

DNR - Mining, Land & Water Online Public Comment

Nancy Lake State Recreation Management Planning

Topic: Public Review Draft

Filtered for:

Comment 1 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 10:43 AM:

This park is well known and well loved for its canoe trail through a chain of lakes. The original plan focused on non-motorized uses and enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system, but the new draft plan includes development guaranteed to spoil these values, including an Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) trail to Butterfly Lake. I don't think the process that has taken place thus far has been conducted in a responsible or a fair manner. I highly support that ATV use by private landowners in the area be eliminated all together to preserve the state lands.

Comment 2 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I am member of the group Stewards of Lynx Lake which is comprised of current landowners/in-holders as well as members of the public who use and enjoy Lynx Lake and the NLSRA. Our mission is to preserve and protect Lynx Lake and maintain it as a place of appropriately balanced outdoor recreation without sacrificing safety, tranquility or the environment. I send this letter as a response to the May 2013 Public Review Draft of the NLSRA Management Plan.

The primary issues that our group would like to address are as follows:

A. Maintaining Lynx Lake road in its traditional and historic form.

Lynx Lake is unique in that it is the only lake within the entire NLSRA that is 100% enclosed within the park boundaries that has private in-holder ownerships. All of the other lakes with private ownership have a portion of their boundaries excluded from the NLSRA. As 100% in-holders the private property owners on Lynx Lake have used the pioneer trail "Lynx Lake Road" for their historic and traditional access, combined with the boat launch currently in place to access those parcels that are not road accessible.

There are currently 13 privately owned parcels of land on Lynx Lake. Of these 13 properties, 11 of these ownerships predate the creation of the NLSRA, with many of the parcels pre-dating Alaskan statehood. Access via Lynx Lake road and the lake also predate statehood and the creation of the NLSRA.

Our group believes the NLSRA planners need to recognize the clear distinction between the historic and traditional access of the Lynx Lake landowners/in-holders versus the access issues currently being disputed by the users of the Butterfly Lake trail.

B. Retaining the locked gate at mile 3 1/2 Lynx Lake road with access only permitted to authorized landowners/in-holders within the NLSRA.

The locked gate is highly effective in protecting both private property as well as the State DNR cabins on Lynx Lake from theft and vandalism. The locked gate with access to landowners only should remain in place as it is necessary to reducing the

pressure on water fowl and other wildlife. It has substantially reduced the illegal use of firearms, poaching within the park, the dumping of waste and the damage to the anadromous fish stream that flow into and out of Lynx Lake. The current practice of restricted public access (the locked gate with access limited to landowners/in-holders) has allowed the State DNR to preserve and protect the land and lakes within the NLSRA without the unreasonable expense of funding additional park law enforcement.

C. If it is deemed a necessity to relocate the locked gate, it should be moved no further than just beyond the proposed Chicken Lake Loop trailhead. In addition, no day-use or overnight public parking areas should be developed on or near the shores of Lynx Lake.

The May 2013 Draft plan proposed the location of the new gate just past the Chicken Lake cross park trailhead, which the park is hoping to further develop for foot traffic. A major concern for the Steward of Lynx Lake is that once the new Chicken Lake cross/park trail is developed and made known to the public it would certainly result in increased traffic (Keep in mind the adage, if you build it, they will come&) Although the Lynx Lake Road would see increased, unrestricted traffic up to the locked gate, the draft plan lacks any provisions for maintenance or improvements to the Lynx Lake Road. It is inevitable that the increased traffic would further degrade the already primitive conditions of Lynx Lake Road and who will be responsible for the maintenance and repair that is to be expected under increased use conditions?

Chapter 5; Page 1, lines 27-32 of the May 2013 Public Review Draft states, "While not a right, this plan recognizes and allows for vehicle access to private property on Lynx, Butterfly, Skeetna, and Delyndia lakes on a short-term basis; however, it also recommends vehicle access be studied in greater detail to determine how access to private property should be addressed on a long-term basis. The same study will address storage of personal property and moorage of boats long-term on state-owned land and water."

Contrary to the statement quoted from the draft plan (shown above) the Stewards of Lynx Lake believe that the private property owners on Lynx Lake do have a right to the continued reasonable and historic access via Lynx Lake Road that they have used for some 50 years or so and which predates the creation of NLSRA.

It is understood by our group that the NLSRA is in place to maximize the recreational opportunities for the general public. Parity for both public and private ownership within NLSRA is especially important but must be balanced against the State of Alaska recreational area goals of developing lands in the NLSRA to, "enhance outdoor recreational opportunities as long as the intensity of modification does not diminish the unit's natural and cultural values." Before any changes to the current status quo of public access to Lynx Lake is made, an environmental impact study needs to be conducted that can measure the current threshold of public use and the impact of increased usage. With the current hundreds of private and public users that recreate on Lynx Lake every summer (which includes the attendees at the Midnight Sun Bible Camp, canoe trail users and the in-holders) an unrestricted winter time public snowmachine users, Lynx Lake already has ample access to the public. Further public access would cause irreparable damage to the lake and

wildlife.

We concur with the Area-Wide Recreation Goals of the Draft Management plan as spelled out in Chapter 4; page 4-4, lines 11-20 which reiterate our position to, "Provide a maximum diversity of outdoor recreation opportunities based on the natural values of the unit and its ability to sustain use without significant adverse effects to the natural resources ...and ...Maintain the quiet natural setting that is currently available on the two existing canoe trails."

D. In the event road access is granted to the public, it should be restricted to special use permits only (short term issued key to gate) and limited to only the individuals who have booked reservations for the 3 NLSRA public use cabins presently located on Lynx Lake.

Chapter 5; Page 5-4 lines 16-23 the 2013 Draft Plan reads, "In the near-term, public use of highway vehicles shall be allowed without authorization on Lynx Lake Road up to the new traffic control device (gate) that will be installed at the new trailhead at the intersection of the Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trail and Lynx Lake Road. Long-term it may become necessary to allow highway vehicle access on all or a portion of Lynx, Lake Road based on future demands for access to recreational opportunities. The specific indicator or standard that will prompt DPOR to look at increased access in the future are provided below in the "Facilities" section." As we have previously explained in item B. of this letter, The Stewards of Lynx Lake are opposed to the potential change in policy which would allow for unrestricted public access to all portions the Lynx Lake Road and believe it would be highly detrimental to public safety in general and more specifically the protection of preservation of the goals of the NLSRA as detailed in item C. of this letter.

Chapter 7; Page 7-8 Lines 15-24, details the proposed 5(five) year period for the performance of a study, "...to determine if vehicle access to private properties accessible via Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail should continue to be authorized; and if so, who should be granted access and what type of vehicle access should be authorized." The Stewards of Lynx Lake feel the language regarding the parameters and implementation of the "study" is too vague and needs more detailed explanation of how the data will be collected for the "study" and other pertinent details of this pivotal, decision making tool.

E. Group Camp Guidelines for Public Facilities as detailed in the Spreadsheet on Page 6-21 of the Draft Plan states that a group camp is incompatible within the Lynx Lake Natural Zone. This language needs to be corrected to indicate that the Midnight Sun Bible Camp located on Lynx Lake actually falls within the category of an authorized use. The statement in the guidelines that this group camp use is "Incompatible" within the Natural Zone is clearly in error. The 2013 Draft Plan needs to consider the number of Alaskans who currently take advantage of the states recreational areas guiding principles while camping at the Lynx Lake Midnight Sun Bible Camp. The Midnight Sun Bible Camp has been present on Lynx Lake since before the creation of the NLSRA. Every year they introduce hundreds of Alaskan children and adults to the priceless outdoor experience of camping and recreating on Lynx Lake.

F. Continue to allow the landowner/in-holders on Lynx Lake to launch and moor their boats at the current Lynx Lake boat launch/landing.

Nine of the Lynx Lake landowners/in-holders do not have direct road access. There is no overland trail or road access available to these properties. These landowners only have access to their parcels via a combination of land and water. The non road accessible properties have utilized a historic and traditional form of access that combines Lynx Lake road (by way of 4 wheel drive vehicles), then via boat across the lake from the boat launch/landing to their parcels/in-holdings.

G. Long Term Anchoring & Mooring at Owner's Upland Private Property on Lynx Lake is detailed in the Guidelines for Public Use Spreadsheet on Page 6-14 of the Draft Plan "Anchoring and mooring (Long Term Greater Than 15 Days)". The guidelines state that this use is "Incompatible" within the Natural Zone which Lynx Lake is located. This needs to be corrected to include Lynx Lake as one of the locations where the use of long term boat anchoring and mooring at private property in excess of 15 days, is allowed without authorization and is not deemed to be incompatible. This discrepancy was pointed out to Mr. Wayne Biessel, Park Superintendent at the May 2013 public meeting in Anchorage. Mr. Biessel concurred that this language is inaccurate and needs to be changed.

H. Guidelines for Private Structures, Hydroelectric Power Development (Small Scale) and Geothermal (Small Scale) as detailed in the Spreadsheet on Page 6-11 of the Draft Plan states that both of these Private Structure Uses are incompatible within the Natural Zone which Lynx Lake is located. The Stewards of Lynx Lake feel that this is an overbroad and sweeping dismissal of these important uses of alternative energy and further consideration should be given to allow them as a compatible use as long as it is a small scale, private use only system that is minimally invasive, located along private property shoreline and appropriately permitted by the State of Alaska.

I. Landowner/in-holder boat access and storage should remain at its existing location at the northeast shore of Lynx Lake at the present boat launch/landing which was previously constructed by the State of Alaska.

Responsible boat access and storage by the landowner/in-holders would protect the park resources by reducing unnecessary traffic by boat trailers along Lynx Lake road.

J. Continue the existing practice of limiting public use boat access to Lynx Lake to canoes and similar non-motorized vessels accessing Lynx Lake via the NLSRA "Lynx Lake Loop" canoe trail.

Use and enjoyment of the Lynx Lake Canoe trails is one of the hallmarks of the NLSRA experience. Every year dozens if not hundreds of boaters experience the safety and serenity of the lakes and portages. If Lynx Lake is open to public road access, the lake will be crowded with motor boats, which would be dangerous not only to the public canoes and kayakers, but also dangerous the waterfowl and other wildlife that live on and adjacent to the waters of the lake.

I, as a member of Stewards of Lynx Lake, respectfully submit these important considerations for inclusion in the proposed NLSRA draft management plan 2013 Public Review Draft.

Comment 3 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

My comments are solely based upon the Butterfly Lake trail and Lynx Lake Road ATV access.

It is my understanding from the current draft plan that the access will remain the same for current special use permit holders until a separate trail study is complete; within a 5 year time period of the plan being finalized. I would like to see current permit holders included in the process of the future study to be performed on the Butterfly Lake trail and boat moorage area. It is concerning to me that there is not a more detailed plan, agenda and scope for this study included in the master plan.

Also, due to state funding being volatile and unpredictable, what happens if this study is not completed within the five year period? Will the current permit holders be granted the same ATV access or will all access be seized for this group?

Comment 4 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on NLSRA. I have enjoyed canoeing, skiing and hiking at Nancy Lakes. Please do not allow motorized vehicles in the area. Very few respect the privacy of those that cherish silence and pollutionless areas. Alaska offers lots of trails that motorized vehicles already use/abuse, there is no need to add another area to be overused.

Comment 5 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Our group Stewards of Lynx Lake is comprised of current landowners/in-holders as well as members of the public who use and enjoy Lynx Lake and the NLSRA. Our mission is to preserve and protect Lynx Lake and maintain it as a place of appropriately balanced outdoor recreation without sacrificing safety, tranquility or the environment. This letter is in response to the May 2013 Public Review Draft of the NLSRA Management Plan.

The primary issues that we would like to address are as follows:

A. Maintaining Lynx Lake road in its traditional and historic form.

Lynx Lake is unique in that it is the only lake within the entire NLSRA that is 100% enclosed within the park boundaries that has private in-holder ownerships. All of the other lakes with private ownership have a portion of their boundaries excluded from the NLSRA. As 100% in-holders the private property owners on Lynx Lake have used the pioneer trail "Lynx Lake Road" for their historic and traditional access, combined with the boat launch currently in place to access those parcels that are not road accessible.

There are currently 13 privately owned parcels of land on Lynx Lake. Of these 13 properties, 11 of these ownerships predate the creation of the NLSRA, with many of the parcels pre-dating Alaskan statehood. Access via Lynx Lake road and the lake also predate statehood and the creation of the NLSRA.

Our group believes the NLSRA planners need to recognize the clear distinction between the historic and traditional access of the Lynx Lake landowners/in-holders versus the access issues currently being disputed by the users of the Butterfly Lake trail.

B. Retaining the locked gate at mile 3 1/2 Lynx Lake road with access only permitted to authorized landowners/in-holders within the NLSRA.

The locked gate is highly effective in protecting both private property as well as the

State DNR cabins on Lynx Lake from theft and vandalism. The locked gate with access to landowners only should remain in place as it is necessary to reducing the pressure on water fowl and other wildlife. It has substantially reduced the illegal use of firearms, poaching within the park, the dumping of waste and the damage to the anadromous fish stream that flow into and out of Lynx Lake. The current practice of restricted public access (the locked gate with access limited to landowners/in-holders) has allowed the State DNR to preserve and protect the land and lakes within the NLSRA without the unreasonable expense of funding additional park law enforcement.

C. If it is deemed a necessity to relocate the locked gate, it should be moved no further than just beyond the proposed Chicken Lake Loop trailhead. In addition, no day-use or overnight public parking areas should be developed on or near the shores of Lynx Lake.

The May 2013 Draft plan proposed the location of the new gate just past the Chicken Lake cross park trailhead, which the park is hoping to further develop for foot traffic. A major concern for the Steward of Lynx Lake is that once the new Chicken Lake cross/park trail is developed and made known to the public it would certainly result in increased traffic (Keep in mind the adage, if you build it, they will come...) Although the Lynx Lake Road would see increased, unrestricted traffic up to the locked gate, the draft plan lacks any provisions for maintenance or improvements to the Lynx Lake Road. It is inevitable that the increased traffic would further degrade the already primitive conditions of Lynx Lake Road and who will be responsible for the maintenance and repair that is to be expected under increased use conditions?

Chapter 5; Page 1, lines 27-32 of the May 2013 Public Review Draft states, "While not a right, this plan recognizes and allows for vehicle access to private property on Lynx, Butterfly, Skeetna, and Delyndia lakes on a short-term basis; however, it also recommends vehicle access be studied in greater detail to determine how access to private property should be addressed on a long-term basis. The same study will address storage of personal property and moorage of boats long-term on state-owned land and water."

Contrary to the statement quoted from the draft plan (shown above) the Stewards of Lynx Lake believe that the private property owners on Lynx Lake do have a right to the continued reasonable and historic access via Lynx Lake Road that they have used for some 50 years or so and which predates the creation of NLSRA.

It is understood by our group that the NLSRA is in place to maximize the recreational opportunities for the general public. Parity for both public and private ownership within NLSRA is especially important but must be balanced against the State of Alaska recreational area goals of developing lands in the NLSRA to, "enhance outdoor recreational opportunities as long as the intensity of modification does not diminish the unit's natural and cultural values." Before any changes to the current status quo of public access to Lynx Lake is made, an environmental impact study needs to be conducted that can measure the current threshold of public use and the impact of increased usage. With the current hundreds of private and public users that recreate on Lynx Lake every summer (which includes the attendees at the Midnight Sun Bible Camp, canoe trail users and the in-holders) an unrestricted

winter time public snowmachine users, Lynx Lake already has ample access to the public. Further public access would cause irreparable damage to the lake and wildlife.

We concur with the Area-Wide Recreation Goals of the Draft Management plan as spelled out in Chapter 4; page 4-4, lines 11-20 which reiterate our position to, "Provide a maximum diversity of outdoor recreation opportunities based on the natural values of the unit and its ability to sustain use without significant adverse effects to the natural resources ...and ...Maintain the quiet natural setting that is currently available on the two existing canoe trails."

D. In the event road access is granted to the public, it should be restricted to special use permits only (short term issued key to gate) and limited to only the individuals who have booked reservations for the 3 NLSRA public use cabins presently located on Lynx Lake.

Chapter 5; Page 5-4 lines 16-23 the 2013 Draft Plan reads, "In the near-term, public use of highway vehicles shall be allowed without authorization on Lynx Lake Road up to the new traffic control devise (gate) that will be installed at the new trailhead at the intersection of the Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trail and Lynx Lake Road. Long-term it may become necessary to allow highway vehicle access on all or a portion of Lynx, Lake Road based on future demands for access to recreational opportunities. The specific indicator or standard that will prompt DPOR to look at increased access in the future are provided below in the "Facilities" section." As we have previously explained in item B. of this letter, The Stewards of Lynx Lake are opposed to the potential change in policy which would allow for unrestricted public access to all portions the Lynx Lake Road and believe it would be highly detrimental to public safety in general and more specifically the protection of preservation of the goals of the NLSRA as detailed in item C. of this letter.

Chapter 7; Page 7-8 Lines 15-24, details the proposed 5(five) year period for the performance of a study, "...to determine if vehicle access to private properties accessible via Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail should continue to be authorized; and if so, who should be granted access and what type of vehicle access should be authorized." The Stewards of Lynx Lake feel the language regarding the parameters and implementation of the "study" is too vague and needs more detailed explanation of how the data will be collected for the "study" and other pertinent details of this pivotal, decision making tool.

E. Group Camp Guidelines for Public Facilities as detailed in the Spreadsheet on Page 6-21 of the Draft Plan states that a group camp is incompatible within the Lynx Lake Natural Zone. This language needs to be corrected to indicate that the Midnight Sun Bible Camp located on Lynx Lake actually falls within the category of an authorized use. The statement in the guidelines that this group camp use is "Incompatible" within the Natural Zone is clearly in error. The 2013 Draft Plan needs to consider the number of Alaskans who currently take advantage of the states recreational areas guiding principles while camping at the Lynx Lake Midnight Sun Bible Camp. The Midnight Sun Bible Camp has been present on Lynx Lake since before the creation of the NLSRA. Every year they introduce hundreds of Alaskan children and adults to the priceless outdoor experience of camping and recreating on Lynx Lake.

F. Continue to allow the landowner/in-holders on Lynx Lake to launch and moor

their boats at the current Lynx Lake boat launch/landing.

Nine of the Lynx Lake landowners/in-holders do not have direct road access. There is no overland trail or road access available to these properties. These landowners only have access to their parcels via a combination of land and water. The non road accessible properties have utilized a historic and traditional form of access that combines Lynx Lake road (by way of 4 wheel drive vehicles), then via boat across the lake from the boat launch/landing to their parcels/in-holdings.

G. Long Term Anchoring & Mooring at Owner's Upland Private Property on Lynx Lake is detailed in the Guidelines for Public Use Spreadsheet on Page 6-14 of the Draft Plan "Anchoring and mooring (Long Term Greater Than 15 Days)". The guidelines state that this use is "Incompatible" within the Natural Zone which Lynx Lake is located. This needs to be corrected to include Lynx Lake as one of the locations where the use of long term boat anchoring and mooring at private property in excess of 15 days, is allowed without authorization and is not deemed to be incompatible. This discrepancy was pointed out to Mr. Wayne Biessel, Park Superintendent at the May 2013 public meeting in Anchorage. Mr. Biessel concurred that this language is inaccurate and needs to be changed.

H. Guidelines for Private Structures, Hydroelectric Power Development (Small Scale) and Geothermal (Small Scale) as detailed in the Spreadsheet on Page 6-11 of the Draft Plan states that both of these Private Structure Uses are incompatible within the Natural Zone which Lynx Lake is located. The Stewards of Lynx Lake feel that this is an overbroad and sweeping dismissal of these important uses of alternative energy and further consideration should be given to allow them as a compatible use as long as it is a small scale, private use only system that is minimally invasive, located along private property shoreline and appropriately permitted by the State of Alaska.

I. Landowner/in-holder boat access and storage should remain at its existing location at the northeast shore of Lynx Lake at the present boat launch/landing which was previously constructed by the State of Alaska.

Responsible boat access and storage by the landowner/in-holders would protect the park resources by reducing unnecessary traffic by boat trailers along Lynx Lake road.

J. Continue the existing practice of limiting public use boat access to Lynx Lake to canoes and similar non-motorized vessels accessing Lynx Lake via the NLSRA "Lynx Lake Loop" canoe trail.

Use and enjoyment of the Lynx Lake Canoe trails is one of the hallmarks of the NLSRA experience. Every year dozens if not hundreds of boaters experience the safety and serenity of the lakes and portages. If Lynx Lake is open to public road access, the lake will be crowded with motor boats, which would be dangerous not only to the public canoes and kayakers, but also dangerous the waterfowl and other wildlife that live on and adjacent to the waters of the lake.

We the members of Stewards of Lynx Lake respectfully submit these important considerations for inclusion in the proposed NLSRA draft management plan 2013 Public Review Draft.

Signed by multiple members of the Stewards of Lynx Lake.

Comment 6 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I am a property owner/ in-holder on Lynx Lake within the N.L.S.R.A. Our 4.78 acre tract has been in continuous family ownership for over 48 years. It is located on Lot 5 of U.S. Survey No. 4648 on the southwesterly shore of Lynx Lake. It is one of the few 100% in-holding within the NLSRA. Our family ownership goes back over four decades with our family enjoying our cabin since it was purchased in 1964. Our 48 years of continuous ownership and use of the cabin predates the creation of the NLSRA and we are proud to be one of the pioneer families on the lake.

Our access to the Lynx Lake cabin has historically been via a combination of overland and boat access. Road access has been by way of the Lynx Lake four wheel drive pioneer road commencing near mile 64.5 of the Parks Highway and terminating on the northeasterly shore of Lynx Lake. This pioneer road was pushed in many years prior to our ownership, being built by the landowner of Lot 12 U.S. Survey No. 4649.

To reach our cabin on the opposite shoreline at the far end of the Lake, a distance of roughly 2 miles, we have always used a small private boat which we keep stored at the boat launch on the northeasterly shore of the lake. There is no overland trail to our property; our access is entirely limited to the road/boat route.

Since the inception of the NLSRA and the installation of the locked gate along the Lynx Lake 4X4 road, we have been encouraged by the reduction of vandalism and decline of habitat destruction along Lynx Lake. My family is deeply committed to the protection and preservation of the NLSRA parklands and the protection of Lynx Lake area in particular. I believe that the current 2013 Draft of the NLSRA Management plan is an improvement over the previous plan submitted for public comment in 2012. That being said I still have the following comments, corrections and concerns I would like to address.

The primary issues that I would like to address are as follows:

A. Maintaining Lynx Lake road in its traditional and historic form.

Lynx Lake is unique in that it is the only lake within the entire NLSRA that is 100% enclosed within the park boundaries that has private in-holder ownerships. All of the other lakes with private ownership have a portion of their boundaries excluded from the NLSRA. As 100% in-holders the private property owners on Lynx Lake have used the pioneer trail "Lynx Lake Road" for their historic and traditional access, combined with the boat launch currently in place to access those parcels that are not road accessible.

There are currently 13 privately owned parcels of land on Lynx Lake. Of these 13 properties, 11 of these ownerships predate the creation of the NLSRA, with many of the parcels pre-dating Alaskan statehood. Access via Lynx Lake road and the lake also predate statehood and the creation of the NLSRA.

It is my strong personal belief that the NLSRA planners need to recognize the clear distinction between the historic and traditional access of the Lynx Lake landowners/in-holders versus the access issues currently being disputed by the users of the Butterfly Lake trail.

B. Retaining the locked gate at mile 3 1/2 Lynx Lake Road with access only permitted to authorized landowners/in-holders within the NLSRA.

The locked gate is highly effective in protecting both private property as well as the State DNR cabins on Lynx Lake from theft and vandalism. The locked gate with access to landowners only should remain in place as it is necessary to reducing the pressure on water fowl and other wildlife. It has substantially reduced the illegal use of firearms, poaching within the park, the dumping of waste and the damage to the anadromous fish stream that flow into and out of Lynx Lake. The current practice of restricted public access (the locked gate with access limited to landowners/in-holders) has allowed the State DNR to preserve and protect the land and lakes within the NLSRA without the unreasonable expense of funding additional park law enforcement.

C. If it is deemed a necessity to relocate the locked gate, it should be moved no further than just beyond the proposed Chicken Lake Loop trailhead. In addition, no day-use or overnight public parking areas should be developed on or near the shores of Lynx Lake.

The May 2013 Draft plan proposed the location of the new gate just past the Chicken Lake cross park trailhead, which the park is hoping to further develop for foot traffic. A major concern for the Steward of Lynx Lake is that once the new Chicken Lake cross/park trail is developed and made known to the public it would certainly result in increased traffic (Keep in mind the adage, if you build it, they will come...) Although the Lynx Lake Road would see increased, unrestricted traffic up to the locked gate, the draft plan lacks any provisions for maintenance or improvements to the Lynx Lake Road. It is inevitable that the increased traffic would further degrade the already primitive conditions of Lynx Lake Road and who will be responsible for the maintenance and repair that is to be expected under increased use conditions?

Chapter 5; Page 1, lines 27-32 of the May 2013 Public Review Draft states, "While not a right, this plan recognizes and allows for vehicle access to private property on Lynx, Butterfly, Skeetna, and Delyndia lakes on a short-term basis; however, it also recommends vehicle access be studied in greater detail to determine how access to private property should be addressed on a long-term basis. The same study will address storage of personal property and moorage of boats long-term on state-owned land and water."

Contrary to the statement quoted from the draft plan (shown above) I firmly believe that the private property owners on Lynx Lake do have a right to the continued reasonable and historic access via Lynx Lake Road that we have used for some 50 years or so and which predates the creation of NLSRA.

It is understood by our group that the NLSRA is in place to maximize the recreational opportunities for the general public. Parity for both public and private ownership within NLSRA is especially important but must be balanced against the State of Alaska recreational area goals of developing lands in the NLSRA to, "enhance outdoor recreational opportunities as long as the intensity of modification does not diminish the unit's natural and cultural values." Before any changes to the current status quo of public access to Lynx Lake is made, an environmental impact study

needs to be conducted that can measure the current threshold of public use and the impact of increased usage. With the current hundreds of private and public users that recreate on Lynx Lake every summer (which includes the attendees at the Midnight Sun Bible Camp, canoe trail users and the in-holders) an unrestricted winter time public snowmachine users, Lynx Lake already has ample access to the public. Further public access would cause irreparable damage to the lake and wildlife.

I concur with the Area-Wide Recreation Goals of the Draft Management plan as spelled out in Chapter 4; page 4-4, lines 11-20 which reiterate our position to, "Provide a maximum diversity of outdoor recreation opportunities based on the natural values of the unit and its ability to sustain use without significant adverse effects to the natural resources ...and ...Maintain the quiet natural setting that is currently available on the two existing canoe trails."

D. In the event road access is granted to the public, it should be restricted to special use permits only (short term issued key to gate) and limited to only the individuals who have booked reservations for the 3 NLSRA public use cabins presently located on Lynx Lake.

Chapter 5; Page 5-4 lines 16-23 the 2013 Draft Plan reads, "In the near-term, public use of highway vehicles shall be allowed without authorization on Lynx Lake Road up to the new traffic control device (gate) that will be installed at the new trailhead at the intersection of the Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trail and Lynx Lake Road. Long-term it may become necessary to allow highway vehicle access on all or a portion of Lynx, Lake Road based on future demands for access to recreational opportunities. The specific indicator or standard that will prompt DPOR to look at increased access in the future are provided below in the "Facilities" section." As I have previously explained in item B. of this letter, I am strongly opposed to the potential change in policy which would allow for unrestricted public access to all portions the Lynx Lake Road and believe it would be highly detrimental to public safety in general and more specifically the protection of preservation of the goals of the NLSRA as detailed in item C. of this letter.

Chapter 7; Page 7-8 Lines 15-24, details the proposed 5(five) year period for the performance of a study, "...to determine if vehicle access to private properties accessible via Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail should continue to be authorized; and if so, who should be granted access and what type of vehicle access should be authorized." It is my observation that the language regarding the parameters and implementation of the "study" is too vague and needs more detailed explanation of how the data will be collected for the "study" and other pertinent details of this pivotal, decision making tool.

E. Group Camp Guidelines for Public Facilities as detailed in the Spreadsheet on Page 6-21 of the Draft Plan states that a group camp is incompatible within the Lynx Lake Natural Zone. This language needs to be corrected to indicate that the Midnight Sun Bible Camp located on Lynx Lake actually falls within the category of an authorized use. The statement in the guidelines that this group camp use is "Incompatible" within the Natural Zone is clearly in error. The 2013 Draft Plan needs to consider the number of Alaskans who currently take advantage of the states recreational areas guiding principles while camping at the Lynx Lake Midnight Sun Bible Camp. The

Midnight Sun Bible Camp has been present on Lynx Lake since before the creation of the NLSRA. Every year they introduce hundreds of Alaskan children and adults to the priceless outdoor experience of camping and recreating on Lynx Lake.

F. Continue to allow the landowner/in-holders on Lynx Lake to launch and moor their boats at the current Lynx Lake boat launch/landing.

Nine of the Lynx Lake landowners/in-holders do not have direct road access. There is no overland trail or road access available to these properties. These landowners only have access to their parcels via a combination of land and water. The non road accessible properties have utilized a historic and traditional form of access that combines Lynx Lake road (by way of 4 wheel drive vehicles), then via boat across the lake from the boat launch/landing to their parcels/in-holdings.

G. Long Term Anchoring & Mooring at Owner's Upland Private Property on Lynx Lake is detailed in the Guidelines for Public Use Spreadsheet on Page 6-14 of the Draft Plan "Anchoring and mooring (Long Term Greater Than 15 Days)". The guidelines state that this use is "Incompatible" within the Natural Zone which Lynx Lake is located. This needs to be corrected to include Lynx Lake as one of the locations where the use of long term boat anchoring and mooring at private property in excess of 15 days, is allowed without authorization and is not deemed to be incompatible. I discussed this discrepancy and pointed it out to Mr. Wayne Biessel, Park Superintendent at the May 2013 public meeting in Anchorage. Mr. Biessel concurred that this language is inaccurate and needs to be changed.

H. Guidelines for Private Structures, Hydroelectric Power Development (Small Scale) and Geothermal (Small Scale) as detailed in the Spreadsheet on Page 6-11 of the Draft Plan states that both of these Private Structure Uses are incompatible within the Natural Zone which Lynx Lake is located. I feel that this is an overbroad and sweeping dismissal of these important uses of alternative energy and further consideration should be given to allow them as a compatible use as long as it is a small scale, private use only system that is minimally invasive, located along private property shoreline and appropriately permitted by the State of Alaska.

I. Landowner/in-holder boat access and storage should remain at its existing location at the northeast shore of Lynx Lake at the present boat launch/landing which was previously constructed by the State of Alaska.

Responsible boat access and storage by the landowner/in-holders would protect the park resources by reducing unnecessary traffic by boat trailers along Lynx Lake road.

J. Continue the existing practice of limiting public use boat access to Lynx Lake to canoes and similar non-motorized vessels accessing Lynx Lake via the NLSRA "Lynx Lake Loop" canoe trail.

Use and enjoyment of the Lynx Lake Canoe trails is one of the hallmarks of the NLSRA experience. Every year dozens if not hundreds of boaters experience the safety and serenity of the lakes and portages. If Lynx Lake is open to public road access, the lake will be crowded with motor boats, which would be dangerous not only to the public canoes and kayakers, but also dangerous the waterfowl and other wildlife that live on and adjacent to the waters of the lake.

K. It is clear that the NLSRA is in place to maximize the recreational opportunities for the general public. Parity for both public and private ownership within NLSRA is especially important but must be balanced against the state recreational area goals of developing lands in the NLSRA to, "enhance outdoor recreational opportunities as long as the intensity of modification does not diminish the unit's natural and cultural values."

Use and enjoyment of the Lynx Lake Canoe trails is one of the hallmarks of the NLSRA experience. Every year dozens if not hundreds of boaters experience the safety and serenity of the lakes and portages. If Lynx Lake is open to public road access, the lake will be crowded with motor boats, which will be dangerous not only to the canoes and kayaks, but to the waterfowl and other wildlife that live on and adjacent to the waters of the lake.

The plan needs to consider the number of Alaskans who take advantage of the state's recreational areas guiding principles while camping at the Lynx Lake Midnight Sun Bible Camp. The Midnight Sun Bible Camp has been present on Lynx Lake since before the creation of the NLSRA. Every year they introduce hundreds of Alaskan children and adults to the priceless outdoor experience of camping and recreating on Lynx Lake. The introduction of public road access to Lynx Lake will degrade the waterway and have permanent and irreparable impact on the safety, educational and recreational experience of these young Alaskans.

I highly recommend that the State of Alaska take into consideration the comments and concerns of members of the public and those who have lived and recreated within the NLSRA and more specifically along the shores of Lynx Lake. Before any changes to the current status quo of public access to Lynx Lake is made, an environmental impact study needs to be conducted that can measure the current threshold of public use and the impact of increased usage. With the current hundreds of private and public users that recreate on Lynx Lake every summer (which includes the attendees at the Midnight Sun Bible Camp, canoe trail users and the in-holders) an unrestricted winter time public snowmachine users, Lynx Lake already has ample access to the public. Further public access would cause irreparable damage to the lake and wildlife. My primary concern is the continued balanced approach that has been in existence for the past 20+ years.

Respectfully Submitted

Comment 7 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I vote yes to motorized access year round to all the trails and on the lake!
Thank you

Comment 8 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 10:20 PM:

The NLSRA is an amazing place to have fun and be in the outdoors without the noise and pollution that surrounds us constantly. The original plan focused on non-motorized uses and enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system, but the new draft plan includes development guaranteed to spoil these values, including an Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) trail to Butterfly Lake. I think the new plan should maintain the NLSRA's quiet, natural setting. A trail for ORV's will only benefit a small group of people at the expense of everyone else. There are currently ORV's traveling across

state lands on an existing foot-path in order to get to Butterfly lake, which is extremely harmful to the natural habitat as well as disruptive to those of us who use the trail and park as it was originally intended. The existing canoe and hiking trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed. All use of ATVs by private landowners for access through the park should be eliminated as it hampers the experience of being in a remote area as well as destroys the natural habitat along the trail.

The proposed new trailhead and cross-park trail accessed by Lynx Lake Road should be eliminated because that road is not maintained by the state and it would draw ORVs to the park. Any plans for further development of trails for ORVs (or anything wide enough for that type of vehicle) should be halted as it will only lead to more use by ORVs and soon more trails to follow... There is only one way I see to preserve the original purpose of the NLSRA, and that is to continue limiting access to activities that contribute to the slow destruction of the area.

Comment 9 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

The Mat-Su District Citizens Advisory Board (CAB) has reviewed the May 2013 draft of the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area Management Plan (NLSRAMP). Many diverse voices were considered to complete this draft. It took a great deal of work, and all who contributed to its completion should be commended. With this management plan comes many new recreation resources and policies: new shelters, consistent dock permitting, and clean mooring areas to name a few.

The CAB does have some suggestions to make the NLSRAMP even better. Below is a list of our recommendations:

1. Recommendation: Eminent domain acquisition of private land within NLSRA will be prohibited.
2. Recommendation: Additional ORV/trail permits will not be issued to owners outside NLSRA.
3. Recommendation: ORVs must be registered with DMV in order to operate within NLSRA.
4. Recommendation: Excessively loud motorized transportation is prohibited within NLSRA.
5. Recommendation: Request that the State create a clearer definition on what constitutes mooring.
6. Recommendation: There should be a differentiation between in-holders permits and permits issued to land owners beyond NLSRA who travel roads and trails within NLSRA.
7. Recommendation: All in-holders permits within NLSRA should have an online renewal option.
8. Recommendation: Butterfly Lake Trail and Lynx Lake Road need to be described as separate entities, so the State is empowered to rule each one individually.
9. Recommendation: In reference to page 5-10:

Access to private properties can continue to be authorized consistent with current

policies via Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail for a period of 5 years or until a detailed study is conducted that analyzes the appropriateness of continued ORV access.

The language should change to:

Access to private properties can continue to be authorized consistent with current policies via Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail for a period of 5 years or until a detailed study is conducted that analyzes the use of continued ORV access.

10. Recommendation: In reference to page 7-8:

Within a five year period following the adoption of this plan, DPOR shall conduct a detailed study to determine if vehicle access to private properties accessible via Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail should continue to be authorized; and if so, who should be granted access and what type of vehicle access should be authorized (i.e. highway vehicle and/or ORV). This study will determine if DPOR should continue the current policy regarding private access, modify the current access policy (i.e. expansion or restriction), or cease to authorize private access. It will be the basis for future decisions regarding private access on these routes. Vehicle access on Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail by private property owners will continue to be authorized for a five year period or until the study is completed consistent with current policy, but will be capped at the number permits issued for access in 2012.

The language should change to:

Within a five year period following the adoption of this plan, DPOR shall conduct a detailed study to determine if vehicle access to private properties outside NLSRA accessible via Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail should continue to be authorized; and if so, who should be granted access and what type of vehicle access should be authorized (i.e. highway vehicle and/or ORV). This study will determine if DPOR should continue the current policy regarding private access, modify the current access policy (i.e. expansion or restriction), or limit private access. It will be the basis for future decisions regarding private access on these routes. Vehicle access on Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail by private property owners outside NLSRA will continue to be authorized for a five year period or until the study is completed consistent with current policy, but will be capped at the number permits issued for access in 2012.

11. Recommendation: In reference to 7-8:

Lynx Lake Road gate will remain at its current location. This gate will be used as a traffic control device to limit public use on Lynx Lake Road when road conditions will not allow vehicle use typically during freeze-up and break-up periods. When conditions allow during snow free periods, the gate will be opened to allow access to the Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trail trailhead.

The language should change to:

Lynx Lake Road gate at the NLSRA boundary will remain at its current location. This gate will be used as a traffic control device to limit public use on Lynx Lake Road when road conditions will not allow vehicle use typically during freeze-up and break-up periods. When conditions allow during snow free periods, this gate will be

opened to allow access to a second gate on Lynx Lake Road near the Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trail trailhead. The second gate, just beyond Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trail trailhead, allows access for permit holders (and prevents continuance for non-permit holders) only.

12. Recommendation: The committee recommends the State post a sign at the Parks Highway stating "No State maintenance beyond this point. Travel at your own risk" or phrasing to that effect.

We hope these recommendations can help make the final draft of NLSRAMP the best plan it can be. We appreciate you your time. Please contact us if we can be of any further assistance.

Sincerely

Comment 10 of 79 - submitted on 06/25/2013 at 10:46 AM:

It would be a mistake to allow increased ATV use within NLSRA. "Maintaining the quiet natural setting while enhancing and expanding recreational 27 opportunities remains the focus of management for the majority of land and water within 28 NLSRA." (Page 1-1, lines 27-29,

http://dnr.alaska.gov/parks/plans/nancylake/draft6may2013/nlsra_prd_ch1.pdf)

While I am completely for enhancing and expanding recreational opportunities, I am not for increased motorized opportunities. There are already plenty of motorized opportunities in nearby areas. Let NLSRA and NLSRP remain a unique piece of Alaska. Thank you for accepting comments.

Comment 11 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I am writing to comment on the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area Management Plan. I object to any Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use in the Recreation Area.

Nancy Lakes is such an asset to nearby communities. Its value lies in being a place for quiet, scenic, non motorized recreation. This is especially so in the increasingly developed MatSu borough. A management plan should be looking forward at the challenges that will be faced in the future. As our borough develops and becomes more urbanized, areas that provide solitude and quiet non motorized recreational opportunities will be few, and Nancy Lakes will be an oasis in an urban world.

Off Road Vehicles (ORVs) should not be allowed in Nancy Lakes State Recreation Area, and an ORV trail should not be constructed in the Recreation Area. I strongly object to this change. Property owners are able to haul in supplies by snowmachine during winter, ORV use is not needed.

Sincerely

Comment 12 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I oppose opening the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area (NLSRA) to ORV's. This recreational area should continue to be set aside for quiet, non-motorized enjoyment.

Please consider instead putting some money into maintaining current facilities - some facilities are at shameful level of disrepair.

Comment 13 of 79 - submitted on 07/09/2013 at 11:53 PM:

The NLSRA is renowned for its canoe trail through a chain of lakes. The original plan

focused on non-motorized uses and enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system, but the new draft plan includes development guaranteed to spoil these values, including an Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) trail to Butterfly Lake. The new plan should maintain the NLSRA's quiet, natural setting. A trail for ORVs has no place in the park. The existing canoe and hiking trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed. All use of ATVs by private landowners for access through the park should be eliminated.

The proposed new trailhead and cross-park trail accessed by Lynx Lake Road should be eliminated because that road is not maintained by the state and it would draw ORVs to the park. Also, new trails and trail upgrades should be as narrow as possible because wide trails would encourage illegal ORV use in areas of the park where enforcement is impractical.

Comment 14 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) reviewed the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Public Review Draft (PRD) of the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area Management Plan (plan). The Nancy Lake State Recreation Area (NLSRA) and Nancy Lake State Recreation Site (NLSRS) were created to set aside state land and water to use for public recreation. The NLSRA contains approximately 22,000 acres of forest, wetlands, lakes, and ponds; the NLSRS contains 30 acres adjacent to Nancy Lake, which includes a public boat launch and parking area. ADF&G previously submitted comments during the Agency Review in March 2013. It appears that DNR has addressed many of our concerns in the PRD of the plan, but we have one remaining concern. Although this is a DNR, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation plan, we would like references to ADF&G and other agencies' permitting authorities clearly outlined throughout the plan. ADF&G recommends language be added to the Authorities section on Page 1-8 to identify that ADF&G has authorities (AS 16.05.871 & 16.05.841) and responsibilities to permit and address activities which may impact fish habitat in fish bearing water bodies.

We appreciate the opportunity to review and work with DNR staff on the development of this plan. If there are any questions or concerns regarding our comments, please contact us.

Comment 15 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 08:44 PM:

Thank you for this last opportunity to comment on the Draft Plan. I have lived near NLSRA for 35 years and have played and volunteered in the SRA all of that time. Overall, I believe the Draft reflects the values and qualities that the recreational public has for the SRA and myself as well. My specific comments are listed below. Lakes Unit Facility and Trail Recommendations: #10 Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trailhead. This has my support. I believe relocating the gate here will create more recreational opportunities without affecting the canoe trail experiences. It will also help with management and enforcement of the area by creating a presence by the facilities themselves and by more people. #16 Butterfly Lake Trail. Although closure on the Butterfly Lake Trail controversy would be nice, due to circumstances I understand the need for further study. It is still my opinion that the qualities of the SRA is best reflected with the trail designated non-motorized or abandoned all together. The trail crossing through private property will always leave future access questionable. #17 Redevelop Chicken Lake Cross Park Trail as a Class 4. I would

rather this trail be developed to class 3 standards. #18 E. Red Shirt Lake Trail. same as above.

Nancy Lake Parkway Unit Recommendations: #24 Design and develop trails around South Rolly Campground. I believe campers of the campground need something to do beyond the lake. I strongly support developing trails of all types for people of all abilities. #25 Develop Dog Sledding Trailhead. I, and I believe the mushing community, support a separated hook up area and access to the Parkway from the winter trailhead to the Bald Lake parking area. Getting by the winter gate with sled dogs is very problematic. #28 Develop a snow trail connecting to North Rolly Lake. I m not sure why this item is listed. This trail already exists and is working perfectly. #29 Nancy Lake Parkway Trail. This trail is needed as a connector with all the facilities and trails along the Parkway and could be used as a dog sled/ski trail in the winter. This proposed trail is also mentioned in the Willow Summer Trails Master Plan.

Northern Unit Recommendations: #39 Public Use Cabins. I think a PUC in the northern non motorized unit will be popular. #40 Ski Trails. I support widening and improving the ski trails. Currently, many places are not wide enough to even snowplow. #41 New Terra Trails. This area of rolling hills would be perfect for single track bike trails.

Thanks again for listening.

Comment 16 of 79 - submitted on 07/09/2013 at 12:00 AM:

The Nancy Lakes State Recreational Area is one of my favorite destinations for wintertime ski-in cabin trips and summertime cabin/canoe trips. This past winter, my friends and I skied out to the James Lake cabin right after a long Chinook that had melted the snow off the lakes. The day before we headed out, there was finally enough snow down to make it ski-able. All of us commented on how that weekend was the best the park had ever looked and felt. At that time, there were no snow machines permitted due to the lack of snow. As a result, we were able to enjoy the true wildness of this place, without snow machine tracks or fumes or noise. It was wonderful.

I understand that development plans are being considered that would increase motorized access to the park. Please don't overrun our little paradise with more tracks and fumes.

Maintaining and improving the facilities and trails that you have would keep us coming back.

Sincerely

Comment 17 of 79 - submitted on 07/09/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Re proposed NSLRA trails:

Please, maintain the natural, quiet setting that is becoming increasingly hard to find in this area. No ORVs! The proposed trailhead and cross park trail accessed by Nancy Lake should be eliminated. No ORVs! Lets maintain the existing trails before considering new trails. No ORVs!

Comment 18 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Dear State Management, Thank you for respecting the rights of private land owners within the Park's boundary. In particular, by having included the following statement (Chapter 8, line 28): "Privately owned land will only be acquired from willing sellers" owners can be assured that the state can not at a later date purchase land by eminent domain. Sincerely yours.

Comment 19 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Dear State Parks, It concerns me that the State recommends access to its "high priority" Chicken Lake facility be via the Lynx Lake Road. The State has reiterated that it does not own this road and that it does not intend to maintain it. The state has also complained that the maintenance currently done by in holders has negatively impacted the surrounding area. Furthermore, the State plans on studying the environmental impacts of access by current in holders to determine if policy changes are needed to limit their access. It's not prudent for the Commissioner to approve a plan that promotes public use on Lynx Lake Road when private in holders have been told by Park personnel that the road is overburdened and causing erosion of public lands. Sincerely

Comment 20 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 11:09 AM:

i would to see public access to lynx lake rd. expanded and improved.the option to pass through the park gate by virtue of land ownership, seems a violation of my civil rights to access state resources with parity. either end access to all or open access to the general public. land owners with non permitted docks should be given a date by which to remove the fixture or be fined and that fine applied to resource development in the area. now is the time to end the "good ol' boys" club by which certain individuals exist as super-citizens to detriment of others. thank you.

Comment 21 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

land owners no matter of time on their plot does not grant them a preference under the law. the egotistical view of land owners fearing the change of progress has no merit other than identifying their ability to concoct a false stratification of citizenry. perhaps they can demonstrate where on the globe progress is not occurring. this "shut the door behind me" seems to leave out the idea that they themselves were at one point the "new comers". they have had many years to adjust and enjoy and disregard the land use laws where they were, however that does not translate to a greater prestige of consideration. we should be identifying illegal docks and property clearing and fining them to maximum. just because they have been wrong for a l-o-n-g time is not a reason for mercy. using buzz-words like trash and pollution as an excuse to disallow increased access is as disingenuous as saying "it's for the children" what a joke. if you buy a piece of property in a recreation area and then complain about others recreating you are not entitled to treated with dignity, but as a land bigot. thank you. 2nd gen born here

Comment 22 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

We have been enjoying this area for about thirty years and would like to encourage things to stay non motorized as has always been the way. We have canoed through so many of these lakes and have appreciated its special atmosphere so close to civilization. You feel as if you are far away from hustle and bustle while it really is accessible. We have appreciated the improvements to the trails and boardwalks over the years but we have noticed a problem with some atvs. Not only is the noise so very offensive in this serene area, the trails are definitely being impacted in a negative way. This area has been designated nonmotorized and we feel it should

definitely stay this way. Please make sure that the original mission is not lost and that the Nancy Lake State Rec Area stays a special, quiet, unique place to continue to enjoy by so many. Thank you!

Comment 23 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 04:04 PM:

Another year has gone by and we find out you will be studying access to our property for another 5 years. We and other property owners have gone through this hassle for years and years. We have spent large sums of money on developing a trail, with the full knowledge of your department who in fact assisted us in locating said trail. We were assured of permanent access to our property only to have the department renege on its promise. There should be no further discussion on this matter, but immediately be given permanent access to our property. At the very least present owners must be given grandfather rights.

Comment 24 of 79 - submitted on 06/04/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I have a place on Lynx Lake with another clan. My concern is the degradation of the existing canoe trail portages, specifically from Lynx Lake to Echo Pond, and Candlestick. They are in poor condition, and they need to be maintained and upgraded before any new trail systems are allocated. If you can't take care of the existing trail systems why would you start new ones?
Thank you.

Comment 25 of 79 - submitted on 06/04/2013 at 12:00 AM:

My specific concern is with the degradation of existing trails at the expense of new trail development. The trail & portage from Lynx Lake to the echo ponds & Candle Stick are in poor shape. Before new trails are developed the existing trails must be maintained.

Comment 26 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Enclosed are my comments on the public review draft plan for Nancy Lake State Recreation Area.

General comments are change "snowmobile" to "snowmachine". I am aware the State has used snowmobile in some items elsewhere, but no real Alaskan calls them anything other than snowmachines. Using snowmobile makes the plan look as if it written by someone Outside.

Also change dock to wharf, pier, or structure throughout the plan. A dock is a space where you place a vessel. It is not a pile driven structure which you moor a vessel to. Classic docks are a dry dock or a wet dock, such as the docks on the Thames River in London. The only docks on Nancy Lake are Shore Stations or EZ Ports which qualify as docks since they hold a vessel. A structure for mooring a vessel which has the long axis parallel to the shoreline is a wharf. They are a few wharfs on Nancy Lake. A structure for mooring a vessel which has the long axis perpendicular to the shoreline is a pier or a floating pier. Most of the mooring structures on Nancy Lake are some type of pier.

The remaining comments are related to specific sections of the plan.

Page 5-9 provides for a marina. This is also provided for at page 6-26 along with a commercial boat launch. Allowing either item on Nancy Lake would be a mistake. There is currently no marina or commercial launch on Nancy Lake so you are not stopping any one's business if such is disallowed. We previously had a marina on

Nancy Lake which included a commercial boat launch. With the closure and removal of the marina, boat traffic has dropped considerably on the lake. We lost most of the floatplane traffic, which is both noisy and dangerous to boats, because floatplanes no longer fly in to fuel. The use of personal watercraft has vastly decreased since no longer can a father give a child gas money and send him off to the marina for fuel. Instead, a parent has to get involved with the fueling in most cases Boat traffic has also decreased because one has to bring their own fuel rather than running over to the marina for a gas. Fueling one's boat involves more work, but the added peace and quiet is well worth it.

Pages 5-13 and 5-14 deals with structures. You are going to require a permit for each structure. I still believe you should issue a blanket permit for conforming structures. This would remove much administrative burden on the State and avoid fees for most landowners. There is no reason to create work for personnel if your goal is to have conforming structures. This is an example of the government doing what does not need to be done.

Paragraph "i" on page 5-14 requires a reflective marker visible for 360 degrees at the outermost end of the structure and 3 to 5 feet above the water. It has to have a surface area of least 100 square inches. This requirement ignores the construction of most piers on the lake.

The first question is why the need for markers? This is Alaska, and Nancy Lake has quiet hours between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. At any time you can legally boat, you normally can see what is there. There is no need for markers in daylight.

Structures are limited to extending 40 feet from shore. Operating that close to shore means you are in the no wake zone so the speed of any vessel should be low. Under the Rules of the Road, in restricted visibility you are required to operate your vessel at such a speed that you can stop your vessel within half of the distance of visibility. If you close enough to shore that you could hit something and cannot see where you are going, you have no business operating your boat.

Assuming you determine there is actually a need for reflective markers, you have to consider what is on the lake. Most of the piers are low in profile and have nothing at the end. A floating pier, such as the ones built by EZ Port, are only 6-8" above the water. You do not have anything sticking up at the end because it would get in the way of mooring. If you have post sticking up 3' at the end of your pier it will be a hazard to avoid when you moor your vessel. Remember the vessels on Nancy Lake are small craft, and no vessel has a bow thruster to assist in mooring. I have a sailboat. A post at end of the pier would be in the path of the boom if I am making a downwind landing. A post at the end of an EZ Port for personal watercraft would be a hazard if there is an error on landing. In short, what you propose to require is unsafe and would create a hazard in many situations.

Apart from the safety hazard to boaters, there is the practical question of how do you construct the required marker? The commercially available floats from EZ Port accept clamp-on mooring chains and screw-in deck cleats. You can only screw in a deck cleat where the mounting nuts are built into the float. The deck cleats are designed to take a load from a mooring line and not for holding something above the float. The mooring chain attachment is clamp-on chain plate which is underwater and not designed to hold a vertical object. If you drill holes in your float,

you will decrease the buoyancy and may risk sinking the float.

Other floats built on float drums or similar materials have limited deck strength. Float decks are designed to stand on, not to build further structures. The proposed reflective marker is a vertical structure which will be subject to the wind loading. Even if you could screw it into a float deck, many of the float decks will not take the loading when a strong wind blows. In short, your marking requirement does not consider the practical aspects of the construction of what you want to mark.

If you are going to require markers, which I believe are unnecessary, you should limit it to reflective tape or markers at the outermost end located above the waterline of the pier. There is no reason to make a marker visible for 360 degrees because by definition one part of the pier faces the shore. Presumably if you own the land, you know where your pier is. The requirement for 100 square inches is too large since it removes the use of reflectors. A smaller requirement is all that is necessary if you decide to require reflectors...

Page 6-30 deals with commercial barges. I do not know what is contemplated here. If you buy a float, such as an EZ Port, you can have the dealer deliver it to Nancy Lake and install it for a fee. They also do some maintenance for some owners. My dealer uses a pontoon boat to do such work. I don't know if this section is designed to regulate such dealers. If so, it should be dropped since there is no need to regulate items such as pontoon boats.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Comment 27 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

In response to the proposed management plan for NLSRA, I would like to voice my opposition to the continued ORV/ATV use of the Butterfly Lake Trail, or expansion of any potentially ORV/ATV useable trails (Level III or IV) in any section of the NLSRA. It is not the legal responsibility of DPOR to provide access to private land owners, nor should it cave to political pressure to do so.

The use of ATVs in the NLSRA is incompatible with and disruptive to all other recreational uses of the area due to the noise pollution and trail destruction ORV/ATVs cause.

I believe that the canoe portages and existing trails should be maintained and repaired first and foremost. I am generally in favor of additional public use cabins, campground development and new hiking or mountain biking trails, if and only if, there is funding sufficient to maintain preexisting trails and facilities as well as any new trails or facilities to be constructed.

Finally I would like to voice my extreme disappointment in the way that the DPOR has handled the Butterfly Lake Trail conflict. Proper public notice is not optional for stewards of state land. I think it's important to remember that the NLSRA is for the use and enjoyment of all Alaskans not just the owners of adjacent property.

Thank you.

Comment 28 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 09:01 PM:

I am opposed to ATV use anywhere in the NLSRA. The Park should be managed for

the benefit of the park users (who were never given notice of the permits being given for ATV use in NLSRA), not private landowners.

It is ironic that DPOR caved to a few to allow ATV access to Butterfly Lake through the Park; had the land been in private hands, no owner would have allowed ATV use (as evidenced by the amount of "no trespassing" signs popping up on the road to Butterfly Lake).

Allowing ATVs on the trail to Butterfly Lake has made the experience unpleasant for walkers and canoers. The trail is rutted and muddy, noisy when the ATVs go by. This is supposed to be a quiet park, not a noisy highway. Stop ATV use and preserve the park. There are areas where ATV use could be allowed, through a state park is definitely not one of them.

Comment 29 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 10:09 PM:

The NLSRA is renowned for its canoe trail through a chain of lakes. This is a park that I grew up in. The first time I visited I was 6 weeks old. The original plan focused on non-motorized uses and enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system, but the new draft plan includes development guaranteed to spoil these values, including an Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) trail to Butterfly Lake. The trails that I grew up hiking on, where I frequently saw moose and bears, the trails that made me proud to be an Alaskan, have been destroyed by ATVs. I can barely stomach setting foot on what used to be my favorite place on earth. The new plan should maintain the NLSRA's quiet, natural setting. A trail for ORVs has no place in the park. The existing canoe and hiking trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed. All use of ATVs by private landowners for access through the park should be eliminated.

The proposed new trailhead and cross-park trail accessed by Lynx Lake Road should be eliminated because that road is not maintained by the state and it would draw ORVs to the park. Also, new trails and trail upgrades should be as narrow as possible because wide trails would encourage illegal ORV use in areas of the park where enforcement is impractical. Alaska is a huge state. People who wish to use ATVs have many, many, options of private lands to do so in. It is unethical, illegal, and immoral to grant ATV access to NLSRA.

Comment 30 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I am opposed to ATV traffic in the park on the Butterfly Lake trail or elsewhere. The current permit system creates a private motorized access corridor through this public non-motorized park. The park should be managed for the benefit of the public recreational users, not private land owners outside the park. This is a public park, not a private right-of-way. I have noted that canoers and other public traffic has virtually disappeared from the south end of the park since ATV traffic was authorized.

A cynic would regard the 5 year study proposal as a stall to allow continued building of "grandfather rights" for permittees and/or to pass this hot potato to a new administration. DPOR has already had 13 years to gather information on its decision to permit ATV use. What could it possibly learn now that it doesn't already know? I believe DPOR has plenty of information on which to make its decision. The longer this decision is delayed, the more people will claim to have purchased real property and ATVs in reliance on the permits. Every year that passes makes it more difficult

for DPOR to change course, even if it ultimately concludes the permits were a mistake. The reason the planning process started 5 years ago was that members of the public immediately complained when they learned DPOR had been granting ATV permits to landowners. There had been no public notice of DPOR's decision. Notice was only given to the landowners who wanted the permits. The primary reason DPOR chose to do a new plan was to allow public comment, for the first time, on the decision to permit ATV use. Now DPOR is proposing to punt on the issue that generated the planning process in the first place. I believe it should make a decision now.

The initial written public comments were overwhelmingly opposed to ATV use - about 85 to 4, as I recall. Those comments have never been posted on DPOR's website, or to my knowledge, made public in any other way. I request that the original set of comments be posted on DPOR's website and considered by DPOR. The new comments are still predominately against ATV use. Comments by disinterested parties, i.e., people other than property owners receiving permits, were overwhelmingly against ATV use. I think DPOR should listen to the public comments. Particular weight should be given to the comments of recreational users, for whom the park was created.

DPOR has not articulated any goals for the study, has not stated what, if anything the study could find that would make DPOR change its mind, and has no money for any study. If there is some fact or facts that a study could reveal that would make DPOR change its mind on the ATV issue, DPOR should identify those fact(s) prior to the study. Otherwise, the public will never know if the study was a legitimate effort to examine the ATV impact, nor whether DPOR has properly responded to the study results. If there are no facts that would cause DPOR to change its mind, there is no point in delaying the decision for another 5 years.

DPOR's records show that it originally started granting permits because of political pressure and threats to cut its budget if it continued to ticket ATV users. I understand that this pressure continues to this day. In my view, there is no point in having a "public" process if the real decision is made based on private communications from politicians. The decision should be made based on the public information and the public process. The legislature is not supposed to manage the parks through private contacts. It is DPOR's job to manage the parks through a public process.

For all the above reasons, the planning process has done nothing to inspire confidence in the integrity of DPOR's decision-making. It gives the appearance that DPOR does not care what the purpose of the park is, and does not care what the public thinks. The process has created the appearance that DPOR is simply going through the motions of a public process to confirm a decision it made privately many years ago. I certainly hope that this perception is incorrect. I hope that DPOR will consider all the public comments and make a good faith determination on the issue of private ATV use based solely on what is in the public interest.

For all the above reasons, the planning process has done nothing to inspire confidence in the integrity of DPOR's decision-making. It gives the appearance that DPOR does not care what the purpose of the park is, and does not care what the public thinks. The process has created the appearance that DPOR is simply going

through the motions of a public process to confirm a decision it made privately many years ago. I certainly hope that this perception is incorrect. I hope that DPOR will consider all the public comments and make a good faith determination on the issue of private ATV use based solely on what is in the public interest.

With regard to the proposed trail system through the interior of the park, I agree that this is a good idea. This will increase the type of use for which the park was created. However, designing and constructing the trails wider than is necessary for hikers and canoers is a terrible idea. I have little doubt that ATVs will use these trails if they are wide enough. DPOR simply does not have the resources to keep them out. The interior of the park is the last area that remains quiet and serene. If ATV-accessible trails are built there, in a few years we will be in the same situation in the interior of the park that exists on the Butterfly Lake trail. Since DPOR cannot enforce the rules, I fear it will do the same thing again - give in and start permitting the illegal ATV use in the interior of the park.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Comment 31 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

NLSRA should continue to be managed for public enjoyment of quiet, scenic recreation. ORV's have no place in the park - not even for property owners because they can haul in materials by snowmachine in winter. The existing hiking and canoe trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed.

Access to the improved cross-park trail via Lynx Lake Road should not be encouraged because the road is not maintained by the state and it would draw ORV's to the park. Also, any new trails and trail upgrades should be designed in a way that would not encourage illegal ORV use in the recreation area.

Thank you

Comment 32 of 79 - submitted on 06/07/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Chapter 5 Map 6 - Property Storage and Moorage Sites

Inset 2 details the storage and moorage area in conflict with the camping area.

Currently we are using the area in front of the host cabin, that was constructed by the Red Shirt Lake Homeowners for the park host, to the south of the camping area.

Please modify the map to show the area being used as the authorized area.

Tip-A-Canoe may continue to use the northern area.

Chapter 5 Page 15 - Property Storage and Moorage - Standards

Limiting storage and moorage to 30 authorizations is too arbitrary. Red Shirt Lake along has 88 private properties on the lake. Cow Lake and Fish Creek owners share storage on Red Shirt bringing the total to over 100. Placing restrictions on these owners denies them the customary access to their recreation property they have always had.

Storage should be allowed to one boat per property. Not everyone will take advantage of this as some own floatplanes and a few can reach their property via land.

NLSRA, being a recreation area, should not be denying access those adjacent to, within, or who access their recreation properties via the NLSRA.

Chapter 6 Page 20 - Fireworks

The use of fireworks in the forested areas should remain prohibited.

The use of fireworks is traditional. Fireworks launched from a barge or raft at least 250 feet lake ward should be allowed.

Chapter 6 Page 18 - Assembly

Limiting assemblies to 20 persons or less is too restrictive. Many families wishing to have a family outing or picnic exceed 20 persons. Association picnics and gatherings also exceed 20 persons. 50 is a more reasonable number. Requiring trivial permits to be processed by park personnel adds another burden to their duties.

Permitting gatherings for political means, demonstrating or for protesting should be under another heading.

Chapter 8 Page 8-1 - Land Acquisitions Map 12 - Proposed Park Additions & Land Acquisitions

When the NLSRA was formed many landowners were forced to become "in holders". Attempts were made to incorporate the private lands into the recreation area. This new plan appears to be another attempt to seize these private lands. This is immoral and improper.

Other acquisitions will force the landholders on the East Shore of Red Shirt Lake and landholders on the South of Nancy Lake to become "in holders". This is very undesirable to these landowners. Many of the lots were patented prior to Statehood and all most probably prior to the establishment of the NLSRA. This squeeze will limit the old and traditional access for hunting, gathering firewood and other activities.

Comment 33 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 12:53 PM:

The NLSRA is renowned for its canoe trail through a chain of lakes. The original plan focused on non-motorized uses and enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system, but the new draft plan includes development guaranteed to spoil these values, including an Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) trail to Butterfly Lake. The new plan should maintain the NLSRA's quiet, natural setting. The existing canoe and hiking trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed. All use of ATVs by private landowners for access through the park should be eliminated.

Comment 34 of 79 - submitted on 06/09/2013 at 04:46 PM:

RE: NLSRA Chicken Cross Park Site Expansion

My wife and I have worked for this park as both volunteers and paid staff and we listened with interest and concern about plans to develop the Chicken Cross Park Trail for hiking and biking. It would greatly increase non-motorized access and use of the southern end of the park, something long overdue. Nothing, however, was said about access to the new trailhead/parking area, and our concern is the increase in automobile traffic on the 4 miles of Lynx Lake Road between the highway and the

trailhead. Even a 12 cars/week increase would double the traffic on a road already in poor condition with mud holes and water up to two feet deep in the good season (July-September). People unused to driving this road are likely to get stuck. Some commitment to improving this road - even as a seasonal minimal use road - needs to be made if development of this trailhead or there will be adverse impacts on the people who live on this road and need it to at least not deteriorate further from expanded use.

A lot was said about keeping people from having adverse impacts on the Park. I just hope, as a Lynx Lake Road landowner and permanent resident, that the reverse is of equal concern.

Comment 35 of 79 - submitted on 06/05/2013 at 12:00 AM:

1. Please ensure that dock permits are given only to upland land owners.

Comment 36 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 11:08 AM:

I strongly believe that our parks should be non-motorized in order to be fully preserved in their natural state for as long as possible. The original plan focused on non-motorized uses and enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system, but the new draft plan includes development guaranteed to spoil these values, including an Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) trail to Butterfly Lake. The new plan should maintain the NLSRA's quiet, natural setting. A trail for ORV's has no place in the park. The existing canoe and hiking trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed. All use of ATV's by private landowners for access through the park should be eliminated.

The proposed new trailhead and cross-park trail accessed by Lynx Lake Road should be eliminated because that road is not maintained by the state and it would draw ORV's to the park. Also, new trails and trail upgrades should be as narrow as possible because wide trails would encourage illegal ORV use in areas of the park where enforcement is impractical.

Comment 37 of 79 - submitted on 06/06/2013 at 12:00 AM:

2-17 (23-24)

Respondents overwhelmingly supported improving the maintenance of existing facilities before developing new facilities when funding is limited

8-7 (36-40) and 8-8 (1-7)

While this document will not address phasing of specific projects, it will address phasing generally by identifying those facility and trail recommendations that should be developed first to address existing facility and trail needs and to enhance or expand recreation opportunities. The following facility and trail recommendations would greatly enhance recreational opportunities and address congestion and crowding at existing facilities:

- Develop a group camp facility at Shem Pete Lake.
- Develop the Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trailhead.
- Develop terra trails in the area of the South Rolly Lake Campground.

- Develop campsites, shelters, and public use cabins.
- Relocate existing campsites away from canoe portage sites.
- Redevelop the NLSRS campground including overflow parking for the boat launch at Nancy Lake.

Comment: Overwhelmingly, the public recommends improving maintenance on existing facilities, but 8-7 prioritizes development over maintenance. The heaviest use trail in the park, Red Shirt Lake summer trail, is in great need of maintenance. It is used by day hikers, fishermen, canoers, campsite users, cabin users and homeowners. There are significant mud holes, deteriorating board walks with surprise flip-up boards, and toxic creosote wood.

5-14 (7-10)

Structures must have a reflective marker visible from 360 degrees and have a surface area of at least 100 square inches. The reflective marker must be affixed to the furthest lakeward extent of the structure and must be placed between three and five feet above the water surface.

6-16 (25-26)

A prohibition on the continuous or repetitive use of motorized uses between the hours of 11p.m. and 7 a.m. shall remain in effect.

Comment: Red Shirt Lake has a restriction starting at 10pm. Not sure where the 11pm came from. The reflective marker 3-5 feet above water on docks is unsafe and unnecessary. Someone is going to get hurt getting in or out of a boat or plane with a 3 foot rod sticking up to poke them in the eye or impale them. A quick review of dock requirements for the State shows this requirement to be unique to NLSRA. The other aspect of this is that there is nothing to reflect off of the reflector. During boating season, Memorial Day to Labor Day, there is sufficient sunlight to make docks visible. Even if it is dark, navigation lights on a boat would not illuminate a reflector. Besides, boats are not to operate after 10pm. Float planes do not operate in the dark, so a dock is not a hazard to them. Drop the reflector requirement on eye poking sticks. This makes sense for pilings in the winter.

1-1 (17-19)

guides the management of recreation and other uses within the NLSRA and NLSRS for the next 20 years. It is intended to be adaptive to the changing needs of the recreating public and resource managers. 5-15 (13-17) 30 authorizations for storage and moorage on Red Shirt Lake (includes storage and moorage for access to Cow Lake).

Comment: Currently, there are nearly 30 boats at the designated Red Shirt Mooring area. There is room for many times more than that number of boats. This number seems arbitrary and unsubstantiated and does not accommodate additional homeowner development on Red Shirt and Cow Lakes. This arbitrary number is in conflict with the statement up front that this plan is a guide and adaptive. There should be a rational for limiting the number of boats. There have been substantial discussions with the Red Shirt Lake Homeowners association in developing the boat moorage requirements and none of the discussions centered on a 30 boat limit. As

the Red Shirt Homeowners Association bought materials and provided labor to build the host cabin at this boat storage area to reduce vandalism, the 30 boat restriction seems to disregard the relationship built over 30 years with the Recreation Area.

6-14 (Anchorage and Mooring (Long Term Greater Than 15 Days at the Owners Upland Private Property))

Comment: Under the Guidelines, the discussion is mooring shall be allowed. Then the column under Natural Zone says it is incompatible use, except for Big Darell, Little Darell, and Skeetna Lakes. This is very confusing as Mooring is allowed at Red Shirt Lake and others. Please clarify this conflicting information.

6-15 (Airplanes)

Comment: Under the Guidelines, the discussion is use of floatplanes is allowed on Red Shirt Lake. Then the column under Natural Zone says it is incompatible use. This is very confusing. Please clarify this conflicting information.

6-17

Use of ORV s on the frozen surface of Nancy, Lynx, Butterfly, and Red Shirt lakes is allowed without authorization after a change to existing regulations.

7-8 (32-35)

Authorizations for ORV use on the East Red Shirt Lake Trail shall be limited to time periods when snow and frost conditions do not allow the use of snowmobiles south of the Nancy Lake Parkway but a combination of snow cover and frost effectively protect the terra trail tread from degradation.

Comment: Overwhelmingly, the Red Shirt Lake homeowners have voiced that they do not want ORV access to Red Shirt Lake. The exception is by permitted use on the East Red Shirt Lake trail when the ground and lake is frozen but there is not enough snow for snowmachines. This permit should cover use on the lake. The homeowners, at their expense, groom snowmachine tails and ski plane strips in the winter. ORV s have come in from the south and made a mess of these groomed trails. This is particularly dangerous in the spring during freeze-thaw cycles and ruts become unwelcome surprises on the expensive, groomed trails. Red Shirt Lake should be removed from this ordinance change.

7-3 (16-17)

During snow free periods, hiking access is primarily conducted on two 16 terra trails (Red Shirt Lake Summer Trail and East Red Shirt Lake Trail)

Comment: The East Red Shirt Lake trail is hardly used for hiking. I don t think it is even complete for summer use.

7-10 (Ref # 5)

Provide a new camping opportunity that does not currently exist at NLSRA and extend camping opportunities, particularly during shoulder seasons when camping use is typically low. This campsite development will also provide a destination at the terminus of the East Red Shirt Lake Trail.

Comment: Parks have held substantial discussions with the Red Shirt Lake Homeowners association about the East Red Shirt Lake Trail. During those discussions, Parks stated the trail would be developed for cross park use and shoulder season access to Red Shirt and not as a destination for Red Shirt Lake in the summer. Homeowners had significant concerns over the fire danger campsite development would have and the possible extension of trails to private property. Policing of this area is out of sight, out of hearing range, and far from the host cabin. I do not support a campsite at this location. The current campsite at the end of the summer trail is never at full capacity and often empty on weekends.

A-1

Comment: Add definitions for Multi-use trail

Map attached.

Comment 38 of 79 - submitted on 06/06/2013 at 08:41 PM:

My final comment is that I think there should be a final review of the document by the public before it goes to the Commissioner for signing. It does not seem right to take something that has had so much public input, make final changes based on input, and not allow the public to see what is being sent for final signature.

Comment 39 of 79 - submitted on 06/06/2013 at 08:30 PM:

8-2 (2-4) Several of the parcels identified for acquisition are subject to an on-going land exchange between the Matanuska Susitna Borough and the State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources.

Comment: Besides the parcel on the East Side of Red Shirt Lake, I would propose the three parcels on the following map labeled Add on the west side of the Red Shirt Lake be annexed into the park too. Secondarily, I would annex the parcels labeled Potential Add . These parcels are all dry, upland wooded land and have high value for multi-use trails. They are a natural extension of current NLSRA lands to the north along the same glacial terminal moraine. These parcels would also help protect the quiet natural setting of the existing NLSRA area and provide for moderate-to-low impact and dispersed forms of recreation.

Comment 40 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

In addition to the comments made by the Stewards of Lynx Lake July 7, 2012 letter, I have found additional references that appear to be designed to limit or even prohibit vehicle access to private inholdings within NLSRA. The most troubling verbiage is found in Chapter 7, pages 7-8. This says "...or cease to authorize private access." This is unacceptable if meant to deprive in holders of vehicle access to their properties. If it meant to prevent general public access, then it and these other examples need to be rewritten to be more clearly understood and expressly state that in holders will not be denied access by motor vehicle at any time. This access was stated in the 1983 review in 3: 3-2 below.

There is also an suggesting undertone that the proposed access study to be taken within the next 5 years may somehow place limits on the number of vehicles including ORV's that can access the private property. I reject such limitations placed on our facility as it could possibly severely impede our operations and enjoyment of the facility.

Examples

Chapter 3: 3 - 2

While much is known about vehicle access to private properties on Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail, some information gaps still exist. Frequency and distribution of vehicle use is not known and the impacts associated with these uses have not been quantified. This plan identifies a policy that allows vehicle access on these two routes to continue to be authorized at current levels until a study is completed and DPOR determines if the current policy needs to be changed. Essentially, this plan allows vehicle access at 2012 levels without exacerbating impacts to the natural environment until additional information is acquired and a decision is made to maintain or change the current policy. It is intended that the access study be completed within 5 years of the adoption of this plan.

Public access on Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail is re-examined in this plan revision. Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail provide access to a large swath of land and lakes in the southern portion of NLSRA. The 1983 Plan analyzed this issue and stated that the Lynx Lake Road "... is not now, nor planned to be, a public access." Consistent with that analysis, the 1983 Plan states, "It [Lynx Lake Road] shall remain gated at the recreation area boundary and its use restricted to existing property owners authorized and holding access permits issued by the Director or designee." Consistent with this management direction, property owners are authorized to travel via motorized vehicle beyond the gate on Lynx Lake Road during snow free periods. Public pedestrian use beyond the gate is allowed without authorization during snow free periods. The existing policy to restrict use of this existing access route has resulted in low levels of public recreation in the southern area of NLSRA during snow free periods. Because NLSRA is intended to be managed to provide a maximum level of outdoor recreation opportunities it is appropriate to re-evaluate the need to increase public access within NLSRA. This plan recommends increased public access on a portion of Lynx Lake Road.

Chapter 5: 5-10

ORV's

ORV use remains prohibited by general regulations (11 AAC 12.020), except their use may be authorized by the DPOR Director under 11 AAC 18 or allowed without authorization in several specific instances. The exceptions to the general prohibition are:

1. Access to private properties can continue to be authorized consistent with current policies via Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail for a period of 5 years or until a detailed study is conducted that analyzes the appropriateness of continued ORV access. Until the study is completed and changes to current policy are made, DPOR will continue to authorize use of ORV s for access to private property at current levels.

Chapter 7: 7-8

Within a five year period following the adoption of this plan, DPOR shall conduct a detailed study to determine if vehicle access to private properties accessible via Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail should continue to be authorized; and if so,

who should be granted access and what type of vehicle access should be authorized (i.e. highway vehicle and/or ORV). This study will determine if DPOR should continue the current policy regarding private access, modify the current access policy (i.e. expansion or restriction), or cease to authorize private access.

The next paragraph is also extremely troublesome verbiage:

It will be the basis for future decisions regarding private access on these routes. Vehicle access on Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail by private property owners will continue to be authorized for a five year period or until the study is completed consistent with current policy, but will be capped at the number permits issued for access in 2012.

This reads as the direction of the NLSRA management plan is ultimately to severely restrict or totally prevent vehicle access of any kind to private property.

Additionally, no outline or discussion is made on how the study would be structured, executed and reported. Normally such detail may not be included in an overall management plan but the results of this study have such negative implications (as currently written) that these details should be outlined and included.

Lynx Lake Road

In Chapter 5, page 4 I found:

Long-term it may become necessary to allow highway vehicle access on all, or a portion of, Lynx Lake Road based on future demands for access to recreational opportunities.

I could not find any reference to the funding of the required improvement and the cost of maintenance that would be required if this were to happen. As you know, we currently provide this service at no cost to the State or general public but it may not be possible to continue to do so with increased traffic use. Provisions and source for this expense, if it were to occur, should be included in the master plan.

Sincerely

Comment 41 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

We often canoe and camp (or ski in the winter) in the Nancy Lakes Recreation Area. We value this quiet chain of lakes with loons calling. We feel lucky to live in Alaska where experiences like these are so close to our home.

We encourage you to continue to manage NLSRA system for public enjoyment of quiet, scenic recreation. ORV's have no place in the park. Property owners can haul in materials by snowmachine in winter. The existing hiking and canoe trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed.

Access to the improved cross-park trail via Lynx Lake Road should NOT be encouraged because the road is not maintained by the state. It would draw)RV's to the park. Any new trails and trail upgrades should be designed in a way that would not encourage illegal ORV use in the recreation area.

Please continue to manage this quiet gem of a state park focusing on

non-motorized uses.

Comment 42 of 79 - submitted on 05/14/2013 at 02:37 PM:

Please support motorized recreation in the Nancy Lake State Recreation Plan. People rely on ATV's, snowmobiles and motorized boats as a form of transportation to their home or cabin. I would also, like to see the Plan to allow people to be able to continue motorized recreation. The Nancy Lake Area has been a special place for families to enjoy the day trips out on the motorized boat or snowmobile and I would like to see this type of recreation to continue in the Nancy Lake Area. Please consider the disabled in the Nancy Lake Plan, by allowing motorized use. Thank you

Comment 43 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 09:51 PM:

Recreational ATV use in Nancy Lake Park is unregulated and causing environmental damage to this beautiful area. Please prohibit these vehicles from doing further damage! Thank you and be well!

Comment 44 of 79 - submitted on 06/25/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Tremendous amount of effort has gone into this 202 page plan! - Thank you!
Comments: 1) Section 6-11 prohibits small scale Geo Thermal collection from lake waters in the Park - Please delete, as this heating source is renewable, clean and will avoid potential fuel spills into the Lakes. 2) Lynx Lake Road and bridge upkeep and maint. is not mentioned in the Plan. As the Road is a key access point to locations within the Par, upkeep and main.t should be included and covered by the State. Also, No mention of upgrading of the State Road near the Nancy Lake State Park entrance is not mentioned - should be! 3) Personal marker floats should be allowed further than 40' from shore to protect docks and shore line from boat traffic wave damage, as the State does near the public access dock on Nancy Lake. Thank you for the work done so far on the Plan!

Comment 45 of 79 - submitted on 07/09/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I am writing to encourage DNR to protect and preserve the characteristics that are most highly valued about the NLSRA: the opportunities to enjoy activities like hiking, paddling and camping in a peaceful setting. A 2010 survey of park users said that the quiet, natural setting of the area was what people liked most about NLSRA (62%), while the least liked was "motorized use of the recreation area." (33%) The NLSRA is fulfilling a great and valued role in providing high quality recreation opportunities that Alaskans enjoy, and I encourage you to retain the essential characteristics that have made the park the treasure that it is.

Thanks

Comment 46 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

i am writing again to state my opposition to any atv use in the park.
i have been using the park for thirty plus years. i value the pristine conditions. i particularly value the undisturbed quiet.

atvs are not quiet and the disturbance an atv causes lasts long after it has left the area. i have already observed the damage atvs have done even though they are supposedly very limited now.

your proposed opening to more atvs changes/diminishes the experience i have so enjoyed.

please do not allow atvs in nlsra.

thank you

Comment 47 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 08:08 AM:

I do not support allowing off road motorized vehicles in Nancy Lake recreation area.

Comment 48 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Department of Natural Resources Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation Nancy Lake State Recreation Area

We are the owners of Blk 3 Lot 9 Butterfly Lake subdivision. As in-holders of property within the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area we believe it our right to access our property through the Lynx Lake Road by highway vehicle and the Butterfly Lake Trail system by means of ATV.

From the 1983 NLSRA Master Plan: page 42, Lynx Lake Access: Use of the unimproved pioneer road by landowners will be allowed to continue on a permit basis . We believe the intent of this statement was specifically for the use of motorized vehicles. page 86, Section line Vacation: The vacating of section lines will not prevent private land owners from obtaining legal access to their lands

From Chapter 3 Public Review draft by NLSRA May 2013: the Lynx Lake road was developed prior to the establishment of the NLSRA and was used to access private lands on Lynx, Butterfly and Delyndia lakes The need was there. This pioneer road was already in existence for motorized use prior to the existence of NLSRA.

We do not support the proposed public use cabin on Butterfly Lake. The proposed site sits very close to our private property and we have concerns with trespass possibilities. There are two other proposed cabins close by on Heart and Candlestick Lakes. We feel the Butterfly, Heart and Candlestick Lake cabins are being placed too close together. A good alternative to the proposed Butterfly Lake cabin would be a cabin on Skeetna Lake. By placing a cabin on Skeetna Lake the cabins would be distributed through out the NLSRA evenly and give recreationalist an opportunity to explore more of the Nancy Lake canoe trail system. It would allow paddlers to float down the Little Su River and enter NLSRA through Skeetna Lake and have a public use cabin available on the south east side of the NLSRA.

Sincerely

Comment 49 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Note to Butterfly Lake people,

My name Is Robyn Marsh. My family owns property on Butterfly Lake. I support the use of ATVs along Lynx Lake Road and the Butterfly Lake Trail because every time we go out to our cabin site my family takes a lot of supplies. If you take away our right to drive in on our ATVs, my family would have to load every thing in on foot to Butterfly Lake. I would also prefer you not to put that cabin on Butterfly Lake so close to our property.

Comment 50 of 79 - submitted on 07/09/2013 at 12:00 AM:

My family and I have been canoeing and skiing in the Nancy Lakes recreation area west of Willow for more than 30 years.

The new plan should maintain the NLSRA's quiet, natural setting. A trail for ORV's

has no place in the park. The existing canoe and hiking trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed. All use of ATV's by private landowners for "access" through the park should be eliminated.

The proposed new trailhead and cross-park trail accessed by Lynx Lake Road should be eliminated because that road is not maintained by the state and it would draw ORV's to the park. Also, new trails and trail upgrades should be as narrow as possible because wide trails would encourage illegal ORV use in areas of the park where enforcement is impractical.

And, to refresh your memory...

A 2010 questionnaire of park users by the state found that:

- The "quiet, natural setting of the area" is what people liked most about NLSRA (62%), while the least liked was "motorized use of the recreation area." (33%)
- The top four uses that users thought were appropriate for the area were: hiking (72%), cross country skiing (69%), camping (69%) and public use cabins (65%).

Thank you for considering my comments.

Comment 51 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I have been enjoying the special natural habitat of Nancy Lakes for years. It's wonderful to have a naturalistic site so accessible from home. What sets Nancy Lakes trail system apart is that it IS possible to go somewhere close to home that is quiet and shared by other people who value the same. It's well known that if you want to do motorized boating or ORVing, go to Big Lake. Quiet sports enthusiasts don't go to Big Lake. Nancy Lakes provides a recreation area for those who do not want to be around motorized vehicles. It's the usual dilemma: motorized users don't mind sharing, because non-motorized users don't wreck their experience. Non-motorized users' experience is completely compromised by motorized users. Thanks for your consideration in this matter. Don't allow the loudest users sway you in understanding the value of Nancy Lakes as it stands. Use our resources to maintain what we already have, rather than to develop more trails that would compound the situation by requiring even more maintenance.

Comment 52 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 12:00 AM:

The new plan should maintain the NLSRA's quiet, natural setting. A trail for ORV's has no place in the park. The existing canoe and hiking trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed. All use of ATV's by private landowners for "access" through the park should be eliminated. The proposed new trailhead and cross-park trail accessed by Lynx Lake Road should be eliminated because that road is not maintained by the state and it would draw ORV's to the park. Also, new trails and trail upgrades should be as narrow as possible because wide trails would encourage illegal ORV use in areas of the park where enforcement is impractical.

Comment 53 of 79 - submitted on 07/05/2013 at 12:00 AM:

The purpose of this letter is to offer the comments of the Alaska Quiet Rights Coalition (AQRC) on the Public Review Draft of the Nancy Lake SRA Management Plan (Plan). AQRC is a state-wide non-profit organization which believes that natural

sounds and natural quiet are resources of our public lands which deserve protection similar to that accorded clean water and clean air. We speak out for quiet and seek a fair and balanced allocation of our public lands for both non-motorized and motorized recreational uses. AQRC has previously commented on the scoping and alternatives phases of this planning process. Our comments are addressed to motorized access issues and do not deal with the storage and dock issues. As general comments, we fully support the NLSRA management intent expressed as: "to maintain the high quality natural character of the majority of the area..." and the recommendations for improvements to, and new construction of, the many non-motorized trails (terra and water) as well as construction of a year-round non-motorized public use cabin. We note, and appreciate, that the Plan explicitly acknowledges the importance of natural sounds with the proposed limitations on mobility devices (p 6-19). We are critical, however, of the seeming emphasis given to providing access to property owners over the general public throughout the Plan. For example, see Chapter 3: Issues, Recreational Facility Development: "DPOR must balance the rights and interests of inholders and other property owners in the area, with the public right to access and to recreate on state land and water". AQRC believes the public's right to access and recreate in NLSRA must be the priority for management decisions; not just a consideration equal in weight to interests of the inholders.

We fundamentally object to this Plan, however, for its failure to make a decision concerning the issuance of Special Park Use Permits to property owners allowing highway vehicle and ORV use. Instead, what is proposed is to continue the issuance of permits (albeit at 2012 levels) to property owners until a study can be completed within five years (depending on staff and funding availability). We note that until the Plan is approved, the "up to five year period in which to conduct the survey which is believed to be required" does not start. Assuming the Plan is approved in 2014 (before 2014 permitting is initiated) and the survey not completed until the conclusion of the five year window, means that eleven years will have elapsed since serious questions were raised about the legality and environmental costs of issuing such permits.

We object to this continuation of the status quo on several grounds:

a. Continued environmental damage: The Plan at p.3-5, Resource Impacts, states that "(A)uthorized use of ORV's on Butterfly Lake Trail is resulting in degradation of some segments of the trail tread making it difficult for hikers ...", "(I)mpacts associated with vehicle use and improper maintenance of Lynx Lake Road is contributing to the sedimentation of adjacent uplands and degradation of the road surface" and "highway vehicle and ORV's (use) on this road has caused rutting, puddle development, and washboarding..." We believe the complaints raised to DPOR in 2008 concerning the environmental damage being caused by ORVs on the Butterfly Lake Trail led to the initiation of this planning process. The failure of the Plan to take action means that the damage to the resource will continue to increase to the detriment of hikers and homeowners who access their property by foot.

b. Continued appropriation of public resources: By failing to take action and continuing to issue permits for up to, say, 2019, DPOR continues to appropriate public resources (road and trail, waters and shores) for the benefit of private citizens. The research cited in the Alternatives publication indicates that no

commitments were made to private property owners to insure their continued access through the SRA at the time NLSRA was created and, in fact, borough documents show that access was to be by plane, snowmachine or via a new road outside the SRA boundaries. Moreover, we believe that Special Park Use Permits granted to property owners to transit across NLSRA to property outside the boundaries of NLSRA are expressly prohibited by 11 AAC 18.010(a)(8).

c. Delay: We object to further delaying a decision. First, it is beyond reason to think that DPOR will have the political will or influence to limit, in any way, the permitting process after another five years plus have passed. Secondly, delaying a decision only exacerbates the issue as new property owners seek permits as was set forth in detail in the Alternatives documents. In view of the past history of granting permits, does the mere statement in the Plan that additional permits (in excess of 2012 numbers) will not be issued hold sufficient legal weight to allow DPOR to reject all such applications? Thirdly, this planning process started in 2008 and one would think DPOR could have collected whatever data is needed to decide whether to continue, curtail or cease granting such permits. Seemingly, they should have the information needed; the regulations at 11 AAC 18.025(a)(6) require the applicant for a permit to supply a physical description and license number of each vehicle (to be) used. However, the Plan includes no data, history or analysis of the permits issued to date. The Plan only states that until a decision is made, DPOR will continue to issue such permits not to exceed the number issued in 2012, but that number is not provided. The only hard number included in the Plan is that a maximum of 6 permits for land owners on DeLyndia Lake were issued in 2012 and will be the future ceiling. In our opinion, any permits, past, present or in the future, for land owners on DeLyndia Lake are questionable since that property is outside the boundaries of NLSRA. AQRC concludes that it well may be that DPOR has not collected data over the years and must do a study to ascertain the basic facts. We strongly recommend that priority be given to conducting this study as soon as the Plan is approved for further delay only makes the issue more difficult to manage and control and the preservation of NLSRA's natural character harder to maintain.

In regard to winter activities, we wonder if the new standard being used to determine sufficient snow cover is to be adopted for other locations and/or units of DNR. How has its reliability been tested and are other agencies using similar measurements? We recommend that the practice of allowing restricted openings on specific trails and areas when the rest of the SRA remains closed to recreational snowmachining not be allowed unless DPOR can provide adequate enforcement. In regard to the Management Guidelines on ORVs (p. 5-10) we question how an ORVs can access the frozen surfaces of Lynx, Butterfly and Red Shirt Lakes since they are not otherwise authorized to travel in the SRA. We raise the same question in regard to highway vehicles being allowed on those same frozen surfaces.

If we have read the Plan correctly, we believe the wording about the proposed study is either misleading or simply confusing. The Issues section of the Plan discusses: access issues on Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail; the issuance of Special Use Park Permits permits to allow private land owners to use highway vehicles and/or ORVs on the Road and ORVs on the Trail to their properties; and the continuation of the practice until an access study is completed. However, the Goals and Objectives section of Chapter 4, Objectives 1-1, limits that study to whether DPOR should continue to authorize ORV access. ORV is defined in Appendix A to exclude highway

vehicles (and snowmachines). This leads us to conclude that the study will not review the granting of Special Use Park Permits for highway vehicles for travel on Lynx Lake Road and therefore that DPOR will simply continue to grant Special Use Park Permits for private landowners utilizing motorized travel on Lynx Lake Road. This limited inquiry does not address the issue raised in the Issues section of the Plan nor our objections to the environmental damage being caused or the allocation of public resources to the benefit of a few private landowners. We recommend that you revise and clarify the scope of the study to include highway vehicle use of the Lynx Lake Road.

Finally, AQRC objects to the recommendation to redevelop the Butterfly Lake Trail as a Class 2 terra trail designed for ORV use. First, until the issue of awarding Special Use Park Permits is settled, no action can, or should, be taken on this recommendation. Secondly, we oppose the introduction of ORVs in the non-snow periods into Nancy Lake SRA on the grounds that they are totally antithetical to the natural setting recognized in its creation and which, surveys show, is highly valued by the users. We are baffled by this recommendation since we find nothing in this Plan which hints of opening the SRA to ORVs in non-snow periods and there is no ORV access to this trail except from outside the SRA.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely yours

AQRC brochure included with comment.

Comment 54 of 79 - submitted on 06/04/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I am a land owner on Butterfly Lake, and I have attended all the meetings concerning the revision of the park rules, and upgrading the documents back from the 80s. This last one I'm at today is because I'm concerned about the 5-year study concerning the access to Butterfly Lake via ATV. One of the recommendations I would like to make is that I would like to be involved in this study, or have input from people on Butterfly Lake as this study process is happening. I don't know how it is going to be done but I would like to stay in the loop - talking to a bunch of folks on Butterfly to be involved in the study and process if that is a possibility. My number is phone number deleted.

Thank you very much.

Comment 55 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

We are long-time users of NLSRA, including PUC's, canoe trails, ski trails, fishing, camping, etc. Our favorite aspect of the area is its peacefulness. We are completely opposed to any change in the management plan that would allow or promote the increased use of ORV's. We feel the language of the last management plan (not the one with a golf course and float plane mariina!) should be maintained: "enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system." More ORV use would be the exact opposite of that.

Thanks for listening.

Comment 56 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I, along with most Alaskans, am very busy with work during the short summer season, so I don't follow these things that come up as closely as I perhaps should. I

am very alarmed at some of the proposals for the public review draft for the Nancy Lakes SRA.

I have skied there in the winter, and canoed there in the summer, and it is a wonderful area as is to go enjoy a very beautiful slice of our state. My understanding of the 2010 park questionnaire of park users that you surveyed, was that 62% liked most the quiet, natural setting of the area, and 33% least liked the motorized use of the area. That along with all the top uses (in the 60s and 70s percentile) were non-motorized uses. So exactly why are you proposing an ORV trail to Butterfly Lake?

There are vast swathes of the our state already open to motorized vehicles. This includes much very beautiful county as well, but much if it is far more remote and for most people takes vehicular access to visit. This is all fine, as we all need to recreate how we see fit. That includes those of us who need peace and quiet. I used to be a motor-head, and I still enjoy motorcycling, ORV-ing, and snow-machining. But as I have gotten older, I find that I appreciate even more the space and opportunity to have quiet time where what I hear is the loon calling across the lake, or the wind gently sighing in the spruce trees; perhaps the soothing sound of gently lapping wind waves on the lake shore. The quietscape of a hundred people out enjoying an area by hiking, paddling, skiing or just sitting at a beautiful camp or cabin, can be totally screwed up by just one ORV or motorcycle snarling away and tearing up a trail or wetland bottom. To have a beautiful area such as this, so close in and easy of access for so many people to enjoy on foot, ski, or canoe is going to be increasingly important as our state grows in population, especially with the growth projections of the Mat-Su Borough in the next few decades.

In short, despite the fact that I own lots of motorized vehicles, allowing any increased or new ORV or motorized use of Nancy Lakes SRA in any way, shape, or form is and will be a huge mistake and not what most people want for the area! Please, we don t need to turn the whole state into vehicular roaded access!

I would also like to say, that any new trails, upgrades, or access points MUST be designed as narrow as possible and with active exclusion barriers to discourage motorized use never to encourage it. There is very little real-world enforcement that can be done in many places, especially given your budget constraints. Anything that Parks does which will facilitate any motorized use of an area, will simply lead to many more problems with resource degradation, facilities degradation, and user conflicts increasing in the future, and increased maintenance and replacement costs to repair damages/vandalism.

Comment 57 of 79 - submitted on 06/25/2013 at 06:56 PM:

I believe it is in the State's best interest in listing Butterfly Lake trail and Lynx Lake road as separate entities. This will empower the State to be able to govern them separately. (so you can close one and not the other)

Clarification needs to be made with regard to the location and function of the new Chicken Lake Crosstrail gate (CLCG)

Recommendation: - Change language to: (that this "CLCG" gate will be located on Lynx Lake Rd just beyond the Chicken Lake Trailhead and is to remain locked when the park boundary gate on Lynx Lake Rd is open. Access through this gate shall be

only for permit holders for in-holders access)

I recommend that all ORV's in NLSRA be required to have a State of AK DMV registration.

Trail Permits : I recommend that In-holders should receive different consideration for property access than property owners outside NLSRA

Comment 58 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I thank you for the opportunity to comment on DNR's "Public Review Draft" of the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area Management Plan. My comments are drawn in part from the 2010 survey done by the State of Alaska, in which 62% of NLSRA users valued retaining the quiet, natural feeling of the area. The top four uses cited were consistent with that goal: hiking (72%), cross-country skiing (69%), camping (69%), and public use cabins (62%).

With that in mind, please do not build ORV trails in NLSRA. It would be a slap in the face of all those users who cared enough to fill out the survey, as well as all those who value peace and quiet. Noise is an issue in so many places these days, and NLSRA is one of the gems of quietude that needs to be preserved.

Another reason to NOT put in ATV trails is that there are so many existing trails, campsites, etc. that currently are in need of maintenance. It makes no sense to build new facilities if monies are not available to maintain what is already there.

I urge you to eliminate the proposed ATV trail to Butterfly Lake from the draft plan, and to keep all ORVs out of Nancy Lake State Recreation Area, including those with claims of needing to access private land. Motorized vehicles are simply not in keeping with the historic goal of the park, stated in the original NLSRA Management Plan, which speaks to "enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system."

How can I put it more clearly? ATVs and quiet recreation are incompatible.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely

Comment 59 of 79 - submitted on 06/21/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Dear sirs,

Please accept my comments for the record as opposing the ADNR/DPOR's Draft Nancy Lake State Recreation Area Management Plan to the extent it continues to permit ATV use in the Park. My reasons for opposing the Draft Plan are as follows:

1) ADNR/DPOR's Draft Nancy Lake State Recreation Area Management Plan commits to continuing another 5 years of ATV use in the Park. That makes 18 years since DPOR started issuing permits for such otherwise strictly prohibited use. The ostensible reason for the NLSRA Management Plan Amendment in the first place, which has now been going on for 4 years, was to resolve the Butterfly Trail ATV issue. Now the DPOR states that it needs another 5 years to assess the effects of this ATV use on the Park. The DPOR's claim that it needs another 5 years to assess this issue is not credible. The DPOR's position throughout this allegedly public process confirms that it is merely seeking to validate the ATV users' otherwise

completely inaccurate claims that they now possess "grandfather rights" to continue ATV use in this unmotorized Park. Conspicuous by its absence in the Plan Amendment is any identification of who is going to conduct the study and what criteria are going to be used in conducting the "study". Given the consistent manner in which the DPOR has disregarded the vast majority of public comments opposing ATV use in the Park, I do not expect, and there is no basis for the public to expect, that there will be any objective "study" of ATV use on the Park. Its sole and transparent purpose, in my view, is to create a consistent and lengthening (but nonetheless "recent") history of ATV use in the Park, to justify its continuance in perpetuity-regardless of the physical damage to the resources of the Park and/or to the quiet spaces there which the public most values.

2) DPOR plans to open the gate, allegedly to allow access to the trail it is building to Chicken Lake. That trail is to be upgraded to allow what DPOR styles 'multimodal access'. This sound very much like DPOR disingenuous double speak for "ATV Access". Whether the ATVs are technically prohibited or not, with the gate open and with the improved trail, ATVs will have access to the entire park, not just Butterfly Lake Trail and the Lynx Lake Road. At that point, anybody who has an ATV, not just landowners, will have unfettered access to the entire Park. How does the APOR intend to police that unauthorized use? It does not take a cynical person to conclude that the very purpose of this action is yet another effort to slowly and subtly erode the foundational principal of keeping NLSRA unmotorized. What will ADPDR say to all the ATV users of Chicken Lake trail who access the rest of the Park over the next 5 years when they claim their consistent and uninterrupted use of ATVs in the Park has given them "Granfather Rights" to do so? Will the ADPDR issue them permits while it undertakes to "study" their use for another 5 years-until the entire Park is motorized? Opening the gate, and "upgrading" the Chicken lake trail for "mulitmodal access a/k/a ATV Access" will be the end of the last quiet areas in the park. In my view, by adopting the above features of Draft Management Plan, the DPOR is abdicating its responsibilities to the public at large, to appease either a motorization bias within APOR's own ranks, and/or local politicians under the influence of a few ATV users.

Please revise the Draft Plan to be consistent with the majority of the public comments about what is valued in the Park. It undermines public confidence in the process, and the DPOR itself, when the most important provisions of the Draft Plan disregard the express desires of the majority, and accede to the demands of the vocal minority. It makes the "process" seem contrived in the face of a predetermined outcome, and that is discouraging to good faith participants, to say the very least.

Sincerely

Comment 60 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 07:57 PM:

I completely object to this draft plan for the Nancy Lake SRA. You supposed protectors of our parks have completely given in to the ATV users. I would like you to just remember 2013 because it will be the year this "Jewel of the State Parks" is changed forever. Because once you unleash this you will never be able to take it back. You have given in to pressure to allow private landowners to dictate a major policy change for a state park. How can you possibly think this is a good idea for the future of this park!

Much of this draft plan presents maps and plans for upgraded campsites and boat

launches. Those are the areas you should be focusing your efforts; enhancing the things that the results of your surveys showed park users enjoy the most - a peaceful quiet environment.

The developers of the 1983 management plan specifically stated that ATV use was NOT compatible with the nature of this park. We are very lucky that the park managers up until this point in time have NOT been so weak because we have had the pure joys this park has given us. I seriously doubt our children will have that same experience.

Comment 61 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I believe use of ATV's by private landowners for "access" through the park should be eliminated.

Please consider the environmental impact for future generations.

Thanks

Comment 62 of 79 - submitted on 07/05/2013 at 08:14 AM:

I support full public motorized access to the Lynxx Road and Butterfly Lake Trail to gain access to the South portions of NLSRA. Prefer parking only for access & not for overnight camping - unless in designated areas.

Impound illegally stored vehicles on state land. use impound fees to remove non usable vehicles that have been abandoned. Make fee based storage possible if suitable room is available as suggested.

Protect underlying vegetation by limiting snowmobile access during low snow cover.

Increase flexibility in openings to include designated winter trails only for access to other areas. Authorize restricted openings on designated trails for low snow access to private property.

Provide large dedicated snowmobile parking areas at access points to major trail systems.

Review the 18" minimum snow depth for trail only openings/use. It could be reduced on designated trails without damaging the trail.

Restrict dock sizes in future and charge existing dock owners for excesses above the new limit.

Harden wet trails that are on marked and maintained trails.

Fully support the upgrading of identified trails to sustainable standards and construction of new trails

ORVs should be restricted to designated and appropriately constructed trails. Fully support mandatory registration and sufficient noise pollution control.

Upgrade Butterfly Lake "Trail" to "Road" status and maintenance levels to improve access to Southern unit - especially canoe trails of Butterfly Lake to Little Susitna River.

Loop all Terra Trails

Fully support Snowmobile Limited access guidelines, especially the limited opening. Recommend reviewing 1.54" water/18 inch minimum depth limit to see if less cover can still protect as desired.

Fully support redevelopment and relocation of campsites & trails in Lakes Unit.

Support #22 - Map #9 - redevelop Existing Trailhead at end of Nancy Lake Parkway.

Support acquisition of lands to be included int NLSRA.

Thank You for the broad reach of this planning proposal to increase access to key areas or the NLSRA for all Alaskans consistent with the Area-Wide Management Intent.

Comment 63 of 79 - submitted on 06/25/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Hello,

Thank you for allowing comments from the community before finalizing your updated policy for NLSRA.

We have used the Nancy Lake SRA for about 25 years off and on. We would like to see shared use of trails - allowing multi-use by snowmachines, skiers, dog teams, hikers, bikers, etc.

Once the snow cover is sufficient for use by snowmachines (so damage does not occur to the habitat), from our experience it is the snowmachiners using the trails that many times opens to way for use by skiers, snowshoe users, dog teams and others. As we snow shoe, ski, snowmachine, canoe, fish and sometimes rent the cabins we believe the multi-use method is a great approach for allowing use by many groups.

Thank you again

Comment 64 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I would like to briefly comment on the draft plan for the Nancy Lakes area as presented to me earlier this week. For nearly 30 years I have enjoyed canoeing in Nancy Lakes, and I am anxious that this area remain as nearly pristine and peaceful as it is today. The State of Alaska has shown great insight in the past by preserving such areas with low impact uses (camping, canoeing, skiing, and low impact public cabin use). The addition of Off Road Vehicle trails and other motorized uses would greatly impair the quality of the experience now enjoyed by many (both in and out of state tourists), and use of ATV's to access private lands in the recreation area should similarly be restricted or eliminated. I would hope that future development funds are targeted at long needed improvements to existing facilities and infrastructure, including existing rails and portages, public use cabins, and parking.

Thank you very much for your efforts on behalf of Alaska's state lands and wild places.

Sincerely

Comment 65 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 12:00 AM:

After review and consideration of the Draft Nancy Lake State Recreation Area

Management Plan, The Redshirt Landowners Association offers the following comments.

1. Maintain Existing Infrastructure Before Developing New Trails and Structures.

Re: Ch. 2, Page 17, (23-24)

Respondents overwhelmingly supported improving the maintenance of existing facilities before developing new facilities when funding is limited.

Re: Ch.7, Page 5, (28-29)

Of these trails, the Red Shirt Lake Summer Trail receives the highest use levels during snow-free periods.

Re: Ch. 8, Page 7 (36-40) and Ch. 8, Page 8 (1-7)

While this document will not address phasing of specific projects, it will address phasing generally by identifying those facility and trail recommendations that should be developed first to address existing facility and trail needs and to enhance or expand recreation opportunities. The following facility and trail recommendations would greatly enhance recreational opportunities and address congestion and crowding at existing facilities:

- Develop a group camp facility at Shem Pete Lake.
- Develop the Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trailhead.
- Develop terra trails in the area of the South Rolly Lake Campground.
- Develop campsites, shelters, and public use cabins.
- Relocate existing campsites away from canoe portage sites.
- Redevelop the NLSRS campground including overflow parking for the boat launch at Nancy Lake.

Comment: Overwhelmingly, the public recommends improving maintenance on existing facilities, but Ch. 8, Page 7 prioritizes development over maintenance. The heaviest use trail in the park, Red Shirt Lake summer trail, is in great need of maintenance. It is used by day hikers, fishermen, canoers, campsite users, public cabin users and homeowners. There are significant mud holes, deteriorating board walks with surprise flip-up boards, and toxic creosote wood. Maintain this trail, other existing trails and facilities, to the highest standard, before investing in new infrastructure.

2. Proposed Reflector Requirements are More of a Hazard than the Docks to which they would be Mounted.

Re: Ch. 5, Page 14, (7-10)

Structures must have a reflective marker visible from 360 degrees and have a surface area of at least 100 square inches. The reflective marker must be affixed to the furthest lake ward extent of the structure and must be placed between three and five feet above the water surface.

Re: Ch. 5-16 (25-26)

A prohibition on the continuous or repetitive use of motorized uses between the hours of 11p.m. and 7 a.m. shall remain in effect.

Comment: Red Shirt Lake has a restriction starting at 10pm. Not sure where the 11pm came from. The proposed reflective marker 3 5 feet above water on docks is unsafe and unnecessary. Someone is going to get hurt getting in or out of a boat or plane with a 3 foot rod sticking up to poke them in the eye or impale them. The elevated nature of the proposed reflector requirement will conflict with aircraft operations. The wings struts and tail of a plane project over the dock surface and will come in contact with the elevated reflector. A quick review of dock requirements for the State shows this requirement to be unique to NLSRA. The other aspect of this is that there is nothing to reflect off of the reflector. During boating season, Memorial Day to Labor Day, there is sufficient sunlight to make docks visible. Even if it is dark, navigation lights on a boat would not illuminate a reflector. Besides, boats are not to operate after 10pm. Float planes do not operate in the dark, so a dock is not a hazard to them. These reflectors even if elevated can be obscured and rendered useless by tall boats and planes when moored to the dock. Drop the elevated reflector requirement for summer water operations. This proposed elevated reflector requirement makes sense for pilings and piers that are not removed or floated to shore in the winter.

3. Boat Moorage Authorizations are not Flexible and Sufficient in Number.

Re: Ch. 1, Page 1, (17-19)

guides the management of recreation and other uses within the NLSRA and NLSRS for the next 20 years. It is intended to be adaptive to the changing needs of the recreating public and resource managers...

Re: Ch. 5, Page 15, (13-17) 30 authorizations for storage and moorage on Red Shirt Lake (includes storage and moorage for access to Cow Lake).

Comment: Currently, there are nearly 30 boats at the designated Red Shirt Mooring area. There is room for many times more than that number of boats. This number seems arbitrary and unsubstantiated and does not accommodate additional homeowner development on Red Shirt and Cow Lakes. This arbitrary number is in conflict with the statement up front that this plan is a guide and adaptive. There should be a rational for limiting the number of boats. There have been substantial discussions with the Red Shirt Lake Homeowners association in developing the boat moorage requirements and none of the discussions centered on a 30 boat limit. As the Red Shirt Homeowners Association bought materials and provided labor to build the host cabin at this boat storage area to reduce vandalism, the 30 boat restriction seems to disregard the relationship built over 30 years with the Recreation Area.

4. Mooring of Boats at Owners Private Property Shall be Allowed Without Authorization.

Re: Ch.6, Page 14, Anchorage and Mooring (Long Term Greater Than 15 Days at the Owners Upland Private Property)

Comment: Under the Guidelines, the discussion is mooring shall be allowed. Then the column under Natural Zone says it is incompatible use, except for Big Darell,

Little Darell, and Skeetna Lakes. Red Shirt Lake is within the Natural Zone. This is very confusing as Mooring is allowed at Red Shirt Lake and others. Please clarify this conflicting information to allow mooring of boats at owners private property without authorization or time limitations.

5. Float Equipped Airplanes (Seaplanes) Shall Be Allowed Without Authorization.

Re: Ch. 6, Page 15, (Airplanes)

Comment: Under the Guidelines, the discussion is use of floatplanes is allowed on Red Shirt Lake and others. Then the column under Natural Zone says it is an incompatible use. Red Shirt Lake is within the Natural Zone. This is very confusing. Please clarify this conflicting information to allow use of float equipped airplanes without authorization or time limitations.

6. Don't Change The Off Road Vehicle Regulation

Re: Ch. 5, Page 10, (24-25), (37-38)

Use of an ORV on the frozen surface of Nancy, Lynx, Butterfly and Red Shirt Lakes will be allowed without authorization.

Re: Ch. 6, Page 17, (Off Road Vehicles)

Use of ORV's on the frozen surface of Nancy, Lynx, Butterfly, and Red Shirt lakes is allowed without authorization after a change to existing regulations.

Re: Ch. 7, Page 8, (32-35)

Authorizations for ORV use on the East Red Shirt Lake Trail shall be limited to time periods when snow and frost conditions do not allow the use of snowmobiles south of the Nancy Lake Parkway but a combination of snow cover and frost effectively protect the terra trail tread from degradation.

Comment: Overwhelmingly, the Red Shirt Lake homeowners have voiced that they do not want ORV access to Red Shirt Lake. The exception is by permitted use on the East Red Shirt Lake trail when the ground and lake is frozen but there is not enough snow for snowmachines. This permit should cover use on the lake. The homeowners, at their expense, groom snowmachine tails and ski plane strips in the winter. ORV's have come in from the south and made a mess of these groomed trails. This is particularly dangerous in the spring during freeze-thaw cycles and ruts become unwelcome surprises on the expensive, groomed trails. Red Shirt Lake should be removed from this ordinance change.

7. East Red Shirt is Not Used as a Primary Hiking Trail

Re: Ch.7, Page 3, (16-17)

During snow free periods, hiking access is primarily conducted on two terra trails (Red Shirt Lake Summer Trail and East Red Shirt Lake Trail)

Re: Ch.7, Page 5, (28-29)

Of these trails, the Red Shirt Lake Summer Trail receives the highest use levels during snow-free periods.

Comment: The East Red Shirt Lake trail is seldom used for hiking. I don't think it is even complete for summer use. Please correct this statement to more accurately describe the East Red Shirt Lake Trail as a secondary or rarely used trail for hiking. It is by no definition a primary trail for hiking or summer purposes.

8. Do not do anything to make the terminus of the East Red Shirt Lake Trail a Destination.

Re: Ch.7, Page 10, (Ref # 5)

Provide a new camping opportunity that does not currently exist at NLSRA and extend camping opportunities, particularly during shoulder seasons when camping use is typically low. This campsite development will also provide a destination at the terminus of the East Red Shirt Lake Trail.

Comment: Parks have held substantial discussions with the Red Shirt Lake Homeowners association about the East Red Shirt Lake Trail. During those discussions, Parks stated the trail would be developed for cross park use and shoulder season access to Red Shirt and not as a destination for Red Shirt Lake in the summer. Homeowners had significant concerns over the fire danger campsite development would have and the possible extension of trails to private property. Policing of this area is out of sight, out of hearing range, and far from the host cabin. We do not support a campsite at this location. The current campsite at the end of the summer trail is never at full capacity and often empty on weekends. Do not do anything to make the terminus of the East Red Shirt Lake Trail a Destination.

9. Add Definitions for Multi-Use Trail and Clarify Intentions for Each Trail

Re: Appendix

Re: Ch. 5, Page 3, (14)

Re: Ch. 5, Page 17, (6-7), (28-29), (34-35)

With few exceptions, trails should be designated and developed to support multiple uses.

Emphasis will be on providing multiple use opportunities of existing and new trails. However, not all trails will be designated or developed to support multiple uses.

Comment: Add definitions for Multi-use trail. The term "Multiple Use Trail" is used frequently. Let's make sure we are talking about the same thing. Who determines which uses are compatible whether or not multiple use is appropriate for a given trail? By developing or designating almost all trails as Multi-Use, doesn't this, by default, up-grade all trails to class 5? Please clarify DPOR's intention for each trail.

10. No Highway Vehicles are Needed or Desired on the Frozen Surface of Red Shirt Lake

Re: Ch. 8, Page 8, (14-15, 29-30)

A list of regulations necessary to implement this plan is provided below.

Allowance of the use of a highway vehicle on the frozen surface of Nancy, Lynx, Butterfly and Red Shirt Lakes.

Comment: There has been no highway access to Red Shirt Lake in the past. There does not appear to be any highway or road access planned, as a part of this plan, to Red Shirt Lake. It is not the desire of the Red Shirt Land Owners Association (RSLOA) to have highway or road access to Red Shirt Lake. The RSLOA was originally formed to prevent a proposed road access to Red Shirt Lake which would alter the character of the lake and surroundings. We see no need to include this allowance for Red Shirt Lake

11. Roads

Re: Ch. 5, Page 16, (34-40)

No expansion or extensions of existing roads or construction of new roads is intended during the 20 year planning period. However, if the need for access to recreational opportunities exceeds the availability opportunities conceived in this plan, DPOR may consider the development, extension, or expansion of roads if necessary to provide access to recreation opportunities.

Re: Ch. 5, Page 6, (36-40)

Long-term (10-20 years), if recreational needs surpass the capacity of current and proposed facilities within the Nancy Lake Parkway Unit, DPOR will re-evaluate the need for more facilities and access into NLSRA. If necessary, facility development may include the development of public facilities (e.g. parking areas, boat launches, trailheads, etc.), roads or trails in areas that have seen little public facility development in the past.

Comment: The proposed methods of future modification to the plan need scrutiny to insure good public process is not able to be circumvented. There is no clear criteria spelled out in this plan in regards to what might allow a new or expanded road. What is the definition of "need" and who besides DPOR gets to define whether or not there is a "need" for a new or extended road? The RSLOA membership has overwhelmingly opposed road access to Red Shirt Lake. This loose criteria for road development has many of us concerned. Please define and quantify what if anything will trigger a new or expanded road.

Thank you for taking our concerns into consideration

Comment 66 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I have loved the NLSRA since the first time I paddled there in the late 1970's, and have had some of the finest moments of my life while camping, canoeing, fishing, and just enjoying being outdoors in the lakes and ponds in the park. In the early 80's, my wife and I bought the cabin on Skeetna Lake, and we continue to canoe and ski out there. Over the past 40 years, there have been many changes to the Mat-Su Valley, the types of recreation people do, and to ourselves, but fortunately, the park remains pretty much the same: a place where people can escape to the quiet and beauty of a boreal forest filled with ponds, lakes, and wildlife.

I have been closely following the new planning effort, read the draft plan and attended the meeting in Willow. My hope for the result of the planning effort, and for the park itself, is for future generations to be able to escape to the quiet, beautiful place that we have been fortunate to enjoy. That hope, and the park's

mission statement (Page 1-4), is my primary criteria for evaluating the new plan. Based on your recent survey of park users, I'd say that the mission statement is a good fit with park users. To your question, "What do you like most about the NLSRA," their first choice was the "Quiet Natural Setting of the Area" (62%), followed by "Remote canoeing and camping"(57%).

I commend your attempts to bring some order and consistency to the dock issue. I think that the increase in shelters, campsites, and cabins, and the moving of some existing campsites to give a more "remote" feel to them, will allow more people to enjoy the beauty of the area (summarized on pp. 7-9 to 7-11). I don't know if the proposed cabin on Candlestick Lake (#9, p. 7-10) is going to be at the old private cabin site, but the old cabin that was there had an interesting floor: the guy who owned it (I forget his name) had just painted the floor and left the doors open to help the paint dry. A bear walked in and, without disturbing a thing, went right through the cabin leaving a nice trail of footprints in the paint. They were still visible last time I looked (just 25 years ago...)

Back to the plan... There have been a couple things going on in the park in recent years that concern me: the lack of maintenance on the canoe trails and the increase in ORV use on the Butterfly Lake trail. There has also been a big increase in ORV use on Lynx Lake Road, which has repercussions for your plan.

As far as maintenance goes, I know that building new stuff gets funded differently than fixing old stuff does, (and I know that I get more excited about building a new shed than repairing my old deck), but over the long haul, the park suffers. For example, the short boardwalk trail from Lynx Lake to the Echo Ponds has been almost impassable for many years now: boards askew, nails up, under water half the time. Yet within the next 400 yards, there are new signs indicating Echo Pond 1, 2 and 3. I bet most visitors to this area would rather have a safe trail for walking with a canoe over their head than signage in a place that is much prettier without it.

I bring this up only to remind you of a lesson that I am still learning: please fix up the old stuff before you start building new stuff. A corollary: don't build anything new that you aren't prepared/budgeted to maintain. Your draft plan has a LOT of new projects in it: a park full of broken down projects and unmaintained trails is worse than one left alone.

The Echo Ponds - where I have watched bull moose compete for a cow in the fall, and mother mergansers lead their ducklings into the grass in the spring - leads me to the next unwelcome change I've seen in the park: ORV's. These ponds and Candlestick Lake used to be a highlight of my canoe trips in NLSRA: even without wildlife sightings (which was rare), they are so serene that there is something very magical about them. In the past few years there is an over 50% chance that there will be ORV traffic driving alongside the ponds when I'm there, and it is hard to put into words how that feels. I'm no anti-motor fanatic or wilderness purist - there is a place for everything. And I never minded portaging into Lynx Lake to find the Church Camp kids waterskiing - they were having as much fun as I was on the lake. But the presence of those ORV's (and the mess on Butterfly Lake) has managed to completely alter the nature of the park in this area. It's obvious why the least liked activity in your survey was: "motorized use in the recreation area" (33%): it is totally inconsistent with the park's mission statement (and it's why ORV's are illegal in most

Alaska State Parks).

Now it appears that, since you are having trouble trying to find a way to fit the ATV genie back in the bottle, you're going to build the genie a permanent trail (#16, p. 7-11), and invite all his friends in. Not acceptable. INCREASED ORV USE IN THE NLSRA WILL RUIN THE PARK'S INTENDED EXPERIENCES FOR MOST USERS. I am very disappointed with the need, after all these years of planning, to further "study" the issue of ORV use (page 3-2)(if, as you state, you can find funding for it...). If you decide, with or without a study, to build the Class-2 ORV trail, you can't build the trail with public funds and not allow the public to use it. So whatever your study shows, you'll get a far different use pattern once the public gets an ORV trail to ride on, which you can obviously anticipate without the study.

And even without the study, you know that the problem, thanks to the slippery slope of the park's permitting process, is that ORV permits have increased from 1 to 100 for 30 private landowners in 15 years. (And worse: some of these properties are not inholdings or even bordering on the park - meaning there could be no end to the numbers of people who would claim the right to a permit to access their property by ATV across park land). The solution is not to throw up your hands and open the floodgates. These landowners have been granted a privilege that they've come to expect as a right, but they don't deserve this public subsidy when it hurts the public interest. They don't need ORV access: they can move any heavy material they need to with a snowmachine in the winter when it doesn't harm anything. Buck the pressure and make a decision based on what's best for the park! Close the ORV trail and eliminate the private boatyard/storage yard/mud hole on the public lakeshore at Butterfly Lake. Now close your eyes and visualize the whole mess gone, grown over, and quiet. Aaah, isn't that better?

Here's something I don't understand: the proposed Butterfly Lake ORV trail construction depends on the Midnight Sun Bible Camp keeping open a public-access easement (page 7-11, #16). What if you build it, and the church changes their minds due to the huge increase in public use? Just this summer they put up a new gate and are closing their road to anyone without property in the NLSRA to prevent just that sort of trespass (at this point, this is people who already have a key from State Parks, but that could change). To me, it doesn't look like you can build the trail with public funds if the public isn't allowed to use it. Do you plan to somehow build it for private landowner use only? Is that a lawsuit waiting to happen? I don't understand why you'd put a costly project in a long-range plan when you have no control over access to it.

There is a similar problem with your proposal to "open up the interior of the park" with a plethora of new looped bike trails based on a trailhead on the Lynx Lake Road (page 3-2, and 7-11 #13, 17, 18) leading to new shelters on Frazer Lake and beyond. You don't maintain Lynx Lake Road - nor does the state. Once again, the Midnight Sun Bible Camp is in charge. As you are well aware, the road is barely passable early in the year of after some rain: increased public use of this road will make it into a disaster. You can't bring in the public unless you're willing to help maintain the road; just like the proposed public ORV trail, how can you propose to spend lots of money developing a parking area/bathroom/trailhead that you can't or won't guarantee that people can get to? I understand why you don't want to take on maintaining the road: it's a very expensive undertaking - more expensive than

maintaining a few miles of canoe trails, which has not been done in years. Thus, these developments are dependent on the Bible Camp continuing to do it. I'm no planner, but I don't know why they would the church folks would want to accommodate your plans. This plan ruins their road, and then depends on their money and effort, in perpetuity, to maintain your access. That's a lot of faith in Christian charity!

I have another concern about the new trails accessed from Lynx Lake Road. As I mentioned before, I am a supporter of new trails. My concern is that these new trails (Bike Class 3 and 4, (#13 and 17, p. 7-11)) have a better surface and incorporate clearings wider than the proposed Butterfly Lake ORV trail. To a non-park-planner, these look like ideal ORV trails, and ORV's will use them. Do you know how much ORV traffic was on Lynx Lake Road over the last Fourth of July weekend? Ask the Bible Camp: it was shocking! There are more ORV's there all the time, and if Lynx Lake Road is opened to the public as the Draft Plan proposes, they will be at the park trailhead (p. 7-10, #10) in droves (in fact, ORV's are the only vehicles that will be able to make it down Lynx Lake Road once it's opened to the public if you don't maintain it). The Draft Plan gives ORV access into the park on Lynx Lake Road, and builds a large system of wide trails into the entire center of the park from there. It does not address how you will keep ORV's from using these nice wide trails in the woods. With signage? Your enforcement presence? You'll have to do better than that. I see a serious problem: it doesn't take many ORV's to tear up a lot of park once you make it easy for them.

Perhaps more troubling than the certainty of rogue ORV use on the Cross-Park and new loop trails is the uncertainty that some future park manager (or state politician with control of your trail funding) decides that motorized recreation is an appropriate new way to enjoy the quiet solitude of the NLSRA. This is not far-fetched: in 15 years, NLSRA has gone from "ORV-free" to having a draft plan with a public ORV trail in it. It would be easy to open up the park's ORV-ready "bike trail" system to motorized use, especially once such use, though unsanctioned, is commonplace. This slippery slope might begin with a well-intentioned "limited access" permit system (sound familiar?), then, a five-year study, and a finding to open it all up "to increase public access to recreation."

Well, that's my personal NLSRA nightmare brought on by this Draft Plan! It's only due to a couple items in the plan: it shouldn't take much to fix them. I appreciate your efforts in trying to balance the variety of needs and pressures to which the park is subjected, and I hope my comments have been helpful. Please make appropriate changes to the Final Draft to allay my concerns. It's up to you to ensure that 100 years from now, a family living in an unimaginable Wasilla will be able to take a tent and a canoe to the NLSRA and still find a wild, wonderful, quiet natural setting in which to recreate, relax, and renew a faith in the natural world.

Good luck.

Comment 67 of 79 - submitted on 07/10/2013 at 12:00 AM:

As a part-time Willow resident, with a partner who is a full time Willow resident, I would like to voice my support of keeping the draft plan inline with the original plan that focused on keeping within the scenic (and more spiritually connected to nature) feeling. I was hiking last week with my dog on one of the side trails, through

mosquitoes, and although I was not far from the road, it was quiet. I appreciate that about the Nancy Lakes area. I have had many a great ski trip into the PUC system and love the area having no ORV access, Those litter the Hatcher Pass area (where I live down the road).

Please please revise the draft plan. Thank you.

Comment 68 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 04:58 PM:

This is a public resource and all citizens should have equal rights to its enjoyment. Granting ATV use by some citizens but not all violates that principle. The use of ATV s by a few degrades the experience and the trail for the vast majority not granted special privileges.

Most of the properties beyond the NLSRA boundaries were developed before ATV use was allowed by hauling materials in the winter, when the vegetation cannot be destroyed. Historical access has been by foot, canoe, snowmachine, and aircraft. It is simply untrue that ATV access is required in the summer - those privileges have only been granted recently, to a very few, and negatively impact all others.

The Plan should recognize and allow the continued access to private properties during winter by vehicles. By this I mean allowing the hauling of materials during winter when all is frozen over and the vegetation cannot be disturbed. The present system only allows for snowmachine use when 18 of snow cover is present. This much snow precludes the use of pickups.

Hauling by pickup truck in the winter should be encouraged as a preferential method of hauling supplies/materials vs. ATV use in the summer. Recognition should be given to allowing hauling by pickup in the winter when the lakes and swamps are frozen hard, but before there is abundant snow cover. There are established and historic winter trails that have been utilized for this purpose long before 4-wheelers were even invented.

Please don t ruin the natural setting of this resource. I believe every time the public has been queried, the vast majority of respondents have most valued hiking, camping, skiing, etc. and consistently rejected motorized vehicle use as the least desirable activity.

Do the right thing. Stay true to the principles under which NLSRA was founded and reject all ATV use in the NLSRA.

Comment 69 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

This is a public resource and all citizens should have equal rights to its enjoyment. Granting ATV use by some citizens but not all violates that principle. The use of ATV's by a few degrades the experience and the trail for the vast majority not granted special privileges.

Most of the properties beyond the NLSRA boundaries were developed before ATV use was allowed by hauling materials in the winter, when the vegetation cannot be destroyed. Historical access has been by foot, canoe, snowmachine, and aircraft. It is simply untrue that ATV access is required in the summer - those privileges have only been granted recently, to a very few, and negatively impact all others.

The Plan should recognize and allow the continued access to private properties during winter by vehicles. By this I mean allowing the hauling of materials during

winter when all is frozen over and the vegetation cannot be disturbed. The present system only allows for snowmachine use when 18" of snow cover is present. This much snow precludes the use of pickups.

Hauling by pickup truck in the winter should be encouraged as a preferential method of hauling supplies/materials vs. ATV use in the summer. Recognition should be given to allowing hauling by pickup in the winter when the lakes and swamps are frozen hard, but before there is abundant snow cover. There are established and historic winter trails that have been utilized for this purpose long before 4-wheelers were even invented.

Please don't ruin the natural setting of this resource. I believe every time the public has been queried, the vast majority of respondents have most valued hiking, camping, skiing, etc. and consistently rejected motorized vehicle use as the least desirable activity.

Do the right thing. Stay true to the principles under which NLSRA was founded and reject all ATV use in the NLSRA.

Comment 70 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

These are my comments on the Public Review Draft ("PRD") of the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area ("NLSRA") Management Plan ("Plan").

I have recreated in the NLSRA for many years, generally by dogteam in the winter and canoe in the summer. It is an exceptional network of lakes and trails in a natural, largely undisturbed setting. What I appreciate most about the NLSRA is that it retains, for the most part intact, its natural quiet and unspoiled environment and landscapes.

General Comments

The process of revising the 1983 NLSRA Management Plan started in 2008, prompted, if memory serves, by controversy over the permits that have been issued by the Department of Parks and Outdoor Recreation ("DPOR") allowing persons to travel through Nancy Lake State Recreation Area with ATVs to gain access to private properties within, adjacent to, and beyond NLSRA.

I am disappointed that ATV use of the Butterfly Lake trail is still allowed. For the reasons expressed in my comment letters of November 20, 2008 (re the proposed plan revision) and August 31, 2012 (re the proposed management recommendations and alternatives), I believe that such access is detrimental to both the natural resources of NLSRA and the quality of the visitor experience. If these comment letters are not part of the official record of this PRD, then I ask that both letters be put on the record.

What folks like about the NLSRA is the natural environment and natural soundscape. In general, I think that the PRD leans too far toward development, even given the fact that state recreation areas are more oriented toward access and facilities development than are, for example, state parks. I think that the Plan's overemphasis on development (including accommodation of ATV use to access private property) puts at risk what folks most enjoy about NLSRA.

For example, it is entirely inappropriate to "redevelop" Butterfly Lake Trail to ORV

standards as is proposed in the Plan (page 7 - 11, #16). DPOR shouldn't be spending public money to benefit private property owners at the expense of the NLSRA natural resources and quality of the visitor experience.

I am also concerned about the Chicken Lake Cross Park Trail (page 7 - 1, #17), which the Plan proposes to be a terra class 4 designed for bicycle use. This class of trail is relatively wide, and given the location of the trailheads, would most assuredly attract ATVs. DPOR lacks monitoring and enforcement capacity necessary to prevent ATV/ORV (I use ATV and ORV interchangeably) access to and use of this trail.

DPOR should never develop or facilitate access, to this Chicken Lake Cross Park Trail or to any other trail or area within NLSRA, unless it first has in place the capacity to monitor and enforce the rules. In this case, this means the capacity to prevent ATV access, but the concept of ensuring adequate monitoring, enforcement, management, and control of any new development or access applies throughout NLSRA. The Plan should contain language to this effect.

In addition, the Plan is replete with phrases like "provide enhanced recreation" or "provide new recreational opportunity." Rarely do I see language that states that DPOR will maintain the trails and facilities it already has, to ensure that they are in good repair, to provide, among other things, for the public safety and enjoyment. Lack of a strong management focus on maintenance and insufficient maintenance funding is a big problem, and this Plan should address it. I recommend incorporating specific language in the Plan's management policy, goals, objectives, intent, and guidelines that emphasizes the importance and priority of keeping its trails and facilities in good repair.

The Plan should also contain similar management guidance with respect to the monitoring and remediation of damage to NLSRA natural resources.

The Plan also needs language stressing the importance of and the need for visitor education (e.g., informational kiosks, brochures, availability of little 3 x 5 cards like the forest service uses to cover topics like bear aware, low impact camping, etc.). Visitor education is important, and it should be addressed in this plan, especially because visitation is high and will get higher in the future.

I think that with the facility and trail development ambitions of this Plan, DPOR is getting ahead of itself with respect to its capacity to monitor compliance with and enforce the rules, to assess and remediate the impacts that visitor use has on the NLSRA natural resources, to maintain trails and facilities, to educate the visitors, and to otherwise properly manage the NLSRA. The Plan provides for development, but the Plan does not adequately provide for necessary management capacity that this new development would create. These deficiencies should be remedied in the Final Plan.

A way to look at this problem is to recognize the distinction between actual demand and induced demand. I recommend that the Plan stipulate that development of any new trails and facilities be driven by actual, demonstrated, verifiable demand rather than building trails or other facilities in order to induce demand, or in the hope that demand will materialize in the future. The Plan, unfortunately, generally encourages development in order to induce demand. Relying instead on actual, demonstrated demand would help keep growth to a manageable level, enabling DPOR's

management capacity (e.g., monitoring, enforcement, education, remediation) to keep pace with trail, facility and other development. This is good for DPOR, visitors, and the natural environment.

Specific Comments

Note, that the comments below bring up a point that is at a specific location of the PRD, but I recommend that the points I make be applied not just at that specific location, but at all locations throughout the Plan having to do with that subject.

Page 3 - 1, beginning at line 14: The PRD discusses the ATV access issue in terms of private property. Private property can be an inholding, a property that is immediately adjacent to but not within the NLSRA (e.g., south-western shores of Butterfly Lake), or entirely outside the NLSRA such as Delyndia Lake and beyond. These are different types of private property in relation to NLSRA. The PRD's proposed access study will hopefully sort this out, but I think that it is important to note in the Plan that there are limits to what access within and through the NLSRA is under consideration. Delyndia Lake is entirely outside the NLSRA and is considered permissible. Is DPOR considering permitting other private properties that are located beyond NLSRA boundaries and are such properties anticipated to be part of the study. Will DPOR consider a permit for ATV access through NLSRA for any private property regardless of its location or proximity to the NLSRA? I think it is important for DPOR and the Plan to define the limits, and be cognizant of the potential "slippery slope" scenario that would open the ATV gates more than they already are.

Page 3 - 5, Resource Impacts section: I am glad that the PRD explains the resource impacts that have occurred and continue to occur. It provides support for some of the PRD's trail improvement recommendations, but it also highlights the need for DPOR to establish a robust monitoring, enforcement, management (including visitor education), remediation, and maintenance capacity. And, to emphasize my concern expressed with the Chicken Lake Cross Trail & if a trail is upgraded to the extent that it provides an attraction for ATVs, it will result in the degradation of the NLSRA's natural resources and quality of visitor experience, and it will become a management headache.

Page 4 - 4, beginning at line 11 and continuing to the end of Chapter 4: The Area-Goals list a number of categories, but neither this section nor the preceding issue-specific section includes a category to list "management goals," which would include such things as 'monitoring and enforcement,' 'public education and information,' 'importance of timely maintenance of trails and facilities,' and 'natural resource damage remediation' and other areas of management aspiration. If NLSRA is to protect its natural resources and maintain the quality of the visitor experience, it must have some fundamental management standards, which would include, among others, the categories that I have suggested above, and I recommend the Plan include such management guidance.

Page 5 - 10, line 24: Plan should consider potential damage to shoreline and ATV trespass in years (like 2012) when the late fall and early winter has cold temperatures with little or no snow, and how DPOR will monitor and control such activity.

Page 5 - 11, line 4: I am a little confused about what the licensing and registration

requirements are for ATVs, but if any of the vehicles that DPOR is considering permitting require either, then DPOR should itself require the permittee to provide license and/or registration documentation as a condition of receiving a permit.

Page 5 - 13, line 34: 450 square feet is too large; should be more like 350 square feet.

Page 5 - 15, line 20: The word "or" should be replaced by the word "and". Otherwise, for example, a raft could be 15' by 16' or a boat could be 9' by 25'.

Page 5 - 16 beginning at line 34: This indicates that this Plan does not contemplate new road development or extensions to existing roads, but holds open the possibility that such action could occur. Road construction and upgrade likely would have significant impact on natural resources and the quality or nature of the visitor experience. Therefore, I recommend that the Plan require that the a full public process be conducted to allow the public the opportunity to weigh in on any proposals for new roads, extensions of existing roads, or major upgrade of any existing road.

Page 5 - 17 beginning at line 12: This paragraph contains exculpatory language (i.e., "should" "where appropriate") that leaves open the possibility of making part of the northern management unit motorized. Non-motorized trails and areas are rare, and they are important to folks. Please make it clear that this area is non-motorized (except the snowmobile corridor) and it shall be managed as such.

Page 5 - 17 beginning at line 16: I don't think there needs to be an undue emphasis on destination trails. I like loop trails, and I don't think they should be de-emphasized.

Page 5 - 17 lines 28 and 29: I recommend that this Plan contain language, in this bullet and elsewhere explicitly stating that some uses are incompatible (e.g., snowmachines are incompatible with snowshoeing/skiing, horses in the winter which post hole and are therefore incompatible with mushing, snowshoeing and skiing) and recognize that some areas and trails need to be set aside exclusively for specific user groups. Only in this way can visitors fully enjoy their chosen winter activity, which all of us have an equal right to do.

Page 6 - 4 and following Permit Categories: I think that the reader will better understand what these three permit types are if the Plan includes an example of each within the respective explanatory narratives.

Page 6 - 13, first row: Pack and Saddle (horses), when used in the winter post-hole and will ruin any trail. For dog mushers, it is dangerous for the dogs which can step in the holes and injure themselves. It is bad for snowshoers and skiers as well. The third box of this row states "authorized on designated routes." The Plan should explain some of the impacts of horses on winter (and summer) trails, and provide management guidance sufficient to ensure that care is taken to choose routes that won't impact other users.

Page 6 - 13, third row: Trapping should not be allowed, even outside of a 300 foot buffer on either side of trails or around use areas. Three hundred feet is not enough; maybe a quarter mile? A person's pet dog caught in a snare is a very disturbing occurrence. Trapping and general recreation don't mix.

Page 6 - 13, fifth row: I am glad to see that all camping must occur at designated campsites, but I am concerned about "bear aware" practices. The Plan should address education of campers, and include requirement for such things as use of bear-proof food containers and garbage management (haul out or put in bear-proof garbage containers).

Page 6 - 18, second row: Personal watercraft should be banned outright throughout the NLSRA. Jet skis and other personal watercraft are exceptionally damaging to the environment (they expel 25% of their fuel unburned into the environment), disturbing to nesting and rearing waterfowl, and noisy and intrusive to people trying to enjoy the natural quiet and unspoiled character of the area.

Page 6 - 18, last row: With respect to fires (in stoves, fire rings, barbecue grill), DPOR should have the authority in exceptionally dry times, to prohibit all fires. This authority should be stipulated in the Plan.

Page 6 - 22 last row: As I noted above, the authorization for any new road, extension to an existing road, or major upgrade of an existing road should not be granted without first providing the public with an opportunity to be heard and participate in the decision.

Page 6 - 29, fourth row: The decision to authorize any "other types of development" not contemplated within this Plan should not be made without first providing the public with an opportunity to be heard and participate in the decision. Any proposed action that has potential material impact should be vetted by the public.

Page 6 - 32, third row: Predator control should not be authorized without first having conducted a full public process.

Page 7 - 6, Eastern Ardaw remote campsite: This lacks a bear resistant food storage container. Is this an oversight, or do campers use the one at Western Ardaw? There should be one of these containers available at all campsites.

Page 7 - 8. lines 37 and 38: The Plan should contain explicit language that recognizes that some uses are incompatible and that each user group has the right use and enjoy their own use without having it impaired by another user group. The Plan should state that some areas and trails should be set aside exclusively for some user groups. When dealing with incompatible uses, which the Plan often is, it is the only fair thing to do.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely

Comment 71 of 79 - submitted on 06/01/2013 at 10:20 AM:

I have owned property on Red Shirt Lake since 1972, the year the road was to be built into the State Land on the Lake. I and others were flown into Red Shirt Lake when it was known as Rolly Joe Lk. in 1960 for a weekend and I realized at that time, the day would come when Big Lake would become over crowded and there would be a need for a beautiful recreational area, such as Red Shirt.

I feel that it can well be agreed, that Big Lake has not only become overcrowded, but is not the pristine Lake it was in the 50's, nor has room to accommodate the number

of people that want to use nice Lakes as recreational activities.

Comment 72 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

The NLSRA is renowned for its canoe trail through a chain of lakes. The original plan focused on non-motorized uses and enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system, and I feel this is very important to maintain this original plan.

The new plan should maintain the NLSRA's quiet, natural setting. A trail for ORV's has no place in the park. The existing canoe and hiking trails, campsites and other developments should be maintained before new ones are constructed. All use of ATV's by private landowners for access through the park should be eliminated from the new plan.

The proposed new trailhead and cross-park trail accessed by Lynx Lake Road should be eliminated because that road is not maintained by the state and it would draw ORV's to the park. Also, new trails and trail upgrades should be as narrow as possible because wide trails would encourage illegal ORV use in areas of the park where enforcement is impractical.

Please consider the long term impacts of allowing ORV's into this area and the damage they would do to this pristine piece of wilderness.

Thanks

Comment 73 of 79 - submitted on 05/09/2013 at 10:18 AM:

On "MAP 2- Generalized land ownership"

Both of the two large tracts "Tract V-1 and Tract W-1" at the southeast corner of Red Shirt Lake are privately owned. The Map shows one tract (the triangle one) as being borough owned - that is incorrect.

Comment 74 of 79 - submitted on 07/03/2013 at 12:00 AM:

My only comment relates to the trail from South Rolly to Red Shirt Lake.

As a property owner in the Red Shirt Lake Subdivision, I think it would be a very good compromise to let that trail be utilized by non-motorized bicycles, seeing how every attempt to get motorized access from anywhere to the lake is always shot down. Someday, maybe we will have the same rights as afforded to the property owners of Lynx Lake.

Until that time comes, if ever, it would be nice to at least be able to bike into the lake, instead of only hiking in. Sometimes, you just can't get certain things out there in the winter, and some of us can't afford float planes or air charters.

Thanks

Comment 75 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I am writing to comment on the May 2013 Nancy Lake State Recreation Area (NLSRA) Management Plan Public Review Draft (Draft Plan).

I have recreated in NLSRA for over three decades of summers and am always awed by the exceptional opportunity it affords for canoeing through a marvelous chain of lakes in an amazingly wild area smack dab in the middle of Alaska's most populated region (from page 2-13: "Just over 50% of the States' population is within

a couple hours drive"). In winter, I appreciate cross-country skiing on the often-peaceful trails.

I want to thank the rangers, specialist, and volunteers who work hard to maintain trails and other developments and to keep the park the special place that it is. This work is not easy and budgets are minimal, so hats off to them!

NLSRA is a treasure that that has become and will continue to become increasingly rare and valuable with the inexorable increase in population in Anchorage and the Mat-Su Valley and the associated roads, railroads, and built-up development. These surrounding changes mean careful management of park is crucial; I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the current Draft Plan.

1. A modest proposal: Reclassify NLSRA

Considering the wilderness-like values described above, the NLSRA mission statement on page 1-4, and the State Park Unit Characteristics (Table 1), the best management practice would be to reclassify NLSRA as a State Park with some small State Recreation Sites where higher use patterns have evolved (like the current Nancy Lake State Recreation Site).

While this reclassification is unlikely, it is useful to consider for the light it sheds on how the designation of State Recreation Area creates a management nightmare with its "intensive public use management emphasis" (Rec. Area) in the remote lakes system area where "resource preservation emphasis" (Park) is needed. The current planning process has brought to light the untenable and undesirable results of trying to manage this area of "distinct natural resource values" (Park) while providing "the maximum level of outdoor recreation opportunities" (Rec. Area).

NL State Park: The majority of NSLRA land area, the rare and precious "natural and scenic values of the lake system at the heart of the area" (from the Mission Statement) best fits the management strategy for a State Park found in Table 1:

Description: outstanding distinct natural... resource values;

Management Objective: prevent deterioration of the natural... resources while providing for appropriate outdoor recreational opportunities;

Overall Intensity of Development: Low

NL State Recreation Sites: The areas that are currently more highly developed along the Nancy Lake Parkway, especially at South Rolly Lake, could then be appropriately classified and managed as the small areas called State Recreation Sites.

2. A realistic proposal: Use the Mission Statement as a guide to promote the characteristics of the two types of management areas that the reclassification proposal identifies.

Provide a balance of high quality recreational opportunities...

This would guide the management of the more developed, high-use areas along Nancy Lake Parkway and the restored and improved Cross Park Trail at the "Intensive Public Use" end of the Management Orientation spectrum (Table 1), including recreation opportunities that have a greater impact.

... while maintaining and enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system at the heart of the area.

This would allow for managing the more remote, less developed canoe trail system area with the "Resource Preservation Management Emphasis" (Table 1), with a Management Objective to provide recreation opportunities that would not detract from the "high quality natural setting" of this area.

3. Off-road Vehicles (ORV's) are not allowed in NLSRA (11 AAC 12.020), and exceptions to this general prohibition should be extremely limited

Re: the section titled ORV's on pages 5-10 to 5-11

- I strongly support the plan that "ORV use remains prohibited by general regulations (11 AAC 12.020)" and recognize the Director has authority to make exceptions. This is consistent with the 1983 Management Plan: "ATV use in the park is closed by park regulations and any changes in these procedures require the Director's approval. This plan does not recommend any ATV improvements or access."

- I support exceptions 2, 3, 6 and 7

- Point 1: No ORV use should be allowed or permitted on the Butterfly Lake Trail

* I do not support continuing to make an exception by granting special permits to private property owners or anyone else for ORV use on the Lynx to Butterfly Lake trail. There is no provision for this in any management plans; the issuance of permits has come about by a willy-nilly slippery slope poor management practice that has resulted in property owners mistakenly seeing these permits to use ATV's on the trail from Lynx to Butterfly Lakes as a right. There is no reason to continue to allow these permits because property owners can use snow machines in winter or float planes in summer to access their property and haul in materials and supplies, or they can canoe/portage or hike in with materials without restriction. Granting these permits to private property owners is not consistent with the fact that NLSRA is a public park; special permits for otherwise-illegal ATV use should not be granted to a somewhat arbitrary group of users (especially those whose property is not an inholding or even bordering on the recreation area).

* The proposed study should be eliminated.

There is no reason for the study, because there is no reason to continue to permit use of ORV's (see above).

The study has not been presented in any kind of rigorous way; from page 7-8, "Within a five year period following the adoption of this plan, DPOR shall conduct a detailed study..." This is incredibly vague and poor planning language - and it totally lacks any kind of scientific methodology.

There is no study plan for the public to review and yet this completely inscrutable study will be used as the basis to make a myriad of very critical, pivotal planning decisions that could alter the very nature of the recreation area: "...to determine if vehicle access to private properties accessible via Lynx Lake Road to Butterfly Lake Trail should continue to be authorized (i.e. highway vehicle and/or ORV)...if DPOR should continue the current policy regarding private access, modify the current

access policy (i.e. expansion or restriction), or cease to authorize private access. It will be the basis for future decisions regarding private access on these routes."

* If DPOR did determine through this unknown study plan that they would indeed continue to authorize ORV access to private property owners and would then "redevelop the Butterfly Lake Trails as a Class 2 terra trail designed for ORV use" (page 7-11) then DPOR wouldn't be obliged to open that trail to the general public? That is certainly at complete odds with prohibition of ORV by general regulations (11 AAC 12.020) as put forth as a general management guideline, and the start of an unavoidable, unmitigable management nightmare! Once the public is allowed onto Butterfly Lake Trail on ATV's, it would be all but impossible to keep them from going off the trail onto all sorts of terrain and wreaking havoc. This is not an exaggeration or "sky is falling" scenario - NLSRA planners and personnel know better than I about already-occurring ATV use in the park and the increasing challenge it is to deal with.

* If DPOR did determine that they would redevelop the Butterfly Lake Trail into a Class 2 terra trail for ORV use, where would the funds come not only to build it, but also to maintain it? NLSRA planners and personnel know better than I about how scarce budget funds are for maintaining even the relatively low-upkeep existing canoe and hiking trails.

- Point 4: An exception to allow possible ORV use in support of "an authorized commercial operation" is vague and thus open to possibly poor management decisions; this exception should be eliminated. If there is a limited need for this kind of an exception, it must be written so that such an exception is spelled out clearly and specifically and with appropriate limits before the public can comment on it for possible implementation.

- Point 5: This exception to allow ORV's on the frozen surface of these four lakes should be eliminated, except possibly for Nancy Lake.

* Lynx, Butterfly and Red Shirt Lakes are all wholly within the boundary of NLSRA and the prohibition of ORV use by general regulations (11 AAC 12.020) should apply year-round. ORV's should simply and consistently be prohibited in NLSRA.

* Nancy Lake has public access that is not over NLSRA lands, so the exception to allow ORV use on the frozen surface of Nancy Lake might be reasonable - planners and park personnel would know best here.

* There is no such public access to Butterfly, Lynx or Red Shirt Lakes, so there should be no exception made for these lakes even in frozen conditions. The issue of access remains the same as in summer - how are these ORV's going to get to these lakes? As in summer, ORV's should not be allowed anywhere within NLSRA. It would be another management nightmare to keep them from being on other lakes, other trails or even off-trail. This can of worms should not be opened.

* While no doubt ORV's will come into NLSRA from any point along the park boundary, including Butterfly and Red Shirt Lake, all boundaries should be treated the same and no ORV's should be allowed to enter the park at any point along the boundary - whether it be lake shore or forested.

* Point 2 describes an exception to allow ORV's to access Red Shirt Lake via a special

restricted public opening during periods of winter when snow conditions don't allow snowmobiles - that does seem to be a reasonable, limited, acceptable exception, where the more general exception in Point 5 clearly is not.

4. The development of a new trailhead and associated facilities at the eastern end at the Lynx Lake Road intersection with what is now being called Chicken Lake Cross-Park Trail (Trail 17) should be eliminated from the plan, and the official Cross-Park Trail access should be from the western end.

The reason for this is simple: Lynx Lake Road is not publicly maintained so DNR/DPOR has no business building a trailhead that will encourage the public to travel this road. If this were to change so the state took over maintenance of Lynx Lake Road, then this trailhead might be reconsidered. Further, since the road is such a mess, this new trailhead and facilities would undoubtedly encourage people to come on their ORV's, and present a whole new management nightmare for rangers to try to control illegal ORV use in the recreation area.

5. Bikes should remain prohibited in the recreation area with exception of Nancy Lake Parkway and, with careful planning and enforcement, Trail 17, the Cross-Park Trail.

Bikes are currently prohibited by regulation in NLSRA (page 7-4). While some biking does occur on a few trails, this does not mean the rule should be changed - it should be enforced.

6. Trails 13, 14, 15, and 18 should not be built as Class 3 or 4 terra trails; any new trails and any upgrades to existing trails should be designed to a lower class (Class 1 or 2), with a smaller footprint, appropriate for backcountry hiking in the summer, and for back-country skiing or snowshoeing in the winter.

- In Table 5, these four trails are shown to be designed and developed or redeveloped to Class 3 or 4 terra trails (designed for bicycle use) - trails of this size and nature traveling deep into the remote reaches of the park are not consistent with the Mission Statement to manage for maintaining and enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system at the heart of the area.

- Further, class 3 or 4 terra trails will encourage illegal ORV use.

- While having some groomed ski trails in the park is appropriate, it is not necessary, desirable or appropriate that most trails be groomed. Indeed, the opportunity to access the more remote, backcountry areas of the park on trails that are not groomed is an important and valuable recreational experience.

7. Trail 16 should not be redeveloped as a trail designed for ORV use

Because ORV's should remain prohibited in NLSRA, there is no reason that this trail be redesigned to accommodate them. Instead, the degradation that has occurred due to ORV use in the past decade or so should be mitigated, and the trail should be maintained as a backcountry hiking trail; I suppose this would be called a Class 1 terra trail.

8. The storage of private boats and barges and other paraphernalia at Butterfly Lake should be eliminated.

This is a public recreation area and there is no reason to allow the unsightly, potentially environmentally toxic storage of private property on public land.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Comment 76 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I sent this letter at 8:30 pm on the day the last round of comments were due, August 31, 2012, but it was not accepted part of the public record. Planner Brandon McCutcheon said he would read my letter, but that he could not include it in the record because it arrived after 5 pm. I am submitting it again for the comment period ending today because some of my remarks remain relevant to the planning process, and I would like them to be part of the public record.

I am writing to comment on the Proposed Management Recommendations and Alternatives for the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area (NLSRA). I have owned the property on Skeetna Lake since February 1983, and have canoed in the area for 33 years.

In a nutshell:

- I generally support the recommendations in Document 3 (see page 4 of this letter).

- Re: Alternatives for Access on Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail During Summer Months (Document 4)

* I strongly oppose Alternatives 2, 3 and 4.

* I started out hoping to support Alternative 1, but after close inspection I cannot support that alternative either (except for not allowing ATV s within NLSRA) because it includes unreasonably expensive recommendations and some ill-advised recommendations, most notably the Butterfly Lake Reroute Access.

* Another alternative should be generated, reflecting the fact that NLSRA is a wonderful recreation area that should be managed and promoted for appropriate public enjoyment. Skiing and snow machining (with adequate snow cover) provide excellent winter recreation opportunities. In summer, the canoe trail system, with river access down the Little Su and trailhead access along the Nancy Lakes Parkway, provides a unique and excellent summer recreation opportunity. The alternative should be designed to simply continue managing the area primarily as a canoe trail system in summer.

Where I support Alternative 1: ATV's should not be allowed.

- The 1983 Management Plan states: "ATV use in the park is closed by park regulations and any changes in these procedures require the Director's approval. This plan does not recommend any ATV improvements or access."

- The public is not calling for ATV's to be allowed.

- In the 2010 questionnaire summary, the two most liked attributes of the NLSRA were "quiet natural setting" and "remote canoeing and camping" and the least liked was "motorized use in the recreation area."

- There is no mandate or precedent dictating that ATV's be allowed. Some temporary permits have been issued but, with one exception (Pierce, 1973), these permits are recent, being issued since 2000.

- ATV's would cause irreparable damage to the resource.

- Re: Document 2, p. 11, that "many of the trails in NLSRA were being used for access to private property, including the trail from Lynx Lake to Butterfly Lake, as early as 1961," it is crucial to note that early ATV use was in winter only:

* We purchased our property in 1983 from the person who originally staked the land in the early 1960's. He told us that he accessed the property by plane or canoe in summer, and that ONLY IN WINTER did they travel across land using an early version of "All Terrain Vehicle."

* Wheeled ATV's were not introduced in the United States until the early 1970's.

Recommendations for a new alternative for Lynx and Butterfly Lake summer access:

1. The existing Butterfly Lake Trail should be abandoned as a summer trail, and allowed to return to its natural state.

- The trail was originally used in winter only. For this reason, the trail was barely discernable in summer (prior to 2000). I know this to be true because I crossed it many times a summer starting in 1983 while portaging on the canoe trail between Candlestick and Buckley Lakes.

- The recently permitted summer ATV use (since 2000) and other non-permitted ATV use has resulted a muddy, messy, ugly scar of a trail that degrades the NLSRA experience.

- There is no need for Butterfly Lake Trail to exist. There is perfectly good access to Butterfly and Skeetna Lakes on the canoe trail. People bought their property knowing they had no overland or ATV access. DPOR should simply reinstate the original system.

- Upgrading and maintaining the existing trail would be very expensive. DPOR would not easily secure funds to do this work. Two facts support there's paucity of funding:

* Many of the existing canoe trails are in need of repair and maintenance - and these are relatively simple trails to maintain.

* We have communicated with DPOR and NLSRA administrators on at least three occasions about buying our inholding on Skeetna Lake - the answer has been a blunt, "There are no funds."

- The recommendation to reroute and develop the trail as a "Class 3 terra trail for horses and bikes" is not necessary and should be dropped from further planning.

* I know of no evidence that the public has been asking for horse or bike trails to be developed in the NLSRA! There are many appropriate areas for horse and/or bike trails; this is not one of them. This area is uniquely and ideally suited to the use it's been developed to promote: canoeing

* See the comment about funding above...THIS kind of trail building is very expensive! All the more so because much of the land is boggy. Rerouting to the uplands west of Candlestick Lake would be costly. What makes today's planners think there might be funding? Maintenance would also be costly.

2. Lynx Lake Road should be left as is.

- There is not a public call for the road to be open to Lynx Lake that I'm aware of.

- Keys to the gate should be given only to a limited and specific set property owners. Who exactly this might be needs a final decision. Reasonable options are:

* Properties located wholly within NLSRA boundaries that are contiguous to Lynx Lake

* Properties located wholly within NLSRA boundaries that are contiguous to Lynx, Butterfly and Skeetna Lakes

* Properties located wholly within NLSRA boundaries that are contiguous to Lynx, Butterfly and Skeetna Lakes, and properties continuous to Butterfly Lake but outside the NLSRA boundary

- Opening the road would have major management implications for Lynx Lake and eventually for the entire NLSRA. Anticipating impacts and implementing regulations to minimize them would be a significant increase to current NLSRA management levels and would require significant funding. Here are just a few impacts that come to mind:

* Increased launching and use of motor boats on Lynx Lake, one of three lakes in the NLSRA where they are allowed;

* Increased illegal use of ATV's; though they are prohibited, experience across the state shows that many ATV users ignore the rules;

* More garbage and litter and human waste at the public terminus to the road;

- The costs to "minimally maintain [the] road common boundary Anchorage Church of Christ" would not be insignificant. Again, where would these funds come from?

- There would certainly be significant costs beyond this "minimal" maintenance.

* Alternative 1 calls for FOUR new or redeveloped parking areas!

* With increased public access to this point, there would be a need for more oversight, meaning paid personnel to monitor the area and enforce rules (such as no ATV's). There's quite likely to be a need for a staffed booth at some point. Kiosks with directions, toilets, signs...and other costly developments that DPOR planners could more readily list than I can.

* Eventually, public use of the road would increase to the point that DPOR would be forced to redevelop Lynx Lake Road into a standard road with a gravel surface and maintain it as such. Again, an extremely expensive undertaking.

* And the proposed Butterfly Lake Access Reroute would be prohibitively expensive!

3. Access to Butterfly Lake from Lynx Lake should be via the existing canoe trail.

- A Butterfly Access Reroute proposal makes NO sense - neither financially nor from the perspective of managing the recreation area for public recreation.

- A Butterfly Lake Access Reroute should be completely dropped from any further consideration.

- Any private landowners who have keys to Lynx Lake Road gate (see #2 above) can use the canoe trail to access their land by canoe. This would best be facilitated if DPOR would:

* Direct its resources and funding toward keeping the canoe trail's portages in good repair;

* Leave Lynx Lake Road as is so that the Anchorage Church of Christ would still allow private landowners to park on their property;

* Work with the Anchorage Church of Christ to develop a designated parking lot for these private landowners and a canoe put-in at the small creek that flows west to Lynx Lake on the north side of the church property. (This creek drains the small pond that is downstream from Baines Lake.)

4. Boat moorage and personal property storage should not be allowed on Butterfly Lake

- Document 2, pages 15-16 states, "The potential exists for hundreds of boats to be moored on the surface of Butterfly Lake and for many boats and other personal property to be stored on the adjacent state uplands." There is no reason for this to be allowed in a PUBLIC recreation area.

- The area where storage has been and is currently allowed is a mess. For DPOR to enforce better practices would be a big, expensive challenge. To do so for potentially dozens or potentially hundreds of boats would not be feasible.

- There is no reason for DPOR to allow storage at Butterfly. People who bought property of Skeetna and Butterfly Lakes did not buy the right to such storage. DPOR should simply cease to allow this.

- Perfectly good canoe access to Butterfly and Skeetna properties precludes the need for storage - canoes can be paddled across and stored on private land. If owners want to haul materials that are difficult to portage via canoe, they can fly them into Butterfly or snowmachine them in during the winter.

My stand on the Proposed Management Recommendations (Document 3)

To me, these recommendations are generally fine, with a few additions:

1. Docks and other Structures

2. Existing Unpermitted Structures

3. Moorage of Boats Adjacent to Private Upland

- Need to develop and implement a system to monitor and enforce the rules.

4. Property Storage and Boat Moorage at Red Shirt Lake

- Need to prohibit food storage and recommend other measures to avoid bear problems
- Need to address the problem of potential contamination from leaky oil containers

5. Access on Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail During Summer Months

- These recommendations, spelled out in Document 4, are ill-considered and unacceptable (see discussion above)

Background of my experiences in and fondness for NLSRA

My husband and I took our first trips into the NLSRA in the summers of 1980 - 81. We canoed in from the parkway and would camp on one of the more northern lakes. We built a wood strip canoe that we completed in the summer of 1982 and took it on its maiden voyage into the NLSRA. This was the first time we paddled to the southern tip of the chain of lakes to Skeetna Lake where, to our surprise, we "discovered" a dock and cabin, both with a lovely view across the lake and over the forest to the Pioneer Peak and the Chugach Range. Back in town, we looked up the owners on the borough tax records and then contacted them in Tacoma, WA, to see if they might be willing to sell. He wrote back that he and his wife were in their late 70's and while "it is hard to part with a piece of property that we both love very much, and has always been a joy to us," her health precluded their getting to the cabin any more. We corresponded further and he came up that winter to fly out to the property with us.

We purchased this sole private property on Skeetna Lake in February 1983. The LeMasters procured the land and built the cabin we still use on what they called "Spearhead Lake" in the early 60's, before the NLSRA was established. Her brother claimed and built a cabin on the peninsula on the north side of Butterfly Lake; that property and cabin now belong to the state and are part of NLSRA. These folks accessed these properties by airplane and, in winter, they hauled building materials to their sites by track vehicle. In fact, Ross, built the Skeetna cabin at his millworks in Tacoma, dismantled it to create a cabin "kit", shipped it north, then hauled it to the lake in winter of to reconstruct it the next summer.

I have over a dozen letters from the previous owners with their memories of their times at "Spearhead Lake." I would be happy to share these with the park if there is any interest.

We are also willing to sell our Skeetna land and cabin to the state so it could also be incorporated into the NLSRA for the public to enjoy. It is interesting that in his very first letter to us, he said, "In case you had to sell the property for one reason or another, the state of Alaska is always ready to pick it up for the park." I've seen in various planning documents that buying up remaining inholdings is a management goal, but when I've mention to DPOR or NLSRA administrators that we'd like sell our land, the response has been that there are no funds.

So, I'm taking this opportunity to say it again: we'd like to sell the Skeetna Lake property to the state so it could become part of NLSRA.

The big picture

How fortunate we are that early planners realized what a gem this area is and, in 1965-66, had the foresight to set it aside! And how lucky that further planning in 1983 maintained goals and directives that have, for the most part, meant that the area has been managed as a quiet, non-motorized canoe trail in summer. Being the "cock-eyed optimist" that I am, I am ever hopeful that the current planning efforts will circle around to those same wise management guidelines.

I hope whoever you are that is reading this letter will see your way clear to helping that happen.

Sincerely

Comment 77 of 79 - submitted on 07/11/2013 at 12:00 AM:

I am very concerned at the recent planning proposals to the Nancy Lake State Rec. Area.

This area is unique for its rare "canoe trail", hiking, camping, and a place for non motorized enjoyment of our state lands.

I am opposed to opening the area to ORV use or expanding roads. ATV use should not be allowed in the park even by land owners as it attracts this use by others. The state should maintain the existing resources and continue to manage the area as a non-motorized recreational choice for both residents and tourists. The original plan focused on non-motorized uses and "enhancing remote recreational experiences consistent with the natural and scenic values of the lake system."

Comment 78 of 79 - submitted on 07/12/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the "Public Review Draft" for the NLSRAMP. I live in Talkeetna, and I have visited and enjoyed the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area since I moved to Alaska in 1990. The Nancy Lake State Rec Area is easily accessible from the urban areas of Anchorage and Palmer/Wasilla and from the more rural communities of Willow and Talkeetna. What it offers is a beautiful and natural place to recreate as though you were miles and miles away from town and the possibility of running into a crowd. It is amazing to have such a resource so close to population center of the state. People do not need to leave Anchorage or Palmer or Wasilla to enjoy developed trails and lakes, but they can't get what NLSRA offers in town. So, this plan needs to make sure that the Nancy Lake State Rec Area retains its natural, quiet, less developed characteristics.

With that view, I think the draft plan is slanted too much toward development rather than making sure that what people enjoy the most is protected. The development seems to be proposed for the sake of development rather to meet an identified need. It is extremely difficult to get state resources (i.e., funds from the legislature) for maintenance and management of state parks. So, it makes no sense to propose more development that will only add to the funding woes. I would like to see the plan focus more on identifying maintenance and management needs and ways to meet those needs.

I oppose allowing ORVs in the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area for any use other than park management and maintenance, with the exception that mushers be allowed to train with ATVs on the park road in the fall. I oppose allowing private property owners to use ORVs to access their property through the recreation area. Transportation to private property is not a recreation. I oppose a trail for ORV use in

the park. They don't belong in the park and such trails would only encourage encroachment into the recreation area itself.

I oppose the proposed new trailhead and cross-park trail that would be accessed by Lynx Lake Road for a bicycle trail. I oppose a bicycle trail until State Parks has the funding and staff to monitor and enforce trespass on a wide, high-end trail that could be easily accessed by ATVs. State Parks does not have such funding and staff now, and, in my view, they are not likely to get it.

The Nancy Lake Recreation Area already has the amenities that people want to hike, ski, spend the night, swim. It does not need more developed amenities. This is a fantastic resource. This plan has to make sure that it isn't ruined by unnecessary efforts to "improve" it.

Sincerely

Comment 79 of 79 - submitted on 06/05/2013 at 12:00 AM:

Thank you for the information on the planning meetings. I would like to attend, but I will be out of town on June 5th. I would like to make some comments to be considered.

I hike the Red Shirt Lake trail several times a week and it is a great trail. I would really like another similar length trail to use in the Nancy Lake Park area for summer use. Also, it would be very beneficial to have a bike/walking trail next to the road into Nancy Lake Park. The road is narrow with little shoulders or edges to walk/ride on and it seems dangerous since it is such a curvy road.

Thank you.