

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Vision and Goals		
Commentor	Comment	Response
Dianne Holmes	The CAC's draft vision and goals statement does not acknowledge the Park Plan's need for developed parks in this area; instead, the vision's emphasis leans heavily away from providing extensive trail-related activities.	<i>The MOA Park Plan classifies Section 36 as a Natural Resource Use Area. The Park Plan also cites the need for developed parks in South Anchorage and calls for some community park development at Section 36. The vision statement and goals are consistent with the recommendations in the Park Plan to provide for the recreation needs of several neighborhoods or a large part of the community while minimizing the impact on natural resources, wildlife habitat, open space, and other factors.</i>
NSAA	A mix of low, medium and high density trail areas, including Nordic ski trails are compatible with the vision of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, i.e., "Encourage, enhance, and provide a balance between appropriate wild land (non athletic field) recreation opportunities and natural open spaces. Section 36 is a place for connecting with and learning about nature through recreation and natural open spaces."	<i>A trail network is consistent with the vision and goals for the area; however, this area is classified as a Natural Resource Use Area and trail construction and use must be balanced with the need to minimize impacts on natural resources, wildlife habitat, open space and other factors.</i>
Park Purpose & Need		
Dianne Holmes	Most of Anchorage's undeveloped land is located in SE Anchorage; this area will experience more growth than other parts of town in the next few years. The revised Parks Plan states this area is already deficient in developed parks (p. 88).	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Nancy Pease	Ensure that this Master Plan meets the needs of the current and future residents who live across the southeast Hillside, not just Bear Valley/Rabbit Creek Road.	<i>The master plan is designed to provide for community recreation needs while balancing the need to minimize impacts on the natural resources.</i>
Nancy Pease	Refer to Map 3 of the 2006 Parks Plan: the south Golden View and Potter areas fall outside the radius of any community parks and, therefore, Section 36 is the de facto community park to serve a 3 to 4 mile radius to the south.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Park Purpose & Need (continued)		
Nancy Pease	Add language to the background of this Section 36 Master Plan to acknowledge that the constituent area for Section 36 community park includes south Golden View and the Potter Valley areas, because the southeast Hillside does not have other municipal parks at the community scale.	<i>This is addressed in Chapter 5: The Master Plan.</i>
Nancy Pease	Refer to the pending Land Use Plan Map of the draft Hillside District Plan. Add language about future population, noting that large tracts in southeast Hillside may be subdivided at higher housing densities than the 1 acre common to much of the Hillside. The closest community park to these denser housing areas will be Section 36.	<i>Although the Hillside District Plan does call for higher densities in some areas of the hillside, it also calls for lower densities in other areas - particularly on the upper hillside. The plan does acknowledge the Southeast District's need for park facilities to support the population throughout the district.</i>
Park Classification		
Nancy Pease	The Master Plan must reflect that Section 36 is designated as a Community Park and Natural Resource Park. This means "focus on meeting the recreation needs of several neighborhoods or a large section of the community as well as preserving unique landscapes or natural use areas."	<i>The MOA Park Plan classifies Section 36 as a Natural Resource Use Area. The Park Plan also cites the need for developed parks in South Anchorage and calls for some community park development at Section 36. The vision statement and goals are consistent with the recommendations in the Park Plan to provide for the recreation needs of several neighborhoods or a large part of the community while minimizing the impact on natural resources, wildlife habitat, open space, and other factors.</i>
Lori Davey	Section 36 is designated as a community park according to the revised Parks Plan (2006) and partially as a natural resource park area. A community park is to serve a wider area than just the neighborhoods. And it should include a variety of activities if appropriate. The Parks Plan says the SE part of Anchorage is deficient in all kinds of developed parks. This area has growth potential and therefore it is important to think ahead for when Section 36 could serve this growing part of town.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Park Classification (continued)		
Dianne Holmes	I do not see where it is stated as to the kind of park Section 36 is - is it a regional park, a neighborhood park, a community park, or a special area park?	<i>A discussion of the classification of Section 36 is included in the master plan report in Chapter 3: Site Inventory and Chapter 5: The Master Plan.</i>
NSAA	NSAA believes that active, trail-based recreation like Nordic skiing is consistent with a "natural resource" oriented park like Section 36. Trails are how people use and enjoy the park's natural resources.	<i>A trail network is consistent with the vision and goals for the area; however, this area is classified as a Natural Resource Use Area and trail construction and use must be balanced with the need to minimize impacts on natural resources, wildlife habitat, open space and other factors.</i>
Planning Process		
Dianne Holmes	The Section 36 platting process intended that a master plan should be developed untainted by pre-existing facilities.	<i>Neither the action by the platting board or the planning commission provided any direction on how to treat existing facilities in the planning process. The one reference to the jeep trail was related to providing access to adjacent properties: "The pioneer jeep trail is a private access for the following properties: ...This access will be allowed to continue to be utilized by the said properties for as long as the properties remain unsubdivided and alternate physical and legal access to the properties does not exist. Upon subdivision of any one of the properties, a new road to the subdivided property must be built to Municipal standards utilizing the public use easement (s) dedicated by the plat for this purpose. Use of the pioneer jeep trail will automatically terminate on those portions of the trail where access is now being provided by the newly constructed road(s)."</i>
Dianne Holmes	The biggest mistake I see is one I've been trying to bring to your attention. The plat was very clear that NO TRAILS were to be shown on the plat map in order for the master planning process to start with a clean slate and not be influenced by "social trails."	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Planning Process (continued)		
Stephen Crozier	The Master Plan should allow for changing usage patterns, future growth and changing conditions.	<i>This master plan is designed to provide overall guidance for development of park facilities and management of park uses. The guidance in the plan should allow for development plans to adapt to changing usage and conditions and future growth.</i>
Bob French	I would encourage that the master plan to be kept as flexible as possible at this stage, realizing that public sentiments change over time, as do the needs of the community.	<i>See above.</i>
John Isby	Local residents concerns must be taken into account in the planning process.	<i>Public input from both local residents and broader perspectives have been taken into account in the planning process.</i>
Bear Valley Community CouncilNOW THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that the BVCC seeks the Section 36 park master plan to include the following:The terms of the November 1995 litigation settlement agreement shall be adhered to in all management plans, including in particular the provision of wildlife corridors.	<i>The 1995 settlement agreement was based on a MOA proposal to build housing in Section 36. Because the entire Section 36 parcel is now proposed to be a park (excluding communications sites), proposing very low levels of development and identifying wildlife corridors, the Department has adhered to the terms outlined in the Settlement Agreement.</i>
Concepts		
Support Concept 1		
Ronald Boyle	I support Concept 1 or 2 for the development of Section 36.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	Concept 1 or a hybrid of Concept 1 and 2 is preferred.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Christopher Souser	I like Concept 1.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Yvonne Goldsmith	I prefer Concept 1 & 2.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Support Concept 1 (continued)		
Chris Allard	I am in favor of the level of development described in Concept 1.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Alaska Quiet Rights Coalition (AQRC)	We support the minimal development option, Concept 1, as being the most appropriate level of development in view of the location of these parklands, the existing natural conditions of the parklands, and its wildlife.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Oppose Concept 1		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We are not in favor of keeping the area completely undeveloped.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Nancy Pease	Do not use Concept 1 as the basis for a trail system. The random "social trails" are not located for sustainable or efficient use of the park. This is not a "cheap and easy" way to go because these trails can't handle future numbers of people or specific types of recreation. Concept 1 is a recipe for resource damage and conflict among users.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Dianne Holmes	Concept 1 is not a viable plan and should be deleted from master planning consideration. It suggests that the existing "social" trails could be improved and used.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
STA	Because Section 36 is probably the last piece of undeveloped park land in Anchorage, economy of space is prudent. For this reason, Draft Concept 1 is least desirable. Existing trails are unsustainable and weren't properly designed for recreation.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Mike Vogel	Do not use Concept 1 as the basis for the trail system.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Support Concept 2		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor using mid-level development represented in Draft Concept 2 as a basis for our comments.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Ronald Boyle	I support either Concept 1 or 2 for the development of Section 36.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	Concept 1 or a hybrid of Concept 1 and 2 is preferred.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Christopher Souser	I like Concept 2.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Bret Berglund	The proposed Concept 2 with some modification is a good choice (without Class 4 Trails and minimal Class 3 Trails).	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Yvonne Goldsmith	I prefer Concept 1 & 2.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Douglas Gray	I would like to place my support behind Concept 2 or 3 to include a mountain biking trail.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Jack Mosby	I would opt for a combination of Concept 2 or 3 with trail development in the moderate to high-density arena.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Oppose Concept 2		
Support Concept 3		
Rachel Steer	Concept 3 is the best solution for this 640 acre park, providing trails and facilities that satisfy all user groups.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Douglas Gray	I would like to place my support behind Concept 2 or 3 to include a mountain biking trail system.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Eric Williamson	I support the development proposed in Concept 3.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Support Concept 3 (continued)		
Jim Hjelm	It would be my recommendation to implement something along the lines of Concept 3 and include a trail system similar to the TOA Trail through the Campbell Tract.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Jack Mosby	I would opt for a combination of Concept 2 or 3 with trail development in the moderate to high-density arena.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Bob French	I believe that Concept 3, with its medium to high trail density is the way to go.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Oppose Concept 3		
Ronald Boyle	Concept 3 is overkill for the area.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Christopher Souser	I don't like Concept 3 mainly due to the higher density of it and the higher cost of maintaining it.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Bret Berglund	There are enough Concept 3-like parks in the area.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Yvonne Goldsmith	I am not in favor of Concept 3.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Other Development Concepts		
Ted Moore	In the Master Plan for Section 36, the most important concept should be to maintain the natural character of the wooded, south-facing slope between Clarks Road and the main ridge line.	<i>The MOA Park Plan classifies Section 36 as a Natural Resource Use Area. The Park Plan also cites the need for developed parks in South Anchorage and calls for some community park development at Section 36. The vision statement and goals are consistent with the recommendations in the Park Plan to provide for the recreation needs of several neighborhoods or a large part of the community while minimizing the impact on natural resources, wildlife habitat, open space, and other factors. These factors include the look and character of the south-facing slope between Clarks Road and the ridgeline.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Other Development Concepts (continued)		
Bear Valley Community Council	<p>....since 1984. the BVCC has spearheaded the creation of Section 36 as wilderness park, and received the support of 33 community councils in this effort; ...THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that the BVCC seeks the Section 36 park master plan to include the following: 1. The park shall be administered to preserve, protect and enhance its values of wilderness, wildlife, diversification of flora and quiet in such manner as will provide to the citizens of Anchorage a park experience unavailable elsewhere in the Anchorage metropolitan area, in particular so far as possible the experience of solitude in nature;</p>	<p><i>As noted above, the MOA Park Plan classifies Section 36 as a Natural Resource Use Area. This designation recognizes the values of the wildlife and flora, but also allows for recreation uses that can be accommodated while minimizing impacts on the natural resources, wildlife habitat, etc. The proposed level of development in the master plan is of a low level, designed to allow Section 36 to continue to provide a more wilderness-like experience.</i></p>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	<p>The community has been fighting for 20 year for a "Wilder Park" with no development or developed trails.</p>	<p><i>See above.</i></p>
William Ennis	<p>Make every effort to maintain Section 36 in as near the present condition as possible.</p>	<p><i>See above.</i></p>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	<p>Bear Valley has wanted a wilder park since 1986. No development at all. Don't spend your money here. We like the trails the way they are.</p>	<p><i>See above.</i></p>
Caryn Smith	<p>Maintain the quiet character of the park.</p>	<p><i>See above.</i></p>
Jamie Patterson-Simes	<p>I believe that Section 36 in the Rabbit Creek area should be thoughtfully and environmentally developed in order to preserve the natural beauty of the area for hikers, mountain bikers and skiers.</p>	<p><i>Acknowledged.</i></p>
Sage Cohen	<p>Priorities for me are quiet (non-motorized) recreation, parking, connectivity to existing trails, and no horses.</p>	<p><i>See above.</i></p>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Focus on Winter Use		
Nancy Pease	Ensure that the value of this park as a winter recreation area be emphasized.	<i>The Park Plan designates Section 36 as a Winter Special Use Site but gives no guidance on how this designation should be applied. The draft plan proposes multi-use trails that will allow for a variety of winter activities in Section 36.</i>
Nancy Pease	The north side of Section 36 is suited for the highest level of winter activities because the snow pack lasts longer here than other parks and it is of a better quality.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	The development of Section 36 should emphasize winter activities because the park is at a higher elevation than other city parks and the north side retains a good snow pack. Skiing, in particular, depends on a reliable snow pack because it is an ongoing investment to groom and re-groom the trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	Winter activities should be emphasized due to the quality and length of snow conditions on the north side.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	Section 36 can help fill the city's deficiency by providing a place for Anchorage's winter activities to grow - cross country skiing, skijoring, dog mushing and snowshoeing.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We are in favor of having an emphasis on winter activities and Kincaid type development on the north side.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	The development of Section 36 should emphasize winter activities because the park is at a higher elevation than other city parks and the north side retains a good snow pack.	<i>See above.</i>
Lori Davey	The elevation of Section 36 and the northern exposure means winter activities are best located and developed there. XC skiing, with separated skijoring or winter walking trails.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Trail Comments		
General Support for Trails		
Rick Jarvis	I support the efforts to improve and maintain trails.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Bret Berglund	I think low impact trails in the area would be a beneficial resource to the entire Anchorage community.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Jim Hjelm	I think that it is an excellent idea to develop trails in Section 36.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Jack Hession	An appropriately developed trail system in Section 36 would enhance recreational opportunities for all residents of the Municipality.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Katherine Coons	I am in support of anything that can expand or maintain a continuation of this trail system.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Jamie Patterson-Simes	It would be amazing to have trails over there for community use.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Corinne Smith	A management plan for Section 36 offers many recreational opportunities and could help ease over use of other trail systems in town, particularly at Hillside (FNBP).	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Michele Gunkel	It would be wonderful to have more trails along Rabbit Creek, Storck Park, Clarks Road and the Bear Valley area.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Danielle Winn	I am very supportive of trail development in Section 36.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Bob French	Section 36 can be designed for both the active recreational trail user as well as contemplative nature lovers seeking solitude.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

General Opposition for Trails		
Frank Cahill	I oppose any new trails in this undeveloped area.	<i>As noted above, the MOA Park Plan classifies Section 36 as a Natural Resource Use Area. This designation recognizes the values of the wildlife and flora, but also allows for recreation uses that can be accommodated while minimizing impacts on the natural resources, wildlife habitat, etc. Trail development is considered to be consistent with the Natural Resource Use Area designation.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	No development at all. We like the trails the way they are.	<i>See above.</i>
Trail Design Process		
Mike Vogel	The Master Plan needs to have a fairly-detailed map for trails, in consultation with trail planning professionals so that there are "mattock-ready" concepts. This would allow the community to raise private funds and volunteers to install some trails in a private-public partnership.	<i>This draft plan is intended to provide guidance for future development. It does not include detailed routing or design of trails. It does provide conceptual trail layouts that could provide the first steps toward grant application and construction.</i>
Nancy Pease	The Master Plan needs to have a fairly-detailed map for trails, in consultation with trail planning professionals so that there are "mattock-ready" concepts. This would allow the community to raise private funds and volunteers to install some trails in a private-public partnership.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor the hiring of professional trail designers to develop a sustainable trail system so grants can then be sought for development.	<i>See above.</i>
Lori Davey	The master plan should be completed with trails mapped (by GPS) in by professional trail designers.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	Trails are meant to be "designed" and designed for a purpose.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	Professional trail designers for each particular trail should be engaged. Funding to construct trails cannot be obtained unless these trails are already designed.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Trail Design - General		
Mark Miner	Trails need to be sustainable and should fit into the contours and aspect of the land and take into consideration what the terrain will be like in the different seasons.	<i>This draft plan is intended to provide guidance for future development. It does not include detailed routing or design of trails. It will provide guidance that any future design and development of trails follow sustainable design methods.</i>
Chris Wrobel	If singletrack is built, please make these trails skier friendly with slightly longer turns.	<i>As noted above, this plan will not include specific trail locations or designs. It will provide guidance for trail design and development. The plan calls for trails which can accommodate a variety of uses.</i>
Mike Vogel	This master plan should provide for ski trails that are designed for grooming.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	This master plan should provide for ski trails that are designed for grooming.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	Please rely on the experts at the NSAA on trail widths for grooming.	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Hession	Design the ski trails along the lines of those at Kincaid Park.	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Mosby	Trails should be of a loop nature and stacked where topographically possible with trail management objectives for each.	<i>See above.</i>
Michael Malvick	There is a variety of terrain in the area to support development of beginner to advanced level trails.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Bob French	The "social trails" are neither sustainable or effective for the park. Because these trails are not specifically designed and constructed for different types of recreation, they will lead to conflicts amongst users, and lead to damage to the soils and surrounding terrain.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Erik Williamson	The eroding trails on the south side need to be blocked off and hikers directed to sustainable trails.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Trail Design - General (continued)		
Dianne Holmes	The jeep road is not likely to lend itself well to becoming a sustainable trail.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Dianne Holmes	Hiking and XC trails require different standards.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Trail Design - Trail Classes		<i>The master plan calls for Class 2 to 3 trails. These trails can provide for a variety of experiences for a wide variety of users.</i>
Christopher Souser	Class 1 to 3 trails preferable, and limited Class 4 trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Ted Moore	With the exception of a Class 2 pedestrian trail traversing along the ridge, Section 36 should not be used for development of intensive recreational facilities.	<i>See above.</i>
STA	The Class 2 and 3 trails of Section 36 could be designed to limit speed. The character could be that of a hiking trail that mountain bikers would enjoy.	<i>See above.</i>
Eric Williamson	I support and encourage Class 2 or 3 trails on the north side.	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Mosby	It should be possible to allow for some non-conflicting multiple use trail development (Class 3-4) and some specific trail use development (Class 2-3) including boardwalk and some wetland areas.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	I firmly believe that Section 36 should eventually be developed to include sustainable Class 2 to Class 4 trails in moderate to high density.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	Limiting Section 36 to "Pedestrian Class 2 and 3" type trails in low density is certainly not acceptable, especially concerning the lack of other Municipal Parklands within a 3 to 4 mile radius to the south of Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Trail Design - Trail Classes (continued)		<i>The master plan calls for Class 2 to 3 trails. These trails can provide for a variety of experiences for a wide variety of users.</i>
Nancy Pease	Level 4 trail development appears to meet the standard for ski grooming because it has a criteria of "few obstacles." Level 3 may not be adequate because of the higher tolerance of obstacles and the maximum trail width of 48 inches. Skiers cannot go past each other in that width.	<i>See above.</i>
Chris Bacon	I think it would be wise to upgrade the multi-use trail in Concept 3 to a Class 5 trail, even if the trail is not constructed to that standard initially.	<i>See above.</i>
Trail Design - Density		<i>The draft plan identifies Section 36 with a trail system that includes low and medium density trails for both active and passive recreational use.</i>
Trail Development - Low Density		
Andrew Lee	If trails are to be developed, the lower the density of trails, the better.	<i>See above.</i>
Yvonne Goldsmith	Section 36 should be primarily low density trail use, not for high intensity development or ski racing.	<i>See above.</i>
Arctic Orienteering Club	Trails, at a low density, can improve our beginner level orienteering courses.	<i>See above.</i>
Trail Development - Medium Density		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor medium density, lighted, groomed cross country ski trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Trail Development - Medium to High Density		
Lori Davey	The density of ski trails should be medium to high like Kincaid or Hilltop and wide enough for grooming.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Trail Development - Medium to High Density (continued)		
Diane Holmes	Develop medium to high density, lighted cross country ski trails with a width that allows for grooming.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	Even popular and dense trails such as found at Kincaid and Hillside parks still preserve, protect and enhance wilderness and wildlife, while protecting diverse flora and allowing the experience of solitude. The abundance and diversity of wildlife found at Kincaid, Hillside and Far North Bicentennial Parks show that trails and wildlife are not mutually exclusive.	<i>See above.</i>
NSAA	Reserving Section 36 for low density trail development, limited to Pedestrian Class 2 and 3 type trails is not acceptable for a Municipal park of this size in this location.	<i>See above.</i>
NSAA	Examples such as Beach Lake Park, Bartlett High School Trail System, Hillside Park Trail System and Kincaid Park demonstrate that a "medium to high density" trail system can serve the active trail users without detracting from the natural resource value of the park.	<i>See above.</i>
Trail Design - Various Densities		
STA	A mixture of low to moderate and high density trails in appropriate areas would improve the overall utility of the park while preserving its natural character. If both trail alignments are carefully coordinated, a moderate to high density Class 2/3 trail system could nestle comfortably within a Class 4 ski trail.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	I believe that a mix of high density ski trails on the north side of the park should be balanced by lower density trails in other areas.	<i>See above.</i>
Trail Design - Wider Trails		
Thomas Coolidge	The plan should allow for a system of Nordic skiing trails that can be effectively maintained by a snow cat.	<i>The plan calls for a wider ski trail around the perimeter of Section 36 that may be groomable.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Trail Design - Wider Trails (continued)		
NSAA	Trail width is also very important. A 10-foot groomable surface is the minimum serviceable width. A groomable width of 16-20 feet is needed for a combined skate and classic trail. This translates to a combination of Nordic Class 3 and 4 trails.	<i>See above.</i>
NSAA	The exact amount of each trail class can be left open for the master plan. The width can also be changed over time; the key is to design for the future potential and start with a minimum 10 foot width.	<i>See above.</i>
NSAA	Narrow hiking and mountain biking trails can be integrated with wide Nordic ski trails in a variety of ways. The question of single use trails versus multi-use can be a future management decision. A trail that is maintained for skiing can serve many types of users as we have experienced on multi-use trails in FNBP, Kincaid, Chester Creek, etc. The keys to making a trail skiable are appropriate design and adequate maintenance.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	Wide enough to accommodate users such as middle and high school teams and the Jr. Nordic program.	<i>See above.</i>
Jolie Pollet Strohmeyer	Please consider the appropriate width (10 feet wide) for grooming Nordic trails in the Section 36 park planning process.	<i>See above.</i>
Paddy Sullivan	...and the trail should be wide enough to be groomed by a piston bully (10-foot), but no wider than necessary.	<i>See above.</i>
Hank Baca	I would very much like to see trails wide enough to groom for Nordic skiing in Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	Trails of at least 12 feet wide are necessary for proper skiing that accommodate both classic and skate skiing with proper grooming equipment.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Trail Design - Wider Trails (continued)		
Bob French	The ski trails need to be a minimum of 10 feet wide to allow grooming, with a trail width of 16 to 20 feet being optimum, to allow for both skating and classic skiing, or to use the terminology of the Master Plan, a mixture of Class 3 and 4 Nordic ski trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Trail Design - Narrow Trails		
Diane Ramey	Would like to see narrow ski trails, limited to diagonal skiing in the park. This would limit the impact and make it more attractive to the orienteering club.	<i>The master plan calls for Class 2 trails in the interior of Section 36 to provide for a more natural experience.</i>
Rob Earl	I think section 36 would be suitable for single track trails only, no skate skiing or equestrian.	<i>See above.</i>
Dan Motoki	Please consider making this into a network of narrower hiking and mountain biking trails, and not into a skate skiing highway.	<i>See above.</i>
Caryn Smith	Trails should be kept small and minimal.	<i>See above.</i>
Bernard Murphy	Prefer to go out on narrow, natural singletrack trails that give the feeling of being in the woods.	<i>See above.</i>
Bernard Murphy	Do not like wide developed and graveled trails. Also, the surface of these "hardened" trails is loud and not comfortable to bike or hike on.	<i>See above.</i>
Sage Cohen	Although I am a Nordic skier, I don't think we don't need more large, wide trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Mara Cramer	I would prefer multi-use trails that are dog friendly-rather than wide groomed ski trails such as those at Kincaid.	<i>See above.</i>
Chris Wrobel	I would like to see narrow, multi-use trails.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Trail Design - Narrow Trails (continued)		
STA	The steep contours are ideally suited for a system of narrow, soft surface trails that are minimally invasive and require only a 3 to 4-foot bench.	<i>See above.</i>
Steve Ryan	I would rather see narrower, twisty trails that were designed to use the terrain, much like the STA trails above the Hilltop ski area.	<i>See above.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	Bear Valley definitely does not want 15- or 20-foot wide ski trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Sue Whitney	Perhaps a narrower format for trails in Section 36 should be pursued.	<i>See above.</i>
Trail Design - Length		
NSAA	Anything less than 3 miles long is not worth the maintenance effort. A larger system would be preferable if the intent is to serve a wide range of users. A total length of 6-10 miles would make a desirable destination.	<i>The master plan calls for a 4 to 5-mile loop trail around the perimeter of Section 36.</i>
Nancy Pease	There should be a groomed trail distance of at least 7.5 km, discounting portions of ski trail that cross roads (which requires skiers to take off their skis); because a shorter ski trail would not need the standard exercise or training aims of most skiers, including school teams; and would be too congested.	<i>See above.</i>
Paddy Sullivan	Would like to see a minimum of a 4 mile loop (preferably 5 miles)	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	I would encourage a minimum of 3 miles of Nordic ski trails at the start (less trails are not economical to groom), with gradual expansion to at least 10 miles being possible in the future.	<i>See above.</i>
Marcus Reese	I'd like to see the ability to utilize the possible trail system for long range Nordic skiing.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Trail Design - Lighting.		<i>Lighted trails are recommended on the north side of the Section 36 ridge to reduce concerns of the Bear Valley residents. The plan calls for this lighting to be designed to be low-impact to minimize impacts to residences and dark skies for stargazing.</i>
Support for Lighting		
Dianne Holmes	Most cross country ski trails should be lit in order to accommodate the widest range of users in the winter.	<i>See above.</i>
Lori Davey	Low level lighting should be included for the ski trails in order for the maximum use by school programs and working adults.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	At least some of these trails should be lit.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	There should be some level of lighting on some of the trails. Ambient night light has increased on the Hillside enough that some trails can be used in the urban night glow, but some uses and users (women and children especially) should have the security of good vision along the trail.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor and are in support of lighted trails on the north side, but nowhere else.	<i>See above.</i>
Thomas Coolidge	Lighted trails should not be prohibited.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	Some lighting is warranted, at least on a portion of the ski and multi-use trails. This is a safety issue, especially in winter because of moose.	<i>See above.</i>
Hank Baca	I would like to see some of the trails lit.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	There should be some level of lighting on some of the trails. Some uses and users should have the security of good vision along the trail.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Support for Lighting (continued)		
Bob French	Lighted trails are essential given winter daylight hours and enhance safety at all times.	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Brown	Lighted trails should not be prohibited.	<i>See above.</i>
Opposition to Lighting		
Ted Moore	There should be no development of lit or groomed ski trails anywhere in this park.	<i>See above.</i>
Mark Miner	Lights should not be a part of this trail system.	<i>See above.</i>
Rob Earl	Please, no installed lighting!	<i>See above.</i>
Bear Valley Community Council	the availability of darkness for stargazing and astronomical uses;	<i>See above.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	Bear Valley does not want lights in Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Chris Allard	No lights,	<i>See above.</i>
Dan Stone	Light pollution has always been a major concern.	<i>See above.</i>
Lighting Design Considerations		
Michael Malvick	Lighted trails can be limited to areas outside the line of sight of most residents. Low scatter lighting can be specified, and/or hours of illumination can be limited.	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Mosby	If any trail lighting is used, be sure it is kept low and does not pollute the night sky.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	The trees east of Storck Park would hide low level lighting, yet lighting is needed for this area because it will probably be the first area developed due to the readily accessible parking lot and because funding won't be available for the remaining facilities for a long time.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Lighting Design Considerations (continued)		
Nancy Pease	Perhaps the Bear Valley side is the logical side to light, since the night sky is already impacted by the lights at the elementary school. Any lighting should be downcast to avoid light pollution.	<i>See above.</i>
Trail Location Comments		
North Slope Development		
Nancy Pease	The north side should be the focus for cross-country ski trails because the north side has a greater acreage than the south side of the ridge; more suitable slopes for trail development; and less exposure to wind and sun which create thaw cycles.	<i>The draft plan identifies a network of Class 2 and 3 trails on the northern slope of Section 36.</i>
Dianne Holmes	The snow remains longer on the north side of the park than elsewhere in town and ski trails are appropriate to develop. The nearby middle and high schools could use this park for their ski practices and their usage should be considered in this planning process.	<i>See above.</i>
Lori Davey	The northern part with an emphasis on winter activities could serve the school ski teams for XC practice and the Jr. Nordic program, which has expanded tremendously in recent years.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	The north side of Section 36 is ideal for Nordic ski trails, as it is on the north side of a ridge, and largely sheltered from the southeast winds that often scour snow off many other areas on the Hillside.	<i>See above.</i>
Caryn Smith	If ski trails are put in, they are more protected from the wind on the north side of the ridge.	<i>See above.</i>
Ted Moore	The development of relatively narrow, unlit trail loops suitable for classical skiing in the winter and mountain biking in the summer should be considered ... in the north-sloping terrain located north of and below the main ridge line.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

North Slope Development (continued)		
Arctic Orienteering Club	We do not oppose development of trails north of the ridgeline area ...	<i>See above.</i>
South of Clarks Road		
Arctic Orienteering Club	We do not oppose development of trails ... south of the swamps.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Deborah Mole	Please consider leaving trails as they naturally exist in the lower part of Section 36, and focusing more on the upper part of Section 36 for public skiing and heavier use.	<i>Proposed trails in the lower part of Section 36 are limited to a multi-use loop from Storck Park along the south side of Clark's Road.</i>
Nancy Pease	Heights Hill area is accessible and an attractive view-point destination from Storck Park and Bear Valley School. The open meadows and sparse forest would allow skiing and hiking trails to be constructed with minimal clearing.	<i>Heights Hill Road is surrounded by wetlands and serves as a wildlife corridor. The master plan proposes limited trail development in this area.</i>
Ted Moore	The development of relatively narrow, unlit trail loops suitable for classical skiing in the winter and mountain biking in the summer should be considered either in the south-sloping terrain below Clarks Road with access from Storck Park,	<i>See above.</i>
Scott Pexton & Robin Abramson	Any trail construction for access into the Class A wetlands from Bear Valley Elementary School will be expensive and will require a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.	<i>Acknowledged. Trail development in the wetland area would need to be coordinated with regulatory agencies.</i>
Scott Pexton & Robin Abramson	If a trail is built in or near the wetlands area, it should be a single loop originating from Bear Valley Elementary School property and should stay north of both drainages to Little Rabbit Creek and extend no more than 1,000 feet east of the western boundary of Section 36.	<i>Acknowledged. The master plan currently proposes only a boardwalk to access the western wetlands near Bear Valley Elementary.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Central Development		
Paddy Sullivan	The center of Section 36 should be left for narrow singletrack trails.	<i>The center of Section 36 is proposed for a network of Class 2 trails on the south slope and a network of Class 2 and 3 trails on the north slope.</i>
South Slope Development		
Jack Hession	Focus biking and hiking trails on the ridge line and south slopes of the park in order to take advantage of earlier break-up on the south side of the park.	<i>All trails proposed in this master plan are considered multi-use trails to provide for the greatest number and variety of users and user abilities. A network of Class 2 trails in proposed on the south slope.</i>
Clarks Road		
Deborah Mole	It would be helpful to have a walking/biking trail next to Clarks Road.	<i>The draft plan recommends bike paths or lanes be incorporated into future road upgrades to provide for additional non-motorized access to the park.</i>
Caryn Smith	The park plan should consider long-term upgrades to bike trails along Clarks Road if the State ever upgrades the road.	<i>See above.</i>
Caryn Smith	Construction of trails should be done very carefully along Clarks Road above Heights Hill, as there are several springs where drainage issues onto Clarks Road could be exasperated by changing drainage.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
General Location		
Kimball Forrest	I support a limited number of new trails provided they don't bisect the prime areas for orienteering.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Chris Bacon	Future links could be provided to connect the two loop ends via a trail that could wind up and over the ridge on the east end.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Mark Miner	Avoid wet, low-lying areas for hiking trails and exposed windy areas for winter trails.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Jack Mosby	It appears there is suitable terrain for numerous trail opportunities on both sides of the ridge, Clarks Road and Heights Hill Road, and some of the wetland area east of Bear Valley Elementary School.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

General Location (continued)		
Mark Miner	I like Troy Duffin's suggestion of a 2 to 3-foot wide trail on top of the ridge and a wider trail lower down.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Trail Development - Trailheads		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We are in favor of using Storck Park parking lots as trailheads for trails built east to Height Hills Road and beyond.	<i>Acknowledged. A multi-use trail loop originating from Storck Park is recommended in the draft plan. Use of Storck Park for parking is also recommended.</i>
Lori Davey	The southern part with Storck Park as a trailhead could provide trails to the east towards Heights Hill for XC and multi-use skiing.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	Use Storck Park and its developed parking lot as a trailhead for a trail system that extends to Heights Hill.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	Storck Park should be the main trailhead for the trails and activities on the south side of Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Access		
Monte Weaver	The number one thing to have for any park is a good plan for access. Access requires trails for walkers, skiers and bikers.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Kimball Forrest	The north side of Section 36 is difficult to use and to access in its current condition.	<i>The master plan proposes a network of trails that would provide better access to the north side. The plan also proposes a future parking area for the north side.</i>
William Ennis	The access road that citizens will use (Clarks Road) is also the one and only access road to the hundreds of families that now inhabit Bear Valley. The prospect of more traffic to restrict our possible emergency exit out of the valley is not appealing.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Bear Valley Community Council the members of BVCC have had a continuous and ongoing concern about crowded access and egress from the "bowl" in which Section 36 and their homes are found, as well as the safety of persons in the area.....	<i>Acknowledged.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Connections		
Storck Park		
Dianne Holmes	A cross country ski trail from Storck Park should be developed.	<i>A multi-use trail is identified in the draft plan originating from Storck Park.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor hiking trails and a connection to Section 36 from Storck Park. Design to avoid wetlands and the use of expensive boardwalks.	<i>See above.</i>
Kimball Forrest	New trails would be beneficial if they helped connect the school to Storck Park and the Park to Section 36. The north side of Section 36 is difficult to use and to access in its current condition.	<i>See above.</i>
Chris Bacon	A link to ... Storck Park would also be prudent.	<i>See above.</i>
Bear Valley Elementary		
Nancy Pease	There should be a multi-use connection trail from Bear Valley School to the Section 36 trails. This would serve students, and also would allow additional or alternative parking for Section 36 trail users if there were a large sports event or rental event going on at Storck Park.	<i>The draft master plan proposes connections between Bear Valley Elementary and Storck Park, and between Storck Park and the portion of Section 36 north of Clark's Road. These connections will need further study and design beyond this master plan.</i>
Nancy Pease	If ski trails are concentrated mostly on the snowier northern slopes, there should still be a groomable ski trail on the south side of the park for use by and from the Bear Valley school area.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	Section 36 should be connected to Bear Valley School and to future trails that will lead to the neighborhoods in the Golden View area.	<i>See above.</i>
Andrew Lee	An improved connection in the area between Storck Park and Section 36 may be of interest to us (Arctic Orienteering). Similarly, an improved connection between Bear Valley Elementary School and Section 36 would be desirable.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Bear Valley Elementary (continued)		
Eric Williamson	I support the connection trail and boardwalks leading from Bear Valley Elementary School and connecting trails to adjacent public areas.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	Having access from Bear Valley Elementary School and closer access to Goldenview and Hanshew Middle Schools will help get our children off their widening behinds and out into the wonderful nature that makes Anchorage an international destination.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	There should be a multi-use connection trail from Bear Valley School to the Section 36 trails. This would serve students, and also would allow additional or alternative parking for Section 36 trail users if there were a large sports event or rental event going on at Storck Park.	<i>See above.</i>
Chugach State Park		
Lori Davey	Connections should be made to Chugach State Park ...	<i>The draft master plan recommends that the MOA continue to pursue connections through Section 36 to Chugach State Park. These connections will require more study and design that is beyond the scope of this master plan.</i>
Christopher Souser	I think to make this park a success, it needs access, and an uninhibited link into Chugach State Park for similar type access.	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Hession	Identify specific connecting routes and trails to ... Chugach State Park.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Greenbelt		
Nancy Pease	Section 36 should be connected to the Rabbit Creek Greenbelt Plan at the western end. This encourages residents from neighborhoods along DeArmoun and North Golden View to get to Section 36 via trail instead of vehicle. Links might include a pedestrian shortcut across Chawa Circle.	<i>The draft master plan proposes connections from Section 36 to the Rabbit Creek Greenbelt. These connections will require more study and design that is beyond the scope of this master plan.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Rabbit Creek Greenbelt (continued)		
Jack Hession	Identify specific connecting routes and trails to the developed and undeveloped Rabbit Creek Greenbelt ...	<i>See above.</i>
Chris Bacon	A link to the Rabbit Creek greenbelt ...would also be prudent. Future links could be provided to connect the two loop ends via a trail that could wind up and over the ridge on the east end.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We do not favor connecting to the Rabbit Creek Greenbelt near the NE corner of Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor utilizing the DOT&PF corridor connecting Chawa Circle with Old Rabbit Creek Road for a connection to the Rabbit Creek Greenbelt.	<i>See above.</i>
Lori Davey	Connections should be made to ... the Rabbit Creek Greenbelt but not in the NE corner as the concept designs show, rather from the NW corner.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	A connection should be provided from the greenbelt's current trailhead on Old Rabbit Creek Road along 140th rather than on Rabbit Creek Road itself.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	The Rabbit Creek Greenbelt Plan of the mid-1980s calls for a connection to Section 36, but refers to a connection at the NE tip of Section 36 in a very steep and undeveloped area. It is more realistic to connect the greenbelt via the NW corner of Section 36, across Rabbit Creek Road and north to 140th, where a trail could proceed west to Old Rabbit Creek Road to one of the greenbelt's trailheads.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	A connection should be provided from the greenbelt's current trailhead on Old Rabbit Creek Road along 140th rather than on Rabbit Creek Road itself.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	Section 36 should be connected to Rabbit Creek Greenbelt at the western end.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

North to South		
Nancy Pease	There should be north-south connector trails (cross country ski trail and multi-use) should be constructed from Storck Park to the north side trails.	<i>A multi-use trail is identified in the draft plan originating from Storck Park with connections to the north side trails.</i>
Mike Vogel	There should be north-south connector trails (cross country ski trail and multi-use) should be constructed from Storck Park to the north side trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	Develop trail connections between north and south sides along the east boundary and just west of the Alascom road.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	There should be at least one trail that connects Section 36 from the north to south.	<i>See above.</i>
Other Connections		
Nancy Pease	Golden View Middle School, in particular, can potentially be connected to Section 36 by future trails in greenbelts and neighborhoods.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Nancy Pease	The master plan needs to include recommended trail connection to Rabbit Creek Greenbelt Park, Chugach State Park, and Bear Valley Elementary School. These recommendations should specify location and types of use for the connection, so that there is clear guidance for obtaining easements or development funding for future connections.	<i>The draft master plan recommends that the MOA continue to pursue connections through Section 36 to other areas. These connections will require more study and design that is beyond the scope of this master plan.</i>
David Mitchell	We should identify potential connections, trail routes and land parcels that could provide connectivity between Section 36 and other open space even if those lands and/or trail easements can't be acquired right now. They are very important to the trail system that we are designing and will help integrate Section 36 into the larger green infrastructure picture. Connectivity will benefit both wildlife conservation and recreation opportunities.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Other Connections (continued)		
Bob French	Section 36 should be connected to adjacent areas and communities, including the Rabbit Creek Greenbelt, at both the northwest and northeast corners, Chugach State Park, Little Rabbit Creek Greenbelt, Bear Valley School, Storck Park and to future trails (proposed in the Hillside District Plan) connecting to the neighborhoods in the Goldenview area. Those connections should be by trail, in order to encourage residents to use the trails instead of getting into their cars to travel to a trailhead.	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Mosby	Section 36 should also provide access (1-2 routes) into Chugach State Park as well as connections to nearby neighborhood parks such as Storck, Bear Valley Elementary and others where possible, and the two neighboring greenbelts (Rabbit Creek and Little Rabbit Creek).	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	The three draft concepts show a connection from the east side of Section 36 to 140th. 140th at this location is not fully constructed to Rabbit Creek Road. Only a small part of the 140th ROW is built and is essentially a driveway and not suitable for public vehicular access to the park. It is a very poor choice to have included this in the Section 36 plan and it should be deleted.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	If a trail is desired from east to west, keep the trail south from 140th by several hundred feet.	<i>See above.</i>
Recreational Uses		
Support for multiple uses of the park		
Rachel Steer	Please consider developing Section 36 as a multi-use recreational area that includes both 10 to 12-foot wide trails suitable for competitive Nordic skiing AND narrower, more intimate trails.	<i>The master plan calls for all trails developed in Section 36 to be multi-use trails to provide for the widest variety of uses and user experiences. It also calls for a variety of Class 2 and 3 trails to provide for wider trails for skiing and narrower trails for hiking and biking.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Support for multiple uses of the park (continued)		
Julia McCarthy	I heard about Section 36 and would love to see this being projected for a diverse range of use, including skiing and mountain biking (even winter biking).	<i>See above.</i>
Robert Ostrom	I'd like to see more hiking and biking trails in this area.	<i>See above.</i>
Leonard Hyde	I'd love to see multi-use trails in Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
John Laurance	Section 36's location can be something all the people of Anchorage can use. It can be used for multiple user groups, such as hikers, skiers, joggers, mountain bikers, berry pickers, etc.	<i>See above.</i>
Corinne Smith	I'd like to see a variety of uses at Section 36; wide trails for family hikes, skate skiing, or biking; narrower trails, maybe through the wetlands (winter only), for diagonal skiing; and singletrack for mountain biking, hiking and snowshoeing.	<i>See above.</i>
Monte Weaver	A wonderful area for hiking, biking and skiing trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Rick Rogers	I would like to see trail opportunities in Section 36 to include multi-use trails designed to accommodate singletrack mountain biking and running/hiking.	<i>See above.</i>
STA	Section 36 can and should accommodate multiple uses.	<i>See above.</i>
Steve Ryan	I support a good mix of trails that could be used by mountain bikers, hikers, skiers, walkers, runners, etc. This area would be perfect for multi-use trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Michael Henricks	I support trail installation at this location for multi-use, particularly mountain biking. This area would be excellent terrain for such use.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Support for multiple uses of the park (continued)		
Christopher Souser	Any development should accommodate multiple user groups and maintain an intimate outdoor feel to it year-round.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	There should be well-designed multi-use trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Hank Baca	Singletrack in other parts of the park would be great, but South Anchorage would really benefit from more Nordic options.	<i>See above.</i>
Robert Werner	Groomed ski trails in the winter would be great. It would be nice to have the great mountain bike trails in the summer that were built by STA on Hillside.	<i>See above.</i>
Monte Weaver	Please include trails for skiers, bikers and walkers as a part of Section 36's future.	<i>See above.</i>
Brian Looney	Please include ski-friendly, multi-use trails in the master plan for Section 36. There should be room for singletrack trails similar to what was just built in the Hillside area.	<i>See above.</i>
Chris Wrobel	All new trails should be multi-use, allowing dogs and winter mountain biking.	<i>See above.</i>
John Isby	I fully support a non-motorized, multi-use trail system that allows people to enjoy this piece of land to its maximum potential.	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Brown	Section 36 should allow for many different uses to accommodate the widest range of public recreational activities.	<i>See above.</i>
NSAA	NSAA recommends that the Section 36 Master Plan include a trail system that serves Nordic skiers as well as mountain bikers, hikers and other non-motorized users. The park should serve the active recreational trail users as well as contemplative nature lovers.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Support for multiple uses of the park (continued)		
Mara Cramer	Trails that can be used for ski touring in the winter or hiking in the summer would be great.	<i>See above.</i>
Ted Moore	The development of high-impact, single-user group facilities such as ball fields should not be allowed in this park.	<i>See above.</i>
Support for Nordic ski trails		
NSAA	NSAA recommends that the Section 36 Master Plan include a trail system that serves Nordic skiers as well as mountain bikers, hikers and other non-motorized users. The park should serve the active recreational trail users as well as contemplative nature lovers.	<i>The master plan proposes multi-use trails that can be used for a variety of activities, including Nordic skiing.</i>
Travis Rector	The popularity of Nordic skiing in the community, and its excellent location for many users, make this an ideal location for Nordic ski trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor trails from Bear Valley School to Storck Park loop that can be used for cross country skiing.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Miller	Please incorporate trails for Nordic skiing into the Master Plan.	<i>See above.</i>
Seth Downs & Erika Monahan	Support for the development of cross country ski trails in Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Nicholas Strohmeyer	I would like to see Nordic ski trails developed.	<i>See above.</i>
NSAA	Section 36 is the only remaining park land in Anchorage suitable for new Nordic ski trails. Section 36 is the obvious (and only possible) site for such facilities.	<i>See above.</i>
Paddy Sullivan	I think a Nordic ski loop around the perimeter of Section 36 would be a valuable asset to the Nordic ski community of South Anchorage.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Support for Nordic ski trails (continued)		
Sue Whitney	Nordic ski trails need to be included in the master plan for Section 36. Nordic trails can be used for multiple purposes during the off-season.	<i>See above.</i>
NSAA	Section 36 also presents a great opportunity for a Nordic trail system because of its elevation (~1200 feet) and a hill with a north facing slope. There should be earlier snow and longer lasting snow on Section 36 compared to Hillside Park.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	Designated ski trails should be specified in the master plan, for compelling reasons of high user demand and the highly favorable snow-retention conditions compared to other municipal parks.	<i>See above.</i>
Michael Malvick	Additional Nordic ski trails are necessary to reduce the congestion on the Hillside trails and to reduce the commute of the South High School and Goldenview Middle School teams.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	Ski trails in Section 36 will provide an alternate, including usage by both the community as well as middle school and high school ski programs.	<i>See above.</i>
NSAA	Section 36 has the potential to support a combined system of high quality Nordic skiing, hiking and mountain biking trails that meet a wide range of user needs and still protect the natural resources of the park.	<i>See above.</i>
Travis Rector	This location is large enough to accommodate many different uses, including a system of lighted Nordic ski trails that are wide enough to be groomed by a snow cat.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Opposition to Nordic ski trails		
Alex Townsend	The support of Nordic ski trail development in Section 36 is an idea that has not been thought out with any common sense. Bear Valley is known for frequent, and often for Anchorage's highest, winds. These winds are warm Chinook winds that quickly strip snow from the valley.	<i>The climate at Section 36 is recognized. The multi-use trails will provide an opportunity for a wide range of uses, including Nordic skiing. It is expected that limited trails will be constructed initially, and that additional trails would be added only when and if it is determined that there is a demand for them, based on use of the initial trails.</i>
Alex Townsend	Setting ski tracks in Bear Valley would be the most expensive tracks in Anchorage the NSAA ski club, MOA or others could maintain. Once the tracks were set, they would likely be chinooked away quickly, or turned to dangerous and unski-able ice patches.	<i>See above.</i>
Alex Townsend	To think that there is reliable snow in Section 36 to regularly cross country ski is foolish.	<i>See above.</i>
Chris Allard	I would like to see Section 36 reserved for walking and snowshoeing. ...no grooming of snow...	<i>See above.</i>
Singletrack/Mountain Biking Trails		
Michael Malvick	I favor development of singletrack mountain biking/hiking/running trails.	<i>The master plan proposes multi-use trails that can be used for a variety of activities, including mountain biking.</i>
Mike Wood	I strongly encourage you to consider the addition of singletrack mountain biking trails to any plan or master plan for Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Doug Gray	Adding additional routes in a new park will only continue to provide great experiences and access for our Anchorage bikers.	<i>See above.</i>
Gloria Menzel	I would like to see more singletrack trails developed for mountain biking. Section 36 would be a wonderful area for future development of singletrack trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Ted Phelps	Please include mountain biking in this area.	<i>See above.</i>
Philip Fontana	Please develop more singletrack in Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Singletrack/Mountain Biking Trails (continued)		
Nicholas Stadnicky	I would strongly encourage the continued development of mountain biking trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Todd Rinaldi	Continue the adoption and construction of mountain bike trails. These trails are sustainable and have very little impact on the environment and relative to horse traffic, have no impact. Mountain bike trails also provide hiking opportunities, increased tourism, and winter recreation for all human powered endeavors.	<i>See above.</i>
Alex Wilson	This is a great area for singletrack. The soil and topography of this area are great for sustainable singletrack trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Dan Motoki	Please consider making this into a network of narrower hiking and mountain biking trails, and not into a skate skiing highway.	<i>See above.</i>
Greg Klein	I support trails be open to mountain biking that are designed to assure maintainability. All new and existing trails should be given consideration to be opened to mountain biking. Decisions to open trails to mountain biking should be made based on practical geographical information vs. emotional feelings and desires.	<i>See above.</i>
Tim Woody	I encourage development of singletrack trails for non-motorized uses such as hiking, mountain biking and classical skiing.	<i>See above.</i>
Dan Boorstein	I wanted to express my interest in seeing singletrack mountain bike trails as part of the project plan.	<i>See above.</i>
Jonathon Harshfield	Alaska has the kind of land and terrain that could be sculpted into a "Mecca" for mountain biking and the tourist industry of Alaska would benefit greatly from this.	<i>See above.</i>
Angela Conroy	It would be extra special to have more tracks like Hilltop close to Bear Valley and its community for more families to enjoy.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Singletrack/Mountain Biking Trails (continued)		
Sunny Mall	I support the inclusion of mountain biking trails in Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Lori Sivitz	I support the inclusion of singletrack trails for mountain biking in Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Carol Jewell	I would like to express my strong support for more mountain biking and hiking trails in Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Phillip Stevens	Mountain biking/multi-use singletrack trails would be a great addition to Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Philip Repetto	The terrain of Section 36 would be well suited for sustainable singletrack mountain bike trails, which offer excellent hiking, running, skiing and snowshoeing opportunities.	<i>See above.</i>
Allen Hansen	We need more singletrack biking trails in Anchorage. The Rabbit Creek 600 acres is ideal.	<i>See above.</i>
Daniel Kane	I would like to make a request that running and mountain biking trails be included within the draft plan.	<i>See above.</i>
Michael Vania	Please consider singletrack in Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Yvonne Goldsmith	Please include opportunities for singletrack bike trails, walking trails and classic ski trails. I prefer a park that is rustic and left in its natural character - narrow trails, not wide ones. Don't want an urban park, the way Kincaid has turned out to be.	<i>See above.</i>
Russell Biggs	I would like to see a singletrack mountain biking trails in this plan.	<i>See above.</i>
Wendy Heck	There is a great need for more mountain biking trails that can be used year round in Anchorage.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor mountain bike trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Forest Bommarito	More singletrack mountain biking trails would be a great asset to the city of Anchorage.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Singletrack/Mountain Biking Trails (continued)		
Yvonne Goldsmith	I favor singletrack mountain bike trails. These can be used by skiers in the winter.	<i>See above.</i>
Gideon Saunders	The potential of singletrack trails is very exciting.	<i>See above.</i>
Ken Robertson	I wanted to state my support for putting in a trail system along the lines of the STA trails in FNBP. Those trails are sustainable, fun, quiet, and get rave reviews.	<i>See above.</i>
Oscar Lage	I believe that singletrack trails would be welcome by most users.	<i>See above.</i>
Rob Earl	I think Section 36 would be suitable for singletrack trails only.	<i>See above.</i>
Jonathon Harshfield	Mountain biking is a fast growing activity that allows one to get out and see Alaska's beauty in a more exciting way than just simply hiking.	<i>See above.</i>
Jonathon Harshfield	The biking community within Alaska is a group that encourages the proper use of natural resources and brings considerable money to all park activities and holds many activities themselves on park lands.	<i>See above.</i>
Diane Ramey	Allowing singletrack biking would also be compatible. There is a large surrounding population that would utilize these trails instead of going to Hillside.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	The terrain and soil in at least the upland parts of Section 36 are suitable for both "singletrack" and "double track" mountain bike trails, either in association with or separate from the Nordic ski trails.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Equestrian trails		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We do not favor horse trails.	<i>The master plan proposes multi-use trails that can be used for a variety of activities, including horseback riding. The area will not be designed to attract riders from outside the southeast Anchorage area, but would be available to local riders.</i>
Rob Earl	No skate skiing or equestrian trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Ted Moore	The development of equestrian trails should not be allowed in this park.	<i>See above.</i>
Chris Allard	I would like to see ... no horses.	<i>See above.</i>
Brian Looney	It is paramount to prohibit horses on any groomed ski trail since they are just not compatible.	<i>See above.</i>
Non-motorized use		
Dianne Holmes	All of Section 36 should be for non-motorized use.	<i>The master plan proposes only non-motorized uses.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We do not favor motorized use.	<i>See above.</i>
Bear Valley Community Council	NOW THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that the BVCC seeks the Section 36 park master plan to include the following:4. Park uses including motorization, such as snow machines, remote operated airplanes, all terrain vehicles, etc., shall be prohibited from the park;...	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	Section 36 should remain non-motorized as much as feasible (existing roads expected).	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	Section 36 is clearly not suited for motorized use.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	Section 36 should prohibit motorized use because of the negative impacts on natural resource values and other user groups.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Hiking/Walking/Snowshoeing trails		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor hiking trails and a connection to Section 36 from Storck Park. Design to avoid wetlands and the use of expensive boardwalks.	<i>The master plan proposes multi-use trails to allow for a variety of uses, including walking, hiking and snowshoeing.</i>
Chris Allard	I would like to see Section 36 reserved for walking and snowshoeing.	<i>See above.</i>
Skijoring trails		
Bob French	In the open wetland terrain, skijoring trails could be developed that would completely disappear in summertime, with no impacts to wetlands.	<i>The master plan proposes multi-use trails to allow for a variety of uses, including skijoring.</i>
Bob French	The areas at the south side are suitable for skijoring, including wetland areas.	<i>See above.</i>
Orienteering use		
Arthur Harmon	I've enjoyed the area at orienteering events and the low level of development is what makes it a fun and technical course.	<i>The master plan does not preclude continued use of Section 36 for orienteering. It proposes a low level of development, which would continue to make for good orienteering.</i>
Ian Moore	The orienteering club has created a detailed orienteering map of the area and hosts several competitions there each year.	<i>See above.</i>
Ian Moore	Arctic Orienteering Club is the only organized group that is currently using Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Paragliding use and landing area		
Jack Brown	A paragliding landing zone is needed in the area, and can easily be incorporated into Section 36 that would be both compatible with other uses, and barely noticeable when not in use.	<i>Paragliding use is not precluded by the master plan. Improvements to specific areas for this use will be evaluated by Parks & Recreation through their permit process.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Paragliding use and landing area (continued)		
Bob French	A paragliding landing zone is needed in the area, and can easily be incorporated into Section 36 that would be both compatible with other uses, and barely noticeable when not in use. The area within Section 36 near the Heights Hill intersection with Jamie Drive could easily be adapted into a suitable landing site that would not be noticeable to visitors, but still allow safe landings while staying compatible with the other uses.	<i>See above.</i>
Arctic Air Walkers	Arctic Air Walkers proposes to improve the fire break on the west side of Heights Hill Road. We propose to remove stumps and dead fall from the fire break to provide a "semi-natural" clearing approximately 300 feet of the existing fire break from the south end to the north. "Semi-natural" - 100 feet of approach on the north and south end clear of stumps and dead fall with 100 feet in the center of the 300-foot level planted in grass. We further propose to install a culvert in the ditch to create access to off street parking for 6 cars maximum.	<i>See above.</i>
Arctic Air Walkers	If Concept 3's development of trails, warming huts and parking were to occur and it fit into the plans, for safety reasons, we would request to widen the fire break by 50 feet into the woods to the west of the road.	<i>See above.</i>
Scott Amy	The Arctic Air Walkers membership roster draws from all walks of life, and it is common for them to work together in an effort to improve the community that we live in, such as adopting a street or highway, or cleaning up after others in areas where we fly. We (Arctic Air Walkers) know we are a small group, so it is important to us to gain the trust of our community and to be recognized as a good community citizens. Please take this user group seriously.	<i>See above.</i>
Arctic Air Walkers	For safety reasons, we request that no overhead power or street lights be installed on the west side of Heights Hill Road.	<i>The master plan proposes limited lighting on the north side of the ridge in Section 36.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Separate trails to minimize conflicts between users.		
Nancy Pease	The park's large size allows a trail system that is separated by activity: cross country skiing separated from skijoring and other winter multi-uses; and singletrack bike trails can and should be separated for safety.	<i>We acknowledge that many user groups would prefer to have separated trails for various activities. However, due to the desire to provide for the widest variety of uses and users, the plan proposes multi-use trails that are open to all users all year.</i>
Nancy Pease	Multi-use trails for skijoring and snowshoeing should be included in the development plan, but separated from the ski trails, like Hilltop trails are.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor separate multi-use trails for skijoring and snowshoeing.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	Multi-use trails for skijoring and snowshoeing should be included in the development plan, but separated from the ski trails.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	The management plan need not decide for single use trails versus multi-use trails at this time. That can be a future management decision that reflects the proportions of users, and the desires of the community.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	Trails can be separated by activity: cross country skiing separated from skijoring and other winter uses; hiking trails can be separated from horse trails or singletrack (if such trails are included in the master plan at all).	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Brown	Trail development should minimize any conflicts between different user groups.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Other Use Comments		
Bear Valley Community Council	<p>NOW THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that the BVCC seeks the Section 36 park master plan to include the following:2. The park shall be developed to provide uses which are not available elsewhere in the Anchorage park system, including but not limited to, the availability of darkness for stargazing and astronomical uses;3. Park uses which will be given priority are those having the lowest impact on the land, examples of such uses are orienteering, berry picking, walking, nature hiking, and non-team, non-competitive Nordic style, individual cross-country skiing;</p>	<p><i>The MOA Park Plan classifies Section 36 as a Natural Resource Use Area. This designation recognizes the values of the wildlife and flora, but also allows for recreation uses that can be accommodated while minimizing impacts on the natural resources, wildlife habitat, etc. The proposed level of development in the master plan is of a low level, designed to allow Section 36 to continue to provide a more wilderness-like experience. Activities such as stargazing, orienteering, berry picking, walking, natural hiking, and cross-country skiing will be accommodated.</i></p>
Park Facilities		
General		
Ken Robertson	I do not support additional infrastructure.	<i>The master plan calls for minimal and low-impact infrastructure, primarily parking, restrooms, trailheads and trails.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	No development at all.	<i>See above.</i>
Bear Valley Community Council	...NOW THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that the BVCC seeks the Section 36 park master plan to include the following: ...2. The park should be developed to provide....the minimizing of structures and appurtenant facilities to enhance the low density/low impact uses of the land;5. Park uses including lighting, sound amplification, mass vehicle parking lots or other indicia of non-small group uses shall be prohibited....	<i>See above.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	The Master Plan should be modest and realistic with respect to new facilities and should advocate practical, inexpensive amenities to the extent possible. The Master Plan can later be amended with public input and support.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

General (continued)		
Dianne Holmes	Develop a parking lot with lights for security, and a simple warm up hut for maximum use by the public, school ski teams and the Jr. Nordic program.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	A small warming building with restrooms such as found at the Beach Lake Trails in Chugiak would not likely be an initial amenity, but should not be prevented from occurring in the future. Bear Valley Elementary School could provide warming and restroom facilities should a Junior Nordic program be started at Section 36, until such a facility could be built.	<i>See above.</i>
NSAA	The extras that make a Nordic center attractive are trail lights, warming building (chalet or hut) and restrooms. In the case of Jr. Nordic, we feel that a warm-up building and restrooms are essential, plus trail lights. Bear Valley Elementary School could serve the purpose nicely if the trails are made accessible. This would require a safe crossing over Clark Road. Lighted trails and a warm-up building are also highly prized by adult skiers.	<i>See above.</i>
Grade separated crossing		
Nancy Pease	Include at least one-grade separated crossing of Clarks Road in this Master Plan. This inclusion in the plan helps to gain funding as part of new road construction.	<i>The plan calls for a future grade-separated crossing of Clarks Road.</i>
Bob French	There needs to be at least one grade-separated crossing of Clarks Road to connect the south and north sides of the park.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	If a parking lot is created on the west side of Rabbit Creek Road, it should also have a grade-separated crossing of Rabbit Creek Road.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Parking General		
Dianne Holmes	Include low level lighting for security and safety in the parking lot(s).	<i>Low level lighting may be included at parking areas.</i>
Nancy Pease	Use existing parking and shared use parking.	<i>Existing parking at Storck Park provides the needed spaces and access to Section 36 in the short-term.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Parking General (continued)		
Nancy Pease	Parking lots are expensive to build and maintain, and more asphalt isn't an asset to the watershed or other natural resource values.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Jack Mosby	I hope the revised draft plan will indicate how many parking spaces are actually intended at each of the proposed parking sites. Keep them suitable, visible and useable.	<i>The draft plan proposes three small 5-12 space parking lots at future trailheads.</i>
Eric Williamson	I strongly encourage parking lots.	<i>Three additional small parking lots are envisioned at future trailheads.</i>
Parking Locations		
Nancy Pease	North side parking and access - given limited funds, the primary parking lot for the north side should be north of the Hosken's residence, not off east 140th. The intersection at 140th and possible wetlands and poor security make it a less desirable location. Security monitoring is easier near Rabbit Creek Road. Generous buffering must be provided to the neighbors of any parking lot.	<i>Exact siting of the proposed north side parking will need to be refined at the design stage.</i>
Mike Vogel	The primary parking lot for the north side should be north of the Hoskens residence, not off east 140th. The intersection at 140th, possible wetlands and poor security make it a less desirable location.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We are in favor of a parking area farther to the east of the Hosken home and driveway, in the upper NW quadrant of Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We are in favor of utilizing an area around the Bear Valley School for southwest parking.	<i>Use of existing parking at Storck Park is recommended for the short term.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Parking Locations (continued)		
Caryn Smith	Keep parking focused on Storck Park and off of Hillside Drive on the small parcel of land on the west side of Hillside Drive.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	Trail access near to Rabbit Creek Road rather than being remote from the road will enhance parking lot safety.	<i>Trail heads are proposed to be sited adjacent to Rabbit Creek Road.</i>
Bob French	Parking lots for trail access to both the south and north sides of the Section 36 ridge should be allowed for in the Master Plan. The existing parking lot at Storck Park can be used in the short term.	<i>The master plan does allow for future parking for trail access and recommends use of parking at Storck Park in the short term.</i>
Caryn Smith	The bus turnaround at the top of Clarks Road already has problems with cars and buses being able to turn around. All methods should be used to discourage parking there including no trailheads at this location.	<i>Parking at the east side of Clark's Road is included in the plan to allow for access to the park from the east and to maintain the possibility for a future southeast connection to Chugach State Park.</i>
Restrooms		
Nancy Pease	Consider toilets. There is a need for porta potties already at Storck Park in summer, and this use might be extended into the winter with all-season permanent pit toilets such as Chugach State Park uses.	<i>The draft plan proposes toilets at each parking area in the future when funding and use increases. For the short-term, toilets are proposed at the parking area at Storck Park.</i>
Bob French	Restroom facilities, including pit toilets are essential to protect health and natural resources.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	Consider toilets. There is a need for porta potties already at Storck Park in summer, and this use might be extended into the winter with all-season permanent pit toilets such as Chugach State Park uses.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	Toilets are a priority over a shelter or warming building because toilets only need pumping.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Restrooms (continued)		
Nancy Pease	Given limited use of resources, toilets are a priority over a shelter or warming building because toilets protect health and natural resources.	<i>See above.</i>
Paddy Sullivan	I see no reason for portable toilets and the winter warming hut.	<i>Most public comments have supported toilets.</i>
Education Center		
Nancy Pease	Education center - no thank you. There is no demonstration of a market, nor a mention of a special focus; and this would be a misuse of funds. There is a very high-class outdoor education center at Campbell Creek already, and there is an intended future Bird Treatment and Learning Center at Potter Marsh; and the MOA can't begin to fund anything comparable. An education center takes ongoing staffing, and MOA Parks staff was just cut nearly in half.	<i>Acknowledged. No specific education facility is proposed in Section 36 in the master plan, other than an interpretative trail near Bear Valley Elementary and the wetland area. The potential for the use of Bear Valley Elementary as a summer Outdoor Education Facility is noted in the plan.</i>
Mike Vogel	If there is a funding source for an outdoor education program, base it at Bear Valley Elementary School to make efficient use of public facilities.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	The facilities and connections need to be designed to attract Bear Valley Elementary kids as well as trail-based recreation for middle and high schools.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	If there is funding for an outdoor education program, base it at Bear Valley School to make efficient use of public facilities.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	If eventual funding for an outdoor education program is dedicated, it could be based at Bear Valley Elementary School.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	There is no demonstration of a market for an education center, nor a mention of a special focus. This would be a misuse of funds.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Education Center (continued)		
Dianne Holmes	An educational center is a very expensive facility and its usefulness is questioned given that the Campbell Science Center already exists. If one is desired, the Bear Valley school may be appropriate, but building a separate facility is not. The expense for such facility and its limited use, in today's poor economic situation, would impact the development of the rest of Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	I don't feel that an "Educational Facility" would be a good use of declining Municipal Park funds, and would take users away from the BLM's Education Center at Campbell Park.	<i>See above.</i>
Warming Hut/Chalet		
Favor - Warming Hut/Chalet		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor a modest chalet or warm up hut in the same quadrant as the parking lot.	<i>Acknowledged. No chalet if proposed in the master plan at this time. The general public feedback favored keeping development to the minimum level.</i>
Lori Davey	Need for a place for the kids to warm up and a small hut is necessary. Therefore, include in the plan a warm up hut.	<i>See above.</i>
Dianne Holmes	A warm up hut should be part of the north side development so the popular and expanding Jr. Nordic program can use the park. This facility needs only to be functional, not fancy.	<i>See above.</i>
Oppose - Warming Hut/Chalet		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We do not favor a chalet or warm up area on Clark's Road.	<i>Acknowledged. No chalet if proposed in the master plan at this time. The general public feedback favored keeping development to the minimum level.</i>
Paddy Sullivan	I see no reason for portable toilets and the winter warming hut.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Low Priority - Warming Hut/ Chalet		
Nancy Pease	A warming building shouldn't be ruled out, but should be low priority. A building requires staffing, whereas pit toilets only need pumping.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Jack Mosby	If any warming structures are built, they better be readily visible. To me, they would be a low priority.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Benches		
Dianne Holmes	Two of the concept plans call for benches, some of which are located near Rabbit Creek Road. Their location here is actually in alder patches without a view or other redeeming value. Remove the benches from the plan.	<i>Several viewpoints were identified during site visits. The plan calls for placing benches and interpretive displays at the main viewpoints.</i>
Boardwalk		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor an ADA compliant educational boardwalk at very low density.	<i>Acknowledged. The master plan currently proposes only one boardwalk from Bear Valley Elementary to an interpretive site at the wetlands.</i>
Nancy Pease	It is cost inefficient to build and maintain boardwalk trails. There is a top-notch boardwalk trail at Potter Marsh with much more visual and educational interest than the Section 36 wetlands.	<i>See above.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor an ADA compliant educational boardwalk at very low density.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	I don't feel that a boardwalk through the wetlands area would be a cost effective use of funds.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	A boardwalk is cost-inefficient to build and maintain.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Wildlife Use		
Consider the wildlife use of the area		
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	The entire wetlands area is not only a moose calving area, but a natural animal corridor for movements of moose, bear, coyote, fox, lynx and occasional wolves. At various times, usually from May through August, moose carcasses have been discovered south of Clark's Road, sometimes west and sometimes east of Heights Hill Road.	<i>The master plan acknowledges that Section 36 provides habitat for a wide variety of wildlife.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	The state wildlife biologist indicated that wildlife species expected to occur in Section 36 include black bear, brown bear, and moose, along with many other species such as voles, shrews, red squirrels, robins, sparrows, juncos, chickadees, red polls, ravens, great horned owls, goshawks, grouse, magpies, coyote, red fox, lynx, mink, marten, porcupine and snowshoe hare.	<i>See above.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	In more recent years, local Bear Valley residents have also reported sightings of wolverine within Section 36.	<i>See above.</i>
Bear Valley Community Council	NOW THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that the BVCC seeks the Section 36 park master plan to include the following:2....the maximization of measures which will prevent abandonment of the land by wildlife, such as bear, moose, wolverine, lynx, wolves, coyotes, eagles, migratory birds, rabbits, weasels, and other resident or transient species;	<i>The MOA Park Plan classifies Section 36 as a Natural Resource Use Area. This designation recognizes the values of the wildlife and flora, but also allows for recreation uses that can be accommodated while minimizing impacts on the natural resources, wildlife habitat, etc. The proposed level of development in the master plan is of a low level, designed to allow for continued use of the area by a variety of wildlife.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Bear/Moose Safety Issues		
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	In addition to potential Municipality liability, there are overriding safety concerns if the Parks & Recreation Department builds or encourages trails to be constructed on Municipal land in known moose calving areas within brown and black bear habitat.	<i>Many of the MOA parks include areas used by moose and bears. The MOA Park Plan classifies Section 36 as a Natural Resource Use Area. This designation recognizes the values of the wildlife and flora, but also allows for recreation uses that can be accommodated while minimizing impacts on the natural resources, wildlife habitat, etc. The proposed level of development in the master plan is of a low level, designed to allow for continued use of the area by a variety of wildlife.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	Any new trail construction and non-winter use should be restricted in the corridor areas due to the increased potential of dangerous moose and bear encounters, particularly for school-aged children.	<i>Minimal trail development is proposed south of Clarks Road.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	There are many bears, black and brown, wolves, coyotes, lynx, moose and wolverines in Section 36. Please make users aware.	<i>See above.</i>
Bob French	The narrow "social trails" envisioned by Concepts 1 and 2 will not provide the bear safety of trails that are both wider and denser. Having people actually use the trails will enhance bear safety.	<i>Many of the MOA parks include areas used by moose and bears. This master plan attempts to balance maintenance of wildlife habitat with recreation uses.</i>
Wildlife Corridor		
Include a wildlife corridor in the Master Plan		
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	A wildlife corridor should be depicted covering the wetlands area south of Clark's Road: the boundaries were recommended by the Alaska Department of Fish & Game; the area is designated for preservation; and, a wildlife corridor would promote the safety of children and park users by reducing the likelihood of moose and bear conflicts.	<i>A wildlife corridor is proposed in the master plan and has been reviewed by biologists from the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. They indicated that a low to medium density of trails would not adversely affect wildlife use of the area. In addition, they noted that although moose and bear may be present, trails in this area would not be any more likely to result in wildlife conflict hazards than other open space/park trails in the Anchorage area.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Include a wildlife corridor in the Master Plan (continued)		
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	The Division of Wildlife Conservation suggested that a vegetated buffer at least 75 feet wide be maintained along the periphery of the preservation wetland and that at least two, 100 foot corridors should be maintained from the top of the ridge to the wetland area to provide animal movement corridors. The preferred locations for these movement corridors would be between the antenna farm road and the intersection of Clark's Road and Heights Hill Road and near the upper end of Clark's Road near the turnaround.	<i>See above.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	Movement corridors should be located in areas where the road shoulders are gently sloped, with no cut-banks to interfere with animal movements.	<i>See above.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	We request that all three Section 36 park concept maps depict as wildlife corridor the entire wetlands area south of Clark's Road, plus a 75 foot buffer area along the wetlands area perimeter and two 100 foot corridors.	<i>See above.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	During the walk with ADF&G, it was discussed that the wetlands in Section 36 run east and west and will naturally create wildlife corridors for movement east to west. So ADF&G identified where the corridors should go for movement north and south. Corridors are described in their letter 1-23-96.	<i>See above.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	The wildlife corridors are also depicted on map Exhibit A of the settlement agreement packet. These corridors were debated during follow-up meetings with the MOA. the corridor next to Heights Hill Road is not shown on the map going north up through the saddle in the ridge to the north and through to Hillside Drive on the north as was described to us by ADF&G during the walk that located these corridors. We were told that the rest of the area was park not to be developed so the entire area would become wildlife corridors.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Include a wildlife corridor in the Master Plan (continued)		
Rodney & Tamara Powell	There was never any discussion of developed trails crossing these corridors. If you plan to develop trails across what are in fact natural wildlife corridors, you will be violating the settlement agreement.	<i>See above.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	The community not only expects the settlement agreement to be followed but they also expect that if you're going to develop near these corridors, they should be physically marked with signs warning people to avoid these areas. Your education curriculum and kiosks/boards should educate users to avoid these areas.	<i>See above.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	Please let me know as soon as possible if you intend to honor the wildlife corridors as located by ADF&G and as agreed upon by the community representatives in 1996. Definition #1A in the settlement agreement undevelopable in this agreement shall mean: wildlife corridors.	<i>See above.</i>
Bear Valley Community Council	NOW THEREFORE IT BE RESOLVED that the BVCC seeks the Section 36 park master plan to include the following:6. The terms on the November 1995 litigation settlement agreement shall be adhered to in all management plans, including in particular the provision of wildlife corridors.	<i>See above.</i>
Ownership		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor the transfer of Section 36 to the Parks & Recreation Department.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Ownership (continued)		
Lori Davey	Section 36 should be transferred to the Parks & Recreation Department, even if funds aren't forthcoming for development of the park.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Dianne Holmes	If it is expected that the Parks & Recreation Department will implement this master plan, then Section 36 needs to be under Parks & Recreation's jurisdiction.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Dianne Holmes	If volunteers or non-profit groups are expected to be the major source of funding and development, then the park should be formally transferred from HLB to Parks & Recreation. Volunteers and granting agencies should not have to deal with intermediary departments/agencies.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Costs/Funding		
Dan Stone	Who is going to pay for this? The MOA is facing the worst budget shortfall ever and now the city is proposing a new park.	<i>The draft plan identifies the primary funding sources available for development and maintenance of Section 36 will be through Partnerships, Capital Improvement Projects, and Operations/Maintenance Funding. The plan acknowledges the fact that MOA funds for construction and operations are limited.</i>
Jay Laxson	The most reasonable option would be to have different user groups combine resources to develop some multi-use trails and allow specific use trails to be developed by specific user groups.	<i>See above.</i>
Jack Brown	Design and development should prioritize low costs for future maintenance and upkeep.	<i>See above.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	Significant park development in Section 36 will be costly at a time when the municipal budget is short of funds.	<i>See above.</i>
Bret Berglund	Costs of construction and long-term maintenance should be considered so significant development such as Concept 3 is unrealistic unless private funds are available.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Costs/Funding (continued)		
Rodney & Tamara Powell	No development at all. Don't spend your money here.	<i>See above.</i>
Ken Robertson	I do not support a huge budget.	<i>See above.</i>
Implementation Priorities		
Dianne Holmes	If this master plan is concluded without a detailed plan of the location of medium to high density cross country ski and multi-use trails, then the first priority should be to develop such a plan.	<i>The draft plan identifies conceptual multi-use trail loops as well as areas where future development can occur. Due to limited MOA funding for improvements, it is likely that volunteer or user groups will need to work with Parks & Recreation to fund detailed design of trail networks.</i>
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We favor medium density, lighted, groomed cross country ski trails. Wide enough to accommodate users such as middle and high school teams and the Jr. Nordic program. This development should be the highest priority.	<i>See above.</i>
Mike Vogel	The first trails should be ski and multi-use trails from Storck Park to take advantage of existing parking and immediately serve the vicinity of the school.	<i>See above.</i>
Nancy Pease	The first trails should be ski and multi-use trails from Storck Park to take advantage of existing parking and immediately serve the vicinity of the school. This could be done without major engineering and no additional MOA Parks staffing.	<i>See above.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Corrections & Clarifications		
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	Many of the trails depicted outside the perimeter of Section 36 are not shown correctly or they do not in fact exist at all. None of these trails are platted easements and, as depicted, they cross private property. The Parks & Recreation Department should not imply that these lines are public trails by putting them on maps or drawings and stating that they are "existing trails."	<i>The master plan concept recommended in this plan does not address trails outside of Section 36. It does indicate the general vicinity where connections to other trails or open space could occur in the future.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	Section 36 Master Plan is not intended to be a trails plan for the Hillside area. Please remove lines depicting any proposed or existing "trails" outside the boundaries of Section 36. Failure to do so may result in unnecessary cases of trespass or invite damage to private property and negatively affect land owners in the area.	<i>See above.</i>
Howard Hosken	I agree with Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson's caution regarding "trails that are depicted outside the perimeter of Section 36. They are not shown correctly or they do not in fact exist at all. None of these trails are platted easements and, as depicted, they cross private property.	<i>See above.</i>
Rodney & Tamara Powell	Take the arrows off your map that lead people across private property.	<i>See above.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	Alascom, Inc. owns rights to a 2.5 acre parcel plus a portion of the Alascom Road. However, Alascom does not own the entire area that is zoned for antenna farm use. Please re-draw the in-holding area to precisely depict the actual private in-holding property boundaries.	<i>This has been corrected.</i>
Scott Pexton and Robin Abramson	The file with additional information erroneously states that "The presence of unique wildlife species and bear encounters are unlikely though a possible moose calving area may be in the wetlands." It is unclear which wildlife the authors consider "unique" in this context.	<i>Discussions with ADF&G indicated that no rare, threatened or endangered species were known to exist in Section 36. Common wildlife species for Southcentral Alaska, such as moose, bear, and lynx are expected to occur in the area.</i>

Public Comment Analysis
Section 36 Master Plan

Other Comments		
Rabbit Creek Community Council	We do not favor naming it Clark Park.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Erik Williamson	I am a leader in Boy Scout Troop 26, whose members mostly live in SE Anchorage. We presently use Section 36 lands for various activities and would welcome active part in this process and assist in projects.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Caryn Smith	I have lived in Bear Valley for 21 years and have worked on Section 36 to get it to a park during that entire time. The original park concept in the development of Section 36 was that everything too steep and too wet was to become a park and everything else was to be developed for housing. Eventually the entire section except the antennae tower and the platted roads became PLI-P. It is a difficult park to plan around because it is divided by roads.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Caryn Smith	I don't want to see an industrial park where the character and uses of the park are more impacting than the original 240 homes that were planned.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Caryn Smith	Tree clearing and cutting should be minimized. Tree clearing for firewise has weakened the ability of the remaining trees to stand up to the 100 mph winds that Bear Valley gets in the winter and early spring.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>
Caryn Smith	Any thoughts of leaving children to ski in Bear Valley on high wind days should be carefully considered as a high hazard to life. Although it is difficult to get people to understand that we do reach Hurricane force winds several times a year in Bear Valley.	<i>Acknowledged.</i>