

Chugach State Park Trail Management Plan
Public Review Draft
Issue Response Summary
August 2011

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION | | | |
| Trail Plan & Master Plan Relationship | I do not clearly understand the relationship of the Trails Plan to the Master Plan being revised right now. Which plan is subordinate and do you intend to hold off finalizing the Trails Plan until the Master Plan is in place? Perhaps the trail plan should remain in draft so it can be synchronized with or incorporated into the upcoming park management plan. I ask that you let us see and comment on the draft Master Plan before closing the public comment period for the Trails Plan, since the trail plan cannot be properly and fully evaluated separately. | The trail plan is subordinate to the park's overall management plan. In order to make sure that the trail plan is compatible with the park's management plan, the two plans will be adopted concurrently. | No change. |
| Planning Process Timing | It is a mistake to separate the revision of the CSP Management Plan into three components (trails, access & management) which are released at different times. By developing the plans for trails and access points before the overall management plan, you limit the management plan to policies which simply implement the two previous plans instead of raising and deciding the overall park policies. | The trail plan and access plan were done before the overall management plan to address two major issues that affect park management and to inform the development of the overall management plan. The access plan is a stand alone document created in partnership with the Municipality of Anchorage to update the 2002 Chugach State Park Access Inventory. The trail plan was needed to address trail management in the park after the adoption of the Division's sustainable trail policy. These plans are more specific and both have implementation guidelines that are not dependent on the overall management plan. The overall management plan focuses more on generalized policy and facility development guidance. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Public Process | I recommend that the park planners notify the public and have public meetings before any substantial changes to trails are made so that all users have a chance to provide input. This will prevent such situations as the German Club bridge to Hidden Lake, which increased trail use even though the trail on the opposite side of the bridge remained a muddy mess. | Multiple public meetings have been held for the Trail & Access plans and more were scheduled for the release of the management plan. Plan recommendations are implemented in phases. Trail upgrades in the future may include bridge installation prior to trail work for many reasons that include funding and crew availability. These are operational decisions made by staff implementing park plans. | No change. |
| CHAPTER 2: GENERAL TRAIL POLICIES | | | |
| Green Infrastructure Page 2-1 | Page 2-1 Green Infrastructure Policies and Definition. The intent that the trail system must be consistent with natural resource conservation is not clear in this paragraph nor in this plan. Conservation is only mentioned in line 15. Line 18 says only that the environmental features “are considered” which is very weak intent. The planners need to respond to natural resource vulnerabilities. The conservation intent is also not clear in the Trail Specific Management matrices of chapter 4. | Conservation is part of the park’s enabling legislation as it relates to the protection of the water supply and scenic values. The enabling legislation also includes intent to provide recreational opportunities for the people by providing areas for specified uses and constructing the necessary facilities in those areas. The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. The plan also seeks to incorporate the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation’s new trail sustainability policy and trail classification system. A green infrastructure approach will be utilized and environmental features will be evaluated in trail planning but providing facilities and areas for recreational opportunities must also be considered equally consistent with the park’s purposes. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Green Infrastructure- Revise Page 2-1, Lines 17-21 | Revise Page 2-1, Lines 17-21 to: “In using a green infrastructure approach, recreation areas, and important environmental features and processes are identified and considered in the planning of park trails and future land management actions. <u>Park planners assess recreation needs, and also assess important environmental features and processes, such as fragile riparian zones or winter feeding areas for sheep. Park planners locate and design the recreation facilities and operations in ways that ensure protection and sustainability of the natural environment.</u> This approach <u>is particularly important in CSP because of its unique and intrinsic natural features are a primary attraction to urban residents and tourists. The over-arching plan for the Park must include environmental protection to conserve the park’s natural qualities for their intrinsic value, and for the benefits a natural setting gives to the increasing volume of visitors from the urban populations and tourist hubs that border CSP.</u> ” | Concur in part. See revision. | The Green Infrastructure section of the plan will be revised to further clarify how the approach is to be used. |
| Green Infrastructure | The plan could be strengthened technically by clarifying how the "green infrastructure approach" is being applied to the planning process. | See above | See above |
| Green Infrastructure- Delete Page 2-1, Line 22-23 | Delete Page 2-1, Line 22-23. This line is vague and inaccurate, because trails don’t beautify or benefit the natural ecosystem, except to mitigate human impacts. In addition, the definition of green infrastructure (page C-3, line 18) states that communities receive “associated benefits” from the landscape, not maximum benefits. | Concur. | See above |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|---|--|
| Modify Trail Design Standards: Ridgelines Page 2-5 | The statement (pg 2-5, line 35) that ridgetop trails are unsustainable does not bear out. Ridgetops in CSP usually do not have flat terrain that would create drainage problems. There is ample evidence that ridgeline trails are often more sustainable than sideslope trails, and afford great drainage, give better views, are resilient to damage, are natural access routes, and are cheap to install and maintain. Delete ridgetop trails from the “environmentally sensitive sites” list and delete the reference to ridgeline trails from the “common trail practices to avoid” on page 2-3, line 43, since the language is inaccurate. | The section in the plan on pg 2-5 provides guidance on environmentally sensitive areas. Ridgelines were given as an example where special location or construction methods may need to be used depending on the site to reduce impacts. There are areas within the park where these considerations have already been employed so it is appropriate to retain the language as written. Additionally, while many of the ridgelines within the park do not have flat terrain, the guidance in the plan was provided as part of the generalized list of common trail practices to avoid and is applicable in some areas of the park. Detailed site analysis and trail prescriptions will ultimately decide the appropriate trail alignment and construction methods appropriate to a given trail. | No change. |
| Re-vegetation Requirements | Add to the re-vegetation requirements section of the plan to recommend that native and self sustaining plant material should be used for re-vegetation. Also provide management recommendations for invasive plant management. | Concur. | The trail plan will be revised to include self sustaining plant material in the re-vegetation requirements. An invasive plant section is included in the overall management plan for the park. |
| Signage | Need better signage for way finding and to clarify restricted uses. | Concur. | No change. |
| Signage | The yield hierarchy signs are confusing, please change these signs so that they are easier to understand. | The figure 2.1: Yield Hierarchy Sign is merely an example of signage that should be posted at access points for multiple use trails within the park and not the final version. | No change. |
| Yield Sign | Yield sign- motorized vehicle users and dog sledders should have the right of way over non-motorized vehicle users because non-motorized vehicle users can hear the motorized vehicles coming and are aware of them well before the motorized vehicle user is aware of them. | The yield hierarchy is based on national standards and used in the park for consistency across agency lands. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|---|--|
| Plan Inclusions | Maintenance priority, budget, grooming ski trail priorities and schedules should be included in the plan. | The trail plan does not provide specific priorities because they are determined on an operational level. General work priorities are addressed in the overall management plan and will be outlined in the implementation section of the trail plan. | The implementation section of the plan will be revised to add general priority language. |
| CHAPTER 3: TRAIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM | | | |
| Class 1 and 2 Trails- Close to Horse Use | Class 1 and 2 trails need to be closed to horses. Every spring horses add to the damage on the front range network of small trails. | The new trail classification system introduced in the draft trail plan is consistent with the Division's trail sustainability policy. This new system prescribes a scale of development for a trail as well as design parameters specific to the most demanding use the trail typically receives. Therefore, a Terra Trail can be designed for Pack & Saddle with a Trail Class 2 level of development and maintenance. Currently there are provisions in regulations to restrict horse use on trails to protect park resources from damage if necessary. | No change. |
| Trail Classes and Park Zones | Match trail classes with park zones. For example trail classes 1 and 2 should not be on the periphery of the park. | The trail classes were assigned to match the general trail criteria and the most demanding use the trail usually receives, as well as to offer a diversity of trail experiences. These vary within the park zones but generally, the smaller more challenging trails are found in the park's wilderness zone. | No change. |
| Trail Construction | I would like to see the park spend more time and money putting in well constructed trails in places that have poorly designed, straight up, widening social trails that were formed by mountain runners. | Concur. The trail plan recommends upgrading trails to meet sustainable standards consistent with the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation's sustainable trail policy. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|---|--|
| Trail Classification/ Design should be Class 3 | Trail classification and design should be at least class 3 for all user groups. Class 1 or 2 trails will require too frequent cut back maintenance which is time consuming and the park does have the staff to do. By cutting brush back more and increasing the tread width more users are apt to stay on the trail instead of pioneering their own, thus reducing vegetation damage. | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. Class 1 and 2 trails have minimal clearing requirements to provide a more rustic and challenging experience desired by some user groups. | No change. |
| Clearing Widths and Standards | Revise width and clearing standards to better match park vegetation and maintenance abilities. For class 1 and 2 they are too narrow for this park's conditions. | Class 1 and 2 trails have more narrow design clearing widths to match the general trail criteria for trails that are meant to be natural and fairly unmodified, with obstacles intended to provide increased challenges for skilled users. | No change. |
| Outslope Requirements | I recommend that you increase your outslope requirements to 10-15% outslope. Throughout the state, land managers are finding that they need to increase the outslope of their trails during construction due to Alaska soil conditions. | Concur. Further research will be done to determine the commonly used outslope requirements that best match local soil conditions. | Outslope requirements will be increased to align with best management practices suitable for Alaska soil conditions. |
| Trail Grade | I am puzzled by the policy of not allowing trails steeper than a certain grade, yet no plans to improve or close trails such as those in the Flattop area, and the one that goes up to O'Malley ridge. There are more appropriate (and safer) routes. Informal trails should be nipped in the bud and signs posted stating possible fines for using unsuitable trails. | The trail plan recommends upgrading all trails managed for visitor use to meet sustainable standards consistent with the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation's sustainable trail policy. A conscious decision was made to not commit resources to maintain some routes for visitor use. This was done in part for resource protection purposes and also to preserve a level of challenge or experience for users with the skill and desire to use these areas. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Nordic Design Parameters & Grooming | Groom-able width on class 3 Nordic trails is too narrow. Nordic Skiing Assoc. of Anchorage would like to be able to groom the major trails in the Hillside area with a small Pisten Bully. The major trails in CSP should be class 4 which can accommodate a Pisten Bully and frequent grooming of the trail. | The Nordic skiing design parameters have flexibility built into them to allow for mechanized grooming even at class 3 which has a tread width up to 8 feet. | The park staff will work with the NSAA to insure that trails can be easily groomed. |
| Nordic Ski (Skate) Design Parameter | I am concerned that when a trail is built to skate skiing width specifications, it is no longer attractive to those other users who want to walk, a snowshoe hike or a slow and peaceful diagonal ski tour. The assumption that is made in your classification of trails, that a wide trail meets the needs of other users including those who have been enjoying the class 2 trails is a false assumption. Once a trail is larger than three feet wide it no longer provides a walk in the woods. It provides a road from which one can see the woods but not feel part of the natural landscape. Skate skiing opportunities already abound in Anchorage at Kincaid and Bicentennial parks. Miles of skate skiing already exists on the Powerline and Gasline trails. | The trail plan includes recommendations for only a few trails to be designed for skate skiing in order to link park trails to similar trails outside of the park and to provide for an additional recreational opportunity. | No change. |
| Ski Trail Grooming | Strongly encourage the park to groom ski trails, especially class 2 and 3 trails for Nordic skiing. Establish grooming standards. | The trail plan takes into consideration appropriate grooming equipment and level of trail development in the Design Parameters for both, Cross-Country Ski and Nordic Ski Designed Uses, as well as the Trail Class for each trail segment. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Skijoring as a Designed/Managed Use | No separate design criterion is created for skijoring, and skijoring is only inconsistently identified as an anticipated or allowed use. There is substantial use of the Powerline trail for skijoring, but it is not identified as a managed use on that trail. Perhaps the plan could make some general statement that the identified managed uses are not exclusive, and a specific statement that skijoring would be anticipated on all cross-country, Nordic and snowmachine routes, conditions permitting. | Several trails include skijoring as a managed use but no trails are being designed specifically for this use therefore the skijor design parameters were not included in the plan. To meet sustainability standards, the most demanding use that a trail receives drives the design of the trail. The trails that included skijoring in the management intent are also managed for other uses with more demanding design criteria. | No change. |
| Dog Walking as a Designed/ Managed Use | Dog walking needs to be identified as designed/managed use in the plan. A very large percentage of hikers on the trails are accompanied by their dogs (off leash). Some parks in the lower-48 put restrictions on dog access, thus unless dog walking and running off leach is recognized as intended uses in the plan, I fear dogs will be required to be on a leash, or excluded from trails altogether. | While dog walking is a trail consideration, it does not drive trail design. Current regulations exist that address dogs in the park. See 11 AAC 20.060. | No change. |
| CHAPTER 4: TRAIL MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS | | | |
| Routes | This plan should not continue to ignore routes and unmanaged trails. Managers should determine whether each trail should be actively managed as routes, improved to a higher class, or closed. | This plan does not ignore routes and unmanaged trail but rather recognizes that some areas shall be left undeveloped to preserve a certain type of experience. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Trail Matrix- Add Trails Current Condition | Please include a column in the chart showing current trail condition, this will allow users to understand the amount of development or classification change that is being proposed. It is difficult to evaluate the trail proposals because there is no evaluation of current trail conditions, carrying capacity, users or allowed uses. | The trail plan provides the management intent and policy guidance for park trails using a nationally recognized trail classification system. Trail management objectives are defined after policy guidance is given and these are documented in the TMO form (see Appendix A for a sample) along with some trail condition information. More detailed condition information will be gathered in the trail assessment stage of the process once specific trail objectives are known. Trail condition information is more appropriately kept at the report level in the field office rather than in a more generalized plan. Consult park regulations to understand what uses are permitted on a given trail. | No change. |
| Trail Matrix- Add Prohibited Uses | I am bothered by the statement, on page 3-7, that “Managed use is applied to indicate a management decision or intent to accommodate or encourage a specific type of use but it does not necessarily mean that other uses are prohibited.” Essentially, we cannot therefore know what uses are allowed or not. The final plan should have an extra category in the trail matrix listing prohibited uses for each entry as well as when prohibited, to clean up the current regulations that are inconsistent and confusing. | The trail plan does not determine which uses are prohibited on trails; this is done during the regulatory process. Trail users can refer to park regulations to understand what uses are allowed on a given trail. The trail plan makes recommendations for regulatory changes but there is a separate process for promulgating those regulations. | No change. |
| Trail Matrix- Add Green Infrastructure | The matrices in Chapter 4: Trail Management Recommendations should clearly show the green infrastructure approach. Use the “comments” column, or create a new “natural features and conservation” column, to list the natural values that will be featured and or protected through design and management of that trail. | Important features to be considered in trail design and connectivity will be identified as trails are assessed and trail prescriptions are written. The trail plan provides generalized guidance and does not go into this level of detail. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| CHAPTER 5: IMPLEMENTATION | | | |
| Phasing | Improvements at vehicle trailheads should be coordinated with improvements to trails. Vehicle trailheads should not be developed or upgraded until there is funding and management for the nearby trails, especially where informal and underdeveloped trails are prone to erosion or other resource damage. Otherwise, the influx of users at the upgraded trailhead will create or aggravate resource damage should the trails not be adequate for use. | Concur. Phasing guidance is provided in the implementation chapter of the trail plan and is always a consideration in any project planning. | No change. |
| New Trails in Future | We urge State Parks to periodically review the plan and consider possible new trails that are not in the present plan but are consistent with plan objectives. | The implementation section of the trail plan sets out a process for which this can occur. | No change. |
| Trail Plan Review Timeline | The Trail Management Plan should be a guiding management document for the next 10 years, not 20 as stated and should be reviewed and updated every 5 years not 10. | The Implementation section states that the planned outlook for the plan is 20 years, with the realization that reviews and modifications may be warranted during this timeframe and it strongly recommends that the plan be reviewed via a public process at least every ten years. | No change. |
| Permitting | Include permitting in the trail management plan. CSP has been filling wetlands without US Army Corps of Engineers permits. | Permitting guidelines are provided in the park's overall management plan. All required permits are obtained when the Division constructs or upgrades trails within the park. | No change. |
| APPENDICES & MAPS | | | |
| Appendix C - Glossary | The use of the words "protrusion, radius, and route" might need to be added to Appendix C. The word "route" is used but not defined as a trail classification. | Concur. This was an oversight while generating the draft document. | The trail plan will be revised to include additional definitions in Appendix C. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|--|---|
| Appendix D- Route Map | Consider providing GPS coordinates for routes shown in Appendix D. | A map is provided to provide approximate locations of routes in the park. Listing GPS coordinates for these would provide a level of specificity that is intentionally omitted in the plan to preserve a level of challenge or experience for those with the skills and desire to use those areas. | No change. |
| Appendix D- Route Map | Remove the map showing routes from the final plan. It is unnecessary and detracts from visitors' sense of discovery when they see lines on a map. A specific line generally indicates a specific location and most of these routes are free areas where one selects their own path. Perhaps change the cartography and use a dashed line. | Concur in part. While it is appropriate to modify the symbology on the Route Map in the final plan to depict routes as dashed lines instead of solid lines, it is not appropriate to eliminate the map altogether since it corresponds with a policy element in the plan. | The route map will be modified to show the routes with dashed lines instead of solid lines. |
| Appendix D- Route Map | Page 4-1, line 11-19 and Appendix D. There is a contradiction between bubble 445 and Appendix D which shows "routes" up the west side of McHugh Peak which "will not be managed for visitor use" according to page 4-1. Delete these from Appendix D and instead show specific trail alignments for the west and south sides of McHugh Peak on Map 4.9 and 4.12 instead of the "bubble" numbered 445. | The routes depicted in Appendix D get some use and but may not necessarily be the trails that are developed in conjunction with the "bubble" 445 recommendation. Since the trailhead location in the McHugh Peak area is unknown, trail alignments cannot be identified at this time. | No change. |
| GENERAL COMMENTS | | | |
| Give Priority to Access & Current Trails | Planning should focus on maintaining access and current trails, before building new trails. An area of prime concern at this time is Ram Valley in ER. Presently, there is no legal access and hence no practical way to utilize thousands of acres of park land. Another long standing issue area is Hunter Creek Road. Land or easements should be acquired and trails built for access into the park. Acquisitions should take funding priority. | Concur, however access and trailhead acquisition and improvements are beyond the scope of this plan and are addressed in the Chugach Access Plan and in the acquisition and facility recommendation sections of the overall management plan. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Vehicular Trailheads-Priority List | Maintain a priority to obtain access for future vehicular trailheads in the event that funding for trailhead and trail construction is delayed. | Refer to the Chugach Access Plan for additional information and options for addressing access to the park. | No change. |
| Public Access | Demand legitimate public access where you have the legal right to do so, from public roads and subdivisions, and from any new developments. The park belongs to everyone. Buy access if you don't have a legal claim. Look to the future. Access will never get easier, it can only get harder. Demand will only increase, it will never decrease. | Concur, however access and trailhead acquisition and improvements are not the purview of this plan and are addressed in the Chugach Access Plan and the overall management plan. | No change. |
| Park Access | The Division of Parks should actively pursue access easements across private land along the park boundary for vehicle and pedestrian trailheads for future use, even if limited funding delays actual trailhead construction. It is far more practical to obtain access during subdivision platting under municipal ordinances than to attempt to purchase access across developed properties at a later time. | Concur, however access and trailhead acquisition are not the purview of this plan and are addressed in the Chugach Access Plan and the overall management plan. | No change. |
| Trail Access | The access to some of the trails is poor. Dedicated access is needed at more locations in Bear and Paradise valleys, Stuckagain Heights, and Hiland Road. Road improvements are needed in Rabbit Creek valley. | Concur. The trails plan outlines the future vision for trails. The access plan makes the recommendations for access to the park and the park's management plan makes facility recommendations. | No change. |
| Park Trailheads | Keep trailheads open to public, do not allow private homes to be built on what should be public land. | The trail plan does not make access recommendations. Access issues are dealt with in the Chugach Access Plan. | No change. |
| Missing Trails & Access Points | Many trails, trailheads and access points are not included in the plan or in the appendix and new trails are planned over existing trails-this gives the reader the impression that the trails inventory is incomplete. | The trail plan provides guidance for the trails the park plans to manage and maintain as trails. There is a section of the trail plan that addresses routes and unmanaged trails. The inventory included many more routes than were included in the trail plan. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Boating Access | Work with the MOA to maintain or clearly secure access to popular creeks and boating routes. With the popularity of pack rafts and other portable boats, most waterways are navigable by these craft. Traditional access has been jeopardized by landowners claiming rights to waterways. The plan needs to recognize the needs of kayakers and rafters who have been running Ship Creek, Peters Creek, the East Fork of Eklutna, the South Fork of Eagle River, Bird Creek, the South Fork of Campbell Creek, and others for years. As with other parts of the park, access to these creeks is sometimes threatened by development and needs to be preserved. And as with trails, users need to be able to get permission to remove fallen trees from rivers, since these can be a deadly hazard to boaters. | The trail plan does not make access recommendations. Access issues are dealt with in the Chugach Access Plan. The management plan addresses tree removal and waterbody modification. | No change. |
| Commercial Use | Commercial use should not be allowed in any areas other than what is already in place. | Commercial use is not the purview of this plan and is addressed in of the overall management plan. | No change. |
| Commercial Use & Organized Events | The plan does not address organized events and commercial uses of the trail system. Parks should allow permitted use of non-motorized sporting events (races), provided there is not alteration of the land required. | Events and commercial use are beyond the scope of this plan and are addressed in the overall management plan. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|------------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Emergency Trail Closures | CSP has been slow to exercise this policy in the past, which resulted in serious damage to Indian Creek trail by horseback hunters two seasons ago. Thirty thousand dollars of recent trail work was destroyed and the trail left impassable. CSP needs to be willing to exercise its authority when a trail faces potential damage from it's users. Additionally CSP needs to coordinate with ADF&G and other state agencies whose policies may impact CSP trails. | Park regulations were modified in 2009 to give the park more flexibility to close trails to horses to protect soils or vegetation. Additionally, the regulations now stipulate that the Indian Creek Valley may be closed seasonally to horse use to control break-up problems or during periods of excessive rain. Prior to 2009, this mechanism did not exist in park regulations. | No change. |
| Hillside District Plan Integration | Refer to the Hillside District Plan for examples of proposed trailheads providing access to CSP. | Concur, the Hillside District Plan was referred to during the creation of the draft trail and access plans. Refer to the Chugach Access Plan for additional information and options for addressing access to the park and the overall management plan for facility recommendations. | No change. |
| Iditarod National Historic Trail | Recommend that the management objectives identified in the interagency Iditarod National Historic Trail Comprehensive Plan (1986) be incorporated in the management of Crow Pass Trail across Chugach State Park lands. Overall we encourage CSP to consider designating eligible segments of the INHT, and adopting INHT trail marking standards for eligible segments (i.e. Indian Pass/Ship Creek, Bird to Girdwood, and Turnagain Arm Trail). Given the contemporary popularity of the historic Iditarod trails in CSP, their designations and markings as such will help give park users a sense of the rich legacy that opened up these trails a century ago. | Concur. The overall management plan provides more background information on the Iditarod Trail and identifies eligible segments. Park staff will work to incorporate trail marking standards as appropriate. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Impact & Use Study | Urge the park staff to study use and impacts of different uses, and request that the impacts of ATVs, bikes, and horse use on trails-including trail erosion, effects on salmon streams, and spreading of invasive plant species- be studied before horses, ATVs or bikes are allowed on more trails. This is a significant user group given the high impacts, and deserves careful study before determining where they can be allowed with minimal damage. Suggest partnering with groups like Friends of CSP and the universities to seek funding for the studies. | Invasive species, trail erosion, and other environmental factors were considered in the development of this plan. The trail plan was developed consistent with park purposes and the Division’s sustainable trail policy where trails are built to handle their intended use and trail classes take into account Managed Uses, user preferences, setting, sensitive resources, and other management activities. One of the purposes for establishing the park was to provide recreational opportunities for the people by providing areas for specified uses and constructing the necessary facilities in those areas. ATV, bike and horse-back riding are all legitimate recreational uses in the park that are deserving of trails. | No change. |
| Leave No Trace Principles | Promote leave no trace, addressing firepits, unburied fecal matter, and litter. | The park takes every opportunity to promote “Leave No Trace” principles where appropriate and the park’s overall management plan further addresses these principles. | No change. |
| Little Rabbit Creek- Designate as Conservation Area | Designate the headwaters valley of Little Rabbit Creek as a stream conservation area. The headwaters are within a steep alpine area on the west flank of McHugh Peak with saturated soils, fragile vegetation, and no natural terrain barriers to keep people and pets away from the wetlands or creek channels. Informal use along the creek would quickly damage the mossy wetlands along the creek and add sediment to the creek. Prohibit trail construction in the creek vicinity and post signs and use other design measures to discourage social trails from developing. This conservation area will not limit hiking opportunities if a trail following ridges up the west side of McHugh Creek is established, thus eliminating any need to use the steep headwaters valley as a route. | The trail plan does not make recommendations for conservations areas nor is this type of designation used anywhere in the park. Because protecting the water supply is a founding purpose of the park, an additional designation is not required. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Resource Protection | Park management is not just about access but also resource protection. I feel this plan does not do enough to balance the resource protection side of this equation. | The trail plan provides policy direction as it relates to trail management and seeks to incorporate the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation's new trail sustainability policy and trail classification system consistent with the park's enabling legislation. While resource protection and environmental features are always considerations, providing facilities and areas for recreational opportunities must also be the considered consistent with the park's purposes. The overall management plan provides more resource protection guidance. | No change. |
| Restrooms | Portable bathrooms at all trailheads will keep human waste from the trail system. | Concur however the trail plan does not make recommendations for facility development. | No change. |
| Seward Highway | I suggest that the Seward Highway is the most important recreational facility in CSP. Driving for pleasure has for many years been the nations number one recreational activity. The Seward Highway should be considered a trail, and receive inclusion into the plan as a significant part of CSP. | Concur in part. The Seward Highway is managed by the Department of Transportation as a major roadway and transportation corridor and is addressed in the overall Chugach State Park Management Plan. The draft trail plan does however propose an extension of the separated bike pathway along the Seward Highway for the segment from Indian to Potter that is currently lacking a separated pathway (see Coastal Trail- Indian to Potter in the Turnagain Arm Unit of the draft trail plan.) | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Volunteers- trail construction & maintenance, patrols | Would like to make some suggestions regarding the building and maintenance of new trails, maintenance of existing ones and a potential way to help monitor trail conditions and improve public relations between park managers and user groups. Given the tight budgetary constraints for the state and municipality, why not make more use of volunteers from all user groups to build and maintain trails within the park? Also, given the increase in numbers of park users and the potential for conflict and medical emergencies, why not form a volunteer back country patrol to help educate all trail users on trail etiquette and assist people in need of help? Moab, Utah is an example of successful partnerships between state and federal agencies and local volunteers. | Concur. Volunteers are already a vital resource for park managers and are utilized on a variety of trail projects. When this plan is adopted and implemented, park managers will look for more opportunities to incorporate volunteers. | No change. |
| Trail Etiquette | Develop a trail etiquette program for all users and explain how all users effect each other and park resources. This should include etiquette for multi use trails (e.g.- who has right of way on up hills) that is published, and posted. | Concur. The trail plan recommends that trail etiquette signs such as the Yield Hierarchy Sign be posted at major access points for multiple use trails within the park to help reduce trail users conflicts. | No change. |
| Low impact use should have priority | I think both motorized vehicle traffic and trapping in the park have a big footprint. Either of these activities can be performed by one person and either can basically ruin it for hundreds more low-impact users. The allocation of the resource should be made with this sort of high impact-per-capita/low impact-per-capita use in mind. | Both activities are legitimate recreational uses within the park. The trail plan was developed consistent with park purposes where a range of recreation opportunities are to be provided. Park resources are allocated consistent with park purposes. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Trail Analysis & Discussion Missing | The existing trails are simply categorized, some new trails are proposed all without any discussion of whether the existing trails serve the needs of user groups or whether there is a need for a new trail in this location with these characteristics. This kind of discussion and analysis needs to be part of this plan, in the absence of the overall direction and policy a management plan would provide. | The park resources were analyzed and considered in the development of this plan. The planning staff also worked with the park's advisory board and a wide variety of user groups in the development of the trail plan to understand user preferences and other trail needs. Specific trail recommendations in the plan reflect the policy direction and desired management intent for the area developed through analysis and public input. The plan was out in draft form to receive comments on the proposed intent for these areas to further refine the policy direction. | No change. |
| Facility Recommendation | Consider building a rain shelter for hikers that are forced to wait in inclement weather for the bus. | The trail plan does not make recommendations for facility development. | No change. |
| User Preferences | There is an inherent assumption that the park needs to provide trails for every type of toy humans make. The park was set aside to provide opportunity for people to be able to stay connected to nature, to find a place to set aside the stress of urban living, and to view wildlife in its natural form. The pressure on the park to provide for each user's needs better long term goals that really define what the land is to be used for. Management believes that the central goals are defined, but there is lots of room for interpretation of what those goals mean. That leaves trail management wide open for ongoing pressure to allow more mechanized toys in the park. Every time a new activity is allowed within the park it displaces others who use the park as a place of quiet observation of nature. | The purposes for which the park was established guide park management. One of the park purposes is to provide recreational opportunities for the people by providing areas for specified uses and constructing the necessary facilities in those areas. The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving the existing experiences. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Funding | Trail plan is a luxury item that must not be funded until this economic recession is past. Sources for funding have not been identified, tax money will be used. Spending needs to stop. | The outlook for the trail plan is 20 years with the understanding that the recommendations in the plan are meant to be implemented over the 20 year outlook. The plan revision was needed to comply with the Division's sustainable trail policy and to provide a policy framework where trail maintenance and development could be sustainable and low-cost over the long term. | No change. |
| Trail Design | Minimize sight distance trail clearing in wetlands and along stream corridors. Minimize stream crossings for new trails. Utilize bridges or natural rock placement to cross streams/drainageways, employing techniques for minimal impact and erosion potential. | The trail plan provides generalized guidance, basic design parameters and management intent for park trails. Specific design considerations such as sight distance clearing and bridges are determined when an individual trail is assessed. | No change. |
| Trails near Clark's Road | I support the potential for 10-20 miles of single track trail near Clark's Road. | This area is outside of Chugach State Park and governed by other entities. | No change. |
| GIS Data | Work with the Municipality of Anchorage on a trail mapping system (GIS) that is integrated with the MOA's dispatch systems, e.g. Fire Department dispatch center and Alaska Troopers. The primary purpose for the GIS should be to make for more efficient and faster rescues, especially as funds decrease for supporting rescues. | The Municipality of Anchorage and State managers are currently sharing GIS data to better manage the trail systems that exist in Chugach State Park and the Municipality. | No change. |
| Park Management-Wilderness & Wildlife Values | I strongly recommend that this park be managed primarily for its wildlife and wilderness values, rather than overdeveloped for recreational uses. The wildlife and wilderness values are what sets it apart from most every other state park in the nation, and should be given the highest priority. | The purposes for which the park was established guide park management. The eastern portion of the park is managed for wilderness values but the remaining high-use areas are managed to provide recreational opportunities and to construct the needed facilities to support those uses consistent with park purposes. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Bicycle Use | | | |
| Bicycle Use | The current regulations which open trails to bicycles do not specify terra or snow use only. Accordingly, this means that all trails once opened allow bicycle use year round regardless of whether, as a snow trail, that managed use has been listed. Recommend that the division structure the regulations so that terra or snow use can be specified for certain trails. | Concur. The park will work to structure park regulations to better specify seasonal use allowances on trails. | No change. |
| Bicycle Use | I support opening as many trails as possible to mountain bikes, especially in areas that connect to bike trails outside of the park such as FNBP. Currently mountain bike use is very limited within Chugach State Park. Support more trails for the increased use of bicycles. The added benefit for including more rideable trails in the park is that the bike associations are eager to participate and willing to assist with trail maintenance and improvement projects. | Concur. The trail plan recognizes that more opportunities were needed for bicycles and recommends additional opportunities however the plan also seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. | No change. |
| Bicycle Use- Oppose in Wilderness | The proposed plan would permit bicycles into the wilderness segments of the park. We support the original decision in the 1986 trail plan which prohibited motorized and mechanized vehicles from the wilderness area of CSP. Allowing bicycles in the wilderness portions of the park would take away from the wilderness ethic established there. In addition they will have negative effects on the trails. Campbell Creek provides a natural boundary between user groups, bicycle traffic should be confined to the west side of Campbell Creek, and at a minimum to class 4 trails only. | The trail plan does recommend expanding bicycle use in the park in an effort to expand opportunities at every scale for this user group. In 1982 the Division issued <u>Alaska State Park System: Statewide Framework</u> to define goals and policies with regards to the management of state park units. The Framework document defines the appropriate developments and activities that can occur in the various zones of the park units. The trail plan is consistent with the wilderness description guidance listed in that document. The trail plan recognizes the need for sustainable trails, designed for their intended use in order to minimize resource degradation and reduce maintenance costs. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|----------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Bicycle Use | Many new trails would be built to accommodate bicycles. State Parks should consult with the public and a variety of user groups before prioritizing trail projects to avoid user conflicts. | Concur. Through the planning process a variety of user groups were consulted and the information provided helped form the recommendations put forth in the trail plan. Additionally, through this comment phase more information has been received that will allow for further refinement of trail recommendations. | No change. |
| Bicycle Use | Hiker/equestrian use has been the traditional use of most park trails, these uses are incompatible with mountain bikes. Consider keeping the status quo which allows both groups that have their own designated trails. | One of the purposes of revising this plan was to recognize and accommodate the new or expanded ways of recreating within the park. Biking has changed dramatically and gained popularity as a recreational activity. The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving the existing experience. | No change. |
| Bicycle Use | One weekend day no bicycle use on all park trails, to allow hiker access on multi-use trails one day a week with the guarantee that no bicycles will be on trail system. | Most of the park trails are designed and managed for hikers so there are many opportunities for hikers to use these areas without encountering a bicycle on the trail. The park was established to provide recreational opportunities for the people and not for the exclusive use of one user group. This trail plan seeks to strike a balance between providing diverse recreational opportunities and protecting existing experiences. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|----------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Bicycle Use | <p>Would like to see winter wide/"fat"-tire bikes added to the trail management plan as an accepted use. With the new winter large diameter low pressure bicycle tires, cyclist can utilize any multi-use trail which is appropriate for skiing or snowmobiles and have minimal impact on the trails. Wide rims and tires allow the bikes to float on top of the snow with minimal grooming, and hikers, skiers and snowmachiners pack down fresh snow to allow the surface to be ridden with no impact to underlying ground and vegetation. Snowbikes/winter "fat-tire" bikes should be permitted on some snow trails used by skiers, wherever snowmachines are allowed, and wherever mountain bikes are permitted during the summer. Snowbikes are a great alternative to people who do not ski. Allow winter biking on one side of ski trails, if snow is set firm.</p> | <p>Concur. The trail plan included numerous recommendations for trails that included winter biking. Those areas that are open to biking in regulation are available for year-round use.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |
| Bicycle Use | <p>Trails need improvements to make them sustainable for summer cycling.</p> | <p>Concur.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|----------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Bicycle Use | Do not support opening more trails to bicycles. Opening trails to bikes means increasing trail widths which destroys the sense of being in a natural setting. Also there are safety concerns. Bicycle use can be incompatible with other uses because of trail conditions and differential speeds, and trail sustainability. Almost every proposed expansion of bike use involves trails that have significant muddy and boggy areas. Unless the funds are found and the work performed to relocate or harden trails, regulation changes to allow bike use should not be sought. Opening more trails to bikes will only cause bikers to go further into restricted areas as evident with current use patterns, so why open up more trails to bikes just because they already ignore the regulations and use the trails when park staff is already unable to enforce or maintain its current regulations, trails or access points? | One of the purposes of revising this plan was to recognize and accommodate the new or expanded ways of recreating within the park. The trail plan was developed consistent with park purposes and the Division’s sustainable trail policy where trails are built to handle their intended use and trail classes take into account Managed Uses, user preferences, setting, sensitive resources, and other management activities. Trail widths will not necessarily be increased because a trail is designed for bicycles. The trail class determines the scale of development. Refer to page 3-12 for the bicycle design parameter. | No change. |
| Bicycle Use | If a trail was built by miners, or the military, or some other mechanical means at one time, then bikes should be allowed on it. | This is already the case, however some trails will be expanded under the new sustainable trails policy. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|----------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Bicycle Use | <p>I support allowing mountain bikes on additional trails as contained in the plan. I fully support changing the regulations to include access for bikes on all of the trails listed in the plan, since opportunities are currently limited and the popularity of mountain biking has increased. The fact that bikers are truly being recognized as a legitimate user group is good news.</p> <p>Recommend more trails be made available to bikers with intermediate skills, not just “expert”.</p> <p>Terra trails sustainable to ATVs and Pack & Saddle are inherently sustainable to lesser impact mountain bikes. Although a trail might not be specifically managed for use by bikes, they should be allowed wherever ATVs and horses are permitted.</p> <p>Designate a couple trails which punch deeper into the park for biking (longer rides). More suitable trails to Symphony Lake or Williwaw Lakes come to mind as possibilities.</p> | <p>One of the purposes of revising this plan was to recognize and accommodate the new or expanded ways of recreating within the park. The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving the existing experience. The plan recommends different settings and class trails for the varying skill levels of users.</p> | No change. |
| Bicycle Use- Signage | <p>Trails where cyclists are not allowed should be clearly signed and it should be made clear to all cyclists that they must yield politely to other users. Fast moving bikes can be an aggravation for hikers on narrow trails and dangerous when hiking with young kids.</p> | <p>Concur. There is room for improvement when it comes to signage, thus the trail plan recommends that trail etiquette signs such as the Yield Hierarchy Sign be posted at major access points for multiple use trails within the park to help reduce trail users conflicts.</p> | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Horse Use | | | |
| Horse Use | Until such a revised regulation is put in place, I would ask that the park staff ban horses on all alpine trails and on trails that are narrow and do not have a hardened base, including the Middle Fork Loop, Hidden Lake, Williwaw Lakes, Near Point, Wolverine Peak, and Falls Creek trails. | Park regulations were modified in 2009 to give the park more flexibility to close trails to horses to protect soils or vegetation when needed. Prior to 2009, this mechanism did not exist in park regulations. | No change. |
| Horse Use | Horse users should be required to help construct sustainable trails to meet their user group needs. Commercial users should be required to bear the financial burden of trail degradation. If their use of specific trails has the potential to cause trail degradation over and above that which was likely to occur without their use, these operations should be made financially liable ahead of time by means of their annual commercial use contracts with the park. | All uses have the potential to cause trail degradation. Equestrian use, especially commercial operation, is very limited in the park. The trail plan recognizes the need for sustainable trails designed for their intended use in order to minimize resource degradation and reduce maintenance costs. | No change |
| Horse Use | Support more equestrian, pack/saddle trails. I believe that horse owners are responsible and should be eligible to ride in the park. I do not believe that they should be restricted to a small portion of trails. | Currently horses are not restricted to a small portion of trails nor does the trail plan recommend any additional restrictions. Horses are allowed to ride anywhere in the park with the exceptions noted in 11 AAC 20.030. | No change. |
| Horse Use | All trails should be closed to horse use unless signed as open. Horse use on trails is damaging to trail leaving pot holes in the trail, this presents conflict on multi use trails. | Equestrian use is a traditional and legitimate recreational use allowed throughout the park with the exception of the areas described in 11 AAC 20.030. | No change. |
| Horse Use | If more horse trails are being created, removal of waste should be mandatory for other user considerations. | The park will take this suggestion into consideration but this type of restriction represents a regulatory change. Regulations are promulgated via a different and separate process than this trail plan. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Horse Use- Commercial | I request that commercial horseback riding be completely banned or significantly reduced, as these large groups have done great damage to trails such as Williwaw Lakes. The park should be maintained for public use, not commercial ventures. | Commercial equestrian use of the park is already very limited in order to balance commercial use with public use of the park. | No change. |
| Horse Use | Horses are allowed on most trails including some that are soft and muddy in the spring and fall. State Parks should consult with the public and a variety of user groups to identify areas to highlight for horses to use as well as sensitive areas that horses should avoid. | Park regulations were modified in 2009 to give the park more flexibility to close trails to horses to protect soils or vegetation when needed. | No change. |
| Horse Use- various trails 406, 408, 438, 508, 509, 515 | Please close Hidden Lake, Williwaw, and Middle Fork trails to horses. Please keep pack and saddle from Indian Valley Trail and Bird Creek Valley Trail. Large numbers of horses have destroyed so many of these trails already. | Closing trails to a particular use requires a regulation change. Regulations are promulgated through a separate process however, park regulations were modified in 2009 to give the park more flexibility to close trails to horses to protect soils or vegetation when needed. The trail plan recognizes the need for sustainable trails designed for their intended use in order to minimize resource degradation and reduce maintenance costs. | No change. |
| Horses- Regulation change | I ask that park regulations be changed so that horse use is subjected to the same process as all other user groups- that is, that horses are prohibited except where they're allowed (as with bikes, etc.), verses the current regulation stating all trails are opened unless specifically closed. Horses, though appropriate on specific trails, can have dramatic impacts. | Regulation format and changes are not the purview of the trail plan and must be addressed in the regulatory process. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|----------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Motorized Use | | | |
| ATV Use | Only 2 trails are available for ATV use within the entire park. More trails need to be established for ATV use within easy traveling distance from Anchorage. With the increase in ATV's on the trail, now is the time to make changes to accommodate future use that is forecast to continue to grow, these changes will enhance the backcountry experience for all trail users. | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. There are numerous ATV trails available in Bird Valley and additional loops are recommended there. | No change. |
| Motorized Use Trails | Motorized trails are notorious for resource destruction when machines go beyond established boundaries. Consideration should be given to creating loop trails wherever possible, such as Bird Creek, Eklutna, and Peters Creek. Loop trails have the potential to enhance the experience of the park visitor and aid public safety with one way traffic. | Concur. The Trail Plan includes recommendations for new loop trails and opportunities to link trails together to create a looped experience. | No change. |
| Motorized Use | Leave ATV and 4-wheeler use as is in plan; no expansions. No motorcycles should be allowed. Concerned about the adverse impact of motorized uses on the resources of the park and other users. | Motorcycles are not permitted on park trails by regulation. All uses within the park have some impact. The trail plan recognizes the need for sustainable trails designed for their intended use in order to minimize resource degradation and reduce maintenance costs. | No change. |
| Motorized Use | Consider banning motorized use in the whole park. | Motorized uses such as snowmobiling and ATVing are traditional and legitimate activities performed in specific areas of Chugach State Park specified in regulation. The number of areas in the park open to motorized use is limited but they are important since the park was established to provide recreational opportunities for the people by providing areas for specified uses. | No change. |
| Snowmobile Use | Support keeping all areas currently open to snowmobiles open. No net loss of snowmobile riding areas. | No snowmobile areas are being altered as a result of this plan. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Non-motorized Use | | | |
| Non-motorized Winter Trails | Support the designation of non-motorized winter trails in the plan. | The majority of trails within CSP are already designated non-motorized winter trails. | No change. |
| Human Powered vs. Motorized | On a larger scale, human powered access should have higher priority than motorized access to promote healthy lifestyles and clean air and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. | Most of the trails within the park already serve human powered activities. | No change. |
| Skiing | | | |
| Nordic Skiing Trails | Because of the multiple opportunities for skate skiing on municipal and university land, I am not in favor of widening existing trails or cutting new trails to accommodate Nordic skiing. | The trail plan includes a few Nordic skiing trails in order to, where appropriate, provide for a variety of experiences, link park trails with similar trails adjacent to the park, and because there was a great deal of input requesting this type of opportunity in the park. | No change. |
| Wildlife & Trails | | | |
| Wildlife Travel Routes | Travel routes for Alaska wildlife need to be preserved so as not to promote potentially dangerous encounters with humans. | Trail alignments will consider wildlife movement corridors. | No change. |
| Trail Development- Human and Environmental Safety | We are concerned that this plan disregards human safety and safety of the environment. Recent events in the MOA have illustrated the danger of human/bear conflicts that have occurred while people are bicycling or jogging in known bear habitat, at times when bears are known to be frequenting the area. Mitigation measures such as seasonal closures should be employed wherever possible, or on trails where bear encounters have previously occurred. As a general rule, bicycle and high-use trails should not be developed in areas where bears are known to frequent. | Negative wildlife encounters in the park are very rare despite the large number of park users. Park managers use a variety of tools, including seasonal or temporary closures, to manage park trails where a wildlife concerns exists. Wildlife concerns were considered in drafting the recommendations in the trail plan. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Trail Management- Bears | Evidence of bears in the area does not automatically equate to a high risk of bear attacks on trail users. Trail management policies should be based on a set of science-based trail design guidelines that address potential impacts of recreational use and facilities on wildlife habitat, wildlife, recreation quality and the risk of human-wildlife conflicts as recommended as a priority action in the 2000 Living with Wildlife in Anchorage report. | Concur. Negative wildlife encounters in the park are very rare despite the large number of park users. Park managers use a variety of tools, including seasonal or temporary closures, to manage park trails where a wildlife concerns exists. | No change. |
| Wilderness | | | |
| New Trails- Wilderness Areas | I urge you to minimize construction of new trails in undeveloped areas, especially wilderness areas. Trails 301, 304a and 518 especially concern me because they are inappropriate for the area and within the designated wilderness. | Trails 304a and 518 are designated to be class 2 trails which are simple, involve minimal development and thus are appropriate for wilderness areas of the park. Additionally, trails in the wilderness are often accommodated to concentrate use and minimize resource impacts or for public safety. Trail 301 does not lie within the wilderness zone of the park. | No change. |
| Trails in Wilderness Zone | Would like to see more or improved terra trails in the wilderness area following Crow Creek Trail built at least to a class 3. | In order to preserve the character of the wilderness areas of the park, trails in that zone are minimal and limited to class 1 or 2. | No change. |
| Wilderness | The TMP does not address or define how the wilderness core area designation of the park affects the class, construction and maintenance of new or existing trails. Change the plan to allow for more infrastructures like bridges, sustainable non-motorized trails, and public use cabins in the wilderness core area. | Concur. The trail plan will be revised to include a discussion of how trail classes relate to the various park land use zones. See the park's management plan for more information and guidance on the uses within the various zones. | The trail plan will be include a brief discussion of the park zones and a reference to the overall management plan for more information. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Trails Priority | | | |
| Trail Prioritization | I encourage the park to be pro-active on their trail priorities. The Trail Plan needs to establish through public involvement, a clear, prioritized set of trail projects and stick to it to avoid permitting the availability of funding from sources outside the Division or the Legislature’s appropriation process to determine which trail is built and to what class or standard. I urge that the plan include priorities for maintenance and new trails and encourage staff to avoid reacting to special interests and/or politics. | Project priorities are not listed in the trail plan because they are subject to change based on a variety of factors and park managers need the flexibility to take advantage of opportunities when they arise. By having this flexibility, the public and park resources have benefited over the years. | No change. |
| New Trail v. Existing Trail Maintenance and Funding | Repair or restoration of existing trails that are causing significant resource damage should receive funding priority over the acquisition or development of new trails, unless the new trails will replace or significantly reduce use of the trails that are causing damage. New trails will increase the maintenance burden over time and detract from current maintenance needs. The plan should separate its new trail “wish list” from the tasks needed on existing trails and establish a clear priority for those. | Park managers need the flexibility to take advantage of funding opportunities when they arise. The trail plan recognizes the need for sustainable trails designed for their intended use in order to minimize resource degradation and reduce maintenance costs. Trail upgrades and reroutes to meet sustainability standards are the main focus of the trail plan. | No change. |
| Trail Improvements | Little to no additional improvements are necessary. We don’t need more buildings or park personal. We need more trails, but not wider ones. | The trail plan was developed to address trail management in the park after the adoption of the Division’s sustainable trail policy. Trail improvements are needed to bring trails up to a sustainable standard and to be in compliance with the Division’s policy. While some may feel existing improvements are adequate, others feel that more are needed. The plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Public Use Cabins | | | |
| Public Use Cabins | Consider building a public use cabin on the proposed route between Mt Baldy and Little Peters Creek trail. The trail offers a steep climb that many people cannot do with a full pack in order to overnight. A cabin would facilitate this and encourage more people to take advantage of the park. | Public Use Cabins are not the purview of this plan and are addressed in the facility development sections of the overall management plan. | No change. |
| Public Use Cabins | A hut to hut system will trammel the environment that already is easily accessible on weekend trips. Chugach State Park is close to an urban area, and within a short distance can be enjoyed in a remote like setting, a hut to hut system will remove this remarkable feature of the park. | The trail plan does not make recommendations for facility development. These types of recommendations are addressed in the park's overall management plan. | No change. |
| Public Use Cabins | Build appropriate cabin and hut structures to enhance safe access to Chugach State Park. Serenity Falls cabin at Eklutna Lake area is a good example. Simple, aesthetic structures that make Alaska's harsh wilderness a bit safer without compromising the wilderness experience. | Public Use Cabins are not the purview of this plan and are addressed in the facility development sections of the overall management plan. | No change. |
| Loop Trails | | | |
| Loop Trails | Any heavily used trail or trails with the potential of heavy use will be improved by the use of loop trails. Loop trails should be promoted on several of the heavily-used or potentially-heavily used trails, including: (a) the backside (Upper Canyon Road) of Flattop; (b) McHugh Peak from Brewster's Road and upper Potter Valley; and (c) Potter/McHugh ridge to McHugh Creek. These trails are effective in promoting a better backcountry experience and are much less prone to deterioration due to heavy use. | In general, where appropriate more loop trails have been added to the Trail Plan for these reasons. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Loop Trails | Add a new standard under page 2-4 “visitor experience”, to this effect: <u>“Most visitors seek an un-crowded experience. Loop trails are effective at reducing the feeling of crowding and the wear-and-tear.”</u> | Loop trails are addressed in the trail layout section on page 2-4. | No change. |
| Loop Trails- motorized use | Recommend loop trails for motorized use in Eklutna, Peters Creek and Bird Valley areas. Motorized use within CSP is strictly regulated and areas of use are limited, thus when non motorized users recreate within the assigned area for motorized use the conflict between user groups arises. Loop trails would help disperse use and help decrease user conflicts along the trail reducing encounters by half. Loop trails would also provide less wear and tear on the trails by allowing the user to return on a different route. | Concur. The trail plan makes several recommendations in an effort to offer more loop trail experiences. | No change. |
| Trapping | | | |
| Trapping | I am against trapping anywhere in the park especially near trails, because it is dangerous for people and their pets that use the trails. Many people refuse to use the park in the winter for fear of the traps along the trails. Better signage is needed in areas open to trapping, including warnings for dog and horse owners, to prevent injury or death to pets. | Trapping is not the purview of the trail plan. Additionally, trapping is regulated by the Board of Game and not Chugach State Park. The park has already posted signs where trapping is authorized to inform trail users of this activity. | No change. |

Chapter 4 Trail Specific Comments by Planning Unit

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|---|
| EKLUTNA-PETERS CREEK UNIT | | | |
| Hunter Creek Access | I support acquisition of legal access for the corridor for the route in the Hunter Creek area. The route currently shown crosses private property. | Concur. The Chugach Access Plan has additional information on addressing access in this region. | No change. |
| Eklutna Lake- Designate South Side as Wilderness | The south side of Eklutna Lake should be included within the wilderness zone of Chugach State Park, and the Master Plan should be changed accordingly. The area should be managed as wilderness since it is of relatively low elevation, unlike much of the area currently managed as wilderness, and there is a need for lower elevation wilderness areas. | Land use designation delineation is beyond the scope of this plan and is addressed in the overall management plan. | No change. |
| Eklutna Lake Watershed | Consideration was given to the Ship Creek watershed as a "major source of water for Anchorage". Similar wording should be noted for Eklutna Lake which serves as the municipality's primary drinking water source. With additional ATV and other trail use, consider potential impacts to the lake and feeder streams entering the lakeshore. | Concur. It is appropriate to include additional language regarding the importance of the Eklutna River Valley as a major source of water for Anchorage. | The trail plan will be revised to include additional language for the Eklutna-Peters Creek Unit description to note that Eklutna Lake is a major source of drinking water for residents of the Municipality of Anchorage. |
| Eklutna Lake Spillway & Lakeside Loop Access Trails (104, 105, & 106) | Support trails 104, 105, and 106 as contained in the plan. | Concur in part. See below. | The trail plan will be modified to split trail 106 into two segments. The segment nearest the campground and picnic area will remain designed and managed for Bicycle, Trail Class 4 with Bicycle and Hiker as Managed Use. The other segment linking to trail 107 will be designed and managed for Hiker-Pedestrian, Trail Class 2 to provide compatible connectivity to trail 107. Trail 105 will be removed. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|--|
| Eklutna Lakeside Loop Trail (107)- Support for Non-Motorized Use Only | I support making the new trail non-motorized. The area is too steep and rocky and a motorized trail already exists on the other side of the lake. Noise, pollution and safety concerns demand that no more motorized access be made available. A pedestrian trail would be sufficient, would create a smaller footprint and should be easier and cheaper to build and maintain. This would also allow hikers a place to escape motorized users for all 7 days of the week. Motorized use could be allowed on the north side trail 7 days a week. | Concur in part. After public input and further evaluation, the recommendation for trail 107, a developed trail paralleling the south side of Eklutna Lake, will be modified. Rather than developing a trail designed for All-Terrain Vehicles, the final plan will recommend the trail be designed for Hiker-Pedestrian, Trail Class 2. | The trail plan will be revised to change the Designed Use of trail 107 to Hiker-Pedestrian, Trail Class 2 with Hiker as the Managed Use. |
| Eklutna Lakeside Loop Trail (107)- Support | I fully and enthusiastically support the proposed Eklutna Lake Loop Trail 107 as contained in the plan. When combined with trail 110 or 111, it could provide an enjoyable 22.5 mile loop for beginning bikers. | See above. | See above. |
| Eklutna Lakeside Loop Trail (107)- Support Opening to Motorized Use Summer & Winter | I support the inclusion of the new Eklutna Lakeside Trail 107 (south loop) and feel that it should be included for year round motorized use. Even if it involves moving the trail up higher or a different reroute all together a loop trail for summer and winter is needed. If the main concern and reasoning that a winter trail is not acceptable is because the new trail would pass through an avalanche zone, then maybe all winter recreation (motorized and non motorized) use should be closed in Eklutna since the whole area is avalanche prone. The existing lakeside trail passes through an avalanche zone currently and a section of the trail near Bold Airstrip has been buried before. Eklutna seems to be the perfect area for multiuse recreation. The management of non-motorized and motorized use seems to complement one another there. | See above. | See above. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Eklutna Lakeside Loop Trail (107)- Support | <p>Eklutna is one of few areas that allows for disabled access, more motorized trails will allow for more disabled access. The current motorized trail is too short; having a connector loop will attract more visitors. And a trail on the south side of lake will help disperse motorized use from the north side. Continue to manage in the same manner so as to provide safe and quiet periods of use on the trail for other users.</p> <p>Additionally a ramp is needed for ATV's to offload in the parking area.</p> | See above. | See above. |
| Eklutna Lakeside Loop Trail (107)- Oppose | <p>I oppose the proposed new trail on the south side of Eklutna Lake. This is a large trail segment that will destroy the currently untouched side of the lake. The south side can currently be accessed by boat, or by foot at most water levels. The trail would impact wildlife viewing that exists on the shoreline of the lake from the north side and it would be detrimental to wildlife, vegetation and our drinking water supply and would cause user conflicts, dust and noise, changing the character of the entire valley. This would be a significant increase in trail mileage adding to maintenance and enforcement burdens. Providing two separate trails to the same destination for the same users, goes against all rational park planning and management in what is, in large part, a wilderness and scenic park that should be minimizing the “built environment” in favor of its natural attributes. The trail will detract from the scenic and wild nature of the area. The south shore of the lake is the only area to escape motorized noise.</p> | See above. | See above. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Eklutna Lake- ATV use | Please leave ATV use of Eklutna as it currently exists- a few days a week, on one side of the lake. | See above. | No change. |
| Eklutna Lakeside Loop Trail (107)- Gate Needed for Winter Closures | This trail will need a gate in the winter to keep snowmachines off the trail. | Concur. | No change. |
| Eklutna Lakeside Loop Trail (107)- Adding Cabins | Add a bridge across west fork Eklutna and public cabin(s) along the newly created trail. | The trail plan does not make recommendations for Public Use Cabins. Cabins are addressed in the facility development sections of the overall management plan. | No change. |
| Bold Ridge Trail (112a-b)- Snowmobile Access | Bold Ridge Trail off the Eklutna Lake Trail is currently closed to snowmobiles. It would be a good trail for snowmobiles to access the mountain terrain there since the trail system in Eklutna is restrictive to most of the off trail areas. | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. The management intent for this trail is a trail designed and managed for hiking only with no recommendations for snow/winter trails or activities. Trails designed and managed for snowmobile use are provided elsewhere in the park's trail system. | No change. |
| Eklutna Glacier Trail (114b) | I do not support trail 114b, Eklutna Glacier Trail as a Class 1, upgrade to Class 3. This would allow greater use by Serenity Falls Hut users and those interested in seeing the receding glacier. | The Designed Use for this trail segment is Hiker, Class 1. This trail class was applied to this trail segment because it most closely matches the general criteria for a trail that receives low level use and requires highly skilled users able to route find, has steep grades, rocks, and other obstacles that are common along the trail, and has minimal to non-existent constructed features (see Figure 3.1 in draft plan). The terrain in this portion of the valley is very limiting where the glacier has receded and steep rock walls and precarious waters remain. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate alignment for this trail segment. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Mt. Eklutna Trail | The draft plan did not include the Mt. Eklutna trail that was originally included in the old plans. The trail parallels a tributary of the Thunder Bird Creek and traverses a Mt. Eklutna ridgeline. | It is appropriate to include a recommendation in the final plan for a trail in this area that originates from a proposed trailhead. The exact location of the proposed trailhead in the Thunder Bird Creek Valley area is unknown at this time. Once a trailhead is acquired and/or established then the exact alignment of the associated trail can be determined through site specific planning. The Chugach Access Plan has additional information on addressing access in this area and the overall management plan has the facility recommendations. | Plan will be modified to include a trail in the Thunder Bird Creek Valley area. The recommendation will include a Class 2 or 3 trail designed and managed for Hiker-Pedestrian. |
| Bear Mountain Trail (116) | Consider developing a switchback on the Bear Mountain trail. The present trail is straight up and is going to get badly eroded in the future. The trail is already showing signs of spreading out and creating an eyesore. | Concur. The trail plan recommends rerouting and upgrading the trail to meet sustainable standards and address the resource degradation problems. | No change. |
| Peters Creek Access | Construct and maintain a dedicated trailhead/parking area for the Big Peters Creek access. | Concur, however the trail plan does not make recommendations for trailhead improvements. They are addressed in the facility recommendations section of the overall management plan. The Chugach Access Plan addresses access issues. | No change. |
| Peters Creek Valley Trail (117a-c) | I fully and enthusiastically support allowing bicycles on Peters Creek Trail from the Trailhead to Wall Street Creek. This would give mountain bikers a 13.8 mile ride, just north of Eagle River. Not many trail resources exist for mountain bikers in this area. Additionally, this trail will tie in nicely with the wilderness route over to Eklutna and the proposed new trail (107) at Eklutna. | Concur. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|--|--|
| Peters Creek Valley Trail (117b) | I do not support trail 117b Peters Creek Trail as a Class 2 trail, upgrade to Class 3 and make it a loop trail on both sides of Peters Creek with bridge crossings and a trail that provides access to a new Public Cabin with a Class B trail to the wilderness zone. The old plan called for a public cabin with a class B trail to the wilderness boundary but has never been built. | Concur in part. The Designed Use for this trail segment is Pack & Saddle, Class 2. This trail class was applied to this trail segment because it most closely matches the general criteria for a trail which receives moderate use and provides a transition to the backcountry. By designing the trail for horse use, the most demanding design requirements, the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. The trail plan does not make recommendations for Public Use Cabins. Cabin recommendations are addressed in the facility development sections of the overall management plan. | See below for the addition of a new trail segment linking Ptarmigan Valley Trail to Peters Creek Valley Trail. |
| Peters Creek Valley Trail- Six Mile Creek to Wall Street Creek (117b) | I am discouraged to see the proposed trail #117b- Peters Creek Valley Trail- Six Mile Creek to Wall Street Creek not listed as “new” since there is no existing trail in this location for most of the 9.5 miles. I would like to see this trail deleted from the plan and the final plan preserve a range of opportunities for all levels of users, including major drainages that do not have trails- we should preserve opportunities for the self-reliant visitor who does not want to see developments (like trails) when they are recreating. The way the draft plan currently stands, the north fork of Ship Creek is the only major drainage that will be trail-less. I don’t think having only one major drainage designated as trail-less is enough to provide this type of opportunity. I urge you to preserve the trail-less quality of the upper portion of Peters Creek. | The trail plan seeks to preserve existing experiences where appropriate however the upper Peters Creek Valley is not trail-less. A trail, while not as large, already exists in the Peters Creek Valley to Wall Street Creek. This trail was identified in the previous 1986 trail plan and is seeing increased use as the valley continues to gain popularity. The eastern portions of the park are available for wilderness oriented pursuits consistent with park purposes. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|---|---|
| Peters Creek Valley Trails Check Snow Depths & Open Area Sooner | Consider opening this area sooner after a heavy snowfall before the wind blows away the snow. Additionally, please check snow depths more frequently to allow the park to be opened sooner to snowmachines. | Snow depth evaluation in Chugach State Park is performed by park staff and is typically done soon after snow fall. There are times when other staff duties have precedence however and it can be particularly challenging to respond quickly to check snow depth. | No change. |
| Peters Creek Drainage Trails & Signage | Develop and sign trails in Big Peters Creek drainage for all user groups including snowmachines and mountain bikes. | Concur. | No change. |
| Connect Peters Creek & Ptarmigan Valley with a Motorized Trail | Recommend a motorized trail from Ptarmigan Trail to Peters Creek Trail to connect the two areas and to help with parking issue at Peters Creek Trailhead. Peters Creek Trailhead has a very limited, small parking area whereas; Ptarmigan has two fairly large parking areas. | Based on public input and further analysis of the existing trails in the area, the final plan will recommend managing a winter motorized trail that leads from the existing Ptarmigan Valley Trail to the Peters Creek Valley Trail and a non-motorized summer trail. | This trail recommendation will be added to the final plan, and will encompass a Class 3 Snow Trail designed for Snowmobile and managed for Snowmobile, Ski, Hiker, and Bicycle. A Class 3 Terra Trail designed for Pack & Saddle and managed for Pack & Saddle, Hiker, and Bicycle will also be included to connect the existing trail systems. |
| Four Mile Creek Loop Trail (118) | I fully and enthusiastically support trail 118 as contained in the plan. | Concur. | No change. |
| Ptarmigan Valley Trail (119) | I fully and enthusiastically support allowing bicycles on Little Peters Creek/Ptarmigan Trail 119 as contained in the plan. | Concur. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|--|--|
| EAGLE RIVER UNIT | | | |
| Mount Baldy Trail (200a-b) | <p>I support the parks efforts to coordinate with the Municipality of Anchorage and reroute the trail on Mount Baldy.</p> <p>Put new trail investments into developing a proper trail at Baldy in Eagle River. The trail is extremely popular and now eroding from the amount of use.</p> | The trail plan recommends upgrading all trails to meet sustainable standards and specifically rerouting this trail to address the resource problems. | No change. |
| Meadow Creek Trail (202) | Few horses use this area at present. If use increases, the erosion caused will quickly become incompatible with the purposes of the Park as stated in AS 41.21.121. This trail should be flagged as an example of problems to be solved with the Park access portion of the overall management plan. The Plan states that the trail starts on private property. I believe the private property encroaches on a public easement. Suggest changing the designed use to hiker. | <p>The Designed Use for this trail segment is Pack & Saddle, Class 2. This was applied to this trail segment because it most closely matches the general criteria and is the most demanding use the trail usually receives. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate trail alignment as well as work needed to bring the trail up to sustainable standards set forth in this plan and the Division’s Trail Management Policy. This will ensure the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance.</p> <p>The Chugach Access Plan has additional information on addressing access in this region.</p> | No change. |
| North Fork Eagle River Boat Launch (206b)- Support Winter Bicycle Use | Support adding bicycle to managed use for North Fork Eagle River Boat Launch. | Concur. | Plan will be modified to include Bicycle as a Managed Use on trail 206b. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|--|---|
| Ram Valley Access & Trail Alternative | Consider an additional future trail to Ram Valley from the vicinity of the Eagle River Nature Center (ERNC) or up valley off the Crow Pass Trail or off Eagle River Road in order to reduce impacts to homeowners related to trail 209. This trail could use the section line easement and/or leave from the Eagle River Road directly into the park. Even though the elevation gain would be greater than trail 209, a direct route into Ram Valley, on park land, is feasible and parking at the ERNC or a trailhead on Eagle River Road would allow access without neighborhood impacts or the need to acquire an easement across private property. The plan needs to provide adequate parking for this proposed Ram Valley Access Trail. | <p>Concur. Based on comments received from the public and on further analysis of the existing trails in the area and land status, it is appropriate to revise the final plan recommendations for the trails to access Ram Valley. A bubble(similar to the one used for trail 445) will be used in this area to depict the recommendation for a Class 2 and/or 3 trail or trails managed for hikers. More than one trail may be appropriate in this area, depending on where a suitable trailhead is established. Once a trailhead location is determined, site specific planning will take place to determine the appropriate Trail Class and sustainable alignments of the associated trails to the valley. This is in keeping with the Division's Trail Management Policy which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained follow the sustainable design framework.</p> <p>Access and parking are addressed in the Chugach Access Plan and the park's overall management plan which makes more detailed facility recommendations.</p> | The final plan will be modified to include a bubble for access trails in the Ram Valley area. The recommendation will include a Class 2 and/or 3 trail designed and managed for Hiker-Pedestrian. |
| Ram Valley Access and Ram Valley Trail (209) | We would like access to continue to Ram Valley in Eagle River, it is a very special place. We understand that there has been a problem obtaining access to the trail. We wholeheartedly support the State acquiring an easement to provide a connector to create public access to Ram Valley (trail 209). Parking is the biggest problem in this area and needs to be addressed. | Concur. Ram Valley is a popular and important park destination with very limited parking and access. The Chugach Access Plan identifies several options for acquiring legal access to the area and the park's overall management plan makes facility recommendations for a future trailhead once a suitable site has been acquired. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|--|--|
| Rodak Nature Loop and River Loop Yurt Trails (211b & 214b) | Do not support widening 211b and 214b to a class 4 cross-country ski trail. The current windy narrow experience is desirable. | The Trail Class 4 was applied to these trail segments because it most closely matches the general criteria and existing condition for the trails that receives heavy use. The Trail Class prescription takes into account setting, the protection of sensitive resources, use levels, and other management activities. | No change. |
| Four Corners Loop Trail (218a) | Trail 218a has two different trail classes depicted in the plan. Map 4.6 shows trail 218a as a trail class 3 whereas the trail recommendations chart on page 4-10 shows the trail as class 4. | Concur. This is a typographical error in the draft document. | The trail plan will be revised to change the Trail Class for trail segment 218a to Trail Class 3 in the Chapter 4: Trail Management Recommendations section. |
| Eagle River Nature Center Trails | I support maintenance and expansion of the excellent trail system in the vicinity of the Eagle River Nature Center. | Concur. | No change. |
| Crow Pass Trail (219a) | Support trail 219a Crow Pass Trail as a class 3 trail with the addition of a foot bridge across Eagle River at the Knob area with a new class 3 trail connecting the existing trail at the ford site to the Knob giving users an alternative to a wet river crossing at the ford site. | A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate trail alignment and bridge locations, as well as work needed to bring the trail up to sustainable standards. | No change. |
| Eagle River Campground Roads | Designate appropriate Eagle River campground roads as winter ski trails (past Hesterberg gate) so the entire campground loops can be used for skiing. | Concur. | The Eagle River Campground loops will be designated as Class 5 Snow Trails with Nordic Ski as the Designed Use and Managed Use. |
| Eagle River Campground Trails | For more beginning type of bike trails it would be appropriate to establish new loops in and around the Eagle River Campground. There is enough land base on the campground side of the river to establish trails using existing cuts. | Concur. The inclusion of the proposed Terra Trails (223a, 224a, and 224d) designed for Bicycles in and around the Eagle River Campground and the use of existing roads provides this type of recreational opportunity. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|---|---|
| Eagle River Campground Trail System (224b-c)- Designate for Summer Use & Class 3 or 4 | This project will provide the final connection between Eagle River High School and Chugach State Park. We suggest the proposed trail 224b-c be constructed as multi-use including summer use as well as winter use and a revised trail class of 3 or 4 instead of the more costly class 5 as proposed. | Concur in part. The inclusion of the proposed Terra Trails 224a and 224d designed for Bicycles in and around the Eagle River Campground provides this type of recreational opportunity. It is however appropriate to revise the final plan to change the Trail Class for Snow Trails 224b-c to Class 4, since the design parameters provide the flexibility needed to design a Nordic Ski trail appropriate for this area and use levels. | The plan will be revised to change the Trail Class for Snow Trails 224b-c to Trail Class 4. |
| Eagle River Campground Trails- New Connector Trail | Designate a planned trail that would connect Eagle River Campground with the recently constructed trail near Eagle River High School and the Glenn Highway bike path on the bluff above (approx. ½ mile of trail generally paralleling Hesterberg Road and providing safe trail access off the road). | A trail paralleling Hesterberg Road and connecting the Eagle River Campground with the Eagle River High School and Glenn Highway bike path would be associated with future road upgrades/improvements and require coordination with a number of landowners. The local topography would dictate the trail alignment and may be a limiting factor for this connection as it traverses state park land. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|---|--|
| Eagle River Greenbelt Trails (223 & 224)- Oppose | <p>I am against the construction of trails in the greenbelt especially between the Glenn Highway and Briggs Bridge.</p> <p>These are areas of high use by brown bears and provide one of the few avenues for wildlife to migrate across the Glenn Highway. The development of these areas for recreational trails will put people at risk to bear attacks and will also result in the unnecessary killing of bears by humans. Improved trails make folks feel “safer” and that awareness and protection are not necessary. Also, the proposed bridges impact the scenic value along the river corridor and can become serious river hazards depending on the bridge design. Since the trail is in wetlands, constructing it would be expensive. It would be a Class 5 trail suitable to beginner mountain bikers and not very appealing to those who enjoy single track trails. Would prefer to see bike lanes or a paved separated path along Eagle River Road.</p> | <p>Upon further evaluation, the recommendations for trail 223 will be modified. The final trail plan will be revised to recommend making the portion of the Eagle River Greenbelt Trail from the Briggs Bridge to the Eagle River Nature Center the priority for development. This allows staff to rethink the design and alignment of the initial portion of the trail between the Glenn Highway and Briggs Bridge so as to better mitigate or lower the potential for human/wildlife interactions and better connect the trail with existing community infrastructure. Consideration will be given to improving sight distances and reducing speeds as well as using fewer bridges over the river and perhaps even keeping the trail on one side of the river. This will require forging partnerships with surrounding landowners to create a better alignment, since there is insufficient state-owned land in this area. Since alternative means of connecting to the Eagle River Greenbelt from the surrounding neighborhoods using existing sidewalks and bike trails already exist, the impacts to access or recreational opportunities should be minimal during this time of re-evaluation.</p> | <p>The trail 223 recommendations will be modified in the final plan to include additional language for the Eagle River Greenbelt Trail to note that the portion that connects the Glenn Highway and Briggs Bridge will be reevaluated and that the remainder of the trail between Briggs Bridge and the Eagle River Nature Center will be the priority for construction.</p> |
| Meadow Creek Area of ER Greenbelt Trail (223) | <p>Trail 223a-b should be moved away from Meadow Creek to mitigate wildlife concerns. A revised field location was reviewed with DNR staff. Eagle River Trails Sub Committee members met with park staff and agreed on a location of this trail, please adjust to the agreed location.</p> | See above. | See above. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Eagle River Greenbelt Trail (223 & 224)- Support | I strongly support including this proposal in the final plan. Eagle River is already an established urban residential area, there is a growing need for outdoor recreational infrastructure. While I am concerned about the increasing impact of human travel in the Greenbelt and am aware of the issue regarding bears, I still favor establishing a formal trail system in this area. Active management and closing the areas and trails where and when bear activity is present would provide public and wildlife safety while allowing for trails. People are going to continue to use this area with increasing frequency and numbers because of its closeness and geography. If all river systems are closed to trail development, there will be a mirage of user created trails and an unmanaged public still using the corridors at an increased risk and increased liability for park managers and more damage to park resources. It is far better to anticipate this traffic and provide a well planned sustainable trail system that guides use off the river’s edge and provides for a diversity of quality recreational and fitness opportunities while minimizing the impact on the environment and wildlife. State Parks has worked since the early 1980s during the NALA Agreement to protect recreational opportunities within the greenbelt. Developing the trail would cut (or eliminate) drive time, traffic congestion, and pollution. | See above. | See above. |
| Eagle River Trails (223 & 224)- Support Winter Use | Improve ski trails near the Eagle River Campground and include a bridge to connect skiers on the other side to a trail from Gruening Middle School/Lions Park to the Eagle River Nature Center. | See above. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|---|--|
| Eagle River Greenbelt Trail (223)- Mitigate Potential Issues During Planning | The proposed Greenbelt Trail will require considerable planning effort and coordination with resource agencies to rectify potential issues with cross-drainage, wetlands impacts, and wildlife habitat fragmentation. With only one access point along 14+ miles of trail, how would maintenance and emergency vehicles access the trail? Safety issues for trail users must carefully be considered. Bear habitat and potential conflicts with humans must be addressed and mitigated for during the design process. | See above. The proposed trail alignment and trail access depicted on the maps for trail 223a are approximations and will likely vary as the trail is improved and developed. A number of access easements already exist along the greenbelt and the Chugach Access Plan contains additional recommendations for the reservation of additional access to the greenbelt. | No change. |
| Eagle River Greenbelt Trails | Homesteaders on the south side of Eagle River rely on trails for access to private property, please reserve and maintain these trails as they are the only access. | The goal of the trail plan is to provide future recommendations for the management and development of recreational trails within Chugach State Park. Access to private property is not the purview of this plan and can be addressed through other means. Portions of the Eagle River Greenbelt Trail (223) however, will traverse the south side of Eagle River once the trail is established. | No change. |
| Eagle River Boat Launch (225b)- Support Adding Winter Bicycle Use | Support adding bicycle to managed use for Eagle River Boat Launch (trail 225b). | Concur. | Plan will be modified to include Bicycle as a Managed Use on trail 225b. |
| Eagle River Water Trail- Note as Snow Trail | Recommend noting Eagle River water course as snowmobile snow trail, since it is open to snowmobiles. | Even through the Eagle River water course and gravel bars are open by regulation to snowmobile use when snow depth is adequate to protect underlying vegetation, users are not confined to just one defined trail; therefore, it is not practical to designate and maintain just one trail as a Snow Trail. | No change. |
| Eagle River Water Trail | I support naming Eagle River as the only defined water trail. If other lesser used creeks are designated as trails, it could lead to beginning boaters attempting areas that are at the limits of advanced boaters. | Concur. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Eagle River- Close To Snowmobiles | I feel the trail management plan is misleading. It does not make it clear that upstream of the Eagle River visitor center the valley is open to snowmachine use on the river bed. Snowmachines are noisy, and obtrusive to skiers enjoyment, even to people who are using a trail off the river bed. I would like to see the Eagle River drainage closed to all motorized use upstream of the visitor center. | The park was established to provide recreational opportunities for the people by providing areas for specified uses and like skiing, snowmobiling is a legitimate recreational activity. Currently, snowmobiles are allowed in specific areas of the park as described in regulation and these areas are limited as compared to skiing. | No change. |
| South Fork Eagle River Trail (227a-c)- Support | I support allowing bicycles on trails 227a-c. This would be a beautiful ride for intermediate and advances mountain bikers who would enjoy a destination ride to Eagle Lake. Only support trail if the entire trail 227a-c is upgraded to a class 3 trail. Parking issues need to be addressed. | See below. | See below. |
| South Fork Eagle River Trail (227a,c-d)- Horse & Bicycle Use | Allowing horse traffic across existing boardwalks at trailhead is not appropriate. How would horses be directed to access the trail from that trailhead? What trail upgrades would be made to accommodate more traffic? By adding bikes and horses to an already popular trail, overuse may become a maintenance issue. | See below. | See below. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|--|--|
| South Fork Eagle River Trail (227a-c)- Oppose Bicycle Use | Oppose opening the South Fork Eagle River Trail to bikes. The South Fork Trail from the trailhead to the bridge (227a-b) is frequented by families with small children and elders, has very poor visibility and many blind corners along the trail, is narrow and is therefore not appropriate for bicycles. Bicycles on the trail would introduce a significant safety hazard to hikers, bikers, and horse users. There are numerous wet areas on trail 227c including narrow broadwalks and stream crossings. Bicycle traffic in this area is very likely to have a significant negative impact on wet areas and stream habitat and appears inconsistent with the DNR trail and habitat protection standards and criteria published in the plan. Bikes would also create many more additional encounters because they can travel quickly, thus detracting from the quality of the experience for many visitors. | After public input and further evaluation, the recommendations for trail segments 227b-c will be modified. Rather than designing a trail for Bicycles to Eagle Lake, the final plan will recommend the trail segments be designed for Pack & Saddle since equestrian use is currently allowed by regulation in this area, it is the most demanding of the Managed Uses and has the most rigorous design parameters and requirements. This will ensure the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. | Plan will be modified to include Pack & Saddle as the Designed Use for trail segments 227b-c with Pack & Saddle and Hiker as the Managed Uses. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>Hunter Pass Trail (228)- Bicycle Use</p> | <p>Because the terrain is too steep to safely allow for bike use straight out of the South Fork Eagle River Trailhead, I do not support allowing bikes on trail 228. To build a trail sustainable for bikes would be expensive and would require the trail to wind around the ridge. The trail modifications would be unsightly and inconsistent with published trail plan criteria which seek to avoid unsightly trails on “highly visible” hillsides. No matter how many switchbacks are built to accommodate bikes, bikes will still be able to go very fast, and the trail would be ridiculous for hikers and runners because it would be too developed, long and the grades overly gentle that hikers will not use it, thus fall-line social trails will be created. I do not support installing a separate parallel trail or any widening of the existing trail in any attempt to make this trail usable by bicycles. To do so would require an extensive (and expensive) change, so much of a change that the natural feel, character and “meander” of the existing trail would be spoiled.</p> | <p>There is currently a highly visible fall line trail in the area that needs to be rehabilitated consistent with the Division’s sustainable trail policy. The designed use for the Hunter Pass trail is Pack & Saddle because the area receives equestrian use that combined with other uses has degraded park resources. Bicycles are included as a managed use since the design parameters for Pack & Saddle are more demanding. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate trail alignment as well as work needed to bring the trail up to sustainable standards.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Hunter Pass Trail (228)- Horse Use & Alternative Trail | The Hunter Pass Trail is not ideal horse access to the Ship Creek drainage, and there have been concerns over erosion on the current trail due to horse use during moose hunting season. I would recommend closing the section of trail that ascends to Hunter Pass to pack and saddle, as horse use will further erosion problems and make the trail an eyesore with regards to the viewshed for Hiland Road residents. More appropriate access to Ship Creek via horse use is over the second pass, further up the South Fork valley. I would recommend keeping the main South Fork Trail to Eagle Lake open to horses, and simply remove access over Hunter Pass to avoid erosion issues and required construction of excessive switchbacks to accommodate horse use to Hunter Pass. | The Designed Use for this trail segment is Pack & Saddle, Class 3. This was applied to this trail segment because it most closely matches the general criteria and is the most demanding use the trail usually receives with the most rigorous design parameters. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate trail alignment, utilizing the existing impacted footprint where appropriate, as well as work needed to bring the trail up to sustainable standards set forth in this plan and the Division’s Trail Management Policy. This will ensure the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. | No change. |
| Hunter Pass Trail (228)- Support | I fully and enthusiastically support trail 228 as contained in the plan. Would provide a connector from trails 301 and 303. | Concur. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|----------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Hanging Valley Trail (229) | A social trail has developed from the South Fork Trail up into the hanging valley. The park could benefit from a constructed trail on the approx 1 mile uphill portion. The social trail continues in a much more sustainable manner along the flatter portion of the hanging valley floor. I recommend changing the length of the trail 229 to 1 mile, ending the constructed trail at the top of the hill, which is also a natural turn-around location. This would provide a sense of discovery and exploration for those continuing on in the valley floor. | Concur in part. The Trail Class 2 was applied to the approximately two mile trail segment because it most closely matches the general criteria for the trail. The Trail Class prescription takes into account setting, use levels, the protection of sensitive resources, and other management activities. A Class 2 trail is to be designed and managed as a simple trail with minor development or constructed features. A Class 2 trail typically receives low-to-moderate use levels and is suitable for many user types but challenging and involves advanced skills and capability of traveling over awkward obstacles. Natural, essentially unmodified and primitive to semi-primitive is the recreation environment and experience attributes for a Class 2 trail. In keeping with the Division's Trail Management Policy and the plan, this trail will need to be brought up to a sustainable standard in order to minimize resource degradation and lower maintenance costs in the future. | No change. |
| Harp Mountain Trail (230) | Recommend extending trail 230 and designating a trail up Harp Mountain. This is an example where new access will increase use, and social trails will cause erosion. | The decision has been made to manage only a short segment of trail leading up the ridge leaving the undeveloped routes to provide and preserve a certain type of recreational experience. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>South Fork Eagle River Valley- New Loop Trail Needed</p> | <p>There is a need to create a loop experience in the South Fork in order to disperse use, create better flow and provide additional hiking opportunities on relatively easy terrain. The new trail segment would be approximately 2 miles from the end of Hiland Road to the existing trail along the valley floor.</p> | <p>Concur. It is appropriate to include a recommendation in the final plan for a trail in this area that originates from a proposed trailhead and connects to the existing South Fork Eagle River Trail. However, a bubble similar to one used for trail 445 will be used since the exact location of the proposed trailhead and the alignment for a sustainable trail in the valley is unknown at this time. Once a trailhead is acquired and/or established then the location of the associated trail can be determined through site specific planning. This is in keeping with the Division’s Trail Management Policy which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained will follow the sustainable design framework. The Chugach Access Plan and overall management plan have additional information on addressing access in this valley and recommendations for facilities.</p> | <p>Plan will be modified to include a bubble for a loop trail in the South Fork Eagle River Valley that links to the existing trail. The recommendation will include a Class 3 trail designed and managed for Hiker-Pedestrian.</p> |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| SHIP CREEK UNIT | | | |
| Arctic to Indian Trails (300, 301, 304a-b, & 509a) | I support the proposed and existing trails in the Ship Creek and Indian Valley as contained in the plan. | Concur. | No change. |
| Arctic Valley Lease Site Trails (300, 301, 302, & 303) | The ski lease property in Arctic Valley is underutilized. A redesigned, sustainable trail system there would bring new visitors. The existing trails are too steep and unpleasant for beginning outdoor recreationalists. Improvements to the trails would provide benefits to not only the general public and park visitors but also to the Anchorage Ski Club. The general public would be served by having more and better designed trails to enjoy Arctic Valley and the ASC would benefit by becoming a more attractive visitor area. The Muktuk Marston Trail extension would be a marvelous addition to the CSP trail system. Because of its western and southern exposure it is one of the first trails in the spring to dry out. It passes through beautiful alpine meadows, terrific blueberry patches, and even has a nuke missile located along the route. It also would improve trail connectivity in the area by linking to the South Fork ER Trailhead. | Concur. | No change. |
| Muktuk Marston Memorial Overlook, Muktuk Marston, and Rendevous Peak Trails (300, 301, & 303) | I fully and enthusiastically support trail 303, when combined with proposed trail 301 forms a loop trail. | Concur. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|--|---|
| Muktuk Marston and Rendezvous Ridge Trails (300, 301, & 303) | Oppose allowing bicycles on new Muktuk Marston Trail #300-301. If the trail on Rendezvous Ridge and Hunter Pass are not open to bikes, it would not make sense to open this new trail to bikers either. | Concur in part. The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. The management intent for trail segments 228, 300, 301, and 303 will remain that one of the Managed Uses is biking in order to provide a loop option in the area. | No change. |
| Rendezvous Peak Trail (302a-b) | We support allowing bicycles on trail 302a-b, could be part of a loop trail when combined with trails 300 and 303, but grade may be too steep for a sustainable trail for mountain bikes. | The plan text needs to be corrected to properly indicate the desired Managed Uses for trail 302a. Bicycle was listed as a Managed Use in error in the draft document. | The final plan will be modified to correct a typo that appeared in the draft plan. The Managed Use for trail segment 302a will be Hiker only. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Rendezvous Peak Trail (302a & 303) | I am opposed to allowing bicycles on trails 302a and 303. This type of use would require the construction of more sustainable trails with lower grades accommodated by switchbacks. The area is currently used by hundreds of hikers. | Concur in part. The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. Bicycle was listed as a Managed Use for trail 302a in error in the draft document and will be corrected in the final plan. The Designed Use and Managed Use will be Hiker-Pedestrian for trail segment 302a. The management intent for trail 303 will remain one designed for Bicycle and managed for biking and hiking. By designing certain trails within the park's trail system for bicycle use, the most demanding design requirements, the trails will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling their intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. Each Designed Use has specific design parameters which vary under each Trail Class and provide guidance for the assessment, survey, design, construction, repair, and maintenance of the trails. All trail recommendations included in the plan follow the Division's Trail Management Policy, which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained follow the sustainable design framework. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Arctic Valley Lease Site Trail (303) | The Anchorage Ski Club manages the Arctic Valley ski area and has a specific safety concern. Trail 303 along the Rendezvous Ridge was originally put in as a road in the 1950s to access the original 1,600 foot rope-tows and later the US Army poma lift and chairlift. ASC's snowcat groomer uses this trail as an access route to the top of the mountain so we can groom the ski slopes. The current trail needs to be widened and rerouted for safety of the cat operators. In 1955 an Army vehicle using this route to service the top of the lift rolled off the back of the mountain killing one of the operators. | Concur. | No change. |
| Ship Creek Trail (304) | Ship Creek 304a-b should be only Class 2, hiker, not Pack and Saddle due to impacts caused by horse use on trails such as trail erosion, effects on salmon streams, and spreading of invasive plant species. | Equestrian use is currently allowed in the Ship Creek Valley. Because equestrian use is increasing in the area and because it is the most demanding of the Managed Uses with the most rigorous design parameters and requirements, it makes sense to design, improve, and manage the trails for this use. By doing so, the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. This is in keeping with the Division's Trail Management Policy which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained follow the sustainable design framework. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Ship Creek Trail (304a-b) | <p>The old trail plan called for a Class A & B trail from Arctic to Indian Creek Pass. The new trail plan calls for a class 2 trail (less than what the old plan called for) this trail section needs to be upgraded to a class 3 trail for trail 304a&b, Arctic to Indian Trailheads.</p> <p>Future consideration for a new Public Use Cabin at the junction of North fork Ship Creek should be considered in the revised master plan.</p> | <p>By designing and improving trail segments 304a-b for Pack and Saddle, Class 2, this trail will not be a lower grade trail. Pack and Saddle is the Designed Use since it is the most demanding of the Managed Uses and has the most rigorous design parameters and requirements. This will ensure the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance.</p> <p>The trail plan does not make recommendations for Public Use Cabins. Cabins are addressed in the facility development sections of the overall management plan.</p> | No change. |
| Muktuk Marston Trail (304a-b & 509a) | Friends of Nike Site Summit (FONSS) support the extension and improvement of the Muktuk Marston trail system, as this trail is along historic routes that have remnants of three Nike Hercules missiles from the early 60's. | Concur. | No change. |
| Arctic Valley to Indian Creek Pass Traverse– Add Bicycle Use | Consider a sustainable trail the length of the Arctic to Indian route that could be built to Class 2 standards that would accommodate mountain biking. This trail would create a world class hiking and biking trail, and would put Anchorage on the map as a destination mountain biking area. Combining trails 300, 301, 304a-b, and 509a, would create a 25.5 mile point-to-point ride similar to a Kenai Peninsula trail experience that is close to Anchorage. If a trail is sustainable to horses it is sustainable to mountain bikes. Recommend access for snow bikes too. This would provide a long through riding opportunity. | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. The management intent for the Arctic Valley to Indian Traverse trail segments seeks to preserve this trail as one designed and managed for equestrian use and hiking. Trails designed and managed for bicycle use are provided elsewhere in the park's trail system. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Ship Creek Trail & Arctic Valley to Indian Creek Pass Traverse (304a & 305) | Why not just create a sustainable trail along Ship Creek (305) and save the hassle of constructing a very long new trail up that high. I recommend creating 305 as a terra trail in addition to a snow trail, and deleting 304a entirely. Hunters and pack rafters do not want to be up that high so they will continue to use 305 and if not improved, it will continue to be an unsustainable mud bog. If CSP retains 304a, please do not open it to horse use. The terrain is not suited for horses. A class 2 trail in this terrain will not sustain horses. | The designed and intended use of the Ship Creek Trail (304a) is Pack & Saddle. All trail recommendations included in the plan follow the Division's Trail Management Policy, which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained follow the sustainable design framework. This insures that a trail conforms to its terrain and environment, is capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and requires minimal maintenance. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate trail alignment as well as work needed to have a sustainable trail. | No change. |
| Arctic Valley to Indian Creek Pass Traverse (305 & 509b)- Add Winter Bicycle Use | The new plan should propose a regulation change to allow winter bicycle use on this trail. | The Arctic to Indian traverse trail was considered for bicycle use; however, cross country skiing and hiking were identified as the Managed Uses in order to preserve the existing experience. Winter biking trails are offered elsewhere in the park. | No change. |
| Arctic Valley to Indian Winter Traverse | This is a very popular winter traverse. The starting point at Arctic Valley is very difficult and even dangerous. A new route should be designed and built to allow a safer way down into Ship Creek. | Concur. | No change. |
| Arctic Valley Trailhead | Consider making the Arctic Valley Trailhead into a legitimate State Trailhead. Work out a co-op deal with the ski club. This would improve tourism into the park. | The trailhead is already a legitimate State trailhead open for public use. | No change. |
| Arctic Valley Lease Site Map Edits | Please list the lease area in Arctic Valley as the 'Anchorage Ski Club, Inc. Lease' or 'Anchorage Ski Club Lease, Arctic Valley' instead of 'Arctic Valley Ski Area'. | The Trail Plan maps are not meant to depict land status and merely identify place names. The land status map in the park's management plan will identify the lease area. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| Arctic Valley Lease Site Plan Edits | Request that the plan acknowledge that the trailhead and trails within the Anchorage Ski Club's lease area are managed and maintained by the ASC. | Concur. | The plan will identify trails that are maintained by ASC. |
| Use of Military Road | On page 4-13 the verbiage states; "the main way to access the unit is via military road that takes you to the Arctic Valley Ski Area." We suggest you inform your users that the military road is only open from 6AM and 10PM. The road is subject to closure by order of the Garrison Commander without warning. | Concur. | The trail plan will be revised to include language regarding the ownership of the Arctic Valley Road in addition to the hours of operation and the potential for closures. Additionally, an Appendix will be added to the plan with the regulations for recreating on U.S. Army Garrison, Fort Richardson lands. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|--|--|
| HILLSIDE UNIT | | | |
| <p>Lost Cabin Valley & Near Point Trails (400a & 401a)</p> | <p>Support upgrading Lost Cabin Trail (400a) from Class 2 bicycle to a Class 3 for bicycles. As the plan is now, it is a lower grade trail at its start and then runs into higher grade trails further in the backcountry, which is backwards from how it should be. The trailhead at 400a is adjacent to Far North Bicentennial Park (FNBP), so upgrading 400a to a Class 3 biking trail would provide continuity with 406c, 404a, and trails in FNBP, at a lower impact, lower cost, and higher benefit than the proposed trail 401a. Designating this trail Class 2 and 401a as Class 3 would direct the greatest amount of public traffic to 401a. This would run counter to the goal of treating the Basher Trailhead as the primary point of public access. Upgrade this trail to a multi-use class 3 and move it away from the bluff edge (future erosion problem) as it runs along the north fork of Campbell Creek.</p> <p>Trail 400a is the only appropriate trail for bike use in the Stuckagain neighborhood.</p> | <p>By designing and improving trail 400a for Pack & Saddle, Class 2 this trail will not be a lower grade trail compared to trail 401a which will be designed for Bicycle, Class 3. This trail class was applied to this trail segment because it most closely matches the general trail criteria for a trail that receives moderate to heavy use and provides a transition to lower class trails further in the backcountry. This trail will provide compatible connectivity to the existing trail system where bikes and equestrians are currently allowed.</p> | <p>Plan will be revised to change the Designed Use of trail 400a to Pack & Saddle, Trail Class 2 with Pack & Saddle, Bicycle, and Hiker as Managed Uses.</p> |
| <p>Lost Cabin Valley Trail (400a)</p> | <p>Hiker/equestrian users are the two users who have traditionally used this trail (400a). It is the only access for equestrians east of the gorge. Equestrians should be added as a managed use for this trail. Bicycle traffic is incompatible with current uses of this trail, with regards to safety as they are a moving vehicle traveling at high speeds. Bicycles also cause erosion and destroy natural habitat when they wander outside trail parameters.</p> | <p>Concur in part. Pack & Saddle will be added as the Designed Use for this trail segment since it is the most demanding of the Managed Uses and has the most rigorous design parameters and requirements. This will ensure the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance.</p> | <p>Plan will be modified to include Pack & Saddle as the Designed Use for trail 400a with Pack & Saddle, Bicycle, and Hiker as Managed Uses.</p> |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|--|--|
| Lost Cabin Valley Trail (400a) | I fully and enthusiastically support allowing bicycles on trail 400a. This trail is already used by mountain bikers as a challenging section of single-track. | Concur. | No change. |
| Lost Cabin Valley Trail (400b)- Add Bicycle as Winter Managed Use | We support adding bicycle to managed use for Lost Cabin Valley Trail (400b) since use is allowed in summer on trail 400a. | Concur. | Plan will be modified to include Bicycle as a Managed Use on trail 400b. |
| Basher Drive Trailhead | The Basher Trailhead at the beginning of the Stuckagain neighborhood is the primary point of access from the neighborhood to the park and should be developed as the major access point and any additional trailheads should be secondary access points only. This would minimize safety problems that go along with locating major parking areas above residential areas. Issues such as: road safety hazards, road condition and maintenance, fire hazard, and vandalism. It would reduce traffic on neighborhood roads and congestion on the single ingress/egress routes for fire and emergencies. And it will be easier for the park to patrol the trailhead and possible to share maintenance and patrol duties with the municipal park. | Concur however the trail plan does not make recommendations for facility development. | No change. |
| Near Point Knoll Trailhead | Support a trailhead on the property in vicinity of Near Point Knoll and a good trail connecting that trailhead to the rest of the Chugach Park trail system. | Concur. The trail plan recommends a trail in the vicinity of the property that connects with the Hillside trail system. Trailheads and access are not the purview of this plan and are addressed in more detail in the park's overall management plan and the Chugach Access Plan. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Near Point Trail (401a) | <p>The proposed new Class 3 segment 401a would be high impact and high cost where it descends the north side of Near Point. This trail crosses a region of fragile tundra that could easily be degraded by steady bicycle use. It would cut across a dense hemlock forest on a steep hillside, and in places it would have to cut through bedrock to meet the width requirements. As mapped it is also too steep for the trail specifications. Its benefits are limited, as it is short, doesn't access a part of CSP without existing access, or complete a trail loop. There is already a footpath in a public easement up the north side of Near Point from the proposed endpoint of 401a, which provides convenient access to the alpine areas of Near Point. Thus it makes more sense to include the existing trail in the plan as a Class 1 pedestrian rather than create a new trail, or reclassify 401a as a proposed Class 1 pedestrian trail. The proposed trail will replace portions of an existing platted pedestrian trail (that is not included on the map) and will cross another pedestrian trail (also not on the map) that starts at Tulugak Circle before connecting to 401b. This trail will destroy the rustic nature of both of the pedestrian trails that ascend Near Point from Stuckagain Height and will invite bike traffic in the fragile alpine zone of Near Point. Designed for bikes at class 3, is this feasible given the steep terrain?</p> | <p>The proposed trail alignment depicted on the map for trail 401a is an approximation and will likely vary as the trail is improved and developed. There is currently a platted trail easement across the Campbell Canyon property that follows a user developed trail which is steep in places as it ascends Near Point. The trail alignment depicted on the map initially follows this easement before switching back across the face of Near Point to avoid the grades too steep for sustainability and connecting with a user developed trail accessed via Tulugak Circle that leads to the existing Near Point Trail. All trail recommendations included in this plan follow the Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation's Trail Management Policy, which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained follow the sustainable design framework. By designing the trail for bicycle use, the most demanding design requirement for the intended uses of the trail, the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance.</p> | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Near Point Trail (401a) | I fully and enthusiastically support proposed trail 401a. It would provide park access from the north; should be suitable for most modes of travel on a Class 3 trail. Trail 401b is already open to mountain biking, thus it is logical to allow bikes access to the CSP trails via trail 401a. Trail 401a has the potential to be one of the jewels of the trail system skirting the front of the Chugach Mountains near Anchorage. Traversing the western flank of Near Point, it would provide great vistas and would provide the final link in a continuous hiking and mountain biking pathway from Near Point to Glen Alps. This trail would attract a lot of use and should be constructed and maintained for both biking and hiking. From the site of the potential trailhead, it should not require much elevation gain to traverse the western flank of Near Point. The trail should remain below tree line so that the fragile tundra would not be impacted. | Concur. | No change. |
| Near Point Trail (401d) | Designate trail 401d as a Class 1 hiking trail but realign on the ridge to the south. Hikers enjoy the character of the Near Point trails. Please keep the new trail building here to a minimum and focus resources on trail improvements that protect the resource by avoiding wetlands and steep slopes, not on increasing the tread width and inviting bikes. | The Designed Use for this trail is Hiker-Pedestrian, Class 3. This Trail Class was applied to this trail segment because it most closely matches the general criteria for this trail which receives moderate to heavy use and provides a transition to lower class trails further in the backcountry. In order to meet sustainable standards set forth in this plan and the Division's Trail Management Policy, segments of this trail will likely need to be rerouted to address resource degradation due to steep grades and fall-line alignment. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate alignment. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Stuckagain Area- Bicycle Use | Allowing bicycles on all trails adjacent to the Stuckagain neighborhood would undermine the peace and tranquility of the traditional use of hiking that residents have enjoyed. | Biking is a legitimate activity performed in Chugach State Park and by designing and managing certain trails in this area for bike use they will tie nicely into the existing trail system where bikes are currently allowed. A number of trails designed and managed for hikers only are still provided in the area. | No change. |
| Hillside Trails near Stuckagain Area (400a, 401a, & 406a) | It is irresponsible of the State to create new trails or widen the existing trails near Campbell Creek, and lead more bears into the Stuckagain Heights neighborhood. Unsafe for the community, as well as putting bears in harms way. | To the best of our knowledge, construction of recreational trails in this area has caused no significant impact on wildlife or their movement corridors. There are many reasons that wildlife may be attracted to a neighborhood such as poor food or trash storage. Per the enabling legislation, the park is responsible for developing and enhancing recreational opportunities and building facilities, such as trails, to support these opportunities. | No change. |
| Dome Trailhead | Dome Trailhead should be indicated on the map. This access point has been enjoyed by many for decades, and recent improvements have resulted in a very functional access point for both residents of the neighborhood and park users. There are multiple trails that originate from this trailhead and access different parts of the park. This trailhead needs additional parking, signs directing users to the trail, and a public easement that allows for safe access to the historic trail leading to The Dome. | Concur in part; however, this trailhead and trail are outside of Chugach State Park and governed by other entities. The state has no control over the management, improvement, or design of this trailhead or trail but the Chugach Access Plan does identify several options for addressing access in this area. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|--|--|
| Campbell Creek Canyon & Williwaw Lakes Trails (402 & 408)- Add Military Land Access Text | On page 4-14 ID# 305 states that “the first 3 miles of trail is on military land” and Maps 4.8 & 4.9 show trails 402 and 408 traversing US Army property. Please see the Fort Richardson Recreational Access policy. The Recreational Access Permit can be obtained free of charge at the Fort Richardson main gate. | Concur. This was an oversight while generating the draft document. | The trail plan will be revised to include language regarding the segment of trails 402 and 408 that traverse military land and Map 4.9 will also be modified. In addition, an Appendix will be added to the plan with the regulations for recreating on U.S. Army Garrison, Fort Richardson lands. |
| Campbell Creek Canyon- Long Lake Trail (402) | No need to upgrade trail 402 to Class 2, keep it unmanaged. This trail is on hardened surfaces all the way to Long Lake, there are few if any wetland issues, just a bit of brush here and there. Hikers and runners absolutely love the wild nature of this trail and this valley. | In keeping with the Division’s Trail Management Policy, this trail will need to be brought up to a sustainable standard in order to minimize resource degradation and lower maintenance costs in the future. A detailed trail assessment will determine where and what type of work will be needed. This plan assigns each trail or trail segment an appropriate trail class to meet a trail prescription that describes the desired management intent for the trail or trail segment. A Class 2 trail is to be designed and managed as a simple trail receiving low-to-moderate use, suitable for many user types with challenges involving advanced skills and capability of traveling over awkward obstacles. | No change. |
| Long Lake Trail Alternative | Consider a trail to Long Lake starting at the Near Point Knoll trailhead site and going along south side of the North Fork Campbell Creek. Presently, hikers going to Long Lake either have to pass through military land to get to the north side, or they have to go over the summit. | Concur. Based on comments received from the public and on further analysis of the existing trails in the area, the final plan will recommend managing the user developed trail that leads along the south side of the North Fork Campbell Creek and connects with trail 402 and bypasses military land. | Plan will be modified to include a Class 2 trail designed and managed for Hiker-Pedestrian in this area. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Wolverine Peak Trail & Near Point Trails (403 & 401d) | Trails 403 and 401d in the Hillside Unit are too steep for biking other than specialized downhill mountain biking, and designing them to sustainable Class 3 standards would require extensive rerouting, including switchbacking across fragile tundra. The expense and impact would be very large. They should be classified as Class 2 for hiking, as Class 3 biking is impractical for terrain and environmental reasons. Class 2 development would adequately satisfy the intended use for the trail - hiking, and would prevent aesthetic damage to the trail. | Concur in part. The trail plan does not recommend trail 403 or 401d be designed or managed for bicycle use. The Designed Use for both trails is Hiker, Class 3. This trail class was applied to these trail segments because it most closely matches the general criteria for a trail with moderate to heavy use. In order to meet sustainable standards set forth in this plan and the Division's Trail Management Policy, segments of these trails will likely need to be rerouted to address resource degradation due to steep grades and fall-line alignment. While it is understood that the initial construction costs to upgrade these trails to a sustainable standard may be more, reduced future maintenance costs should more than compensate for those initial investments. | No change. |
| Wolverine Peak Trail (403)- Add Bicycle Use | Great place to bike, open the Wolverine Peak Trail to bikes all the way to the peak. | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. The management intent for this trail is as a trail designed and managed for hiking. Trails designed and managed for bicycle use are provided elsewhere in the park's trail system. | No change. |
| Wolverine Bowl Ski Loop (405a-b)- Add Winter & Summer Bicycle Use | Support adding bicycle use on Wolverine Bowl Ski Loop summer and winter (trails 405a-b). Linking with 404a-b and 400a-b creates an excellent loop ride. | Trail connectivity for bicyclist is provided via a loop created when trails 400 and 404 are combined, while reserving trail 405 for hikers and skiers. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| <p>Middle Fork Loop Trail and Extension</p> | <p>The mountain biking options in much of the Hillside Unit are relatively limited. We support upgrading the Middle Fork Loop Trail for bicycles if it can be designed sustainably and rerouted out of wet areas. We support and would love to see the whole Middle Fork Trail open for biking; linking 406a and 406c with 406e and 438a would provide a nice looped trail system. Modify trail tread and relocate when needed to improve sustainability; install drainage and install or fix bridges when necessary. Some bikers already use the Middle Fork Trail, and with minimal improvements, it would be a fine single-track bike trail without detriment to other users.</p> <p>I support the proposed new trail 406e-f connecting to Hidden Lake as a winter trail for skiers and allowing bicycles.</p> | <p>Concur. The trail plan recommends upgrading all trails to meet sustainable standards and specifically rerouting this trail to address the resource problems. A detailed trail assessment will determine where and what type of work, such as rerouting segments of the trail that are subject to erosion, bridges, etc., will be needed to bring the trail up to sustainable standards.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| <p>Middle Fork Loop Trail and Extension- Oppose Bicycle Use</p> | <p>These trails should be for hikers only as they access some of the wildest country adjacent to the Hillside development. Heavy bike use would negatively impact these fragile trails. Also oppose opening to bicycle use because this currently provides the only relatively long flat trail for hiking in natural surroundings between two trailheads.</p> | <p>The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. A portion of the Middle Fork Trail is currently open to bicycle use, therefore it makes sense to design, improve, and manage the complete trail loop for bicycle use, since it is the most demanding use and design requirement. By doing so, the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. It is understood that in order to meet the sustainable standards set forth in this plan and the Division’s Trail Management Policy, segments of this trail will need to be rerouted to address resource problems. The plan has identified a number of trails within the park’s trail system that will be designed, improved, and managed for hikers only.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Middle Fork Loop Trail Extension (406e) | Please don't build trail 406e-f- the Middle Fork to Hidden Lake Trail- for either hikers or bikes. I strongly disagree with this proposed trail. This area is of high wilderness value and wildlife value that requires protection. Users walking the Powerline Trail often see moose, wolves, and bears across the creek on that side. Moose congregate not far from the proposed trail during rutting season, providing some of the best wildlife viewing in Alaska. That side of the valley provides a kind of refuge for the wildlife from all the park users. A trail here would not only negatively impact the superior wildlife viewing opportunities and the wilderness values of those walking the Powerline, O'Malley, Hidden Lakes, Flattop trails, but it would also fragment wildlife habitat, forcing wildlife to cross a loop trail to get to the creek, thus increasing human/wildlife conflicts. | This area and trail are outside of the park's wilderness zone and to the best of DNR's knowledge, based on a review of habitat information and consultation with ADF&G, construction of a trail in this area will cause no significant impact on wildlife or their movement. However, the trail may provide the public with additional opportunities for wildlife viewing and a new loop option. | No change. |
| Middle Fork Loop Trail- Add Additional Extension | We encourage you to consider an additional trail extension connecting the Middle Fork Loop Trail (trail 406e) to the Powerline Trail near Green Lake (425e) for an upland option and loop trail. When combined with 406a, c, e and 425 it would form an approximate 16-mile looped trail. | The plan recommends a number of loop opportunities in the Hillside unit and specifically linking trails 406 and 425 via existing and proposed trails. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| <p>Middle Fork Campbell Creek- Oppose Bicycle Use</p> | <p>On the whole, the new plan favors bicycles too much on class 2 and 3 types of trails, many of the trails are muddy until July.</p> <p>The Middle Fork of Campbell Creek is very muddy most of early summer and then again in August and September. Please take bicycles out on the Middle Fork and keep them off class 2 trails.</p> | <p>The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. By designing certain trails within the park’s trail system for bicycle use, the most demanding design requirements, the trails will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling their intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. Each Designed Use has specific design parameters which vary under each Trail Class and provide guidance for the assessment, survey, design, construction, repair, and maintenance of the trails. All trail recommendations included in this plan follow the Division’s Trail Management Policy, which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained will follow the sustainable design framework.</p> <p>The trail plan does not recommend trail 408, the only trail within the Middle Fork Campbell Creek drainage, be designed or managed for bicycle use. The Designed Use for this trail is Hiker, Class 2. In order to meet sustainable standards set forth in this plan and the Division’s Trail Management Policy, segments of this trail will likely need to be rerouted during upgrades to address erosion and resource degradation.</p> | <p>No change.</p> |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Williwaw Lakes Trail (408) | Chugach State Park has an opportunity to turn the Williwaw Lakes Trail into the showcase of the park. This trail has a gentle slope, connected to a large parking lot/trailhead, and the distance is suited to most hikers. Consider improving this trail, by widening it in some places, fixing the mudholes and making the trail more aesthetically pleasing to all visitors. | Concur. The trail plan recommends upgrading all trails to meet sustainable standards set forth in the Division's Trail Management Policy and in this plan and specifically rerouting segments of this trail to address resource degradation. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate alignment and work needed to bring the trail up to sustainable standards. | No change. |
| Spencer Loop Connector Trail (409a-b) | Support allowing bicycles on this trail both summer and winter (trails 409a-b), but would recommend upgrading to a Class 4 terra trail not Class 3 terra. The multi-use trail provides 4-season connectivity between FNBP and CSP and needs to be a Class 4 to be groomed by piston bully. The MOA intends this trail on municipal land to be 4 season multi-use meaning all modes of non-motorized travel should be permitted including winter bicycles. | Our recent review of the January 2011 Far North Bicentennial Park Trail Improvement Plan indicates that the recommendations in the Chugach State Park draft trail plan for the Terra and Snow Trail segments (409a-b) are still compatible to the linking trail segments in Far North Bicentennial Park. By designing and managing trail segment 409b for Nordic Ski, Trail Class 4 it will match up nicely with the neighboring trail segment and provide a continuous grooming surface. While bicyclists will be allowed to use this trail year-round once regulation is changed, trail segment 409b will only be managed for Nordic Ski and Skijor uses. A number of trails managed for bicycle use are provided in the vicinity and they offer a number of loop options for winter use in the Hillside unit. | No change. |
| Spencer Loop Connector Trail (409a-b) | Nordic Skiing Assoc. of Anchorage envisions there to be two connecting trails, an up trail and a down trail which is not shown on your map, to link up to trails in FNBP. The down trail would be a short segment from the Prospect parking lot to the upper gas line in FNBP. This will create a loop starting at Prospect as well as allowing for a one way trail from Hilltop to Prospect and back down. | Concur. Based on a review of the January 2011 Far North Bicentennial Park Trail Improvement Plan, it is appropriate to modify the final Chugach State Park trail plan to include a short trail segment that connects and is compatible to the linking trail segment in Far North Bicentennial Park. | This trail recommendation will be added to the final plan, and will encompass a Class 4 Snow Trail designed for Nordic Ski and managed for Nordic Ski and Skijor uses and a Class 3 Terra Trail designed for Bicycle and managed for Bicycle and Hiker. This will provide compatible connectivity to the Far North Bicentennial Park trail system and a continuous grooming surface in winter. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|---|---|
| Llama Trail (410b) | The summer classification for Llama Trail (410a) is Class 2 Pack and Saddle. The trail corridor on both municipal and state land is narrow, the ceiling is low and the trail tread is narrow and primitive. It offers intermediate and advanced mountain bikers a technical challenge to hone their skills, and is ill-suited for grooming. This trail and the new singletrack trails in the area provide great skiing. The narrow twisty rolling ungroomed trails are suitable for backcountry skiing in winter and are popular as is. Recommend designing trail 410b to sustainable Class 2 standards as opposed to Class 3, and oppose the widening of Llama to permit grooming for nordic skiing. There are plenty of highly manicured ski trails in Anchorage for those who want them and more are planned for in the future in Far North Bicentennial Park. | Concur. Our review of the January 2011 Far North Bicentennial Park Trail Improvement Plan indicates that the recommendations in the Chugach State Park draft trail plan for the Terra trail segment (410a) is still compatible to the linking trail segments in Far North Bicentennial Park. However, the Far North Bicentennial Park Trail Improvement Plan does not make recommendations for a Snow or winter trail linking to this segment (410b); therefore, it is appropriate to modify the Chugach State Park trail plan recommendation to better match up with the neighboring trail segments. | The trail plan will be revised to change the Designed Use of trail 410b to Cross-Country Ski, Trail Class 2 with Ski, Bicycle, and Hiker as Managed Use to provide compatible connectivity to the Far North Bicentennial Park trails. |
| South Fork Rim Trail (412a) | Support trail 412a as contained in the plan. | Concur. | No change. |
| Alder Trail (415)- Add Bicycle as Winter Managed Use | Support trails 415a-b as contained in the plan and recommend adding bicycle use on the Alder Trail (trails 415c-d) since it is proposed to allow use in the summer on trails 415a-b. The terrain is very appropriate for mountain biking, and the new trail combined with trail 424 would provide an enjoyable Class 3 connector from Glen Alps Trailhead to Alder and South Fork Rim trails to the north and down below. Currently, the only north/south, up/down trail options are the Class 4-5 utility corridors. | Bicyclists will be allowed to use this trail year-round once the regulation is changed but the management intent for the trail segments will be for Nordic Ski and Skijor uses. A number of trails specifically managed for bicycle use are provided in the vicinity and they offer a number of loop options for winter use in the Hillside unit. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|---|--|
| Preserve Area Between Gasline & Powerline Trails- Oppose New Trails 415 & 424 | Oppose dicing up the area between the Gasline (415b, 415d, 424c, 424d) and Powerline Trails. There is no need for a third multi-use trail to serve that area. It would adversely affect wildlife and damage existing neighborhood trails and perhaps destroy the current visual and sonic barriers which separate users on those two trails. | The park was established to provide recreational opportunities for the people by providing areas for specified uses and constructing the necessary facilities in those areas. The Powerline and Gasline trails follow existing easements which were established before the park was created. These utility corridors were never designed with recreation in mind. They are old service roads and the alignments are wide, straight, and steep in places. As an alternative to the Class 4 easement trails, the decision was made to provide a more park-like trail that will be designed to a Trail Class 3 with gentler grades and more sinuosity. There has been no indication from ADF&G that would suggest adverse impacts to wildlife would occur from construction of a trail in this area. | No change. |
| White Spruce Trail (416a-b)- Add Bicycle as Winter Managed Use | Support trail 416a as contained in plan and recommend adding bicycle use on the White Spruce Trail (trail 416b) since it is allowed in summer on trail 416a. | Concur. | The trail plan will be modified to include Bicycle as a Managed Use on trail 416b. |
| Replace Bridge Connecting Blueberry Hollow & Middle Fork Trails and Add New Trail Segment Connecting Middle Fork Campbell Creek with Powerline | Consider restoring the bridge over South Fork and building a short connection trail from Middle Fork (406c) back to the Powerline Trail (425a) and Blueberry Hollow (417a) along the South Fork overlook, so users can loop back to Prospect or Glen Alps trailheads without doing the entire current distance back up. The trail exists but the bridge is no longer there. | Concur. Based on public input and on further analysis of the existing trails in the area, the final plan will recommend improving and managing the user developed trail that links the Middle Fork Loop Trail to Blueberry Hollow Trail across the Campbell Gorge. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate trail alignment and bridge location, as well as work needed to bring the trail up to sustainable standards. | This trail recommendation will be added to the final plan, and will encompass a Class 2 trail designed and managed for Hiker-Pedestrian. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|--|---|
| Blueberry Hollow Trail (417a-b)- Add Summer & Winter Bicycle Use | Support adding bicycle use on Blueberry Hollow Trail (trails 417a-b) summer and winter. It is a reasonable sustainable trail that has some of the best “flow” of any trails in the Chugach front range. | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. These trails are intended as a Terra Trail designed and managed for hiking and a Snow Trail designed and managed for cross-country skiing. A number of trails designed and managed for bicycle use are provided in the vicinity and provide a number of loop options for both summer and winter use in the Hillside unit. | No change. |
| Gasline Trail (419b-c)- Add Bicycle as Winter Managed Use | Support adding bicycle use on Gasline Trail (trails 419b-c). | Concur. | The trail plan will be modified to include Bicycle as a Managed Use on trails 419b-c. |
| Groom Trails in Glen Alps Area | Groom trails in the Glen Alps area, at the least during good snow conditions, or winters when snow conditions in the lower part of Anchorage is poor. | The grooming of ski trails in Chugach State Park is performed by park staff and is typically done soon after adequate snow fall. However, the park has very limited staff and the rangers are responsible for all aspects of managing the front and back-country facilities and areas of the park. Trail grooming is sometimes a lower priority than other staff duties thus it can be particularly challenging at times to respond quickly to groom the trails. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|--|--|
| Snowmachine Use- Glen Alps Area | <p>I am a snowmachiner, but I suggest closing snowmachine use in the Glen Alps area. The snowmobile area is seldom open due to inadequate snow cover to protect the vegetation from the machines and the machines from the rocks and seldom remains open due to high winds that expose the alpine zone in the South Fork Campbell Creek valley. There are often people hiking or skiing in the area, sometimes with dogs, it is a dangerous combination. It is senseless to have it designated as a snowmachine area.</p> <p>Instead give snowmachiners more area around Turnagain Pass and south.</p> <p>I do not support Hillside Unit snow trails 419d and 425b & c. Close trails 419d and 425b & c snow trails permanently to motorized use. And resource damage is occurring on trail 438c, Hidden Creek Trail.</p> | <p>Park regulations stipulate the areas to be open to snowmobile use when the snow depth is adequate to protect the underlying vegetation. Snowmobile use is a traditional and legitimate use in the area. The number of areas in the park open to snowmobile use is limited but they are important since the park was established to provide recreational opportunities for the people by providing areas for specified uses. The area around Turnagain Pass and south are outside of Chugach State Park and governed by other entities.</p> <p>The trail plan seeks to preserve existing experiences where appropriate. Since a portion of the south fork of Campbell Creek is already open by regulation to snowmobile use it makes sense to design, improve, and manage the trails leading from the parking lot to the designated open area for snowmobile use. Snowmobiles have the most demanding design requirements so designing trails for this use will provide sustainable trails that conform to the terrain and environment, are capable of handling their intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. The trail plan does not recommend trail 425b or 438c be designed or managed for snowmobile use.</p> | No change. |
| Shebanof Avenue Connector Trail (422b)- Add Bicycle as Winter Managed Use | Support adding bicycle use on Shebanof Ave Trail (trail 422b) since it is proposed as allowed in the summer on trail 422a. | Concur. | The trail plan will be modified to include Bicycle as a Managed Use on trail 422b. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Upper Huffman Snowmobile Trail (423a-c)- Add Bicycle as Winter Managed Use | Support adding bicycle use on Upper Huffman Snowmobile Trails 423a-c. | While bicyclists are allowed to use trails and areas open to the use of snowmobiles under 11 AAC 20.040, these trail segments will be managed for snowmobile use. A number of trails managed for bicycle use are provided in the vicinity which offer a number of loop options for winter use in the Hillside unit. | No change. |
| Upper Huffman Snowmobile Trails (423a-c) | The inbound and outbound snowmobile corridors were designed to avoid head on accidents and reduce speed to and from the parking lot and are not a problem during winter. The problem lies during summer use. The outbound corridor is near an underground spring or some type of water source making the trail extremely soft and muddy for use. Either close this section down during the summer or reroute the corridors and have both inbound and outbound share a common corridor to the power line. | Park managers have decided to establish a Class 5 two-lane snowmobile trail that leads initially from the parking lot to a separate inbound and outbound trail in order to provide a tool to help improve management. By designing one trail, park managers will only have one gate to manage from the parking lot and the inbound and outbound trail segments that are not sustainable can be rerouted or closed. | No change. |
| Upper Huffman Trailhead | Parking is limited at the Upper Huffman Trailhead and needs expanding to avoid conflicts with homeowners along Sultana Drive. | Concur; however, the trail plan does not make recommendations for facility development. | No change. |
| Hemlock Burn Trail (424c) | I fully and enthusiastically support the proposed new trail 424c connecting Glen Alps to Upper Huffman Trailhead. This will take some pressure off the Glen Alps parking lot/trailhead area. | Concur. | No change. |
| Hemlock Burn Trail (424d)- Add Bicycle as Winter Managed Use | Recommend adding bicycle use on the Hemlock Burn Trail (trail 424d) since it is allowed in the summer on trail 424c. Support four season multi-use trail. | Bicyclists will be allowed to use this trail year-round once regulation is changed but the trail segment will be managed for Nordic Ski and Skijor uses. A number of trails managed for bicycle use are provided in the vicinity and they offer a number of loop options for winter use in the Hillside unit. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|--|---|
| Hemlock Spur Trail (424a) | I support trail 424a as contained in the plan. It provides a useful connector between the new 424c trail and Powerline Trail. | Concur. | No change. |
| Hemlock Spur Trail (424b)- Add Bicycle as Winter Managed Use | Support adding bicycle use on Hemlock Spur Trail (trail 424b) since allowed in the summer on trail 424a. | Bicyclists will be allowed to use this trail year-round once regulation is changed but the trail segment will be managed for Nordic Ski and Skijor uses. A number of trails managed for bicycle use are provided in the vicinity and they offer a number of loop options for winter use in the Hillside unit. | No change. |
| Need More Than Just Trail 425a in Hillside Area Open to Horse Use | The largest horse community resides in Hillside area, this area needs loop connectivity, and trails originating from the residential areas. | The State recognizes the concerns raised by the equestrian community in reference to the need for additional trails designed and managed for horse use and loop options in the hillside area. The final trail plan will be modified to include additional trails in the Hillside unit designed and managed for Pack & Saddle. | Revise plan: see trails 400a, 404a, 419a, and 421a. |
| Little O'Malley Peak & Ballfield Trails (436 & 437) | Consider improving the connector trail from the Powerline to the Ballfield. Due to the amount of use this area gets the trail should be a class 3 and not a class 2. The current braided trail is up a steep slope and is an eyesore from the major erosion. The trail in its current condition is a significant physical barrier to many people and should be improved so more people can access this beautiful spot. | Concur in part. The Designed Use for these trail segments is Hiker, Class 2. This Trail Class was applied to these trail segments because it most closely matches the general criteria for a trail requiring more advanced skills to traverse and the desired management intent to provide diverse experiences in the area. In order to meet sustainable standards set forth in this plan and the Division's Trail Management Policy, it is expected that a number of segments along these trails will likely need to be rerouted to address resource degradation due to steep grades and fall-line alignment. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate alignment. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Hidden Lake Trail (438a)- Oppose Bicycle Use | This trail provides access to some of the more wild areas of the Park adjacent to Anchorage. Allowing bicycles would take away from the wilderness experience one can have there. | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. This trail was identified in order to tie into the existing trail system where bicycles are currently allowed and to provide an additional loop option for park users. Only a short segment (438a) of the Hidden Lake Trail will be designed, improved, and managed for Bicycle use. All trails beyond the trail 406e and 438a junction are to be designed and managed for hiking only. | No change. |
| Hidden Lake Trail- Add Bike Rack | A bike rack at the trailhead of Hidden Lake Trail would be a good idea. Wet areas are increasing trail damage; the trail needs some drainage control/boardwalks. | Concur. A bicycle rack is being built at this time to be installed at this location at a later date. | No change. |
| Hidden Lake Trail (438b) | The Hidden Lake Trail (438b) should remain a class 2 hiker/pedestrian trail and not improved to class 3. It is wonderful the way it is. | The Designed Use for this trail segment is Hiker, Class 3. This Trail Class was applied to this trail segment because it most closely matches the general criteria for a trail which receives moderate to heavy use, is moderately easy hiking for users with intermediate skill level and experience, is appropriate for users with minimal orienteering skills, and provides a transition to lower class trails further in the backcountry. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| Ship Lake Pass Trail (439) | The Ship Lake Pass Trail (439) should remain Class 1 hiker/pedestrian and not improved to Class 2. It is wonderful as is. | This plan assigns each trail or trail segment an appropriate Trail Class to meet a trail prescription that describes the desired management intent for the trail or trail segment. The prescription takes into account user preferences, setting, protection of sensitive resources, and other management activities. A Class 2 trail is to be designed and managed as a simple trail with minor development or constructed features that typically receives low-to-moderate use involving advanced skills and capability of traveling over awkward obstacles. This trail segment plays a key role in transitioning hikers from a moderately developed trail to a minimally or undeveloped trail further in the backcountry. | No change. |
| Backside Flattop Trail (441) | I support the proposed trail 441 up the south/backside of Flattop Mountain, specifically to reduce the extent of erosion. The erosion caused by the multiple existing routes is blight. This heavily used trail should be a top priority for upgrading. | Concur. | No change. |
| Backside Flattop Trail Addition | Consideration should be given to connecting this trail to Section 36 via the Rabbit Creek greenbelt. | Because the majority of the greenbelt is outside of the park and governed by other entities, the decision was made to not commit resources to building this trail segment at this time. Should an organized trail be established on the other agency lands, the park could, at a later date, provide a connection. For now, this area will be left undeveloped to preserve a certain type of recreational experience. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Backside Flattop Trail Additional Loop | Add a trail up Peak 3, to form a loop with the proposed trail 441 up Peak 2. The Peak 3 slope already receives thousands of users in three seasons, including mountain runners-in-training. Trails up Peak 2 (441) and Peak 3 should be a priority for upgrading both to stop erosion and denuding and to reduce user conflict by spreading people out. | A conscious decision has been made through this plan to not commit resources or manage certain areas for visitor use that include some routes and “social trails” within the park. These areas are not being ignored but rather recognize that some area should be left undeveloped to preserve a certain type of recreational experience. Additionally, the plan recommends a number of loop opportunities in this area. | No change. |
| Rabbit Creek Valley Trailhead/Access | Major improvements need to be done at the trailhead serving the proposed new trail 441 (backside flattop) such as decent parking and restrooms. Put in a fee station to pay for it. A new parking lot needs to be built on the newly acquired inholding land. The upper reaches of DeArmoun Road need to be improved to provide safe access and parking for a high volume of summer and winter users. | Concur, however access and road and trailhead improvements are beyond the scope of this plan and are addressed in the Chugach Access Plan and in the facility section of the overall management plan. | No change. |
| Rabbit Lake Trail (442)- Support Bicycle Use | Support upgrading Rabbit Lake Trail to allow bicycles. It would be a great mountain biking trail and is a former road bed up to 1 mile from the lake. The trail is already very popular among bikers, so a regulation change is needed. | Concur. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|--|
| Rabbit Lake & McHugh Creek Trails (442 & 502)- Bicycle Use | Support trail 442 as a designed use for bicycles as a class 3 trail but there needs to be a newly constructed trail with loop trails above and below the existing old roadbed. Trails needs to be well defined and signed above treeline to prevent random bike use in fragile alpine zone and limit riding to the designated trail. The 502 valley trail will become attractive for mountain bikes that have traveled up trail 442 to Rabbit Lake. The decision whether or not to allow mountain bikes on 502 should be made now. If mountain bikes are not allowed, that policy will require deterring bike use through trail design and enforcement. | Concur. This is a valid concern that park managers have considered. Trail 442 will be improved and managed for bicycles since a significant portion of the trail follows an old homestead road dating back to before the park was established. Trail 502 will be improved and managed for hikers only. By designing and improving trail 442 for bicycle use, the most demanding use and design requirements, the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. It is appropriate to include additional recommendations for better signage and possible loop design to trail 442. It is understood that enforcement measure may be required once the regulation is changed to allow bicycle use on trail 442. | Revise text to include that trail 442 should be designed in such a way as to discourage bicycle use beyond its terminus. |
| Rabbit Lake Trail (442) | The upper Rabbit Creek Valley is one of the most scenic areas of the park and should be kept at hiker only status. If bikes are allowed to go to Rabbit Lake, it would be difficult to regulate their use beyond that point | See above. | No change. |
| Ptarmigan Pass Trail (443)- Add Summer & Winter Bicycle Use | Would like to see bicycle access from Rabbit Lake Trail to Powerline Trail via Ptarmigan Pass (trail 443). | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. Trails designed and managed for bicycle use are provided elsewhere in the park's trail system. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-----------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Grandview Trail (444) | <p>Extend trail 444, Grandview. As shown, this trail is just under a mile and terminates at a knoll. Hikers will tend not to terminate at the knoll and will continue along the ridgetop to McHugh Peak. Extend a trail to McHugh Peak. Also, the existing trail 444 is poorly aligned up the fall-line on steep terrain and erosion is taking place. Hikers are already creating a network of alternate trails. Another trail to the south has actually been in use longer, and is along a better and easier hike. Specify in the trail matrix that trail 444 needs to be re-aligned so that it traverses along the west side of the ridge when it rises above private property in Bear Valley.</p> | <p>The decision was made to manage a short segment of trail leading from the Grandview Trailhead to the ridge in order to provide and preserve a certain type of recreational experience. Additionally, parking at the Grandview location is very limited and there is no room for expansion; therefore, the main access and trails in this region will have to be located elsewhere. The Chugach Access Plan identifies several options for addressing access in this area in order to provide additional parking and recreational opportunities. Once a trailhead is established in the McHugh Peak area, site specific planning will take place and the locations and alignments of the associated trails will be determined. The series of trails that will originate from this new location will be designed and built to a sustainable standard in keeping with the Division's Trail Management Policy and trail management plan.</p> | No change. |
| Grandview Trail Parking Lot | <p>Enlarge the parking lot for the Grandview Trail (444) to accommodate more than a few cars that can currently park there. It's far too small for the use that trail gets. The new trail that zigzags up to the ridge needs better signage, and will need to be monitored for erosion.</p> <p>The private property/no trespassing signs on a private gate need to be removed. These signs deter some public users from proceeding into the parking area.</p> | <p>This trailhead and a short segment of the trail are outside of Chugach State Park and governed by other entities. The small trailhead was platted to accommodate approximately 3-5 vehicles at the end of the publicly dedicated road and cul-de-sac which is completely surrounded by private parcels resulting in no room for expansion at this location. The small informational kiosk located at the trailhead was erected by the local community. While the state has no control over the management, improvement, or design of this trailhead, the Chugach Access Plan does identify several options for addressing access in this area.</p> | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|
| McHugh Peak Area Trailhead/Access | CSP needs to secure permanent trailhead parking and trail access easements in the vicinity now to preserve this historical route up to McHugh Peak and take pressure off of Glen Alps parking/trailhead. | Concur, however access and trailhead acquisition and improvements are not the purview of this plan and are addressed in the Chugach Access Plan and the facility section of the overall management plan. | No change. |
| McHugh Peak Trail (445) | I wholeheartedly support the concept of developing a new trail to McHugh Peak (trail 445) which will improve access in a currently undeveloped area, accommodate future growth, and take pressure off Glen Alps. | Concur. | No change. |
| McHugh Peak Area Trails (445) & Access | No trails for McHugh Peak are shown in the CSP draft. The McHugh Peak area is a real question mark in CSP planning, and depends heavily on three things. 1) Coordination and planning with the MOA, 2) coordination and acquisition effort with conservation groups, 3) getting more funding allocated to land acquisition and trailhead development. | Concur. See below. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| McHugh Peak Area Trails (445) | The “bubble” for proposed McHugh Peak trails needs to be replaced with three specific trail routes. The current bubble handicaps rather than helps the MOA and private efforts to identify a suitable trailhead and parking area, because reluctant neighborhoods can argue to “put the trailhead somewhere else.” CSP needs to take the initiative and map the best trails according to terrain and recreation demand. That gives MOA planners and the public a target so they can focus their efforts to obtain easements to the park boundary at the intended locations for trails. The Western Rib from Stewart Homestead Road (which is a worn, informal trail needing a formal route to protect the side-slopes it traverses from erosion), the Rib North of Little Rabbit Creek Headwaters, and the Potter Ridge to McHugh Peak and Grandview trails merit a place on your map. The trails from the west side offer the possibility of a loop with a proposed trail outside the CSP. | A bubble is used to depict the recommendation for a series of trails designed and managed for hikers in the McHugh Peak area. The decision was made, in consultation with the Municipality of Anchorage, to include the “bubble” as a means of identifying the general area suitable for trailhead acquisition since the trailhead may likely be sited on lands outside of the park boundary. The exact sustainable alignments of associated trails in this area cannot be determined until a trailhead is acquired and/or established in the McHugh Peak and Potter Valley areas. Once trailhead locations are determined, site specific planning will take place to identify the sustainable alignments of the trails. This is in keeping with the Division’s Trail Management Policy which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained will follow the sustainable design framework. Please refer to the Chugach Access Plan for additional information and options for addressing access in this region. | The trail plan will be revised to include additional language to clarify that the trail recommendation for 445 denotes a series of Class 2-3 trails designed and managed for Hiker-Pedestrian and not just a single trail. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|---|---|
| McHugh Peak Complex Loop Trail Addition | The backside of Potter Ridge could be a good loop trail, extending from Johnson Trail up to the ridge leading to McHugh Peak and Grandview, providing a very scenic route and a connection from the Potter Marsh and Potter Creek area to the McHugh Peak area and beyond. A traditional trail used for years exists, but is now being taken up with development. The optimal trail would follow the actual ridge, but portions are on private land. Encourage State to work with MOA and other organizations to try to acquire land for this route, as it follows a more natural walking route. If optimal alignment is not feasible/possible, then a trail along the park boundary should be established. The trail would connect in to other trails leading to Grandview and Baldy. | Concur in part. It is appropriate to include a recommendation in the final plan for a trail in this area that originates from a proposed trailhead. However, a bubble similar to one used for trail 445 will be used since the exact location of the proposed trailhead and the alignment for a sustainable trail in the Potter Valley/Ridge area are unknown at this time. Once a trailhead is acquired and/or established then the location of the associated trail can be determined through site specific planning. This is in keeping with the Division's Trail Management Policy which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained follow the sustainable design framework. The Chugach Access Plan has additional information on addressing access in this region. | Plan will be modified to include a bubble for a trail in the Potter Valley/Ridge area. The recommendation will include a Class 3 trail designed and managed for Hiker-Pedestrian. |
| McHugh Peak Complex Loop Trail Addition | Add a new link from trail 502 up to McHugh Peak. There is ample parking at McHugh Creek Trailhead and there are social trails that need to be hardened and formalized. | Concur. | This trail recommendation will be added to the final plan, and will encompass a Class 2 trail designed and managed for Hiker-Pedestrian that creates a loop option from the McHugh Creek Trail to the McHugh Peak Ridge trails. |
| McHugh Peak Area Trails-Add Bicycle Use | I would like to see bicycle access from Rabbit Lake Trail to Bear and Potter Valley. | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. A number of trails managed for bicycle use are provided elsewhere in the Hillside unit. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Near Point & Wolverine Trails (401, 403- 405) | Plan calls for upgrading Near Point and Wolverine trails from class 2 to class 3. Please leave trails at class 2. A simple trail with only minor development is most appropriate for these areas. And improvements to a class 3 aren't necessary and will only mar the wilderness experience and negatively impact wildlife. Believe it is better to fix the current trail than upgrade. | This plan assigns each trail or trail segment an appropriate Trail Class to meet a trail prescription that describes the desired management intent for the trail or trail segment. The prescription takes into account user preferences, setting, protection of sensitive resources, and other management activities. A Trail Class 3 was applied to these trail segments because it most closely matches the general criteria for these trails which receive moderate to heavy use and provide a transition to lower class trails further in the backcountry. In order to meet sustainable standards set forth in this plan and the Division's Trail Management Policy, segments of these trails will likely need to be upgraded and rerouted to address resource degradation. | No change. |
| Near Point, Williwaw Lakes, Middle Fork Loop, & Hidden Lake Trails | The Near Point, Williwaw Lakes, Middle Fork Loop, and Hidden Lake trails should be repaired and/or rerouted before any trail upgrades are done. | Concur in part. In keeping with the Division's Trail Management Policy, these and all other trails within the park will need to be brought up to a sustainable standard in order to address and minimize resource degradation and lower maintenance costs in the future. By designing and upgrading each trail or trail segment for the most demanding Managed Use, the trail or segment will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate alignments and work needed to bring these trails up to sustainable standards. This will likely involve a number of trail segment reroutes. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|-------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Chugach Rim Trail | Could the plan simply mention the Chugach Rim Trail concept generated by the MOA L RTP and describe the need for further study, given resources and management issues. | The exact alignment for the complete Chugach Rim Trail is unknown at this time and until a trailhead is acquired and/or established in the McHugh Peak and Potter Valley areas, the locations of the associated trails are also unknown. Once trailhead locations are determined, site specific planning will take place and that will determine the sustainable alignments of the trails in the area. This is in keeping with the Division's Trail Management Policy which directs that any trail developed, improved, or maintained will follow the sustainable design framework. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|--|---|
| TURNAGAIN ARM UNIT | | | |
| Turnagain Arm Trail (501a-b) | Runners and walkers enjoy the existing experience of a trail meandering through the forest above Turnagain Arm. Please preserve this more intimate experience by changing it to a class 3 trail between Potter and Rainbow and a class 2 between Rainbow and Windy. | The trail segment between Potter and Windy Corner receives heavy use, is easy hiking for users with minimal skill level and experience, and is appropriate for users with minimal or no orienteering skills. The actively managed existing uses, user preferences and setting were taken into account to determine the Trail Class. Trail Class 4 was applied because it most closely matches the general criteria for this type of trail and the management objectives identified by the park and the public. | No change. |
| McHugh Peak- Re-establish Trail Segment from McHugh Creek to Ridge | Restore the over-grown original trail up McHugh Creek from the McHugh day-use area on the Seward Highway to the Potter Ridge/McHugh Peak Ridge. This trail will be used for a longer season than the west routes because it is south-facing and has ample, existing paved parking and toilets at the day-use area. | Concur. | This trail recommendation will be added to the final plan, and will encompass a Class 2 trail designed and managed for Hiker that creates a loop option from the McHugh Creek Trail to the McHugh Peak Ridge. |
| McHugh Creek Trail (502) & Connection to Rabbit Lake Trail (442) | Support allowing bicycle on trail 502 and would like to see a connection to Rabbit Lake Trail. | The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. The management intent for this trail (502) seeks to preserve this trail as one designed and managed for hiking. Trails designed and managed for bicycle use are provided elsewhere in the park's trail system. | No change. |
| McHugh Creek Trail (502) | This trail is a favorite of many hikers; however it could use some brushing out in the lower portions. | Concur. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|---|---|---|
| McHugh Loop Trail (505b) & Connection to Rainbow Peak Trail (506) | <p>I support the new trail segment 505b McHugh Loop Trail.</p> <p>Consider a future connection from 505b to above brush line on Rainbow Peak to make a loop with 506.</p> | <p>Concur.</p> <p>The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. In this case, a conscious decision has been made to preserve a relatively undeveloped type of recreational experience. This route is not being managed for visitor use nor is the park going to commit resources for trail development in this area.</p> | No change. |
| Falls Creek Trail (507a-b) | <p>Leave Falls Creek Trail at a Class 2. Don't improve it to a Class 3. It's not necessary, and will only mar the wilderness experience and negatively impact wildlife. The trail is too steep for the proposed upgrades with little room for widening, and the upgrade will increase impacts. Every trail cannot be accessible to every user group, only every hiker. Nor should every trail be upgraded just because.</p> | Concur. | The trail plan will be revised to change Trail 507a to a Class 2 trail designed and managed for Hikers. |
| Falls Creek Trail (507a-b) | <p>The Falls Creek Trail is quite steep with a clay rich bed in many places. As such it can get quite slick and dangerous for walking during periods of wet weather. The addition of switchbacks to lessen trail grades would be a welcome upgrade.</p> | Concur. | No change. |
| Indian Valley Trail (509b)- Bicycle Use | <p>We support adding bicycle use on Indian Valley Trail.</p> | <p>The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. The management intent for this trail is a Snow Trail designed for cross-country skiing. A number of trails designed and managed for bicycle use are provided in the vicinity that also provide a loop option.</p> | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|--|---|
| Bird Creek Valley Trail System (515) & Connection to Penguin Creek Trail (519) | Support upgrading trails 515a-b as contained in the plan, and recommend a motorized loop trail formed by connecting the Bird Creek and Penguin Creek trails, preferably connecting the ends of trails/old logging roads. Also, replace existing bridges with one bridge upstream from existing location; connectivity can be accomplished by making trail a "one way" for ATVs. All this would help reduce damage to existing trails and reduce conflicts. ATV options are very limited in Chugach State Park. | Concur. Park managers hope to have a professional trail assessment and detailed trail layout/plan completed in the future for the Bird Creek Valley Trail System in order to enhance both summer and winter motorized recreation in the valley by utilizing more of the existing logging roads and trails and creating a series of loop options designed to provide for a range of recreational riding experiences and skills while deterring illegal use in closed areas and off-trail use. | The trail plan will be revised to include additional language for the Bird Creek Valley Trail System to note that a comprehensive site plan is needed that includes connector and looped trails and other design features to better facilitate motorized use. |
| Bird Creek Valley Trail System (515c-d) | Support trails 515c-d as contained in the plan. | Concur. | No change. |
| Bird Pass Trail (517) | Support trail 517 as contained in the plan. | Concur. | No change. |
| Bird Pass Trail (517) | Support a new foot bridge across Bird Creek along trail 517 to make Bird Pass more accessible and upgrading trail 517 to a class 3 terra/hiker trail from a class 2. | The Designed Use for this trail segment is Pack & Saddle, Class 2. This Trail Class was applied to this trail segment because it most closely matches the general criteria and the most demanding use the trail usually receives. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate trail alignment and bridge locations if applicable, as well as work needed to bring the trail up to sustainable standards set forth in this plan and the Division's Trail Management Policy. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|
| South Fork Bird Creek Trail (518) | I do not support the proposed pack/saddle trail along South Fork Bird Creek (518). It seems like this low lying area would be severely negatively impacted by horses. This area is a Class B wetland (MOA standards) and would be costly to build a sustainable Class 2 trail. No trail should be proposed. | In keeping with the Division's Trail Management Policy, this and all other trails within the park will be developed, improved, and maintained to a sustainable standard in order to address and minimize resource degradation and lower maintenance costs in the future. By designing and upgrading each trail segment for the most demanding Managed Use, the trail will conform to the terrain and environment, be capable of handling its intended use without serious resource degradation, and ultimately require minimal maintenance. A detailed trail assessment will determine the appropriate alignment. | No change. |
| South Fork Bird Creek Trail (518) | Support trail 518 as contained in the plan. When combined with 515 and 517, this would make an epic out-and-back bike ride. | Concur. | No change. |
| Penguin Creek Trail (519a-b) | Support trails 519a-b as contained in the plan. This would make a beautiful loop trail combined with 515a. The terrain is interesting and well suited to singletrack. Recommend that it be constructed as a class 3 trail, not class 2. | Concur in part. The Trail Class 2 was applied to these trail segments because it most closely matches the general criteria for the trail. The Trail Class prescription takes into account setting, the protection of sensitive resources, and other management activities. | No change. |
| Bird Creek Valley Trail System- Motorized Use | Enforcement of motorized closures is very difficult unless, point of closure is right at trailhead, or there is a natural obstacle to motorized use right at the trailhead. For this reason no new trails that would be passable to motorized users should be created. Motorized users will use new trails regardless of designation. Trash/spills left by motorized users negatively affects Bird Creek when snow melts. | Motorized uses such as snowmobiling and ATVing are legitimate activities performed in specific areas of Chugach State Park specified in regulation. There are limited areas of the park open to motorized use and in the Bird Creek Valley, a number of old logging roads provide the motorized trail system. While some users may violate motorized closures, the occurrence is low. Closure violations are not limited to motorized users. | No change. |

| <u>Subject</u> | <u>Issue Summary</u> | <u>Response</u> | <u>Recommended Revision</u> |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Coastal Trail (522a) | I fully support and applaud the extension of the Coastal Trail from Indian to Potter along Turnagain Arm. The Girdwood to Indian bike trail is the most heavily used trail in Chugach State Park. I'd like to see trail 522a be the highest priority new trail, because it has the highest benefit to the greatest number of users with minimal wildlife and wilderness value impacts. Regulation changes should be done ASAP so funding can be applied for. A paved, separated pathway from Potter to Indian is sorely needed to give cyclists a safe alternative to riding the Seward Highway, which is such a narrow road with inadequate shoulders, gravel on the shoulder, and guard rails preventing escape; it doesn't lend itself at all to safe riding and it is equally dangerous for drivers. | Concur. | No change. |
| Abes & California Creek Trails (524 & 525) | The Girdwood Trails committee supports the connection between Abe' Creek and California Creek trails. This would make an excellent hiking loop for residents of the Girdwood valley. | Concur. | No change. |
| California Creek Trail (524b) | I support the level 1 & 2 trails as shown. It is important to provide all levels of hiking and skiing trails to satisfy the different users, it is also important to maintain some of the more primitive level of trail for the people looking for this type of experience. | The California Creek Trail is listed as Hiker-Pedestrian, Trail Class 2. The trail plan seeks to strike a balance between expanding recreational opportunities and preserving existing experiences. In some areas of the park, a conscious decision has been made to preserve a relatively undeveloped type of recreational experience. | No change. |
| Turnagain Arm Snowmobile Access | Allow snowmachine access to more areas south of Turnagain, e.g. Center Creek Gorge off of the Johnsons Pass Trail. | This area south of Turnagain and Turnagain Pass are outside of Chugach State Park and governed by other entities. | No change. |