Recommendation Support, Project Support, Project Prioritization	3	Overall I'm pleased with the plan. I am happy there there is a priority for connectivity, too many places in Anchorage the bike lane or sidewalk ends and spits the traveler onto the side of a road or into a snow bank. I would like to see Project 3 connecting Campbell Creek trail to Fish Creek trail be prioritized more highly. One major thing that the Anchorage trail system is missing is more north-south trails. In a future plan I would like to see better bike/walk infrastructure along C street or the Seward highway.	Thank you for your supportive comment. The Fish Creek Trail to Campbell Creek Trail Connection received a 'low' priority due to the significant lack of municipal public land along the corridor. However, we agree this project would greatly improve recreational connectivity. Your comment on improved infrastructure along C Street and the Seward Hwy is document for future updates to the Non-Motorized Plan.	No action.
111	4/1/2026		Design Standards		I would love it if there was more single track (or maintaince of) that parallels the green belt paved trails.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.

Comment		Date	Project				
ID	Received	Submitted by	Topic	ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
112	4/1/2026		Design Standards		Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack be added as a standard design option alongside multi-use paths, consistent with existing Anchorage trails like the Chester Creek Singletrack.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
113	4/1/2026		Maintenance		This comment responds to the draft plan's laudable goal for winter trail maintenance/grooming on page 15 and 16 and its reference to "[a] detailed description and cost analysis of the Department's winter maintenance process [in] . . . the 2024 Winter Operations Plan." (See WOP page 10.) In practice, each year, Anchorage falls short of achieving its winter trail maintenance goals. The city is always late out of the gate after the first snowfall and then after subsequent snowfalls, there are long delays before trails are groomed. Money is not the answer to the problem. Appendix II (page 21) of the WOP's cost analysis for grooming the Coastal Trail is both confusing and shockingly high. Whatever the actual cost, it could be substantially reduced by volunteers. Numerous citizens (myself included) will gladly donate their time to operate the two snow machines that pull the roller and the snow blade. The Coastal Trail would then be groomed immediately after a snowstorm and regularly throughout the week. The mental and physical well-being of citizens requires that we make the most of our trails over the long winter. \$350 for labor is the bulk of the \$498.80 "total cost per session" for grooming the Coastal Trail. Paring 70% of that cost will save the city money and free up Park employees for other tasks that must otherwise wait. A city should not use its limited financial resources to pay for work when some of its citizens are able and willing to do it sooner and for free.	Thank you for your comment. Improving winter maintenance and trail grooming continue to be a priority for the Department and its partners (NSAA). Numerous challenges complicate the request for volunteer-based trail grooming, including liability, safety, equipment, and increased staff time required for supervision and training. Please find more information about our volunteer programs at https://www.muni.org/Departments/parks/Pages/Volunteering.aspx .	No action
114	4/1/2026		Design Standards		I would like to express my support for constructing parallel progressive soft surface singletrack alongside multi use paths. This concept is similar to the trails adjacent to the Chester Creek path. I have seen this successfully implemented in other cities and is an affordable method of reducing congestion on the paths. I am also in favor of mountain bike skill parks in Kincaid and Hillside. Any additional outdoor recreational opportunities and options available in Anchorage will continue to make the city a healthy and desirable place to live and work.	The Parks Department is supportive of working with user groups as these opportunities arise, however the design standards are intended to apply to multi-use trails. Parallel progressive soft-surface singletrack trails would be in addition to a multi-use trail. The design standards included in this Plan are not intended to prevent or preclude specialty-use trails. Parks looks forward to continuing to collaborate on opportunities to expand recreational experiences like the singletrack trails along Chester Creek. Recommended Trail Project 7 Coastal Trail Singletrack is an identified opportunity that would directly implement the requested parallel progressive singletrack. Recommended Trail Project 8 to update the Kincaid Park Master Plan will include consideration of expanding mountain biking opportunities within the park. Your comment will be carried forward into that planning process.	Add narrative to the design standards section of the Plan to include encouragement of compatible specialty-use trails adjacent to multi-use trails.
115	4/1/2026		Recommendation Support		Kudos on a really well done and comprehensive plan. Great to see all the potential projects in one place. Can't wait to see them start coming to fruition.	Thank you for your supportive comment!	No action
116	4/1/2026	Kyle Shedd	Project Prioritization, Project Support, Document edit	8, 13, 14, 17	Trail Project 08: Kincaid Park Master Plan Update should focus on getting greater public benefit out of the chalet. The Muni should consider having staff for two shifts so the chalet could be open during daylight hours throughout the winter to rent nordic ski gear. This would make it much easier for beginners to learn how to cross country ski and could help make Kincaid more of a winter destination for out of state tourists. It is also worth considering having the chalet rent mountain bikes in the summer. Trail Project 13: Chugach State Park Connection Improvements should be a high priority in coordination with the CASA process. With the explosion in visitation to Chugach State Park (CSP) since the COVID-19 pandemic it is imperative to improve public access and trail connectivity to the CSP to spread out impacts and reduce overcrowding at existing trailheads. Trail Project 14: Rabbit Creek Greenbelt should be a medium priority as it would provide connectivity to Echo Canyon park and CSP and help alleviate parking concerns on Canyon Road. Non-Motorized Project 17: Birch Road Pathway Improvements is shown on the ArcGIS storymap, but not in the PDF Rec Trails Plan. This is an important recreational corridor for connecting Hillside neighborhoods to Hillside and Far North Bicentennial Park. One project or policy that appears to be missing is to encourage the development of restaurants, coffee shops, breweries, food trucks, etc. along active transportation corridors similar to what Seattle has done with the Burke-Gilman Trail. Portions of the Coastal trail or Ship Creek trail would seem ideal for this.	Thank you for your comments. The Kincaid Park Master Plan update is underway and your comment will be carried forward into that planning process. Access projects to Chugach State Park may show up lower in the priority categories due to the fact that it is not municipal park land. The Plan recommends these types of projects are coordinated with landowners, Chugach State Park, and other public entities, the Chugach State Park Access Service Area (CASA), and Road Service Areas. Trail Project 14 appears in the low prority category due to land availability and development constraints. We will amend the error on Non-Motorized Project 17. Additional consideration for including economic benefits of trails and opportunities for recreation-supporting commercial development adjacent to trails in the Plan narrative will be given.	Amend static map of Recommended Non-Motorized Projects to include Project 17 Birch Road Pathway Improvements. Add narrative on the economic benefit to trails and potential opportunities for recreation-supporting commercial development adjacent to trails.

Comment ID	Date Received	Submitted by	Topic	Project ID	Comment	Staff Response	Proposed Action
117	4/1/2026		Document Edit		The maps that appear (on my) pages 50 through 63 of the draft were lacking any conclusions/suggestions/information for me as a reader.	Thank you for your review and comment. We will reevaluate the titles and introduction of the maps and amend the narrative where relevant.	Review and amend demogrpahic map introduction and titles for clarity.
118	4/1/2026		Project Concern	12	Hello. This is a comment about Section 36 (found on pages 93, "Recommendations" and 119 "Implementation" and other areas. Section 36 has long been planned for seasonal cross-country ski trails on the north side and for minimal walking trails on the south side of the ridge. The idea that the land uses should be expanded for bicycle trails (which includes e-bikes, and e-vehicles) is anathema to the purposes for which the Park was created. Its concept is a wilderness park where the diversity of fauna and flora could be viewed by residents undisturbed by vehicular traffic or density of human use which might destroy its unique convergence of 3 ecosystems. The plan created for Section 36 includes walking trails, wildlife corridors and special isolation of human activity to protect its ecological values thereby providing a truly "Alaskan" experience including a sense of isolation, solitude, repose and accessibility to the core of the metropolitan Anchorage. Therefore, please do NOT provide additional access to bicycle traffic (they already have at least 22 miles of trails in existing parks!) at the expense of fulfilling the needs of Anchoragites who need a place, below treeline, where they can go for a simple walk in a peaceful setting. This is precisely what the Anchorage Park System lacks. And yet is so essential to the human soul and psyche. Thank you for listening.	Thank you for your comment. This Plan recommends an update to the Section 36 Master Plan (Trail Project Recommendation 12). Your comments will be carried forward into that Master Planning process.	No action.
119	4/1/2026		New Proposed Project, New Recommendation		I support expanding Anchorage's trail system to include more directional, bike-optimized mountain bike trails, especially those that provide access into the front range/alpine terrain. Purpose-built trails improve safety, reduce user conflicts, and create better riding experiences. I also strongly support development of a large, centrally located bike skills park that is accessible and designed for all ages and skill levels, with a focus on youth progression. In addition, the plan should include neighborhood pump tracks to expand access to bike skills infrastructure. These are low-cost, high-impact amenities for kids and families. The Turnagain neighborhood would be an excellent location for one of these facilities. These improvements would enhance recreation opportunities, support youth engagement, and help position Anchorage as a leading outdoor recreation community.	Thank you for the suggestion on bike parks around Anchorage. Parks looks forward to opening the Jeff Dusenbury Bike Park in South Anchorage after years of community advocacy and collaboration. Smaller pump tracks are often suggested and explored in Park Master Plans. We would recommend participating in these open houses when they arise. This year, we are working on Master Plans for Kincaid Park, the Chester Creek Sports Complex, and Goose Lake.	No action.
120	4/1/2026		Project Support	6, 13, 2, 1	Advance Anchorage project ID 6 as soon as possible. I was carrying a baby at mile marker 1 on the coastal trail and was hit by a cyclist in 2021. In 2024 and 2025 I did not take small children on the trail south of Elderberry in the summer due to the speed of the e-bikes. MOA needs to work with rental shops to place limiters on the e-bikes while making the trail class 6 from Elderberry to Lyn Ary as soon as possible. E-bike tourist rentals are more of a problem than local riders but with class 6 many problems could be alleviated. Advance Anchorage project 13. Access to the Chester Creek trail needs to be restored due to the removed staircase. This affects summer tourism as well as the neighborhood Advance Anchorage project 02. Any effort to divert people away from Minnesota/Northern Lights to the trails is needed. I was a witness of a pedestrian death on Minnesota across from DonDees dry-cleaning north of Northern Lights. It's unsettling and disturbing to witness such a thing and hope that any way to get people away from Minnesota further west will help improve pedestrian/bike safety. Finish project 1. I am not seeing safe connectivity to the Government Hill neighborhood, however. When Elderberry to Ship Creek is finished will there be access to Government Hill to get downtown is a question. Please advance the planning and construction associated with the Alaska Long Trail	Thank you for your supportive comments. Improvements in safety on our trail and non-motorized network are a priority of this Plan, Parks, and AMATS.	No action.
121	4/1/2026		Project Support	5	Advance project 5. This looks to be the upgrade to class 6 and could have prevented an incident where I was carrying a child and was struck by a bicyclist on the Coastal Trail south of Elderberry park.	Thank you for your supportive comment.	No action.
122	4/1/2026		Design Standards		I support STA and their ideas for the Recreational Trails Plan. More trails, more accessible!	Thank you for your comment.	No action.
123	4/1/2026	Alaska Botanical Garden	New Proposed Project		The Alaska Botanical Garden (ABG) suggests and supports the concept to connect the new/existing Chugach Foothills Connector (CFC) with the existing perimeter loop around ABG (existing firebreak). The shortest and simplest way to do this is from the point where the CFC meets the Benny Benson school parking lot. Trail users would be directed south along/across the parking lot to the front gate of ABG, then around the perimeter. ABG is in the planning stages of a land acknowledgement sign that will be installed immediately outside the front gate, which will welcome visitors and describe features within and around the Garden.	Thank you for your comment and the idea to expand access and connectivity around the Alaska Botanical Gardens. As the trail and signage described would be on Anchorage School District and Alaska Botanical Garden property, Parks can be a supporting partner in this effort initiated by ASD or ABG. We look forawrd to improving access with you.	No action.