

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING TESTIMONY  
COUNTYWIDE PARK TRAILS PLAN AMENDMENT  
February 6, 2003**

<b>Speaker</b>	<b>Summary of Testimony</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
<p>Northwood-Four Corners Civic Assn (Chs. Pritchard)</p>	<p>Must address major problem of trail user competition: what user groups should be allowed or permitted on trails?</p> <p>Shared use trails not panacea and require monitoring and enforcement.</p> <p>Decided lack of balance in park trail system in regard to pedestrian users.</p> <p>Need places to find tranquility and true communion with nature.</p> <p>History of Countywide park Trails plan rather shifty.</p>	<p>The factors used to determine a trail's use category are listed on page 27 of the PH Draft, under Phase 3 of the Trail corridor Planning Process. The Sustainable Trail Initiative proposed in the packet includes a trail monitoring and maintenance element to assure permitted trail uses are being accommodated in an environmentally sound and socially responsible manner.</p> <p>Agree. Shared use trails will be designated in accord with criteria in the PH Draft Plan. Agree that monitoring and maintenance is an issue we need to address. The PH Draft Plan recommends more emphasis on these trail aspects in the future.</p> <p>Disagree. All trails in park system are open to hikers/pedestrians.</p> <p>Agree. The Plan does recognize that some trails should be "hiker only" in some cases for environmental reasons, in other cases to allow users the "tranquility" of a nature experience.</p> <p>The Countywide Park Trail Plan process included 20 public meetings, a Planning Board Public Hearing, 7 Planning Board work sessions, and a briefing of the County Council. The public was involved and informed at every step of the process.</p>
<p>Sustainable Montgomery (RG Steinman)</p>	<p>Absence of criteria to guide choice of hard vs. natural surface trail.</p> <p>Resource protection should be commanding principle in trail planning process.</p> <p>Achieving recreational goals is inconsistent with loss and degradation of resources.</p>	<p>The planning process and criteria used for hard surface trail planning is included in Table 2 (see Phase 3), and on page 29, question 4.</p> <p>Achieving a balance in terms of recreation, environment and transportation concerns was established by the Board and agreed to by the Council as a guiding principle in trail planning. The concept of balance is explained in more detail on pp 7-9 of the PH Draft.</p> <p>In a park system that mandates stewardship of natural plus</p>

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
<p>Maryland Native Plan Society (John Parrish)</p>	<p>Question legitimacy of Countywide Park Trails Plan.</p> <p>MNPS recommends that natural resource protection take precedence when deciding whether to accommodate recreation activities. We offer the following suggestions toward formulating criteria for the siting of hard and natural surface trails.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only natural surface trails should be permitted within forested areas. This will automatically minimize the width of trail corridor impacts.</li> <li>• Hard surface trails should never be constructed within designated biodiversity areas. For example, we are alarmed that the Plan calls for a paved trail through four biodiversity areas regardless of whether the ICC is ever build!</li> <li>• No new natural surface trails should be constructed within biodiversity areas unless it serves a purpose to reroute an existing environmentally damaging trail.</li> <li>• Only natural surface trails should be allowed in Conservation Parks.</li> <li>• Mountain biking should be restricted to non-forested sites such as old landfills &amp; old farms.</li> <li>• Bicycling in general should be accommodated on hard surface trails. Construction of hard surface trails should be sited in abandoned trail corridors, alongside new &amp; existing roads, through non-forested areas, old farm roads, and utility corridors. Wetlands, wetland buffers, habitats of rare species, &amp; steep slopes should be off limits to all new hard surface and natural surface trail construction.</li> </ul> <p>All corridors in Countywide Park Trail Plan need further study.</p>	<p>cultural resources and recreation, these will always be trade-offs among values.</p> <p>See previous response on this issue.</p> <p>The approach suggested here is inconsistent with the philosophy of trail planning embraced by the Planning Board and Council and outlined in the section entitled "Achieving Recreational and Environmental Protection Objectives" in the PH Draft Plan.</p> <p>Agree. The next Trail Corridor planned for study is the Northwest Brach Trail Corridor.</p>

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
<p>International Mountain Bicycling Assn, Maryland Chapter (David Scull)</p>	<p>Support idea of a trail corridor plan to recommend hard surface, natural surface or no trail.</p> <p>Provide flow chart to show how environmental data is used to determine siting of hard and natural surface trails.</p> <p>Include glossary of terms in plan.</p> <p>Appreciate using wording from an accord signed by the Sierra Club and IMBA in 1994.</p> <p>Concerned over following details: "environmental criteria" will become nightmare of cost, complexity unless clarified- they are guidelines.</p> <p>Bias that walking is acceptable but biking is not ignores positive experience with biking over past 5-10 years.</p> <p>Why can't MNCPPC shake its fears of using volunteers?</p>	<p>Agree. There will always be portions of a Trail Corridor where trails are not recommended and where informally created "people's choice" trails should be closed. It bears emphasis that people are using ALL parks; staff have not visited a park yet that does not show evidence of informal trails. The challenge is to direct human access to portions of the park that can sustain trail visitors and to direct people away from sensitive environmental and cultural features.</p> <p>Refer to text and chart in PH Draft Amendment.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Staff will rely on a combination of general criteria and best professional judgment.</p> <p>The PH Draft specifically recognizes biking as a legitimate use of park trails. MORE's commitment to building sustainable trails for biking and volunteering to build and maintain trails has been wonderful. The basic issue regarding mountain biking is distinguishing beyond those casual cyclists who want to enjoy a ride in the woods and those experienced mountain bikers who prefer challenging trail loops with many obstacles. This latter user group should be accommodated on specific mountain bike courses in recreational settings. Our park system needs to include this type of facility.</p> <p>We rely on park volunteers to help build and maintain natural surface trails. In the past 3 years, more than 3000 hours of volunteer trail time has been documented. Hiring a full-time Trail Volunteer Coordinator is essential to increased use of volunteers. The importance of implementing the 1998 Countywide Park Trail Plan recommendation to establish a Trail Blazer Volunteer program is reaffirmed by this Plan amendment.</p>

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
<p>Melanie Frank</p> <p>MORE: Mid-Atlantic Off-Road Enthusiasts (Austin Steo)</p>	<p>I love being outdoors and wish there were more places to ride my mountain bike.</p> <p>Most mountain bikers looking for a place to ride which has a minimum of about 8 to 10 miles – preferable in some form of loop. Mountain bikers have different skill levels and different trail expectations.</p> <p>Support shared use of natural surface trails. Otherwise concentrating user groups on few trails will increase risk of overuse.</p> <p>What does criterion related to "displacement of users" mean?</p> <p>Each trail user has special needs to respect and accept. We live in a society where different people and groups must share the same public land and country, and parks are not exception.</p> <p>Mountain bikes are perceived as having more impact on trails than other users. This is an inaccurate statement. Studies seem to suggest mountain bike impact falls somewhere between hikers and horse.</p> <p>Modern trail design methods are effective in creating trails that are both environmentally sustainable and enjoyable by all users.</p> <p>Ineffectual involvement of volunteers in trail building/maintenance. Need to fill Trail Volunteer Coordinator position.</p> <p>Support Trails Work Program.</p> <p>Trails Implementation Program seems too unwieldy.</p>	<p>Agree. The Public Hearing Draft distinguishes between bike riders on trails and those who seek a more challenging course. This latter group should be provided a facility in a park.</p> <p>Some trails should be "hiking only" not only for environmental reasons, but to accommodate those seeking solitude and quiet.</p> <p>This is trying to capture the situation where use of a shared use trail might become so heavy/intense that the enjoyment and safety of trail users begins to suffer. In these instances, the Trail Assessment Study may have to be revisited.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree. The Sustainable Trail Initiatives outlined in the packet are intended to improve new trail constructions and allow us to remedy existing trails in need of attention.</p> <p>Need to fill Trail Volunteer Coordinator position is emphasized in Plan Amendment.</p> <p>Agree. The Natural Surface Trail Planning Process is proposed to be modified (see packet).</p>

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
<p>Jed Prentice  Joe Foley  Jens Nielsen  Ronald Alt  Bob Caverly  Adam Cramer  Mickey Hall  Michael Kunst  Rob Kibler  Patrick McQuown  Joseph Romero  Scott Siegel  Ed Wallach</p>	<p>Support MORE testimony.</p>	
<p>Friends of Northwest Branch  (Ron Lacoss)</p>	<p>Appreciate effort to define policy that governs placement and use of trails in our parks.</p> <p>Concept that a sensitive ecological area such as a conservation park should be left primitive for the preservation of wildlife with recreational minimized or excluded does not exist. Direct staff to create a Conservation Corridor Planning Process, identify best natural areas, retain pristine conditions, may mean discouraging all forms of intrusion including hiking.</p> <p>Need conservation policy that carries equal weight to a policy that designs trails.</p> <p>Only 18% of survey respondents said "build recreational facilities" should be a priority.</p> <p>The great majority of citizens want natural paths in stream valleys and natural areas to preserve so they can enjoy nature, just like statistics have shown. Tear up the draft and think of connectivity with natural trails.</p>	<p>The concept of excluding ALL human access from certain parks is an issue that needs to be explored in a larger policy context than this Amendment. It should be noted that people's choice or informal trails are present in every park that staff have visited. The intent of trail planning is to channel people to areas of our park system that are most suitable for trail use and to avoid sensitive areas. Our policy is to protect the best natural areas wherever they occur.</p> <p>Agree; that policy is "balance."</p> <p>See packet for discussion of park surveys.</p>
<p>Burnt Mills Citizens Assoc. (Dan Wallace)</p>		<p>This approach would exclude the majority of county residents who need firm and stable trail surfaces to enjoy nature. As noted elsewhere, the number one use of hard surface trails is to enjoy nature.</p>

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
<p>City of Gaithersburg Bicycle Pedestrian Committee (Alan Migdoll)</p>	<p>Difficult challenge: provide park facilities for the benefit of all county residents while making every effort to get public input and accommodate specific individual concerns.</p> <p>General public loves trails but people are busy and often cannot find time to be involved in process.</p> <p>Keep in mind the benefits that park projects have on the overwhelming majority of our citizens who are not part of this process.</p> <p>Need more objective criteria to determine trail use.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Frank Ierardi</p>	<p>Add primitive trails as Special Focus: a blazed trail that leaves the ground ungraded, only removing dead wood and trimming back brush to make a path. Less environmental impact and more challenging.</p>	<p>A combination of general criteria coupled with staff's best professional judgment will work.</p> <p>Agree</p>
<p>Frances Ligler</p>	<p>Concerned about lobby to exclude or minimize recreational use on trails.</p> <p>Have helped construct, maintain trails through Potomac Bridle and Hiking Trails Association (PBHTA).</p> <p>Recreational trail riding is primary use of horses in Maryland and contributes to economy.</p> <p>We have a vested interest in maintaining the quality and environmental integrity of "our" parks.</p> <p>Riders are respectful of avoiding trails during bad weather.</p> <p>Nonmotorized trail bikes can be accommodated if directed to trails in higher, dryer areas.</p>	<p>Agree and extend our appreciation.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree</p>

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
<p>Sierra Club, Montgomery County Group (Jim Fary)</p>	<p>Sierra Club supports Trails Work Program.</p> <p>Sierra Club supports both hard and natural surface trails in our parks that are well planned and located so as not to damage the environment.</p> <p>Strongly object to opening all natural surface trails to potential multi use.</p> <p>Send Staff Draft to your environmental (not just recreational) planning staff to work on an objective policy to locate trails in an environmentally sensitive way.</p> <p>Must preserve natural surface trails for the 85-90% of park users who just want to have a peaceful, safe walk to enjoy nature in our parks.</p> <p>Strongly object to defining stewardship as balance.</p> <p>The Plan states " a Trail Corridor Plan is preceded by an environmental analysis." Has this ever been done by MNCPPC? Existing process is to first decide that a trail should be paved, then doing an environmental analysis to justify minimum impacts that can be mitigated. The recent environmental study of the proposed Matthew Henson paved trail has no environmental analysis. The decision to pave Muddy Branch was made without even an environmental study. Is MNCPPC really willing to change its existing process and will it use resources to really do an environmental analysis instead of the usual justification study? If so, this would be a radical, but beneficial policy change.</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>Nowhere in The PH Draft is this stated as a policy. The trail category will be determined on a case-by-case basis in accord with Trails Plan objective to seek balance between recreational and environmental objective.</p> <p>Such a policy already exists and is reinforced by this PH Draft that incorporates criteria endorsed by The Sierra Club.</p> <p>A "peaceful safe walk" is only be possible with hard surface trails for those with disabilities, for parents with strollers and young children. In fact, the number on e use of hard surface trails is to enjoy nature. For those seeking a rustic experience, this Plan Amendment includes "Hiking Only" natural surface trails and proposes a new category "Primitive" trails.</p> <p>Disagree-See Packet.</p> <p>This is a very disappointing testimony in light of the proposed process, which states an environmental analysis is the first step in the trail planning process. As staff has stated repeatedly in meetings with the Sierra Club, our mission is to balance environmental and recreational planning objectives. In terms of Muddy Branch, the Muddy Branch Trail Corridor Plan <u>removed</u> a hard surface trail from 2/3 of the stream valley for environmental reasons. The Facility Plan for Matthew Henson trail included in-depth environmental analysis and the project team included ecological expertise. It is absolutely untrue that environmental studies are only done after a trail route is selected.</p>

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
<p>Maryland Alliance for Greenway Improvement and Conservation (MAGIC) Bob Degroot</p>	<p>Include Park City Agreement</p> <p>People already control 87.5% of the land surface for their exclusive use.</p> <p>Trails plan completely avoids dealing with the problems associated with fragmentation of remaining wildlife habits in the county by trails.</p> <p>Trails in most parks should be confined to narrow, natural surface trails that can be enjoyed by nearly all people.</p> <p>Wide paved multi-user trails should be severely restricted or entirely eliminated from park plans.</p>	<p>The Agreement is included in the PH Draft criteria relating to natural surface trails.</p> <p>Disagree. This is listed as an impact that must be considered in the trail planning process.</p> <p>Agree that narrow, natural trails are preferred in areas of environmental significance but disagree these types of trails can be enjoyed by nearly all people. To allow people of all ages and mobility levels to enjoy the outdoors, some trails must have firm and stable surfaces and meet accessibility guidelines. The beauty of Montgomery County parks should not be limited to those fit enough to hike.</p> <p>The PH Draft has incorporated the trail design guidelines submitted by the Sierra Club.</p> <p>Agree. The PH Draft Plan identifies different trail categories and directs trail category for a particular park be decided after study of opportunities and constraints.</p> <p>First obligation is to balance stewardship and recreation across the park system.</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>Some stream valleys are poor choices but others are suitable depending on amount of disturbed areas, pattern of existing people's choice trails and boundaries of sensitive area in relation to park boundaries.</p> <p>The confusion over trail designation for Seneca Creek is one of the reasons this PH Draft Amendment is needed. How trails are designated needs to be explained and codified.</p>
<p>West Montgomery County Citizens Assn (Ginny Barnes)</p>	<p>Provided example from Sierra Club website as to conservation ethic, criteria for various trail uses and methods for applying that criteria.</p> <p>Balance is not achieved by providing every park user with the same trail to use.</p> <p>First obligation is to environmental protection.</p> <p>I suggest we start over.</p> <p>Trails in stream valley parks are poor choices for "shared use" designation.</p>	<p>The PH Draft Plan identifies different trail categories and directs trail category for a particular park be decided after study of opportunities and constraints.</p> <p>First obligation is to balance stewardship and recreation across the park system.</p> <p>Disagree</p> <p>Some stream valleys are poor choices but others are suitable depending on amount of disturbed areas, pattern of existing people's choice trails and boundaries of sensitive area in relation to park boundaries.</p> <p>The confusion over trail designation for Seneca Creek is one of the reasons this PH Draft Amendment is needed. How trails are designated needs to be explained and codified.</p>
<p>Coalition for Seneca Creek Greenway and Trail</p>	<p>Never involved when county changed the policy on trail use to shared use.</p>	<p>The confusion over trail designation for Seneca Creek is one of the reasons this PH Draft Amendment is needed. How trails are designated needs to be explained and codified.</p>



Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
<p>Ed Shultze</p>	<p>From my point of view, we have the best parks and park systems of all the southern cities and suburban areas. We should all be proud.</p> <p>Very impressed with what has been accomplished on the Seneca Creek Greenway Trail. Whatever it takes to keep the SCGT moving please do.</p> <p>Recommend small advisory panels to each of the trail ways would serve the County as a whole well and MNCPPC.</p> <p>What is decided will set precedent for region.</p>	<p>The Planning Board will approve Community Outreach program prior to initiating a Trail Corridor Plan.</p>
<p>Washington Area Bicyclist Assn. (Ellen Jones, Exec. Director)</p>	<p>Support environmental concerns are being studied on a case-by-case basis and that draft does not prohibit planning or building a trail in an environmentally sensitive area.</p> <p>Believe intelligent planning and engineering can solve many concerns about environmentally sensitive areas.</p> <p>Need identification of criteria, which weigh in favor of a hard surface trail in an environmentally sensitive area.</p> <p>Need recognition of role of hard surface trails in region-wide bicycle transportation system. Should be part of balancing process.</p>	<p>Agree. The first choice is always to avoid sensitive environmental features but in some cases trail connectivity requires traversing an environmentally sensitive area and when this must occur, mitigation is critical.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>The decision to build a hard surface trail is the result of analyzing many factors. The list of criteria considered in trail planning is included in the Public Hearing Draft Plan.</p> <p>Agree.</p>
<p>North Potomac Citizens Assn (Sandy Liu)</p>	<p>Halt all planning proposals until you straighten up shop and define qualities of different parkland.</p> <p>Need shift of P&amp;P culture to accept no development.</p> <p>Balance means equilibrium, not a sacrifice of environment over recreation. Balance means conserving natural resources versus enhancement of already developed</p>	<p>Disagree. The different qualities of different parkland are examined and evaluated in trail planning process.</p> <p>This is an issue that needs to be studied in a broader context than this amendment.</p> <p>The mission of MNCPPC is to balance human access to parks with environmental protection, to be user friendly and environmentally friendly.</p>

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
	<p>environments.</p> <p>Continued disregard for creating 100 ft. buffer zone along either side of streams.</p> <p>Different areas of Montgomery County have different community demands and different expectation of parkland.</p> <p>Object to public notice relating to the public hearing. Consider process secretive.</p>	<p>The focus of environmental analysis is the Sensitive Buffers Area, which encompasses all environmental features of concern. This buffer can be 20' or 200' depending on the stream valley. An arbitrary buffer zone number that does not reflect the unique characteristics of a stream is not good policy.</p> <p>Agree. This is why land use zoning and density in a Trail Corridor is evaluated during the Trail Corridor Plan process.</p>
<p>West Montgomery County Citizens Assn (Ginny Barnes)</p> <p>Liles Creighton, Potomac Appalachian Trail Club's (PATC) trail manager in Maryland</p>	<p>What does geographic parity mean?</p> <p>Provide for more volunteer assistance. Look to PATC and Montgomery Parks agreement as model.</p> <p>Recognize that different segments of trail may have to be designated differently depending on wear factors.</p>	<p>Staff can always do better in terms of notifying the public. To address concerns of those wanting more time to review this Amendment, the Planning Board kept the record open for 3 weeks after the Public Hearing.</p> <p>"Geographic Parity" means different types of trails should be within a reasonable distance of population centers in the County. The Countywide Park Trails Plan, for example, proposes a hard surface trail network for the upcounty and the downcountry. Connections to these networks from communities in the east and west are proposed. In terms of natural surface trails, the term applies to different categories of natural surface trails. In areas of the county where many residents own horses or where stables are located, the pattern of equestrian trails should allow people to access trails without having to transport their horses by trailer. Hikers should be able to enjoy a walk in the park without having to drive too far; ideally, they would have trails within easy access from their home. Those who enjoy riding bikes on trails should have that opportunity near their community.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Agree. The Sustainable Trail Initiative proposed in the packet emphasizes the importance of trail monitoring so that wear</p>

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
Michael Donnellan	<p>Distressed MNCPPC has built so few natural surface trails over past decade and that amendment proposed rules that may slow pace even further.</p> <p>Need opportunities to bike on natural surface trails closer to home (Silver Spring) rather than having to go up county.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for all different types of trail users.</p> <p>Hard surface trails can be more environmentally friendly than natural surface trails.</p> <p>Eliminate "This list is not all-inclusive" from section 7.</p> <p>Natural surface and hard surface trails should have the same planning process.</p>	<p>factors can be identified quickly.</p> <p>The process proposed is intended to help the trail program by standardizing the planning and development process and by consolidating, planning, and implementation in one department.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Agree.</p>
John Faueryby	<p>Ask for public hearing to be rescheduled, as draft is different from what was presented to Planning Board earlier.</p> <p>If anything needs fixing, it is lack of trail output, not out of control approval process.</p> <p>Proposed rules appear heavily biased against bikes.</p>	<p>The PH Draft Amendment proposes the same general planning criteria for both types of trails but the decision-making timeline is shorter for natural surface trails.</p> <p>Not true. This issue was addressed at the Public Hearing by staff.</p>
Sally Gagne	<p>Proposed rules appear heavily biased against bikes.</p>	<p>This PH Draft is intended to clarify the trail process in hopes of allowing trails to proceed in a more timely, orderly fashion.</p> <p>There is no bias intended.</p>
Brent Goldstein	<p>Amendment seems to attempt to do away with unpaved trail cycling through onerous regulation.</p>	<p>See above responses.</p>
Drew Haldane	<p>Attempts to do what last year's failed anit-trails could not.</p> <p>Proposed trail planning process is unnecessarily complex and open to repeated challenges and review.</p> <p>Make better use of volunteers.</p>	<p>See above responses.</p>
Craig Hunt	<p>Am retired and am an avid mountain biker; support MORE.</p>	
Peter Kimm	<p>Support WABA testimony.</p>	

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
Larry and Ada Larson	Support a network of connected bicycle trails.	
Richard Lashley	Support WABA, particularly adding clean transportation values as Plan objective. Support extension and completion of bike trails. We need to rely more on alternatives to the automobile.	Agree. Improving air quality through reduced reliance on the automobile is an important environmental goal.
Kenny Lipsman	County should be building recreational bike trails like those at Schaeffer Farm.	Agree that such a facility is needed.
David Magjill	MORE has thoughtful new trail proposals pending at several county parks and offers to provide all construction and labor free of charge through trained and equipped volunteers. Concerned this draft being viewed by some as opportunity to institute a failed County Council legislative bill (Ewing bill).	Volunteer groups like MORE are critical to the success of our natural surface trail program.
Alan Migdall	Not enough emphasis on connectivity of hard surface trails as trail planning factor: health benefits, reduce pressure to build more roads, air quality. Recognize importance of terrain to trails and level topography of stream valleys. Add as objective connectivity of trails so people may get "from here to there" safely by bicycle.	Agree that health benefits and our quality benefits are not emphasized enough in terms of trails.  The focus of the Countywide Park Trails Plan is connectivity.
Barry Irwin	Address ways to provide maximum safety after sundown. Support WABA testimony.	
Marisa Kim	I am avid cyclist and encourage a network of connective bike trails. Cycling promotes health and cleaner environment.	Agree.
Bob Alexander	Enjoy biking, hiking and cross country skiing in county parks. Concerned these areas will become off limits to bikers. Need to educate public. Only by allowing all users access to our lands will the areas be better understood and protected by a greater number of citizens.	

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
David and Catherine Berglund	Concerned at absence of community input from planning process (pp 30-33). Please include our community in the planning of trails in Sandy Spring/Ashton.	Community participation is part of every phase of the planning process.
Councilmember Nancy Floreen	Concerned about environment but also concerned about cost and complexity to an already open process.  Inclusiveness should remain our aim. All residents should have access to our park environment.	Staff is recommending a more streamlined natural surface trail process.  Agree.
Fran Hayward	Local community should be considered a user group. Does not address problems of close proximity between farm properties and suburban trail users.  Place a moratorium on new trail planning until problems with trail corridor process have been worked out.	Local community members will be welcome at all public meetings during trail planning. The issue of how the trail relates to adjoining development has been added to the planning process.  Disagree.
Dan Hudson	Is not enough open space in region to favor one group over others; need shared use trails. Enjoy mountain biking and support additional access for this under-served constituency.	The needs of all trail user groups should be accommodated across the countywide park system.
Keith Kozloff	Please consider environmental benefits of bicycle riding	
Environmental Defense (Michael Replogle)	Endorse WABA proposals. Creating better bike trail network in our parks will cut air pollution, water pollution, and greenhouse emissions and improve public health.	
Dave Sears	Support WABA testimony.  Local community should be part of trail planning process.	Agree.
Robin Ziek	Need more guidelines on compatibility with nearby residents, including fencing.  Under 6(j) on page 33, local community not included.  Apply moratorium on new trail planning until problems with planning process worked out.  Please note, correct error in text on page 24 of Countywide Park Trails Plan that trail north of RT 108 crosses private land.	The issue of how a trail relates to existing development has been added to the planning process.  Community input will be added.  This section not part of the Plan amendment. Will correct any factual errors when Countywide Park Trail Plan is reprinted.

Speaker	Summary of Testimony	Staff Response
B. Peter Yarrington	<p>Note enough public input.</p> <p>Unclear as to when park managers take control of planning and construction.</p> <p>No guidance as to how park trails will be coordinated when trail traverse parks under two or more jurisdictions.</p> <p>A trail user who causes no damages does not exist.</p> <p>People love trails. Disheartening to see MNCPPC's plan to avoid building new single and multiple use trails.</p> <p>Please go forward on trails.</p>	<p>Park managers are part of the trail planning process and the trail construction process. Their most important role is trail management and monitoring the trail once constructed.</p> <p>Coordination with adjoining municipalities is a "given" in planning but will correct text to clarify this.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>This is not the intent of the Plan Amendment. We hope by clarifying the planning and implementation process and by following a Trails Work Program we will be providing more natural trails on a more timely basis.</p>
Joseph Yannie		