

Comment		Committee response		Action
	County Commission			
1.	Better explain and set parameter on when Easements vs. Construction is required	Agreed, however we want to maintain some flexibility in the process to adapt to each individual project and still maintain consistency.		None
2.	Add a corridor disclaimer to each map showing proposed routes and in the subdivision review procedure/draft regulations	Agreed		Added to each map explanation that maps show broad areas where trails should be built and recognition that unless implemented through subdivision or agreements from private landowners the trails will not be completed.
3.	Power line corridor to Kelly Canyon as potential alternative to "M"	Staff looked at this approach; however getting an easement under the power line will require the same amount of easements and permissions from private landowners as the current route (possibly more).		None
4.	Draft Regulation needs to be in a strikeout form to the existing regulations to better show what changes would be implemented through the adoption.	At this time the draft regulations show concepts.		Staff is working on including these concepts along with other subdivision changes. These will be brought to the Commission in 2011.
	County Planning Board			

Comment		Committee response		Action
5.	Manhattan to Springhill slide needs to be corrected	Agreed		Making Correction
6.	What percentage of users would use the facilities?	It is unrealistic to place an overall number for all facilities. Each facility differs and has different uses. A soccer field would have different users than a motorized trail.		None

Comment

Committee response

Action

7.	Funding Analysis: a. Ongoing Maintenance costs; b. Cost/Benefit Analysis	Through the funding analysis we can determine an estimated ongoing maintenance cost for each existing and new facility, however, this is too deep an analysis at this point since none of the routes/facilities are recommended for implementation by the County. In the future, each priority route/facility will have to undergo a project analysis to be considered for implementation. This will include maintenance and management costs along with a cost/benefit analysis. A cost/benefit analysis is difficult to complete for the entire plan as each facility is different. For example, a pool should serve 10% of the population but in a community like West Yellowstone it would only serve 100 people. The cost of an indoor heated pool in West Yellowstone would be a high cost to benefit only 100 people, which is why it wasn't listed even though it was identified as a need.	None at this time. Will be done for any project considered for implementation.
8.	Address Management and Maintenance early on in the plan	Agreed	Text added
9.	RAC reference on p. 20 is incorrect	Agreed	Made correction
10.	Complete the inventory	Agreed	Added Forest Service inventory
11.	Correct the Def. on p. 69 (#19) for "Rural Recreation Route"	Agreed	Revised definition

Comment

Committee response

Action

	TCC		
12.	Add BABAB (Bozeman Area Bicycle Advocacy Board) to the list of contributors.	Agreed. They were stakeholders.	Made the appropriate correction.
13.	Include Valley Center route in the Belgrade to Bozeman Route	Agreed	Now that Valley Center will be completed from Bozeman to Jackrabbit the route will be included in the plan.
14.	Need to further explain the county's role beyond development	Agreed	Better explained in the operation and maintenance section of the plan the roles and responsibilities of the county once a facility has been built.
15.	Require subdivisions to put in trails- don't give them the excuse (I think this is already in effect, but check with Chris Scott)	Agreed, but not every circumstance is the same. Some trails are part of the transportation network in lieu of sidewalks others are exactions of the subdivision and some maybe part of parkland dedication. Flexibility is required.	No change to current plan.
	Big Sky		
16.	Big Sky Trails Plan needs to be adopted by the County Commission. An Appendix needs to be included summarizing the Big Sky Trails Plan priorities and indicating where a full copy can be found.	The Big Sky Trails Plan needs to be adopted by the Park Commission, the Big Sky Zoning advisory committee, the Big Sky Planning and Zoning Commission and then finally to the County Commission.	The Big Sky Trails Plan has been referenced and priority routes included.

Comment

Committee response

Action

17.	In regards to the Growth Policy and the adoption of the Parks and Trails Plan into it, language needs to be included indicating areas outside of the Growth Policy but still within the county and mentioned in the Parks and Trails Plan also apply (don't know if this is possible),	Agreed. Since the Growth Policy does not apply to 101 zoning districts, it would not apply to Big Sky.	The County Commission will determine if they want to place language in the Growth Policy from the Plan or just reference citations in the Growth Policy from the Plan. It may be necessary to have the County Commission adopt the County Parks and Trails Plan separately.
18.	Create a list format of the Routes and Priorities for each region in Appendices D & E as introduction to make them easier to navigate.	Agreed	Final version will contain a table listing the Route and Facility and the page number it can be found on.
19.	List some of the successes/positives of a parks and trails system in the introductory paragraph.	Agreed	The introduction has been modified to better outline the positive nature of parks and trails.
20.	In the Sub. Regs and Draft regulations require Trail stub outs as part of the construction phase.	This is a difficult issue. We want to ensure as much access as possible during all phases, however the policy needs to be flexible to account for safety and use of the land until development to prevent situations where facilities are installed only to have to be removed and re-installed in further phases.	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	Bozeman Creek Neighborhood Assoc.		
21.	Requests that County plan recognizes Bozeman Creek Neighborhood plan that was adopted by City of Bozeman as it preserves this corridor from Kagy to Main.	Committee recognizes the existence of a Neighborhood plan, however at this time the plan only documents County and Regional facilities. Planning at the Community and Neighborhood levels will need to be implemented over time.	Upon adoption of the plan the Bozeman Creek Neighborhood Association may request that the park commission adopt a neighborhood plan into the Park and Trails Plan. It will be done with public comment at a public hearing. Can't we just say that it is outside our jurisdiction?
22.	We feel that the Route #29 map and project be replaced with a new map which incorporates the Bozeman Creek Neighborhood Plan, showing a potential for creating a future trail corridor which would be funded via public and private sources.	Committee recognizes the existence of a Neighborhood plan, however at this time the plan only documents County and Regional facilities. Planning at the Community and Neighborhood levels will need to be implemented over time.	Upon adoption of the plan the Bozeman Creek Neighborhood Association may request that the park commission adopt a neighborhood plan into the Park and Trails Plan. It will be done with public comment at a public hearing. Can't we just say that it is outside our jurisdiction?
	GALLATIN VALLEY LAND TRUST		
23.	Supports LOS approach: many areas underserved, use of Bozeman facilities by County is straining City capacity	Agreed	No change
24.	Require Public Access for all subdivision parks and trails	Agreed, however MCA provides for and the County Commission has the ability to allow for private subdivision parks. Also county can only control parks or trail as part of the parkland dedication. Other parks beyond the scope of dedication may be in a subdivision where the county cannot	Review plan language to make argument as strong as possible

	Comment	Committee response	Action
		require them to be public.	
25.	Greenways: require public access, specifically designate areas,	Greenways are a concept at this point in the plan. Without having more in-depth planning with Neighborhoods and affected landowners designating Greenways at this time would make it unlikely they would ever be implemented.	Definition changed to public access only.
26.	Development review: allow public comment as early as possible in process; add Parks and Trails Development component to Title 11, Chpt 6 to implement policy in Chapter 1.	The current plan has the most public comment possible in the development review process without becoming overly burdensome for the developer and making review unreasonably long.	None
27.	Cash-in-lieu fund section should state that money could go toward land acquisition	Agreed	Revised Cash-in-lieu
28.	Recording of plats: need to mention trails	Agreed	Clarified in Plan
29.	Liability of Landowners: reword to acknowledge landowner protection in MCA	Agreed	Clarified in Plan
30.	Route Descriptions and Maps: put maps and route descriptions in same order, same route titles and numbers on maps and tables, make route descriptions consistent on maps and tables.	Agreed	Revised as specified

Comment

Committee response

Action

31.	Manhattan to Logan Route 1: change wording to match route description on map	Agreed	Revised as specified
32.	Sourdough Trail from Goldenstein to GNF #28: widen corridor to include alternatives GVLTL is working on	Agreed	Revised as specified
33.	Kagy to Bear Canyon #51: text additions to include working with GNF	Agreed. The Gallatin National Forest must coordinate with County.	Revised as specified
34.	Gallatin Face Trail #47 (see attached)	Agreed	Revised as specified
35.	Bozeman Creek Corridor Trail System #29: change to reflect PROST and Neighborhood plan	Disagree. This potential trail falls completely within the city limits of Bozeman and is outside County jurisdiction.	None.
36.	Arrowleaf to Main Street #27: Change to reflect work the Bozeman Deaconess Health services, City of Bozeman, GVLTL and BSF have already done on this corridor	Agreed	Revised as specified
37.	Mount Ellis/Painted Hills Loop Trails #26: wording changes to reflect reality of planning already done	Agreed	Revised as specified

Comment

Committee response

Action

38.	Nash Park Trail Conn. #31: extend eastern edge to achieve Sourdough connection	Agreed	Revised as specified
39.	Fairgrounds to M #32: broaden corridor, needs to include Story Mill and Drinking Horse.	Agreed	Revised as specified
40.	Churn Creek #3 include in Bozeman/Belgrade/Four Corners routes	Agreed	Revised as specified
41.	Transportation in Subdivisions Regs: still gap between rec. and bike/ped safety between this plan and the revised Sub Regs. Encourage County Comm. To revisit regs after this adopted.	Agreed. However, the purpose of this plan is to address recreation, not transportation, while recognizing both compliment and facilitate each other. To that end, this plan strives to provide connections to trails planned in the GBAT Plan.	Will revisit in future
	Bicycle Advisory Board		
42.	It is important to increase the number of trails and parks accessible to Gallatin County residents, particularly those outside the Bozeman area. I believe the County currently relies too heavily on the resources of Bozeman, and needs to increase County facilities. Public access should be retained to all parks and trails that are created	Agreed, however MCA provides for and the County Commission has the ability to allow for private subdivision parks. Also county can only control parks or trail as part of the parkland dedication. Other parks beyond the scope of dedication may be in a subdivision where the county cannot require them to be public.	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	through development (dedicated through the subdivision review process). From what I understand, state statute requires that any dedication be available to any member of the public. Even if it were not so in the state statute, it is the right thing to do. I am not sure what problem the Plan aims to solve by allowing some parkland or trails to be private, but that is not the appropriate solution in my view.		
43.	Greenways are great, but the Plan should specify where these greenways are needed, and trails should be accommodated through the greenways in ways that protect wildlife habitat. These uses of greenways are not mutually exclusive, as I have seen in many other areas of the country.	Greenways are a concept at this point in the plan. Without having more in-depth planning with Neighborhoods and effected landowners designating Greenways at this time would make it unlikely they would ever be implemented.	Name changed to Recreational Parkway. Changed definition to public access only.
44.	Development review is critical and the Plan appears to have a good process except that the public should be offered opportunities to comment from the beginning of the process. I would urge the County to take advantage of the Bozeman Area Bicycle Advisory Board and	The current plan has the most public comment possible in the development review process without becoming overly burdensome for the developer and making review unreasonably long.	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	the City/County Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Committee, as well as the County Parks Commission, to utilize these bodies early in the review process to help ensure effective park and facilities are made available through every development.		
45.	Cash-in-lieu funds should be available for parkland acquisition. There are too many developments that leave open space that is not usable by the public – i.e., it meets the letter but not the intent of the law. Developers should be able to provide payment to the county for purchase and development of parks and trails outside the subdivision but near it, meeting needs of both subdivision residents and those who live nearby or elsewhere in the County.	Agreed. Currently in Plan.	None
46.	Both trails as well as parks should be recorded in the plats	Agreed	Will clarify language in plan
47.	Landowner liability should be limited when granting recreational access, but this limit should first rely on the already existing state statute.	Agreed	See GVLТ Comments
48.	Trail connections from Goldenstein to Sourdough Creek and between Triple		Addressed by GVLТ's Comments

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	<p>Tree and other trail systems nearby (including Painted Hills) should be a goal in the County's plan. The need for this connectivity of trails was mentioned frequently in volunteered comments on the Bozeman Area Bicycle Advisory Board's survey of Bozeman area residents completed three years ago as part of the development of the Transportation Plan. Likewise a Gallatin Face Trail linking Bear Canyon to South Cottonwood would be a marvelous addition to the trail systems south of Bozeman.</p>		
49.	<p>The Bozeman Creek Corridor Trail System should be a priority for both the County and the City of Bozeman. The County should work with all private landowners along the corridor outside the City to make such a trail system complete, all the way to the East Gallatin.</p>	<p>Committee recognizes the existence of a Neighborhood plan, however at this time the plan only documents County and Regional facilities. Planning at the Community and Neighborhood levels will need to be implemented over time.</p>	<p>Upon adoption of the plan the Bozeman Creek Neighborhood Association may request that the park commission adopt a neighborhood plan into the Park and Trails Plan. It will be done with public comment at a public hearing.</p>
50.	<p>A Fairgrounds to the "M" trail should also be a County as well as a City priority, connecting both to the Story Hills trail and the Drinking Horse trail, both of which I use frequently as a nearby resident. A Churn Creek Trail would also</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>See GVLTC Comments</p>

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	make an excellent addition to the trails available north of Bozeman.		
51.	Functional transportation corridors for bicyclists and pedestrians, integrated with mass transit, should be a basic tenet of both the Parks and Trails and Transportation planning conducted by the county.	Agreed. However, the purpose of this plan is to address recreation, not transportation, while recognizing both compliment and facilitate each other. To that end, this plan strives to provide connections to trails planned in the GBAT Plan.	Future work on the integration of transportation and recreation will happen after adoption.
	BSF		
52.	BSF joins in and supports the comments submitted by Ted Lange on behalf of GVLT. Those comments will not be repeated here. Ted has accurately captured the need for some additional clarification regarding public access to dedicated trails and open space. BSF uses public trails for training and ski education and it is critical that these trails remain open to the public. In addition, BSF is particularly supportive of the Gallatin Face Trail (Route 47) as well as the Sourdough Trail from Goldenstein to Gallatin National Forest (Route	Agreed	No action at this time. The plan will after adoption work on specific travel planning for winter and summer use. Any additional trail routes can be amended into the plan at that time.

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	<p>28). These trails would both improve the recreational and training opportunities in the County, they would potentially connect the Hyalite Canyon and Bozeman Creek ski trails with downtown Bozeman. To be able to ski from Hyalite Reservoir to Main Street is a realistic goal and would only enhance Bozeman's national reputation as a ski community.</p>		
53.	<p>Finally, BSF joins in the comments regarding the Arrowleaf to Main Street trail (Route 27). BSF has spent many hours working with the Hospital, the City, and GVLТ to put together multiple use trails in this area. The work is reflected in the Bozeman Deaconess Health Services Subarea Plan and the BDHS Knolls East/Highland South</p>	Agreed	Revised as specified.

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	preliminary plat. These trails are critical to the future development of a dedicated facility for BSF and future local ski opportunities should the trails near the cemetery ever be lost.		
	Bozeman Pedestrian and Traffic Safety Committee		
54.	Our primary concern lies in the plan apparently permitting some trails to be limited to private use of some subset of the general public. As a general statement, we feel that such action would be unwise and thus language allowing such restrictions to be unwise. We believe all of these trails should be open to all of the general public. The only exception that we might recognize would be if there was some <u>overwhelming</u> benefit to the general	Agreed, however MCA provides for and the County Commission has the ability to allow for private subdivision parks. Also county can only control parks or trail as part of the parkland dedication. Other parks beyond the scope of dedication may be in a subdivision where the county cannot require them to be public.	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	<p>public that would occur if a certain trail were restricted to private usage. That would be a very, very unusual situation. We have lobbied long and hard before the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC), the City Commission, and other groups about the need for providing more opportunities for pedestrians and removing “gaps” in existing facilities. To permit the development of new facilities that are not open to the general public will lead to future gaps and thus is counter-productive.</p>		
	Landowners		
55.	<p>As the landowner of most of the land between the frontage road and the river from Manhattan almost all the way to Logan I can tell you it's a physical impossibility to connect Manhattan to Logan along the river with out using part</p>	<p>Agreed. We appreciate your comment and regret that we did not have the opportunity to meet with you before the draft was released. Please understand that the trail corridors shown on the maps are only areas where trails would be beneficial sometime in the next 50 years, recognizing that lands change ownership and are sometimes subdivided. Prior to any trail being</p>	<p>Statement added to maps to clarify for landowners that corridors are only areas where potential future trails may be located.</p>

Comment	Committee response	Action
<p>of the actual rail line, also I don't anticipate we would have any interest in giving a 3 to 4 mile easement through the middle of the ranch for a public trail! As for the route along the north side of the frontage road, it looks like you would need to rely on an easement from the railroad between the frontage road and the tracks up to the point where the railroad turns north and leaves the frontage road at which time you would need an easement from us to continue towards Logan if you wanted to stay on the north side of the road. I don't think at this time that is anything the ranch would be interested in. It would seem to me before you put these plans together and put them out for public comment you should at least have some dialogue with the parties who will be most affected by the proposed plans. Sincerely, Brian King, Helen Van Dyke King F Double D Ranch</p>	<p>constructed access would have to be given by private landowners or the trail will never be built.</p>	
Gallatin Valley Bike Club/The Dirt Concern		

	Comment	Committee response	Action
56.	<p>Bike Park. Although mentioned, the location of a Bike Park is unspecified. Basically in Gallatin County, during the summer, the Gallatin National Forest functions as a bike park. But for the rest of the year, about 8 months, other facilities are needed. Gravel Pit restoration plans intended for public use could include bike challenge courses and trails of varying difficulty. Gravel Pits, whenever possible, are excellent locations for bike parks.</p>	<p>Difficult to determine a specific location for every needed facility. Site location will be determined in the future by looking at use, availability, funding, available land, etc.</p>	<p>County will work with bike clubs to lay out some options for a future bike park.</p>
57.	<p>Not mentioned is the need for connector trails linking Bozeman Creek, Hyalite Creek, and S. Cottonwood Creek. This is a desired condition of the Gallatin National Forest 2006 Travel Plan. This could be partially fulfilled by endorsing the proposal for a Gallatin Face Trail</p>	<p>Plan calls for a Gallatin Face Trail. However, note that this was not a recommendation of the 2006 GNF Travel Plan. It has been proposed by several groups and organizations and we support this trail as a multiple use facility.</p>	<p>None</p>

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	system.		
58.	<p>The Gallatin Face Trail is mentioned as a priority route for Gallatin Gateway. It should also be a priority route for Bozeman, which it would relate to better. This trail, along with a trail linking Bozeman Creek GVLТ trails to the Sourdough Trailhead, would benefit the most people. Simply stated, the recreational community just needs the county to recognize this trail concept and offer conceptual support. The recreational community needs to find the funding.</p>	<p>County Park and Trails Plan recognized the Gallatin Face Trail as a county wide priority, since it crosses more than one region. It is listed under Gallatin Gateway because it came up at their Community Priority meeting.</p>	None
59.	<p>A map of trail 47 indicates part of the area that would be served by the Gallatin Face Trail. It does not show the whole area or the proposed trail alignment itself. This map indicates a possible lack of understanding of the</p>	Will review	Map amended?

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	concept and a possible source of mis-communication between the county planners and the public. The Gallatin Face Trail as a complete concept is included as a separate file along with this letter. The Gallatin Valley Bicycle Club feels that it is important that the County Trails master plan accurately reflect the Gallatin Face Trail concept.		
	General Public Comment		
60.	Keep the existing trails open for multiple uses. No more Wilderness	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple uses and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
61.	Please let us use this great land or at least access it for ALL to see how beautiful this great state is.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple uses and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
62.	Multiple use means	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple uses and motorized use concepts, and	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	everybody, should be able to use it. Quit closing down snowmobile land and other motorized areas down to just skiers and hikers.	seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	
63.	Please let ALL of us enjoy MT. Bikes, ATV, Horses. Open more trails.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple uses and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
64.	Restrict motorized use (noise, pollution, erosion)	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple uses and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users. The majority of trails within city and county jurisdictions as well as most of the trails on federally managed public land within Gallatin County are already closed to motorized.	None
65.	If you close trails, close hiking trails also. Not Just motorized use trails. Can't we share all trails every other day for motorized and nonmotorized?	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users. The idea of alternating days has been implemented in some federal agencies and will be a tool available if needed by the county.	None
66.	Share all Trails	Agreed	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
67.	Do not share trails. Hiking and Motorized are different things. Designate for one or the other fairly.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users. The idea of alternating days has been implemented in some federal agencies and will be a tool available if needed by the county.	None
68.	Include Cottonwood Road south of Huffine in the Bike/Jog lane. Restrict motorized use on trails.	Will look at Cottonwood Road as part of the corridor for that area. There is a disproportionate amount of trails already restricted to motorized use and in an effort to provide a balance of recreational opportunities the new Parks and Trails Plan is working to include motorized use.	?
69.	Correct spelling of "litter" on exhibit K PG 1 4 ii	Agree	Revised as specified.
70.	Bicycle trail up Bridger Canyon	Difficult to determine the intent without more specifics. Current plans are to have trails that connect from town into the M and Drinking Horse trails.	None
71.	Destruction of Bear Canyon Trail by motorized use is prime example of damage by abuse of trails by ATV users. Please ensure this will not happen	The County, through the policies in this plan intends to work with user groups to educate them and the public about courteous and safe trail sharing and partner with them for maintenance. However, this plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users. Please remember that	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	to other area trails.	a majority of trails within city and county jurisdictions as well as most of the trails on federally managed public land within Gallatin County are already closed to motorized use.	
72.	More city bike lanes and wilderness access. Bike lanes through town would cut down on accidents.	This plan focused on Parks and Trails from a recreational perspective. Bike lanes fall under transportation planning. While trails can be used for transportation they are separated from the street.	None
73.	Provide more bike trails and lanes along roadways as well as off.	Agreed	None
74.	Stop restricting motorized use. There are enough trails and trail areas for true multiple use. May areas are only accessible to handicap users via motorized.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
75.	Continue good work on trail plan Bozeman to Belgrade, Manhattan and Three Forks. RT 24	Agreed	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
76.	Stop restricting motorized use of trails. There are plenty of non-motorized trails already. Not everyone can take days off at a time to hike deep into wilderness areas. But I can ride a long trail in an afternoon.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
77.	Divert money away from Parks and Trails and into EMS & Law Enforcement personnel and infrastructure facilities.	Disagree. Currently health and public safety receive the majority of the funding. Parks and trails receive very little. They rely on private fundraising and volunteer labor to fulfill much of the need.	None
78.	More motorized trails for Snowmobiling and ATV's. Not everyone can walk or climb on horses.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
	More motorized trails	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
		users.	
	Please do not develop Mt. Ellis Trailhead. The nicer you make the trailheads the more use and impact they have.	Disagree. Increased population will eventually increase the impact on trails and trail heads regardless of if they are improved. Without proper improvements to infrastructure the resource will become damaged.	None
	MORE mountain bike trails to support county growth. More trails + less conflict and abuse.	Agreed. However this plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users. A majority of trails within city and county jurisdictions as well as most of the trails on federally managed public land within Gallatin County are already closed to motorized and mechanized use.	None
	More Dirt Bike Trails	Agreed	None
	Belgrade to Bozeman Trails would be awesome to have.	Agreed	None
	Please don't close anymore motorized access.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
	All streets that are	This plan doesn't address bike lanes as they are a transportation issue, however we do recognize the	None

Comment		Committee response	Action
	installed or upgraded should have bike lanes. But all drivers need to be educated on bikers, signals and laws. At the same time, bikers need to be educated on the laws and that they need to abide by driving signals. There is a current lack of education. Make const crews clean up roads every day, not leave gravel an dirt scatter doll over.	need for education on bicycle safety and traffic laws.	
	We need more motorized trails and need a way to make hikers pay for use of trails.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
	God made earth for us to walk on we shouldn't have to pay for walking!!!! AMEN!	No response	None

Comment	Committee response	Action
More dirt bike trails for free!	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
Share all or none.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
No bicycles on horse trails. Safety issue.	One of the goals of this planning effort is to attempt to reduce conflicts between different types of use. One plan policy is to coordinate with stakeholders to produce clear and consistent signage between management jurisdictions.	None
Stop restricting motorized ATV/bicycle, snowmobile access.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
Balanced use for everyone. Trails need more markers to stop motorized users from using unknown trail choice errors. Stop closing more trails to motorized use.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users. One plan policy is to coordinate with stakeholders to produce clear and consistent signage between management jurisdictions.	None
Gallatin County desperately needs interconnected bike trails.	Agreed. Although this current effort of the Parks and Trails Plan focuses on recreation, there will be opportunities at a later date to connect these	None

Comment	Committee response	Action
Saves fuel, saves \$, reduces traffic congestion, reduces emission, good exercise.	identified recreation trails to provide more connectivity throughout the County.	
Snowmobiles leave no trace when summer comes. Maintain the trails for motorbikes and ATVs. Punish those who do not comply, but don't close more trails. We as tax payers should all be afforded equal access.	This plan, over previous County plans recognizes multiple use and motorized use concepts, and seeks to provide balanced opportunities for all users.	None
BSF benefits from groomed trails provided by the Gallatin Valley Snowmobile Association (GVSA) and would like to see a funding compensation to GVSA from this organization. All users should contribute to the improvement and maintenance of these trails and it seems some users have a benefit with little or	Agreed. Several Plan policies recognize importance of user groups and the County working together.	None

	Comment	Committee response	Action
	no funding contribution.		
	Tree huggers suck.	None	None