

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
1	AARP	64	Health & Equity	Are areas with higher concentrations of Alaskans 50+ given higher weights for health and equity? Although they may only constitute 9% of the area population, they are vulnerable users with high health needs	This analysis considers people over 65 and under 18 as vulnerable users and highlights areas with these populations.	No action.
2	AARP	81	Public Support	Have Anchorage residents 50+ specifically been targeted for outreach? How can AARP AK help to facilitate this outreach?	The NMP did not specifically target people 50+ years of age in it's public involvement. This could potentially be done in a future NMP update. The plan could also recommend specific implementation actions to target people in this age group in future education and engagement activities.	Include action item in implementation chapter to specifically target people 50+ in age for education and outreach.
3	AARP	64	Connectivity	What about connectivity to housing or between housing and employment or housing and schools? We know that older Alaskans are desirous of housing that allows them to have needed amenities within a walkable distance. https://aedicweb.com/project/anchorage-housing-survey-report-2018/	The NMP incorporated housing proximity into the demand analysis that was used to prioritized projects in the NMP.	No change recommended.
4	AARP	28		Older Americans are the fastest growing group of cyclists. Bicyclists age 50 and over pedaled an estimated 2.6 billion miles on 830 million rides in 2009 (the latest figures available), according to the U.S. Department of Transportation's National Household Travel Survey. That's way up from 1995 when people in that age group covered less than 400 million miles on 175 million rides. Bicycle riders age 70 to 79 alone made 147 million trips in 2009; those 80 and over took 13 million trips by bike. According to a comprehensive survey released in March 2015 by PeopleForBikes: 19 percent of Americans 55 and older rode a bike in 2014, as did 27 percent between the ages of 45 and 54 and 34 percent of all people over the age of two. 17 percent of older Americans reported riding a bicycle for recreation, seven percent rode as a way to get around and five percent said they bicycled for both transportation and fun. The survey showed that bicyclists age 55-plus hit the road and trails more often than any other adult group with 42 percent riding more than 25 days a year. https://www.aarp.org/livable-communities/getting-around/info-2015/bicycles-bike-riding-older-adults/	This comment does not ask for a specific change to the NMP.	No change recommended.
5	ADOT&PF		General	All maps need to have a more visible way of distinguishing proposed connections, existing connections, and connection gaps. This would make it easier to see where the existing infrastructure is, and would make it clearer where proposed projects/priorities are creating links.	All maps already show proposed connections, which are connecting to existing connections. These proposed connections signify a gap that already exists in the infrastructure.	No change recommended.
6	ADOT&PF		General	Priority should focus on where the existing network has missing links over the creation of further discontinuous segments. Missing links should also be priorities over upgrading existing segments that already provide some use	Closing gaps in the existing infrastructure was a main focus of this plan. Gap closure was incorporated into the data analysis that was used for project selection and prioritization. All proposed projects look to close an existing gap and provide a more cohesive overall network.	No change recommended.
7	ADOT&PF	66	Fig 5.1 Prioritized Bicycle Corridors	Minor connections are proposed for Fig 5.1. Consider closing the gap around HIGH crash areas. HIGH: There are four HIGH crash areas which could benefit the most from big investments in parallel routes where lower Levels of Traffic Stress are available – these are around 1) Muldoon, 2) Northern Lts/Benson, 3) Tudor & Lake Otis to Piper Street, and 4) Dimond Boulevard. MEDIUM: There are also at least 8 other corridors where a difficult and significant investment would be required within the existing right-of-way. Those could rank as MEDIUM (or LOW) investments due to the level of effort over time, if work can be funded beyond routine 1R and 3R work. LOW (or MEDIUM): There are 8 more corridors with relatively simpler low cost longitudinal BIKE investments possible, making them stronger HSIP candidates. These can address sight distance, STOP bar sweeps, and buffers where ROW exists. Might reverse LOW and MEDIUM priorities based on costs and right of way complexity.	Figure 5.1 is the prioritization matrix. Where are the proposed secondary route connections. Also, we are getting conflicting comments that are asking to reprioritized to high major road connections like Northern Lights/Benson and at the same time reprioritize to high secondary connections that run parallel to these roads.	Ask for clarification. Evaluate priorities for major road and secondary parallel roads.
8	ADOT&PF	70	Tbl 5.2 Bicycle Projects	Recommend adding a column to the table for PRIORITY. This could be on the left side and would be consistent with the ped project priority table (5.4).	Figure 5.2 already has a priority column.	No change recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
9	ADOT&PF	156	Tbl 5.4 Sidewalks	Bicycle racks are mentioned on sidewalks. This is followed by Downtown sidewalks. This is the Pedestrian Facilities page. Is it clear bicycles are allowed on these sidewalks?	Bicycles are allowed on sidewalks in some areas of Anchorage although not in Downtown. This does not apply to bicycle racks, however.	No change recommended.
10	ADOT&PF	97	Tbl 5.4 Prioritization (Projects), Figures, Tables	What is the intended project priority for work on existing grade separations? Would this be a line item for an annualized program? There are over 50 structures about 50 years old in place. In the next 20 years, AMATS will need to recognize investment plan to retain, rehabilitate, or remove these structures. This has been occurring already and should be documented in the plan. Recommend describing where capital reinvestment come from in the AMATS funding plan. It is much bigger than deferring to routine M&O. Consider outlining 1) DOTPF Bridge program funding, 2) As 4R capital project budgets allow within AMATS, or 3) by special appropriation, bonding when possible.	Staff agree and a recommended project to develop a line item grade separation improvement fund will be added to the plan.	Add recommendation to 'recommended programs' in Chapter 6.
11	ADOT&PF	146	Tbl 7.1 Pedestrians	Age 9-13. Recommend "may require supervision depending on ability". ITE publishes results of studies with age concerns up through age 11. This is an important factor used in standards to evaluate school zone walking routes and choose traffic control devices. It introduces the need to address non-engineering factors as MOA's Vision Zero designs a system for all ages. No amount of design can make up for lack of supervision when there is a limitation to a pedestrian's ability to exercise reasonable and prudent judgment.	This chart does not have a source, at a minimum a reliable citation is needed.	Alta to review table 7.1 and provide a citation. If a source cannot be found chart should be amended based on cited ITE studies.
12	ADOT&PF	160	Tbl 5.4 Shared Use Pathway or Sidepath	Last par. Cited distances are not agency standards. Please add a note that AMATS and DOTPF does use 0 to 10 feet setbacks (urban) per Regional Details, and 0-8 feet (rural). Clarification is required. Beyond the citation of this one AASHTO statement, there is balancing here the same as there is in the buffer/railing discussion on this page. Sidestreet STOP bar compliance and sight triangles are also critical at intersections. This means sweeps are less than 5 ft and not as great as 24 feet occur in practice, due to multiple citations and a DOTPF HSIP review of sweeps in Anchorage along arterials. AASHTO's Guide (p. 5-43) does not recommend 24 feet of separation unless it is far enough to become a separate intersection. Instead it encourages urban paths to be "in close proximity to the intersection" (p. 5-43).	Staff agrees.	Add note as requested.
13	ADOT&PF	163	Tbl 5.4 Shoulders	PROWAG R302.4 is not adopted for shoulders by DOTPF. Request this design feature (5x5 passing areas) be deleted as a shoulder requirement. Is AMATS prepared to implement 5x5 passing areas on multiuse shoulders throughout Anchorage? On the Hillside?	Staff agrees.	Add note as requested.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
14	ADOT&PF	200	Tbl 5.4 Maintenance Matrix	Disagree with first sentence term "thoughtful roadway design". This term has unclear meaning or definition. It seems to imply the key problems with existing systems begin in Design. Instead, pre-Design efforts and budgets are where the concerns for snow removal are first created. First, Planning has to enable improved snow storage in the scope of work. Second operating budgets must be enough to fund removal staff as well as equipment. Otherwise the problem won't be changed by Design from the current road conditions. When AMATS scopes and budgets are significantly constrained, without right of way authorization, Designers hands are tied and unable to create the snow removal change desired. They have no space to accommodate snow storage. Lack of storage means the same old snow buildup in areas where users want to be. This forces limited hauling of snow. Hauling a) costs extra operating money and time (both in short supply) and b) occurs well after initial removal only a couple times per winter (Undesirable, but buildup must be enough to justify hauling usually mid-season). Recommended change: "One of the most efficient ways to facilitate timely snow removal is to plan, budget, and design for snow storage. For existing corridors, this may require additional right-of-way from adjacent landowners. Given both public and private owners are responsible for snow removal next to the road, the associated delays in hauling and pushing of snow onto each other's work areas are inevitable. A larger public right of way space with agreement for a singular public responsibility could make snow storage and removal more efficient and remove burdens from the private landowner."	Staff agrees.	Make update, with note that another option is reallocation of ROW space.
15	ADOT&PF	86	Tbl 5.4 Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007)	Recommend a new right side STATUS column to show that we track the plan and achieve the plan. Recommend "inadequate" not be a term of use without definition, replace or define. Implies unusable, unsafe, and should be closed, which is not the case. Recommend Abbreviations and definitions at end of table to support notes in the "Description" and "Status" columns.	Making changes to the 2007 Pedestrian Plan is not within the scope of this project.	Staff will review pedestrian project table to make sure it is accurate and reflects any new projects that have been completed since 2007.
16	ADOT&PF	157	Tbl 5.4 Bicycle Facility Selection Tool	Agree with the hierarchy of facilities based on roadway speed and traffic volume. This is consistent with typical project designs to date, and with the DOTPF Highway Preconstruction Manual's reference in Chapter 1200, to the 1994 FHWA guidance for different roadway user skill levels as ADT and speeds go up.	N/A	No change recommended.
17	ADOT&PF	160	Tbl 5.4 Shared Use Pathway or Sidepath	As noted, a 5 ft buffer or a railing is not mandatory and requires balancing all needs. This has clearly not been a common feature for most designs in Anchorage for various reasons noted as balancing.	N/A	No change recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
18	ADOT&PF	61		Anchorage has a 4-5x larger ped fatality problem than bike problem. Ped fatality crashes are higher per mile of facility investment than Portland or Salt Lake City. This indicates that in terms of safety, pedestrian facilities should take priority.	Staff agrees that there is a perception that this plan prioritized bicycles over pedestrians. We will recommend several changes to help change this perception to show that pedestrians are planned for equally in this plan.	1. Add section in the Executive Summary to show examples of facility types. This will help show that enhanced shared roadways and shared use paths are actually serving both pedestrians and bicyclists. 2. Change to color of existing facilities from grey to another color that stands out more. This will give plan observers a better idea of how existing facilities are connecting with proposed facilities. 3. Bring the existing facilities map forward into the executive summary to better illustrate where we are starting from. 4. Include shared use pathways and enhanced shared roadways in pedestrian map. 5. Include icon for modes served in key of both pedestrian and bicycle map.
19	ADOT&PF	162	Tbl 5.4 Equestrian Trails	In the Elmore Road figure shown - where are pedestrians accommodated (other side of road)? Bicyclists are not recommended. How about pedestrians? Can they use the equestrian trail?	Pedestrians are accommodated on the other side of the road where the sidewalk is shown. The equestrian trail is open to both bicyclists and pedestrians.	No change recommended.
20	ADOT&PF		Chapter 5 (All) Prioritization (Projects), Figures, Tables	Recommend a joint meeting with AMATS Planning, MOA Traffic, DOTPF Traffic to review project priorities related to HSIP safety rankings. Safety scores could be checked and increased for projects mitigating top HSIP ranked pedestrian and bicycle areas. While HSIP aligns with the high injury network figures and other barrier maps, the project priority tables do not align as well. The projects rank lower in areas of safety concern, or have many missing areas. Raising project priorities for top ranked DOTPF HSIP corridors helps make a stronger case for federal HSIP funds. Those HSIP funds are value additive to current AMATS allocation. HSIP has recently committed over \$25 million to nonmotorized projects in Design and Construction already. We can better attract future funds when the AMATS plan aligns with HSIP rankings. Pedestrian crash areas in Anchorage are the primary safety focus, as they have the greatest statewide share of nonmotorized serious injuries and deaths historically.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
21	ADOT&PF		Anchorage Downtown Plan	Last sentence. The first part of the recommendation - "improved crossings", remains a possible goal. Downtown is a HIGH HSIP ranked area of crashes. There are always other options, even though AMATS is aware Downtown has already had more investment in curb bulbouts and frequent crosswalks than any other roads. Future options could include increased lighting, pedestrian countdown timers, leading ped intervals, and flashing yellow arrows for turns at key intersections.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
22	ADOT&PF	23	Fig 2.12 High Injury Network Map	No change requested. Correlates to HSIP PED Safety Ranks.pdf	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
23	ADOT&PF	24	Fig 2.14 Level of Traffic Stress	No change requested. Correlates to HSIP PED Safety Ranks.pdf	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
24	ADOT&PF	26	Fig 2.17 Demand Analysis	No change requested. Correlates to HSIP PED Safety Ranks.pdf	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
25	ADOT&PF	42	Fig 3.3 Barriers and Safety Concerns Webmap	No change requested. Partially correlates to HSIP PED Safety Ranks.pdf. Partially correlates to Chapter 2 Figures on Demand, Equity, but not strongly	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
26	ADOT&PF	53	Fig 4.1 Recommended Bicycle Network	Recommend minor changes to Fig 4.1 after comparing with Fig 5.1. Arterial right of way widths are limited by public space available and cost to change. For this reason, it makes sense to look for parallel opportunities. Alternative routes generally have more unused space in Municipal ROW, lower costs to change, and more desirable Levels of Stress. See minor connections recommended for Fig 5.1. These connections could improve HSIP BIKE crash rankings of concern.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
27	ADOT&PF	68	Fig 5.4 Prioritized Pedestrian Corridors	Does not reflect all HSIP HIGH crash areas in the priority list. Request 4 HSIP HIGH PRIORITY corridors line types be upgraded to red lines, to show HIGH PED needs on Gambell, Tudor, Muldoon, and Seward Hwy per HSIP PED Safety Ranks.pdf, showing them as #1, #2, #4, and #6 in the State. All are higher speed, higher volume highways of concern.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
28	ADOT&PF	68	Fig 5.4 Prioritized Pedestrian Corridors	Request MEDIUM Priority corridors match HSIP Top 25% statewide ranks: Add 4th Ave (full length), Lake Otis Pkwy (Dowling to Waldron), Northern Lts Blvd (Lake Otis to Bragaw), Debarr Rd (Airport Hts -Boniface Pkwy), and Boniface Pkwy (Mayflower Cir to Glenn Hwy). Request upgrade to Medium Priority: A St from 5th-6th Ave and Dimond Blvd, C St - Vanguard/88th Ave.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
29	ADOT&PF	70	Tbl 5.2 Bicycle Projects	Recommend edits to list, descriptions, or a RT column to show which segments have HSIP HGHI or MEDIUM crash rankings.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
30	ADOT&PF	84	Tbl 5.3 Priority Pedestrian Corridors	Most HSIP Top 5% HIGH crash corridors are present, but not ranked as HIGH priority. Higher rank can increase chances to attract HSIP funding if it is a data driven rank. Recommend upgrading HIGH ped priority corridors based on their HSIP Program Ranks as noted on Fig 5.4, especially Gambell, Tudor, and Muldoon.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
31	ADOT&PF	84	Tbl 5.3 Priority Pedestrian Corridors	Recommend adding seven more HSIP Top 25% MEDIUM ranked corridors. These were not already mapped on Fig 5.4. The reason for listing them is that even though they have existing facilities, they are older facilities, and could be improved fairly easily if the scope of work was within the existing right of way and modified sight distance, and buffers. These are highlighted in yellow in markups to Table 5.3.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
32	ADOT&PF	86	Tbl 5.4 Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007)	Recommend top note or footnote referencing 2018 HSIP Rankings (10 yrs of data) as a source of input. Recommend deleting decade old HSIP rank # and either put in new ranks or just cite "HSIP ranked concern". Request HSIP legal definition be placed at end of table. This definition applies to MOA, DOTPF, and AMATS use of HSIP crash ranks and recommendations in this table.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
33	ADOT&PF	62		Strictly from a funding perspective, and deciding which projects are likely to go forward, it would be valuable to include HSIP criteria into the prioritization matrix.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.
34	ADOT&PF	171	Tbl 5.4 Bicycle Boxes	Skid resistance. FYI - an option to colored concrete can still be inlaid MMA. This striping material is showing acceptable skid results as good as minimum initial requirements, but after 3 years of winter testing at Spenard Rd and 36th Ave intersection. The key is maximum aggregate is mixed in, is applied to a hand mixed - hand applied material. The final research report and specs remain to be written.	Staff agrees to add language about inlaid MMA here.	Add text about the usefulness of inlaid MMA as an alternative to colored concret in this section.
35	ADOT&PF	97	Tbl 5.4 Prioritization (Projects), Figures, Tables	Recommend listing other grade separations under AMATS consideration now - 92nd Ave (not listed) and Midtown. There are more concerns for grade separation to consider from past community discussion, but they do not have a home in this list, including at the Oean Dock Rd freight crossing and the Tikhatnu/Glenn freeway crossing.	Staff agrees to incorporate these grade separation projects in the NMP.	Incorporate grade seperation projects including 92nd Ave, Ocean Dock Rd freight crossing and the Tikhatnu/Glenn freeway crossing.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
36	ADOT&PF	68	Fig 5.4 Prioritized Pedestrian Corridors	Request adding LOW Priority connections to plan for areas with significant land use, a history of pedestrian/vehicle conflict and deaths, and yet recognizing significant delivery hurdles and timelines affect priority. These include future grade separations a) Campbell Crk at Lake Otis Pkwy (shown on p. 78, 100, 105, but not this Figure), b) 92nd Ave (underway w/AMATS at Scooter Ave - to Dimond Mall complex), c) Tikahtnu Mall to Boundary (larger than Dimond Mall complex but no project), and d) Ocean Dock Road at the northern ramps - (see the existing at-grade conflicts with an expressway design, freight route).	Staff agrees to look at adding low priority connections in these areas.	Look at adding low priority pedestrian connections to Campbell Creek at Lake Otis Pkwy, 92nd Ave, Tikahtnu Mall to Boundary, and Ocean Dock Road at the northern ramps.
37	ADOT&PF	69	Fig 5.5 Prioritized Pedestrian Corridors: Downtown	Request same changes as on Fig 5.4: a) HIGH Priority at Seward Hwy Midtown, Gambell St. B) MEDIUM Priority for 4th Ave, 3rd Ave from Gambell east to Post Rd, and A St 3rd to 6th.	Staff agrees to look at adding low priority connections in these areas.	Look at adding priority connections to Seward Hwy Midtown (High), Gambell St. (High), 4th Ave and rd Ave from Gambell east to Post Road (Medium) and A St 3rd to 6th (Medium).
38	ADOT&PF	53	Fig 4.1 Recommended Bicycle Network	A few smaller but important gaps in the bicycle network may be needed on this map. For example, Elmore N and S of Tudor Bike Lane drops, and 27th Ave perimeter alternatives to Northern Lts Blvd (more are shown in the Spenard Corridor Plan.)	Staff agrees.	Add existing road north of Tudor along Elmore and add bicycle facility north and south of here.
39	ADOT&PF	57	Fig 4.4 Recommended Pedestrian Network	Recommend additional network be reflected as "primary corridors" and "secondary corridors", based on HIGH and MEDIUM crash rankings in HSIP PED Rankings. These crash areas most likely reflect demand as well. Consider adding 4th Ave (all), Mtn View Dr., NE Boniface Pkwy, Lake Otis YMCA area, and Providence Dr in UMed.	Staff agrees.	We will make these changes.
40	ADOT&PF	57	Fig 4.4 Recommended Pedestrian Network	Two other gaps of concern are to/from housing to shopping and large employment in the Ped network. These would include how desirable access is to major mall generators at Tikhatnu, Dimond Mall. AMATS should already recognize 92nd Avenue in ongoing Design work. Beign simiar in scale, Tikhatnu should be reviewed for options. Pedestrians have died trying to walk there, and have died in similar mall areas around the City. Walking route plans would help.	Staff agrees.	Add 92nd Ave and evaluate best corridor designations around Tikhatnu and Dimond mall areas.
41	ADOT&PF	158	Tbl 5.4 Bicycle Boulevard	Please restate the last sentence more similar to the 2nd paragraph for RRFB's on page 181. This would more accurately reflect actual AMATS agency practice, and comply with standards adopted by Statute (the MUTCD). "Critical" by itself can be misleading and implies mandatory. It could lead to perception all crossings automatically benefit from a traffic control device. See the language on page 181, par. 2, or clarify to be more clear on this - the process is to "evaluate and improve crossings based on the findings". Example 1: The 10th Ave bike boulevard was evaluated this way by the City and State. It was found to be adequate without added improvements at this time. Otherwise the City's project would be in noncompliance with this statement as written. Example 2: Hightower Avenue in Girdwood illustrates the flexibility in device selection based on evaluation. While a pushbutton beacon system there made sense at one central location with more conflicts, it did not get automatically applied to all other crosswalks in the community, nor is it always recommended. They key is to evaluate conflicts - gaps, speed, visibility, volumes of competing users, or basically how hard a crossing is to make and whether this is the right spot. Otherwise, building traffic control devices without a data driven evaluation and analysis can lead to misuse, unintended consequences (sometimes crashes) and a waste of limited resources. Just one device can cost \$2500 to \$10,000 per year to operate. If there were as many new pushbutton systems as there are grade separations in Anchorage, the annual AMATS operating budget implications are as high as \$500,000 per year. There are actually about 300 pushbutton signals in Anchorage already, and these already cost over \$2 million per year to operate.	Staff agrees.	Add "The selection and placement of RRFBs are based upon an engineering review of visibility, gaps, speed, crossing length, and traffic and pedestrian volumes." to the last sentence under Bicycle Boulevards.
42	ADOT&PF	173	Tbl 5.4 Rail Crossing	3rd paragraph. Recommend the full title as 1988 Joint ARRC-DOTPF Policy for Rail-Highway Crossings. Recommend citing ARRC Technical Design Standards are required as well.	Staff agrees.	Change text here to include full titles mentioned in this comment.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
43	ADOT&PF	177	Tbl 5.4 Undercrossings	Recommend more clarification or modification of grade separation criteria. Given crossing history in Anchorage, may want to modify DOTPF HPCM 1130.7 further to relax requirements to 1) prioritize greenbelt crossings and 2) school crossings based on walking route plans at less than the 150 peds/hr listed.	Staff agrees.	Add text below last bullet on 177 to "prioritize greenbelt crossings" and "school crossings based on walking route plans at less than the 150 peds/hr listed.
44	ADOT&PF		General	It would likely be informative for the maps to include major bike/ped crossing barriers to give a better picture of the real situation on the ground. Such barriers include major highways, creeks/streams, barricades, railroad (minus breaks for crossings) etc.	Staff agrees.	Staff will look at including a map or description of significant bicycle/pedestrian barriers.
45	ADOT&PF		General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Bragaw to U-Med •Campbell Creek x-ing at Lake Otis •Elmore Bike lane (drops at MLK and Elmore – lack of facilities N of Tudor) •27th Ave corridor/Festival Streets to Northern Lts Mall as per Spenard Corridor Plan •Ped x-ing to major malls: Dimond and 92nd ave, Tikahtnu and Oklahoma •Ped activity to and from airport •Tudor and C •Dimond and C •Old Glenn crossing Bike boulevard routing at Minnesota and 27th Ave	Staff agrees.	Staff will include a map showing these barriers to bicycle/pedestrian crossings.
46	ADOT&PF		Design Guidance Section	Please include 1988 Joint ARRC-DOTPF Policy for Rail-Highway Crossings and ARRC Technical Design Standards.	Staff agrees.	Staff will include this policy in our design guidance chapter.
47	ADOT&PF	67	Fig 5.2, 5.3 Prioritized Bicycle Corridors	Missing some major possibilities for gaps and conflicts along the Glenn pathway corridor through Chugiak-Eagle River and within Downtown Anchorage. Disagree this many miles can be prioritized and accomplished at a MEDIUM priority due to the volume/cost of the work. Consider LOW priority for routes that have significant costs and ROW needs.	The Glenn pathway corridor through Chugiak-Eagle River has been looked at and will be added to the new NMP draft. This comment does not suggest specific connections through Downtown Anchorage. Staff recommends leaving the priorities as is, but adding more time for implementation for each category.	Add Chugiak-Eagle River connection along Glenn Hwy. Add more time to the implementation matrix for medium and long term projects.
48	ADOT&PF	165	Tbl 5.4 Bicycle Lane	Last sent - as an interim solution. Request clarification - exiting is not a forced option. "Bicyclists may choose to proceed through on the roadway under vehicular rules of the road, or are provided the option to exit to the nonmotorized facility and use pushbuttons and follow pedestrian rules of the road." "Ramps may be retained to provide users of various skill levels a choice at larger, busier intersections, just as is standard for roundabouts."	The problem is, most bicyclists don't view ramps as a "choice" option. Their lane disappears and they are directed to move off the road up onto to sidewalk. Staff does not feel comfortable suggesting that a ramp poses a choice rather than a road design directive to the cyclist.	No change recommended.
49	ADOT&PF	163	Tbl 5.4 Signed Routes	AMATS has been working to clarify the signed routes. White/green BIKE ROUTE signs are used where bike rules of the road apply, and black/white PATHWAY signs are used where regulatory ped rules of the road apply. We use two signs. Consider two figures. We have many older BIKE ROUTE signs for curbed facilities that do not operate beyond ped rules. Our goal is to be clearer with the distinct use of these two signs.	This seems unnecessarily confusing. Why are there two signs for following the rules of the road? Shouldn't rules of the road be followed everywhere?	No change recommended.
50	ADOT&PF	64	Tbl 5.1 Prioritization Criteria Matrix	Request edits to Connectivity and Safety scores as HIGH in HIGH crash areas, as demonstrated by HSIP Program Ranking 2018 using a longer period of crash history to accumulate more patterns. Request ped and bike projects/priorities in Tables 5.3, 5.4 be assigned the full 5 points reflecting HSIP Top 5% HIGH crash areas and the full 3 points in HSIP Top 25% MEDIUM crash areas.	Unfortunately, at this point, reassigning and recalculating criteria values in the prioritization criteria matrix is well beyond the scope of our budget for this plan. We can look at making this change in a future NMP effort.	No change recommended.
51	ADOT&PF	86	Tbl 5.4 Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007)	Recommend updating Priority in left column. After a decade later, many are out of date and out of order since 2007. Would help by deleting number system and instead new ranking of HIGH, MED, LOW	Updating the 2007 Pedestrian Plan project prioritization is not within the scope of this project and would require a completely new data analysis.	No change recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
52	ADOT&PF	53	Fig 4.1 Recommended Bicycle Network	Comparing to Demand and Equity maps – pg 26, 30-31. Safety problems are prevented by meeting Demand. Currently Northern Light Blvd in this area is demonstrated as a MEDIUM Bicycle Crash corridor of concern. Is Fig 4.1 missing a more direct Bragaw Street connection from northern neighborhoods to the largest opportunities for education and employment in the U-Med district? This would appear to fit the plan goals in Table 1.1.	We have had a number of comments about the priority of Northern Light's Blvd and Benson roads. We will take another look at reprioritizing these corridors from medium to high. Staff agrees that we need to add a connection from northern neighborhoods to UMed area.	Look at reprioritizing Northern Lights/Benson to HIGH> Label ALL streets on ALL maps. Add connection
53	ADOT&PF	165	Tbl 5.4 Bicycle Lane	A design width of six feet is not as much of a concern for designated, marked, signed bicycle lanes. However, consider if another paragraph for clarification can be added. When not designated, marked, and signed as a bicycle lane, 6 foot is a concern approaching major urban intersections. This is wide enough some motorists have been observed to intentionally use it as an auxiliary vehicle turn lane.	AMATS would not be recommending bicycle lanes that are not designated, marked and signaled as a bicycle lane.	No change recommended.
54	ADOT&PF	70	Tbl 5.2 Bicycle Projects	Over a dozen small additions are recommended to "complete" the routes of AMATS future projects (see orange rows). These are alternative routes to HSIP ranked areas, and may not occur if not listed. Currently projects listed sometimes terminate "away" from the high injury network and do not complete the alternative route. y table (5.4).	Request meeting to go over HSIP coordination.	No change recommended at this time.
55	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 1 (Introduction)	On the connectivity issue, we urge you to make sure your maps throughout this non-motorized plan reflect the opportunities and gaps in Anchorage's non-motorized connections north to Eagle River and south to Girdwood.	Staff agrees that opportunities can be emphasized.	Text edits will be made to emphasize opportunity in Ch 2 and 5 and added to the Executive Summary.
56	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 1 (Introduction)	We appreciate your consideration of equity, inclusion, health, safety, winter maintenance and connectivity.	N/A	No change recommended.
57	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 5	The Moose Loop IS the active transportation network spine from which connectivity expands to the mountains, to the sea and to every neighborhood in-between.	N/A	No change recommended.
58	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 7	A large group of stakeholders and the broader Anchorage community are unified in this branding effort. A team of volunteers from the Anchorage Trails Initiative, part of AEDC's Live.Work.Play effort, analyzed connectivity routes for the Moose Loop and settled on an "official" route. Participants included representatives from Anchorage Economic Development Corporation, Anchorage Park Foundation, Bike Anchorage, Alaska Trails, Visit Anchorage, health care, engineering and transportation professionals and new bicycle users among others.	N/A	No change recommended.
59	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 18	The Moose Loop is special because it safely connects Anchorage residents to each other through dozens of parks and neighborhoods. We support all opportunities to link neighborhoods and parks together, whether it's a sidewalk, soft surface trail, paved path, shared use pathway – any opportunity that still allows for winter maintenance so we can be active year round. There are many opportunities to make these types of connections.	N/A	No change recommended.
60	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 30	Identifying the barriers to connectivity and working to resolve them requires communication, cooperation and partnerships between state and local agencies and departments – parks, traffic, engineering, planning, neighborhoods, elected officials and leadership. The Anchorage Park Foundation is ready and willing to be an active participant to improve our active transportation infrastructure.	N/A	No change recommended.
61	Anchorage Parks Foundation	132	Chapter 2, 4 & 31	Open Streets/Parklets/Pop ups (p. 132): We strongly support any pilot projects that promote connectivity. There are opportunities in many neighborhoods across Anchorage, including those organized by Anchorage Downtown Partnership and those identified in the Spenard Corridor Plan for festival streets.	N/A	No change recommended.
62	Anchorage Parks Foundation	134	Chapter 2, 4 & 32	Winter Maintenance (p. 134): Again, as a Winter City Anchorage needs a serious plan to keep our roadways safe for all users year-round. We applaud Anchorage Parks and Recreation for the work they did on the Moose Loop trails this year. The traffic data proves the increase in use throughout 2020.	N/A	No change recommended.
63	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 34	The Anchorage Park Foundation is proud to be a part of the CDC's Active People, Healthy Nation campaign to get 27 million more Americans active by 2027. We look forward to working with you to implement this active transportation plan to make Anchorage more active and healthy, together.	N/A	No change recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
64	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 1 (Introduction)	Winter maintenance continues to be a concern for bicycle and pedestrian safety. We urge the creation of a task force to look at funding solutions so we can have a healthy winter city that prioritizes active transportation year-round on both city and state owned/managed streets.	Staff agrees.	Include the development of a Winter Task Force as a near term action item in the implementation matrix.
65	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 5	We request that Anchorage's Moose Loop shared use pathways- the Coastal, Campbell, Chester and Ship Creek trails - AND the streets that connect them, be identified on all the maps as a connected and prioritized existing and proposed bicycle network. The Moose Loop is the pride and joy of our existing investment in active transportation infrastructure. It is safe, it is used heavily, and branding it as the Moose Loop is compelling and memorable. It helps the public identify a reference point for how to better connect their daily destination routes to that system. It also serves as a destination trail to attract and retain a quality workforce to Anchorage, making us more competitive and increasing prosperity for all.	Staff agrees.	Staff will add these recreational networks to our overall network maps and distinguish them as community resources.
66	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 8	We recommend the green BIKE ROUTE signage be strategically added to the city/state streets between the shared use pathways so people feel comfortable that they are on the correct route.	Staff agrees.	Include coordination with the municipal traffic department and ADOT&PF to add green BIKE ROUTE signage to strategic network connection areas, as an action item in the implementation table.
67	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 9	Below is the list of streets that we request signage, starting counter-clockwise from mile 0.0 at the start of the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail (at the Downtown intersection of 2nd Avenue). All are Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) streets except where listed.	Staff agrees.	Include this list of streets as areas to incorporate green BIKE ROUTE signage in above action item.
68	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 10	Tony Knowles Coastal trail travels south for 10.5 miles to Kincaid Park Chalet and Raspberry Rd. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raspberry Road from Kincaid Park Chalet to Sand Lake Road • Sand Lake Road south to Dimond Boulevard (state maintained road) • Dimond Boulevard east to Jewel Lake Terrace (state maintained road) • Jewel Lake Terrace north one block to 88th Avenue (where it enters the Campbell Creek Trail) 	Staff agrees.	Include this list of streets as areas to incorporate green BIKE ROUTE signage in above action item.
69	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 11	Campbell Creek Trail travels east and south for 7.5 miles, merges into the Chester Creek Trail, crosses the bridge at Northern Lights Boulevard at East High and connects to Russian Jack Park at Pine St. This is also the intersection where people may choose to take the Chester Creek Trail west to Westchester Lagoon. Anchorage Park Foundation comments on AMATS non-motorized plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pine Street/McCarrey Street north to Mountain View Drive (some signage exists) • Mountain View Drive west to N. Lane • N. Lane Street ½ block through Louie G. Mizelle Park to Peterkin Blvd. • Peterkin Bike Boulevard (signage already exists) to Meyer Street • Meyer Street south ½ block to Richmond • Richmond Ave west merges into Ship Creek Trail at Tyson Elementary School 	Staff agrees.	Include this list of streets as areas to incorporate green BIKE ROUTE signage in above action item.
70	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 12	Ship Creek Trail travels west for 2.5 miles to the intersection with N. C Street <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N. C Street (state maintained road) to W. 1st Ave • W. 1st Avenue/Christensen to W. 2nd Ave. • W. 2nd Avenue merges on to Tony Knowles Coastal Trail 	Staff agrees.	Include this list of streets as areas to incorporate green BIKE ROUTE signage in above action item.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
71	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 13	Other Priority Projects: On the network development and prioritization issue, we are supportive of all efforts to increase opportunities for safe corridors, particularly those that connect to the Moose Loop. The Moose Loop active transportation infrastructure connects dozens of parks with restaurants, shops, schools and attractions throughout the city. We would like you to consider giving a higher priority to the roads that connect to the Moose Loop so there is a seamless, protected corridor to walk, bike and roll to daily destinations.	Staff agrees.	Make the "Moose Loop" a high priority project.
72	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 14	Momentum is building for the vision of an Alaska Long Trail, similar to the west coast's Pacific Crest Trail. Work has begun to build this connected trail from Fairbanks to Seward, including portions of the Iditarod National Historic Trail, and we don't want Anchorage to miss out on being part of that connected system. From the North, we want to connect Mirror Lake to the Glenn Highway trail to the Moose Loop access point in Mountain View, which connects to the Ship Creek Trail and revitalization efforts downtown and at the small boat launch. We are strongly supportive and appreciate of AMATS' high prioritization to connect the Ship Creek Trail to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail. We support the proposed Blue Route that would extend the Ship Creek Trail west from C Street to the small boat launch area and beyond to connect with the Coastal Trail at Elderberry Park.	Staff agrees.	Include language in the plan to give extra support for the Blue Route listed in this comment.
73	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 15	The Alaska Long Trail will also connect to Anchorage from the south. There are only a few missing links remaining between Girdwood and Anchorage along the Seward Highway to Potter Marsh. From Potter Marsh we would like to help you prioritize the safest connections to the Moose Loop's Campbell Creek and Coastal Trails.	Staff agrees.	Add "Work with the Anchorage Parks Foundation to develop connections to the Moose Loop's Campbell Creek and Coastal Trails." as an action item in the implementation matrix.
74	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 16	On the Potter Marsh portion, opportunities may still exist to partner with Alaska Department and Fish and Game as they upgrade the old DOT Potter Marsh weigh station at the south end of the marsh where Potter Valley Road leaves the Seward Highway (aka the "mailbox pullout"). There is only 1/3 of a mile to connect this site to the Turnagain Arm trailhead at Potter Creek. This connecting trail would act as an alternative trailhead to the Turnagain Arm trail, particularly in winter when the upper lot at the trailhead is closed.	Staff agrees.	Include this recommendation to partner with ADF&G as action item in the implementation matrix.
75	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 19	Connect Fairview by linking the Chester Creek Trail to Ship Creek Trail – this greenbelt connection is supported by the Fairview Community Council.	Staff agrees.	Include this connection as a greenbelt connection in the plan.
76	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 20	Connect Spenard: We strongly support the Fish Creek Trail to the Ocean plans (from Cuddy Park to the Coastal Trail) and the Ure Park connection to the Fish Creek Trail.	Staff agrees.	Include this connection as a greenbelt connection in the plan.
77	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 21	North/South Corridors: We also support the 2010 Anchorage Bicycle Plan's proposed separated multi-use pathway along the Alaska Railroad corridor, which would provide an important undivided north-south pathway through Anchorage.	Staff agrees.	Work with ARRC to include this connection in the plan.
78	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 22	We strongly support the NE Connector Trail to connect neighborhoods to Far North Bicentennial Park.	Staff agrees.	Include this connection in the plan.
79	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 23	Connect Muldoon (the perimeter trail): The Anchorage Areawide Trails Plan shows a planned/proposed multi-use trail extending east from DeBarr Road and continuing along Chester Creek in what is now the Muldoon Town Square Park site, north of Windsong Park. This trail is shown connecting with a planned/proposed north-south multi-use trail along the MOA/JBER property boundary, and identified as the "Muldoon Perimeter Trail" in the East Anchorage District Plan.	Staff agrees.	Include this connection in the plan.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
80	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 29	We were happy to see the Campbell Creek Trail/Lake Otis crossing identified as an example in this implementation section. We strongly support this project and encourage you to give this project a higher priority due to its popularity and extensive use. A less expensive alternative to the bridge could be a High intensity Activated crossWalk (HAWK) pedestrian crossing beacon, which is commonly used in other cities, especially at major arterials with minor street intersections. Unlike traffic signals, the HAWK only operates when a pedestrian pushes the crossing button.	Staff agrees.	Make the Campbell Creek Trail/Lake Otis crossing a HIGH priority project in the plan.
81	Anchorage Parks Foundation	189	Chapter 2, 4 & 33	Signage and Wayfinding (Design Section, p. 189): We strongly support better wayfinding on the city streets that connect to the Moose Loop. We also encourage the recognition and integration of Indigenous Place Names signage, to celebrate and honor the indigenous people of this land.	Staff agrees.	Include the development of recognition and integration of Indigenous Place Names signage as an action item in the implementation matrix.
82	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 27	We would also like to add a new Schools on Trails trail project to this non-motorized plan. It would be to create a non-motorized trail connecting Golden View Middle School and Bear Valley Elementary School via a Section Line Easement and platted-but-undeveloped pedestrian easement.	Staff needs to check on MOA coordination before implementing adding this connection in the plan.	No change recommended at this time.
83	Anchorage Parks Foundation	131	Chapter 2, 4 & 25	Safe Routes to School (p. 131): Anchorage Park Foundation's Schools on Trails program has helped identify better, safer trail connections to schools and worked to build them with Anchorage Parks and Recreation utilizing the Youth Employment in Parks program. A recent example is the Rabbit Creek Trail connection to Rabbit Creek Elementary.	Staff needs to check on MOA coordination before implementing adding this connection in the plan.	No change recommended at this time.
84	Anchorage Parks Foundation		Chapter 2, 4 & 26	We strongly support a separated bikeway and increasing from medium to high the prioritization of Huffman Road. Chapter 5, page 78 calls for a 3.6 mile length on Upper Huffman from Toilsome Hill Drive to Lake Otis Parkway. Huffman is part of the Hillside District Plan and the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. Huffman Elementary is at the intersection of Huffman and Elmore and would support safe routes to school. The Principal at Huffman Elementary is strongly supportive. There is currently no trail connection east on Huffman between Elmore and Birch. If built it would connect to many other safe trails in the area.	Staff needs to check on MOA coordination before implementing adding this connection in the plan.	No change recommended at this time.
85	Anderson, Evan		General	There's a few things I've observed – our communities are totally divided by major roads, and in many instances the trails offer needed connectivity – but not always.	N/A	No change recommended.
86	Anderson, Evan		General	I am concerned about the increasing numbers of pedestrian fatalities, particularly the deaths of houseless individuals. These are tragedies that are preventable with better transportation policy. I believe that increased investments in services for houselessness, drug & alcohol treatment, and mental health services are needed to ensure all residents have a safe place – but I also believe in sanctioned camps for houseless individuals – to ensure that they can stay safe wherever they happen to spend the night. The presence of houseless individuals shouldn't make trail users feel less safe – in fact, I feel safer on the trails at night when I've had the chance to stop & chat with campers in the area.	N/A	No change recommended.
87	Anderson, Evan		General	I believe that until we start investing in protected bikeways on major arteries, it will be impossible to reach the level of connectivity I know many of us are hoping for. I would love to see bike-ways (with a protective barrier) on either C or A st to connect downtown with mid-town, and an East-West route on either 15th Ave or Northern Lights. Downtown, I believe 5th or 6th Ave should have a full-lane bikeway as well. This may require widening streets in some instances, or removing a full lane of car traffic in others – and I believe that is worth it. In mid-town, I think a full lane on Northern Lights / Benson could be converted as well – and where they intersect with Spenard / Arctic / C st, they would offer improved bike/ped access to a huge commercial region.	Staff agrees.	Explore incorporating protected bikeways with a protective barrier on C and A street connections from midtown to downtown, 15th, Northern Lights, Benson, and 5th avenue.
88	Anderson, Evan		General	In South Fairview, where I live, we need lower speed limits, speed bumps, and sidewalks - everywhere. The 20th Avenue corridor is especially troublesome, with no real crosswalk onto Juneau St or Karluk St, and tons of pedestrians/bikers/kids crossing to the Chester Creek greenbelt all the time.	Staff agrees.	Include traffic calming recommendations for the 20th Avenue corridor (crossings on Juneau St and Karluk Street) in the plan.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
89	Anderson, Evan		General	Another area of concern is in Mountain View -- I love the Ship Creek Trail, but I think there is a need for protected bikeways and better wayfinding so that more neighborhood residents can find the trail -- and while the Pine Street bridge is accessible, many neighbors cross the Bragaw bridge on foot/bike -- and that is another place where dedicated ped/bike facilities are sorely needed.	Staff agrees.	Explore recommendations for protected bikeways and wayfinding signage connecting Ship Creek trail with the Mountain View neighborhood.
90	Anderson, Evan		General	Thanks for all your work on the non-motorized plan. I'm a bike commuter & dog-owner living in Fairview, and I've lived in Fairview or downtown for the last 6 years -- the first 3 years of which I didn't own a car and was entirely reliant on walking & biking. I owe my ability to do that to the excellent organizers & planners who have made the green-ways of our city so safe & accessible.	Wow thank you!	No change recommended.
91	Babb, Melissa	viii	Figure ES.2	Does this plan include consideration of potential future connections to areas outside the AMATS boundary (will any of these trails/bike paths connect to an trails heading north to the Valley, south to Girdwood, or even up into the foothills?).	AMATS can only plan within our AMATS boundary. Any areas outside our boundary are not allowed to be included in any federal fund expenditures.	No change recommended.
92	Babb, Melissa	19	Figure 2.6	Do you need this graphic? It's hard to read and it doesn't seem to be referenced in the text.	AMATS fields a lot of questions about road ownership from local, municipal and state agencies as well as the public. We feel that including the ownership map in this plan is helpful.	No change recommended.
93	Babb, Melissa	8		How does this plan relate to the Non-Motorized section, particularly Chapter 7, of the MTP2040 plan? I think this plan includes a ton of great information, but I'm not clear on how it relates to other existing plans. If it is meant to supersede the other plans, then we (designers) should be able to set those other plans aside and just come to this one for guidance on all non-motorized transportation projects from now on. It seems like this plan is still relying on those older plans for design criteria.	The MTP2040 includes projects that were listed in the previous MTP, the TIP, the previous Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans and projects that were funded as part of the Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funds. Because of project timing, it does not include new recommendations that can be found in the NMP. The NMP will include the projects found in the MTP2040, however, but the MTP will still serve as the overarching planning document for AMATS. The NMP is not meant to supercede the MTP. It is meant to augment it. The NMP includes a design chapter that recommends design criteria in greater detail that exists in the MTP. It draws on best national practice for its design recommendations, largely those found in NACTO design guides and updated AASHTO guidelines as well as others.	No change recommended.
94	Babb, Melissa	28	tend to be correspond	Awkward wording	Staff agrees.	Text to be updated.
95	Babb, Melissa	30	Figure 2.20	Maybe consider calling these "areas of higher relative need" and "areas of lower relative need" instead.	Staff agrees.	Changes made to maps 2.20 - 2.22.
96	Babb, Melissa	189	general comment re: Chapter 7	What about the use of technology? https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8-1NolxYsBQ Link to signage using light projection onto a snowy surface. This has MANY applications, not just signage.	Staff agrees.	Add note to Chapter 7 about new technology and add this as an example.
97	Babb, Melissa	131	Driver Education Program	YES YES YES!!! This needs to be emphasized!	N/A	No change recommended.
98	Babb, Melissa	139	general comment re: Chapter 7	I'm excited to see these ideas implemented in future projects!	N/A	No change recommended.
99	Babb, Melissa	174	Protected Intersection photo	This would be so great to see implemented in town. I foresee objections from snow plow operators, but I'm sure there are ways we could adapt this design to accommodate snow plow needs.	N/A	No change recommended.
100	Babb, Melissa	1		Doesn't quite make sense to leave this entirely for a future planning process as aspects of the Recreation Trails are very important for this plan as well. Bike commuting may also happen on recreation trails.	Opportunities to address the recreational shared use pathway and trails network are only described briefly in this plan as they are recommended to be addressed comprehensively in a future Recreational Trails Plan process.	No change recommended at this time.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
101	Babb, Melissa	1		I agree with Erik's comment on this. The trail system is an integral part of the city's non-motorized transportation network. It is understood that there are complications regarding ownership and maintenance of those trails vs. AMATS sidewalks and pathways, but they are all part of the same system and should be considered as part of this plan.	Opportunities to address the recreational shared use pathway and trails network are only described briefly in this plan as they are recommended to be addressed comprehensively in a future Recreational Trails Plan process.	No change recommended at this time.
102	Babb, Melissa	2	Figure 1.1	The existing "spine" isn't reading very clearly in these graphics. Perhaps it should be highlighted with a thicker line and brighter color, especially if it is integral to the structure of the network.	Staff agrees.	Increase thickness of "spine" in the overall network so it can be seen more clearly.
103	Babb, Melissa	20	Second line of text. "Severe" is misspelled.	Spelling	Staff agrees.	Fix this typo.
104	Babb, Melissa	26	Figure 2.17	This is a great graphic. Just as a resident, and in looking at this graphic, it seems like there is a serious need for stronger and quicker connections between Midtown and Downtown. I'm curious why improved connections between the two hubs aren't considered high priority projects.	Staff agrees.	Explore options to reprioritize midtown-downtown connections to high priority.
105	Babb, Melissa	27	While several of these corridors, such as Tudor Road, do feature sidepaths, it should be noted that gaps in the sidepath network, alignment along only one side of the roadway, and unsignalized crossings limit the utility and comfort of these facilities.	This is a super important point, and maybe should be highlighted. Just because a sidewalk exists, doesn't mean it's a good one. Take Spenard for example....	Staff agrees.	Insert text on this page to indicate that there are many places where gaps exist in the sidepath network. List a few ways that sidewalks are being addressed in this plan and agency wide.
106	Babb, Melissa	53	Figure 4.1	Is this not already a separated bikeway on the south side of Raspberry?	Staff agrees.	Fix this graphic to show the current facility.
107	Babb, Melissa	69	Figure 5.5 (referencing gap in pedestrian corridor network at both A Street and New Seward at the Chester Creek corridor.	Same comment as above. These seem like significant gaps in the network, and based on the matrix should have scored as high priority projects.	Staff agrees.	Our project team will take another look at adding pedestrian corridor priority recommendations that connect Chester Creek with A Street and New Seward Hwy.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
108	Babb, Melissa	107	Figure 6.6	Bettisworth North graphics... need to ask about Image credit?	Staff agrees.	Staff has asked for image credit permission. It was granted. Insert "Image courtesy of Bettisworth North" under graphic.
109	Babb, Melissa	18	Figure 2.4	The green is hard to read against the gray and green of the base graphic.	Staff disagrees.	No change recommended.
110	Babb, Melissa	17	Existing Bicycle Facilities Infographic	It would be helpful if these statistics reflected the color designations on the map	Staff is unsure what "statistics" are being referred to in this comment.	No change recommended at this time.
111	Babb, Melissa	56	The Anchorage Pedestrian Plan of 2007 can be used as a primary resource for identifying the type of facility (e.g. sidewalk or sidepath) that is recommended for a given corridor.	Why are we referencing the 2007 plan at all if the facility type should be updated according to this plan and current conditions/best practices.	The project team decided to include projects from the 2007 Pedestrian Plan for a few reasons. 1) Implementing pedestrian projects is hugely expensive and therefore, only a small percentage of projects from the 2007 plan were able to be implemented in the last 23 years. 2) A lot of these projects are still relevant today. 3) Current municipal GIS data for sidewalks and sidepaths is not up to date and would require a complete overhaul and update in order to perform a comprehensive inventory and analysis to recommend and prioritize a new list of pedestrian projects in the AMATS area. This was not within the project scope for this planning effort although AMATS has made it an action item in this plan and a goal for the MOA.	No change recommended.
112	Babb, Melissa	143	Anchorage Pedestrian Plan, Anchorage Bicycle Plan, Areawide Trails Plan	Same comment again. Not sure why we need to reference these. If this plan is meant to supersede, combine, and update past plans, then these should be set aside.	This plan will supercede the existing Anchorage Bicycle Plan and Anchorage Pedestrian Plan. We are only including the pedestrian plan projects for the reasons we listed above. The NMP will eventually supercede the 1996 Areawide Trails Plan but not until such time as a comprehensive trails inventory has been completed as well as a separate planning effort. At that time the NMP will be amended to include the new Areawide Trails Plan element.	No change recommended.
113	Babb, Melissa	17	Figure 2.3	what do the yellow and dark blue represent?	Yellow represents existing bicycle boulevards. Dark blue represents existing bicycle lanes.	No change recommended.
114	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	Adding training and outreach for Traffic Control Plan engineers and operators to ensure that temporary signage and detours are compatible with bike facilities. Signs must not block bike lanes or paths, and detours must be safe and convenient to encourage their use. The Plan should advocate for prioritizing access for non-motorized users at the same level as motorized traffic even when construction or temporary closures limit the use of a facility.	AMATS has provided and will continue to provide training opportunities for transportation engineering agency municipal and state staff as well as for private sector transportation professionals.	No change recommended.
115	Bike Anchorage	n/a	Chapter 7. Design	b. We also ask that designs described and recommended by the Plan consider the entire roadway, not just the bicycle facilities. Designs and speeds on the motorized roadway strongly affect safety and comfort for bicyclists, even when separately designated facilities are provided. To encourage active transportation the Plan should suggest the use of slow design speeds and traffic calming to ensure that motorized traffic speeds match the NACTO recommendations for the proposed bicycle facility type. Roads that are safe and speed-limited by design will reduce the burden on law enforcement and improve the experience for all non-motorized users of a corridor.	Efforts to address the entire roadway are not within the scope of this planning project. AMATS does however plan to begin work on a Street Typologies Plan in 2021, which will look at design and speed for entire roadways as well as designated vehicle speeds.	No change recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
116	Bike Anchorage	n/a	Chapter 2. Existing Conditions	a. Some of the “secondary paved paths” marked on the Existing Bicycle Network Map do not meet AASHTO standards for sidepaths due to narrow widths and lack of either a five-foot offset or a barrier from the roadway. In some cases, the best facility for biking switches between sides of the road, sometimes at unmarked/unsigaled intersections, so that either option—crossing or continuing on the unsuitable sidewalk—would be dangerous. Examples include long sections of Tudor, Northern Lights, Lake Otis, Minnesota, and Boniface. Many of these corridors were identified in the 2010 Anchorage Bicycle Plan as high-crash areas for bicyclists. We suggest excluding these inappropriate and dangerous facilities from consideration as “existing bicycle facilities” because they do not provide safe accommodation for bicyclists. As noted in the Plan, further study of sidepath conditions would help inform which sidepaths are suitable bike facilities.	Suggest additional text edit.	We understand that not all pathways meet AASHTO standards. One weakness of the existing data is lack of detailed information about which pathways meet and do not meet standards. We will add this note to the existing conditions chapter.
117	Bike Anchorage	n/a	Chapter 2. Existing Conditions	The mapped network ignores many small gaps in the existing facilities. For example, bike lanes drop out on sections of Wisconsin and Arctic, both at intersections and along the roadway. Although these breaks in infrastructure are short, they affect the bikeability of the entire corridor. We suggest displaying breaks in the lines, adding lane-drop marks, or using color variation to identify the incompleteness of corridors where facilities are not consistently available. We also recommend that the Plan explicitly encourage closing these gaps whenever possible, such as when reconstruction projects are planned for other reasons. Addressing these gaps or providing a continuous alternate route will be important actions in improving connectivity of the non-motorized network	Suggested text edits.	We will add a note about general conditions including drops in the existing conditions and adding language in Chapter 5, addition of a gap closure policy in Chapter 6.
118	Bike Anchorage	n/a	Chapter 7. Design	d. In the Design Guide (Chapter 7), please also provide the turning radii for the indicated types of bicycles. Turning radii are a key element of facility design and providing them here will help inform future projects. Please also specify that a 10’ cargo bike should be used as the design vehicle, as this will ensure that all bicycle types are accommodated, including those used by cyclists with mobility limitations or those traveling with children in a trailer.	This isn't a typical request because turning radii typically depends more on turning user than vehicle.	AMATS needs to determine appropriate design vehicle. Alta has typically seen ten foot cargo as one type of bicycle that needs to be accommodated but not used as the design vehicle for a plan.
119	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	Improving lighting, especially at driveways and intersections where conflicts are most frequent, so that non-motorized users are more visible.	Suggested text edits.	Will add general language on lighting to chapter 5.
120	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	Chapter 7, Supplemental Bike Facilities - Paved Shoulders subsection. This subsection talks about pedestrians only, but it's in a bike section; was some bike-relevant information meant to be included here?	Recommend additional content.	Alta to add bike-relevant information to this section.
121	Bike Anchorage	n/a	Chapter 7. Design	Optimal design and implementation. We provide a few suggestions for ensuring that design elements described in the Plan optimize safety and useability of the non-motorized network.	N/A	No change recommended.
122	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	3. Non-infrastructure solutions. The Non-Motorized Plan currently focuses almost exclusively on infrastructure-based improvements. We suggest that the Plan also identify and advocate for other solutions that could improve the network, such as:	N/A	No change recommended.
123	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	It would be useful to provide the current maintenance costs for each corridor to provide a basis for comparison with the estimated maintenance costs of proposed projects. The stand-alone values for future maintenance do not have any context, as it's unclear whether that would be an increase or decrease over current maintenance costs.	Providing maintenance costs for each corridor included in the AMATS area is not within the scope of this planning project.	No change recommended.
124	Bike Anchorage		Chapter 2. Existing Conditions	Inaccuracies in the Existing Bicycle Network map. We identified a few aspects of the map of existing facilities that appear inaccurate or misleading. We urge the team to make this map as accurate and representative as possible to best represent current bicycling conditions and therefore best inform identification of gaps in the network.	Staff agrees.	The project team will take another look at the existing conditions map to ensure that it is accurate.
125	Bike Anchorage	n/a	Chapter 2. Existing Conditions	For now, we would like to see more explicit acknowledgment that some of the indicated “secondary paved paths” are unsuitable—perhaps both in the text discussing the Existing Bicycle Network and by using a different color to denote substandard facilities on the map. Evaluation of gaps in the existing network must consider the fact that many of these secondary paths are unsuitable and dangerous for bicycling.	Staff agrees.	We will make edits to the plan to reflect that some of these secondary paved paths are unsafe and substandard.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
126	Bike Anchorage	n/a	Chapter 7. Design	c. Please explicitly state that bike lane widths should not include the gutter pan. In some existing facilities, gutter pans appear to be considered part of the bike lane. However, gutters are not safe for bicycle travel, or even as an emergency refuge for evasive action, because 1) gutters are too often filled with road debris, 2) the gutter pan is angled, presenting a particular hazard when wet, icy, or covered in debris, 3) the seam between the gutter and asphalt can catch bike tires and unseat the bicyclist, and 4) the bicyclist must maintain some space from the curb to avoid contacting it with their foot while pedaling.	Staff agrees.	We will add language that explicitly states that the gutter pan should not be included in the bike lane width.
127	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	a. Improving wayfinding signage. We suggest adding short-term goals to the plan to provide signs that 1) identify bicycle routes, and 2) identify cross-streets on bicycle paths where road signs are not visible (for example, at intersections on off-road multi-use paths). 3) Adding signage to correct “dead end” and “no outlet” signage where non-motorized pathways connections exist down those roads. Streamlining route-finding will greatly improve the useability of the non-motorized network, and will also improve safety by allowing users focus on other traffic rather than devoting time and attention to wayfinding.	Staff agrees.	Signage and wayfinding action items are already part of our implementation table. We will make sure these three elements are included in that language.
128	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	Increasing outreach and education to both motorists and bicyclists to improve road-sharing behavior and safety.	Staff agrees.	Increasing outreach and education is already an action item in the NMP Implementation matrix.
129	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	Please check for projects that are not included in the Proposed Bicycle Network. We noticed a few upcoming projects that were omitted: a. Coastal Trail to Ship Creek Trail connection b. Fish Creek to Coastal Trail connection (CFHWY00587) c. Spenard Road Rehabilitation: Minnesota Drive to Benson Boulevard d. 30th-33rd Complete Streets project e. Northeast Connector Trail Phase II	Staff agrees.	The project team will make sure that these projects as well as others that may have been overlooked are included in the final plan document.
130	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	Two unlabeled green lines on Figure ES.8 (one at 88th Ave close to Jewel Lake and another SE of Potter Dr). Please delete or add line type to map key. If these are proposed paved trails, please add lines for previously noted new trail projects to map.	Staff agrees.	We will do this map edit.
131	Bike Anchorage	54	General	Bottom of page 54 cuts off mid-sentence - what is missing?	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
132	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	Chapter 6, Project 4 - Arctic Boulevard to Blueberry Rd bullet point: missing closing parenthesis makes the meaning unclear.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
133	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	We suggest providing a table of projects that were included in the previous plan but not this one, with explanations of whether they have been completed or why they have been dropped from consideration. Such information would improve continuity and transparency between plans.	The only table of projects we included in this plan (from a previous planning document) were the projects listed in the 2007 Pedestrian Plan. Many of the projects in the 2010 Bicycle Plan were able to be implemented since its adoption and due to the nature of ever evolving bicycle infrastructure and technology, staff feels it is better to move forward with a fresh assessment of bicycle needs within the AMATS area, based on current census data and the newest bicycle related infrastructure national recommendations.	No change recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
134	Bike Anchorage	n/a	Chapter 7. Design	a. Please further consider how to optimize infrastructure designs for efficient winter maintenance. While the Plan recognizes that snow accumulation renders much of the network unusable, the Plan does not provide much in the way of solutions. We suggest that the Plan prioritize infrastructure designs that mitigate the need for winter maintenance. For example, implementing a five-foot buffer or a physical barrier between a road and a sidepath, as per AASHTO standards, reduces the extent to which road plows push snow onto the sidepath and therefore reduces the frequency with which the sidepath must be plowed. Another approach could involve providing on-street bicycle lanes with the info@bikeanchorage.org www.bikeanchorage.org (510) 478-4279 stipulation that the lane would be plowed at the same time as the motorized vehicle lanes. In contrast, the raised cycletracks suggested for Project 3 (Fireweed) would require frequent winter maintenance that might not be cost-effective and thus would likely pose a barrier to non-motorized transportation on that corridor. Integrating winter maintenance considerations into project design will be crucial for maximizing the non-motorized routes that are available year-round.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
135	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	Increasing spring and summer maintenance. More frequent sweeping of streets so that debris does not accumulate in bike lanes or shoulders, repairing damage to pavement both on roads and on bicycle paths, and ensuring that queuing buttons for crosswalks are functional will help encourage use of non-motorized modes of transportation.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
136	Bike Anchorage	n/a	General	b. Changing timing of traffic signals to prioritize non-motorized users. This is a key step toward realizing the Plan's goal of increasing the number of trips and miles traveled by non-motorized modes. The currently long wait times at signalized intersections, especially where crosswalk signals are not part of the standard cycle and must be solicited with the queueing button, are deterrents both to choosing non-motorized transportation and to safely crossing intersections by waiting for the crosswalk signal. We suggest that the Plan advocate for automatically including the crosswalk signal in the signal cycle; prioritizing the crosswalk signal in the cycle after the queueing button is pressed; adjusting timing of road-traffic signals to allow for bicycling speeds; and ensuring that red light clearance intervals are sufficient to allow bicyclists to clear the intersection before cross-traffic receives a green light, especially where bike infrastructure is present at either side of the intersection. Given the number of collisions that occur at intersections, the extent to which convenience and wait times can influence transportation choices, and the added discomfort of waiting in the cold for bicyclists and pedestrians, prioritizing non-motorized transportation at signalized intersections will go a long way to encouraging safe use of these modes.	While an overhaul of traffic signal timing is not within the purview of AMATS, rather the MOA traffic department, we recognize that this element plays a key role in pedestrian and bicyclist safety.	AMATS will encourage MOA Traffic to be mindful of pedestrian and bicyclist safety when planning and assigning traffic signal timing.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
137	Birnbaum, Sean			<p>I recently had both the opportunity to look over the proposed draft Non-motorized plan and to view the recording of the Feb 18, 2021 Open House. There is one particular project within the plan that is of particular interest to my family, and that is this Campbell Creek trail connection over Lake Otis Parkway. I have the unique circumstance of being a resident on E 47th Ct, which the trail currently runs along before reconnecting to the protected trail on the west end of the street. The proposed trail reroute to cross over Lake Otis seems to present two notable issues of concern. The first is actually related to the St. Mary's Episcopal Church, which currently owns and utilizes a patch of land that fronts Lake Otis Parkway that is used as a community garden from late spring until early fall. The proposed rerouting of the trail would appear to conflict with the location of the community garden. Planners may want to adjust or reconsider where the bridge over Lake Otis is situated so as not to conflict with this community garden. The second issue is the proposed reroute/ trail connection to Cambell Creek Trail on the west side of Lake Otis. The trail connection shown appears to follow along the top of a heavily wooded ridge. This ridge and forested area serves as a beautiful backdrop for the homes on the North side of E 47th Ct and the West side of Cassin Dr. The proposed location of the trail connection would seem to both threaten to take down forest canopy to accommodate paved (and presumably lighted) trail, and in doing so, infringe on the backyard privacy of these properties since pedestrians and cyclists would be able to see into people's backyards. With that said, a simple solution to this trail connection may be simply extending the trail connection West to join up with an existing nature trail that connects the Thomas Center with the Campbell Creek Trail (or cutting a new trail segment due West of this nature trail). Reuse of this existing thoroughfare would both preserve neighborhood privacy, and provide a seamless connection to the Campbell Creek Trail. It is not desirable to see cyclists, walkers, etc. on the ridge behind our homes; pushing the trail connection further back in the woods (to the existing path outfitted with better facilities) is a better option.</p>	This comment will be addressed after consultation with R&M Consultants.	No change recommended at this time.
138	Birnbaum, Sean			<p>Alternatively, another approach AMATS could take is the procurement of a vacant lot that abuts Lake Otis Parkway, and possibly even the HUD home that is for sale adjacent to it. The bridge over Lake Otis could then land pedestrians on this property and then direct them down E 47th Ct as it does currently. I must acknowledge, however, that satisfaction with trail traffic along E 47th Ct. is a bit of a mixed bag with approximately 60% of households holding great appreciation for the trail access and enjoyment of the regular trail traffic, with the other 40% being not particularly satisfied with the trail routed along the street and do not enjoy the added pedestrian traffic that came with it.</p>	This comment will be addressed after consultation with R&M Consultants.	No change recommended at this time.
139	Birnbaum, Sean			<p>Despite being of the crowd that enjoys the trail traffic, the most sensible and practical solution would likely be the slight reroute I mentioned previously. Doing so would retain immediate trail access for the households of E 47th Ct and Cassin Dr. that regularly use it, while keeping most of the pedestrian traffic off of E 47th Ct appeasing those that don't appreciate the pedestrian traffic, and preserve the privacy of those on the North side E 47th Ct and the West side of Cassin Drive. Added privacy measures may also be advisable between the housing at the North end of Cassin Drive and the MultiFamily housing due immediately North and above Cassin Drive where the trail would have to pass through to accommodate the proposed bridge crossing.</p>	This comment will be addressed after consultation with R&M Consultants.	No change recommended at this time.
140	Birnbaum, Sean			<p>Hopefully, you find these insights helpful and constructive. We greatly look forward to a pedestrian bridge being erected over Lake Otis Parkway. Doing so will bring great satisfaction to pedestrians of all varieties that regularly use the trail that have to face the frustration of safely navigating across Lake Otis.</p>	N/A	No change recommended.
141	Black, Jessica			<p>I'm emailing today to ask that the northern extension of the Glenn Hwy bike path be included in the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. I believe it is important for the the Glenn Hwy separated and protected bike path to be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklunta Overpass for the end goal of having uninterrupted access from the Valley to Anchorage. It would offer a better , healthier alternative to families and commuters alike.</p>	Staff agrees.	We will include this connection in the new plan draft.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
142	Bradford, Traci			I understand this portion of an upgrade to the existing MOA bike trail system is being removed from the nonmotorized plan. Please reconsider and add this as a priority item to the plan. this would be a major commuter route for cyclists into town. Thanks for considering this request.	Staff agrees.	We will include this connection in the new plan draft.
143	Brown, Stephanie		General	I am interested in the connection between Princeton Way (College Gate? College Village? I never know) and 36th Ave. This came up at a community council meeting and sparked my interest. Seems like SUCH a natural north-south connection, and I see on the Bike Plan there is a proposed connection between Lake Otis (the lake and Carlson Park) and 36th. But in the recent non-motorized transportation plan draft, there is no connection there. It sounds like maybe some boy scouts put in a rough summer-use walking path, but I wonder why not pave it and make it official?	Staff agrees.	We will include this connection in the new plan draft.
144	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Chapter 4	Since Staff did not understand a previous suggestion that we made about facilitating completing of the Dimond/Jodhpur/Kincaid sections, I will explain it here. If we name it The Jodhpur Connection, it would be easily recognizable as a segment of connectivity AND less contentious than the South Extension of the Coastal Trail. Think about it.	Staff is unclear what the intent of this comment is.	No change recommended at this time.
145	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	53	Chapter 4	Proposed Bicycle Network (p 53): Figure 4.1: Recommended Bicycle Network 1. Due to the mix of homes near the roads on Dimond/Jodhpur/Kincaid, it is important to consider a Shared Use Pathway, instead of a Separated Bikeway to facilitate community buy in and completion. The community has long expressed that it is not desirable to take land unnecessarily. One way to accomplish this is to use a buffered bike lane, which would be a shared use path (every time mentioned in these comments). Another way would be to insert a Separated Trail where there is reasonable room without taking property not part of an easement, and utilizing a buffered lane, along stretches where there is less distance from the homes to the extent that is possible. If this option is designed be sure to include ramps for bikers to get from roadside to separated trail. The speed limit on these roads should be lowered. They serve as entrances to Kincaid Park in ways that they did not do before Park enhancements and the popularity. As such the speed limit should be lowered to 35 mph for safety and comfort.	A shared use pathway will require more land and ROW than a separated bikeway. Staff will take another look at this proposed network.	No change recommended at this time.
146	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Executive Summary: Figure ES 1 AMATS Boundary Map (p vii):	The AMATS boundaries should not jut out into the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge. Please correct that errant boundary wherever it occurs. The blue lines keyed as the 2010 Census Expanded Urbanized Area Boundaries are erroneous. The tide flats and coastal wetlands of the refuge are not urban and should not be within AMATS Boundaries. (Figure 1:1 AMATS Boundary Map (p 2); P 10 graphic Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan Map;)	The AMATS Boundary is determined by rules and guidance from FHWA. Those rules stipulate that the boundary shall be determined by using Census block data. Some of these blocks overlap in the ACWR. There is nothing that can be done to change this until FHWA passes new regulations about how MPO boundaries are drawn.	No change recommended at this time.
147	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Chapter 4	Investigate the possibility of making Old Seward Highway east of Potter Marsh as an enhanced Shared Roadway/Neighborhood Greenway. This area is frequently used by bicycles, pedestrians, nature lovers, and other fitness enthusiasts, but the narrowness of the road and lack of a Shared Roadway facility is making it increasingly dangerous. Continue the road from Rabbit Creek Road to Potter Valley Road instead of stopping it near Tidewater. Ensure a low-speed limit to enhance the aesthetic enjoyment and safety next to Potter Marsh, an unparalleled attraction for neighbors and visitors alike. Improving neighborhood connection while increasing safety would be a positive attribute of this improvement.	Staff will check on AMATS Boundary and trail feasibility.	No change recommended at this time.
148	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	12	Chapter 2	Under the Maintenance bullet, please explain what is meant by "and priority for access and improvements?"	Suggested text edits.	strike 'and improvements' for clarity

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
149	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	28	Chapter 2	2.4 Health and Equity: Question: Why are individuals under 18 and over 65 assessed separately within this indicator?	Text edits	Add explanation for separate analysis of these groups. Essentially, the needs of these populations while similar in many respects can have different demographic patterns. Review the more disaggregate data can be helpful and reveal additional age-specific needs (e.g., related to schools).
150	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	68	Chapter 5	Priority Pedestrian Network (p 68): As in comments for pp 53 and 66 consider naming strategy and avoiding named potential pitfalls. This is a dangerous place to walk, run, or bike, with little to no place to get off the road especially in winter and in addition to strong consideration of at least partial Shared Use Roadway, or buffered bike lane, the speed limit should be lowered.	Staff is unclear about the intent of this comment.	No action.
151	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	171	Chapter 7	Crossbike (p 171): Where will there be examples of crossbike intersections with markings that one may view in Anchorage if or after they are approved by the FHWA?	Suggest text edits	Call out box to include potential locations of cross bikes in Anchorage.
152	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Chapter 2	It is good to build on past and current efforts as long as they are not or have not become bad ideas. Careful review about constraints and benefits must be considered.	N/A	No change recommended.
153	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	8	Chapter 2	2.1 Existing Plan Review: Be mindful to not build from a failed plan nor a failed part of a plan	N/A	No change recommended.
154	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	9	Chapter 2	Anchorage Downtown Plan (p 9): Be careful to give as much space as possible on walkways, avoiding jamming people together on narrow paths unnecessarily.	N/A	No change recommended.
155	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	40-43	Chapter 3	3.1 Field Data Collection + Community Input Map: Thank you for reposting the Online Interactive Map for viewing after I requested it. Since it is referenced, we truly wanted to have another look. It is difficult to read or review though because the document seems extremely sensitive so that it rapidly zips to sections unintended by the viewer.	N/A	No action recommended.
156	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	49	Chapter 3	3.5 Winter Maintenance (p 49): The increased use of buffered bike lanes where applicable will greatly facilitate more effective and desperately needed snow plowing and make more miles of routes and connectivity available both for bicycles and pedestrians. Lots of people are out walking and sometimes that is the only place to walk unless you want to walk right in the road.	N/A	No action recommended.
157	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	107	Chapter 6	Representative Project #2 (p 107): This crossing is a much-needed safety and comfort upgrade for Campbell Creek Trail!	N/A	No action recommended.
158	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	52	Chapter 4	4.1 Bicycle Network (p 52) Shared use pathways are for both bicycle and pedestrian travel. If there is nowhere else to walk, will pedestrians be allowed on Separated Bikeways?	Pedestrians are allowed on all bicycle and trail facilities.	No action recommended.
159	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Proposed Pedestrian Network (p x):	The "medium priority" trail from Kincaid to Raspberry was completed years ago as a paved and separated multiuse trail that roughly parallels the road in. Update this map.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this map edit.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
160	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Priority Bicycle Network (p xii):	For the bicycle network we believe that due to increased use and traffic in the area by bicycles, pedestrians, and training teams, as well as motorized vehicles the Dimond (correct spelling), Jodhpur, Kincaid loop should be elevated in priority. There are rapidly growing housing developments in the area, so the resident population here has grown considerably in recent years. Building continues in this part of town year-round. There is increased use of the Jodhpur parking lot since the single-track trails and parking lot development. This area of the park is very popular with the motocross users, walkers, runners, skiers, bikers, and nature aficionados. A good multi-use trail or bike lane would both alleviate the vehicular traffic inviting more people to ride bikes there instead of loading them on their vehicles and allow non-motorized users enroute to and from the Jodhpur entrance safer travel along Dimond, Jodhpur, and Kincaid. It also gives neighborhood residents most of whom walk, run, and bike, safe places to exercise close to home. It has been astounding, really, to see how many neighbors are out and about every day during pandemic. A proverbial silver lining is that many people are vowing to keep it up when the pandemic is over. This could probably be accomplished with less objection from the citizens if it were a buffered bike lane like on part of Kincaid Road from West Park to Sand Lake Road, except where there would be room for a separated trail. This might be best accomplished by lowering the speed limit to 35 mph. There is no need for people to be driving on those roads at 45 mph.	Staff agrees.	We will look at moving the Kincaid loop into a High Priority category.
161	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	13	Chapter 2	NACTO and many other acronyms should be included in a key for quick reference and written out the first mention.	Staff agrees.	Include an acronym index.
162	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	66	Chapter 5	Priority Bicycle Network (p 66): We see that the Dimond/Jodhpur/Kincaid route connecting Kincaid with existing bicycle/pedestrian facilities at West Park on Kincaid Road, the Jodhpur Parking Lot, and West Park on Dimond Road is rated low priority on this map. During recent discussions in past plans Staff agreed that it would be worth considering moving these routes up in time. Again, to facilitate ease of process and avoid contention to the extent possible see #1 on previous page.	Staff agrees.	The project team will look at making this connection High Priority.
163	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	146	Chapter 7	Design Needs of Users (p 146): To encourage more active transportation, Anchorage as a whole needs more benches, trash and recycling receptacles, and poop stations. Consider including such requirements or options in plans.	Staff agrees.	We will add this language to the Design Needs of Users section.
164	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	183	Chapter 7	7.5 Bicycle Parking (p 183): This is becoming increasingly critical for Anchorage. To encourage and facilitate more use of nonmotorized transportation for travel within Anchorage we must provide more innovative bicycle parking and it must be safer. Be sure to include grocery stores for lighting and safety with an eye towards preventing theft. Many more citizens would ride bikes for those quick trips to the grocery, drug, or local hardware stores if they could shop without fear someone would steal their bike and/or trailer. The last time I rode my bike to the grocery store I saw the remains of a bike that the thief could not cut loose from the rack. This will help build a healthier population and reduce carbon emissions.	Staff agrees.	We will include language in this section about lighting and safety.
165	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	18-19	Chapter 2	Existing Pedestrian Network: It is important to get the sidewalk and shared use pathways data updated to facilitate planning and communication.	Staff agrees. Updating this GIS data layer is already an action item in the implementation matrix.	No action recommended.
166	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	44	Chapter 3	3.2 Open House/Community Workshop (p 44): Thank you for putting the Appendices online after I requested them. Truly, anyone reviewing the NMP should have started requesting the appendices by the time they reached the 3rd chapter. It would have been helpful to have them when the draft NMP was released for public review.	Staff agrees. We apologize for the oversight.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
167	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	P 80:	Chapter 5	To accomplish the above anytime soon, Jodhpur/Diamond and Kincaid would need to be moved up in priority. See above.	Staff has already agreed to take a look at reprioritizing this connection to High Priority.	No action recommended.
168	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	119-120	Chapter 6	Representative Project #5 (p 119-120): To help deter criminal activity and be more inviting along this particular stretch or others like it some amenities are needed, such as benches and trash, recycling receptacles, and scoop the poop stations. Generally, Anchorage needs more such amenities. People need places to rest, especially the young and old. Trash and fecal matter could be greatly reduced with this if the Municipality could partner with nonprofits to create PSA educational spots.	Staff will consult with R&M project team to add in language for street amenities on this project.	Staff will add language regarding street amenities for this project.
169	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Chapter 6	Representative Project #6: Same as Project #5.	Staff will consult with R&M project team to add in language for street amenities on this project.	Staff will add language regarding street amenities for this project.
170	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Chapter 6	Consider placing trail on same side of street as senior center.	Staff will look at placing trail on same side of street as Senior Center.	Staff will look at placing trail on same side of street as Senior Center.
171	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	39	Chapter 3	Public involvement: Question: What agencies were part of the Agency Advisory Group? It appears that they are businesses involved with the planning process and not government agencies?	That is incorrect. The agency groups included a wide range of municipal agencies, ADOT&PF, State of Alaska Health and Human Services and others.	No action recommended.
172	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Chapter 3	It is a mistake to post a map showing a trail through an area through which there is no legal way to put a trail such as the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge and the Campbell Creek Estuary Natural Area Conservation Easement. Suggesting that there could be a trail here by posting the drawn-on maps when a long and arduous process found the coastal routes along the Refuge to be unfeasible is wasteful of people's time, money, and energy. Furthermore, it is likely to draw unnecessary contention to the process when we could be working together productively instead of fighting.	The interactive map was used for data gathering purposed during the planning process and is not shown in the planning document.	No action recommended.
173	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Chapter 3	Again, I think it is potentially and unnecessarily contentious to ask people to draw trails where they would like them without some caveats. It is like asking a kid if they are hungry and letting them choose candy.	The interactive map was used for data gathering purposed during the planning process and is not shown in the planning document.	No action recommended.
174	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	10	Chapter 2	Graphic: The map used as a graphic on this page mistakenly shows usable land in the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge. Please correct this error everywhere it occurs.	This graphic is an image of the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan Map which was adopted unanimously by the Anchorage Assembly in 2017. Any changes to this map must be admitted to the Municipal Long Range Planning department as an official amendment to this plan and approved and adopted by the Anchorage Assembly	No change recommended.
175	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	127	Chapter 6	6.1 Policy + Programs (127): Driver Education Program (p 131): The program should be geared towards all public users: new drivers, current drivers, pedestrians, bikers, and anyone who uses the roads and crosswalks.	This is an action item in our implementation matrix.	Staff will include this language about inclusion into the implemetation matrix for this action item.
176	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge		Chapter 4	Wherever possible the plan should avoid cutting people's properties into parts. Collaboration and foresight is better than long contentious battles where nobody wins.	Staff will make sure that the images in this plan do not suggest that it is the plan's intent to make changes to any property line within the AMATS area. This plan does not alter any properties within the AMATS area. Maps and graphics contained within the plan are purely conceptual in nature. Any change to any property after this plan's approval and adoption will be subject to the same platting and permitting process as currently exists within the Municipality of Anchorage and Chugiak/Eagle River.	Include text in plan to make it clear that this document does not alter any property lines within the AMATS area.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
177	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	135	Chapter 6	6.3 Next Steps (p 135): Question: What is the projected timeline on the planning effort for a Recreational Trails Plan and who will be involved with the process?	This plan will hopefully begin sometime in the next two years.	No action recommended.
178	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	1	Chapter 1	When do you expect the Recreational Trails Plan process to begin?	This plan will likely begin until some time in 2022.	No change recommended.
179	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	17	Chapter 2	2.3 On Street Bicycle Facilities: Citizens need for MOA maintenance to raise the priority of clearing snow from the trails as well as the streets for the safety of bicycles and pedestrians. Non-motorized travel all over town has been increasing steadily and we must step up to embrace this healthier lifestyle that will also reduce carbon emissions.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
180	Carlson, Barbara - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	26	Chapter 2	Demand Analysis: The analysis of Dimond/Jodhpur/Kincaid in SW Anchorage needs to be re-evaluated due to high use, if the data used is more than a few years old. Both neighborhood and city-wide use of the area has been steadily increasing, both with the development of the Jodhpur area of Kincaid Park and continual housing construction.	We will be doing another look at these areas using HSIP data in coordination with ADOT&PF data sources before the final draft is developed. This will hopefully provide the most up to date data for coordinating into the plan. Any other data inquiries at this point in the plan are out of the scope of this project and will have to wait until the next NMP update.	No action recommended.
181	Clark, Catlin			I am emailing to ask that the Glenn Hwy Bike Path Northern Extension be included in the new 2020 AMATS non-motorized plan. I think having the bike path extended from Peters Creek to the Eklutna Overpass is a good idea and prudent use of resources.	Staff agrees.	We will include this connection in the new plan draft.
182	Cole, Christopher	191		PG 191 Making bike lanes a higher priority seems out of context here or with the NonMotorized Plan and safety records. Recommend we serve high-priority non-motorized facilities first, not bike lanes first. Consideration is some walking areas may be bigger safety problems historically, and higher priority than some bicycling areas.	Bicycle lanes are not prioritized higher than walking infrastructure. This is a misconception about the plan.	No action recommended.
183	Cole, Christopher			Table 7.6 Summer Maintenance – can we change “as needed” to “as budgeted”?	Staff agrees.	Change text to read “as budgeted” in this section.
184	Cole, Christopher	188		<p>PG 188 “One of the best ways to facilitate removal of snow from non-motorized facilities is through thoughtful roadway design.”</p> <p>o I think this would be clearer if it were more direct: “One of the best ways to facilitate the removal of snow from non-motorized facilities is to ensure adequate storage space is available and to fund staffing and equipment for more frequent removal.”</p> <p>o As worded implies design is the solution. Actually planning and budget, scope solves the first one—Design will implement what is planned and budgeted. No amount of design thinking can make up for lack of storage space or ROW budgets and impacts to achieve storage if it is not in the project scope. Similarly on operating budgets which are also not Design. No amount of design can resolve cuts to staff and equipment or do the work.</p> <p>This language change would be consistent with refining M&O policies and budgets to respond faster. We always write we need to do more, and like this report shows- we have to link the ability to succeed to budgets and staffing.</p>	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
185	Collins, Jeri		General	I’m asking for the Glenn Hwy separated (and protected) bike path to be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklutna Overpass as it was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. (It is currently NOT in the new plan.)	Staff agrees.	We will include this connection in the new plan draft.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
186	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Pedestrian Facilities	As the design section of the NMP notes, six feet of space makes a sidewalk comfortable for two people to walk beside each other or pass each other. However, the NMP should recommend that major corridors outside of central business districts should have sidewalks even wider than six feet. When the central business district minimum of 11.5 feet is impossible along key corridors, the NMP might consider recommending a minimum of two additional feet beyond the six-foot recommendation that can act as a buffer from cars and as snow storage. An example of wider facilities can be observed in the northern section of Spenard Road which was updated in recent years; this type of facility should be replicated between Benson and Minnesota as well as on other primary pedestrian corridors around Anchorage.	Suggest text edits.	Add text to Chapter 7 to recommend additional sidewalk width on major corridors when possible and pointing to the redesign of Spenard Road as an example.
187	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		General	We are pleased to see this plan moving along and generating community conversation around non-motorized transportation. Enhanced opportunities for non-motorized transportation in Anchorage and Eagle River will support the mental, physical, and environmental health of our community. Beyond this, ensuring safe access to quality non-motorized travel facilities is an equity issue for those who may be unable to travel by other modes for reasons related to cost or ability. As such, we were encouraged to see that analysis around need was a major factor in this planning process.	N/A	No action recommended.
188	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		General	Adding together recent, current, and future development in the central section of the Spenard neighborhood, CIHA will provide over 50 affordable housing units, including set-aside units for seniors, homeless households, and households with disabilities. This increase in residential development along Spenard Road is expected to bring more non-motorized traffic to the corridor as it develops into the more active mixed-use center envisioned in the Spenard Corridor Plan (2020). As such, many of our comments relate to the non-motorized facilities planned in central Spenard and ensuring that they are safe, accessible, and convenient for residents of all ages and abilities.	N/A	No action recommended.
189	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Representative Project #6	We are in strong support of Representative Project #6 for improvements to Coronado Street in Chugiak-Eagle River. As noted in the project description, CIHA owns and operates a significant amount of affordable housing for seniors and families nearby, so these amenities would greatly expand access to downtown Eagle River for many CIHA residents and neighbors. We support the cost and time-saving idea to include a separated multi-use pathway on the south side of the road only, which is where most people would likely access the route. However, we do wish to highlight a passage to edit for accuracy: Where it says: "Recent developments such as CIHA's 56-unit Coronado Park Senior Village and the Petersen Group's Coronado Park, which includes 43 structures comprised of over 90 units, access Coronado Street from the south." We recommend that it instead read: "The neighboring Coronado Park development includes a mix of ownership and rental housing, and a mix of units that serve seniors and families. At full buildout the site will include 185 units, 83 of which are reserved for senior households. These units all access Coronado Street from the south."	N/A	No action recommended.
190	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Pedestrian Facilities	Sidewalks are currently insufficiently wide along this stretch, are in disrepair, lack accessible curb cuts, and in many places they are made inaccessible by utility poles blocking the way. This is especially an issue when considering wheelchair users and factoring in snow storage that may block additional space on the sidewalks. The NMP should include firm recommendations that utilities be moved underground and sidewalks be widened beyond five feet whenever possible, especially along major pedestrian routes such as Spenard Road. Five feet is insufficient to support safe and comfortable pedestrian and/or wheelchair travel in a business corridor.	Staff agrees.	We will include this language in this section.
191	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Winter Maintenance	CIHA has collaborated with the Anchorage Parks Foundation's initiative to install signage with Indigenous Place Names. We support the continuation of this effort and see the NMP's design guidelines section as an opportunity to help this initiative become a more formalized part of facility construction.	Staff agrees.	Staff will work to incorporate recommendations for indigenous names to be included in design guidelines.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
192	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Pedestrian Facilities	Alaska DOT&PF is currently in the process of planning for the rehabilitation of Spenard Road between Benson Boulevard and Minnesota Drive in the coming years. Pedestrian facilities along this primary corridor are currently marked as Medium Priority, but they should be High Priority due to this being a High Traffic Stress area with high composite equity scores and an expected increase in demand.	Staff agrees.	We will look at reprioritizing this network connection to High.
193	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Bicycle Facilities	The plan is currently missing bicycle facilities on Spenard Road between Benson and Minnesota; this needs to be added to keep this segment consistent with prior phases of Spenard Road Rehabilitation that included bicycle facilities, as well as the plan that is being developed for this segment by DOT&PF.	Staff agrees.	We will add this missing project link.
194	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Bicycle Facilities	We support the proposed Enhanced Shared Roadways along 27th Avenue (as shown in Representative Project #4) and Chugach Way since these play a critical role as supporting routes for access to the Spenard Road corridor. We support that the 27th Ave project is listed as High Priority, but we recommend Chugach Way be changed from Medium Priority to High Priority to match this and help complete the network in this neighborhood. As the area around Chugach Way is recommended as a Reinvestment Focus Area, we think prioritizing infrastructure, especially when completely lacking, should be a priority to help implement the RFA areas and catalyze and support new housing investment.	Staff agrees.	We will look at changing Chugach Way to a High Priority project.
195	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Winter Maintenance	We were pleased to hear that another Winter Maintenance Forum will be taking place in the future, and we recommend that plans for snow storage and removal along a prioritized network are considered in collaboration with Maintenance staff. We acknowledge that while increased funding is needed, we must also plan with current conditions and capabilities of the system in mind. If a prioritization system is used, it should take into account areas of highest need (areas with lower vehicle ownership, where residents rely on non-motorized travel and transit).	Staff agrees. Development of the Winter Maintenance Forum will take place after this planning effort has concluded. We will make prioritizing need based maintenance a priority for this effort.	No action recommended.
196	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Crossings	We are pleased to see the plan's goal of safety and perception of safety applied to crossings. The central area of Spenard is indicated in plan maps as having LTS 4 Higher Traffic Stress and is located in a High Injury Network, and neighborhood residents have noted that more crossings are needed. It would be helpful if the plan included a map indicating the locations of existing and potentially beneficial crossings, focusing on primary pedestrian corridors such as Minnesota Drive and Spenard Road. This could be used to identify gaps and make recommendations for where additional crossings could be constructed and what type of crossing would be the most safe based on the type of road.	Staff agrees. We are looking at developing a map to show high conflict crossing areas.	Staff is working on this change.
197	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Connections to Public Transit	We strongly support Goal 5, Objective I: "Prioritize making links in the network where there are opportunities to connect to other modes such as public transit." Many lower-income residents, including many CIHA residents, rely on the People Mover service to get around town. Several mentions of connecting the planned non-motorized system to transit and bus stops are made throughout the plan, but consideration of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2040 (2020) and a map of current route and stop locations would help illustrate where non-motorized facilities should be prioritized to ensure access to transit.	Staff will look at creating a map that overlays the overall network with existing transit facilities.	Staff will work on this potential map.
198	Cook Inlet Housing Authority		Winter Maintenance	We believe the best way to "future proof" high operational costs of winter maintenance is to design spaces that provide adequate temporary or even more permanent snow storage. Given the cost of maintaining and installing landscaping, as well as the somewhat poor track record of maintaining extensive landscaping and hardscaping amenities over the long term (see Creekside Town Center and Muldoon Road as prime recent examples), we strongly recommend prioritizing winter snow storage and ease of maintenance and reducing landscaping. Prioritizing function and keeping operational costs low should be the priority in our winter city.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
199	Corbridge, Will			Please include the northern extension of the separated and protected Glenn Hwy bike path in the 2020 non motorized plan. Thank you!	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the plan.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
200	Cravez, Glenn			<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Non-Motorized Plan. I strongly support efforts to improve options for biking and walking in Anchorage. As the draft plan is finalized, I urge you to ensure that the map of existing conditions accurately reflects routes that are safe and comfortable for bicycling; to encourage the use of supplemental solutions such as wayfinding, traffic signal timing, enforcement, and education in addition to building infrastructure; and to continue working to ensure that winter maintenance is sufficient to allow reliable, safe, and equitable non-motorized transportation throughout the year.</p> <p>Thank you for working to improve non-motorized transportation in Anchorage, which is such an important part of making our city safer and more livable.</p>	Staff agrees.	We will make sure the existing conditions map is reflective of these elements. Thank you.
201	CRW Engineering	54		Page 54 – Map omits above project an enhanced shared roadway on 31st Ave. This is redundant to the W. 32nd Avenue & E. 33rd Avenue route and should be deleted.	Staff agrees	We will fix this error in the plan.
202	CRW Engineering	17		Page 17 – Map in lower right corner is missing legend.	Staff agrees.	We will make this map edit.
203	CRW Engineering	53		<p>Page 53 – Map indicates two locations for 27th Avenue. The lower 27th Avenue appears to be 32nd Avenue. The currently in design route between Spenard Road and Old Seward Highway is not shown. The route includes a. Sidewalks and onstreet bike lanes on W. 30th Avenue from Spenard Road to North Star Street and a new pathway along North Star Street from W. 30th Avenue to W. 32nd Avenue, and terminating at the W. 32nd Avenue and Arctic Boulevard Intersection. Construction in 2021.</p> <p>Interim on-street bike lanes on W. 32nd Avenue from Arctic Boulevard to C Street. Construction in 2021.</p> <p>Protected Bike Lanes (behind curb) and sidewalks on W. 32nd Avenue, Calais Drive, W. 33rd Avenue, Fairbanks Street and W. 34th Avenue between Arctic Boulevard and Old Seward Highway. Design is 65% complete. Construction will be phased as funding allows.</p>	Staff agrees.	We will fix this error in the plan.
204	CRW Engineering	57		Page 57 - See comment 3 above. W. 32nd Avenue and E. 33rd Avenue will be the primary biking and walking route across Midtown Anchorage and is not shown on the map.	Staff agrees.	We will show 32nd and 33rd as primary pedestrian corridors.
205	CRW Engineering	17		Page 17 – Map in upper right corner is missing existing bicycle lanes constructed on Old Eagle River Road.	Staff agrees.	We will make this map edit.
206	CRW Engineering	69		Page 69 – See comment 3 above.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this error in the plan.
207	CRW Engineering	108		Page 108 – Construction Engineering amount is calculated incorrect.	Staff agrees.	Our project team will review this construction estimate to make sure that it is correct.
208	CRW Engineering			Comment from Brendan – The Old Glenn Highway is listed as a future separated trail where one exists already.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this error in the plan.
209	Dau, Kelly			Please build the Glenn Hwy separated bike path extending from Peters Creek to the Eklunta Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. (It is currently NOT in the new plan.)	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the plan.
210	Davis, Tom			SPECIFIC REQUEST: Review and update 2010 Bike Plan Goal 5, Policies 5.1 and 5.2. as part of the remaining NMP public process, and incorporate into the NMP. Some possible options for where it could fit NMP's organization are as follows:	Staff agrees.	We will make this suggested edit to the plan.
211	Davis, Tom			NMP Chapter 1, Table 11: Could include an updated/simplified version of 2010 Bike Plan's Goal 5 as an "Objective" in NMP Table 11, perhaps as a new Objective VI under Goal 1.	Staff agrees.	We will make this suggested edit to the plan.
212	Davis, Tom			NMP Chapter 6, Section 6.2 Policy + Programs: Could add a policy/program subsection to address the relevant elements of 2010's Policies 5.1 and 5.2 (pp. 112-113), to review and improve T21 requirements for bike parking, including long-term bike parking, and standards for adequate security, sheltering, accessibility, etc.	Staff agrees.	We will make this suggested edit to the plan.
213	Davis, Tom			NMP Chapter 6, Table 6.14: Implementation Matrix: Could add implementation action(s) to incorporate updated/relevant action item recommendations from pp. 112-113 of 2010 Bike Plan policies 5.1 and 5.2.	Staff agrees.	We will make this suggested edit to the plan.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
214	Deats, Cindy			Please include the Glenn Hwy separated bike path extension from Peters Creek to the Eklutna Overpass (as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan) in the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the plan.
215	Dommelen, Lang Van			Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Non-Motorized Plan. While it's great to see Anchorage working on this plan, I'm discouraged that yet again, Fairview is relegated to a lower priority.	Fairview was not relegated to a lower priority in this plan. All areas within the AMATS Boundary were analyzed with the same data set and criteria and projects were scored based on this areawide data analysis.	No action recommended.
216	Dommelen, Lang Van			According to NMP, Fairview and downtown are areas of high inequity and high demand for pedestrian and bike paths. I live on 17th and Karluk in Fairview, and we have a year-round problem with speeding cars and unsafe drivers. The problem is particularly noticeable on 20th avenue coming from Gambell and on 17th, these streets are straight, have no stop signs and In the past week alone I have seen many cars pushing speeds of 35-45mph. In addition, I have also seen two cars spin out of control and end up on the sidewalk. Stop and yield signs are taken as suggestions. The section of Karluk between 17th and 15th is an icy mess in winter, and I have seen multiple cars slide through the intersection into the road and crossing the sidewalk, as a pedestrian I wait to ensure no cars are coming down the hill before walking because I don't trust that cars will stop.	Staff agrees.	Staff will ask the project team to take a look at this road segment and advise a potential project.
217	Dommelen, Lang Van			The traffic situation is particularly worrisome as this neighborhood has many pedestrians, and because we have several lower-income housing developments, many of my neighbors do not have cars, and so commute on foot or bikes. Many people in this community also enjoy outdoor activities and have dogs we walk around the neighborhood. We have often discussed how unsafe we feel doing these activities, especially in winter when the sidewalks are covered in snow and we must walk on the roadway. I personally change the side of the street I walk on near corners because I have seen so many cars slide out of control taking corners at excess speed.	Staff agrees.	Staff will ask the project team to take another look at Fairview connections for more projects and higher prioritization of projects.
218	Dommelen, Lang Van			This is also a young neighborhood with a lot of kids. It's great to see kids playing in their yard and on the sidewalk, but there's little protection between them and the speeding cars. And while we are next to Eastchester Park and the greenbelt, the commute to the park and the trails cuts across the roads with speeding drivers.	Staff agrees.	We will take a look at recommending traffic calming techniques in this area.
219	Dommelen, Lang Van			Fairview is a young, dynamic community. People in the neighborhood bike, walk, and ski regularly to commute, or for pleasure. Yet the current design of the neighborhood makes these activities unsafe. Having a designated bike/pedestrian lanes would be of great benefit to Fairview and its residents, in addition to traffic calming measures that will make it safer for pedestrians in this neighborhood.	Staff agrees.	We will take a look at project recommendations for designated bikeways and pedestrian activity in Fairview.
220	Drummond, Dana			Please consider amending the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan so that the Glenn Hwy separated bike path is extended from Peters Creek to the Eklutna Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. The path is a huge improvement to the quality of life in this city and would help minimize some user conflicts. This is also the next step needed in connecting a non-motorized network of paths between Anchorage and The Valley.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the plan.
221	Edwards, Ira			I ride a wheelchair and I would respectfully ask you to change you icon in the link above. It's really really bad posture and is not indicative of an active user. take a look at this. these logos have been in use by the muni and private businesses like costco and FedEx for several years http://accessibleicon.org/	Staff agrees.	We will make this change in the plan.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
222	Ellis, Tyndall			Thanks for putting together this plan. I'm a heavy trail user and live in Waldron Park near the proposed Lake Otis Overpass for Campbell Creek. I'd like to suggest updating the tunnel under lake otis as part of this project. My wife and I use the tunnel to get to the east side of Lake Otis. We then travel E 50th to Folker to access the Campbell Creek Trail. The tunnel is very poorly lit in the winter and would benefit from better lighting at both entry and exit. The lighting inside the tunnel is currently painted black. I'd also suggest modifying the stairs into the tunnel and perhaps adding a ramp up and out that goes along 50th. Including tunnel improvements in the overpass project would benefit the community that lives next to Lake Otis.	Staff agrees.	We will make this a project recommendation in the plan.
223	Evans, David	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Add enhanced shared roadway on 26th between Denali (continuing across A and C) to Blueberry, to match up with enhanced shared roadway designated for 27th. This is a low-stress travel path for bicyclists and is preferred over travel along Northern Lights.	27th Ave is designated as a future bicycle boulevard and will serve both east and west traveling bicyclists.	No action recommended.
224	Evans, David	184	7.5 – Bicycle racks	Revise the NMP to state: "AMATS should work to update Title 21 to reflect best practices..."	AMATS does not update Title 21. Title 21 is updated by the Municipal Current Planning Section and Long Range Planning Section.	No action recommended.
225	Evans, David	4	Table 1.1 Goal 1, Objective IV and Chapter 6.2 and 6.3	Add a comprehensive discussion of current AMATS policy related to funding of non-motorized projects. Add a recommendation that AMATS review its funding allocation policy and consider whether the current 10 to 15 percent limit should be raised.	The 10-15% funding allotment for non-motorized projects is set by FHWA. This will remain the same until it is changed at the US Congressional level.	No action recommended.
226	Evans, David	189	7.6 – Signage and wayfinding	<p>Revise the NMP to recommend that every non-motorized creek crossing have signs, at each end of the crossing, that include the name of the creek. Consider showing both the current and original (indigenous) names. Signage should name creeks to enhance the public's awareness of the watershed in which they live and to encourage good stewardship of our valuable streams, wetlands, water supply and overall watershed. Even small or intermittent creeks in culverts should be signed, if only to say "a branch of the XYZ fork of Campbell Creek" or "flows into the XYZ fork of Campbell Creek".</p> <p>Consider including some of the guidance in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Creek Signs – Guide to Developing a Local Watershed and Creek Signage Program," produced by the Southern Sonoma County Resource Conservation District – it has helpful suggestions regarding sign size, design, location, etc. • "Creek Signage Placement, Municipality of Anchorage," prepared by Anchorage Waterways Council, February 1, 2019 	Creek signage is under the jurisdiction of the Anchorage Parks and Recreation Department. AMATS does support the use of indigenous names and will advocate for these in upcoming Signage and Wayfinding plans like the most recent plan completed by The Anchorage Parks Foundation.	No action recommended.
227	Evans, David	vii	Executive Summary	State the expected review cycle for this document (number of years between reviews), other than the upcoming 2021 revisions for finer details.	It is estimated that a new Non-motorized Plan will be drafted 10 years after the current version has been adopted.	Staff will include this language in the NMP.
228	Evans, David	n/a	General	Use consistent terms throughout the NMP. In particular, replace the infrequently-used term "multi-use" with the often-used "shared use." The "Bicycle Facility Selection Tool" on page 157 refers to "multi-use" paths. But the "multi-use" is only used in a few other places in the Draft Plan, and most of the Plan refers to "shared use" paths or pathways, not "multi-use" paths.	Suggested text edits.	Review for consistent use of terminology
229	Evans, David	110	6.1 – Fireweed project	<p>Change the recommendation to "protected bikeway or shared-use path," to be consistent with other parts of the NMP. With the posted speed and current and forecast AADTs, the Tool on page 157 recommends "protected bikeway or multi-use path" ("multi-use" should be "shared use" per our previous comment).</p> <p>Furthermore, the recommended solution, a raised cycle track, is not mentioned in the "Bicycle Facility Selection Tool" on page 157, nor is it defined or mentioned anywhere in the Draft Plan.</p>	Suggested text edits.	Terms to be updated for consistency. Cycle track to be renamed as PBL.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
230	Evans, David	167	7.4 - Intersections	Include guidance on how to deal with bike lane and on-ramp intersections such as the ones that were so contentious, not long ago, at the Raspberry and Minnesota interchange. The chapter is silent on this important topic.	Staff agrees.	Alta to provide content to cover interchanges.
231	Evans, David	201	7.8 - Maintenance	Add "within 24 hours" to "snow should be removed from separated bicycle lanes after the adjacent street is plowed"	Please see response to above comment.	No action recommended.
232	Evans, David	201	7.8 - Maintenance	That sentence leaves the timing undefined.	Please see response to above comment.	No action recommended.
233	Evans, David	various	overall	Add to the MOA GIS mapping application all existing and proposed non-motorized facilities.	Staff agrees	This data will be incorporated into municipal GIS databases after plan approval and adoption.
234	Evans, David	70	Tables 5.2 and 5.3	Add identification numbers to each project in the tables. Put the numbers on a map at the location of the project.	Staff agrees that adding project identification numbers to the table is merited. However, adding the entirety of project numbers to the map will result in a map that is visually disruptive and hard to read.	Include project identification numbers on the project tables.
235	Evans, David	98	6 - Implementation	Revise the introduction to Chapter 6 to focus on the strategy, not the examples, and reorganize this Chapter so that section 6.2 and 6.3 are first, since they deal with the primary topic of Chapter 6: implementation strategy. Move section 6.1 (the examples) to the end of the chapter. Update the example narratives to specifically reference the implementation strategies.	Staff disagrees with this formatting suggestion. We feel that the order and formatting of this chapter is intuitive and guides the reader through implementation strategy and examples.	No action recommended.
236	Evans, David	112	6.1 – Fireweed project phasing	Recommend that the stretch of Fireweed from Denali St to the Seward Highway be the highest priority phase. The NMP notes that the scope of improvements is too large for a single project and recommends future studies evaluate dividing the work into logical phases. The NMP should state that highest priority phase is the portion east of Denali. That has the highest traffic volumes, and at Denali, bicyclists can use 26th, 27th, and parking lots and alleys to parallel Fireweed Lane while going west, all the way to Spenard.	Staff disagrees with this recommendation. This segment of Fireweed is owned by ADOT&PF and may provide further complications for complete streets renovation. The scope of improvements listed in this section is reasonable in comparison to similar projects that have been completed.	No action recommended. Ask R&M to clarify project phase priority.
237	Evans, David	110	6.1 – Fireweed project	Include undergrounding of utilities along Fireweed in the project. This should free up additional width of sidewalk and facilitate winter maintenance.	Staff disagrees with this recommendation. Undergrounding utilities along this stretch of Fireweed will add significantly to the cost of this project.	No action recommended. Ask R&M to clarify project utility focus.
238	Evans, David	99	6 - Implementation	Revise the paragraph on page 99 to eliminate the nearly duplicate sentences regarding what the example projects provide. The introductory paragraph needs a major overhaul.	We will eliminate duplication of information on page 99.	Eliminate duplication of information on page 99.
239	Evans, David	70	Table 5.2 – Bicycle projects	Change the PDF so that the table is printed on 11x17s, not spanning two 8.5x11s.	Staff will ask the project team to make this change.	Ask project team to make this change.
240	Evans, David	110	6.1 – Fireweed project	Rename what is currently shown as the "raised cycle track" to "setback" or "buffer" or "snow storage area" to be consistent with the "shared use" path narrative on page 160. It is disturbing to us year-round utility cyclists that the current narrative says the "raised cycle track can accommodate temporary snow storage during winter months." Storing snow on non-motorized facilities should not be the default position and is not the approach a world-class winter city should take.	Storing snow partially on non-motorized facilities, while not ideal, is a common practice and is allowed in the AMATS planning area.	No action recommended.
241	Evans, David	vii	Executive Summary	Revise the Executive Summary and related narrative to state that the NMP does not supersede the parts of the existing bicycle, pedestrian, trails, district, neighborhood, and park plans that pertain to recreational trails and trails not yet addressed in the NMP, and add a footnote stating that a Recreational Trails Plan will be developed in the future. The Executive Summary states that the NMP supersedes existing bicycle, pedestrian, and trails plans, but it is not yet complete, as acknowledged by the statement that it is planned to be amended in a future year. The NMP should state that, in the meantime, and until the Recreational Trails Plan is completed, the existing plans are still in force.	The NMP will supersede the existing Anchorage Bicycle Plan and Anchorage Pedestrian Plan when adopted by the Anchorage Assembly and approved by the AMATS Policy Committee. It will not supersede the 1996 Areawide Trails plan until such time as that portion of the Non-motorized Plan has been completed and is also adopted and approved as an amendment to the NMP.	Staff will add language to the NMP to state that the Areawide Trails Plan will not be superseded by the NMP until such time as described in this staff comment.
242	Evans, David	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Add the missing utilitarian link described in column to right.	The project team will look at adding this project link.	No action recommended at this time.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
243	Evans, David	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	From south end of Princeton Circle, add unpaved N/S trail that connects to 36th (at MacInnes).	The project team will look at adding this project link.	No action recommended at this time.
244	Evans, David	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Add enhanced shared pathway on MacInnes from 36th to Tudor. Add enhanced shared roadway on Shelikof from Tudor to Chirikof Ct.	The project team will look at adding this project link.	No action recommended at this time.
245	Evans, David	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Add N/S trail west of Waldron Pond, crossing Campbell Creek trail to Cache Drive	The project team will look at adding this project link.	No action recommended at this time.
246	Evans, David	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Add enhanced shared roadway for Cache Dr to the NE corner of Tudor Elementary School pathway.	The project team will look at adding this project link.	No action recommended at this time.
247	Evans, David	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Include pathway connection from the school to Waldron Dr and Little Tree St intersection (in lieu of Bartlett Dr to Waldron currently shown).	The project team will look at adding this project link.	No action recommended at this time.
248	Evans, David	99 and 100	6 - Implementation	Revise the narrative on pages 99 and 100 to describe why the six example projects were selected. It is not clear why the six example projects were chosen. Are they especially high priority projects? Were they randomly selected? Were they picked because of some convenience?	These six example projects were chosen because they are a good representation of both bicycle and pedestrian project recommendations in the plan. They show realistic examples of what implementation of each type of project might look like and therefore help the general public make informed decisions when they are recommending projects for funding, etc.	Add language explaining why these projects were selected to this section.
249	Evans, David	15	2.3 Existing Network	Revise the existing non-motorized network maps to include all existing non-motorized, non-recreational connectors between neighborhoods, schools, parks, and business areas. This will require maps with much finer detail and higher resolution. There are many non-motorized, non-recreational connections not shown on the Draft Plan maps. If they are not shown on a plan, they don't exist and can't be protected. These are not "recreational," per se, since they facilitate non-motorized connectivity between neighborhoods, schools, parks, and businesses. Here are two examples, out of hundreds in the Municipality (see row below).	This request is beyond the scope of this planning project. In addition, current Municipal databases for sidewalks and sidepaths is not reliable or up to date. These databases must be brought up to current standards before a map like the one suggested in this comment can be created.	No action recommended.
250	Evans, David	171 172	7.4 – Intersections	Include a discussion of the winter-time visibility and long-term effectiveness of bicycle boxes, turn boxes, and other major painted features, when compacted snow and ice may cover them, or plows may damage them. A survey of other winter city experiences with these features may be helpful. It is understood that AMATS does not have the authority to unilaterally update Title 21, but the language in the draft NMP is weak: "AMATS should consider reviewing the development code and updating to reflect best practices regarding required bicycle parking."	Visibility of on road bicycle infrastructure such as bicycle boxes, turn boxes and bicycle lane markings will be altered during wintertime snow conditions. These and other winter maintenance issues are discussed in the maintenance section of the Design Chapter 7. The Long-Range Planning Section of the Municipal Planning Department is already working with AMATS to update Title 21 guidance for bicycle parking.	No action recommended.
251	Evans, David	201	7.8 - Maintenance	Change the policy recommendation for the snow removal timing goal from 72 hours to 24 hours. FHWA "Guide for Maintaining Pedestrian Facilities for Enhanced Safety Research Report" notes that "The majority of municipalities contacted require snow to be removed from sidewalks within 24 hours after a snow event. It is common and appropriate to require a shorter time frame in high pedestrian zones such as in business districts where pedestrians need to access transit and amenities. The City of Boston combines these strategies by requiring all property owners to remove snow and ice within three hours of the end of the snow fall or three hours after sunrise. This is one of the shorter time frames of those contacted and is actively enforced with substantial fines for noncompliance. Ann Arbor, MI, requires that any snowfall accumulation before 6 AM must be removed by noon." https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/tools_solve/fhwasa13037/research_report/chap2d.cfm	While AMATS advocates for better winter maintenance throughout the planning area, snow removal times are set by the Municipality and ADOT&PF's Maintenance and Operations divisions and are directly dependant upon funding and staffing available. AMATS does support increasing priority, funding and staffing of maintenance divisions	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
252	Evans, Diana and David		Chapter 6	We are looking at the NMP out for public comment and wonder if the project cost in Chapter 6 for Fireweed Lane are for the non-motorized portion only, or if it includes the roadway improvements to decrease the lanes from 4 to 3.	Staff will ask R&M to make this clarification.	Clarify project cost in plan text.
253	Evans, Diana and David		Chapter 6	Also, this project has a line item for 30% contingency on project subtotal, where the Campbell Creek grade-separated crossing does not have a line item for contingency. Why is that?	Staff will ask R&M to make this clarification.	Clarify contingency discrepancy in plan text.
254	Fairview Community Council			It needs to establish a systems connection to the Primary Transit Corridors. Every bus rider is a pedestrian before and after their trip. The Anchorage People Mover has made a significant commitment of resources to support these corridors with more frequent bus service. However, the NMP does a poor job of acknowledging the importance of pedestrian infrastructure within these corridors. The NMP should identify as an Action Item a project to inventory the pedestrian infrastructure within a ¼ mile of the right-of-way edge, develop an assessment metric and make recommendations for programming TIP funds to address all identified deficiencies within the short term.	Staff agrees that the NMP can do a better job of showing how existing and new infrastructure will connect to primary and secondary transit corridors. Updating the municipal GIS database to show all pedestrian infrastructure within the AMATS area is an action item in the plan.	Create a map to show how existing and planned infrastructure will overlay with primary and secondary transit corridors. Acknowledge the importance of pedestrian infrastructure (1st and last mile) within these areas in the planning text. Include action item to further plan for these areas in addition to updating municipal GIS database.
255	Fairview Community Council			1.It needs to include improvements to the bike trail segment from 15th Avenue to Sitka Park. This section is significantly deteriorated and presents a safety hazard to users.1	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the plan.
256	Fairview Community Council			2.It needs to include a new trail link on the west side of the North Fork of Chester Creek from Sitka Park to Chester Creek Trail. The new link creates a public loop trail and enhances the physical recreation opportunities for neighborhood residents and users of the Anchorage Senior Center.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the plan.
257	Fairview Community Council			3.It needs to conform to the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan and include the Fairview Greenway connection between Chester Creek and Ship Creek Greenways. This creates an urban bike/ped beltway around the center of the City and significantly enhances the investment environment for the entire urban core area.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the plan.
258	Fairview Community Council			6.It needs to raise the priority levels for pedestrian improvements to Gambell and Ingra Streets as they consist of inadequately maintained 4 foot sidewalks directly adjacent to traffic often traveling in excess of the posted limits. Gambell Street is severely impacted by the presence of utility poles in the sidewalk presenting an additional hazard for those in wheelchairs.	Staff agrees.	We will make this prioritization change in the plan.
259	Fairview Community Council			5.It needs to discuss the inadequacies of the existing approach to in-street bike lanes during winter months when the painted lane striping is covered by snow and ice. It is suggested that the NMP discuss opportunities for innovative solutions. For example, the placement of a separate luminaire arm on existing poles extending out over the bike lane provides year-round visibility for the in-street bike lane at a marginal cost.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No recommended change at this time.
260	Fairview Community Council			4.It needs to describe the significant pedestrian safety issues associated with the existing pedestrian sidewalk infrastructure as it relates to inadequate set asides for snow storage. The existing dominance of rolled curbs within the street cross-section effectively eliminates the sidewalk during much of the winter forcing pedestrians to walk in the vehicle travel way.	We think that adding general language in the plan about the drawbacks of rolled curbs and snow storage will be a good idea.	Include language in the plan explaining the drawbacks of rolled curb snow storage.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
261	Ferrarese, Jena			I'm reviewing the online plan pdf in advance of tonight's community open house, and am having a hard time "flipping" between pages that show the project maps and the extensive pages of individual project details. What I'm looking for is a web map that would allow a user to click on a project and get a popup of the project details. This is easily configurable through ArcGIS Online and/or Esri Web Appbuilder, as well as other open-source mapping software, but I didn't see a link for anything like that in the plan or on this website. I'm definitely not ruling out me just missing/not finding the map; if such a web map exists, could you please point me to the url? And if not, I would strongly recommend developing one. The muni does a lot with public-facing Esri maps, so I would hope the licensing is available for this as well. If you need help building that I am happy to provide technical advice or, if you need a volunteer, I'm raising my hand :) Just let me know.	Staff agrees that a webmap showing project details and location will be beneficial.	Create an action item in the implementation matrix to create an interactive webmap for existing and planned non-motorized facilities within the AMATS area. This webmap will be created by Municipal GIS and hosted on the Anchorage municipal website.
262	Fields, Zack			That is the first addition to the non-motorized plan that AMATS should pursue: Any street that lacks either pedestrian or dedicated bicycle facilities should have them added during the course of maintenance, typically repaving. Making safety upgrades within existing curb cuts clearly requires additional planning, and generally is only possible with lane/road diets. Systematically using road and lane diets to improve safety and mobility should be the primary focus of the non-motorized plan, since with the cost of traditional road redesigns we will be waiting hundreds of years to upgrade the numerous unsafe roads like Tudor, Seward Highway, Benson/Northern Lights, and so on.	AMATS has a Complete Streets Policy and is developing a Complete Streets Checklist that will be used to ensure that all future AMATS funded projects plan and design for non-motorized users to the best of their ability. Staff disagrees that systematically using road diets should be the primary focus of this plan. The Non-motorized Plan takes a comprehensive approach to complete the overall network and focus on the areas of highest need and vulnerability. This includes many new projects and new infrastructure as well as recommendations for traffic calming such as road and lane diets.	No action recommended.
263	Fields, Zack			I'm writing to suggest significant changes to the draft non-motorized plan. The current draft plan contains no recommendations for improvements to many common commuter/shopping routes that serve major residential population centers (9th Ave, Benson/N Lights, Raspberry, Dimond and Lake Otis are just a few examples). Since the Municipality adopted a "Vision Zero" policy several years ago, there have not been sufficient programmatic changes in how we build and maintain infrastructure to come close to reaching the goals articulated in Vision Zero. Pedestrians, bicyclists, and automobile drivers continue to die on outdated, high speed roadways.	Suggested text edits.	Recommend attention to shopping routes and residential centers as part of Complete Streets typology overlay plan, mention the effort as part of this plan.
264	Fields, Zack			In addition to articulating how to add dedicated bike/pedestrian facilities as part of the maintenance process, the non-motorized plan should recommend dedicated pedestrian facilities on all roads, and dedicated bicycle facilities on all roads where posted speeds exceed 25mph, with the potential for bike lanes on more urban roads that have 25mph limits (i.e. downtown). If there's not a dedicated bike facility recommended that should be the exception rather than the rule.	Text edit.	Add recommendation to develop a policy that bike and pedestrian facilities should be included on all new construction or reconstruction in manner that is consistent with current design standards.
265	Fields, Zack			Finally, the non-motorized plan should clearly outline how bike and pedestrian facilities will be implemented in intersections. Far too often, traffic engineers' fixation on unnecessarily wide lane widths has resulted in bike lanes being cut off before intersections, and in unnecessarily wide crosswalks that increase danger for pedestrians. Bike lanes should continue up to intersection stop bars. Design criteria should emphasize shortest-possible crosswalk lengths to improve pedestrian safety. Again, these improvements are only possible with lane and road diets.	Text edit.	Suggest language to emphasize the importance of intersection design for bike/ped implementation.
266	Fields, Zack			Although the city has done a few major roadway re-configurations (ie Spenard), the city has not figured out how to use its regular maintenance schedule to improve safety of roadways at a meaningful scale. Moreover, improving little connector streets (ie 27th Ave) is nice but doesn't address or obviate the need for safety improvements to adjacent arterials (Northern Lights/Benson). Major and minor arterials serve retail, grocery stores, houses and apartment complexes. If major and minor arterials like Northern Lights and Lake Otis remain dangerous and dysfunctional, then most utilitarian bike and pedestrian trips will also have at least some portion of the trip that is dangerous as well.	Staff agrees that including major arterials serving high use commercial areas in the plan's project recommendations is beneficial.	The project team will include project recommendations (high priority) for major arterials serving high use commercial areas within the planning area.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
267	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 2	Several planning documents have either been adopted or are in the works that don't appear to be reflected in the NMP. We would like to see Spenard Corridor Plan (SCP), the Anchorage Area Plan (AAP) 2040 and the Anchorage Climate Plan more clearly integrated and reference to the Chugach Way Area Transportation Elements Report (Chugach Way Report), currently in planning.	All of these plans were adopted after the NMP was already underway. Staff agrees that they are important plans and will work on incorporating them into the NMP. The Chugach Way Area Transportation Elements Report is not yet finished or approved, therefore, it cannot be incorporated into the NMP.	Incorporate major elements of these plans into the NMP.
268	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	Future Fish Creek feasibility studies will reveal more about potential creek routes, which will hopefully also open up possibilities for a better east/west non-motorized connection than what is currently available east of Cuddy Park, especially east of the New Seward Highway.	N/A	No action recommended.
269	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 8	36th Avenue east of Spenard should be a "medium" priority. It has been enhanced between Spenard and Arctic on the north side, which is a good start.	Staff agrees.	We will make the reprioritization edit.
270	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 3	The ability to compare the existing pedestrian and bicycle network with proposed routes is helpful in understanding connectivity and where specific changes are needed. We suggest enlarging maps so street names are easier to read, use the same street names on both existing and proposed networks, and display existing and proposed networks side by side in the NMP so it's easier to make comparisons.	Staff agrees that both the existing and proposed facilities maps should have similar street naming to help with map navigation. Staff disagrees that they should be represented side by side in the planning document however as there is quite a bit of data analysis explanation that precedes development of the new proposed network.	Make street naming consistent between existing and proposed facilities maps.
271	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	Minnesota Drive has a tremendous amount of pedestrian and bicycle use and should be reclassified to reflect all users, instead of prioritizing motorized traffic. The NMP should include locations for traffic calming that enhance safety and connectivity along Minnesota. Roundabouts, raised intersections, crosswalks and/or other safety and traffic calming amenities should be considered throughout this corridor.	Staff agrees that the NMP should include recommendations for traffic calming along Minnesota. There are several recommendations already included in the Spenard Corridor Plan that project staff can review and pull into the NMP.	Include recommendations for traffic calming along Minnesota that incorporate recommendations from the SCP.
272	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	Enhanced Shared Roadway should be extended from Harrison Street to Minnesota on either 40th or 41st Avenue. This will be addressed in more depth in the Chugach Way Report and we anticipate that document will be reflected in the finalized NMP.	Staff agrees that this is an important connection for the Spenard area.	Staff will direct project team to take a look at including this project link.
273	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	Central Spenard Road is blank.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the plan.
274	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	Intersections of particular concern not addressed in the NMP include 26th Ave, 36th Ave, and 41st Ave.	Staff agrees.	Have project team take another look at these intersections. (26th Ave, 36th Ave and 41st Ave.)
275	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	Fish Creek Trail to the Ocean is missing.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the plan.
276	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	A proposed Fish Creek trail corridor is included in the AAP 2040, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) 2040, and the SCP. Though a route is yet to be determined, language for the proposed corridor should be included in the NMP.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the plan.
277	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	36th Avenue needs addressing. It is a well-traveled corridor that connects to the Boys and Girls Club, Woodland Park and Fish Creek on its west end. As long as there is not a safe way to cross there will continue to be injuries and fatalities, especially along this section.	Staff agrees.	Include project recommendations for 36th Ave.
278	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	To add connectivity to the Fish Creek corridor at Red Bridge Park a safe crossing is needed between Spenard and Tudor. We suggest a 41st Avenue crossing to the proposed network on Harrison St.	Staff agrees.	Include project connection between Spenard and Tudor Road.
279	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	Include the shared use path identified in the 2010 Anchorage Bicycle Plan and affirmed in the SCP along the railroad corridor through Spenard.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the plan.
280	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	Fish Creek trail is effectively dead-ended at the eastern edge of Red Bridge Park when it meets Tudor Road at Taft. A shared use pathway should be included between Minnesota and Taft to complete connectivity. With the constant presence of semi-trucks from Spenard Builders Supply and an intersection with the railroad, this well-used corridor places non-motorized users at risk, especially in winter when snowplows create berms along this stretch.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the plan.
281	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 5	Spenard Road should be a "high" priority, in line with the Spenard Road Rehab project and affirmed by the SCP.	Staff agrees.	Make this project a high priority in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
282	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 6	Chugach Way should be a “high” priority as affirmed by the Chugach Way Report and SCP.	Staff agrees.	Make this project a high priority in the NMP.
283	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 7	Minnesota should be a “high” priority. This high-speed corridor has been identified as such by community and affirmed in the SCP, the MTP 2040 and AAP 2040. We would like to see speeds lowered on Minnesota Drive to no higher than 35 mph southbound from downtown to Tudor Road. Minnesota is an important alternative to the Seward Highways and the A/C Street couplets for north/south vehicular traffic, however it bisects the Spenard neighborhood and is extremely dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists, as we unfortunately saw when a pedestrian was recently killed at 35th Ave. The combination of high speeds and lack of crosswalks creates a deadly combination for neighbors, especially in winter when the already narrow sidewalks are further reduced. Pedestrians are seen walking in the street in winter because the sidewalk is inaccessible, while cars driving 45-50mph fly past.	Staff agrees.	Make this project a high priority in the NMP.
284	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 7:	Considerable time and effort went into the creation and adoption of the Spenard Corridor Plan. We're proud of this document and its transportation approach to development. Several items from the SCP should be included in the NMP, such as festival streets, way finding, and inclusion of e-bikes when considering bicycle networks.	Staff agrees.	We will include discussion of festival streets. Wayfinding and discussion of e-bikes is already included in th NMP.
285	Friends of Fish Creek		Chapter 4	The four-year window for crash data does not give an accurate portrayal of safety concerns. For example it does not capture recent bicyclist deaths, giving a false impression about that risk. The 2010 Anchorage Bicycle Plan used a thirteen-year window for crash data (pages 19 and 20). Without a wider window of crash data, it is difficult to more fully identify problem areas that need mitigation. There is a gap in non-motorized planning statistics from 2007 to present for bicyclists and 2003 to present for pedestrians, including wheel-chair users, given when the last plans were adopted.	Staff is already working wiht ADOT&PF to incorporate HSIP crash data to augment the Vision Zero data that was used for this plan. Those two data sets are the most up to date crash data we have available to use in the NMP.	No action recommended.
286	Friends of Fish Creek		General Comments	Though acknowledged as a winter city, the NMP doesn't adequately reflect it in photos, design ideas and examples, in network maps, or implementation. Wintery conditions comprise a majority of the year in Anchorage and create additional challenges to foot and bicycle traffic. Winter maintenance is critical to a functioning non-motorized plan and enhancing safety for non-motorized traffic. The NMP should include network maps that show priority areas for winter maintenance both for public comment and, once adopted, online so users can chose routes that are safest.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No recommended change at this time.
287	Fullman, Tim		General	Thank you for all your hard work developing the draft Non-Motorized Plan! One of the things I really appreciate about Anchorage is the variety of non-motorized transportation options and I am grateful for your work to maintain and enhance these resources. I strongly support efforts to improve options for biking, walking, and other non-motorized transportation in Anchorage.	N/A	No action recommended.
288	Fullman, Tim		General	My family only has a single car, so for the past 6.5 years I have commuted downtown for work year-round on my mountain bike (with studded tires in winter). Good bicycle connectivity is crucial for me and my family. Apart from my commute, I also enjoy recreational non-motorized use, including biking, walking, and cross-country skiing. Non-motorized transportation is an essential part of my life that I participate in on an almost daily basis. Its value has especially been reinforced to me during the Covid-19 pandemic, when opportunities to get outside for exercise and recreation have been key to my mental and physical health.	N/A	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
289	Fullman, Tim			I am a scientist with a PhD in Geography, so I very much appreciate the value of maps and data. I appreciate the maps and information presented in the plan. As you finalize the plan, I urge you to continue ensure that additional data are collected so that the map of existing conditions accurately reflects routes that are safe and functional for biking by people of all skill levels. As this is done, it is important that it be made clear where "secondary paved paths" have little suitability for safe bicycling due to their narrow width or concentrations of driveways. I have experienced the challenges of using such paths as part of my commute and know that they are not the same as other, more dedicated paths, which are better for safety of cyclists, pedestrians, and motorized vehicle drivers.	Staff agrees.	We will make sure that the existing conditions map is accurate.
290	Fullman, Tim			Finally, I was surprised in something called the "Non-Motorized Plan" that skiing got such limited attention. While biking is my primary means of transportation, I am increasing my frequency of cross-country skiing. I did a search of the document for the term "ski*" and was a little disappointed by the fact that there was not more information or consideration in what is supposed to be a comprehensive plan. I would like to see this improved upon in the final plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include more recommendations for skiing the non-motorized network because it is a popular form of transport in the AMATS area.
291	Fullman, Tim	134	General	I am strongly supportive of the winter maintenance strategy described on p.134. There is a need for improved coordination among agencies, especially between street plowing and sidewalk clearing. Every winter there are instances where the streets get plowed right onto the sidewalks. This dense, dirty snow is very difficult, if not impossible, to plow through, greatly hindering my commuting ability. I am thankful when the Muni subsequently clears those sidewalks, but sometimes it can take a few days. Better coordination might allow avoiding the problem altogether, if there is somewhere else that snow can go, or shorter time lags between street plowing and sidewalk clearing.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
292	Fullman, Tim	134	General	I also appreciate the strategy's consideration of the type of plowing or grooming treatments to be applied. The plan gives an example that "grooming protocols could be established that would provide for bicycle access along shared use pathways or sidepaths" (p.134). This is extremely important. Often during the winter I am frustrated during my commute by the Coastal Trail having just been groomed for skate skiing. This results in soft, powdery snow into which my tires dig deep, hindering my ride and no doubt frustrating skiers who then have to contend with the gouges I leave behind. I do not want to have this effect, but I need to be able to commute in. Altering the timing of grooming so that it has time to harden overnight before the morning commute may be one option to reduce such impacts. Not grooming the entire trail, but leaving a section of more compacted snow for easier bicycle travel along the edge of groomed areas is another. I hope that this working group will be established and a coordinated winter maintenance strategy created.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
293	Fullman, Tim			Similar to the winter maintenance strategy, there is also need for a plan for the break-up period. Each year there is a period of several weeks in which snow is melting and the trails become very difficult for biking. It would be helpful to have further discussion about maintenance options to enhance trail access during this period. This could include efforts to clear snow along one side of paths to provide bicycle access, even while the remaining portion is left with snow for end-of-season skiers. Often what actually happens is alternating patches of melt and snow that make travel difficult. Removing those smaller bits of snow might be possible. I did not notice any discussion of this in the plan and request that it be added to the final version.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
294	Fullman, Tim			I would also like to see maps that distinguish winter routes from those accessible during the summer. Patterns of snow removal, grooming, and snow storage all affect which routes are accessible. Part of developing the winter maintenance strategy mentioned above should include identification and education regarding winter biking route options. I agree with Bike Anchorage and their request for creation of a "prioritized winter bike network," which I personally would find very helpful during my winter commute.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
295	Funatake, Jean			<p>Dear AMATS Planning Team, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Non-Motorized Plan. I strongly support efforts to improve options for biking and walking in Anchorage. As the draft plan is finalized, I urge you to ensure that the map of existing conditions accurately reflects routes that are safe and comfortable for bicycling; to encourage the use of supplemental solutions such as wayfinding, traffic signal timing, enforcement, and education in addition to building infrastructure; and to continue working to ensure that winter maintenance is sufficient to allow reliable, safe, and equitable non-motorized transportation throughout the year.</p> <p>I enjoy biking the "moose loop" for summer recreation, however there is an issue crossing at Lake Otis. The tunnel 3 or 4 blocks south of the direct crossing for the bike path is too far out of the way. Additionally I have been accosted several times by sketchy men and made to feel unsafe at the tunnel entrances.</p> <p>My preferred solution would be to add a push button crossing signal that would stop traffic to enable a safe crossing. If this is not cost effective, suggest adding a curb cut on the east side of Lake Otis to make it easier to travel directly across as traffic permits.</p> <p>Thank you for working to improve non-motorized transportation in Anchorage, which is such an important part of making our city safer and more livable.</p>	Staff will take another look at the existing conditions map to make sure it is accurate. The plan already includes wayfinding, traffic signal timing, education and building new infrastructure in the implementation section at action items.	We will work to make sure the existing conditions map is accurate and include language about enforcement in the implementation chapter.
296	Gleason, Erin			Please keep the separated Glenn Highway bike path extending from Peters Creek to Eklutna in the non motorized plan. The bike path is always being used by cyclists, walkers, runners, families, and competitive athletes. Extending it north would be a great service to Anchorage, Eagle River, and Chugiak communities!	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP
297	Gray, Robin			Please consider adding the bike path extension from Peters Creek to Eklutna in your master plan. I live and bike in Peters Creek and would love to see this extension happen. Lots of people use these paths and would be an amazing addition to our neighborhood. This would be such a great asset to our community.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
298	Grober, Marc			<p>The people of East Anchorage DO appreciate the opportunity to comment on the AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. We have long identified two high priority, long-standing goals for non-motorized connections within our community, which goals have focused not only upon greater community connectivity but also upon increased access to the community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * An East-West link bringing the Chester Creek Trails to the foothills at or about Chanshtnu Park, and. * A North South trail running along Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (in or out of the base) connecting "the curve" to North East Anchorage by the Powerplant and thence to the bike path north of the highway. <p>which goals should include at a minimum the following "projects":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Construction of bridges in Chanshtnu Muldoon Park * Connected and upgraded trail along the South Fork of Chester Creek from Cheney Lake Park through the existing easement to Patterson Street (private funding has already been sabotaged by Parks and Recreation once with the statement that this was planned for future paved development, though no such development is apparent in the Plan). * Designation of some form of ROW and usage agreement, as well as eventual trail development along the MOA JBER boundary or in JBER <p>The people of East Anchorage have also endorsed additional projects, such as the completion of a second tunnel under DeBarr as set forth in the Russian Jack Springs Master Plan for decades, further connection above or below the Glenn Highway connecting the Northeast communities to the bike path on the North side of the highway, integration of our most eastern neighborhoods with non-motorized connectors, facilitating seamless access to school and services as recommended by a number of east side persons to the Community and Economic Development committee of the Assembly in February.</p>	Staff is unsure what this comment is asking for.	No change recommended at this time.
299	Grober, Marc			<p>as i understand it, the assembly has already refused to consider half a dozen recommendations made by THE PUBLIC that are encompassed in the draft non-motorized plan - why oh why adopt a guideline that the persons responsible for compliance have already eschewed???? the inanity of having the assembly approve of guidelines they will never follow is what makes this entire process little more than a travesty</p> <p>the draft plan at its worst is an inside job that ignores anyone AND EVERYONE but private corporations, AMATS selected echo chambers, and a few dozen persons attending dog and pony shows, while at its best it is a recognition that Anchorage sucks as compared to other northern cities, in large part because the Assembly insists on ignoring best practices necessary to do something about bicyclist and pedestrian safety and access.</p> <p>the assembly was asked to adopt NACTO guidelines and at a minimum affiliate with NACTO and were told that has to come from AMATS, when AMATS told the public that has to come from the assembly but we still see NO ACTION from the ASSEMBLY on ANYTHING.</p> <p>the whole disastrous mess is just shameful.</p>	Staff is unsure what this comment is asking for.	No recommended change at this time.
300	Hajduk, Lindsey			Including the southern Spenard Road rehab project on our maps and project tables as a recommended separated bikeway and high priority pedestrian corridor.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
301	Hajduk, Lindsey			Replacing the enhanced shared roadway on 31st with the 32nd/33rd separated bikeway recommendations on both maps and project tables.	Staff agrees.	We will make this change.
302	Hajduk, Lindsey			Editing the Bicycle Network Map to show existing facility types and how they are connecting to proposed facility project recommendations.	Staff agrees.	We will create show these network links in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
303	Hajduk, Lindsey			Including the Fish Creek Trail connector to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail (the primary active network as shown on the Open Space Network map on pg. 44 of the SCP) as a recommended shared use pathway in the NMP.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
304	Hajduk, Lindsey			Including and highlighting the "Ride the Moose" route in the NMP.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
305	Hajduk, Lindsey			Including the Fairview Greenway in the NMP.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
306	Hajduk, Lindsey			Including proposed festival streets in our recommended network maps as well as festival street design recommendations in chapter 7 of the NMP.	Staff agrees.	We will include festival streets and festival street design recommendations in chapter 7.
307	Hajduk, Lindsey			Looking at major connection barriers to the Ride the Moose route such as the Lake Otis crossing and connection through Mountain View.	Staff is working with ADOT&PF to identify major barriers to non-motorized travel including intersections.	We will include a map showing major barriers and problem intersections.
308	Hajduk, Lindsey			Include Winter Route Map (probably after the second maintenance forum is held) which will prioritize our network for winter maintenance that can be reasonably achieved.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	
309	Halverson, Eileen			<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Non-Motorized Plan. I strongly support efforts to improve options for biking and walking in Anchorage. As the draft plan is finalized, I urge you to ensure that the map of existing conditions accurately reflects routes that are safe and comfortable for bicycling and walking; to encourage the use of supplemental solutions such as wayfinding, traffic signal timing, enforcement, and education in addition to building infrastructure; and to continue working to ensure that winter maintenance is sufficient to allow reliable, safe, and equitable non-motorized transportation throughout the year.</p> <p>Thank you for working to improve non-motorized transportation in Anchorage, which is such an important part of making our city safer and more livable.</p>	Staff agrees.	We will make sure the existing conditions map is accurate.
310	Hamler, Tami			I am in strong support of including the northern extension of the Glenn Hwy bike path in the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. This path will provide residents and visitors a safe way to travel and recreate.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
311	Hamler, Tami			Please include the Mirror Lake to Eklutna bike path extension as a priority project. More separated bike trails connecting key parks and towns create opportunities for residents and visitors to recreate safely.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
312	Hamm, Mark			I ask you to please consider to include a protected and extended bike path from Peters Creek to the Eklutna Overpass. I live in the Birchwood areas and often recreate on the bike path along the highway. It is difficult and cumbersome to have to ride through neighborhoods to get around the Peters Creek area. Additionally I ride several times a year on the main highway between the mirror lake area and eklutna because there is no sidewalk. Including a bike path would be much safer.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
313	Harvey, Ali			<p>I'm writing to encourage you to please keep the northern extension in the new non-motorized plan. As a cyclist and south central booster - former resident of anchorage and currently in Palmer - I've ridden the path many times and often wished there were better, safer connection on the north side. I think part of encouraging safe, fun, healthy outdoor activity in our amazing region is having the infrastructure to do so. It will also be an investment in our future to be able to attract bike tourists with more exciting and extensive routes.</p> <p>Thank you for all you do and I hope the northern extension is included in this plan.</p>	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
314	Hilcoske, Mary			Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Non-Motorized Plan. I strongly support efforts to improve options for biking and walking in Anchorage. As the draft plan is finalized, I urge you to ensure that the map of existing conditions accurately reflects routes that are safe and comfortable for bicycling; to encourage the use of supplemental solutions such as wayfinding, traffic signal timing, enforcement, and education in addition to building infrastructure; and to continue working to ensure that winter maintenance is sufficient to allow reliable, safe, and equitable non-motorized transportation throughout the year. Thank you for working to improve non-motorized transportation in Anchorage, which is such an important part of making our city safer and more livable.	Staff agrees.	We will make sure the existing conditions map is accurate.
315	Hodgson, Shannon			I would like to voice my request that the Glen Hwy bike path be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklunta Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. Please include the northern extension of the Glen Hwy bike path in the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
316	Holman, Larry	n/a		It would be great if the Glenn HiWy bike trail be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklutna overpass. I have ridden that stretch many times and the older I get the more daunting it has become. We generally ride on the East side of the main highway facing the traffic because its wider but biking toward the oncoming cars and trucks and especially the big campers is a scary experience.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
317	Holzapfel, Lisa	n/a	General	Many Anchorage bicyclists travel north along the Glenn Highway and are at high risk when navigating along the State Highway system. In many locations there are no safe alternatives. Riders are put in the same corridor as fast moving vehicles and trucks. We do training rides for fitness and bikepacking trips that are several days in length. Currently there are many unsafe sections of state highways that do not accommodate safe passage for people traveling by bicycle.	N/A	No action recommended.
318	Holzapfel, Lisa		General	The 2020 AMATS Non-motorized Plan does not include the northern extension of the Glenn Hwy bike path from Peters Creek to the Eklutna Overpass, as recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. That ride is very dangerous. And I know many bikers who have had near misses. To keep Alaskans and visiting bikers safe, we need separated and protected bike paths on all of our major highways.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
319	Iden, Tanya			Hi - I recently submitted comments regarding a specific project - the Lois & 32nd Upgrade Project. In those comments I suggested the following: Can we pass an ordinance that requires a walkability/ADA accessibility audit be done for every public school, recreation center, bus stop, library, and park to include a mile radius around the public facility and then use the findings to direct funding for improvements that promote transportation equity? This would help support the numerous plans that have been adopted by the MOA that say we need better walking and biking – Vision Zero, Climate Action Plan, Welcoming Anchorage Roadmap, AMATS Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan, Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, AMATS Complete Streets Policy, 2040 Comprehensive Plan, West Anchorage District Plan, Spenard Road Corridor Plan. It was suggested that I should also submit this idea to the Non-motorized Transportation Plan. I thought that this plan was already adopted? Anyhow, please consider the idea outlined above. Thank you.	Staff agrees that this type of ordinance would be a good idea and help improve walkability and ADA accessibility.	Staff will work on including this recommendation in the policy section of the NMP.
320	Iverson, Dwight			Hello, I would like to voice my support for building and continuing to build on the Glenn Highway bike path. I think it's helpful and helps make our society more safe when there are more separated bike and walking paths. I would be safer for motorist and safer for pedestrians and bikers if there's a separated bike path. Please continue to build on bike path infrastructure along the Glenn Highway and particularly from Anchorage and Eagle River heading north. Thank you very much,	Staff will work on including this recommendation in the policy section of the NMP.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
321	Jamison, Bill			I would like to voice my strong support for including the Northern extension of the Glenn Hwy bike path in the 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
322	Jeffers, Stephany			I am writing today to ask that the proposed northern extension of the Glenn Hwy bike path be included in the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. Mirror Lake is one of the most well-used public areas in the Muni and there are very limited bike paths in the area. The extension would not only offer better access for local municipal residents, but it would offer additional public recreation opportunities in around one of the best parks in Anchorage.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
323	Joe Hackenmueller			Please include the Mirror Lake to Eklutna extension as a priority project in the current AMATS NMP (non-motorized plan). Thank you for your consideration.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
324	Johnson, Barbara			<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the Non-Motorized Plan. While it's great to see Anchorage working on this plan, I'm discouraged that yet again, Fairview is relegated to a lower priority.</p> <p>According to NMP, Fairview and downtown are areas of high inequity and high demand for pedestrian and bike paths. I live on 17th and Karluk in Fairview, and I can confirm these findings. I will start by saying that we have a year-round problem with speeding cars and unsafe drivers. The problem is particularly noticeable on 20th avenue coming from Gambell and on 17th. In the past week alone, I have seen two cars spin out of control and end up on the sidewalk. The stop sign at 17th and Karluk is ignored as often as it is respected, and the yield sign at the T intersection at 17th and Juneau is just ignored. The section of Karluk between 17th and 15th is an icy mess in winter, and I have seen 5 cars slide down that hill this past winter.</p>	Fairview was not relegated to a lower priority in this plan. All areas within the AMATS Boundary were analyzed with the same data set and criteria and projects were scored based on this areawide data analysis.	Staff will have the project team to look into several specific project recommendations for the Fairview neighborhood.
325	Johnson, Barbara			This situation is particularly worrisome as this neighbourhood has many pedestrians, bikers, skiers etc... Many of my neighbors do not have cars, and so commute on foot or bikes. Many people in this community also enjoy outdoor activities, and have dogs we walk around the neighborhood. We have often discussed how unsafe we feel doing these activities, especially in winter when the sidewalks are covered in snow and we must walk on the roadway.	Staff agrees.	Staff will have the project team to look into several specific project recommendations for the Fairview neighborhood.
326	Johnson, Barbara			This is also a young neighborhood with a lot of kids. It's great to see kids playing in their yard and on the sidewalk, but there's little protection between them and the speeding cars. And while we are next to Eastchester, the commute to the park and the trails cuts across the roads with speeding drivers. In fact, the intersection of Karluk and 20th is where I saw cars spin out of control.	Staff agrees.	Staff will have the project team to look into several specific project recommendations for the Fairview neighborhood.
327	Johnson, Barbara			Fairview is a young, dynamic community. People in the neighborhood bike, walk and ski regularly to commute, or for pleasure. Yet the current design of the neighborhood makes these activities unsafe. Having a designated bike paths would be of great benefit to Fairview and its residents.	Staff agrees.	Staff will have the project team to look into several specific project recommendations for the Fairview neighborhood.
328	Kelly, Jacob			The Glenn Hwy separated/protected bike path should absolutely be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklutna overpass as originally recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. This is a wonderful aspect of Anchorage and a great addition as well as attraction for future residents (and visitors). Please do not overlook this original recommendation/plan. I am happy to discuss further.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
329	Kempen, Allen			The NMP could be improved by inclusion of a section discussing the impacts of shadows on pedestrian/bicyclist infrastructure in our subarctic environment and making recommendations for mitigation of negative impacts. Life at 61 Degrees North Latitude means living with the presence of domineering shadows. Not the quiet shadows of the lower Latitudes with their intermittent and often pleasant influence on the built environment. We experience loud shadows that dominate a person's experience often in an uncomfortable way.	A discussion of the effects of building shadows is more appropriate for an Urban Design plan or something more akin to the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan and is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
330	Kemplen, Allen			These "Shadow Spaces" have an inordinate impact on the quality of life, on the convenience of pedestrian mobility and the safety of both pedestrians and bicyclists. Shadow Spaces have lower ambient temperatures than areas where the sun has influence. The darker aspect of inspire deep mystery. Shadow Space is often considered something to be avoided. This is evidenced by the use of techniques in Title 21 of the Municipal Code to protect solar access so as to minimize the most egregious aspects of Shadow Spaces.	A discussion of the effects of building shadows is more appropriate for an Urban Design plan or something more akin to the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan and is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
331	Kemplen, Allen			The future of the Anchorage Bowl is increased urban density. This means higher buildings, often with greater mass and a larger site footprint. Such development will create more shadows. Many of these shadows, absent mitigating design features, will be deep and foreboding. The negative impacts of shadows on adjacent properties are often cited as a reason to oppose greater density. Within the public realm of the right-of-way these shadows result in longer melt times for snow stored on sidewalks, icing during those times when the freeze/thaw cycle is active and cooler ambient air temperatures at the street level environment.	A discussion of the effects of building shadows is more appropriate for an Urban Design plan or something more akin to the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan and is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
332	Kemplen, Allen			The NMP should instead be making recommendations that acknowledge this institutional and political set of circumstances. One method would be to recommend a tiered corridor network whereby one set of roads are specifically recognized as being necessary for efficient arterial functions while another set of roads are specifically recognized necessary for other modes of transportation. Those corridors emphasizing multi-modality should be controlled by the Municipality in order to establish a stronger urban design connection between land use development and transportation. For example, it would be appropriate for the NMP to recommend prioritization of bike and pedestrian improvements within the Primary Transit Corridors. Such a policy recommendation would show a real understanding of other Municipal and AMATS planning documents.	AMATS does not have any control over road ownership or maintenance within the AMATS area. This recommendation is outside the scope of this plan.	No action recommended.
333	Kemplen, Allen			In addition, there is significant interest by the marketplace in developing new technological solutions to the "last mile" problem of small parcel delivery. Some involve the use of new drone technologies but others are focusing on surface delivery methods. These represent a significant concern for transportation planners who are working on future bike and pedestrian infrastructure. See the following links for just two examples: Roxo the FedEx SameDay Bot FedEx Meet Scout (aboutamazon.com) A new section should be included discussing the impacts of such new technologies on the nonmotorized infrastructure in the Anchorage area. It would be poor practice to dismiss these technological developments with the statement that local ordinances prohibit their use. Ordinances can be changed. See Sidewalk robots get legal rights as "pedestrians" - Axios Pedestrian First Streets	Drones and sidewalk robots are outside the scope of this planning document.	No action recommended.
334	Kemplen, Allen			Most of these roads are the responsibility of the State DOT&PF whose primary mission is the safe and efficient movement of goods and services. The record shows that within the AMATS boundary area, the priority of DOT&PF is movement of vehicles first. For the NMP to advance recommendations that will require limited State right-of-way to be re-allocated to the improvement of pedestrians and bicyclists is a recipe for conflict and is not well grounded in reality.	For several years now, FHWA has been advocating for a change in focus from traditional vehicle-centric LOS to multi-modal LOS. It is incorrect to assume that the priority of DOT&PF is movement of vehicles first on every ADOT&PF owned road. Staff disagrees with this comment.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
335	Kemplen, Allen			Where there exists a need for pedestrian and bicyclist infrastructure outside of the Primary Transit Corridors, the NMP should be advancing recommendations to minimize conflict between high-speed arterial traffic and low-speed pedestrians and bicyclists. As the average walking pace of a healthy adult is approximately 3 miles per hour and the average biking speed is 10-12 miles per hour, the travel corridors for these modes should be designed appropriately. One example would be for the NMP to recommend that a network of lower-speed pedestrian streets be systematically developed within the Anchorage Bowl. This network would have enhanced non-motorized linkages to arterials with bus stops. This network of pedestrian streets could be modeled after the "Woonerf" approach which consciously designs the right-of-way for pedestrians and bicyclists as a priority. Vehicles can still use them but at the prevailing speeds of the mode they are designed for. See attachment as an illustrative example within an urban or community center land use area.	Text edit.	The plan identifies high priority corridors for pedestrian improvements based on need rather than a comprehensive pedestrian network. Staff will investigate addition of developing a comprehensive pedestrian network in the future.
336	Kemplen, Allen			The NMP could be improved with a more robust discussion of the opportunities for enhancement of the pedestrian and bike infrastructure. For example, there appears to be limited discussion of heated sidewalks as a method to enhance the winter mobility experience. See adjacent figure for an existing application in mid-town. The Municipality has also heated F Street between 6th and 7th Avenues in order to enhance pedestrian movement between the Performing Arts Center and the Dena'ina Convention Center.	Suggested text edits.	Add additional language that Ch 7 presents several ideas and this is an area for ongoing exploration at future Winter Maintenance Forums.
337	Kemplen, Allen			Another example of how to successfully adapt lower latitude design techniques to our northern environment is related to the in-street bike lanes that the NMP is promoting. All the images show the bicyclists riding in the warmer seasons. During our six months of winter, these painted markings disappear and all visual guidance to the motorist or bicyclist is gone except for some small bike lane signage at the side of the road. Placement of an additional luminaire arm on existing light or utility poles about half way up and extending to a point where the light is directly over the bike lane. A small bike lane sign could be attached to the head unit which should be powder coated a distinctive and visible color. This technique allows for full fourseason utility of the in-street lane and minimizes the possibility of motorists using it or of them parking in the lane, where on-street parking is permitted.	Add text	Submerged pavement markings, physical separation such as vertical delineators, lighting is another good strategy.
338	Kemplen, Allen			The NMP should also explicitly call out the winter city differences between curb and gutter versus rolled curb street designs. Curb and gutter with a landscape buffer allows for the sidewalk to be fully reserved for the non-motorized user. Snow placement within the buffer instead of the sidewalk makes it much easier for someone to maintain the sidewalk. The current use of rolled curb sidewalks as snow storage means that the pedestrian is forced to walk in the travel way with vehicles. This situation is extremely hazardous and a significant disincentive to growth of the pedestrian mode share. While the street maintenance grader operators attempt to clear these sidewalks with 72 hours there are many instances where the snow remains on local streets for weeks if not months in some neighborhoods.	Suggested text edits.	Add note about different curb types to Chapter 7.
339	Kemplen, Allen			The rolled curb design is also problematic due to poor definition of the pedestrian space. We often see situation where large multi-unit trash receptacles are placed partially or wholly on the sidewalk. This again presents a barrier to pedestrians and force them into the street with motorized vehicles. The NMP ignores these on-going problems with the pedestrian infrastructure It should acknowledge these realities and present practical recommendations for addressing them in a logical and systematic fashion.	Suggested text edits.	Add note about different curb types to Chapter 7.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
340	Kemplen, Allen			Another example would be to recommend a greater use of Chicanes within the right-of-way such as the one existing on Karluk Street between 15th Avenue and 9th Avenue in the Fairview neighborhood. This type of approach creates safer pedestrian and bicyclist environment while allowing vehicles to travel at reasonable speeds along the corridor. It is accepted to incorporate more curvature within the lower-speed road network. It is pervasive in the suburban sub-divisions. Use of the Chicane design in areas of town where the right-of-way is linearly established allows for the prioritization of pedestrians and bicyclists on an alternative lower-speed network and, when done in a thoughtful and systematic manner creates a viable non-motorized street network where pedestrians and bicyclists are made to feel they are the priority versus the motorized machines.	Recommend against.	Chicanes and snow plows generally don't mix well. Recommend against, unless Anchorage can prioritize use of small plows on routes wit chicanes.
341	Kemplen, Allen			Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the AMATS Public Draft Non-Motorized Plan (NMP). I submit the following observations and suggestions as an effort to advance understanding of Anchorage's unique set of circumstances. It is the only major metropolitan area in North America located in a sub-arctic environment. While some of the issues raised cannot be incorporated in this final draft public document, it is hoped AMATS staff can consider the more robust changes in the next iteration of the NMP.	N/A	No action recommended.
342	Kemplen, Allen			As a Winter City, Anchorage has approximately 6 months of winter. Historically, Anchorage's winters have started in the latter part of October and then lasting through "Break-Up" in mid-April. This long period of winter has several distinct subseasons: Early Winter when darkness settles in and temperatures begin dropping; Deep Winter when darkness is pervasive and temperatures are consistently below freezing; Late Winter when the sun starts its return and temperatures begin to rise; Break-Up when winter is melted away and conditions become extremely difficult for pedestrians and bicyclists. It bears repeating that Anchorage is the only major metropolitan area in North America located in the sub-arctic. This is a sign of uniqueness. Yet there is very little recognition of this northern reality in the NonMotorized Plan. The reality of life in the North is well articulated in the quote to the right.	N/A	No action recommended.
343	Kemplen, Allen			In conclusion, it is quite apparent a lot of work went into production of the NMP. It is unfortunate it does not substantively address the unique pedestrian and bicyclist needs of our sub-arctic Winter City. The document puts forward recommendations more appropriate for the Lower 48 rather than our sub-arctic metropolitan community.	N/A	No action recommended.
344	Kemplen, Allen			If Anchorage is to establish itself as a truly livable Winter City then the planning documents produced by AMATS must explicitly acknowledge the realities and challenges of mobility within and through a sub-arctic metropolitan area. The current public draft NMP indicates we still have a long way to go before we are able to discard a legacy Lower 48 mindset and forge a new direction befitting our unique environmental setting	N/A	No action recommended.
345	Kemplen, Allen			The NMP could be improved by greater integration with northern urban design and Anchorage's 2040 Land Use Plan (ALUP). For example, the ALUP was updated to reflect future population growth in the Anchorage Bowl. Anchorage is bounded on the east by the Chugach Mountains, the north by Elmendorf AFB and Fort Richardson, Knik Arm to the west and Turnagain Arm to the south. This means that in order for the community to accommodate the growth, land use will change. The ALUP identifies where and how land adjacent to rights-ofway will be shifting. There will a much higher emphasis on mixed-use development and higher densities. The ALUP also identifies particular road corridors as Primary Transit Corridors where higher bus frequencies along with higher densities will be focused. However, the NMP appears to ignore this future land use reality.	Please see response to above comment.	Staff is currently working on coordinating the NMP with the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
346	Kempen, Allen			Where is the discussion about what happens to pedestrians and bicyclists during Chinooks and Break-Up as they attempt to move about the transportation network on narrow facilities adjacent to high-speed traffic and on roads where the drainage systems are iced over? Where is the discussion about the impact of shadows creating icy infrastructure on the non-motorized infrastructure? Where is the discussion about past efforts to implement Winter City design techniques to improve mobility for pedestrians? Where is the discussion about how the pervasiveness of rolled curb street designs are a structural impediment to winter pedestrian mobility?	Staff agrees that a couple of these topics should be discussed in the plan.	We can incorporate some discussion about the challenges of break up barriers and rolled curb into the planning document.
347	Kempen, Allen			It is noted that of the approximately 102 images of people and design examples, 8 of them show winter conditions with seven showing snow removal equipment. This equates to less than eight percent of the visual imagery illustrating winter pedestrian and bicyclist infrastructure. This appears out of sync. Anchorage is located at 61 degrees north latitude. This is about the same latitude as Oslo, Norway and other large Nordic metropolitan areas. This is illustrated below.	Staff agrees.	We will add more images of winter city non-motorized users.
348	Kempen, Allen			The NMP should incorporate the recommendations of the ALUP as it relates to the changes in projected land uses, designated Primary Transit Corridors and identified Greenways. Special note that the NMP should include the Fairview Greenway that will provide a future pedestrian and bicyclist greenway between Chester Creek and Ship Creek Greenbelts. This will in turn create a unique pedestrian and bicyclist beltway around the urban core of the city. It will consist of Tony Knowles Coastal Trails on the west, Chester Creek Greenbelt on the south, Fairview Greenway placed above the future H2H connection and Ship Creek Greenbelt on the north.	Staff agrees.	We are working on coordinating the NMP with the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan Transit Corridors and Greenways.
349	Kempen, Allen			The public draft NMP through its length in development and in the number of pages gives the reader an impression that it is a substantive document. It certainly looks like a lot of work was put into its production. It is unfortunate that it has two major flaws: first is the heavy emphasis on Lower 48 designs applicable for latitudes where there are four seasons, each three months long. Second is the narrow focus on just the actual footprint of the pedestrian/bicyclist infrastructure at the exclusion of the interface with adjacent land uses.	The NMP draws upon research and facility design suited for winter cities in North America and abroad. It is well suited for Anchorage's climate and region. Staff disagrees with this statement. The project team is already looking at coordinating with the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan in the next draft.	No action recommended.
350	Kempen, Allen			The winter season is Anchorage's dominant season. As such issues associated with winter mobility should have at least fifty percent if not more of the text and graphics.	The plan is not organized in seasonal format. Staff disagrees with this recommendation.	No action recommended.
351	Kempen, Allen			This lack of a connection with land use development weakens the usefulness of the NMP. As the Anchorage Bowl becomes denser, the development pattern will transition from an autooriented suburban pattern to a more urban one. Rather than building setbacks, new development will start adhering to Build-To lines as buildings are moved closer to the street edge. This is an important change because this creates a new context for the pedestrian and bicyclist. The future urban street edge environment is likely to have more awnings, overhangs, covered arcades and other features that alter the pedestrian experience. The NMP is not intended to be a short-range programming document. Thus, it should be looking at the streetscape environments anticipated within the planning horizon. These are described in the Anchorage Land Use Plan. A long-range planning document which the NMP does a very poor job of coordination. As a product of the MPO, the NMP should adhere to the principles of the 3-C process.	These types of Landuse/Transportation street related design alternatives will be explored in the upcoming AMATS Street Typologies Plan and are outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
352	Kempen, Allen			The NMP could be improved by incorporating a more robust evaluation of the potential issues and challenges associated with the rapid development of new transportation technologies. There are numerous examples of new small electric mobility devices being used in urban areas. Most of them are operating at the lower speeds typical of pedestrians and bicyclists and thus gravitating toward the bike and ped infrastructure. This is a current and growing policy issue that the NMP does not adequately address.	This plan could benefit from some discussion of electric mobility options being used in other MPO areas around the country such as bike shares and electric scooters etc..	Include discussion of these in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
353	Kempen, Allen			The NMP assumes the existing right-of-way edge environment does not change. This assumption contravenes adopted Municipal land use documents. As such it reveals a lack of coordination between this MPO sanctioned work product and the Municipality of Anchorage. This seems to violate the spirit of the 3-C process and may lead to unnecessary confusion and conflicts. It should be stated again that the NMP produced by AMATS should more explicitly reflect the land use decisions made by the Municipality.	This plan seeks to coordinate with the existing Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan.	Include language stating the coordination between the NMP and the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan.
354	Kempen, Allen			This bias is reflected also in the NMP's set of recommendations for pedestrian and bicyclist infrastructure. There are only a few roads in the Anchorage Bowl capable of moving significant volumes of vehicles. Yet this is where the NMP seeks to direct bicyclists and pedestrians through its list of prioritized improvements. This will place them directly adjacent to the traveling high-speed traffic subject to negative impacts including water spray during snow melt conditions.	This plan seeks to strike a balance between recommendations for better non-motorized connections on major arterials and less busy roads/streets. There is a need for both, as demonstrated by this planning document and the large number of comments supporting both approaches.	No action recommended.
355	Kempen, Allen			I took part in the public involvement process as did many of my neighbors. It is my recollection there was public input regarding the importance of dealing with Anchorage's six months of winter in a substantive manner. However, it is difficult to find where the draft NMP gives winter conditions, winter mobility and mitigating actions much attention. It is acknowledged the project team hosted one winter maintenance forum during the day when most residents could not attend. The few pages discussing winter maintenance are appreciated.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
356	Kempen, Allen			As the Anchorage Bowl continues to increase its density there needs to be a more forwardlooking approach to the issue of snow management. Increased densities will make it much more challenging to store snow. The horizontal space will not be there. The NMP should include more discussion of options for proactive snow management. One example would be to make recommendations that on streets with rolled curbs that the grader operators consciously avoid using the sidewalk as for snow storage. Many of the local streets have 60' right-of-way where the cross-section consists of 4' sidewalk, 2' rolled curb and approximately 48' of asphalt. As the Municipal land use development code (Title 21) aggressively mandates minimum off-street parking there is very little demand for parking on-street. The practical result is that the motorized vehicles enjoy a wide ALLEN KEMPLEN swath of the right-of-way while the pedestrian is treated as an afterthought. The NMP should call attention to the inequity in the use of public right-of-way and make recommendations for treating all users of the right-of-way fairly, especially as it comes to snow management practices.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
357	Kempen, Allen			Another example is the use of neighborhood-based snow removal. This is where the snow is placed in a below-ground snow melt cistern and the liquid can be either directed into the storm drain system or allowed to filter into the natural ground water table. Many metropolitan communities require the private land owner to be responsible for maintenance of the sidewalk fronting the street. It is my understanding that the current Municipal code requires this only for the Central Business District. The NMP should discuss the disparities in responsibilities placed on the private land owner. It is quite reasonable for a land owner to be responsible for snow maintenance of their particular sidewalk. However, they cannot do so if Street Maintenance uses the sidewalk as snow storage and places concrete like snow berm on it for them to remove.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
358	Kempen, Allen			There have been several initiatives over the years to create a new snow management tool. This would be creating a supportive policy and program framework for Volunteer Snowfighters. The concept is modeled after the more traditional volunteer fire fighter's approach. It would not be that difficult for government to establish a system whereby citizen volunteers sign up for the program, receive proper training and accept use of a commercial grade snowblower for use during the winter season. The units would be dropped off in mid to late October and picked up in mid to late April. Participants would be treated for risk management purposes the same way that communities treat volunteer fire fighters.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
359	Kemplen, Allen			For example, the NMP should have a section examining the non-motorized infrastructure within the Primary Transit Corridors (defined as ¼ mile on each side of the road corridor), identify where there are gaps between the bus stops and buildings, quantify the cost of addressing those deficiencies and then present a set of prioritized recommendations for inclusion into future Unified Work Programs and Transportation Improvement Programs along with the Municipal Planning and Capital Improvement processes.	We are currently working on this.	No further action recommended.
360	Kemplen, Allen			The NMP should complement the Anchorage Land Use Plan and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan in their efforts to create viable Primary Transit Corridors. This is particularly relevant in the issue of winter access to bus stops. It is difficult for the Anchorage People Mover to grow its ridership when the pedestrian experience too often looks like that in the below figures. How do you think a physically disabled resident feels as they consider using public transit for their trips around town with these prevailing conditions? The fact that the NMP gives only lip service to the real issues affecting Winter City pedestrians appears to reflect either a conscious or unconscious bias. One that perpetuates the dominant automobile-oriented paradigm at the expense of regular people and alternative modes of transportation.	We are currently working on this.	No further action recommended.
361	Kirby, Aaron			I would hope that your office would add the northern extension to the Glenn Highway non-motorized path to the 2020 plan. It would be a huge improvement to the community to have an uninterrupted non-motorized path from the Valley to Anchorage. Thank you for your time.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
362	Klein Family			We need a non-motorized path from Anchorage to the valley. With more users and evokes becoming more common this is a high need. Please include a Glenn Hwy separated (and protected) bike path extended from Peters Creek to the Eklunta Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
363	Kruger, Laura	n/a		I'm asking that you please consider the Glenn Hwy separated bike path to be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklunta Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. Biking is important to our community! There are many, many bikers who often bike out to Eklutna lake, who now as you know, have to unsafely ride on the highway shoulder. A bike path to the Eklutna overpass would be a much appreciated and safer means to travel in this area.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
364	LeBeau, Michelle		General Comments	I would like to comment on a pedestrian barrier in my neighborhood. Right now, there is no established walkway on Brayton between Huffman Rd and Tradewind Drive heading south. There are nice big paved paths along Huffman and starting again at Tradewind, which goes all the way up DeArmoun. Adding a designated path to connect these two major existing paths would be a huge improvement and bring safer access to existing paths. Many people in the neighborhood including my family walk along Brayton, but it feels less safe without a walkway, especially in the winter. Please consider this small trail connection in your non-motorized plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
365	Lindsey, Chris			I am writing to ask for the Glenn Hwy separated (and protected) bike path to be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklunta Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. (It is currently NOT in the new plan.)	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
366	Lyon, Kelly			Just writing to ask that the northern extension of the Glenn Hwy bike path be included in the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. A bike path to be extending from Peters Creek to the Eklunta Overpass allows access to Mirror Lake and Eklutna exits. At Mirror Lake there is single track and a proposed bike park in the works. Being able to ride there from my house in Chugiach would be a great summer adventure.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
367	MacGregor, Jim			I'm writing to request that the Glenn Hwy separated bike path be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklunta Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. Developed bikeways allow people an opportunity to safely recreate, as well as enhance Anchorage's profile as a bike tourism destination.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
368	Martin, Gary			<p>Hello. I was at the Chugiak Community Council and heard about Non Motorized plan. I have a proposal to be added to this plan.</p> <p>There is a sidewalk coming up South Birchwood Loop Road. The sidewalk goes about 1/2 way up the road towards the Old Glen Hwy and then just stops. There is a huge safety risks for pedestrians and students who walk to Chugiak H.S. as they have to walk along the side of the road the rest of the way.</p> <p>I would like to encourage this sidewalk be extended up to the newer Old Glen Hwy non motorized sidewalks.</p>	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
369	Mills, Mary			<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Non-Motorized Plan. I strongly support efforts to improve options for biking and walking in Anchorage. As the draft plan is finalized, I urge you to ensure that the map of existing conditions accurately reflects routes that are safe and comfortable for bicycling; to encourage the use of supplemental solutions such as wayfinding, traffic signal timing, enforcement, and education in addition to building infrastructure; and to continue working to ensure that winter maintenance is sufficient to allow reliable, safe, and equitable non-motorized transportation throughout the year. Thank you for working to improve non-motorized transportation in Anchorage, which is such an important part of making our city safer and more livable.</p> <p>Also, I like the new bike lane on Pine street and the resurfacing of Fish Creek trail.</p>	Staff agrees.	We will make sure the Existing Conditions map is accurate.
370	MOA PM&E		Fig. 4.1 & 4.3	While Separated Bikeways sound great, the available ROW to implement the proposed bicycle improvements will be extremely challenging to impossible. Downtown separated bikeways would mean removing on-street parking. Downtown already faces problems with having enough available parking. The loss of parking will mean the loss of businesses downtown.	Text addition	Studies have been completed in other winter cities demonstrating the balance of PBLs and removal of on-street parking and resulting status quo or increase in business activity. Citation of examples elsewhere to be included.
371	MOA PM&E		Fig. 2.4	Add the following to having a shared use pathway: · 100th Avenue—Minnesota Drive to C Street · Dimond Boulevard — West Park Drive to Sand Lake Road · 100th Avenue — C Street to Old Seward Highway · King Street — Dimond Boulevard to 104th Avenue · 104th Avenue — C Street to King Street · 40th Avenue — Lake Otis Parkway to Dale Street · Strawberry Road — Jewel Lake Road to Northwood Drive	Staff agrees.	We will add these missing project links.
372	MOA PM&E		Most Figures	Make sure to show 100th Avenue extension between Minnesota Drive and C Street	Staff agrees.	We will fix this missing project link.
373	MOA PM&E		Most Figures	Correct spelling of "Diamond" Boulevard to "Dimond"	Staff agrees.	We will fix this tex edit.
374	MOA PM&E		Fig. 2.3 & 2.4	Missing connection of Campbell Creek trail at New Seward Highway. Lori Schanche fought hard for that connection.	Staff agrees.	We will add these missing project links.
375	MOA PM&E	n/a	Table 5.4	List of Priority Pedestrian project appears to be severally out of date. I'm estimating 10-20% of the projects in MOA ROW and on the list have been completed. Contact Gary Jones, MOA PM&E for him to review complete list on MOAs behalf. I would also recommend contacting ADOT to have them review the list of projects. Some projects that I worked on and should be removed from list include: · Project #136 – sidewalk/pathway constructed in approximately 2009. · Project #259 – sidewalk/pathway constructed in 2007. · Project #271 - multi-use pathways on both sides of roadway were completed in 2008. · Project #312 - multi-use pathways on both sides of roadway were completed in 2018.	Staff agrees.	We will update this list for the final NMP draft.
376	Myers, Kristen	n/a	General	I noticed discussions about side paths. They are a good idea, if it is obvious where they are located.	N/A	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
377	Myers, Kristen	n/a	General	Side Paths don't always work when trying to get to shopping and business areas on main roads. For example, Tudor, Debarr, Boniface, Old Seward, Northern Lights, Dowling, International Airport Road, and many others. I am sure you have heard these and more.	N/A	No action recommended.
378	Myers, Kristen	n/a	General	I have noticed that the "On and Off Ramps" between the trails and roads are rarely cleared in winter. This may be due to confusion on who is responsible for these access ramps. It makes it very difficult to travel the trail, and then get on the road to access businesses.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
379	Myers, Kristen		General	Many sidewalks and crossing areas are blocked by vegetation in the summer. Also, the sidewalks are overgrown with vegetation, and no one seems to be responsible for cutting them back off the sidewalk.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
380	Neighborworks Alaska		Proposed Bicycle Network	The approach in the NMP is to identify general bicycle or trail enhancements, which would be further defined in the design stage. As such, it is challenging to identify the connectivity of the bicycle network, especially by facility type, for existing conditions and proposed conditions in this plan. The plan should include a figure to identify the core bicycle network, especially considering winter conditions, to test whether city-wide access and connectivity is achieved with this plan.	Text addition	While this plan recommends designation of a core bicycling network, this has not yet been developed. The recommendation of development of a winter network will be amended to include the connectivity test described here.
381	Neighborworks Alaska			Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. Creating an integrated planning document for pedestrians, bicyclists, and trail users is the right way to approach non-motorized transportation for Anchorage residents. The following comments are a reflection of NeighborWorks Alaska's (NWAK) mission to improve the quality of life for families and individuals by preserving homes, creating new housing opportunities, and strengthening neighborhoods. Safe access to walk, bike, take public transit, or drive are essential for our residents as well as for all community members across Anchorage. NWAK's Community Development Department specifically works to improve the physical aspects of communities by engaging residents to support health and safety for public trails, roadways, and green spaces. These comments were created in conversation with community members several neighborhoods we work in across Anchorage.	N/A	No action recommended.
382	Neighborworks Alaska		Plan Goals & Objectives	Overall, the seven goals listed in "Table 1.1: Plan Goals and Objectives" (p. 4-5) include the framework for the plan to include promoting and improving health and quality of life, improving safety and security, and connect communities through all modes and destinations. For these goals and objectives, NWAK stresses the following:	N/A	No action recommended.
383	Neighborworks Alaska		Additional Projects to Include	Generally, NWAK is pleased to see many projects identified in the proposed network, including the Fireweed Ln. and Denali St. separated bikeways in Midtown, and primary pedestrian corridor along Bragaw St. in Russian Jack. However, there are additional pedestrian, bicycle, and trail projects NWAK recommends are included on the proposed networks and prioritized as such. These include the following:	N/A	No action recommended.
384	Neighborworks Alaska		Implementation: Policy and Programs	There are a number of important policy and program recommendations outlined in the plan. NWAK would like to add our additional support for the following:	N/A	No action recommended.
385	Neighborworks Alaska		Proposed Pedestrian Network	The approach in the NMP is to identify a proposed pedestrian network through corridors rather than specific projects. The proposed pedestrian network (Figure ES 5: Proposed Pedestrian Corridors) identifies corridors more heavily focused in the Downtown to Midtown areas. However, outside of that pedestrian corridors generally appear 1 mile apart or more, such as Northern Lights Blvd. and Debarr Rd. in East Anchorage, or Raspberry Rd. and Dimond Blvd. in West Anchorage, areas where we should still work to improve pedestrian safety. Downtown and Midtown are job centers, and important to make safe for all users, but many city residents live outside these areas and need options for commuting, running errands, and otherwise having safe options from home to their destinations.	Staff agrees.	We will add project recommendations for these corridors.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
386	Neighborworks Alaska		Proposed Bicycle Network	The proposed bicycle network (Figure ES2: Recommended Bicycle and Shared Use Pathway Network) should also better incorporate references to and connections with the “Moose Loop” that connects the major greenbelt trails with neighborhood connectors. There are inadequate neighborhood connections to the regional trail network for non-motorized users, and pedestrian safety concerns along the way.	Staff agrees.	We will incorporate the Moose Loop into our project recommendations and network maps.
387	Neighborworks Alaska		Additional Projects to Include	There are a number of projects currently in different stages of planning, design, or construction that are not included in this document, which should be amended. These include, but are not limited to, the Spenard Road Rehabilitation (Benson Blvd. to Minnesota Dr.); 30th/32nd/33rd Avenue projects (Spenard Rd. to Old Seward Hwy.); and Fish Creek Trail to the Ocean. These projects are supported by area’s respective community councils (Spenard, Midtown, and Turnagain).	Staff agrees.	We will include these projects in the NMP.
388	Neighborworks Alaska		Additional Projects to Include	☐ The Fairview Greenway connection between Chester Creek and Ship Creek Greenways is supported by Fairview Community Council and integrated into the Anchorage Land Use Plan 2040 as a policy. This should be included as a pedestrian and bicyclist connection to our greenbelt trails.	Staff agrees.	We will include the Fairview Greenway connection in the NMP.
389	Neighborworks Alaska		Additional Projects to Include	Previously identified in the 2010 Anchorage Bicycle Plan is a proposed separated multiuse pathway along the Alaska Railroad corridor, which if feasible, would provide an important undivided north-south pathway through Anchorage and could be an important feature for tourism and add to the quality of life for our residents. Having a separate, dedicated path in this area, which is already commonly used by many residents, is also a safety benefit particularly for the Railroad, as it would minimize and prevent potential collisions and interruptions of train operations along this corridor. We support pursuing this corridor and making it a continued priority in the area.	Staff agrees.	We will include this pathway in the NMP.
390	Neighborworks Alaska	131	Implementation: Policy and Programs	Safe Routes to School (p. 131): As an example, we have been working with the Russian Jack community on as resident survey since 2013 and have identified concern for children to safely walk to and from school. The challenges in the winter with unplowed sidewalks, poor street lighting, and fast traffic are some examples. Prioritizing funding the SRTS program, and coordinating policy decisions and projects that correspond with the already-identified SRTS routes at school facilities citywide, could help address these long identified community needs. Every school has a map identifying routes, which should be reflected in this plan.	Staff agrees.	Let's discuss as a team how to best include the SRTS routes in the NMP.
391	Neighborworks Alaska		Implementation: Policy and Programs	Open Streets/Parklet/Pop ups Pilot Program (p. 132): These pilot projects can often lead to longer-term or permanent programs that improve walkability and bikeability in many communities. There are opportunities in many communities across Anchorage, including those identified in the Spenard Corridor Plan festival streets or downtown open streets projects the Anchorage Downtown Partnership has hosted over the years and especially during the pandemic. In 2015, NWAK and partners successfully hosted a pop-up Winter Market at the intersection of 13th and Gambell in Fairview, showcasing how spaces can be used and activated differently. Supporting more of these projects, and locating them strategically near transit, pedestrian and bike corridors, can provide a fun destination and promote the overall goal of safe, walkable, vibrant neighborhoods.	Staff agrees.	We will include policy language in the NMP to support these types of pilot projects.
392	Neighborworks Alaska	189	Implementation: Policy and Programs	Signage and Wayfinding (Design Section, p. 189): We support and encourage the recognition and integration of the Indigenous Place Names project, through the Anchorage Park Foundation and many partner organizations, to celebrate and honor the indigenous peoples of this land. Cultural place-making projects like this also educate the community about the diverse peoples in our city, and recognize stories and identities that have not always been celebrated or prioritized.	Staff agrees.	We will incorporate policy recommendations for indigenous names in signage and wayfinding in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
393	Neighborworks Alaska		Plan Goals & Objectives	Goal 5: Connect communities through all modes to all destinations. Connecting the pedestrian network, especially to access public transit, is a priority for NWAK's residents. It is often the "first and last mile" between a person's origin/destination and transit station/stop that makes all the difference in safe access to transit, and which encourages more people to consider using transit day to day, in addition to better serving those who rely on transit with few other options. The proposed pedestrian network focuses on corridors, and should include an objective to include improvements around transit routes. This may also be a potential policy to identify in "Chapter 6: Implementation."	Staff is working on coordinating the project recommendations with the Anchorage 2040 Transit corridors.	Provide map to show how project recommendations coordinate with ALUP 2040 Transit Corridors.
394	Neighborworks Alaska		Plan Goals & Objectives	Goal 4: Optimize maintenance for all seasons. These objectives include improving and prioritizing winter maintenance. There should also be an additional objective to prioritize the proposed bicycle and pedestrian networks to be located on municipally maintained roadways. As a Winter City, the muni needs to be able to make decisions around improving maintenance, including funding and staffing support. Examples: ensure that all streets with dedicated bike lanes, marked as Bike Routes, and/or listed as school routes in each school's Safe Routes to Schools Plans are prioritized for winter snow plowing. During the spring months, when street sweepers are removing gravel from roadways and sidewalks, prioritize these same routes. Currently, gravel and debris are often swept into the bike lanes and remain for several days before being picked up, keeping sidewalks clear but endangering cyclists by increasing chances of flat tires, which also increases risk of injury and falling while cycling next to car traffic.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
395	Neighborworks Alaska		Proposed Pedestrian Network	The proposed primary and secondary pedestrian corridors are also located along generally highspeed roadways that are often state-managed and maintained in the wintertime. Concerns around winter maintenance to keep sidewalks free of snow storage and passable year-round need to be addressed in this plan.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
396	Neighborworks Alaska	134	Implementation: Policy and Programs	Winter Maintenance Strategy (p. 134): Again, as a Winter City, Anchorage needs a serious plan to keep our roadways safe for all users year-round. Identifying the core networks that receive winter maintenance first is essential, as well as ensuring these fall on municipally managed roadways where funding and staffing is adequate.	Wait to answer until we discuss maintenance concerns more broadly.	No change recommended at this time.
397	Nelson, Gretchen			<p>First of all, it is imperative that the city of Anchorage do everything it can to get people put of their cars and moving about through public transportation or non-motorized methods in order to reduce green house gas emissions and attempt to mitigate the possibly disastrous effects of climate change. We must work to ensure a habitable place to live for generations to come.</p> <p>I appreciate your work toward this end and the goals of the Anchorage Climate Action Plan, which as adopted, should be the guide for all AMATS projects.</p> <p>Regarding the non-motorized plan, I expect that every project will use it's guidelines to improve walkability to public transit and other amenities for all residents of Anchorage. I wonder how the plan integrates with The Department of Transportation's policy guidelines and hope the aim of increasing non-motorized transportation comes to the forefront in all cases. My last thought is how our city will ensure that the improvements and added amenities for non-motorized use do not push people out of their neighborhoods due to market increases and their inability to meet higher housing costs.</p>	Suggested text edits.	Will include reference to climate action plan in Chapter 2.
398	Northeast Community Council			Designation of some form of ROW and usage agreement, as well as eventual trail development along the MOA JBER boundary or in JBER.	ROW and Usage agreements are outside the scope of this plan.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
399	Northeast Community Council			<p>The NECC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the AMATS Non-Motorized Plan.</p> <p>Whereas, the NECC has long identified two high priority, long-standing goals for non-motorized connections within our community which projects have focused not only upon greater community connectivity but also increased access to the community at large by East Side Residents, and</p> <p>Whereas, the NECC has proposed, endorsed, and campaigned for the following projects for the purposes of accomplishing those goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An East-West link bringing the Chester Creek Trails to the foothills at or about Chanshtnu Park, and 	N/A	No action recommended.
400	Northeast Community Council			Whereas the NECC applauds the Plans recognition in Chapter 2 that Anchorage lags way behind other northern cities in addressing non-motorized users, and likewise applauds the recommendations that the MOA affiliate or join NACTO, and	N/A	No action recommended.
401	Northeast Community Council			Whereas, while the NECC appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Plan, significant work is still required with the community to complete the Plan, and	N/A	No action recommended.
402	Northeast Community Council			Whereas the draft in failing to reject prior management and design eschewing protected bike lanes and total reliance on paint as the most important aspect of providing safe infrastructure for non-motorized users, appear to endorse a policy of “more of the same”, which does little or nothing to make Anchorage safe for “All Ages and Abilities”,	N/A	No action recommended.
403	Northeast Community Council			<p>Which projects should include as the NECC has documented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction of bridges in Chanshtnu Muldoon Park. 	Staff agrees.	We will add this project link to the NMP.
404	Northeast Community Council			A North South trail running along Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (in or out of the base) connecting “the curve” to North East Anchorage by the Powerplant and thence to the bike path north of the highway in addition to a connection at Muldoon to the ‘diverging diamond’ which crosses the Glenn Highway and connects with the Glenn Highway Trail.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project link to the NMP.
405	Northeast Community Council			Connected and upgraded trail along the South Fork of Chester Creek from Cheney Lake Park through the existing easement to Patterson Street.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project link to the NMP.
406	Northeast Community Council			The connection from Cheney Lake to Muldoon is currently identified in the Plan as exiting the Cheney Lake trails from the east at Foothill, to Sherwood, and East 20th. The Muldoon interface with East 20th is unsignaled, and at the top of a relatively steep hill. A much better connection is currently heavily used, and noted on the 2020 Bike Trail Map. Replace the Plan’s connection with: east of Cheney Lake north to E. 16th, Patterson St. Chester Ct, and through to Begich Middle School and Creekside Center Drive. This allows users to go to north or east and arrive at signaled intersections at DeBarr or Muldoon, both of which continue on to Chanshtnu Muldoon Park. This would also take advantage of a current PM&E non-motorized project along Patterson St.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project link to the NMP.
407	Northeast Community Council			<p>While the NECC has also endorsed additional matters such as the completion of a second tunnel under DeBarr as set forth in the Russian Jack Springs Master Plan</p> <p>for decades, further connection above or below the Glenn Highway connecting the Northeast communities to the bike path on the North side of the highway, integration of our most eastern neighborhoods with non-motorized connectors, facilitating seamless access to school and services as recommended by a number of east side persons to the Community and Economic Development committee of the Assembly in February, and</p>	Staff agrees.	We will add this project link to the NMP.
408	Northeast Community Council			Whereas, though NECC has been at pains to pursue these plans through CIP listing, political efforts, and external grant development, the Plan largely ignores the interests of the largest community council in Anchorage, and	Staff disagrees with this statement.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
409	Northeast Community Council			Now therefore be it resolved that while the NECC supports the inclusion of the projects mentioned above in the Non-Motorized Plan, as well as the increased connectivity, safety, and access for non-motorized users as discussed above, the NECC also finds that additional collaboration with the community is necessary to complete the Plan and that the plan cannot be endorsed at this time.	Staff will confer with the NECC prior to final plan development.	Schedule meeting with NECC to go over proposed project revisions.
410	Parsons, Eric			I'm writing to express my support for an extension of the bike path along the Glen highway to the Eklutna / Thunderbird falls exits. It makes a lot of sense. There's fantastic biking to continue on in that area. I know a lot of people who would like to bike the Eklutna lake road from the bike trail but having to get on the highway is a no-go. Please include a trail connector in the planning process.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project link to the NMP.
411	Pease, Nancy			The muni has forfeited numerous non-motorized connections in the Rabbit Creek area when staff or appointees did not apply Title 21 requirements or did not understand trail design possibilities. Examples include Upper Canyon Road and several connections in the Little Rabbit Creek vicinity.	N/A	No action recommended.
412	Pease, Nancy			Include annual training for staff and appointees about non-motorized connectivity.	AMATS already provides annual training for municipal staff and advisory committee members as well as other transportation agencies, private sector transportation professionals and the public.	No action recommended.
413	Pease, Nancy			Add to Section 6.2 Program recommendations, Internal Staff Trainings (p 129 of draft NMP):	AMATS already provides annual training for municipal staff and advisory committee members as well as other transportation agencies, private sector transportation professionals and the public.	No action recommended.
414	Pease, Nancy			a. Include annual training for the Platting Board and Planning and Zoning Commission, as well as Planning and Development Services staff regarding non-motorized connectivity requirements for platting, subdivision design, and road design.	AMATS already provides annual training for municipal staff and advisory committee members as well as other transportation agencies, private sector transportation professionals and the public.	No action recommended.
415	Pease, Nancy			B.4 Under Goal 1, Objective 4, (Allocate more funding for non-motorized transportation): Set a target for changing the funding split for motorized and non-motorized transportation. AMATS policy currently only calls for 10 to 15 percent. The NMP should call for a higher percentage of spending on non-motorized projects, as needed to support the goals of shifting travel modes and reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled.	AMATS does not control the % split of federal dollars that go toward non-motorized projects. This percentage is determined by Congress with the passing of new transportation legislation.	No action recommended.
416	Pease, Nancy			E.4 Page 201. Change the policy recommendation for snow removal to ensure snow removal from non-motorized facilities within 24 hours, not 72 hours. A 24-hour snow removal goal is supported by the FHWA "Guide for Maintaining Pedestrian Facilities for Enhanced Safety Research Report".	AMATS does not have any control over M&O snow removal times. These are determined by state and municipal funding and staffing choices. AMATS does plan to hold a Winter Maintenance Forum following NMP adoption to help facilitate meaningful dialogue around the issue of better winter maintenance.	No action recommended.
417	Pease, Nancy			E.5. Page 201. List specific priorities for snow removal from non-motorized facilities. It is unclear what page 203 means by "primary routes". Perhaps this refers to the "primary corridors" on Figure 4.4. Assign priority to routes that serve transit stops and transit corridors.	As part of the Winter Maintenance Forum, one of the goals will be to develop a map of prioritized winter routes that will be maintained to a higher standard during the winter.	Include development of Maintenance Forum and prioritized winter route map in action items for Implementation matrix.
418	Pease, Nancy			E.3. Add to Chapter 6: Create an inventory of undeveloped easements and ROW, accessible online. This could be funded as a TIP project.	Creating an inventory of undeveloped easements and ROW is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
419	Pease, Nancy			E.2 Add to Chapter 6: Develop specific targets for shifting trips from motorized to non-motorized modes, and quantify the resulting reduction in greenhouse gas emissions as part of our citywide target of 40 percent reduction by 2030. This may require further planning resources through a TIP project.	Developing a program to link specific target mode share shifts with greenhouse gas emission reduction goals for 2030 is beyond the scope of this planning document.	No action recommended.
420	Pease, Nancy			Shift xx percent of travel from motorized to non-motorized trips, to reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions by xx percent and to support compact land use patterns, in accordance with the Anchorage Climate Action Plan and land use plan.	Developing performance measures to keep track of greenhouse gas emission reductions and mode shift is outside the scope of this plan. We can include these items as action items in the implementation chapter.	Include these goals in the implementation matrix.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
421	Pease, Nancy			B.2 Adopt other specific targets to achieve Goal 1. How many miles of protected facilities does Anchorage need to add to shift to more non-motorized travel? What number of non-motorized trips does Anchorage want to achieve, especially for business commuting and school commuting?	Developing performance measures to predict mode shift is outside the scope of this plan. We can include these items as action items in the implementation chapter.	Include these goals in the implementation matrix.
422	Pease, Nancy			Our current transportation system produces 53 percent of Anchorage's GGE. This NMP needs to help implement the ACAP. This NMP should define specific targets for shifting trips from motorized to non-motorized modes, and quantify the resulting reduction in greenhouse gas emissions as part of our citywide target of 40 percent reduction by 2030.	Suggested text edits.	Include references to plan coordination and the role walking and bicycling plans in emissions reductions to CH 2.
423	Pease, Nancy			Page 27 makes a very brief reference to the 2020 Comp Plan and Land Use Plan 2040. Make additional reference to the adopted municipal goals of reducing infill and redevelopment to create a more compact urban footprint and walkable/bikeable city centers.	Map and text edit.	Staff will include a map that overlays the land use plan improvement corridors with the bike network recommendations to show the relationship.
424	Pease, Nancy			B.3 Under Goal 3 (Improve Safety and Security): include specific objectives for safe crossings. Include measurable targets. Here are a couple of examples:	Text edits	Identifying specific objectives is inconsistent with the format of current goals and objectives. Will add a recommendation to the implementation matrix (6.15) to explore and develop measurable objectives to track implementation progress.
425	Pease, Nancy			- School zones: all schools should have safe walking and riding zones for a 1-mile radius	No action.	No action.
426	Pease, Nancy			- Park zones: neighborhood and community parks should have safe crossings of adjoining streets with 25 mph speeds or greater.	No action.	No action.
427	Pease, Nancy			D.1 Page 161. Shared Use Pathway. Add an additional definition for a type of off-street pathway suited to the rural and semi-rural Area B of the Anchorage Bowl: something simpler than a 10-14-foot-wide paved pathway. On difficult terrain, it is impractical to develop off-street pathways with a 10 to 14-foot-wide paved surface. Some public pedestrian easements are only 10 feet wide.	Text edit.	This plan focuses specifically on shared use (Class V) pathways. However, we will include mention here of other trail types and times when they might be the appropriate facility type.
428	Pease, Nancy			D.2 Paved shared use pathways should have an unpaved shoulder 2 to 3-feet wide on at least one side. Runners and dogs stay healthier if they have an unpaved surface that reduces impact to their joints. They will run on the edge of the paving and create an erosive swale. Design the shared pathway to be healthy and durable for all types of users.	Clarify design guidance	Check AASHTO and other relevant guidance to confirm this is acceptable. However, the unpaved pathway shoulders are intended as shy distance, not an unpaved pathway.
429	Pease, Nancy			D.3 Low-stress corridors. Identify additional parallel alignments to major roadways to develop as non-motorized corridors. This draft NMP illustrates the levels of traffic stress (Figure 2.14, pages 24-25) but nonetheless proposes that most pedestrian and bike routes align with high stress roadways. For example, use of the Alaska Railroad Corridor for would be far safer for north-south bicyclists than the Old Seward Highway, north of Dimond.	While this is true, the high traffic roadways often contain destinations that bicyclists and pedestrians may need to access. The plan does propose a low-stress bike boulevard network in many places to augment the high traffic corridors.	No action recommended.
430	Pease, Nancy			D.4. Page 156. This plan should mandate sidewalk separation on streets larger than neighborhood streets. Require a curb and a minimum two-foot buffer along low-traffic collectors; and a four- to six-foot buffer along roads that are major collectors or bigger, or with cars traveling 30 mph or greater	The plan recommends modal separation to the greatest extent possible. The plan must work within existing ROW constraints, however and seeks to balance the needs of all potential users.	No action recommended.
431	Pease, Nancy			E.6. Chapter 6 pages 132-133. Add to Sample Programs the School Streets concept used in London. This program involves closing the street surrounding a school to vehicles at start-up and dismissal time to give priority to non-motorized travel. See Bloomberg CityLab article dated 12-4-2020 at bloomberg.com.	Not recommended at this time to due winter conditions during the school year.	No action recommended.
432	Pease, Nancy			F.2. Identify Old Seward Highway east of Potter Marsh as Enhanced Shared Roadway/Neighborhood Greenway	Facility addition	staff to add project with appropriate facility type.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
433	Pease, Nancy			- Project length. This part of the bicycle network should connect Rabbit Creek Road to Potter Valley Road, not stop near Tideview. Also, this should be a shared use project: it is identified on the Pedestrian Project list as Project 314.	Text update	See response to associated comment F2.
434	Pease, Nancy			Please consider the value of 'truth in labeling'. This is not an umbrella non-motorized plan, and should not be titled as such. The public, officials, and developers should know that they can't rely on this volume alone.	N/A	No action recommended.
435	Pease, Nancy			The Non-Motorized project initially sought to merge the Muni's Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Areawide Trails Plan. This draft does not do that. This draft is primarily a plan for the bike network and city center pedestrian corridors.	N/A	No action recommended.
436	Pease, Nancy			The draft NMP acknowledges that it does not include a trails inventory. It doesn't show local connector trails and pathways in the urban centers. This does not address policies, design, funding, management of a range of trail types. Subsequent trail planning will need a much finer level of map detail, and a host of policies. The follow-up trail planning may be guided by the same goals; but it also may need additional goals and objectives. It will be a substantive plan, much more like a second volume than an amendment.	N/A	No action recommended.
437	Pease, Nancy			I appreciate that the NMP is more concise and readable than AMATS' recent MTP 2040. It is a relief to find goals and objectives printed on two pages. The NMP's comparison of Anchorage to similar cities is insightful. Thank you for those features.	N/A	No action recommended.
438	Pease, Nancy			A.4 Support future land use pattern of infill and redevelopment.	N/A	No action recommended.
439	Pease, Nancy			D. Design Features, Chapter 6	N/A	No action recommended.
440	Pease, Nancy			A.3 The NMP should add additional Pedestrian Corridor priorities south of Tudor Road. Listing Priority Pedestrian Corridors is critical to catalyze agencies, the public, and developers to collaborate. The NMP shows only ONE pedestrian corridor priority south of Tudor Road. Because dangerous roads often deter walking and bicycling, developers and road builders may claim that there is lack of demand for pedestrian access, and then deny amenities. This has happened in my community council area, Rabbit Creek. Our Community Council has requested two pedestrian corridors (addressed later, under specific projects).	Staff agrees.	Staff is working with ADOT&PF to incorporate HSIP data into the NMP. This will also serve to highlight additional pedestrian corridors in some of these areas as well as intersections that need safety improvements.
441	Pease, Nancy			F. Specific projects F.1 Re-align the DeArmoun Road to Rabbit Creek Road bicycle route. The proposed route in the NMP is impractical and inconvenient.	Staff agrees.	We will make this project edit in the NMP.
442	Pease, Nancy			142nd Avenue is part of the chosen route, but it is unsafe owing to very steep grades and a blind crest. Also, it requires north-south riders to ascend extra elevation if their intent is to continue south to Goldenview. The NMP should show a bicycle route connecting DeArmoun to Rabbit Creek Road on either the Buffalo alignment or on Evergreen Street.	Staff agrees.	We will make this project edit in the NMP.
443	Pease, Nancy			- Project type: neighborhood greenway. The Old Seward Highway near Potter Marsh is an ideal project for an Enhanced Shared Roadway/Neighborhood Greenway as outlined on page 158. Rabbit Creek Community Council has been working for over a year with ADOTPF, trying to get Share-the-Route signage and a reduced speed limit. With the bordering wildlife refuge, this is a model location for a "Neighborhood Greenway" as described in the NMP, with "low traffic volumes and speeds, designated and designed to give bicycles and pedestrians travel priority" while "discouraging through-trips by non-local motorized traffic".	Staff agrees.	Staff will look into recommending a Shared Roadway on this segment of the Old Seward Highway.
444	Pease, Nancy			- High priority. Show this route as a high priority. There is an existing and growing safety hazard along this connection. There are no shoulders, poor sight lines and steep embankments. Cyclists need an alternative to the current bike route on the Seward Highway, where there have been multiple fatal vehicle accidents. The Alaska Departments of Transportation (DOTPF) and Fish and Game (ADFG) have designed a pullout with parking and toilets at the south end of this connection, which will increase vehicle traffic that must share the roadway with non-motorized users. In addition, this road provides neighborhood connection and serves as a popular exercise/recreation corridor.	Staff agrees.	Staff will look into recommending a Shared Roadway on this segment of the Old Seward Highway.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
445	Pease, Nancy			As an addenda to my letter sent earlier today, I'd like to add a suggestion to re-name the Non-Motorized Plan as Non-Motorized Plan Volume 1. The subtitle could be: bike network and city center pedestrian corridors.	Staff disagrees with calling the NMP Volume 1. This would suggest that a volume 2 is planned.	No action recommended.
446	Pease, Nancy			Consider re-naming this as Volume 1.	Staff disagrees with calling the NMP Volume 1. This would suggest that a volume 2 is planned.	No action recommended.
447	Pease, Nancy			The draft NMP has a glaring omission: the role of non-motorized travel in reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GGE). The NMP's review of existing municipal plans (Section 2.1) neglects to mention the Anchorage Climate Action Plan (ACAP), which commits to 40 percent GGE reduction by 2030. Please include the ACAP in the summary of existing plans.	Staff does think including a discussion of Climate Action is a good idea for the NMP.	Staff will include discussion of the ACAP into the NMP.
448	Pease, Nancy			The NMP should adopt specific measurable targets, based on the compact land use pattern outlined in our adopted plans, and on the target for shifting a certain percent of vehicle trips to non-motorized trips.	Targets for what exactly is being asked for here?	No action recommended.
449	Pease, Nancy			A.1 This Plan should be crystal-clear that it does not supercede District and Neighborhood Plans, nor Park Master Plans, nor the Areawide Trails Plan. The NMP acknowledges that AMATS did not complete detailed planning for trails. Therefore, revise the Executive Summary, and other references in the NMP, to assert the continued authority of other plans with regard to trails and community connectivity. Specifically, delete and add sentences as follows:	The NMP will supersede the existing Anchorage Bicycle Plan and Anchorage Pedestrian Plan when adopted by the Anchorage Assembly and approved by the AMATS Policy Committee. It will not supersede the 1996 Areawide Trails plan until such time as that portion of the Non-motorized Plan has been completed and is also adopted and approved as an amendment to the NMP.	Staff will include language in the NMP to clarify which plans it supercedes and which plans it does not.
450	Pease, Nancy			Executive Summary, page vii: The 2020 NMP supersedes the existing bicycle, pedestrian and trails plans. It includes a broad overview of trails that will be amended with finer details in 2021, when additional information about trails such as width and pathway quality is available. The Areawide Trails Plan and adopted local plans will continue to guide the development of trails and local connections. Future detailed planning for trails will include local community councils and residents for each part of the Anchorage Bowl.	The NMP will supersede the existing Anchorage Bicycle Plan and Anchorage Pedestrian Plan when adopted by the Anchorage Assembly and approved by the AMATS Policy Committee. It will not supersede the 1996 Areawide Trails plan until such time as that portion of the Non-motorized Plan has been completed and is also adopted and approved as an amendment to the NMP.	Staff will include language in the NMP to clarify which plans it supercedes and which plans it does not.
451	Pease, Nancy			E. Implementation, Policies and Programs, Chapter 6.2: E.1 Add to Chapter 6: Program Recommendation to adjust the Project Scoring Criteria for the TIP and the MTP to prioritize projects that support a shift to non-motorized travel. This scoring needs to be carefully worded. Non-motorized projects that are tacked onto major road projects are not mode-shifters.	The TIP and MTP will be incorporating complete streets into thier newest drafts. There will be a scoring criteria checklist that will help prioritize streets geared toward complete streets design for funding. All new non-motorized projects help make facilities safer and more comfortable and therefore work to help shift more of the modeshare to non-motorized users.	No action recommended.
452	Pease, Nancy			c. Acknowledge that trail corridors often begin as disjoint segments that are connected when funding and easements become possible.	This comment is more appropriate for the Areawide Trails update.	No action recommended.
453	Pease, Nancy			d. Acknowledge that an undeveloped easement near a proposed development is a stranded asset and does not release a developer or road project from providing connectivity within the project.	This comment is more appropriate for the Areawide Trails update.	No action recommended.
454	Pease, Nancy			B.1 Add a new climate change objective to Goal 1 (Increase the use of the non-motorized system).	This goal is already stated in the plan.	Staff to include language in the plan about coordinating with climate action plan as mentioned above.
455	Pease, Nancy			b. Include information that lay persons' judgment about the practicality of trail construction cannot be the basis for avoiding a non-motorized connection where indicated by adopted plans or Title 21.	This is outside scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
456	Pease, Nancy			A.5 Commit to an inventory of undeveloped ROW, platted pedestrian easements, and Section Line Easements. Anchorage neighborhoods have numerous undeveloped pedestrian easements and Rights-of-Way (ROW) that can provide non-motorized connectivity.. This includes State of Alaska Section Line Easements. The NMP should adopt policies to:	This is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
457	Pease, Nancy			a. Add an Implementation Policy in Chapter 6 to Create an inventory of undeveloped easements and ROW, accessible online. This could be funded as a TIP project.	This is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
458	Pease, Nancy			b. Educate staff that an undeveloped easement is a stranded asset and does not release a developer or road project from providing connectivity in a project.	This is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
459	Pease, Nancy			A.6 Create a template for developing off-street non-motorized corridors	This is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
460	Pease, Nancy			Enable citizens to build pathways on undeveloped public easements. Develop a partnership template for citizens' groups or non-profits to work with the Muni. The Muni should be a partner by providing support such as surveying, bonding, insurance, grant receivership, and post-construction maintenance. The NMP should assign specific MOA officers to complete this template within the near-term (six months) so that the next round of detailed trail planning is not constrained by "lack of policies".	This is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
461	Pease, Nancy			F.3 Add a Pedestrian Corridor from Golden View Middle School along the 156th and 155th Avenue corridors or other existing easements to Jamie Avenue, with a T or spur trail to connect to Bear Valley and Section 36 Park. This should be depicted as a Near-Term priority because of the ongoing subdivision of surrounding tracts and scoping for road connections. A corridor delineation in this NMP will ensure that road designers and subdivision owners work cooperatively to connect schools, neighborhoods and parks.	This project link would require coordination with the municipal zoning/platting divisions and is outside the scope of the NMP at this time.	No action recommended.
462	Pease, Nancy			This corridor is shown as a future road and trail connection in the Hillside District Plan.	This project link would require coordination with the municipal zoning/platting divisions and is outside the scope of the NMP at this time.	No action recommended.
463	Pease, Nancy			D.5. Sidewalk facility selection tool. Add a sidewalk selection diagram that serves the purpose of the bicycle facility selection tool on page 157.	Staff disagrees with this comment.	No action recommended.
464	Pease, Nancy			A.2 The follow-up trails plan should not be called a "Recreational" Trails plan. The follow-up plan should include connections for utilitarian travel between neighborhoods, schools, and other community destinations. The label of "recreation trails" may limit funding sources and create legal problems for use of easements. In addition, the word "recreation" may imply jurisdiction of the municipal parks department, which will often not be the case.	When the Areawide Trails Plan is updated to become an element of the Non-motorized Plan, it will be renamed at that time.	No action recommended.
465	Pease, Nancy			B. Goals, Objectives and Performance Measures	N/A	No action recommended.
466	Pease, Nancy			B. Training for staff and appointees	N/A	No action recommended.
467	Rabbit Creek Community Council			5. Coordination with the Schools on Trails program of the Anchorage Park Foundation.	Staff agrees.	We will include language about coordinating with Schools on Trails program in the policy section of the NMP.
468	Rabbit Creek Community Council			10. Include annual training for staff and appointees about non-motorized connectivity. The muni has forfeited numerous non-motorized connections in the Rabbit Creek area when staff or appointees did not apply Title 21 requirements or did not understand trail design possibilities. Examples include Upper Canyon Road and several connections in the Little Rabbit Creek vicinity.	AMATS already provides annual training for municipal staff and advisory committee members as well as other transportation agencies, private sector transportation professionals and the public.	No action recommended.
469	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Add to Section 6.2 Program recommendations, Internal Staff Trainings (pg. 129 of draft NMP): Include annual training for the Platting Board and Planning and Zoning Commission, as well as Planning and Development Services staff, to inform them of requirements to ensure nonmotorized connectivity during platting, subdivision design and road design. This should specifically include information that lay persons' judgment about the practicality of trail construction cannot be the basis for avoiding a non-motorized connection where indicated by adopted plans or Title 21.	AMATS already provides annual training for municipal staff and advisory committee members as well as other transportation agencies, private sector transportation professionals and the public.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
470	Rabbit Creek Community Council			14. Add a Pedestrian Corridor from Goldenview Middle School along the 156th and 155th Avenue corridors or other existing easements to Jamie Avenue, with a T or spur trail to connect to Bear Valley Elementary School and Section 36 Park. We request that this be shown as a Near-Term priority because of the ongoing subdivision of surrounding tracts and scoping for road connections. A corridor delineation in this NMP will ensure that road designers and subdivision owners work cooperatively to connect schools, neighborhoods and parks. a. This corridor is shown as a future road and trail connection in the Hillside District Plan. b. Currently, Bear Valley School has zero areas that are designated for safe walking or biking. This school is one of only two in the entire Municipality where NO KIDS ARE ALLOWED TO WALK TO SCHOOL. c. There is also a road design underway for Mountain Air Drive which will include a segment of pathway but Mountain Air Drive will NOT provide a contiguous connection to existing neighborhoods or to Goldenview Middle School d. RCCC residents and school staff have expressed interest in a trail corridor along existing platted but undeveloped pedestrian easements and the Section Line Easement. This avoids the high speed traffic and steep grades of Rabbit Creek Road.	This type of project will require extensive coordination with multiple municipal departments. Staff will inquire with these departments before adding this project to the NMP.	No action recommended at this time.
471	Rabbit Creek Community Council			An addition is needed: Pedestrian Corridor from Golden View Middle School along the 156th and 155th Avenue corridors to Jamie Avenue, with a T or spur trail to connect to Bear Valley and Section 36 Park. We request that this corridor be shown as a Near-Term priority because of the ongoing subdivision of surrounding tracts and immediate residential development.	This type of project will require extensive coordination with multiple municipal departments. Staff will inquire with these departments before adding this project to the NMP.	No action recommended at this time.
472	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Bear Valley is only one of two schools in the entire district to have zero walking access. By the current scoring system, it apparently gets zero safety points because there are zero ASD-approved walkers? Golden View is in a similar "no-walk zone" with only a few residential streets approved for student walking. Our residents, staff, and teachers have expressed interest in a trail corridor along existing platted but undeveloped pedestrian easements and the Section Line Easement. This avoids the high speed traffic and steep grades of Rabbit Creek Road.	This type of project will require extensive coordination with multiple municipal departments. Staff will inquire with these departments before adding this project to the NMP.	No action recommended at this time.
473	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Connectivity from Golden View Drive to Potter Valley Road: This is an important neighborhood connection. Why is no connection shown? There are several options, and we don't need to wait for a road connection.	Staff agrees.	Add a project for this suggested connection.
474	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Potential connectivity for pedestrian path with easy gradient from DeArmoun at Cannon Woods Road through several municipal parks to Our Own Lane and Old Rabbit Creek Road, as an alternative to steep grades and fast traffic on RC and DeArmoun Road. Much of this route crosses municipal parkland, and there are existing easements for short segments outside of parks. Additional subdivision is occurring along Our Own Lane, so this corridor should be promoted now.	This type of project will require extensive coordination with multiple municipal departments. Staff will inquire with these departments before adding this project to the NMP.	No action recommended at this time.
475	Rabbit Creek Community Council			F.4 Connectivity from Golden View Drive to Potter Valley Road (Pedestrian Project 216): A short segment of Goldenview Drive is shown on the NMP Bike Network Priority Map. The complete connection should be shown. In addition, Goldenview Drive should be shown on the Pedestrian Priority map. RCCC has been rebuffed in its requests for a safe walk-to-school route in past re-design efforts for Golden View Drive.	Staff agrees.	Add a project for this suggested connection.
476	Rabbit Creek Community Council			F.5. Add a new corridor: Pedestrian or shared use path from DeArmoun at Cannon Road through several municipal parks to Our Own Lane and Old Rabbit Creek Road. This is shown as a primary corridor in the Hillside District Plan, This route would avoid steep grades and fast traffic on Rabbit Creek and DeArmoun Roads, This route crosses and connects tracts of municipal parkland, This partly off-street connection has a far lower construction cost than retro-fitting either Rabbit Creek or DeArmoun Road.	This type of project will require extensive coordination with multiple municipal departments. Staff will inquire with these departments before adding this project to the NMP.	No action recommended at this time.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
477	Rabbit Creek Community Council			11. We request a new definition for a type of off-street pathway suited to the rural and semi-rural Area B of the Anchorage Bowl: something smaller and simpler than a 10-14-foot-wide paved pathway, as defined in this NMP. On some terrain, it is not desirable to develop off-street pathways to the level of a Shared Use Pathway (paved, 10 to 14 feet). In fact, some existing public pedestrian easements are only 10 feet wide.	Text edit.	This plan focuses specifically on shared use (Class V) pathways. However, we will include mention here of other trail types and times when they might be the appropriate facility type.
478	Rabbit Creek Community Council			There is also a road design underway for Mountain Aire Drive which will include a segment of pathway but Mountain Aire Road will NOT provide a contiguous connection to existing neighborhoods or to Goldenview School	N/A	No action recommended.
479	Rabbit Creek Community Council			There is an existing and growing safety hazard along this connection. There are no shoulders, poor sight lines and steep embankments. Cyclists need an alternative to the current bike route on the Seward Highway, where there have been multiple fatal vehicle accidents. The Alaska Departments of Transportation (DOT&PF) and Fish and Game (ADFG) have designed and are implementing plans for a pullout with parking and toilets at the south end of this connection. This will surely increase vehicle traffic that poses a hazard to non-motorized users. In addition, this road provides important neighborhood connections and serves as a popular exercise/recreation corridor.	N/A	No action recommended.
480	Rabbit Creek Community Council			There is an existing and growing safety hazard along this connection. Through-cyclists (and other non-motorized users) need an alternative to the Seward Highway along Potter Marsh, where there have been multiple fatal vehicle accidents. DOTPF and ADFG have designed a pullout with parking and toilets at the south end of this connection, and this facility will surely increase vehicle traffic along OSH, posing further hazards to non-motorized users. In addition, this is a neighborhood connection and also a popular exercise/recreation corridor.	N/A	No action recommended.
481	Rabbit Creek Community Council			6. Early neighborhood outreach during trail planning and development. Additionally, we are disappointed that this plan does not incorporate any references or policies to implement the Anchorage Climate Action Plan of 2019. Now that a draft Non-Motorized Plan has been published for public review, we are providing these additional comments.	Outreach and education specific to trail planning can be fleshed out in the upcoming Trails Plan update.	No action recommended.
482	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Early neighborhood outreach is essential to successful planning. Trail planning should incorporate early notices and involvement of neighbors to best identify the most useful routes, and reduce/mitigate any perceived or actual problems for potentially affected home/land owners.	Outreach and education specific to trail planning can be fleshed out in the upcoming Trails Plan update.	No action recommended.
483	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Table 5.2 Bicycle Projects: In addition to the Table, these should be numbered and printed on a locator map, or on several locator maps, one for each priority, High, Medium, and Low. Without a locator map, the reader must guess the projects' names. Likewise, there should be a locator map for Table 5.4 with over 300 pedestrian projects.	Staff agrees that these locator maps would be useful.	Staff will create maps showing numbered projects.
484	Rabbit Creek Community Council			G.1 Table 5.2 Priority Bicycle Projects should be numbered and printed on a locator map. Without a locator map, the reader must guess the projects' names. Likewise, there should be a locator map for Table 5.4 with over 300 pedestrian projects.	Staff agrees to creating a table and map with project numbers. Creating a map of pedestrian project numbers for the old Pedestrian Plan is out of the scope of the NMP.	We will create a table and map with project numbers for NMP prioritized projects and corridors.
485	Rabbit Creek Community Council			RCCC residents are disappointed that there are no priority shared pathways south of Dimond Blvd. Our council area has several priorities which we ask AMATS to add to the NMP. Over the years, we have recommended many of these connections in commenting on the Capital Improvement Program, area plans, subdivision plats, and zoning considerations, among others.	Staff agrees to take a look at these project recommendations.	Staff will look at adding priority shared pathway projects south of Dimond Blvd.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
486	Rabbit Creek Community Council			F.6. The segments of bicycle network depicted at Jamie Avenue and at Potter Heights and Southpointe Ridge should have project numbers. They both provide important neighborhood connections. The Jamie Avenue connection would provide direct pedestrian access to our proposed School Corridor along the 156th alignment. The Potter Heights connection does not appear to be listed in Table 5.2. The roads in this area are due for upgrading, so the bicycle network connections should be clearly depicted on the Tables.	Staff agrees.	We will make this correction in the NMP.
487	Rabbit Creek Community Council		G.2 Table 1.1 Goals and objectives	Spell out the word “and” instead of using a “+” in the goal statements. In a table, the plus symbol implies adding quantities. It’s a distraction.	Staff agrees.	We will make these text edits to the NMP.
488	Rabbit Creek Community Council			I am writing about the bike path along the Glenn in the municipality of Anchorage specifically from the Ladybug Rock in Chugiak to Eklunta overpass. Currently, riders are trying to bike through neighborhoods to get to Mirror Lake and drivers do not pay attention making it difficult for me to bring my children on rides with me. Mirror Lake is a great place to let kids play and the trail system is great at that location. Having a designated bike path to this area will alleviate some of the parking issues during the summer months and still allow access to the trails. Extending the bike path all the way to Eklunta creates so many opportunities to get to Thunderbird falls as well as lake activities. I can see the possibilities of renting a cabin and biking there with kids opening their eyes to the beauty of this area. I appreciate your time and consideration to include this area along the highway to a designated bike route. Thank you,	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the NMP.
489	Rabbit Creek Community Council			As a lifelong Alaskan resident, married to another lifer, I urge you to include the Glenn Hwy bike path extension in the master plan. I grew up in Thunderbird Heights, and occasionally I biked or walked home from Chugiak High. I was adventurous. But as a 40-plus year old adult, I recognize how dangerous it was/is to ride on the shoulder of the Glenn. 30 years ago, the powers that be talked about extending the bike trail. It hasn’t happened. My parents still live in T-Bird Heights. We live in Eagle River with our four kids. I would love for my children to have the opportunity to bike to Papa and Nana’s house safely. Please don’t punish those of us in Eagle River who love being a part of the MOA, and appreciate the thought and planning that goes into making our community a better place to work and live. Please keep the extension in the master plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the NMP.
490	Rabbit Creek Community Council			There is no mention or projects described for a coastal trail extension from Kincaid Park to the shooting range/Potter Marsh area. This has been a long-standing proposed project and would be a great addition to the current longer distance connecting bike and pedestrian trails in the Anchorage Bowl.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the NMP.
491	Rabbit Creek Community Council			There appears to be no specific project linking a coastal trail or even a neighborhood trail route from the west side of the New Seward Highway to the Old Seward Hwy/Rabbit Creek Rd area. This connection is needed to link up longer trails in the Bowl to trails along the Seward Hwy (all the way to Girdwood and beyond).	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the NMP.
492	Rabbit Creek Community Council			There is a relatively short trail described along the Old Seward Hwy south of Rabbit Creek Rd, but it is truncated and doesn’t even reach Potter Valley/south end of Potter Marsh area. This stretch of Old Seward gets significant use by pedestrians, dog walkers, ski boarders, and bikers. There is NO shoulder along the stretch, there is considerable fast traffic, the road is significantly deteriorating, and safety concerns are real and increasing. There needs to be a separated trail along the Old Seward from Rabbit Creek Rd all the way to the New Seward Hwy. This would eventually connect to a trail extending southward along the New Seward Hwy, and connect to the proposed Potter Valley trail. This could be done in conjunction with a badly needed upgrade of the Old Seward Hwy in this stretch.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
493	Rabbit Creek Community Council			I read today that the north extension of the Glenn Hwy bike path has not been included in the 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. I strongly urge AMATS to reconsider this exclusion. Non-motorized transportation routes serve so many purposes and users [and a growing user group] in our community. The proposed project area currently has no paths or readily accessible routes for non-motorized users. If there were, I know I would use them. The trail would also provide a safe space outside of the highway corridor for users traveling to Eklutna and outside the borders of the Municipality.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the NMP.
494	Rabbit Creek Community Council			12. Re-align the DeArmoun Road to Rabbit Creek Road connection: the proposed bicycle ! network in the NMP doesn't achieve a practical connection. Rabbit Creek Community Council (3-4-2021) Page 2 of 4 , - 142nd Avenue is part of the chosen route, but it is unsafe owing to very steep grades and a blind dip. Also, it requires north-south riders to ascend extra elevation if their intent is to continue south to Golden View. Buffalo Street is shown as worth improving as shown in the draft NMP, but the improvement should not leave any gap between DeArmoun and Rabbit Creek Road. The NMP should show improvements extending to Rabbit Creek Road on either the Buffalo alignment or on Evergreen Street.	Staff agrees.	We will make this project alignment edit.
495	Rabbit Creek Community Council			13. Identify Old Seward Highway east of Potter Marsh as an Enhanced Shared Roadway/ Neighborhood Greenway. The draft NMP map (Figure 2.1) proposes that the bicycle network should extend only part way from Rabbit Creek Road to Potter Valley Road. It should not stop near Tideview. It should instead be extended the complete distance. Also, this should be a shared use project: it is identified on the Pedestrian Project list as Project 314. Old Seward, with blind hills from Rabbit Creek to Potter Valley, receives extensive use by pedestrians, bicyclists, and roller skiers throughout the year.	Staff agrees.	We will make this project alignment edit.
496	Rabbit Creek Community Council			RCCC requests a high priority project to establish the Old Seward Highway near Potter Marsh as an Enhanced Shared Roadway as outlined on page 158. RCCC has been working for over a year with the Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (ADOT&PF), trying to get Share-the-Route signage and a reduced speed limit. With the bordering state wildlife refuge, this is a model project for a "Neighborhood Greenway" as described in the NMP, with "low traffic volumes and speeds, designated and designed to give bicycles and pedestrians travel priority", while "discouraging through trips by non-local motorized traffic".	Staff agrees.	We will make this priority project edit.
497	Rabbit Creek Community Council			15. Connectivity from Golden View Drive to Potter Valley Road (Pedestrian Project 216): A short segment of Golden View Drive is shown on the NMP Bike Network Priority Map. The complete connection should be shown. In addition, Golden View Drive should be shown on the Pedestrian Priority map. RCCC has been rebuffed in its requests for a safe walk-to-school route in past re-design efforts for Golden View Drive.	Staff agrees.	We will make this project edit.
498	Rabbit Creek Community Council			16. Add a new corridor: Pedestrian or shared use path from DeArmoun at Canyon Road through several municipal parks to Our Own Lane and Old Rabbit Creek Road. This route would avoid steep grades and fast traffic on RC and DeArmoun Roads. This is shown as a primary corridor in the Hillside District Plan. Much of this route crosses municipal parkland. This partly offstreet connection has a far lower construction cost than retrofitting either Rabbit Creek or DeArmoun Road, both of which have high traffic stress levels and steep gradients. Moreover, off-street connections provide a higher quality and safer experience for non-motorized users.	Staff agrees.	WE will make this project edit.
499	Rabbit Creek Community Council			17. The segments of bicycle network depicted at Jamie Avenue and at Potter Heights and Southpointe Ridge should have project numbers. They both provide important neighborhood connections. The Jamie Avenue connection would provide direct pedestrian access to our proposed School Corridor along the 155th alignment. The Potter Heights connection does not appear to be listed in Table 5.2. The roads in this area are due for upgrading, so the bicycle network connections should be clearly depicted on the Tables.	Staff agrees.	WE will make this project edit.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
500	Rabbit Creek Community Council			5.Coordination with Anchorage Park Foundation's (APF) Schools on Trails program. This program involves working with schools, neighbors, and kids to identify and establish safe pathways within neighborhoods to schools, and to promote outdoor learning. Funds can be provided to citizen-led efforts to plan and establish these trails, including trail work through the APF's Youth Employment in Parks program. This program should be recognized and included in the plan.	Staff agrees.	Make this an action item in the NMP.
501	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Our Council seeks to support those projects that are compatible with the Hillside District Plan and Anchorage Comprehensive Plan and these recommendations fit within their tenets. We would be happy to sit down with you (e.g., Zoom) and discuss these comments as you are developing the Plan.	Staff agrees.	Staff will schedule a meeting to discuss plan projects.
502	Rabbit Creek Community Council			DeArmoun Road to Rabbit Creek Road bicycle connection: the proposed bicycle network in the NMP doesn't achieve a practical connection. Why was 142nd Avenue the chosen route. It is unsafe owing to steep grades and a blind dip. The climb is too steep and requires riders to ascend extra elevation and then descend on North Goldenview. Why can't the NMP show improvements extending to Rabbit Creek Road on either the Buffalo alignment or on Evergreen, or even Elmore Road?	Staff agrees.	We will modify this project recommendation to support this alignment.
503	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Old Seward Highway east of Potter Marsh: this route is proposed to be upgraded only part way from Rabbit Creek Road to Potter Valley Road, and should instead be extended the complete distance.	Staff agrees.	We will modify this project recommendation to support this alignment.
504	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Unexplain the discontinuous trail at Jamie Avenue, and unexplained fragment of bicycle network at Southpointe Ridge Drive	Staff agrees.	We wil fix this project error.
505	Rabbit Creek Community Council			8. The follow-up trails plan should not be called a "Recreational" Trails plan; something like "Trails" or "Trails and Community Connections" would be better. The follow-up plan should include connections for utilitarian travel between neighborhoods, schools, and other community destinations. The label of "recreation trails" may create limits for funding sources as well as legal problems for use of easements. In addition, the word "recreation" may imply jurisdiction of the municipal parks department, which will often not be the case.	The Areawide Trails update the supercedes the 1996 Areawide Trails update will not have its own name. It will become an element of the NMP.	No action recommended.
506	Rabbit Creek Community Council	0		In addition, as an interim measure, we request a high priority project to post Share-the-route route signage and to reduce the speed limit.	The NMP does not include interim measure recommendations in its scope.	No action recommended.
507	Rabbit Creek Community Council			4. Continued authority of existing municipal and Chugach State Park Trails Plans, including adopted neighborhood and district plans such as the Hillside District Plan.	The NMP will not supercede the 1996 Areawide Trails plan until a seperate trails plan update has been completed and incorporated into the NMP as an amendment to this plan.	Add language to the NMP to clarify this point.
508	Rabbit Creek Community Council			7. Acknowledge the continued authority of the Anchorage Trails Plan, district plans, and neighborhood plans, especially with regard to pedestrian pathways and trails. Delete the sentence about superseding from the Executive Summary (pg. vii, para 1), which would abandon the detailed connections identified in prior adopted trails plans. Instead, insert a statement such as this: The Areawide Trails Plan and district and neighborhood plans will continue to determine non-motorized connections until AMATS amends the Non-Motorized Plan with detailed trails planning. The 2021 Non-Motorized Plan does not lay out detailed connections for trails and pathways at the neighborhood level, nor does it address many off-street connections or recreation trails.	The NMP will not supercede the 1996 Areawide Trails plan until a seperate trails plan update has been completed and incorporated into the NMP as an amendment to this plan.	Add language to the NMP to clarify this point.
509	Rabbit Creek Community Council			4. Continued authority of existing trails plans. The pending Non-Motorized Trails Plan should clearly state that it does not address pedestrian connectivity at the necessary level of detail, and that, the Areawide Trails Plan, the Hillside District Plan, and other adopted 11neighborhood plans remain the appropriate documents for implementing trail connections.	The NMP will not supercede the 1996 Areawide Trails plan until a seperate trails plan update has been completed and incorporated into the NMP as an amendment to this plan.	Clarify this language in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
510	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Municipal and citizen partnership for pedestrian corridor development. Municipal agencies will develop a template for partnering with citizens' groups or non-profits who initiate public trail corridors along existing undeveloped easements, so that public insurance and bonding and other supports are available.	There is already a process in place for coordinating between the public and the Municipality for corridor development.	No action recommended.
511	Rabbit Creek Community Council			· Currently, Bear Valley School has zero areas that are designated for safe walking or biking.	This project link would require coordination with the municipal zoning/platting divisions and is outside the scope of the NMP at this time.	No action recommended.
512	Rabbit Creek Community Council			· RCCC residents, and school staff have expressed interest in a trail corridor along existing platted but undeveloped pedestrian easements and the Section Line Easement.	This project link would require coordination with the municipal zoning/platting divisions and is outside the scope of the NMP at this time.	No action recommended.
513	Rabbit Creek Community Council			· This pedestrian corridor would avoid the high-speed traffic and steep grades of Rabbit Creek Road.	This project link would require coordination with the municipal zoning/platting divisions and is outside the scope of the NMP at this time.	No action recommended.
514	Rabbit Creek Community Council			Use of undeveloped ROW and Section Line Easements. Municipal planning and Right-of-way staff will work with Alaska Department of Natural Resources to acquire use agreements for Section Line Easements where these easements can provide convenient non-motorized connectivity, in accordance with adopted planning goals and plans, within the municipality.	This request is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
515	Rabbit Creek Community Council			The NMP should include policies regarding: 1. Enabling development and use of off-street pathways within undeveloped right-of-way (ROW) and Section Line Easements.	This request is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
516	Rabbit Creek Community Council			9. The NMP should be clear that off-street infrastructure is part of the basic infrastructure in new development and re-development. RCCC requests that the NMP include policies as follows: 9A. Off-street pathways in new plats: as a condition of future plat approval, non-motorized off-street connections shall be cleared, surveyed, permanently signed, and developed with at least a durable soft-surface tread at the time of other infrastructure. In residential subdivisions, off-street pathways should be constructed prior to sale of lots 98. Off-street pathways along existing but undeveloped easements or ROW: MOA planning and ROW staff will create a template and a process for developing an off-street trail or pathway along existing easements and ROW.	This request is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
517	Rabbit Creek Community Council			The Rabbit Creek Community Council (RCCC) is interested in developing non-motorized pathways within existing undeveloped Rights-of-Way and Section Line easements. These corridors are a practical way to connect neighborhoods and community destinations where road upgrades and roadside pedestrian amenities are not likely to be funded, whether because of terrain features, cost, or low neighborhood density. They may also serve to provide fire department or other emergency access to isolated neighborhoods, improving response speeds and offering alternative exit routes. Over the years, the RCCC has made numerous comments regarding the need to maintain neighborhood connectivity and ensure access for emergencies, which are particularly challenging in our steep neighborhoods with large lots. An important aspect of these goals is to have non-motorized pathways. Thus, at the RCCC's publicly-noticed December 10, 2020, meeting, the RCCC voted to request that MOA planning staff incorporate the following policies into the draft Non-Motorized Trails Plan (15 in favor, 1 opposed and 2 abstained).	This request is outside the scope of the NMP.	No action recommended.
518	Rabbit Creek Community Council			2. Municipal and citizen partnership for off-street non-motorized corridor development.	This request is outside the scope of the NMP. There is already a municipal process in place for corridor development.	No action recommended.
519	Rabbit Creek Community Council			3. Maintenance funding for pedestrian connections, both within and outside of roadways.	Staff agrees this is important. We will be adding more recommendations for improved maintenance after our 2nd winter maintenance forum.	No action recommended at this time.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
520	Rabbit Creek Community Council			3.Maintenance funding for pedestrian connections. The Municipality will identify ways to program funding for maintenance of pedestrian connections, both within and outside of roadways.	Staff agrees this is important. We will be adding more recommendations for improved maintenance after our 2nd winter maintenance forum.	No action recommended at this time.
521	Rast, Frank			A State grant funded West Dimond Road Improvements from Sand Lake Road to Jodphur, due to funding shortfalls the project ended at Westpark Drive in 2016. With Westpark development there has been a significant increase in bicyclist and pedestrian conflicts with motor vehicles between Westpark Drive and Jodphur. The remaining segment of West Dimond roadway has poor sight distance and many vehicles exceeding posted speed limits. If a road improvement can not be funded, a separated pathway would greatly improve safety at a much lower cost than a full road reconstruction. The previous project work identified many right-of-way conflicts along the north boundary including structures and side streets outside of platted streets. Any pathway extensions should be along the south boundary to avoid ROW and grade conflicts.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project recommendation to the NMP.
522	Reed, Carma			(I work in mid-town on C Street, by Benson, I live on Borealis Dr in North Star, near C Street, and it is amazing to me how hard it is to walk or bike to work much of the year)	N/A	No action recommended.
523	Reed, Carma			I was pleased to see that C Street was identified as needing “enhanced sidewalk” in the plan. I want to follow up by emphasizing that the West side of C Street is the side that the bus stops, and is currently the side where there is no winter maintenance for parts of the street. I have asked about this many times and I understand there are challenges, but these challenges need to be addressed. There are so few routes to walk or bike from mid-town to downtown, why not try to do a separated pathway on C Street, the WEST side, there seems to be right of way that could be used or purchased/expanded with a little engineering.	Staff agrees.	The project team will take a look at recommending a project in this spot.
524	Reed, Carma			Also, right around where 21st would cross C Street if C Street were not elevated, pedestrians regularly trudge up the embankment to C Street – in the snow, the mud and the dust. Could there be a ramp that would enhance access from the west side of C Street, which could possibly also be incorporated into a separated bike pathway. Right now C Street is not prioritized for a bicycle path, but it would help with downtown/midtown connectivity if there could be a separated pathway on the west side of C Street, which also connects to 21st.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project recommendation to the NMP.
525	Reed, Carma			The prioritization for C Street (Fireweed to 13th) does not include points for schools or transit, which seems odd. With elimination of the North Star stairway there is even less access to North Star Elementary Central Middle School and Steller Optional, all very close to C Street. Also, C Street is a transit corridor. This is a heavily used pedestrian way, EVEN when it is not adequately plowed. It is very dangerous.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project recommendation to the NMP.
526	Reed, Carma			I would also argue employment – as a missing corridor between midtown and downtown, and the residential areas along Chester Creek.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project recommendation to the NMP.
527	Reed, Carma			I also noticed that the West side of C Street between Fireweed and 36th is not really discussed – maybe I missed it. But there is a firehydrant in the middle of the sidewalk just south of Benson. There is poor/no maintenance of the side walk in the winter on the West side of the street – again the side of the street that the bus stops on!!! Really, the snow needs to be removed on the west side of C Street between 13th and 36th. Why not assess property owners to fund it – code does require business owners in business districts to maintain sidewalks, and they do not do it. But they would benefit from it, if everyone did it – not just if it is done in a patchwork way. The city has to manage it.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project recommendation to the NMP.
528	Reed, Carma			Please fix non-motorized movement on C Street between 13th and Fireweed, especially on the West side!!	Staff agrees.	We will add this project recommendation to the NMP.
529	Reyes, Janus			Please include the northern extension of the Glenn Hwy bike path in the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
530	Reyes, Janus	n/a		A separated (and protected) bike path needs to be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklunta Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Bike Plan! This is a safety and mental health issue!	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
531	Richardson, Cheryl	n/a	General	Non-motorized funding in Anchorage needs to be greatly increased in order to keep up with community values and travel needs. AMATS should revisit its policy that limits the percent of funding awarded to non-motorized projects and should let non-motorized projects compete more directly with road projects, including expedited funding of inexpensive projects that would deliver important safety improvements.	The NMP does not have the authority to change funding percentages that are mandated by the federal government.	No action recommended.
532	Richardson, Cheryl	n/a	General	Anchorage should lobby ADOT to allocate more funding under AMATS control. And because ADOT can flex or transfer federal highway funding from one funding program to another, Anchorage should also lobby ADOT to spend a larger share of its program on non-motorized projects.	The NMP does not have the authority to change funding percentages that are mandated by the federal government.	No action recommended.
533	Richardson, Cheryl		General	Last but not least, non-motorized investments are needed to meet Greenhouse Gas Emission targets in Anchorage's newly adopted Climate Action Plan. The ACAP sets a target, and now we need Anchorage's transportation plans to articulate the GGE emissions reductions that can be achieved by shifting investments into less polluting transit and bicycle-pedestrian travel.	The NMP will include a discussion about the Anchorage Climate Action Plan.	Include discussion about NMP coordination with the ACAP.
534	Richardson, Cheryl	n/a	General	It is common for tourists and Alaska's rural families to walk along Minnesota boulevard at Westchester Lagoon instead of using the separated trail there. This can be inexpensively remedied by greatly improving trail signage at Romig Middle School and at 15th and L.	This will be more appropriate for the Areawide Trails Plan update, which will begin after the adoption of the NMP.	No action recommended.
535	Richardson, Cheryl	n/a	General	Another element is to rebuild the trail that ADOT removed some years ago from 15th and L to the Lagoon, on the backside of the guard rail. ADOT told me it was removed due to homeowners' complaints, but it was never discussed with the community council or those who used that connection.	This will be more appropriate for the Areawide Trails Plan update, which will begin after the adoption of the NMP.	No action recommended.
536	Richardson, Cheryl	n/a	General	I hope the plan includes repair of what was labeled an accessibility improvement in the sidewalk curb cut at 10th and N that made it difficult for bicycles to navigate north-south.	We can add this sidewalk improvement to the pedestrian project list.	Add this sidewalk improvement to the pedestrian project list.
537	Rombach, Matt			I am writing to ask the the Glenn Hwy separated bike path to be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklunta overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan. The path is a vital source of recreation for many Alaskans and allows them to do so safely. Thank you for your consideration.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project recommendation to the NMP.
538	Saddoris, Julie			It has come to my attention that the planned extension of the Glenn Highway bike/multi-use path has been eliminated. In a year that has put more people outside and on bicycles than ever before, this doesn't make sense. Bicycles are in short supply as the demand is very high. Eliminating the extension means there will be fewer miles to bike. I ride from my house near Elmore and 80th all the way to Mirror Lake and would love to continue further north to have a safe long-distance ride. This state's economy is hurting but we could help with the opportunity to make it safer and more enjoyable for bicycle tourism. Yes, it is a thing. And it brings money to the state. Adding additional safe travel routes for bicycles will help grow Alaska's tourism. I, along with many other Alaskans, love to ride long distances and we do this on the roads. I've ridden my bike from Anchorage to Valdez, taking the ferry to Whittier and continued my ride to Anchorage. I have also ridden my bike numerous times from Anchorage to Seward. It was disappointing to see the planned multi-use trails not go in on the Seward Highway. The cost is so much less with all the equipment, etc., already out performing the work. It is a minimal cost to add this with all the rebuilding of the highway. As someone who rides the Glenn Highway multi-use trail often, I would encourage the state and DOT to reconsider the elimination of the Glenn Highway extension.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
539	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 6: Add objective to partner with large land owners (JBER, State, University) and utility companies to create new (or identify, improve, and maintain existing routes—for example those through UMED) non-motorized connexions through private/public property and along utility easements.	AMATS already partners with many agencies through our planning processes.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
540	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 100: Great project selection. There is great breadth of project type and it is really great to see a plan go into specifics.	Awesome!	No action recommended.
541	Scherr, Connor			Consider using alleys in Downtown and Government Hill for facilities.	No action.	No action.
542	Scherr, Connor			Consider relocating separated bikeways shown along 5th, 6th, and L to alleys or less trafficked streets for improved safety.	These facilities provide direct access to destinations and opportunities for protected crossings at intersections.	No action.
543	Scherr, Connor			Consider an enhanced shared roadway on the north side of Downtown, or one crossing north to south, to act as an arterial (4th, 7th, F, K).	A dense network of protected bike facilities is already recommended for the downtown.	No action.
544	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 57: Why are there no proposed corridors south of Dimond?	Roadways south of Diamond did not meet the selection criteria used in this plan. However, roadways south of Diamond do retain the recommendations carried forward from the 2007 plan.	No action.
545	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 134: I am unsure what “grooming protocols could be established that would provide for bicycle access along shared use pathways or sidepaths” means. Provide a better, more tangible, example. Does the plan use grooming and snow removal interchangeably? In my mind, they are different maintenance strategies.	Text update	Clarify to read that pathway grooming protocols should facilitate bicycle access to shared use pathways rather than exclude their use by bicycles, when appropriate.
546	Scherr, Connor			To Ms Wilm and the planning team behind the Non-Motorized Plan, thank you for your hard work. I hope this plan serves Anchorage for many years, and leads to improvements to our non-motorized infrastructure network. This plan has obviously been under development for many years, and with the pandemic unfortunately coincidental with its completion and roll-out, you should commend yourselves for continuing its development. Generally, the plan is a terrific, specific, and ambitious document. However, there are some shortcomings. There are many opportunities for improving the graphics, and I encourage changing out some of the photos per my comments, and updating the maps to show more data. This plan should stand for ten to twenty years, and having maps already out-of-date handicaps its effectiveness. This plan is coming from AMATS, not Parks and Recreation, and is about active transportation, not recreation. As a result, show fewer images of people recreating on shared use pathways (an infrastructure expressly not a feature of this plan), and more users of sidewalks, bike lanes, and shared roadways. Since the plan's development, we have more of these infrastructures, and the plan should include images from these and the successful improvement of the Spenard Corridor. Finally, I really enjoyed looking at several specific projects and the ambitious prioritization of others. Please feel free to respond with any questions or needs for clarification, and I look forward to seeing the plan adopted.	N/A	No action recommended.
547	Scherr, Connor			Text edit p.i under Pedestrian Network.	N/A	No action recommended.
548	Scherr, Connor			Text edit p. 5 under Goal 7.	N/A	No action recommended.
549	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 13: In Portland, OR the police will pull over bikers without lights and give them one for free.	N/A	No action recommended.
550	Scherr, Connor			I am happy to see Fireweed identified as a potential E-W route through Midtown.	N/A	No action recommended.
551	Scherr, Connor			Further separating some uses as recreational and others as non-motorized transportation introduces a hierarchy that is disingenuous to our climate and location. I recreate and commute on bike, in all seasons, weather, and levels of lighting, as well as on skis, and my feet, thankfully. There exist infrastructural needs for all of these activities (ski lockers, shower facilities at workplaces), and while the plan addresses them, part of the effort towards increasing awareness, use, and growth of nonmotorized travel is rebranding those modes, changing the perception that they are not only for recreation. There was a time, within living memory, that people commuted with dogsled in Anchorage, and on horses as well. Although skiers and snowbikers have vast networks of recreational trails, they also go places—stores, work, school—and the infrastructure should address and encourage that.	N/A	No action recommended.
552	Scherr, Connor			Were alleys considered for shared roadways?	No.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
553	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 4: Goal 1, Objective V, include infrastructure changes to decrease travel speed and travel time to disincentivize single-person car use—like narrower lanes, more signals, or modified traffic patterns.	Staff agrees.	We will make this text edit.
554	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 4: Goal 2, Add objective to implement green infrastructure—like bioswales, planters, and impervious pavers.	Staff agrees.	We will make this text edit.
555	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 4: Goal 3: Include discussions of improved route lighting under this section.	Staff agrees.	We will include discussion of improved lighting.
556	Scherr, Connor			Text edit p. 8: spell out “pedestrian”.	Staff agrees.	We will make this text edit.
557	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 16: This map is out of date. The Ship Creek extension along MLK, and around University Lake, is missing. Other missing shared use paths include along Sand Lake, Dimond, Raspberry, and likely several other places. I recognize that not everyone uses these facilities, and this planning process began some years ago, but at least one missing pathway is right outside the PDC. I hope this is not the first time the missing data has come up in the plan development. At least add an asterisk like the one that appears on the sidewalks map.	Staff agrees.	We will update this map in the NMP.
558	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 53: I have several comments on this map. o I am surprised to not see the “Fish Creek Trail” shown on this map, nor infrastructure along the ARRC ROW.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this map edit in the NMP.
559	Scherr, Connor			The “separated bikeway” along Raspberry road already exists, so that can be gray.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this map edit in the NMP.
560	Scherr, Connor			The pathway starting at the Tudor Curve should begin at Campbell Airstrip Road, as that project is currently in the planning phase.	Staff agrees.	We will make this project edit.
561	Scherr, Connor			The enhanced shared roadway along Wesleyan seems duplicative of the existing (and unfortunately unmapped) pathway around University Lake, and there could be increased connexions to this trail instead of an entire improvement of the roadway.	Staff agrees.	We will include the pathway around University Lake.
562	Scherr, Connor			Campbell Airstrip Road between Tudor and Northern Lights should be an enhanced shared roadway, as should Kennyhill and Emmanuel.	Staff agrees.	We will include these missing project links.
563	Scherr, Connor			I think we should seriously consider paving the Tour (Old Rondy) Trail from MLK to Service HS, but this may be in the forthcoming plan dealing with shared use pathways. This is an important and frequently used route from the Hillside to North Anchorage, and users are not exclusively recreational.	Staff agrees.	We will include this msising project link.
564	Scherr, Connor			E 142nd Ave is too steep of a roadway for the connexion to Goldenview, and this should instead be on Woodhaven and Park Hills. Additionally, these roads already have asphalt paving. Alternatively use the platted Section Easement for the connexion to Goldenview.	Staff agrees.	We will include this msising project link.
565	Scherr, Connor			Consider connexion to Ship Creek Trail at Reeve Blvd. Look at prioritizing neighborhood connexion to Government Hill Elementary School.	Staff agrees.	We will look into this reprioritization
566	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 98: This is the same photo from the previous chapter. Maybe put a picture of a sidewalk here (like Spenard?)	Staff agrees.	We will replace this photo.
567	Scherr, Connor			Text edit p. 110: Colored letters.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
568	Scherr, Connor			Text edit p. 133: paragraph 1.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
569	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 133: Restaurants have been using streets for outdoor seating throughout the pandemic. Perhaps including this as an example, or outlining the how structures of these agreements between agencies, individuals, companies, and the Municipality worked. This could help guide future efforts and reduce skeptics.	Staff agrees.	We will include some language to this effect in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
570	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 149: While people recreate with the listed activities, they can also commute using skis and snowbikes. These represent unique modes to Alaska, and present opportunities for infrastructure development and maintenance. My worry, with the images shown in the plan, and some of the language mentioned, is that this plan weighs too much towards non-winter and daytime active transportation, and does not offer enough consideration to active transportation in winter and darkness. Most of the imagery is of people recreating on shared use pathways, instead of commuting on those, bike lanes, sidepaths, or any of the other infrastructures in Anchorage. If the goal of this plan is to plan for non-motorized transportation for going to destinations, and not primarily for recreation, then the photos should reflect that.	Staff agrees.	We will include some more pictures of diverse facility users.
571	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 166: Put a different picture here, or make the picture of the planner smaller.	Staff disagrees.	No action recommended.
572	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 204: This is a great photo that deserves being earlier in the plan.	Staff disagrees.	No action recommended.
573	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 11: Notwithstanding the complete lack of a directly comparable city to Anchorage, this list is good, but perhaps reaches for cities with too great a population. Montreal is a great city, but its historic, geographic, and political contexts are completely dissimilar from Anchorage. Although I lament the insular research of only North American cities, Montreal is more similar to a European city than to Anchorage. Madison and Minneapolis are great case studies, as is Salt Lake. Calgary is another terrific example. If we limit the study area to North America, I would have included cities in the Mountain West, like Montana (Missoula) or Idaho (Coeur d'Alene), or the Cascade region, like Oregon (Bend), California (Tahoe). These are American West cities with young histories, formerly auto-centric urban planning, and have winter climates.	Staff disagrees. All of the cities chosen in the peer review and direct and related similarities to Anchorage's climate and winter maintenance challenges.	No action recommended.
574	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 13: I would like to see more information on the other cities. I suggest a page on each, with a good image, and bullets describing successes, shortcomings, and key takeaways. I want to know what their infrastructure is like, what their user types and numbers are, and how they improved their cities to have more non-motorized infrastructure. Two pages on the research is not sufficient. Show how you reached the key takeaways, and illustrate you did more than a quick web-search and visit to the cities' websites. Did you send staff to the cities? Did you have meetings with officials there? Did you talk to local advocates and nonprofits? Did you talk to any residents? Did you check if the policies and goals these cities implemented actually created improvements?	Staff feels that the peer review is good as is.	No action recommended.
575	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 14: This is a general comment. Almost all the photographs of facility users are from behind. Perhaps get some from the front, side, or even top. Also, they are almost all in summer, in fair weather. As we have a variable climate, and eight months of mostly dark days, the plans should include pictures of this. We should show snowbikers and skiers on their way to work (if you need, I live right next to the Chester Creek Trail, and could take some for you), or bikers in the rain and at night. Further, there should be pictures of diverse users, in ethnicity, gender, and age, but most importantly, ability. Please show persons with mobility challenges as well.	Staff is already working on incorporating more diverse photos for weather, gender, race and age.	No further action recommended.
576	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 5: Goal 6, Objective 3, resurrect the partnership with Strava that allowed the bike heat map story map application.	Strava has been phased out in the Municipality.	No action recommended.
577	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 64: This is a terrific matrix. I appreciate the time and thought that went into this.	Thanks!	No action recommended.
578	Scherr, Connor			Perhaps there should be a connexion from MacInnes to the Campbell Creek Trail (a softsurface social trail currently exists).	This edit is more appropriate for the upcoming Areawide Trails Plan update.	No action recommended.
579	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 47: I am not confident from the picture of the advisory committee that all users were represented in the planning process.	This photo is not meant to represent all members of the advisory committee. It is just a photo to show a typical advisory meeting.	No action recommended.
580	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 54: In the Downtown area, for access to Government Hill, consider using E Bluff Drive instead of the Railroad lands for the shared use pathway.	This project is influenced by the Government Hill Neighborhood Plan and reflects that effort.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
581	Scherr, Connor			Comment p.2.: box referring to an “integrated network of routes accessible for people...” applies only during between May and November. Such a network requires regular plowing and maintenance through all seasons, and maybe this should be presented as an aspirational statement, and not a fact.	This text is part of the vision statement for the NMP and is aspirational in nature.	No action recommended.
582	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 4: Add objective to map and identify existing infrastructure, especially sidewalks. It’s hard to plan for what you do not know. This is noted on p. 128, but I think it would be helpful in the goals/objectives table.	Unfortunately, the Municipality of Anchorage does not have a current sidewalk dataset so we are unable to show those on the map at this time.	No action recommended.
583	Scherr, Connor			Comment p. 18: I feel like there are many more sidewalks, especially in Downtown. See my other comment about the shared use pathways.	Unfortunately, the Municipality of Anchorage does not have a current sidewalk dataset so we are unable to show those on the map at this time.	No action recommended.
584	Schuetter, Christine			No pedestrian primary corridors Eagle River map	Roadways in Eagle Creek did not meet the criteria laid out for designation of primary corridors, Eagle Creek does have several secondary corridors where improvements would be prioritized and would be considered the 'primary corridors' within the vicinity.	Roadways in Eagle Creek did not meet the criteria laid out for designation of primary corridors, Eagle Creek does have several secondary corridors where improvements would be prioritized and would be considered the 'primary corridors' within the vicinity.
585	Schuetter, Christine		Maintenance Matrix	Why is the Winter Maintenance Equipment column left blank?	This column is dependent upon receiving data from describing current winter maintenance practices in use by M&O. If information is not provided summer and winter maintenance rows will be omitted from the final plan.	Action pending additional data.
586	Schuetter, Christine		1.2	Do you list out who is in the CAG and AAG anywhere?	No but we can.	List out members of CAG and AAG on plan intro.
587	Schuetter, Christine			Should the goals have a subheader?	No.	No action recommended.
588	Schuetter, Christine		Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan (2017)	Typo (iupdated) should be updated	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
589	Schuetter, Christine		Health & Equity	Typo : omit the word (be). It should read tend to correspond, not tend to (be) correspond	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
590	Schuetter, Christine		Non-White Population	Typo: words run together in the third line (AMATSPanningarea. Thenorthern)	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
591	Schuetter, Christine			Incomplete sentence or missing a period at the end of the page (cooridor)	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
592	Schuetter, Christine			missing the legend on the second map	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
593	Schuetter, Christine			Typo: In the first paragraph, it should read high rise housing not high (rises) housing	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
594	Schuetter, Christine			Typo: add an (s) to solution in the third sentence. It should read other innovative/green infrastructure solutions (not solution).	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
595	Schuetter, Christine		Design Features	Typo: In the second paragraph, it should be an not (and). It should read, trends are separated by an elevation change, not trends are separated by (and) elevation change	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
596	Schuetter, Christine	71		The word Neighborhood is spelled wrong in Mountain View Neighborhood Plan	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
597	Schuetter, Christine	73		same spelling error as above	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
598	Schuetter, Christine	74		I believe "Arctic" Warrior/Loop should be "Arctic" Warrior/Loop. Maybe spell check the Project Tables one more time.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this text edit.
599	Schuetter, Christine			For intentionally blank pages, can we repeat the text (This page intentionally blank) to the top of the page? If you are using a screen reader, it is time consuming to follow the blank page halfway down before you see that this page does not actually have content on it.	Staff disagrees.	No action recommended.
600	Schuetter, Christine			No contingency on this project estimate on this project	Staff is unsure what section this comment is referring to.	No action recommended.
601	Schuetter, Christine			Should we include Transit on the Move now that it is a completed plan?	We can include it but since it was not used in the creation of the plan it can only be listed as a resource going forward.	Include Transit on the Move as a resource going forward.
602	Schuetter, Christine		Design Features	Potential typo: (traveled way) width	Staff agrees.	We will fix this typo.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
603	Scott Mlynarczyk and Susan Sommers			A Glenn Hwy bike path northern extension is desperately needed! This corridor should be expanded to the Valley eventually and as the stage to Eklutna has already been planned it should be completed ASAP. For north bound cyclists it is a massive safety hazard to be forced onto the Glen Highway. Increased traffic and distracted drivers make this a very unpleasant and nerve-wracking area to cycle. Please add it back into your plan for completion as soon as possible. It will be a great asset for the residents of those communities it passes and for northbound cyclists and touring visitors.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link.
604	Shearer, Jamie			Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Non-Motorized Plan. I strongly support efforts to improve options for biking and walking in Anchorage. I commute year round by foot and bike and am interested in increasing safe connectivity throughout Anchorage.	N/A	No action recommended.
605	Shearer, Jamie			Safety is my biggest concern and it is usually the primary factor when I choose to drive over biking/walking. There are three things that I feel make non-motorized travel less safe: motor vehicles, path conditions (especially in winter), and crime (will my bike be safe when locked and left). I want my kids to be less car dependent, but I also fear their safety when our routes are not along the shared use pathways like Chester Creek.	N/A	No action recommended.
606	Shearer, Jamie			As the draft plan is finalized, I urge you to ensure that the map of existing conditions accurately reflects routes that are safe and comfortable for walking and bicycling - especially as there is a significant difference between summer and winter travel in Anchorage. I also encourage the use of supplemental solutions such as wayfinding, traffic signal timing, enforcement, and education in addition to building infrastructure. I have introduced a number of fellow cyclists to the path that continues from MacInnes across 36th into College Village onto Princeton Way. It is much nicer than having to ride along 36th. Including locally known "secret" shortcuts such as this on maps or having "non-motorized pathway" signs are much less expensive solutions to some connectivity issues. I also wish for you to continue working to ensure that winter maintenance is sufficient to allow reliable, safe, and equitable non-motorized transportation throughout the year.	Staff agrees.	We will make sure that the map of existing conditions is accurate in the NMP.
607	Shearer, Jamie			Thank you for working to improve non-motorized transportation in Anchorage, which is such an important part of making our city a more connected, healthier, safer, and more livable place.	Thank you!	No action recommended.
608	Siskoff, Mikhail			Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Non-Motorized Plan. I strongly support efforts to improve options for biking and walking in Anchorage. As the draft plan is finalized, I urge you to ensure that the map of existing conditions accurately reflects routes that are safe and comfortable for bicycling; to encourage the use of supplemental solutions such as wayfinding, traffic signal timing, enforcement, and education in addition to building infrastructure; and to continue working to ensure that winter maintenance is sufficient to allow reliable, safe, and equitable non-motorized transportation throughout the year. Thank you for working to improve non-motorized transportation in Anchorage, which is such an important part of making our city safer and more livable	Staff agrees.	We will make sure that the map of existing conditions is accurate in the NMP.
609	Smith, Rod			Dear AMATS planning team, Thank you for the detailed and complex plan that you have put forward to improve non-motorized recreation. As a long-term bike commuter and often year round rider, I can speak best to the area of the Hillside to the University/Med Area that I know best. I have also seen major changes in use. The complexity of the proposed projects and the cost is considerable and will be more challenging going forward in a challenging financial environments that are emerging in AK.	N/A	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
610	Smith, Rod			The root cause of many of the issues has been transportation engineering understanding their jobs only in the context of 'car traffic engineering' to the detriment of all other users. This is also the reason AMATS is left with increasingly expensive solutions. Current fetishes such as "roundabouts" are classic examples of this single user thinking that is hardly assisted by a few adding bike lanes. As shown on many of widening and straightening projects, the roads become more dangerous as traffic speed follows the road design and not posted limits. Many examples seem to be DOT roads that seem out of touch with any goal other than "make cars go fast". Elmore and Abbott have become high speed barriers that block movements of kids to school or people or bikes that need to cross to commute or use the trails recreationally. Intelligently placed traffic lights are unthinkable to DOT because "cars must go fast" even when the reality is there will be a traffic bottle neck at schools or other high use location. The intersection of DOT road with Service High School may be the best example of poor road design.	N/A	No action recommended.
611	Smith, Rod			The notion of high stress roads is correct in much of Anchorage and is linked to traffic and the high posted speed limits and even higher defacto speeds. Some of the maps of density of use also seem out of touch with the changing use that has occurred—I would have agreed with the low-use assessment for Hillside 15 years ago but not currently. The demographics of the Hillside and other areas of South Anchorage have been changing with more active individuals compared to 20 years ago, and for many of those who have aged away from the hills, eBikes are changing use patterns and making longer and steeper commutes much more feasible. Much of this is hard to sample, since the routes are often not obvious to the city planners and have considerable optionality. This too has changed with bikes that are comfortable to ride on tarmac, gravel and even on some single track.	N/A	No action recommended.
612	Smith, Rod			For some inspiration, perhaps we should make the Finnish city Oulu our sister city for cycling purposes. This is a good introduction and pokes some fun at our southern neighbors in Canada at the same time Why Canadians Can't Bike in the Winter (but Finnish people can) - YouTube. I can recommend most of the videos in this series to explain what people want for non-motorized transportation—the car traffic engineers will be a little triggered but the rest of us can provide them with support and encouragement.	N/A	No action recommended.
613	Smith, Rod			Another challenge is defining what the city can make available reliably to bikers in winter—there needs to be a winter as well as a summer map. The reliability is the factor that makes commuting and errands feasible. The city has come a long way to maintain some of the key trails but this is often undermined by DOT operations that cover trails in debris. The same is true for the slow clearing of shoulders in the Spring that are a menace to bike use.	Staff agrees.	There will be a winter maintenance route map developed as part of the 2nd Maintenance Forum. AMATS will organize this forum following adoption of the NMP.
614	Smith, Rod			Much more can be done than we are doing presently but the needs of a winter trail for bikes or people on foot can be very simple. It just requires better coordination of snow mitigation services and creativity. Some very simple equipment can maintain simple lower use trails and perhaps the real need is for partnerships with private groups as has been done with Nordic skiing or the Single Track Association. This could free the city to clearing the more complex urban corridors. The same is true for summer where simpler well built gravel trails will meet almost all the needs of tarmac. The obsession with hardened trails has not been one that I have never expressed to the city, but they are much more profitable to contractors. Again, tarmac has its place, but the role of simpler trails in areas that will not be completed for decades is a starting point where bypass of dangerous high speed roads is needed to achieve connectivity.	Staff agrees.	Coordination of winter maintenance equipment will be a product of the 2nd winter maintenance forum.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
615	Smith, Rod			The city plan needs to also consider that for bikes to be used, there needs to be place to secure them well. In two systems that I see and compare, ANMC/ANTHC has at least three excellent bike cages and Providence, as a larger center, has one small and over-burdened bike cage. Both centers depend on large number of workers who would do well if they could reduce car cost, which bikes can achieve. Clearly, there needs to be AMAT grades for companies and organizations that translate into rewards and penalties. This might allow more lenient parking requirements or cost recovery in other manners—we can call these “incentives with teeth” but they need to deal with security issues that are a great barrier to wider use of bikes.	Staff agrees.	Include recommendations on incentivizing bike parking through businessness and places of work in the AMATS area.
616	Smith, Rod			Your plan also underestimates the health benefits of a healthier population. The studies show a much greater effect than you suggest. I am more than willing to help with this part of the report if revisions are needed. It will also help build a city for the future. I do suspect this will need to be done with more small interventions than expensive projects.	Staff disagrees.	This plan evaluated and incorporated census data that included health and equity for the AMATS area. This data was a high priority criteria that was used to score and prioritize bicycle projects and pedestrian corridors.
617	Sorensen, Fred	Overall	Page 131	We need Pedestrian and bicycle education especially protocol for passing pedestrians etc.	Education and outreach is already an action item in our implementation matrix.	No further action recommended.
618	Sorensen, Fred		Page vii	Winter devices? Dog sleds? Clearer definition Is Girdwood in the Metro? If Eagle River is why not Girdwood?	Text update	Update 'Winter Devices' to winter travel modes. Girdwood is not within the Metro per map on page 7. Defer to land use plan on inclusion of Eagle Creek and exclusion of Girdwood.
619	Sorensen, Fred		Page 21-23 all charts	a) The problem with small numbers is that using statistics exaggerates the perception. One accident could account for half of the statistics (50%), i.e. p22 only 2 people represents 22% b) Using info that includes impaired drivers or pedestrians in this report is deceitful. Accidents involving impairment have absolutely nothing to do with the roadway, traffic patterns, or other conditions.	Text edit.	This report clearly states that collision analysis data is extracted from the Vision Zero plan. This section will be amended to include a cautionary note on the small number of collisions.
620	Sorensen, Fred		Page 43 P 1-2	How many of the 200 spot locations are from the 15 volunteers? If most of the information comes from those volunteers come from then be up front about it. How much actual information came from the public other than the 15 volunteers?	Clarifying text.	This section to better clarify what data came from the public engagement map vs. the volunteer field survey.
621	Sorensen, Fred		Pages 101-127	Representative Projects It is interesting that the minimum cost for the projects is \$1.2 M (not counting maintenance, refer to my notes early on), and there are 319 projects listed (53 high priority).	N/A	No action recommended.
622	Sorensen, Fred		Page 11 Table 2.1	NACTO ? Professional jargon and needs to be spelled out. Same on page 13.	Staff agrees.	Define NACTO in the NMP.
623	Sorensen, Fred		Page 15 P5	Define ‘utilitarian trips’	Staff agrees.	Define "utilitarian trips" in NMP.
624	Sorensen, Fred		Page 17 text	‘that the municipality’sbreakdown lanes’ needs to be capitalized, underlined, and in bold. It is easy to get capital to build expensive projects but impossible to get annual budgets to maintain projects. Maintenance, especially in winter is the key. Not being able to use these transportation networks for 6 months of the year is social and fiscal stupidity.	Staff disagrees.	No action recommended.
625	Sorensen, Fred		Page 1	A major problem is the lack of clearly identified connections between the Pedestrian Network and the Shared Use Pathway Network	The Shared Use Pathway network is a network for pedestrians as well as bicyclists.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
626	Sorensen, Fred		Page 62	A concern that I have is that if a route is not used because it is unsafe then by your criteria it will never be prioritized because it is not used. For example; the West Diamond/Jodhpur is low priority even though the new development on the north side in increasing traffic and the only south entrance to Kincaid Park (very popular with bikers) is on that section of Jodhpur.	There were several data sets and criteria used for project and priority selection. Project recommendations were not based on whether or not an existing route is being used or not. In fact, there exists very little ability to count bicyclists and pedestrians on the vast majority of the non-motorized network throughout the AMATS area.	No action recommended.
627	Sorensen, Fred		Page 130	As I sated earlier (p62), the problem is that more people are going to use what's already there. Counts do not reflect places where new access should be i.e. Jodhpur access to Kincaid Park. People do not use unsafe areas but would use it if improved.	There were several data sets and criteria used for project and priority selection. Project recommendations were not based on whether or not an existing route is being used or not. In fact, there exists very little ability to count bicyclists and pedestrians on the vast majority of the non-motorized network throughout the AMATS area.	No action recommended.
628	Sorensen, Fred		Page 2	Equestrian trails along roadways – Is this sole use and who shares the maintenance. These are also a temptation for off road vehicles.	These trails are shared between all users. Motorized vehicles are not allowed on multi-use trails. E bikes and other electric mobility options that travel less than 25 mph are an exception.	No action recommended.
629	Sorensen, Fred		Page 5 goal 7 X	What is "Vision Zero"? If this is something that the AMATS team knows, the public doesn't and needs to be defined or fully introduced.	Vision Zero is explained in the NMP.	Staff will make sure Vision Zero is better defined in the NMP.
630	Spenard Community Council	Overall	Chapter 5	Tables 5.3 Priority Pedestrian Corridors. Explain the proposed infrastructure changes on the "Priority Pedestrian Corridors." The plan lists primary and secondary pedestrian corridors, but does not explain the kind of pedestrian infrastructure recommended to make those often high-speed roadways safer for pedestrians. The 300 projects listed also do not seem to align with the corridors and include many facilities and intersections. This makes it difficult to understand when pedestrian projects may get implemented along the proposed primary or secondary networks. This needs further explanation to help ensure pedestrian projects do get developed in a timely way.	Due to existing data constraints as well as high funding estimates for average pedestrian facility upgrades, the plan focused on highlighting primary and secondary corridors rather than recommending specific projects. This allows these areas to be open to more project funding opportunities and gives designers and engineers more flexibility to implement best, most up to date design guidance that can be specific to each project.	No action recommended.
631	Spenard Community Council	Overall	Network Maps	Develop low-speed infrastructure for pedestrians and bicyclists that is separate and distinct from high-speed vehicle traffic. Pedestrian speeds are about 3 mph, and bicyclists are at 10-12 mph. Rather than including core components of the pedestrian and bicyclist networks on high-speed roadways, we would like to see the core networks, which is especially true in the proposed pedestrian network. Right now many of the primary network improvements are along state-managed roads, which often are more difficult to address.	Text addition.	This plan recommends bike/ped facilities on higher speed roadways where destinations are located. The facilities on these streets call for maximum separation where possible. Complimentary facilities along parallel corridors will be mentioned but recommendations along major roadways that provide access will remain.
632	Spenard Community Council	34	Chapter 2	Level of Traffic Stress. The level of traffic stress on the roadways should be considered for the pedestrian primary network. As described, the "level of traffic stress" was part of the prioritization process for the bicycle network. However, the mapping of the "Level of Traffic Stress" shows that most of the primary pedestrian corridors are on high-stress roadways. The Non-Motorized Plan should put pedestrians first, but as it is many of the recommended roadways for pedestrians are along fast roads with many lanes and inadequate sidewalks. Recognizing this won't change overnight, there should be roadways within the pedestrian network that are lower stress and put people before vehicles.	Text addition.	We acknowledge that this plan calls for improvements along priority pedestrian corridors rather than laying out a complete pedestrian network. The plan recommends additional data collection so more detailed pedestrian planning can be completed over time. This plan will include a recommendation in the implementation chapter to develop a complete core pedestrian network.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
633	Spenard Community Council	39	Chapter 2	Particular attention should be made to health outcomes and stressors of surrounding communities when accommodating high speed/heavy use roadways. Asthma prevalence-Multiple studies have been done regarding living in proximity to highways which in many ways Minnesota functions as. There are higher rates of asthma in children within one-quarter of a mile of a highway. These studies should be considered when balancing neighborhood needs and moving traffic.	This is an important consideration that should be considered by AMATS in the future. The policy implementation required is beyond the scope of this plan and will be noted by AMATS staff as the planning for the next TMP commences.	No action.
634	Spenard Community Council	53	Chapter 4	4.1 Bicycle Network. Approach. Explain how "Yield Roadways" would function in the car-centric culture of Anchorage. The description of "yield roadways" seems similar to many Anchorage roads by default, but this does not necessarily make them safe for pedestrians and bicyclists. Does this terminology and roadway fit the culture of Anchorage and promote the safe use of roadways for all users?	This facility type is offered up as one solution. Implementation would require consideration of design and potentially change how roadway culture in Anchorage works. Ultimately, this tool may not be adopted in Anchorage.	No action.
635	Spenard Community Council	127	Chapter 6	6.2 Policy + Programs. Add a municipal policy that whenever roadways are repaved, on-road (buffered, sharrows, etc) bicycle facilities should be considered the re-striping. By building this policy into the maintenance cycle, progress to upgrade facilities with minimal footprint changes can occur more timely. The plan should lay out how to recommend dedicated pedestrian facilities on all roads, and dedicated bicycle facilities on all roads where posted speeds exceed 25mph, with the potential for bike lanes on more urban roads that have 25mph limits, like downtown where bicycles are required to ride in the roadway without any on-road facilities. If there's not a dedicated bike facility recommended that should be the exception rather than the rule.	Text addition.	Plan will recommend this policy be considered for adoption.
636	Spenard Community Council	128	Chapter 6	6.2 Policy + Programs. Create a municipal policy that would integrate policy recommendations of Vision Zero going forward. The municipality has a Vision Zero Action Plan with numerous action items that should be integrated into the Non-Motorized Plan's policy recommendations and implementation. All of the city's planning documents should not be siloed, but should be better integrated. Examples include staffing, task forces, reducing speeds, and more. Since adopting this plan, there have not been sufficient programmatic changes in how we build and maintain infrastructure to reach the goals articulated in Vision Zero.	Text addition	Staff will add a note on plan integration to Chapter 2 and also add a recommended synthesis action in the implementation matrix to align these planning efforts.
637	Spenard Community Council	134	Chapter 6	Safe Routes to School. Prioritize funding and integrating safe routes to school in municipal projects. Funding this program has decreased over the years, and makes implementing lasting partnerships difficult. The municipality needs to prioritize safe routes to schools so students can walk and bike safely. Right now, most schools just have sidewalks along school grounds or are lucky to have bicycle racks. These infrastructure pieces are just as important as community partnerships.	Text addition.	Will add a recommendation to include SRTS as a future prioritization criteria to be used in this plan or within the TMP planning process.
638	Spenard Community Council	158	Chapter 7	7.3 Facility Types. Design bicycle infrastructure for a winter city. Winter maintenance is always a challenge for our roadways. We need to consider above-ground indicators for sidewalks, paths, and on-street facilities like signs with lane markings, street lights for bike lanes, and other creative solutions for when snow and ice may hide facilities.	Possible text edit.	Examples of lighting, etc. could be added. Recommend use of flexible vertical lane delineators to highlight bike lanes during snow events as well.
639	Spenard Community Council	167	Chapter 7	Yield Roadway. Expand the design options for an "Enhanced Shared Roadway" to incorporate safe pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure that would fit with Anchorage's culture and advance us toward more active transportation awareness. The "Yield Roadway" as described would not allow for painting or signage. Instead, the Yield Roadway design should better mirror "Neighborhood Street Design Alternatives" included in the Spenard Corridor Plan (p. 96-98 for example). This would allow for sidewalks or paths, swales, sharrows and bike markings, and signs.	The yield roadway facility type does not preclude installation of an bike boulevard which recommends installation of the elements described here (e.g., sidewalks, signs and traffic calming).	No action.
640	Spenard Community Council	179	Chapter 7	Intersections and crossings. Include recommended maximum distances between signalized crosswalks. Right now Anchorage has many "super blocks" with signalized crosswalks over 0.5 miles apart, encouraging jay walking on high-speed roads. This plan should recommend a maximum distance for signalized crosswalks especially along the primary pedestrian network.	Text update.	Include text in Chapter 5 describing priority corridors to include more frequent crossings and midblock crossings on long blocks. Ch 6. Include policy to develop a crossing spacing standard.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
641	Spenard Community Council	189	Chapter 7	Signalization. Include additional design features for safer signalized crossings at intersections, including automatic activation of pedestrian signals and bicyclists. Intersections are one of the most dangerous places for pedestrians and bicyclists being hit by people in cars. Options like increasing lighting at key intersections, allowing the walk signal to start before vehicle traffic, automatic "walk signals," allowing for manual activation to happen even after the traffic light changes when time allows, etc.	Text update.	Update design guidance to include a list of additional interventions that can enhance pedestrian and bicycling safety and further prioritize active modes.
642	Spenard Community Council	127	Chapter 6	Include guidance on implementing solutions around education, encouragement, equity, and enforcement, in addition to the engineering and evaluation included in this plan.. There are a number of ways to improve our non-motorized network beyond the physical system and data. These can include improving wayfinding and signage, adjusting timing of traffic signals for non-motorized users, improving law enforcement and education, and adding lighting where needed.	The plan already includes recommended programmatic and policy changes and outlines recommendation timelines.	No change.
643	Spenard Community Council	64-65	Chapter 5	There are a number of projects that should be included in 5.2 Bicycle Projects table, explained above.	N/A	No action recommended.
644	Spenard Community Council	General	Proposed Pedestrian Network	Tudor Road. As stated above, Tudor Road is dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists alike. There are sections along this road that should be identified for safer crosswalks, including where pedestrians are unfortunately injured or killed by vehicles.	Staff agrees.	We are working with ADOT&PF to identify dangerous crosswalk areas and map areas of high safety concern.
645	Spenard Community Council	Overall	Network Maps	Include combined maps of existing infrastructure and proposed infrastructure. The included maps do not have a high level of detail on what facilities are existing since all lines are gray and could signify bike lanes, multi-use paths, sidewalks, etc., but it is impossible to distinguish them on the maps. Without seeing the connections of the infrastructure it is difficult to identify what is proposed and how it relates to the existing network.	Staff agrees that a map that highlights new infrastructure connections to existing infrastructure would be helpful.	Staff will work on developing this map for the NMP.
646	Spenard Community Council	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Include working with the Alaska Railroad to access ROW for a pedestrian/bike trail from Fish Creek Trail at Red Bridge Park to Minnesota Dr. Currently, Fish Creek Trail deadheads at Taft, which is very dangerous due to the deep curve that was installed for the purposes of the trucking industry. There is no sidewalk or pathway from Harding to Minnesota and nowhere to walk other than in the vegetation when crossing the railroad tracks if one wants to stay out of the road.	Staff agrees that this could be an action item in the implementatin matrix for the NMP.	Include this as an implementation action item in the implementation matrix.
647	Spenard Community Council	1	Network Maps	Create a winter map of the pedestrian and bicyclist core network. There is mention of Anchorage as a winter city, but it is not clearly reflected in the document. We should be able to look at a map of our winter vs. summer networks and see if the infrastructure maintenance plan will work. The winter network could be the "core" network prioritized for winter maintenance, and the summer network would be all infrastructure. There are differences in staffing and funding for state and city winter maintenance, so much of the city's core network should be on municipally managed roadways, which often are lower speed.	Staff agrees.	We will be creating a winter prioritized non-motorized map after the 2nd maintenance forum. This forum will take place after the NMP has been adopted.
648	Spenard Community Council	15	Chapter 1	It's important to create ways for inter-transit activities, like people walking or biking to bus stops, and the bicyclists and pedestrian infrastructure should consider access to transit stops within primary transit corridors. This document needs to include the Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2040 for transit-oriented planning as our city's true long-term transportation planning document. As it is now, People Mover transit routes are created through a short-range transit planning effort (about 5 years).	Staff agrees.	We are looking at incorporating the Transit Corridors from the Land Use Plan 2040 into the NMP.
649	Spenard Community Council	16	Chapter 2	2.1 Existing Plan Review. Incorporate and include finalized plans after 2018. Incorporate and include the Anchorage Climate Action Plan (2019), Spenard Corridor Plan (2020), Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2040 (2020).	Staff agrees.	We are working to incorporate these planning documents into the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
650	Spenard Community Council	53	Chapter 4	Spenard Road rehab project: Add a HIGH priority as recommended separated bikeway and high priority pedestrian corridor. Spenard Road currently has some multi-use pathways along the southern portion, and bicycle lanes and wide pedestrian facilities on the northern portion. However, it does not have safe pedestrian or bicycle facilities in the central region between Benson Blvd. and McRae Rd. The current draft plan identifies this section as a medium priority for pedestrian facilities, but nothing for bicycles. It should be identified as a HIGH priority for both. This was reaffirmed in the 2020 Spenard Corridor Plan. This central region of Spenard Road (from Benson Blvd. to Minnesota Dr.) is currently a project Alaska Department of Transportation is beginning design work on and construction in the next 5 years.	Staff agrees.	This project is already underway but we will make it a high priority project in the NMP.
651	Spenard Community Council	53	Chapter 4	Minnesota Drive: Add as a HIGH priority pedestrian and bicyclist facility. Minnesota Dr. should be better incorporated into the NMP as an active transportation corridor. This roadway is one of the only uninterrupted north-south connections, which funnels pedestrian and bicyclist activities to the roadway. Minnesota Drive is also part of the gateway to the Chester Creek Trail system via Romig Middle School and West High on Hillcrest Drive.	Staff agrees.	We are currently looking at recommendations for Minnesota. We will include a high priority recommendation project in the NMP.
652	Spenard Community Council	53	Chapter 4	Chugach Way: Add as a HIGH priority pedestrian and bicyclist facility. This is a project high on the community's Capital Improvement Program list. This is currently listed as a MEDIUM bicycle facility. It is also important to connect this project with the proposed enhanced shared roadway along 40th Avenue, as these two projects together connect Spenard neighborhoods east-to-west, including to Springer Park, Cuddy Family Midtown Park, and the Loussac Public Library.	Staff agrees.	We will incorporate a high priority project recommendation for Chugach Way into the NMP.
653	Spenard Community Council	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	36th Avenue: Add as a MEDIUM priority pedestrian and bicyclist facilities. 36th Avenue is a primary active transportation corridor that needs improvements. The current facilities, including multi-use paths are inconsistent along the corridor, with notable impediments like light poles within sidewalks, and dangerous crossings.	Staff agrees.	We will add a medium priority project at 36th Ave.
654	Spenard Community Council	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Tudor Road: Add shared use pathway from Minnesota Dr. to Harding Dr. Tudor Road currently has a combination of multi-use paths, sidewalks, and shoulders, but this section is non-existent and extremely dangerous in the winter with snow banks and semi-trucks. Along the full stretch of the corridor, there are numerous crossings and driveways that are dangerous, especially for pedestrians crossing the high-speed roadway with few crosswalks and poor lighting. This roadway needs to be prioritized and improved.	Staff agrees.	We will look at a new project recommendation for Tudor Road along this section.
655	Spenard Community Council	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Include an active transportation corridor along the Alaska Railroad. Alaska Railroad multi-use trail: As identified in the 2010 Anchorage Bicycle Plan, this multi-use trail along the railroad corridor should be reinstated. This corridor was reaffirmed in the 2020 Spenard Corridor Plan as a "future active transportation corridor."	Staff agrees.	We will include this corridor as an active transportation corridor in the NMP.
656	Spenard Community Council	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Include an active transportation corridor along the Fish Creek Trail, including the Fish Creek Trail connector to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail, as a recommended shared use pathway Fish Creek Trail: This multi-use trail along the Alaska Railroad, as identified in the 2010 Anchorage Bicycle Plan and reaffirmed in the 2020 Spenard Corridor Plan (primary active network as shown on the Open Space Network map on pg. 44 of the SCP), should be included. The council also supports a trail connection from Ure Park to the Fish Creek Trail. Fish Creek Trail to the Ocean is a project currently in the works for bond funding, but it is not included on the trail map. Our council strongly supports connectivity of our parks and trails, as well as the long-term vision of daylighting Fish Creek. This corridor is identified as a "future active transportation corridor" in the 2020 Spenard Corridor Plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include this corridor as an active transportation corridor in the NMP.
657	Spenard Community Council	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Include and highlight the "Ride the Moose Loop" route as well as priority connections, like through the Mountains View neighborhood. Major connection barriers to the Moose Loop, such as the Lake Otis crossing and connection through Mountain View.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project recommendation in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
658	Spenard Community Council	57	Proposed Pedestrian Network	There should be a trail connection on the north side of International Airport Road from Spenard to Northwood as there is no shoulder path or trail to walk on safely. The residents who live in the area to the north of International Airport Road cannot safely walk, catch a bus or ride a bike because the bike trail has never been finished between Spenard and Northwood. Many of the cars driving on that strip of road are going in excess of 45 mph.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project recommendation in the NMP.
659	Spenard Community Council	57	Proposed Pedestrian Network	Include a core pedestrian network that puts pedestrians first. Right now this document does not prioritize active transportation users on any roadways throughout Anchorage. Right now the core network appears along most state-managed roadways, which are often at high speeds and are not as frequently maintained in the wintertime. Secondary or tertiary streets as the main network would be a practical approach the muni could better implement. Pedestrians often face difficult conditions along sidewalks, which snow dumped on them, cars parked over the curb, and barriers within pathways, all issues that make sidewalks/pathways often impassable.	Staff agrees.	We will work on a core pedestrian network for the NMP.
660	Spenard Community Council	57	Proposed Pedestrian Network	The corridors do not capture important neighborhood connections or safe routes to schools. These should be represented in the plan in some way. For example, Lois Drive is an important pedestrian corridor through Spenard and it is not identified in the plan. There are also numerous schools that only have a block of sidewalk (if that) surrounding the school properties, not representing realistic or safe pathways for children to access schools.	Staff agrees.	We will include a project recommendation for Lois Drive.
661	Spenard Community Council	57	Proposed Pedestrian Network	Include the Fairview Greenway as a priority. This is identified in the Fairview Community Plan (page 60) Goal "5.2 Improve and identify linkages to the Ship Creek and Chester Creek greenbelts and trail systems." It is also included in the Anchorage Land Use Plan 2040 and should be part of the priority pedestrian network, connecting the Chester Creek Trail through Fairview and to the Ship Creek Trail.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project recommendation in the NMP.
662	Spenard Community Council	57	Proposed Pedestrian Network	Incorporate "Open Streets" within the primary pedestrian network. Anchorage has many opportunities, like in Downtown Anchorage, where roadways could be closed off to vehicle traffic and put active transportation users first. These could be anchors within the pedestrian network. This policy is described as a pilot program (page 132-133); however these potential locations can be identified and described within the primary network. A pedestrian plan should have some areas where pedestrians are "first," but right now the network still resides mainly on high-speed roadways designed for vehicles.	Staff agrees.	We will incorporate open streets into the NMP Pedestrian recommendations.
663	Spenard Community Council	131	Chapter 6	Data Consolidation. Share non-motorized data online in an easily accessible format. The "general public" is listed as an audience and should be able to easily seek and find the data. Consider sharing data in user-friendly ways to find and visualize the data over time.	Staff agrees.	We are working with the Municipal GIS department to coordinate our NMP data with online capability for mapping and public sharing.
664	Spenard Community Council	147	Chapter 6	Winter Maintenance Strategy. Create a map of the core pedestrian and bicyclist network. As a winter maintenance policy and procedure is created, there needs to be more recognition that Anchorage is a winter city October-April each year. Our pedestrian and bicycle network and facilities should show this.	Staff agrees.	We will be working on a map of core pedestrian and bicycle routes and winter routes as a follow up to NMP adoption. This will be a result of the 2nd AMATS initiated maintenance forum.
665	Spenard Community Council	155	Chapter 7	Design Needs of Users - Bicyclists. Include electric bicycles (e-bikes) in the bicyclists users. E-bikes are becoming more popular to assist bike riders throughout the municipality, but are not mentioned within the plan. This impacts accessibility along the network, speeds, and more.	Staff agrees.	We will include e-bikes in chapter 7
666	Spenard Community Council		Chapter 7	Signage and Wayfinding. Incorporate Indigenous Place Names in signage and wayfinding. The Indigenous Place Names Project is a successful initiative of the Anchorage Park Foundation and many partners, but this project should be more broadly adopted and integrated into the municipality's design process as a cornerstone for the city.	Staff agrees.	We are working to incorporate Indigenous Place Names into signage and wayfinding in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
667	Spenard Community Council	53	Proposed Bicycle Network	Include the 32nd & 33rd Avenue projects as HIGH priorities. This project is in design and is moving into construction on 30th Avenue and Spenard. It is a "Complete Streets" project for the city. It may be that the enhanced shared roadway on "31st Ave" should be replaced with the 32nd/33rd separated bikeway recommendations on both maps and project tables.	Staff agrees.	We will include these projects as high priority in the NMP.
668	Spenard Community Council	57	Proposed Pedestrian Network	Include a map of all the 300 pedestrian projects Looking at the "Proposed Pedestrian Network" and "Priority Pedestrian Network" does not illustrate where all 300 projects land on the map and how they relate to the priority corridors.	Staff disagrees. Creating this map from the old Pedestrian Plan is out of the scope for this planning project.	No action recommended.
669	Spenard Community Council	52	Chapter 3	3.1 Field Data Collection and Community Input Map. Include a map with the overlaid Proposed Networks onto the public input GIS map (this can also be shared on the website). Public input in the community processes or on the online interactive map are explained in the plan, including if or how this input was incorporated into prioritization. A map illustrating how the proposed networks overlays onto the public input map will show this relationship.	Staff does not feel that a map overlaying proposed networks onto the interactive webmap would be useful. The interactive webmap was just one of many criteria used in developing project recommendations.	No action recommended.
670	Spenard Community Council	5	Chapter 1	Shared Use Pathway Network. More clearly label the "Shared Use Pathway Network" as the "Trails" portion of this plan. Without clearly making the distinction that the 1997 Trails Plan is incorporated into this document as the "Shared Use Pathway Network," the trails portion gets lost in this document. The Existing and Proposed Bicycle Network maps and descriptions should also have the words "Trails" titles to more clearly communicate the incorporation of our multi-use pathways. As it appears now, there are only about 7 projects for trails.	The Shared Use Pathway network is a network for pedestrians as well as bicyclists. The Areawide Trails Plan from 1996 is not represented in this plan update. It will be an additional effort that will become an amendment to the NMP after it is completed.	No action recommended.
671	Spenard Community Council	41	Overall	Include an explanation of the gap in time from 2018 to the draft release in 2021. The draft NMP was expected in spring of 2018. The last public engagement on this project appears to have been early 2019, and in that time the community has not participated for nearly 2 years. The lack of momentum and transparency of the process in those 2 years is troubling.	These planning projects take a very long time. The majority of the delay can be explained in initially underestimating the amount of time and effort needed to get the draft plan through internal agency review. It went through several TC and PC meetings and work sessions as well as special work sessions with transportation agency groups like MOA Traffic and ADOT&PF.	No action recommended.
672	Spenard Community Council	24	Chapter 2	Existing Bicycle Network. Include a map with more clearly defined existing and proposed bicycle infrastructure. It is difficult to identify the existing infrastructure on the "proposed bicycle network map" so one needs to flip between the only map that shows existing infrastructure. A combined map will explain and communicate the proposed connectivity.	This comment is essentially a repetition of the first comment from the SCC. Please see above comment response.	We will work on creating a map that shows the relationship between existing and planned infrastructure.
673	Spenard Community Council	Overall		There are a significant number of substantive recommendations included within these comments. We respectfully ask that these issues are addressed and incorporated into the document before the Assembly and AMATS Policy Committee adopt this plan.	To make the best use of our budget for the plan, AMATS will seek approval of all comments/changes prior to adoption and once those have been approved by the AMATS Policy Committee, changes will be incorporated into the document.	No action recommended.
674	Spenard Community Council	70-96	Chapter 5	Table 5.1 Prioritization Criteria Matrix. Include criteria (potentially under "Previous Support") for projects that appear in community council's Capital Improvement Plan prioritization for the municipality. There are a number of projects that have high community support, and these can be found in recent annual CIP priorities for each community council.	Unfortunately, it is too late to change the criteria for project selection and prioritization. This is something that will need to be done in the next plan update.	No action recommended.
675	Spenard Community Council	70-83	Chapter 5	Tables 5.2 Bicycle Projects. Revisit this prioritization to ensure the active transportation corridors identified in the Spenard Corridor Plan are included in the process. Though the SCP is listed in the prioritization table for "Previous Support" (p. 65), it does not appear for all the projects identified in the existing or proposed active transportation corridors (primary, secondary, or both) within this table. Examples include 27th Ave, 40th Ave, Chugach Way, and Wilson/Cambridge/Cope.	Unfortunately, it is too late to change the criteria for project selection and prioritization. This is something that will need to be done in the next plan update.	No action recommended.
676	Spenard Community Council	8 thru 10	Chapter 1	This plan focuses on paved shared use trails and pathways. There is a forthcoming plan on recreational trails. What is the time frame for the plan? Will the plan show the intersection of recreational trails and hard surface trails or sidewalks?	We hope to begin work on the update to the Areawide Trails Plan in a year or two following adoption of the NMP.	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
677	Spring, Jon			Not sure how separated bikeways can be designed downtown on 5th and 6th Avenues. Design guidelines say that the minimum width of bicycle lanes and painted buffer is 7 feet. Will parking remain on the street or will a travel lane need to be removed. It might be better to focus on development of a bicycle facility on 5th Avenue especially if it is eventually converted into a two way street as recommended in the Downtown Plan.	Thank you for the comment. These are valid questions to be considered during any preliminary design work. Ultimately the strategies recommended here could be used.	No change.
678	Spring, Jon			It looks like most of the high priority bicycle projects are in the central core. Maybe this could be expanded to include some of the town centers.	Thank you. Anchorage will continue to support development of Neighborhood Plans that highlight circulation routes in town centers in greater detail.	No change.
679	Spring, Jon			One figure shows the Ship Creek Trail as a secondary paved shared use facility and another as a primary facility.	Map update.	Thank you. We will make this updates.
680	Spring, Jon			Figure 2.8 Would help to include crashes on a percapital basis and extend the years covered to at least 10.	Collision analysis was extracted from the Vision 0 plan and no additional analysis was completed for this plan.	No change.
681	Spring, Jon			Why is Eagle River Loop Rd. a high injury route (Figure 2.12). The figure doesn't show any crashes on it.	The high injury routes were developed as part of the Vision 0 plan.	No change.
682	Spring, Jon			Don't understand the Level of Stress map. Why is Elmore between Abbott and Dowling a LT4? It has a separated bike/ped facility and a lower level of traffic. Does it only apply curb to curb?	Clarification.	LTS only applies to the roadway facility itself rather than the adjacent trails. Trails are shown so corridors should have both an LTS 1 and LTS 4 facility shown.
683	Spring, Jon			Terrace is an emerging important connector for a developing residential neighborhood (Powder Reserve in Eagle River). During the PZC review of subdivision plans many residents expressed the need for upgrades to Terrace which included new pedestrian facilities. It would also serve as a useful bicycle connection.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project recommendation in the NMP.
684	Spring, Jon			There is also a need for a bicycle connection between the Powder Reserve and Chugiak High School.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project recommendation in the NMP.
685	Spring, Jon			Isn't there an existing multi-use path along Kincaid Park Rd. connecting the chalet to Raspberry Rd.? (see Figure 2.1. If so then there is no need for a new project.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this missing project link.
686	Spring, Jon			Isn't the Campbell Airstrip Rd facility a secondary paved shared use facility? Figure 2.1 shows it as an existing paved shoulder bikeway. I think it's separated. Same question regarding Eagle River Loop Rd. Might need someone to do a final map review.	Staff agrees.	We will fix this project link.
687	Spring, Jon			Figure 2.3 Isn't there a secondary paved shared use facility on Spenard Rd. between Hillcrest and Chester Creek Trail?	Staff agrees.	We will fix this project link.
688	Spring, Jon			Figure 4.1. There doesn't seem to be any major bike facility improvements on the east side of town, especially east/west routes. The old bike plan had proposed a bike facility improvement along Debar.	Staff agrees.	We are looking at including more projects on the east side of Anchorage.
689	Spring, Jon			The pedestrian network should be reviewed to be sure that all transit supportive corridors as identified in the 2040 Land Use Plan are included.	Staff agrees.	We will be including transit supportive corridors in the NMP.
690	Spring, Jon			Didn't the 2040 Land Use Plan include a major bike/ped facility east west through midtown (along 40th and Loussac Library all the way to Fish Creek.	Staff agrees.	We will include this missing project link in the NMP.
691	Spring, Jon			The connection between the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail and the Ship Creek Trail has been an ongoing issue. It looks like the plan is for there to be a street connection along Christianson. Are you eliminating the coastal connection from consideration?	The coastal connection has not been eliminated but is not feasible at this time due to cost constraints.	No action recommended.
692	Spring, Jon			The sidewalk database was last updated for the 2007 Pedestrian Plan and should be available from the GIS Department. It included all sidewalks local and major streets.	The most up to date data for sidewalks was used for the NMP. The municipal pedestrian database is out of date and needs to be updated before an accurate assessment of existing facilities can be made.	No action recommended.
693	Tallman, Peter			I'm writing to ask that the Glenn Hwy bike path be included in the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. I'd like the Glenn Hwy separated bike path to be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklunna Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan.	Staff agrees.	We will include this missing project link in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
694	Taygan, Will			what is the scope of draft AMATS NMP? Why is this important? Is it limited to road right-of-ways? What about stream setbacks and other easements that are preferred active transportation routes? Chugiak has large areas zoned as development reserves. How does the AMATS NMP address future development?	For this plan update we are focusing on core network routes (mostly paved). It is possible that stream setbacks and other easements will be addressed in the areawide trails update following this plan.	
695	Taygan, Will			The draft AMATS NMP removes several projects from the 1997, 2007 and 2010 plans. How can we ensure that those projects are included in the current NMP?	These several projects that were dropped intentionally to better align the network with updated transportation and land use plans.	No action recommended.
696	Taygan, Will			<p>Hi Joni. I've attached a few maps of existing and missing bike infrastructure in Chugiak. This does not include all the new ped trails that CBERRSA has built in the past few years. I would recommend that AMATS connect with the local road boards as several ped projects have been completed from the 2007 ped plan.</p> <p>Regarding 2010 Bike plan for Chugiak. I would recommend keeping it as is for 2020, but have also attached a few updated maps.</p> <p>Connections between the Old Glenn and New Glenn Paths are needed at: West Lake Ridge Drive. This is the most used connector as it allows folks biking from Chugiak to cut over from the nice new path on the Old Glenn to the New Glenn path and avoid the driveways and traffic in downtown Eagle River.</p> <p>South Birchwood connects the new path on the Old Glenn to Chugiak High School. Needed for Safe Routes to Schools.</p> <p>Old Glenn path at North Birchwood is missing striping. This should be an easy fix, but needs DOT approval. Currently there is a 0.5 detour that is a bit ridiculous.</p> <p>The Northern extension of the Glenn Hwy Bike Path is needed to serve the northern communities of Mirror Lake, Paradis, Thunderbird and Eklutna. The northern neighborhoods have NO nonmotorized access as there is no frontage road to the Glenn Hwy.</p>	Staff agrees.	We will include these missing project links in the NMP.
697	Taygan, Will			<p>One other specific intersection I forgot is the main Eagle River exit at Artillery Road. The bike path ends and then riders need to negotiate that major intersection, cut through the neighborhood, and then get back on.</p> <p>It really needs a tunnel or something. I think there are plans to redo that exit and we really need to fix that non-motorized connection when they do that!</p>	Staff agrees.	We will include this missing project link in the NMP.
698	Taygan, Will			The draft AMATS NMP plan replaces the 1997 Trails Plan, the 2007 Pedestrian Plan and the 2010 Bicycle Plan, but does not address recreational trails. How are recreational trails different from active-transportation trails? Can you clarify how these will be included?	Unfortunately, we discovered early on in our planning process that doing an update of the Areawide Trails Plan during this update would not be feasible due to budget constraints. We plan to do an areawide trails update following adoption of the NMP and incorporate it into the NMP as an amendment, once approved.	No action recommended.
699	Taygan, Will			As for my own concerns, the 2007 Eagle River Long Range Transportation Plan calls for completion of the 1997 Areawide Trails Plan high priority trails including the Glenn Hwy Path Extension, Eklutna Waterline Path, and Coastal/Hillside recreational trails. Of these, the Glenn Hwy Path extension to Palmer was shortened in the 2010 bicycle plan to the Eklutna Overpass, but now the 2020 draft AMATS NMP stops at North Peters Creek. How can we ensure that the bicycle path along the highway from N. Birchwood to Eklutna, as well as the associated neighborhood safety paths extending from N. Peters Creek to Mirror Lake Park (on both sides of the Glenn) are kept in the NMP? These connections are critical for Eklutna and Thunderbird falls communities to connect to Mirror Lake Park, Mirror Lake Middle School, and the rest of the non-motorized trail networks, as they have no paths and no roads other than the Glenn Hwy.	Staff agrees.	We will include these missing project links in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
700	Taygan, William			<p>Hi John, thanks for attending the Council meeting last week. It was a great! Our Council has been supportive of expanding the trails and sidewalks out here so it would be easy to move forward with any projects you recommend.</p> <p>Blake Merrifield on the CBERRSA board has done a great job of building out the 2007 pedestrian plan on city-owned street in Peters Creek, but we don't have an easy mechanism to build on the state owned roads.</p> <p>My #1 project is extending the Glenn Hwy bike path from the Peters Creek Exit to North Peters Creek exit on the EAST side of the highway</p> <p>There is a new CBERRSA-built path on the west side, but it doesn't capture the pedestrian use on the mountain side, and the road is very narrow with no shoulder and a tight guardrail.</p> <p>Our goal is to also extend the nonmotorized paths to the neighborhoods north of Mirror Lake, especially to connect Eklutna and Thunderbird to Mirror Lake Middle School and Mirror Lake Park, as the only connection now is the shoulder of the Glenn Hwy.</p>	Staff agrees.	We will make sure that the Glenn Hwy bike path from Peters Creek Exit to North Peters Creek exit on the East side of the hwy is included in recommended projects for the NMP. We will also look into recommending projects to connect Eklutna and Thunderbird to Mirror Lake Middle School and Mirror Lake Park.
701	Taylor, Family			Please respect the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan to construct a Glenn Hwy. separated bike plan to be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklutna Overpass. We need these plans to be included in the new 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. The biking community is a thriving and growing community, both in the Valley and in Anchorage; and this extension continues a plan that serves this area and extends access for families and bikers alike. Ultimately, non-motorized options need full access from Anchorage to the Valley for a healthy alternative to travel, both commuting and recreational. This extension from Peters Creek to Eklutna is a small piece of that larger goal and is critical to keep this vision al	Staff agrees.	We will make sure this project is included in the NMP.
702	Telford, Brandon (PM&E)			The draft AMATS Non-motorized Plan indicates a Bicycle Boulevard should have a posted speed of 25 mph and target a motor vehicle volume of less than 1,500 vehicles per day, not to exceed 3,000 vehicles per day. The NACTO Urban Bikeway Design Guide further indicates that streets designated as bicycle boulevards should meet a strict target of an 85th percentile speed of no more than 25 miles per hour.	N/A	No action recommended.
703	Telford, Brandon (PM&E)			The draft AMATS Non-motorized Plan recommends an improvement standard of Enhanced Shared Roadway for E 120th Avenue from John's Road to Old Seward Highway. PM&E is currently in the design phase of an improvement project for this section of E 120th Avenue and based on traffic volumes, posted speed, and historic 85th percentile speeds the Enhanced Shared Roadway classification appears to be inappropriate.	Staff agrees.	We will look at changing the project recommendation for this segment of E 120th.
704	Telford, Brandon (PM&E)			The posted speed limit on E 120th Avenue from John's Road to Old Seward Highway is 30 mph, recent traffic volume counts indicate volumes in excess of 2,500 vehicles per day, and historic speed studies indicate an 85th percentile speed in excess of 35 mph. Please consider a different improvement standard for E 120th in the AMATS Non-motorized Plan.	Staff agrees.	We will make a different project recommendation for this section of E 120th.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
705	Townsend, Curtis			I have many times biked, rollerbladed and ran on the trail that parallels the Glenn and Old Glenn Highway. I understand that the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan included a northern extension of this route to Eklutna overpass. I am in support of this bike path. I love using this path by myself, with my children and with friends. It is great for exercise, commuting to friends and stores, and is a great asset to our community.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the NMP.
706	Turnagain Community Council		General	Change "Separated Bikeway" to "Multi-use Pathway" o Most, if not all, of the 'ways' in Turnagain included in the Plan are used by pedestrians as well as bicycle riders — makes more sense to be 'inclusive' when look at these non-motorized projects	Separated bikeways are indeed inclusive of side paths. The plan clarifies this in several locations.	No action.
707	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Please Note: Lakeshore Dr. has no curb/gutter — and no pedestrian amenities on the north side, Change to Enhanced Shared Roadway/Multi-use Path on south side	The separated bikeway category is inclusive of a side path that accommodates both bikes and pedestrians.	No action.
708	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Minnesota SB off Hillcrest — Separated Bikeway — Hillcrest Drive to West 15th Avenue — Medium (pg. 76) No room for Separated Bikeway East side: No room — tight ROW along businesses on south end-residential lots on north end Land slopes down to Minnesota Dr./existing landscaping would be impacted/Westchester Lagoon • What is intent for bikeway to be developed separate from pedestrian use on west side?	Recommend removal of this link.	Remove link.
709	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Hillcrest — Enhanced Shared Roadway — Spenard Road to Forest Park Drive — High (pg. 72) • TCC supports the "High" priority ranking of this project	N/A	No action recommended.
710	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Wisconsin St. to Spenard Rd: This roadway was upgraded a few years ago — non-motorized elements were included in project, but compromised due to very narrow ROWs	N/A	No action recommended.
711	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Turnagain — Enhanced Shared Roadway — West Northern Lights Boulevard to Illiamna Avenue — Medium (pg. 78) • TCC supports the Enhanced Shared Roadway designation	N/A	No action recommended.
712	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Clay Products — Enhanced Shared Roadway — Telequana Drive to Marston Drive — Low (pg. 78) • TCC supports the Enhanced Shared Roadway designation	N/A	No action recommended.
713	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Marston — Enhanced Shared Roadway — Clay Products Drive to Pete's Place — Low (pg. 80) TCC supports the Enhanced Shared Roadway designation	N/A	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
714	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Telequana — Enhanced Shared Roadway — West Northern Lights Boulevard to Clay Products Drive — Low (pg. 80) , TCC supports the Enhanced Shared Roadway designation	N/A	No action recommended.
715	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	#57 Minnesota Dr & Northern Lights Blvd. #2 Crash location — Crossing (pg. 87) TCC supports crossing improvements at this location	N/A	No action recommended.
716	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	• #83 Benson/Northern Lights Blvd — pedestrian amenities — Crossing (pg. 88) TCC supports crossing improvements at this location	N/A	No action recommended.
717	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	109 Hillcrest crosswalks — Minnesota Ramp, Wildwood Dr, Spenard Rd — Crossings (pg. 89) TCC supports crossing improvements at this location Please Note: Hillcrest Dr. is a roadway identified in TCC's SRTS project list. Minnesota Dr. Ramp (some work has been done) and Wildwood Dr. • Additional Safety Enhancements are recommended.	N/A	No action recommended.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
718	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	#178 Turnagain Elementary School — West 29th Ave, Wisconsin St to school — Missing sidewalk. lighting (pg. 91) TCC supports sidewalk at this location	N/A	No action recommended.
719	Turnagain Community Council		General	• NEED TO CHECK FOR ANY STREET NAME ERRORS in the following FIGURES:	Staff agrees.	We will double check for street name errors on this graphic.
720	Turnagain Community Council		General	• Figure ES.2: Recommended Bicycle and Shared Use Pathway Network (page viii)	Staff agrees.	We will double check for street name errors on this graphic.
721	Turnagain Community Council		General	• Figure ES.8: Prioritized Bicycle Corridors (page xii)	Staff agrees.	We will double check for street name errors on this graphic.
722	Turnagain Community Council		General	• Figure 2.1: Existing Bicycle Network (page 16)	Staff agrees.	We will double check for street name errors on this graphic.
723	Turnagain Community Council		General	• Figure 4.1: Recommended Bicycle Network (page 53)	Staff agrees.	We will double check for street name errors on this graphic.
724	Turnagain Community Council		General	• Figure 5.1: Prioritized Bicycle Corridors (page 66)	Staff agrees.	We will double check for street name errors on this graphic.
725	Turnagain Community Council		General	Significantly enlarge/Bold font size of Table & Figure Names	Staff agrees.	We will enlarge the text of table and figure names.
726	Turnagain Community Council		General	Projects listed in Table 5.2 should be numbered for easier reference	Staff agrees.	We will number the projects listed in table 5.2.
727	Turnagain Community Council		General	Projects listed in Table 5.2 — should be consistent — add roadway designation to all street names in all columns, not just some (i.e., in “Corridor / Street Name” column, streets do not include Ave., Pkwy, Dr., etc. — but they do have those identifiers in the “Corridor To” and “Corridor From” columns	Staff agrees.	We will add roadway designation to all street names in all columns in table 5.2.
728	Turnagain Community Council		General	Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — title should be at top of each page of this list (pages 87 to 95)	Staff agrees.	We will add the title at the top of each page of this list.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
729	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please Note: TCC had identified multiple pedestrian-related projects called “Safe Routes to Schools” (SRTS) within the West-Romig Campus, including development of missing sidewalk segments on the south side of Hillcrest — this is also a High priority project for Forest Park — Enhanced Shared Roadway — West Northern Lights Boulevard to Unnamed Road — Medium (pg. 74) Change “Corridor From” to Hillcrest Dr. Please Note: Forest Park Dr. is another roadway identified in TCC’s SRTS project list. Due to the extremely tight ROW along this road, the only feasible remediation to create safer non-pedestrian use is to repave and repaint outer /shoulder lane lines closer to center line to enlarge shoulder areas. TCC has been working with the Municipality on this low-level, but important, project. 	Staff agrees.	We will change corridor from to "Hillcrest Drive" Change this project priority to High.
730	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Lakeshore — Separated Bikeway — Wisconsin Street to Lakeshore Drive — Medium (pg. 76) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change “Corridor To” to Spenard Beach Park 	Staff agrees.	We will change corridor to to "Spenard Beach Park" for this segment on Lakeshore.
731	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change “Corridor From” to Lions Park” 	Staff agrees.	We will change corridor from to "Lions Park" for this segment on Lakeshore.
732	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Change to “High” priority • Add sidewalk on north side	Staff agrees.	We will make this project recommendation change.
733	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	On south side, there’s already a multi-use path on south side from Wisconsin to Spenard Beach	Staff agrees.	We will take a look at this section and make another project recommendation remove the existing project recommendation.
734	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Need to continue multi-use path from Spenard Beach Park on south side until it meets up with existing multi-use path on north side at Lions Park	Staff agrees.	We will include this project recommendation.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
735	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Minnesota — Separated Bikeway — West Northern Lights Boulevard to Hillcrest Drive — Medium (pg. 76) TCC recommends DELETION of this project from the Plan. Would take up too much space — existing landscaping would be highly impacted This project would create an “artificial connection” — there’s already a connection that is There’s no room for Separated Bikeway or any other new path in most of this corridor — project is not feasible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No room: East of existing chain-link fence (ends in Romig campus area): slope down to Minnesota Dr./existing trees/sidewalk from Romig parking lot south to W. Northern Lights functionable in this area — used as a Multi-use Path No Room: West of existing chain-link fence: existing sidewalk through northern part of Romig campus off Hillcrest Dr./another chain-link fence right up to existing chain-link fence/trees/portable classroom buildings/existing sidewalk starts at Romig parking lot and goes to W. Northern Lights Blvd. along trees/Arthur Campbell Greenhouse parking lot/trees/old Shell parking lot/trees	Staff agrees.	We will delete this project from the NMP.
736	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	West side: Separated multi-use path already exists along Westchester Lagoon up to Hillcrest Dr. • But, if needed, just widen existing multi-use trail instead of creating two separate amenities and put separation lines to designate lanes for bikes and lanes for walkways wetlands would need to be filled	Staff agrees.	We will edit this project recommendation
737	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Need to specify this is Turnagain Parkway (there’s also a Turnagain Blvd. and a Turnagain St.) This is a narrow road with existing painted bike lane on east side	Staff agrees.	We will make this text edit.
738	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Aero — Enhanced Shared Roadway — Milky Way Drive to West Northern Lights Boulevard to — Low TCC recommends DELETION of this project from the Plan Already built to Neighborhood Collector standards: bike path on west side/sidewalk on east side	Staff agrees.	We will delete this project from the NMP.
739	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Northern Lights — Enhanced Shared Roadway — Aero Avenue to Telequana Drive — Low (pg. 80) TCC recommends DELETION of this project from the Plan Already a multi-use path on north side and sidewalk on south side, Do you mean Telequana Dr. to Clay Products Dr.?	Staff agrees.	We will delete this project from the NMP.
740	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	#51 Northern Lights Blvd — path on south side, La Honda Dr to Lois Dr — Missing Sidewalk (pg. 87) TCC recommends DELETION of this project from the Plan, This project was complete several years ago	Staff agrees.	We will delete this project from the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
741	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	#137 Seppala St — Northern Lights Blvd to Balto Seppala — Missing sidewalk (pg. 90) TCC supports this project, but project scope needs to be amended: • Change West Northern Lights Blvd to 30th Ave — already a sidewalk along Seppala St. from West Northern Lights Blvd. to 30th Ave. — still need sidewalk from 30th Ave to Balto Seppala Park	Staff agrees.	We will make the project edits.
742	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	#142 Balto Seppala Park & Lloyd Steele Park to Turnagain Elementary School — Missing link walkway (pg. 90) TCC supports pedestrian connector at this location o Because of wetlands/wet conditions, a boardwalk should be built, similar to one installed connecting the northwest corner of Balto Seppala Park to the southeast corner of Lloyd Steele Park	Staff agrees.	We will make this project edit.
743	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	#143 Aero Ave — West 36th to West 44th Ave — Missing link walkway (pg. 90) TCC recommends DELETION of this project from the Plan, Surprised to see the resurrection of this idea — for many years, TCC has opposed any development (Aero Ave. Extension/walkway extension) south of a non-existent W. 36th Ave. • Class A Turnagain Bog wetlands would need to be filled for this project • In the past, U.S. Corps of Engineers said it would not permit a road extension, due to wetland impacts	Staff agrees.	We will delete this project from the NMP.
744	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	#144 Hillcrest Dr — Atwood Dr to Spenard Rd — Missing sidewalk (pg. 90) Change "Corridor To" to Atwood Dr.; change "Corridor From" to Forest Park Dr (to Spenard Road) Please Note: Hillcrest Dr. is a roadway identified in TCC's SRTS project list (#8)	Staff agrees.	We will make this project edit.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
745	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	#191 Turnagain St — West Northern Lights Blvd to West 35th Ave (McRae) — Missing sidewalk (pg. 92) TCC supports sidewalk at this location • Project should be ranked higher than any other Turnagain project (sidewalk along with road upgrade is TCC's #2-ranked CIP project)	Staff agrees.	We will make this project edit.
746	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	# 245 Forest Park Dr — Northern Lights Blvd to East High School — Missing sidewalk (pg. 93) Need to correct typo: change East to West, however: • TCC recommends DELETION of both project segments project from the Plan Please Note: Forest Park Dr. is another roadway identified in TCC's SRTS project list. Due to the extremely tight ROW along this road, the only feasible remediation to create safer non-pedestrian use is to repave and repaint outer /shoulder lane lines closer to center line to enlarge shoulder areas. TCC has been working with the Municipality on this low-level, but important, project	Staff agrees.	We will delete this project from the NMP.
747	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	• Project on Hillcrest Dr. is redundant to project #144 Hillcrest Dr. and Forest Park Dr. Enhanced Shared Roadway under Bicycle Projects (see pg. 2 of our comments)	Staff agrees.	We will delete this project from the NMP.
748	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.4: Priority Pedestrian Network Projects (from 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan) — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	# 307 Postmark Drive — Lake Spenard to Earthquake Park — Missing sidewalk (pg. 95) • Change Earthquake Park to Point Woronzof Dr., but TCC has opposed non-motorized projects along Postmark Dr. in past because of wetland impacts, Postmark Dr. already has wide shoulders on both sides, No room along GA plane tie-down areas on south end, Not sure Airport would support • If project is developed, it should be a multi-use path directly adjacent to road on east side	Staff agrees.	We will make this project edit.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
749	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Aircraft — Separated Bikeway — Lakeshore Drive to Tom Wardleigh Drive — Low (pg. 78) • Not sure exactly where this is — project road/corridors don't make sense. Project unlikely; ROW is very tight in this general area to accommodate Separated Bikeway — Not sure if Airport would allow projec, should be designated Enhanced Shared Roadway	Staff will take another look at this project.	Staff will take another look at this project.
750	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Lakeshore — Separated Bikeway — Lakeshore Drive to Aircraft Drive — Medium (pg. 779) • Not sure exactly where this is — project road/corridors don't make sense If it means Lakeshore Dr. going west, past Lions Park and south of gravel runway strip, to Helio Drive, there would potentially be room to continue the existing separated multi-use trail part of the way, to where there are taxiway gates; then it should be an Enhanced Shared Roadway	Staff will take another look at this project.	Staff will take another look at this project.
751	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Milky Way/35th/McRae — Separated Bikeway — Spenard Road to Aero Avenue — Medium (pg. 76) There may not be room for Separated Bikeway — should be Enhanced Shared Roadway	We will take another look at this project reommendation.	Staff look again at this project recommendation.
752	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Aero Ave. to Wisconsin St: Existing sidewalks on both sides, but missing sidewalk link on south side of Milky Way from McKenzie Dr. to Aero Ave. No room to add separated	We will take another look at this project reommendation.	Staff look again at this project recommendation.
753	Turnagain Community Council		Table 5.2: Bicycle Projects — Turnagain CC Boundary Projects:	Postmark — Separated Bikeway — Helio Place to Point Woronzof Drive — Low (pg. 80) TCC has opposed non-motorized projects along Postmark Dr. in past because of wetland impacts, Postmark Dr. already has wide shoulders on both sides, No room along GA plane tie-down areas, Not sure Airport would support	We will take another look at this project reommendation.	We will take another look at this project reommendation.
754	Udevitz, Molissa			<p>I am writing to express support for prioritizing the Campbell Creek Trail Lake Otis Parkway Crossing to create an uninterrupted, safe route to get across Lake Otis and connect the Campbell Creek Trail.</p> <p>I am surprised to see this project rated as "low priority" in this non-motorized plan because as a regular summer bike user of this route, I see numerous people walking and biking jaywalk across Lake Otis at neither the Waldron or Tudor intersections. Additionally, a raised median makes this jaywalk even more dangerous, especially on a bike.</p> <p>I am pleased this Campbell Creek Trail Lake Otis Parkway Crossing is included as a representative project in the plan and that steps have already been taken to assess this project feasibility. I would like the next steps to be taken in pursuing this project. As an Anchorage property owner, I would be happy to vote yes on a bond that would help pay for these next steps.</p> <p>Thank you for your efforts to improve non-motorized transportation in Anchorage.</p>	Staff agrees. This project is listed in the NMP and is a priority.	We will make this project a high priority in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
755	University Area Community Council		General	Piper Street is within the UACC area. Potential improvements are indicated in the plan along Piper Street. What are the details or particular ideas regarding these improvements? Sidewalks have already been constructed along Piper.	Piper Street has been identified as an ideal street for a separated bikeway in the NMP. This could be a bikelane separated by a striped buffer, a bikelane protected by a physical barrier such as bollards or a bikelane that is raised (not on street level). Pedestrian improvements identify the intersection of Piper and Tudor Road as high priority for pedestrian improvements. Specific improvements have not been identified.	No action recommended.
756	University Area Community Council		General	In the Facilities Examples section, a few more ideas on minimizing conflicts between the usual bikes/pedestrians/cars/dogs/equestrians would be great. Knowing the latest state of the art and what has been, or is currently underway elsewhere in the US, or other countries, would be very informative.	Staff will investigate opportunities to add more examples as final edits are completed.	Possible Action
757	University Area Community Council		General	The UACC generally supports the AMATS Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. There has not been any opposition or issues from UACC members. Members of the UACC reviewed the document. The consensus is non-motorized transportation is really a good thing, and the UACC area needs improvements from the way things are now. There is clearly a need to minimize conflicts between bicyclists and on-leash and/or off-leash dog walkers and also between walkers/runners and bicyclists, especially at transition points (e.g., a path accessing a lake in winter, intersection of two paths, etc.	N/A	No action recommended.
758	University Area Community Council		General	The UACC is supportive of the Tudor Road improvements on the project list. These projects include pedestrian safety improvements and crossing Tudor Road. It has been identified by the UACC these improvements are needed, specifically between Lake Otis and Piper. A lighting improvement project in this area has been proposed. Hopefully the AMATS Non-motorized plan will be the catalyst for additional safety focused projects.	N/A	No action recommended.
759	University Area Community Council		General	The UACC supports the goals of the AMATS non-motorized plan. Some additional ideas on the education goal and how this will be attained would be helpful.	Staff agrees.	We will include more specifics on how education and outreach will be improved.
760	University Area Community Council		General	The UACC respectfully requests a reply to our comments, especially those pertinent to our community council area and let us know what we can do to participate in the process of finding solutions.	Staff has responded to these comments. Please see responses above.	No action recommended.
761	University Area Community Council		General	The UACC realizes the plan is very general and covers all of Anchorage, what would be the financing mechanism for these improvements? Bonds? Federal or State grants? Is there a specific timeline for completion of these projects? Tudor Road is of particular interest because accidents occur regularly along Tudor Road.	The projects listed and eventually approved in this plan are eligible for Transportation Improvement Plan funding, Transportation Alternative Program Funding, CIP funding and other sources.	No action recommended.
762	University Area Community Council		General	What is the status of the wayfinding project that is referred to in the plan? In progress? Are some of wayfinding areas completed? It appears the wayfinding in the UACC area has not been completed yet.	The Wayfinding plan is still being implemented. It is being managed by Parks & Recreation in coordination with the Anchorage Parks Foundation.	No action recommended.
763	Weatherby, Sam			I am writing concerning the removal of the mirror lake to Eklutna bike path extension from the 2020 NMP. I believe it is in the best interest of Anchorage and all of Alaska to extend pathways such as this at every opportunity to facilitate safe non-motorized travel for residents and visitors. I am fortunate that I can choose to drive or not, but many people cannot due health, financial, or other reasons such as being a child. I would like to see less of my property tax being used to subsidize motorized transportation and instead provide safe non-motorized alternatives for everyone.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the NMP.
764	Weikert, Lee			I'm writing to ask that the northern extension of the Glenn Highway separated and protected bike path be included in the 2020 AMATS non-motorized plan. Extending the path from Peters Creek to Eklutna would greatly increase the safety of bikers, runners, and walkers and would extend the trail and make Eklutna Lake a safe and viable ride for the public. This would also be good for the Alaska Long Trail currently being devised to connect Seward to Fairbanks and would meet the needs for all multi-purpose trail users seeking safe and reliable pathways.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project in the NMP.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
765	Wilber, Michelle			I am broadly supportive of any additions to safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Anchorage, especially those that prioritize the neighborhoods that would most benefit from these - the densest neighborhoods, those with lower income residents, and those with low car ownership.	N/A	No action recommended.
766	Wilber, Michelle			While I am commenting at the last minute, and realize it is late to suggest changes, I have been a little disappointed over the years to see suggestions for bike improvements concentrate on streets just off the main corridors. As much as I approve of bicycle improvements on residential streets nearby, I would also like to see major bike improvements directly on the major streets. In my case, the highest priority streets would be Northern Lights and Benson blvds, Tudor Rd., and 36th Ave. The north-south streets of A, Arctic and Spenard are improving, and I approve. The reason for this is that my destinations are usually on these roads, not the nearby parallel roads, and biking down a nearby road requires more prep and stress to remember where to head over to the main road. Biking from my home on Spenard and 30th to the university down 32nd is great, but eventually I have to weave over to 36th as I get to Old Seward, and there are so many other destinations on 36th (the library, etc) that it would be nice if there was just a beautiful, safe, protected bike lane on 36th.	Staff agrees.	We will take another look at recommending more substantial improvements on main corridors (Northern Lights/Benson, Tudor Rd., 36th Ave)
767	Wilber, Michelle			But great job, and thanks so much for working to make Anchorage a better, more livable city! I can't wait until density and transportation development make it even easier to hop a bus, walk, and/or bike (or even grab an electric bike off the street like in other cities) and get where I am going!	Thank you!	
768	Wnetrzak, Mark			I am asking for the Glenn Hwy separated (and protected) bike path to be extended from Peters Creek to the Eklutna Overpass as was recommended in the 2010 Anchorage Bike Plan.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project to the NMP.
769	Wolfe, Avery			In planning and implementation, what will be done to mitigate potential gentrification? I think it is quite common that non-motorized and other improvements and investments lead to increased popularity/demand in the area, which in turn leads to more development, higher rents/home prices, etc., and eventual displacement of many current residents/community. I think it's really great that this plan focuses so much on equity and prioritizing improvements in areas that have been historically under-resourced or are currently lower-income, but I fear that, without the appropriate forethought and subsequent action, the intended benefits to these neighborhoods could actually induce harm down the line. Gentrification mitigation should be directly addressed in this plan.	This is a possible concern that can be mentioned in the plan. References to other cities that are considering these issues can be made. Optional addition of a policy recommendation to Chapter 6 to review and develop formal policies around gentrification that apply to AMATS overall. As this issue has implications beyond this single plan.	Possible text edit.
770	Wolfe, Avery			I'm a little worried that the pedestrian network suggestions are too weak. I understand that there were data limitations and that the plan recommends further data collection and investigation into this topic, but I also think that more could be done to ensure that all of Anchorage (including neighborhoods) is more realistically walkable. Most (if not every) Anchorageite should ultimately have the option to walk from their front door to the nearest bus stop, at the very least, and even to nearby destinations (e.g. school, work, grocery, restaurant, etc.). I feel that this plan does not come close to aiming for that, much less ensuring it. Maybe this is where Anchorage's Complete Streets policy and TIP/TAP can be better utilized - e.g. non-motorized improvements (such as adequate sidewalks, crossings, traffic calming, etc.) get folded into any road improvement project. However, it is important to ensure that those improvements are actually functional (e.g. adding a section of sidewalk on one block where a construction project happens but there is no continuity of that sidewalk beyond that block). What's the point of improving the non-motorized network in a piecemeal way if those pieces stand alone without due diligence re: connectivity and functionality? This is where I think Complete Streets often falls short.	We acknowledge that this plan calls for improvements along priority pedestrian corridors rather than laying out a complete pedestrian network. The plan recommends additional data collection so more detailed pedestrian planning can be completed over time. We are also adding a recommendation to include bike/ped facilities as standard infrastructure during new roadway construction and reconstruction.	Text addition.

Public Review (60 day) Draft Comment/Response Table						
Comment #	Reviewer	Page #	Section	Original Comment	Original Staff Response	Original Proposed Action
771	Wolfe, Avery			Overall, I thought this was a great plan. I will say that it was initially difficult for me to find the actual document on your website and I am probably a more "techy" person than some. I was pleased with the needs assessment and prioritization in the plan - great job focusing on health and equity. I was a little surprised that sustainability/environmental benefits were not also mentioned but maybe that was an intentional marketing decision.	N/A	No action recommended.
772	Wolfe, Avery			I think this plan and it's implementation should be as much about improving the non-motorized network for those who currently rely on it for transportation or recreation as it is about encouraging MORE people to use these options (in conjunction with public transit and ride-sharing) for their transportation needs.	Staff feels that this plan does a good job of balancing improvements for existing users with trying to create infrastructure for new users.	No action recommended.
773	Yates, Tyler M.			Side note: I have seen off-road vehicles using the bike trail at corner of Raspberry and Jewel Lake.	N/A	No action recommended.
774	Yates, Tyler M.			I'm writing today to voice my support of the Glenn Hwy bike path northern extension that failed to be included in the 2020 AMATS Non-Motorized Plan. We need bicycle infrastructure. In 2020 cycling exploded (we couldn't keep bikes in stock) and our existing infrastructure saw an increased load. Adding this plan (that should have been implemented in 2010) would connect areas north of Anchorage, provide the local communities a safe and reliable way of commuting, and Anchorage could rise up and join the ranks of progressive bike aware communities like Wasilla, Seward, and even Chitina that have non-motorized paths leading in and out of their towns. It's embarrassing that a popular bike path just ends and forces users on to the shoulder of a highway. As Alaska's largest town (and many tourists first impression of the state), we should be leading by example, not struggling to keep up.	Staff agrees.	We will add this project link to the plan.
775			General	I would also love to see repairs to the paved trail on the south side of 15th leading west from Sitka Street Park – and ultimately some kind of under/overpass here to connect north and south fairview without risking a timely and potentially unsafe crossing of 15th ave.	Staff agrees.	We will include this project link in the NMP.
776			General	There are informal trails at the east end of 17th avenue and the south end of Orca Place that could be formally maintained to offer all our residents quick, easy, and beautiful access points to Sitka Street Park.	We feel that these trail linkages may be better suited for the Areawide Trails Plan update, which will begin following the adoption of the NMP.	No action recommended.