

DNR - Mining, Land & Water Online Public Comment

Nancy Lake State Recreation Management Planning

Topic: Comments on Proposed Management Recommendations and Alternatives

Filtered for:

Comment 1 of 97 - submitted on 07/10/2012 at 10:15 PM:

Thank you for allowing me to comment on the NLSRA plan. I appreciate the effort that has gone into updating the plan.

My area of comment is boat moorage at Red Shirt Lake terminus. I own property on Cow Lake and I use Red Shirt Lake and the Park to access my property via a boat that is moored at the terminus of the Red Shirt Lake Summer Trail. I noticed that you carefully noted my situation in your background section. My concern, is that in the description of the proposed management recommendation it appears moorage at the Red Shirt Lake terminus will be limited to only Red Shirt property owners. Did you mean to purposely exclude those with property near Red Shirt lake from boat moorage at the Red Shirt Lake terminus? If so, could you explain the reasoning why you would exclude those very few (likely 1 or 2) property owners that access their property via a boat moored at the Red Shirt Lake terminus, while at the same time allow all Red Shirt Lake property owners moorage at the terminus?

I purchased my property over a decade ago and have used the Red Shirt Lake boat access as a means of access ever summer since the purchase of the our Cow Lake property. Limiting moorage to Red Shirt Lake property owners unduly harms my access to my property at Cow Lake. There appears little gain in restricting my moorage at the Red Shirt Lake terminus given the few owners who fall into this category, while at the same time allowing all Red Shirt Lake property owners full access to moorage. If in the future, usage by non-Red Shirt Lake property owners is unduly impacting the NLSRA, authorization for storage and moorage may be capped, reduced, or eliminated.

Thank you for your time, The McCracken Family

Comment 2 of 97 - submitted on 07/11/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Thank you for emailing me the information about Nancy Lake State Recreation Area. I was born and raised in Alaska and I have concerns regarding the Nancy Lake Recreation Area. First of all, I live in the Matanuska Susitna Borough because it has always been a motorized recreation area. Extreme environmental groups are working hard in taking motorized recreation away; which has been an Alaskan tradition for the true Native Alaskans.

The Matanuska Susitna Borough is still extremely remote and people rely on A TV's, motorized boats and snowmobiles as a form of transportation. I understand that there is a proposal that only land owners will be able to apply for a permit to have motorized access into the Nancy Lake Recreation Area. This means Nancy Lake will only be available to 2 user groups; the environmental user groups and to the people who have the wealth to purchase land in the Nancy Lake Recreation Area. This means the Nancy Lake Recreation Area will be closed off to those families who are low-income and can't afford to purchase land in the Nancy Lake Recreation Area. It will be closed off to the families who use the camp grounds to take their families for

a motorized boat ride or to go jet skiing. It will be closed off to the families who take day trips and go snowmobiling or for that four wheeler ride. Many people will have the Alaskan tradition of motorized recreation slowly taken away if the environmentalists have their way.

Anchorage has 1,255,104 acres of land which is closed to motorized recreation. If the environmentalists have such a problem with people having fun with motorized recreation, then they can play on the 1,225,104 acres which is closed to motorized recreation. Thank you and please support motorized recreation for the remaining areas which are left for this type of activity.

Comment 3 of 97 - submitted on 07/18/2012 at 12:00 AM:

My comments concern the Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail, summer access alternatives. As a property owner at Butterfly Lake, me, my family and our guests have enjoyed the privilege of being able to access the Lake during the summer months. The Butterfly Lake is a wonderful place but, for the most part, cannot be enjoyed by the general public due to its limited access. I believe that Alternative #3 provides the best alternative at the present time. It not only improves the access road (which can be treacherous to near impassable in the Spring and rainy periods). This alternative would open both Lynx and Butterfly Lakes to summer recreational activities as there would be a good road with adequate parking within the Park. For those older folks, ATV access to the lake is essential since it would be nearly impossible for me, my wife and other older people to hike in (carrying supplies) what would likely be several miles.

The second best alternative would be Alternative #2 but this would require developing/improving the parking area adjacent the Parks Highway to accommodate the increased traffic. Alternative #1 is unacceptable as it does not permit any ATV traffic. This alternative would essentially close Lake access to those not capable of hiking in and those property owners needed to resupply their cabins or those wishing to camp at Butterfly Lake. Alternative #4 should be looked at as a longer term plan as this is the most expensive alternative.

Be advised too that there are those property owners on these lakes who wish to further restrict any land access to these lakes rather than open its up. These are generally the people who own float planes and wish to have the lakes to themselves.

The Church of Christ has recently instituted a \$100 annual fee (one key, one registered vehicle) for property owners inside the Park to access their road and parking area via motorized vehicle. In my opinion, and I m sure other property holders would agree, if the Church of Christ is unwilling to provide the State a permanent public easement across their property, the State should simply close Lynx Lake Road at the new Baines Lake Parking Area to all motorized traffic and require Camp visitors to hike the rest of the way to the Camp or they could use the Lynx Lake Boat and Parking area to access the Camp.

Thank You

Comment 4 of 97 - submitted on 07/25/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Thank you for the shared information at the Willow Community Hall last night 7/24/2012. Regarding the construction of new docks:

I'd recommend a maximum water foot print of no greater than 500 sq. ft. The 10'

foot maximum width should not be applicable for deep water shore lines that have no water plant growth to affect, or if the bottom is rocky. My personal observations from snorkeling over ½ mile of Nancy Lake shore line, over several years, is the docks form a harbor and protection for small fish, who flourish near the docks. The docks also help buffer wave action and shore erosion. I support the other new dock recommendations.

I would also recommend the allowance of lake based geo thermal systems to heat shore based structures. Many possible advantages to residences, minimal impact, if any to the lake. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Thought of a couple of additional comments from last night's discussion: Personal water craft docks, boat lifts and trampolines would not count as part of the lot owners 450/500 sq. foot dock allocation.

Comment 5 of 97 - submitted on 07/26/2012 at 12:00 AM:

I support continued ATV access on the Butterfly Lake trail, as we depend on this access for getting to our property on Delyndia Lake. I prefer Alts 2 or 3 for this component, as I enjoy the remote access component of getting to our cabin. I support continuing to have boat storage at Butterfly Lake, as it is essential for access to our cabin on Delyndia. I support being allowed to have more than one boat (we have a motorized row boat and a canoe), as our mode of access depends on whether we are with someone who is comfortable using a motor or not.

The management plan needs to include or be published in conjunction with an implementation proposal that explains how existing conditions will continue to be managed until the funding is available for the plan to be fully implemented. For example, if the Butterfly Lake trail is slated to be rerouted around Candlestick in the management plan but there is no funding available to accomplish this, how will the State deal with existing deterioration on the current trail? Will property owners be allowed to improve the existing trail until such time as the reroute can occur?

Comment 6 of 97 - submitted on 07/26/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Sirs:

I am submitting this letter to comment on the proposed Nancy Lake State Recreation Area management plan. This letter is intended to be included with the public comments.

As a preface, we own waterfront property on Nancy Lake and are impacted by the proposed plan. We use the waters of Nancy Lake both winter and summer. We go into the recreation area in winter by snowmachine including to Lynx Lake, Red Shirt Lake, and Butterfly Lake.

1. Nancy Lake comments.

A. RECOMMENDATIONS.

The proposal to define certain structures as compatible if they meet the standards and thus not require a permit for them is sound. This greatly lessens the administrative burden since most structures are of good construction with appropriate materials and do not present a problem.

The concern in document no. 2 about the loss of lake surface from structures seems misplaced. Piers and wharfs start at the water's edge or are displaced and connected

to shore by some type of ramp. The area immediately along the shoreline is not useable by boats since it is too shallow. Nancy Lake fluctuates in water level both seasonally and from year to year so the water depth next to the shoreline varies over time. The lake has an existing no wake zone extending out 100' from shore. This moves most of the boat traffic out at least that far since few powered vessels travel around the lake at 2 knots or less. I don't believe there is an actual problem with the exception if someone were to build a structure in one of the straits of Nancy Lake.

As to standards in document no. 3 at page 1 they are generally good. The limitation on encapsulated float material in par. 1.a.iv. should be expanded to exclude float logs. I have seen float logs which are coated with a thin layer of fiberglass. Fiberglass boat hulls develop hairline cracks over time which allows the foam inside the hull to become saturated. Fiberglass float logs will likely develop similar cracks and become waterlogged.

The 450 square feet limit in par. 1.a.v. is not large enough for some lake users. The standard includes floating swim platforms. There are some large water toys in use which might push some property owners beyond the 450 square feet limit. I suggest a higher limit is appropriate.

Par. 1.a.vii. imposes a 10 feet width limit on structures, but does not specify how that is measured. There are some wharfs(1) around Nancy Lake which obviously are longer than 10 feet but do not extend very far into the lake. I don't see a reason to prohibit such structures. A suggestion to solve this is to state no structure shall be larger than 40 feet on it longest axis and longer than 10 feet on the axis perpendicular to the longest axis. This would still keep the proposed 10 feet limit but allow the existing wharfs.

Par. b addresses commercial structures, but I am unsure what it is contemplated since I do not know of any current commercial structure on Nancy Lake. A large portion of the lots around the lake are subject to covenants which prohibit commercial structures. The State of Alaska should not approve any structure which violates property covenants.

Nancy Lake is a recreation area with access for the public already provided at the state launch ramp. We don't need a commercial activity operating in the recreation area. I suggest this section be changed to prohibit commercial structures.

Par. c provides for a marina at the location where it was previously located. The marina operated for years and provided gasoline for boats and aviation gasoline for floatplanes. Pumping gasoline at the marina likely lessened the number of gasoline spills as opposed to filling boats from portable gas cans.

The marina brought floatplane traffic which was very noisy and often conflicted with traffic on the lake. Floatplanes on the water are subject to the rules of the road for boats. Many floatplane pilots do not know or choose not to follow the rules of the road with resulting conflicts with boats. I do not know of any boat-floatplane collisions on Nancy Lake, but there have been some near misses.(2)

The marina provided another launch ramp which mean more boat traffic on the weekends. Without the marina we now have less boat traffic and much less floatplane traffic. Nancy Lake is a better place for recreation without the marina.

Where the marina was has been replatted. A large house is being built on the actual marina site. To rebuild the marina at its prior location is no longer practical. We do not need a marina at another location. My suggestion is to determine a marina at any location is incompatible with the recreation area.

Par. 2, fn 3 has a statement that all landowners must have an authorization prior to maintaining an existing dock. This appears to be inconsistent with the concept of conforming structures being compatible uses which do not need a permit. The footnote should be harmonized with the concept of conforming structures not needing a permit.

B. SUGGESTED ADDITIONS.

The standard in par. 1. a. should include a requirement to maintain any floating structure so it floats are at its normal design water line. There are a number of half-sunken floats around the lake which look like junk and should be removed. They are not useable except at risk to the users. Some break apart over time and pieces drift around. The lake would be better with them gone.

The standard in par. 1. a. doesn't address buoys, but a number of lake property owners place buoys out from shore. Not all owners remove their buoys before freeze-up. These buoys become covered with snow and present a real hazard to snowmachiners who think they are a snow drift rather than something solid. I have seen snowmachines crash which hit such buoys. The standard should include a requirement to remove from the lake all objects not physically attached to shore before freeze-up in the fall.

The management plan does not address any boating restrictions. There are quiet hours starting at 11 p. m. which provide relief for residents although there are some scofflaws. This is not a management problem but rather one of education and possibly enforcement.

What should be addressed are noise restrictions during regular hours. A number of times each summer someone brings to the lake a boat with no muffler or an inadequate one. These are often jet boats, and the operators are fond of high speed runs no matter what the time is. In addition, there are some boats and PWCs on the lake which have worn out mufflers. The noise can be a serious problem on weekends.

There should be a requirement that no vessel is operated on Nancy Lake unless it has a factory muffler or functional equivalent in good operating condition. This would improve the recreation qualities of Nancy Lake.

Even with the closure of the marina, Nancy Lake still has considerable floatplane traffic. Most of these aircraft are extremely loud on take-off. In addition, some pilots are fond of down-wind takeoffs and landings and buzzing their cabin, as well as the neighbors, upon arriving or departing. These pilots present a risk to both to those on shore and on the lake if they crash.

Floatplane traffic should be limited to the same quiet hours as boats. Also there should be no commercial operations on the lake, no practice landings and takeoffs, and no touch-and-goes. Traffic should be restricted to flying pilot and passengers to and from the lake.(3) Restricting the traffic would make Nancy Lake a more quiet

place.

2. Lynx Lake Road comments.

We sometimes use Lynx Lake Road for snowmachine access in the winter. This is an alternative route to and from Lynx Lake and beyond although it is unmaintained so it often washboards severely. Most of the winter traffic is snowmachines although I once saw a JD-450 with low pressure tracks pulling a large sled loaded with building supplies.

A number of the alternatives propose pack and saddle access. Horses should be kept out of the Nancy Lake Recreation Area. The horseshoes destroy a trail in short order unless the trail is built on rock or gravel. Horses leave manure which attracts flies and smells. The use of horses on a trail wrecks it for the other users.

The present trail seems to serve most summer users who use ATVs and UTVs to access their property. Access for ATVs and UTVs should be continued. The proposals to develop the trail into a real road would change the area with more conventional vehicles accessing it. You need to ask the existing property owners whether this is a desired change.

I do not know where funding would come from to improve Lynx Lake Road. If such a road were built, it would bring more problems with struck and crashed vehicles. For comparison look at Nancy Lake Parkway and some of the vehicle crashes on it. Generally, someone who breaks down with their snowmachine or ATV has the capability, via friends and others, to recover their snowmachine or ATV. This is not true of conventional vehicles. Any plan for an improved road has to deal with the potential vehicle problems.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully yours

(1) A wharf is attached to land and runs parallel to the shoreline to provide a mooring area for a vessel. A pier runs generally perpendicular to shore and provide mooring space for vessel on one or both sides. A dock is a space in which one can put a vessel. An EZ-Port for a personal watercraft is properly called a dock. Likewise, a Shore Station for a ski boat is a dock.

(2) A few years ago a floatplane landing at Big Lake hit a PWC and injured the PWC operator.

(3) The limitation to passengers is necessary because a few years ago one pilot used the lake as a base for flying gravel in 5 gallon buckets to a remote lake. This operation went on for weeks.

Comment 7 of 97 - submitted on 08/02/2012 at 07:45 PM:

Having used the Nancy Lake Rec for many years and many different types of activities its obvious that change is coming in some form or another to the NLSRA and Butterfly Lake. I have reviewed the four alternative plans presented, attended one of the two public meetings for comment and carefully thought out how the proposals would effect myself/family/friends and the public. As a landowner who accesses our property on Butterfly Lake through the NLSRA by the use of various

types of transportation to include highway vehicle, ATV, snowmachine, aircraft and by foot, I cannot support alternative one which inhibits ATV access. This proposal, as far as our family and numerous friends are concerned, is not an option that would benefit our traditional use of the Rec. area. We would support all three of the other proposals, even tho alternative four would prevent ATV access and bring the most change to Butterfly Lake. Plan two would probably be the least invasive and probably would be the favored choice and all around compromise for all types of users, with plan three the next. Funding is going to an issue with any of the four proposed plans, but if things are done in phases, any plan could be accomplished to include plan four. I know there are alot of issues to consider when trying to finalize the management plan, but I hope property owners still have access via ATV in the final plan.

Thank you Steve Pahkala

Comment 8 of 97 - submitted on 08/06/2012 at 08:48 AM:

One thing I did not see addressed is the use of an atv to access Long lake road from Nancy Lake Pkwy. I do not see where using the road system to access Long lake road needs to be restricted. I believe there only to be a couple hundred feet of road at the most within the rec area boundary. I am not talking about going off the road onto wild lands just using that access that exists already. I believe if a car can go down the road without ill effects an atv on there is no different. Would greatly appreciate this consideration.

I think the width of a dock in Nancy lake could be larger than 10 feet as long as you stay within the 400 sq ft limit. I can see in a much smaller lake where this could be an issue. In my years on this lake I only know of two occasions where individuals abused the dock building one in the bird refuge area, and one huge drilling platform looking dock way out in the lake and the latter has been changed. Also would like to see some fish management of some sort the northern pike have decimated the other species and pretty sure ruined the sockeye run in little susitna river, that used Nancy lake as their spawning grounds . Why bother to get worried about managing docks and structures if we are not going to address the fisheries. Thankyou for the opportunity to comment.

Comment 9 of 97 - submitted on 08/08/2012 at 12:00 AM:

The trail should remain as is, with understanding that we, the users of the trail, can improve & upgrade this same trail.

Comment 10 of 97 - submitted on 08/08/2012 at 12:00 AM:

We wish to have the trail remain as is and be able to improve and upgrade the existing trail.

Comment 11 of 97 - submitted on 08/08/2012 at 02:17 PM:

I would like to submit the following comments on the proposed management recommendations and alternatives. I am a property owner on Delyndia Lake, and I access my property both by hiking in from the parking lot at the church camp, and by ATV from the Parks Highway, along Lynx Lake Road. I have also used the NLSRA for recreation many times, particularly the canoe trails, and the Lynx Lake loop trail. 1) I support continued ATV access to Butterfly Lake for property owners. Many of us purchased our land with the understanding that there was an existing, permitted

trail that was accessible by ATVs. At times, we go to the cabin with family members who would not be able to get out there any other way, and this is an important use for our family.

2) I am concerned that the alternatives for the plan identify that ATV access on Butterfly Lake Trail (under Alternatives 2 and 3) would be allowed specifically on the redeveloped trail. While I acknowledge that there are some parts of the existing trail in need of remediation, I am concerned that you will institute a management plan that calls for rerouting the trail around Candlestick Lake, but lacking an immediate source for funding the new trail, you will not allow us to continue to use or improve the existing trail in the interim. I note that property owners have wanted to improve the existing trail for several years (with their own funds), and have been prevented from doing so by the park service. The management plan, or an accompanying directive from the park service, needs to explicitly address what accommodation will be made for current usage in the interim between when the management plan is adopted, and when funding is available to institute the improvements or changes that are called for in the plan. Additionally, it would be helpful for the park service to identify some priorities for which projects would be likely to be instituted first, depending on available funding.

3) I do not support building a highway road all the way to Butterfly Lake, as proposed in Alternative 4 (although I don't object to considering it as part of the suite of alternatives). I think this will completely change the character of the Nancy Lake canoe trails, and will make Lynx Lake more like Nancy Lake. This type of experience is already available within the NLSRA; the Lynx Lake canoe loop is a unique experience, which will be completely altered with direct and easy vehicular access to Lynx Lake.

4) For the same reasons, I also support maintaining the gate at the boundary of the NLSRA, on Lynx Lake Road.

I look forward to seeing the public review draft of the management plan.

Comment 12 of 97 - submitted on 08/12/2012 at 12:00 AM:

I tried to review the volume of data regarding Nancy Lake regulations and have some concerns and suggestions. My wife and I purchased our recreational property on Nancy Lake ~15-years ago. The property included a boat lift and a floating dock. Our dock is 18' x 24' with a 18' x 4' walkway. That equates to a 432 square foot platform and a 72 square foot walkway. As this is greater than the proposed 400 square foot maximum are we now out of compliance? Are we grandfathered in like our original 12' x 16' cabin that was originally set ~50' from the water in the 1970's? Does it make a difference that we have a moveable floating dock?

I have a few recommendations:

-Consider that floating docks are not the same as stationary docks with pilings.

-Consider that many of us have had the same docks for 10+ years.

-Boat lifts are beneficial to the shoreline by exposing less contaminants to the water and by keeping the shoreline free of damage.

By the way, what are the regulations regarding shoreline improvements? We have

been playing by the rules according to the Nancy Lake Park Service by not clearing any of our shoreline. We appear to be in the small minority. We have over 400' of shoreline and would like to improve less than 25% of that. Improve meaning clear brush and improve access to our property. All we get from the park service is a stern reply NO. Besides going after docks and boat lifts, position statements regarding shoreline improvement need to articulated. What, are we trying to save the pike population?

Another concern are PWC. They are a lot of fun but enforcement needs to considered regarding those in the minority that buzz the shoreline. The reason we have bouys in front of our property is to warn watercraft users that we have young people swimming in the area.

I would appreciate a response to my concerns.

Sincerely

Comment 13 of 97 - submitted on 08/14/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear DPOR,

My name is Kurt Eriksson. My family has owned and used property on Red Shirt Lake since the 1960's. My father originally attempted to homestead Lynx Lake, but was "paper staked" and moved to Red Shirt as a result. We have had regular visits to Lynx Lake over the many years.

I would like to address the public access issue to the lakes within the NLSRA, specifically the proposed Lynx Lake boat launch development. It is my opinion that expanding public access in ways that encourage greater motorized water craft access to the lakes within the NLSRA significantly reduces the quiet outdoor experience we so value in this unique area.

I live on the Kenai Peninsula on a public access lake (Longmere Lake). Longmere Lake has an expanded and developed boat launch. While I believe the public has a right to enjoy the lake as much as I do, the negative impact from increased boat traffic and personal water craft has greatly reduced the appeal of living on the lake. The lake is significantly noisier and more congested. Conflicts with aircraft and water craft are more common. The pollution (garbage, gas/oil) is more abundant during heavy use times. During the heavy use days it is not a friendly canoe or kayak lake. At times I think the public boat launch has turned our quiet and peaceful lake into the "Big Lake" of the Peninsula.

We spend a great deal of time at Redshirt Lake to enjoy the quiet and remote area appeal. I enjoy recreating on Red Shirt Lake without the conflict and noise from constant water craft. It is a unique feature of the lakes within this recreation area that I would not wish to see disappear.

I sincerely hope that the new NLSRA Management Plan will result in quiet and peaceful use of area lakes that can be enjoyed by nature, in-holders and the public alike.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Comment 14 of 97 - submitted on 08/14/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Margaret Walker and I am an original homesteader of Lynx Lake. My husband and I homesteaded our property in the early fifties. We cut down trees and stripped them to build a small cabin with large porch so we could enjoy the pristine beauty of the lake and listen to the loons in the evening. Our family has enjoyed the quiet serene beauty of Lynx Lake these many years and I shudder to think what may happen to it should unrestricted public access be made available.

This lake is totally surrounded by NLSRA land with access only by the locked gate which I am sure has contributed to its undisturbed beauty these many years. There are very few areas left where natural fauna and fowl can thrive in their natural habitat.

I wholeheartedly agree with the position taken by the Stewards of Lynx Lake. I am proud to be associated with land owners and members of the public who value the fragile environment of this very unique lake and feel responsible for protecting it from the onslaught of unrestricted access.

I sincerely hope that the NLSRA management plan will give serious and thoughtful consideration to the concerns of those who have voiced objection to removing the gate and providing large scale public access to Lynx Lake.

Sincerely

Comment 15 of 97 - submitted on 08/14/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Garrett Walker and I am a property owner at Lynx Lake. My Lynx lake property has been in my family since it was homesteaded in the 1950's. I am writing to provide you my insight and comments for consideration in updating the NLSRA Management Plan, and specifically with respect to the Lynx Lake road and access alternatives that have been drafted and presented for comment at public meetings held on July 24th and 26th of this year.

While I can appreciate and support the desire for parity between private and public access within the NLSRA, I am extremely concerned by, and vehemently object to, the unrestricted public access to Lynx Lake as incorporated into each of the four alternatives.

Lynx Lake provides a wonderful opportunity for in-holders and visitors to enjoy nature, wildlife, and waterfowl in a quiet, natural setting this is precisely what attracted my family to homestead the property. I have complete certainty that this aspect of Lynx Lake will be forever lost if unrestricted public access, even unrestricted day access, were to be allowed. I am similarly confident that my personal desire to maintain Lynx Lake's current serene setting is one shared by all in-holders as well as the majority of the public, and I offer the following points and information as evidence of this fact:

As stated in the 1983 Master Plan:

- Master Plan objective number 3, page 24, states: "To retain the area's quiet, natural beauty, the attribute most sought by NLSRA visitors while providing

recreational activities most appropriate to NLSRA and most desired by the public."

- Red Shirt Lake Access, page 42, states: "The consensus of the public meeting participants and the Red Shirt Lake Homeowners Association was to upgrade the trail for ease of access. People preferred not to develop a road into the lake so as to maintain the quiet, natural beauty of the recreation area, to protect resource values, to provide more hiking opportunities, and to keep the lake less developed."

- Local Recreation Preferences, page 28, provides results of surveys and four public meetings that revealed attitudes and preferences that affected the '83 master plan, including:

- The most frequently given reason for coming to the NLSRA was to enjoy the quiet natural setting.

- The five most frequently mentioned items visitors want more of in NLSRA is hiking trails, fishing, canoeing, campgrounds and associated facilities; and public cabins.

- The five most frequently mentioned facilities or activities considered inappropriate for NLSRA were motor boats, commercial establishments, snowmobiles, more roads, and motorized vehicles.

- The five most frequently mentioned existing qualities of NLSRA appreciated most were natural beauty, open space and quiet, campgrounds, easy access and convenience, canoe trails; and good maintenance.

- The five most frequently mentioned existing conditions liked least were overcrowding, overdevelopment and noise, poor fishing, motor boats and planes, lack of firewood, and poor maintenance

As stated in DPOR s Planning Update #2 - October 2010

- The majority of respondents selected "Opportunity to escape urban environments", with "Own property in the area" and "Quiet natural setting" as their reason for recreating in NLSRA.

- Top choices for most liked were the quiet natural setting, remote canoeing & camping, and the diversity of recreational opportunities.

- Question ten asked respondents about the amount of development that is appropriate for the NLSRA with the majority of responses being "Keep it near current levels" or "Increase it slightly" respectively.

I submit that unrestricted motorized public access to Lynx Lake beyond that specifically authorized in conjunction with a permitted reservation to use one of the public use cabins located on the lake, will irreparably damage what is currently the beauty of the Lynx Lake environment and experience. I believe the 1983 Master Plan had it right with respect to: "In lieu of constructing additional roads, this master plan focuses on a more cost effective approach to facility development. Maximum utilization from the existing parkway is gained by developing additional campgrounds, trailheads and facilities along the existing road spine, thereby filling in existing gaps and concentrating future development and management. Not only is this approach most cost effective, it reflects a spectrum of opportunities from the public's desire to have more road accessible campgrounds and associated facilities,

to keep the backcountry canoe trails quiet and in a natural state, to have a relatively undisturbed natural area for backcountry trails, remote cabins and wildlife viewing, and to avoid conflicts between private landowners and park users."

I further submit that the current recommendations and Lynx Lake road alternatives, all of which open Lynx Lake road to unrestricted public access, are deficient with respect to providing specific justification for this significant departure from the conclusions and recommendations as provided in the 1983 Master Plan, and for not more specifically addressing and advising the public as to the potential impacts these alternatives could present with respect to public safety, invasive plants, waterfowl, wildlife, noise and natural habitat as assessed by recognized subject matter experts in these fields.

Additionally, due to the islands and shallows located near the middle of Lynx Lake, any appreciable increase in public motorized lake traffic will significantly increase the risk of personal injury to those recreating on lake...especially those who are doing so in a non-motorized manner. Similarly, it would significantly increase the potential for an incident between aircraft and motorized boat operations.

My Specific Recommendations:

I recommend that the portion of Lynx Lake road that provides access to Lynx Lake remain permitted and gated. If not in its current location at approximately 3.25 miles from the Parks Highway, the gate should be located no further than just beyond any newly developed access to Butterfly Lake and/or the Chicken Lake Cross Park trailhead.

I recommend that the Butterfly and Delyndia Lake access and moorage/storage issues be addressed separately and independently from the access to, and the development of, Lynx Lake.

I recommend that any new development of facilities at Lynx Lake be done in a manner that maintains the overall existing level of development at the lake, i.e. with respect to public use cabins, camp sites, access, and motorized traffic on the lake.

I recommend that no parking facility for Lynx, Butterfly, Delyndia, and Skeetna lakes be built past (i.e. inside) the gate to control access to Lynx Lake. I further recommend that any such parking facility should be located as near as possible to the Parks Highway to minimize impacts due to vandalism, trash, lack of appropriate sewage/waste facilities or operational costs of maintaining same.

I recommend that no parking facility be built to accommodate public access to Baines Lake, unless there is a corresponding campground or public use cabin built at Baines Lake. Providing vehicular access and parking without commensurate camping/cabin facilities will result in the destruction of park land and habitat due to visitors opting to stay overnight in non-designated areas, and/or using Baine Lake access as a means for unpermitted use and camping at Lynx Lake.

I recommend that Lynx Lake access and motorized boat use, be limited to in-holders and potentially those permitted users of the Lynx Lake public use cabins. Doing so will not only help to ensure the current beauty and setting of the lake is preserved for generations to come, but it will also provide users of the canoe trail system a full loop trail option without the need or fear of having to traverse a lake

with significant motorized boat traffic and the associated noise and urban usage elements that would ruin the canoe trail experience on Lynx Lake.

I recommend that all current and future Lynx Lake public access and use be specifically regulated, and enforced, so as to ensure maintenance of the quiet, natural setting and to protect the wildlife and waterfowl that call the lake their home. No increase to public access should be provided for within the management plan without also specifically providing for a commensurate enhancement to enforcement of park regulations. This would also include educating park visitors to the rights of private landowners, soliciting in-holders to serve as Park hosts to aid with enforcement of park regulations on the lake, and providing all Lynx Lake visitors maps depicting private properties and sensitive wildlife and habitat areas around the lake.

Finally, I recommend the State very carefully weigh and consider the issue of the Lynx Lake road access, because as is noted in the States Introduction and Background section of Document 1 as posted on the NLSRA Planning website, "On a large scale, the character of an entire area may change based on management decisions."

Thank you in advance for your careful consideration of the above feedback and recommendations-

Regards

Comment 16 of 97 - submitted on 08/17/2012 at 02:49 AM:

We lived in Alaska for 12 years and used the Midnight Sun Bible Camp at Lynx Lake every year, our children grew up there and we staffed the camp in various capacities each year. Many thousands of hours of work, many thousands of dollars have been spent to build and operate the camp over the past 52 years since camp was established here in 1960. Multiple generations of campers have and still come to camp each year. Camp is a large ministry of the Anchorage church of Christ congregation. Recent public meetings have also shown that the camp is well supported by their neighbors in all that they do but especially in bringing children out that might never get to experience an Alaskan wilderness setting. We've seen this new plan and want to register our opposition to the removal of the gate, the establishment of additional campsites and boat access to Lynx Lake. Thank you!

Comment 17 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 12:00 AM:

We have owned property on Delindia (Butterfly Lake) since 2004. (Wolverton Mt. Lot 10). We also have a boat storage permit at East butterfly Lake. When we first purchased our property the Butterfly Lake access trail for ATV use was in very poor condition. The private land owners got together and improved the trail to its current condition with our own labor and funding. We have been told not to do any more improvements on the trail by Alaska State parks, that was three years ago! The Anchorage Church of Christ have been good neighbors and we have worked together in allowing private land owners access to the Butterfly Lake trail. When the Church Camp asked us if we would rebuild the first bridge on the Lynx Lake Road the private land owners got together with our own labor and funding and rebuilt the bridge. (ATV users that is no walk in people present).

As private land owners we would like to see the Lynx Lake Road gate stay at the same location with key access for ATV and personnel vehicles. The Butterfly Lake Trail needs improvement, the private land owners have funds already established for those improvements. Butterfly Lake Trail can be moved east of Candlestick Lake to higher ground if the state will allow us to do so at the private land owners expense. The boat storage docking area at East Butterfly Lake can be improved, a staging area could be established for loading and unloading boats and barges. Private land owners have policed activities at Lynx Lake Road access gate, Anchorage Church of Christ parking lot and Butterfly Lake Trail for several years and will do so in the future. The public has access to the Nancy Lake State Park via canoe trail system and public use cabins. By leaving the Lynx Lake Road gate the same and Butterfly Lake Trail with improvements, it insures that the park and private land owners will have less vandalism and liter through out the park.

Comment 18 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Subject: Summer Access to Lynx Lake Road & Butterfly Lake Trail

To whom it may concern:

After having been associated with the Midnight Sun Bible Camp run and operated by the Anchorage Church of Christ, I have become concerned about some of the changes being purposed by the DNR. Over the years I have known many who have benefited from the programs provided by the camp and the chance for individuals and families alike to get away from the busy life of the city and find tranquility in nature while being taught skills that will help them in life as they mature and grow. I am of the opinion that it is necessary to keep the gate along Lynx Road locked during the summer time while these programs are in session until another alternative route is built to get to other parts of the park and Butterfly Lake without crossing our property. Having the gate open to the general public not only will bring a less secluded environment, but could provide a security problem. Signs showing that certain parts of the land are "Private Property" could be put up, but would no doubt be ignored since much of the time there is no one to enforce the law.

Please consider waiting to make any changes to the 1983 agreement until more alternative trails are built that do not cross our property.

Sincerely

Comment 19 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 12:00 AM:

In response to your request for comments on the proposed NLRA plan, the following is provided.

I have owned a cabin on Nancy Lake for 22 years which is accessed from Hardship Lane (private road) on the NW side of the lake. We enjoy the NLRA and have recently had a great day on the smaller canoe trail. I am currently chair of the Hardship Lane Homeowners Association. I have made previous comments to the NLRA planning and have requested information concerning the state planning process.

The comments are not prioritized as to importance.

1. DEFINITION OF THE AREA - What is the Nancy Lake Recreational Area? This question has caused confusion in the past regarding use of the area and how the area is managed. I feel that this confusion could result in the new plan not resulting

in a successful outcome.

My understanding is that part of the land could be considered a true park (designated in the land transfer) and most is considered a multiple use recreational area with several "inholding" parcels of private land. When the NLRA was created by the state this mixture resulted in issues of access to private lands, control of public access, and conflicting interpretations of rules.

Some local lake residents have stated to me that the NLRA is a park and should be managed as a park with many restrictions. This understanding could come from it being managed by a State park department with a "Park Ranger". Other residents of Hardship Lane have reflected that management is over restrictive as when the park ranger stops them on the outer end of the Parkway or Long Lake Road to threaten arrest when residents use an ATV or side-by-side ATV along the side of road. A more user friendly neighbor attitude would help. This route from Hardship Lane to Long Lake Road is an important to access the areas behind Willow. These two roads are maintained under the State Highway and Borough and should be available for responsible ATV access to the north. The responsible use of ATV along the MSB roads, parts of Wasilla, and State Highways is generally accepted and should also be acceptable on this part of our road. The new plan needs to allow responsible access on this route. ATV Restrictions applied after the NLRA entrance kiosk seem appropriate along with signs to stay on the side of the road on the short stretch to Long Lake Road.

2. MARINA/FUELING SITE - The proposed plan recommends that a marina or fueling site is possible on Nancy Lake if it is placed in the same place as the old one. This land has been purchased by a private party, subdivided using MSB regulations, and there is no place for a commercial site. The current owners have no plans for a fueling site. Do the state planners realize this? The plan should state that a marina or fueling site is possible on Nancy Lake if it is built in accordance with state and MSB regulations.

3. ACCESS TO PRIVATE PROPERTY - The 1983 master Plan recommends that many of the private in holdings in the NLRA be purchased by the state. Some of these were located on Nancy Lake (Hardship Lane). I understand that these purchase plans were not followed because of State budget restrictions and increased land prices. The land on Hardship Lane has been improved by the owners and I think lands on other lakes have been improved and not purchased by the state. This reality change over the past 30 years should change the thinking of the state planners because the private holdings have not been reduced and people want to have access to their lands. (Redshirt Lake, Lynx and Butterfly Lake). These Prior access rights must be honored. If I had a cabin on Lynx Lake and ask a friend to come there on his ATV, this should be possible - I understand that this visitor currently must travel to the site with the cabin owner.

The use of ATV and side-by-side ATV vehicles has exploded during the past 30 years after their general use was halted in the NLRA. Many more people use these types of vehicles. It seems that a better plan could be developed than the current gated system with cabin owner keys. A maintained light duty road to Redshirt, Lynx, and Butterfly lakes with notice of rules, signage and severe penalties for tearing everything up seems like it may work. The 7/2008 trail consultation report on the

Butterfly Lake Trail indicates that a suitable light duty road could be built at a nominal public investment. I am against restricting these trails further to foot traffic only as one of the alternates proposes.

4. DOCK PERMIT - The new general rules for the dock permits seem like a workable plan as we proceed to get them permitted. However, I understand that some recent past permits have taken months to process and have had multiple agency feedbacks for additional information before they are processed. If a burdensome new process is developed by state regulators without the goal of getting everyone permitted, the proposed plan to improve the situation will not be achieved.

5. CINDY LAKE - I have previously requested the DNR intentions regarding the small lake on Hardship Lane "Cindy Lake" that borders the NLRA. The 30 acre parcel is isolated from other state lands and has been visited several times by DNR planners. We would like to keep this area preserved and would like to know what is the status of the planners thinking.

6. STATE LOT ON "NO WAKE COVE" - There is one lot at the mouth of "no Wake Cove" that could be accessed from Hardship Lane. The lot is not maintained and has many dead black spruce trees (fire Hazard). Is this lot in the NLRA and how does it fit into your plan.

Thank you for chance to input thoughts.

Comment 20 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Sir,

I own a cabin on Butterfly Lake (sometimes referred to as East Butterfly Lake in the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area. In 2007, some property owners on Butterfly Lake learned that DPOR had issued permits to ATV users to reroute the Butterfly Lake Trail and to use ATVs on that trail. DPOR first started issuing the permits in 2000. This was done without public notice. Once the word got out that DPOR had permitted this activity, interested parties, protested and pointed out that issuing these permits violated the Management Plan, the governing regulations, and was resulting in impairment of the park experience and damage to the park. DPOR responded that the Management Plan would be revised. The actions for DPOR in continuing to issue those permits is now pending before the Alaska Supreme Court.

One simple decision would have resolved the issue that initiated this process: DPOR could have either decided that ATVs would be allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail, or that they would not. DPOR instead embarked on a lengthy and expensive planning process, but still has not addressed the core issue.

The proper approach is to address the ATV issue. Then the pre-2000 situation (no ATV permits) or after 2000 (ATV permits on Butterfly Lake trail) would be restored.

DPOR has stated that it based its proposals, in part, on the assumption that summer time ATV use has been allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail since inception of the park. This is incorrect.

Summertime access was not allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail prior to 2000. The trail was a winter cat trail that ran through a swamp. It was totally unsuitable for

summertime ATV use. The occasional (illegal) summer ATV user tore deep ruts into the wetlands, making the trail virtually impassable even for foot traffic. The rare ATV use apparently occurred only at night or on week days, because ATVs were never sighted even by people who had walked that trail on a regular basis for almost 20 years. On the rare occasion when a ranger was in that area, if he/she caught an ATV user, the user was fined. A cabin owner on Butterfly Lake, Jeff Gorton was so ticketed and fined for driving a 4-Wheeler through the park on the Butterfly Lake Trail. DPOR's own files reflect that such use was regarded as "Outlaw" use prior to 2000. DPOR informed property owners, in writing, that such use was illegal. A single permit was issued to Max Pearce 39 years ago for a single season, apparently based on the fact he sold property to the park. There is no evidence of any other pre-2000 permits.

Contrary to the suggestion in the draft at page 10, both the 1983 Management Plan and the controlling regulations prohibit ATV anywhere in the park, including on the trail. The 1983 plan states at page 88 that "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." To the extent that there is any ambiguity in the 1983 plan on this point, that was resolved by the sworn statement of Dennis Heikes, one of the two drafters of the plan. Mr. Heikes has unequivocally stated that ATV use was not allowed prior to 1983, and that the 1983 plan did not intend to create or allow such use. There is no one who was around at the time who has given a contrary statement, for the simple reason that Mr. Heikes is right.

I understand you are relying on the following statement from the 1983 plan to support your position that ATV access was allowed prior to 2000: ""The Lynx Lake road provides private access to authorized users who lived within and beyond NLSRA and were using the road for access to their property at the time of the recreation area's establishment in 1966." The summer time access beyond Lynx Lake in 1966 was by foot and by canoe, not by ATV. The Butterfly Lake trail was a winter only cat trail. As shown above, with a single exception, there was no "authorized" summer motorized access on the trail prior to 2000. ATVs did not even exist in 1966 - they clearly weren't used for summertime access on the trail. Mr. Heikes, a drafter of the plan, has explained the statement in the 1983 plan - the statement refers to property owners parking at the church camp and walking or canoeing from there on. The summer time access to properties beyond NLSRA was not by ATV. It simply not true that ATV use was allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail at any time prior to 2000. DPOR should not base its plan on this erroneous assumption.

I and multiple others have had a consistent complaint from the start of this process that DPOR has never done any outreach to the recreational users of the park. The park was created for them, not for the surrounding property owners. The current (1983) plan recognized the fundamental purpose for the park. The drafters contacted and distributed questionnaires to over 350 park users. This time, DPOR has contacted property owners in the area, all of whom have an axe to grind, but has made no specific contact with park users. A public process for a public park isn't worth much if there's no outreach to the public users of the park. The comments from the park users in 1983 were strongly opposed to the sort of motorized use DPOR has decided to allow here. There is no evidence that public sentiment has

changed, and there will not be any such evidence as long as DPOR declines to survey the recreational users of the park.

I reviewed all of the responses submitted during the original comment period. I don't recall a single one requesting opening the Lynx Lake Road. The responses were about 4 to 1 against ATV use on the Butterfly Lake Trail, which was the subject of virtually all the comments. DPOR apparently didn't like the results, so it reopened the comment period. I understand that most of these comments were submitted over the internet, so it isn't public information, or available to the public to know what comments were made, but I would like to see them. The draft does state that "few people commented" on the use of highway vehicles beyond the Lynx Lake road gate, but doesn't say how many comments there were or what they said. I attended a public meeting on the plan in Anchorage, and not a single person has ever requested that the road be opened. I am told by one of the people who attended a meeting in Anchorage after the draft plan came out, that the attendees were unanimously opposed to the proposed road opening.

In short, it appears that the proposal is against the great weight of the comments, and maybe against all of them.

The participants at the recent Campbell Creek Science Center meeting opposed the decision to open the road, and inquired why leaving things as they are was not presented as an option. They were informed that the 4 alternatives were merely some of the options under consideration, and that the status quo was also an option under consideration. I have been informed that a contrary statement was made at the recent Mat-Su Trails Committee meeting. I am told that Mr. Biessel informed the Committee that the gate was going to be opened as stated in the draft plan no matter what, and without regard to the public comments or any other consideration.

At this point, I don't know which of DPOR's statements to believe. But it is painfully apparent that DPOR is giving little or no consideration to the public comments on this point.

If it is true that DPOR is going ahead with opening the Lynx Lake road no matter what the public says, it should just put an end to this expensive time-consuming "public process" and do what it has already decided to do.

This plan does no analysis whatsoever of the impact to the park of opening this road to public motorized traffic. This proposal constitutes a radical change in the management approach for the interior of the park, which has been in effect for 46 years. It is inconceivable that this long-standing policy will be abandoned without any analysis of the reasons the policy was originally adopted, whether the policy has worked as intended, and the impacts that will result from changing it.

If such a change is even going to be considered, at a minimum, the following impacts must be addressed:

There is no way that this "road," which is really a trail, can support 40 - 70 vehicles towing boat trailers. That sort of traffic will tear up the road, people will get stuck, and chaos will ensue. There is no room to turn around, and there are many areas where a head-on pass by two vehicles towing trailers will be difficult, if not impossible. The "road" simply cannot take a heavy traffic load, particularly from drivers who are unfamiliar with the road.

The park doesn't have the resources to patrol the interior of the park now. What is going to happen when dozens of boats with trailers, and unlimited ATV traffic descends on the park on a weekend? Who is going to ensure they park where they're supposed to? What if there are more vehicles than parking spots?

How are the ATV users going to be stopped from running all over the park? There are multiple seismic lines and trails throughout the park. The Butterfly Lake Trail was opened in 2000 in part because DPOR couldn't stop the illegal use by adjacent landowners. How is it going to keep a greatly increased volume of ATV riders confined to the road? At least the landowners were going to a particular location. The general public will just want to ride their ATVs over the next hill. What is this new ATV traffic going to do to the park?

What is going to happen to the experience of the canoers for whom the park was created when they hit Lynx Lake on a sunny weekend and there are 50 speed boats running around? Lynx Lake is the intersection of all the canoe trails. Any canoer going through the portages ends up there eventually. What about their right to enjoy a peaceful back country experience?

What effect will having unlimited motorized access have on the peace and quiet for which the park was created?

What is going to happen to the property owners on Lynx Lake - how are they going to be protected from vandalism and theft?

These are just a few of the many potential problems and impacts that will result from opening the gate. It would be a reckless act to proceed with this plan without analyzing the impact on the park.

All 4 proposed alternatives assume significant expenditures of state funds. What happens if the money is not forthcoming? The plan doesn't address this, and doesn't say what happens in the interim while DPOR (presumably) looks for funding.

The least expensive alternative (No. 1) proposes building an ATV trail through the area east of Lynx Lake. Most of this area is swamp. It would require substantial fill for extended distances. At least 2 bridges would be required. It is by no means certain that the necessary permits could be obtained from the Corps of Engineers and Fish & Game. Why would those agencies allow the unnecessary filling of these wetlands?

Even if the permits are obtained, why would the legislature appropriate money for such a boondoggle? The trail will benefit a few property owners at the expense of the general public. DPOR surely has higher priority needs than this trail or road. The park doesn't maintain the minimal facilities (boardwalks and trails) that exist now. How in the world are they going to get the money to build, much less maintain and patrol the proposed new trails and deal with the increased traffic?

I have practiced law in the area of construction litigation--primarily road, highway, and runway construction litigation, and I am confident that building a 24' gravel road through this country would be a multi-million dollar undertaking. Where would this money come from?

What is the fall-back position if none of these pipe dreams comes to pass? Why isn't

there an alternative in the plan (i.e., status quo pre-2000 or after 2000) that may actually occur? Why doesn't the plan tell us what DPOR is going to do between now and the time the funds are appropriated, especially since that may never occur?

This draft plan should go back to the drawing board.

The first step should be outreach to the recreational users of the park, for whom the park was created. DPOR should pay particular attention to their comments. It should consider the comments from the rest of the public.

DPOR should then decide whether summertime motorized use should be allowed on Butterfly Lake trail through the non-motorized part of the park based on the public comments and the best interests of the park.

The plan should address what will happen if no funds are appropriated for any of the 4 proposed alternatives.

Sincerely

Comment 21 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 12:00 AM:

This letter is concerning the State of Alaska's proposed changes for the Nancy Lake Recreation Area.

I was in attendance at the open houses in Willow and Anchorage and feel the four alternative plans do not take into account the unique situation Lynx Lake plays in the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area. Lynx Lake is a small and quiet lake that hosts a small loon population as well as other migratory waterfowl. Many parts are shallow and are an ideal habitat for not only birds but other species such as beavers, muskrats and foraging moose and bear. Currently access to the lake by the public is by portage of canoes and kayaks in the summer and many means of transportation in the winter. There are 13 in-holding parcels held privately. About half of these parcels have direct access to their property by way of the Lynx Lake road. The others, approximately 7, use a small parking and launch site. The State's proposed plans all want to develop this area into a vast public boat launch facility, complete with parking for 40-70 vehicles. This lake is prized by the public who enjoy the canoe trails. The lake, as it sits now offers canoeists a tranquil wilderness experience that is convenient to large urban areas. I believe the State's plan of promoting motorboat activity will ruin recreational canoeing on this lake.

I am opposed to eliminating the gate located at mile 3.5 on the Lynx Lake Road. Currently, the gate is closed and locked only during the summer months and in the winter it is open for use as a snow machine, cross-country ski and snowshoe trail. The gate serves it's purpose by safeguarding the natural habitat when there is no snow cover. With the combination of the road, hiking trails and canoe portages the area has year around access for all.

I believe any future subdividing of lots to be minimal on Lynx Lake. In the last 40 years the lake has only seen one property subdivided into four lots. The rest of the lots on the lake are not well suited for subdividing. Current redevelopment restrictions such as set backs from the lakefront would make this difficult.

The State of Alaska has voiced concern over the summertime mooring of boats and storage of other gear at the Lynx Lake landing. I've spoken to several parties that

use this site and we recognize the State's point and are removing the stored items. There are only five boats, approximately 12ft. in length, that are moored during the summer at Lynx Lake.

In summary, I believe the current management plan as adopted in 1983 provides unprejudiced public and private use.

Thank you

Comment 22 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 12:00 AM:

I am a property owner on east butterfly. I don't want any motorized anything. I especially don't want ATV's and dirtbikes. It seems to me that the place should remain a place of silent nature as it has been for me and for many of my friends over the last thirty years. No ATVs. None. Thank you.

I have copied below the entire text of an excellent letter from Pat Gilmore. Rather than repeat his points I have copied his very clear arguments. Read it again, as the comments of many of us.

I have several comments regarding the draft plan. Most of them relate to Document 4, the 4 alternatives for the Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail. REQUEST TO MAKE COMMENTS AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC AND REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.

I have two requests for information.

First, I request that all comments from all comment periods be placed on your website, or otherwise made available to the public. DPOR should have done a compilation of the comments. That should be made public as well. The public comments should be public information. Making them available to interested parties will assist those parties in analyzing the draft plan.

Second, Mr. McCutcheon stated at the recent Campbell Creek Science Center meeting that recreation areas are intended to be more developed than parks. I am unaware of any support for this statement. Please advise whether that statement is accurate, and if it is, provide a citation to the supporting authority.

BACKGROUND - PREFERRED APPROACH.

This process started in 2007 when property owners on Butterfly Lake learned that DPOR had issued permits to ATV users to reroute the Butterfly Lake Trail and to use ATVs on that trail. DPOR first started issuing the permits in 2000. This was done without public notice. Once the word got out that DPOR had permitted this activity, interested parties, including me, protested and pointed out that issuing these permits violated the Management Plan, the governing regulations, and was resulting in impairment of the park experience and damage to the park. DPOR responded that the Management Plan was would be revised.

One simple decision would have resolved the issue that initiated this process: DPOR could have either decided that ATVs would be allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail, or that they would not. DPOR instead embarked on this lengthy (and presumably expensive) planning process, but still has not addressed the core issue.

In my view, the proper approach here is to address the ATV issue. Then the status quo ante will be restored, whether it be pre-2000 (no ATV permits) or after 2000

(ATV permits on Butterfly Lake trail).

MISSTATEMENT REGARDING PRIOR SUMMERTIME MOTORIZED USE ON BUTTERFLY LAKE TRAIL

DPOR is basing its proposals, in part, on the assumption that summer time ATV use has been allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail since inception of the park. This is incorrect.

Summertime access was not allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail prior to 2000. The trail was a winter cat trail that ran through a swamp. It was totally unsuitable for summertime ATV use. The occasional (illegal) summer ATV user tore deep ruts into the wetlands, making the trail virtually impassable even for foot traffic. The rare ATV use apparently occurred only at night or on week days, because ATVs were never sighted even by people who had walked that trail on a regular basis for almost 20 years. On the rare occasion when a ranger was in that area, if he/she caught an ATV user, the user was fined. DPOR's own files reflect that such use was regarded as "Outlaw" use prior to 2000. DPOR informed property owners, in writing, that such use was illegal. A single permit was issued to Max Pearce 39 years ago for a single season, apparently based on the fact he sold property to the park. There is no evidence of any other pre-2000 permits.

Contrary to the suggestion in the draft at page 10, both the 1983 Management Plan and the controlling regulations prohibit ATV anywhere in the park, including on the trail. The 1983 plan states at page 88 that "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." To the extent that there is any ambiguity in the 1983 plan on this point, that was resolved by the sworn statement of Dennis Heikes, one of the two drafters of the plan. Mr. Heikes has unequivocally stated that ATV use was not allowed prior to 1983, and that the 1983 plan did not intend to create or allow such use. There is no one who was around at the time who has given a contrary statement, for the simple reason that Mr. Heikes is right.

I understand you are relying on the following statement from the 1983 plan to support your position that ATV access was allowed prior to 2000: "The Lynx Lake road provides private access to authorized users who lived within and beyond NLSRA and were using the road for access to their property at the time of the recreation area's establishment in 1966." The summer time access beyond Lynx Lake in 1966 was by foot and by canoe, not by ATV. The Butterfly Lake trail was a winter only cat trail. As shown above, with a single exception, there was no "authorized" summer motorized access on the trail prior to 2000. ATVs did not even exist in 1966 - they clearly weren't used for summertime access on the trail. Mr. Heikes, a drafter of the plan, has explained the statement in the 1983 plan - the statement refers to property owners parking at the church camp and walking or canoeing from there on. The summer time access to properties beyond NLSRA was not by ATV. It simply not true that ATV use was allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail at any time prior to 2000. DPOR should not base its plan on this erroneous assumption.

FLAWED PROCESS -- NO SOLICITATION OF PARK USER INPUT -- NO ATTENTION PAID TO INPUT OF OTHERS

I have had a consistent complaint from the start of this process that DPOR has never done any outreach to the recreational users of the park. The park was created for them, not for the surrounding property owners. The current (1983) plan recognized the fundamental purpose for the park. The drafters contacted and distributed questionnaires to over 350 park users. This time, DPOR has contacted property owners in the area, all of whom have an axe to grind, but has made no specific contact with park users. A public process for a public park isn't worth much if there's no outreach to the public users of the park. The comments from the park users in 1983 were strongly opposed to the sort of motorized use DPOR has decided to allow here. There is no evidence that public sentiment has changed, and there will not be any such evidence as long as DPOR declines to survey the recreational users of the park.

I personally reviewed every response submitted during the original comment period. I don't recall a single one requesting opening the Lynx Lake Road. The responses were about 4 to 1 against ATV use on the Butterfly Lake Trail, which was the subject of virtually all the comments. DPOR apparently didn't like the results, so it reopened the comment period. I understand that most of these comments were submitted over the internet, so I don't know what they addressed. The draft does state that "few people commented" on the use of highway vehicles beyond the Lynx Lake road gate, but doesn't say how many comments there were or what they said. I have attended at least 3 public meetings on the plan, and not a single person has ever requested that the road be opened. One of those meetings was in Anchorage after the draft plan came out. The comments at that meeting were unanimously against the proposal.

In short, it appears that the proposal is against the great weight of the comments, and maybe against all of them.

The participants at the recent Campbell Creek Science Center meeting opposed the decision to open the road, and inquired why leaving things as they are was not presented as an option. We were informed that the 4 alternatives were merely some of the options under consideration, and that the status quo was also an option under consideration. I have now been informed by two different individuals that a contrary statement was made at the recent Mat-Su Trails Committee meeting. I am told that Mr. Biessel informed the Committee that the gate was going to be opened as stated in the draft plan no matter what, and without regard to the public comments or any other consideration.

At this point, I don't know which of DPOR's statements to believe. But it is painfully apparent that DPOR is giving little or no consideration to the public comments on this point.

If it is true that DPOR is going ahead with opening the Lynx Lake road no matter what the public says, it should just put an end to this expensive time-consuming "public process" and do what it has already decided to do.

IMPACTS FROM PUBLIC ACCESS ON LYNX LAKE ROAD

This plan does no analysis whatsoever of the impact to the park of opening this road to public motorized traffic. This proposal constitutes a radical change in the management approach for the interior of the park, which has been in effect for 46

years. It is inconceivable that this long-standing policy will be abandoned without any analysis of the reasons the policy was originally adopted, whether the policy has worked as intended, and the impacts that will result from changing it.

If such a change is even going to be considered, at a minimum, the following impacts must be addressed:

There is no way that this "road," which is really a trail, can support 40 - 70 vehicles towing boat trailers. That sort of traffic will tear up the road, people will get stuck, and chaos will ensue. There is no room turn around, and there are many areas where a head on pass by two vehicles towing trailers will be difficult, if not impossible. The "road" simply cannot take a heavy traffic load, particularly from drivers who are unfamiliar with the road. The park doesn't have the resources to patrol the interior of the park now. What is going to happen when dozens of boats with trailers, and unlimited ATV traffic descends on the park on a weekend? Who is going to ensure they park where they re supposed to? What if there are more vehicles than parking spots?

How are the ATV users going to be stopped from running all over the park? There are multiple seismic lines and trails throughout the park. The Butterfly Lake Trail was opened in 2000 in part because DPOR couldn't stop the illegal use by adjacent landowners. How is it going to keep a greatly increased volume of ATV riders confined to the road? At least the landowners were going to a particular location. The general public will just want to ride their ATVs over the next hill. What is this new ATV traffic going to do to the park?

What is going to happen to the experience of the canoers for whom the park was created when they hit Lynx Lake on a sunny weekend and there are 50 speed boats running around? Lynx Lake is the intersection of all the canoe trails. Any canoer going through the portages ends up there eventually. What about their right to enjoy a peaceful back country experience?

What effect will having unlimited motorized access have on the peace and quiet for which the park was created?

What is going to happen to the property owners on Lynx Lake - how are they going to be protected from vandalism and theft?

These are just a few of the many potential problems and impacts that will result from opening the gate. It would be a reckless act to proceed with this plan without analyzing the impact on the park.

PRACTICAL AND FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

All 4 alternatives assume significant expenditures of state funds. What happens if the money is not forthcoming? The plan doesn't address this, and doesn't say what happens in the interim while DPOR (presumably) looks for funding.

The least expensive alternative (No. 1) proposes building an ATV trail through the area east of Lynx Lake. Most of this area is swamp. It would require substantial fill for extended distances. At least 2 bridges would be required. It is by no means certain that the necessary permits could be obtained from the Corps of Engineers and Fish & Game. Why would those agencies allow the unnecessary filling of these

wetlands?

Even if the permits are obtained, why would the legislature appropriate money for such a boondoggle? The trail will benefit a few property owners at the expense of the general public. DPOR surely has higher priority needs than this trail or road. The park doesn't maintain the minimal facilities (boardwalks and trails) that exist now. How in the world are they going to get the money to build, much less maintain and patrol the proposed new trails and deal with the increased traffic?

I m no construction expert, but I'm quite confident that building a 24' gravel road through this country would be a multi-million dollar undertaking. Where would this money come from?

What is the fall-back position if none of these pipe dreams comes to pass? Why isn't there an alternative in the plan (i.e., status quo pre-2000 or after 2000) that may actually occur? Why doesn't the plan tell us what DPOR is going to do between now and the time the funds are appropriated, especially since that may never occur?

REVISIONS REQUIRED

In my view, this draft plan should go back to the drawing board.

The first step should be outreach to the recreational users of the park, for whom the park was created. DPOR should pay particular attention to their comments. It should consider the comments from the rest of the public.

DPOR should then decide whether summertime motorized use should be allowed on Butterfly Lake trail through the non-motorized part of the park Based on the public comments and the best interests of the park. The plan should address what will happen if no funds are appropriated for any of the 4 proposed alternatives.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Comment 23 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 12:00 AM:

I have several comments regarding the draft plan. Most of them relate to Document 4, the 4 alternatives for the Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail.

REQUEST TO MAKE COMMENTS AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC AND REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.

I have two requests for information.

First, I request that all comments from all comment periods be placed on your website, or otherwise made available to the public. DPOR should have done a compilation of the comments. That should be made public as well. The public comments should be public information. Making them available to interested parties will assist those parties in analyzing the draft plan.

Second, Mr. McCutcheon stated at the recent Campbell Creek Science Center meeting that recreation areas are intended to be more developed than parks. I am unaware of any support for this statement. Please advise whether that statement is accurate, and if it is, provide a citation to the supporting authority.

BACKGROUND - PREFERRED APPROACH.

This process started in 2007 when property owners on Butterfly Lake learned that DPOR had issued permits to ATV users to reroute the Butterfly Lake Trail and to use ATVs on that trail. DPOR first started issuing the permits in 2000. This was done without public notice. Once the word got out that DPOR had permitted this activity, interested parties, including me, protested and pointed out that issuing these permits violated the Management Plan, the governing regulations, and was resulting in impairment of the park experience and damage to the park. DPOR responded that the Management Plan was would be revised.

One simple decision would have resolved the issue that initiated this process: DPOR could have either decided that ATVs would be allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail, or that they would not. DPOR instead embarked on this lengthy (and presumably expensive) planning process, but still has not addressed the core issue.

In my view, the proper approach here is to address the ATV issue. Then the status quo ante will be restored, whether it be pre-2000 (no ATV permits) or after 2000 (ATV permits on Butterfly Lake trail).

MISSTATEMENT REGARDING PRIOR SUMMERTIME MOTORIZED USE ON BUTTERFLY LAKE TRAIL

DPOR is basing its proposals, in part, on the assumption that summer time ATV use has been allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail since inception of the park. This is incorrect.

Summertime access was not allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail prior to 2000. The trail was a winter cat trail that ran through a swamp. It was totally unsuitable for summertime ATV use. The occasional (illegal) summer ATV user tore deep ruts into the wetlands, making the trail virtually impassable even for foot traffic. The rare ATV use apparently occurred only at night or on week days, because ATVs were never sighted even by people who had walked that trail on a regular basis for almost 20 years. On the rare occasion when a ranger was in that area, if he/she caught an ATV user, the user was fined. DPOR's own files reflect that such use was regarded as "Outlaw" use prior to 2000. DPOR informed property owners, in writing, that such use was illegal. A single permit was issued to Max Pearce 39 years ago for a single season, apparently based on the fact he sold property to the park. There is no evidence of any other pre-2000 permits.

Contrary to the suggestion in the draft at page 10, both the 1983 Management Plan and the controlling regulations prohibit ATV anywhere in the park, including on the trail. The 1983 plan states at page 88 that "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." To the extent that there is any ambiguity in the 1983 plan on this point, that was resolved by the sworn statement of Dennis Heikes, one of the two drafters of the plan. Mr. Heikes has unequivocally stated that ATV use was not allowed prior to 1983, and that the 1983 plan did not intend to create or allow such use. There is no one who was around at the time who has given a contrary statement, for the simple reason that Mr. Heikes is right.

I understand you are relying on the following statement from the 1983 plan to support your position that ATV access was allowed prior to 2000: ""The Lynx Lake

road provides private access to authorized users who lived within and beyond NLSRA and were using the road for access to their property at the time of the recreation area's establishment in 1966." The summer time access beyond Lynx Lake in 1966 was by foot and by canoe, not by ATV. The Butterfly Lake trail was a winter only cat trail. As shown above, with a single exception, there was no "authorized" summer motorized access on the trail prior to 2000. ATVs did not even exist in 1966 - they clearly weren't used for summertime access on the trail. Mr. Heikes, a drafter of the plan, has explained the statement in the 1983 plan - the statement refers to property owners parking at the church camp and walking or canoeing from there on. The summer time access to properties beyond NLSRA was not by ATV. It simply not true that ATV use was allowed on the Butterfly Lake trail at any time prior to 2000. DPOR should not base its plan on this erroneous assumption.

FLAWED PROCESS -- NO SOLICITATION OF PARK USER INPUT -- NO ATTENTION PAID TO INPUT OF OTHERS

I have had a consistent complaint from the start of this process that DPOR has never done any outreach to the recreational users of the park. The park was created for them, not for the surrounding property owners. The current (1983) plan recognized the fundamental purpose for the park. The drafters contacted and distributed questionnaires to over 350 park users. This time, DPOR has contacted property owners in the area, all of whom have an axe to grind, but has made no specific contact with park users. A public process for a public park isn't worth much if there's no outreach to the public users of the park. The comments from the park users in 1983 were strongly opposed to the sort of motorized use DPOR has decided to allow here. There is no evidence that public sentiment has changed, and there will not be any such evidence as long as DPOR declines to survey the recreational users of the park.

I personally reviewed every response submitted during the original comment period. I don't recall a single one requesting opening the Lynx Lake Road. The responses were about 4 to 1 against ATV use on the Butterfly Lake Trail, which was the subject of virtually all the comments. DPOR apparently didn't like the results, so it reopened the comment period. I understand that most of these comments were submitted over the internet, so I don't know what they addressed. The draft does state that "few people commented" on the use of highway vehicles beyond the Lynx Lake road gate, but doesn't say how many comments there were or what they said. I have attended at least 3 public meetings on the plan, and not a single person has ever requested that the road be opened. One of those meetings was in Anchorage after the draft plan came out. The comments at that meeting were unanimously against the proposal.

In short, it appears that the proposal is against the great weight of the comments, and maybe against all of them.

The participants at the recent Campbell Creek Science Center meeting opposed the decision to open the road, and inquired why leaving things as they are was not presented as an option. We were informed that the 4 alternatives were merely some of the options under consideration, and that the status quo was also an option under consideration. I have now been informed by two different individuals that a

contrary statement was made at the recent Mat-Su Trails Committee meeting. I am told that Mr. Biessel informed the Committee that the gate was going to be opened as stated in the draft plan no matter what, and without regard to the public comments or any other consideration.

At this point, I don't know which of DPOR's statements to believe. But it is painfully apparent that DPOR is giving little or no consideration to the public comments on this point.

If it is true that DPOR is going ahead with opening the Lynx Lake road no matter what the public says, it should just put an end to this expensive time-consuming "public process" and do what it has already decided to do.

IMPACTS FROM PUBLIC ACCESS ON LYNX LAKE ROAD

This plan does no analysis whatsoever of the impact to the park of opening this road to public motorized traffic. This proposal constitutes a radical change in the management approach for the interior of the park, which has been in effect for 46 years. It is inconceivable that this long-standing policy will be abandoned without any analysis of the reasons the policy was originally adopted, whether the policy has worked as intended, and the impacts that will result from changing it.

If such a change is even going to be considered, at a minimum, the following impacts must be addressed:

There is no way that this "road," which is really a trail, can support 40 - 70 vehicles towing boat trailers. That sort of traffic will tear up the road, people will get stuck, and chaos will ensue. There is no room turn around, and there are many areas where a head on pass by two vehicles towing trailers will be difficult, if not impossible. The "road" simply cannot take a heavy traffic load, particularly from drivers who are unfamiliar with the road. The park doesn't have the resources to patrol the interior of the park now. What is going to happen when dozens of boats with trailers, and unlimited ATV traffic descends on the park on a weekend? Who is going to ensure they park where they're supposed to? What if there are more vehicles than parking spots?

How are the ATV users going to be stopped from running all over the park? There are multiple seismic lines and trails throughout the park. The Butterfly Lake Trail was opened in 2000 in part because DPOR couldn't stop the illegal use by adjacent landowners. How is it going to keep a greatly increased volume of ATV riders confined to the road? At least the landowners were going to a particular location. The general public will just want to ride their ATVs over the next hill. What is this new ATV traffic going to do to the park?

What is going to happen to the experience of the canoers for whom the park was created when they hit Lynx Lake on a sunny weekend and there are 50 speed boats running around? Lynx Lake is the intersection of all the canoe trails. Any canoer going through the portages ends up there eventually. What about their right to enjoy a peaceful back country experience?

What effect will having unlimited motorized access have on the peace and quiet for which the park was created?

What is going to happen to the property owners on Lynx Lake - how are they going to be protected from vandalism and theft?

These are just a few of the many potential problems and impacts that will result from opening the gate. It would be a reckless act to proceed with this plan without analyzing the impact on the park.

PRACTICAL AND FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

All 4 alternatives assume significant expenditures of state funds. What happens if the money is not forthcoming? The plan doesn't address this, and doesn't say what happens in the interim while DPOR (presumably) looks for funding.

The least expensive alternative (No. 1) proposes building an ATV trail through the area east of Lynx Lake. Most of this area is swamp. It would require substantial fill for extended distances. At least 2 bridges would be required. It is by no means certain that the necessary permits could be obtained from the Corps of Engineers and Fish & Game. Why would those agencies allow the unnecessary filling of these wetlands?

Even if the permits are obtained, why would the legislature appropriate money for such a boondoggle? The trail will benefit a few property owners at the expense of the general public. DPOR surely has higher priority needs than this trail or road. The park doesn't maintain the minimal facilities (boardwalks and trails) that exist now. How in the world are they going to get the money to build, much less maintain and patrol the proposed new trails and deal with the increased traffic?

I'm no construction expert, but I'm quite confident that building a 24' gravel road through this country would be a multi-million dollar undertaking. Where would this money come from?

What is the fall-back position if none of these pipe dreams comes to pass? Why isn't there an alternative in the plan (i.e., status quo pre-2000 or after 2000) that may actually occur? Why doesn't the plan tell us what DPOR is going to do between now and the time the funds are appropriated, especially since that may never occur?

REVISIONS REQUIRED

In my view, this draft plan should go back to the drawing board.

The first step should be outreach to the recreational users of the park, for whom the park was created. DPOR should pay particular attention to their comments. It should consider the comments from the rest of the public.

DPOR should then decide whether summertime motorized use should be allowed on Butterfly Lake trail through the non-motorized part of the park. Based on the public comments and the best interests of the park. The plan should address what will happen if no funds are appropriated for any of the 4 proposed alternatives.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Comment 24 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To whom it may concern,

This comment concerns the NLSRA Management Plan, with reference to the Lynx

Lake Road access alternatives that have been drafted and presented online at the DNR website.

Much of the public-planning process in use today consists of presenting to the public a series of choices that are in themselves variations of a predefined outcome. This current plan is no different. To take one example from the four presented alternatives concerns increases in road traffic and public parking within the NLSRA along Lynx Lake Road. All four alternatives involve increasing parking spaces at the terminus of Lynx Lake Road and provide a convenient way to quantify the different alternatives. Even Alternative 1, self-described as minimally increase recreational use and access& would result in a new parking lot for 40 public vehicles adjacent to Lynx Lake. Alternative 2, 3 and 4 all propose parking lots for 70 vehicles. Bear in mind that the DNR in its own Planning Update October 2010 identified that respondents to the NLSR questionnaire to question 10 selected to keep development near current levels. It is hard to justify how, at a minimum, adding 40 public parking spaces addresses this concern.

As presented the current proposed alternatives do not match the earlier public comments and a greater range of alternatives need to be provided, including at least one alternative to leave things as they currently exist.

Sincerely

Comment 25 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 04:08 PM:

To Whom It May Concern,

I am in opposition to the recent proposals regarding the NLSRA plan 1) to remove the Lynx Lake Rd gate, 2) adding more campsites and 3) allowing additional unrestricted amounts of watercraft on the lake.

The removal of the Lynx Lake Rd. gate would allow the public unrestricted access to private property, notably the Midnight Sun Bible Camp. In recent years the growth in the area has already caused incidents of vandalism and theft at the camp. Many congregations have put thousands of hours and dollars to make this a quiet, private retreat for people from all over the U.S. Many of them children who might not get the chance to discover the outdoors as it is meant to be experienced, especially in Alaska. Too add the extra noise and water congestion suggested by the proposals would defeat the purpose.

There is also the issue of security for the private property holders. As mentioned above, we have had an increase in vandalism, theft and people being on the property without permission. The DNR has failed to provide even limited security or protect the privacy rights of the property holders in the area. What will be the result of this with an extra influx of public traffic and watercraft?

Lastly, the funding for these proposals require alternate funding some of which could run into the millions of dollars. Where will that money come from?

In 2011, the Midnight Sun Bible Camp signed a revocable Limited Public Access Agreement with the DNR. By Alaska statute, this protects the camp from the general public crossing our property and becoming hurt. The access is limited to staying on the road as far as Butterfly Trail Head and nowhere else. In this agreement, it was stated that if the DPOR removes or unlocks the gate, we will immediately revoke all

public access across the property. This will force hikers to completely circumvent our property and hike on non-existent trails through wet lands and generally swampy areas to get to the other side of the property to access the trail or other lakes. Which is not ideal for them or the environment.

The website does not give any information about a fifth option of "current management". Which at this point is the only choice. There is no reason for Lynx Lake to become another lake with overuse and abuse of the facilities. Thank you

Comment 26 of 97 - submitted on 08/21/2012 at 06:21 PM:

To whom it may concern,
Please consider leaving the Lynx Lake road access "as is" continuing the Current Management so as to keep the lake and canoe system more of a wilderness recreation area.

Thank you,

Darren McLaughlin

Comment 27 of 97 - submitted on 08/23/2012 at 12:00 AM:

This letter is in response to State of Alaska's new plan for the Nancy Lake Recreation Area.

Enhancing public experience and access to the NLSRA is important but it is also important to realize the potential environmental damage that can occur with the alternative proposals that State of AK has suggested. The Lynx Lake area and all of the NLSRA already has unrestricted public access for the winter months and has unrestricted summer access through the canoe trail system already in place.

The general consensus from all in-holders is that Lynx Lake be considered as a separate issue and not lumped together with the problems associated with Butterfly and Delyndia lakes. It is a unique area in which the entire lake and all in-holders are completely encompassed by the State recreation area and that future private development and subdivisions will not come into play.

Lynx lake Road: Response from the two public meetings (one at Willow Community Center on July 24th and one at the Campbell Creek Science Center on July 26th) was overwhelming in favor of keeping the Lynx Lake road gate in place. The property owners on lynx, Butterfly and Delyndia lakes do not want the current status of the Lynx lake road gate (at approximately mile 3.5 of Lynx Lake road) to change. This opinion was by both people who want an enhanced ATV trail or no ATV access to Butterfly lake as well as other recreation area users.

Whether property owners drive automobiles, trucks, ATV's or snowmobiles they feel that the gate provides a necessary way for permit holders to control access into the NLSRA. The gate is only closed approximately 5 months of the year and is open to all public once the snow cover is deemed sufficient for snowmobile travel.

My suggestion is to leave the gate intact and to not move it. In fact better barriers from non-permitted ATV users were recommended by all.

Lynx Lake boat launch access: There is currently unlimited public access to Lynx Lake through the canoe trail system during the summer and unlimited public access

via snowmobile on all trails and roads during the winter months.

Allowing general public summer access through the Lynx Lake road will create large problems with invasive weeds, poaching, waterfowl and wildlife harassment as well as degradation of the riparian habitat. Lynx lake has narrow sections and tight coves which are very susceptible to damage occurred by large wakes and heavy usage which will occur from unrestricted power watercraft.

Even with proposed small general public boat access to Lynx Lake it will create a huge impact and pressure for boaters to seek unregulated and private areas for moorage, campsites, and picnic sites which will cause irreversibly damage the flora and fauna of the area.

There are 3 islands on Lynx Lake which have been traditional nesting areas for loons and safe place for a resident moose cow to have her calves on. These islands have been used by the loons and moose continuously for decades. The current residents of Lynx Lake appreciate the fragility of these islands their wildlife inhabitants. They are respective of these nesting and rearing areas which has allowed the Loons and Moose to be undisturbed during their critical times. Allowing unrestricted public access to this area will basically be a death knell for the Loons and Moose.

The State of AK has not done any studies on public use thresholds for these areas and I believe they do not have an accurate measure of actually how many people currently use this area and what level of thresholds are acceptable.

I have read the log books placed at the public use cabins within the NLSRA throughout the past 30 years and the one thing that is written again and again is how much people appreciate the quiet serenity and remoteness of Lynx Lake and surrounding areas. Many people say that this is the one reason why NLSRA is a destination of choice. There are multiple lakes throughout Matanuska-Susitna area that are not within the NLSRA that offer unlimited access and use of jet skis, high power boats. The consensus is that opening Lynx Lake to unlimited public access would ruin the overall experience for all users.

The Midnight Sun Bible Camp already has records as having up to 500 people a year using Lynx Lake through their many camp programs. Children and adults have accessed this tranquil lake to learn of safe boating, nature, and its beauty as well. Among its programs this camp offers a deaf camp for children and adults where they can canoe and use paddle boats on Lynx Lake without fear from multiple power boats and jet skis. Allowing unrestricted public access would create a dangerous situation where adults and children's safety would be compromised.

The residents of Lynx Lake are in the process of forming a homeowners association called "Stewards of Lynx Lake". The residents of Lynx Lake (including the Midnight Sun Bible Camp) already have a gentlemen's agreement for the ban of personal watercraft. They are currently in the process of applying to the State for an official ban on them.

The current boat launch at the north end of the lake is now being policed and managed by the inholders. Neighbors make sure that boats that are tied up at the landing are bailed and that all gas cans and personal property is removed from the boats to ensure that area is kept clean and not an attractive nuisance for bears. The overall response from the in holders is to keep the current landing on Lynx Lake and

for it to stay intact, not moved or changed to allow general public access.

Docks

The in-holders of Lynx Lake acknowledge the need for restrictions and standards for boat docks. There is a general consensus that the 400 sf dock is a very liberal size.

Summary

The need for more public access is acknowledged as a goal for the State of Alaska. The NLSRA already has 2 campgrounds with public boat access, canoe trail system and all are south of the Nancy Lake Parkway has unlimited snowmobile access. An alternative is suggested that more readily accessible lakes within the NLSRA be considered for increased general public access for the summer months. It is my recommendation that Tanaina, Ardaw, Shem Pete and Bald Lake are great lakes that could be enriched with new campsites and more public access. The proximity of these lakes to the already developed Nancy Lake Parkway would make them a much more viable alternative.

Sincerely, Barbara Russell - Current member of the Mat-Su State Parks Citizen Advisory Board - Property owner on Lynx Lake Alaska

Comment 28 of 97 - submitted on 08/23/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom It May Concern,

The Mat-Su/Copper Basin Area State Parks Citizens Advisory Board (hereafter Board) wishes to respond to the proposed management recommendations and draft alternatives for the Nancy Lakes State Recreation Area (NLSRA).

After carefully reviewing the documents, and hearing from members of the public at special meetings convened outside the regular session, the Board would like to address each of the main components. Our premise is to help create a management plan that addresses public access concerns and maintains the current quality of outdoor experiences. NLSRA is unique from other state recreation areas in that the "quiet, graceful and natural beauty" is easily accessible from the metropolitan areas (from 1983 Plan).

Listed below are comments on each component of the draft alternatives. Please note that these comments were very carefully considered and represent the result of many hours of thoughtful discussion and debate.

Board Responses to NLSRA Management Recommendations

1. Docks and other structures: We support the recommended findings and standards.
2. Existing unpermitted structures: We support the recommended findings and standards.
3. Moorage of boats adjacent to private uplands: We support the recommended findings and standards.
4. Property storage and boat moorage at Red Shirt Lake: We support the recommended findings and standards.

5. Non-motorized recreation access: We do not support horse access within NLSRA; we do support bicycle access.
6. Lynx Lake Road gate removal: We do not support removing the existing gate (at the NLSRA boundary); we support opening it to the public on a limited basis.
7. Lynx Lake Road upgrade: We support upgrading to a 24-foot park standard road.
8. Extension of Lynx Lake Road: We support extending the road but could not come to agreement on where.
9. Parking Areas: We support maintaining the status quo on all existing parking areas, with the assumption that there will be on-going monitoring and assessment to determine suitability and the need for additional parking areas.
10. Butterfly Lake trail upgrade: We support redeveloping/upgrading to a Class 4 Terra Trail.
11. Butterfly Lake trail re-route around church property: We support re-routing the trail.
12. Highway vehicle access on Lynx Lake Road: We support allowing public highway vehicle access on Lynx Lake Road (in addition to in-holder access). We support access past the church boundary but we could not come to an agreement on how far within NLSRA to allow public highway vehicles.
13. ATV access: We support allowing ATV access within NLSRA, but only to in-holders.

The Board recognizes motorized boat use within NLSRA (engines of any horsepower on any lake) as an important issue but did not take it up for discussion at this time.

Throughout all discussions of increasing public use within NLSRA, enforcement has been highlighted as critical to maintaining the existing character of the area. Although the Board did not specify what type and level this might entail, we recommend an increased enforcement presence if/when NLSRA is opened up to public use via Lynx Lake Road.

The Board appreciates the opportunity to respond to the proposed management recommendations and draft alternatives for the Nancy Lakes State Recreation Area. We look forward to further involvement in management planning.

Sincerely

Comment 29 of 97 - submitted on 08/23/2012 at 05:04 PM:

To Whom It May Concern,

Dave and I have been going to Lynx Lake for the past 25 years. We used the canoe head trail for 6yrs. before we where fortunate to purchase a piece of property in 1993. We feel you will be opening a can of worms when opening the gate to, parties, garbage, poaching,theft,vandals,ext. Our concern is for the wildlife,and the fire hazard that will be unprotected 24-7. We have been to the meetings and have heard your comments on what you have in mind. For one thing who maintains the gate? What is there to maintain? Will you have a camp host? Do you do backround checks

on these people? Will you have a park ranger there 24-7 to break up the parties and the drugs that will brought into the park? I see alot of gates around parks. Even Wasilla public lake has a gate they close to the public. The gate keeps alot of this out. Have any of you even been back there for a weekend? Seems to me you have alot of work for something that has been working just fine. There are all kinds of alternatives. Thank you. Dave and Denise Perala

Comment 30 of 97 - submitted on 08/23/2012 at 07:38 PM:

To the Commissioner:

I know much thought has gone into the four options you have listed for Lynx Lake road as you have posted. It appears there is actually a fifth choice and that would be to allow the current model to continue as it is.

I have worked with Midnight Sun Bible Camp since 1981 and have insight into the workings of the road as it affects the park and the camp. One of the primary purposes of the camp is to provide a safe, siren setting for the campers we serve to be taught God s word in a remote site that many would never have the opportunity to experience.

A major contributing factor to that safety and serenity is the gate near the park boundary. During the summer when the road is restricted to only those who have legitimate need to use the road that terminates within the boundaries of the camp, we enjoy a measure of safety. When the gate is open and unrestricted travel upon the road has been allowed, vandalism on Lynx Lake and un-authorized access to the camp and vandalism has increased.

Although the Parks staff members are conscientious they are spread far to thin, as is their budget to implement the radical changes the four options propose. As workers at the camp I have often been the first to respond to those using the canoe trail and the state cabins who have fallen prey to accident or illness simply because the response time for rangers is greater than that of the camp staff. I believe the opening of the gate would jeopardize not only the resource but also lives and property of private landholders such as Midnight Sun Bible Camp.

Please allow the access to the Road remain as it is! Leave the Gate in place!

Comment 31 of 97 - submitted on 08/24/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom It May Concern

My name is Marjorie Bellringer. 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 47 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 47 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 Mr. Rocky (Clayton) Racca 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.

The preliminary documents in the "Proposed Management Recommendations" for the NLSRA are a cause of deep concern and distress regarding the treatment on the road access and proposed intensive public use developments and restricted boat storage along the shoreline of Lynx Lake.

The Four "Alternatives" as discussed in document #4 are not truly alternatives, as none of them addresses leaving Lynx Lake's road access in the current status quo condition with a locked gate.

I am writing this letter go on the official record as being strongly against any gate removal or opening of public road access to Lynx Lake. 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 wildlife, the illegal use and discharge 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. Removal of the locked gate is a very bad idea and should not be implemented if the State DNR wishes to preserve and protect the land and lakes within the NLSRA. In the winter time and during the spring/ late fall shoulder seasons, the Park rangers have kept the gate locked to help protect the road and the park lands when the wet weather makes them the most fragile. Our family and the other landowners along Lynx Lake are committed to Stewardship of the water and wildlife of Lynx Lake and believe that a locked gate limited to private in-holders access and not open to public access is vital to the protection of Lynx Lake.

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.

"The development of a 40 to 70 space parking lot along the NE shore of Lynx Lake and allowing for "day-use" would be in direct opposition to these stated goals. Day use cannot be imposed without strict enforcement. Past budgeting and staffing at the NLSRA has never provided for the kind of 24/7 enforcement level that would be necessary at Lynx Lake to protect the park resources. In the past the public use cabins have been subject to fire, vandalism and unauthorized use by people who did

not pay the "honor system" rental fees that are now collected on-line. How would the NLSRA be able to maintain the peace at Lynx Lake when no provision is made to protect these assets?

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 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. 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.

There are currently only 13 private parcels on Lynx Lake. Of these 13 properties, 11 of the ownerships predate the creation of the NLSRA. 9 of these private parcels do not have road access and have historic and traditional access via boat across the lake from the terminus (boat launch installed by State).

Lynx Lake is unique in that it is the only lake within the entire NLSRA that is 100% enclosed within the park boundaries that have 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 to access their ownerships and the boat launch currently in place to access those parcels that are not road accessible.

At the most only 5 boats have ever been moored at the boat launch for storage at Lynx Lake Landing. Removal of the opportunity to store our boats at the landing would cause increased traffic and potential damage to the road and adjacent parklands from repeatedly having to haul a boat trailer for every trip to the lake. Boat storage is allowed at Red Shirt and Butterfly Lakes in your recommendations, so it seems arbitrary and unnecessary for the Lynx Lake landowners to be denied the same boat storage at the Lynx Lake landing. Lynx Lake in-holders should be allowed to store their boats at the current Lynx Lake boat launch/landing, when they are not in use so they can ferry across the Lake to their private property.

The subjects of the Butterfly Lake Access and the Lynx Lake Access need to be separated out and treated as the separate access issues they truly are. Lynx Lake Access has historically been in use by the private property owners since pre-statehood, and before the creation of the NLSRA. The state installed a gate to protect their public use cabins from vandalism and to also protect the NLSRA from poaching, illegal firearm discharge, destruction of habitat and to protect the quality and natural state of Lynx Lake and adjacent recreational areas.

I find no issue with the proposed recommendations for docks. Our small cedar dock has been in place prior to creation of the NLSRA; in addition it is only 4' x 16.5' (66

square feet) in size and is well within the suggested size maximums.

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. Please do not adopt the proposed alternatives to the management plan as submitted in the preliminary pre-draft. The best option is to maintain the status quo and leave Lynx Lake use and management as it is currently and has worked successfully since the inception of the NLSRA.

Respectfully Submitted

Comment 32 of 97 - submitted on 08/24/2012 at 12:00 AM:

As a property owner on Nancy Lake thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment on these proposed changes the proposed revisions of the Nancy Lake State recreation area need to be adjusted.

1. DNR's requirements for docks have been unknown to me and I have been a property owner since 1995, I believe that the property owners I have spoken with were also not aware of these requirements.
2. All existing docks in the state recreation area should be grandfathered as is. All existing docks should be issued a grandfathered permit, as this would allow both the property owner and the DNR to help bring all structures into compliance with the new standards. Giving an existing dock an as is survey would be the bases of where things are at the time of the grandfathered dock.
3. Under your proposed new standards, "iv. Only encapsulated commercially available floatation will be authorized." There needs to be more flexibility in this area, clean nylon or plastic drums are readily available that can meet the needs of flotation and preserving the quality of the state waters. Pressure treated wood should be allowed in the construction of the above water parts of the dock.
4. "vii. No part of the structure shall exceed 10 feet in width or extend more than 40 feet in to the water body beyond Ordinary High Water Line (OHWL)" I can understand the 40-foot into the water body requirement, this makes sense as to not interfere with the Navigable water way. Although the width of 10 feet is too constricting as you already have the 450 square foot requirement. Any configuration that works with the shoreline should be acceptable.
5. Either auger style pipes of not more than 4 inches or driven in piling are needed to stabilize these structures and help prevent damage to the shore line.
6. Any dock that is not connected to the shoreline should not be allowed, as these

structures could be dangerous to persons on the lake.

7. Commercial boatlifts adjacent to the dock should be allowed. These should not count toward the total square footage allowed for the dock. Mooring your watercraft to a dock should not require any permit.

8. Clear and well published standards need to be mailed to all land owners in the future. A pamphlet that clearly defines the standards and how you get the permit would be very helpful.

9. There needs to be a 10 foot set back of all structures from the property line and only the land owner could receive a permit.

10. Dock permits should be transferable to any new property owner as well.

Thank you for considering my comments in your proposed plan.

Comment 33 of 97 - submitted on 08/24/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Department of Natural Resources,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area Public Comment Period regarding docks in Nancy Lake. I am a private property owner on Nancy Lake.

Enclosed are my comments:

1. All existing docks owned by private landowners, connected to their private land, on Nancy Lake should be grandfathered. DNR's requirements for docks have been unclear, and unknown to most property owners.

2. DNR should provide routine information to property owners about permit requirements. I have owned property at Nancy Lake since 1997 and this is the first time I have received any correspondence from DNR about dock requirements.

3. DNR should require people to remove docks that are not connected to land they do not own. DNR should verify that any dock connected to private land is owned by the landowner before grandfathering the dock. There are cases on Nancy Lake where people have attached docks to property that they do not own. DNR should not grandfather these docks, and should require those docks to be removed.

4. DNR should revise its regulations at 11 AAC 12.140 and 11 AAC 18.010 to clarify dock construction standards and permit approval criteria and/or issue clear written guidance documents to landowners.

5. DNR's plan to issue establish clear and consistent standards for future dock permits is a good idea, however, the process for applying for the permit and obtaining the permit should be streamlined, cost effective, and efficient.

a. The permit application form should be simple, and a copy should be sent to each property owner.

b. The application fee should be no more than \$20.

c. DNR should produce a clear list of standards to be used for DNR staff to use to determine whether the permit can be approved. That list of standards should be placed in regulation and included on the permit form so that the property owner is

very clear what is required, and so that the approval criterion does not change once this process is developed.

d. DNR should approve the permit within 15 calendar days.

6. I recommend that DNR and ADF&G coordinate dock permitting, so that only one permit is required for each dock from the State of Alaska. It is inefficient for the state, and cumbersome for property owners to have multiple, uncoordinated permitting requirements from the State of Alaska.

7. I agree that Moorage of Boats at privately owned docks and along private property should not require a separate or additional permit. An approved dock should automatically include moorage of boats.

8. Documents 2 and 3 state that: "A riparian property owner has a modified right to wharfage. Such owners have a right to construct a dock to provide access to navigable water; however, DPOR has the responsibility to ensure that the dock does not unduly impede use of the water body by other people." DNR's proposed recommendations do not explain what criteria will be used by DNR to determine whether a dock "unduly impedes the use of a waterbody." This needs to be clarified.

9. Define the term "encapsulated commercially available floatation." This term needs to be defined to more clearly establish the approved floatation devices allowed in dock construction. DNR should allow existing, clean barrels (e.g. 55 gallon plastic vegetable oil drums, or other well cleaned drums) to be used to provide for opportunities to recycle and re-use existing materials that are clean and not harmful to the environment. I do not support a proposal that may eliminate recycle and reuse opportunities.

10. Please clarify that it is not DNR's intention to require the use of plastic commercially made docks. Those docks in my opinion are aesthetically unattractive and inconsistent with the more rustic, wooded dock look more traditional to Nancy Lake.

11. Please clarify that pressure treated wood is allowed to be used in dock construction.

12. Please clarify that a new dock can only be permitted and attached to property you own, and that a dock cannot be attached to another person's private property. The permit approval process should include verification of land ownership. There are docks in Nancy Lake that are attached to private property that is not owned by the dock owner. These docks should be removed unless the landowner has given consent.

13. There should be a setback requirement for a dock from the property line. For example, the dock should be setback at least 10' from the property line.

14. Please clarify that there is no public access allowed to docks constructed by a private owner and connected to private property, and that those docks are private property.

15. DNR has proposed conflicting standards. DNR has proposed a maximum dock size of 450 square feet, and a 10' maximum width and 40' maximum length which would be 400 square feet. I support a maximum dock size of 450 square feet, but

do not think there should be a restriction on the dock shape. Most docks have a small gang plank extending from the shore to limit the impact to the shoreline. A narrow gang plank has less impact. The gang plank is then connected to a dock in a "t" shape configuration, typically oriented at a 90 degree angle to the gang plank to limit the dock extension into the waterbody. DNR is proposing that docks extend out 40' into the water. A dock configured in a "t" shape using a gang plank connection to the shore would not extend out that far into the water. It is recommended that DNR establish a maximum dock size, but allow the dock owner the discretion to construct the dock to limit the shoreline impact, and design the dock shape to make the most sense for the water depth and its use.

16. Docks installed on Nancy Lake require anchoring because of boat wakes. DNR should allow pilings to be driven into the lake bed to stability the dock. I can tell you from experience; it is not possible to anchor a dock only at the shoreline. It is recommended that the permit allow auger style pipes of up to 4" in diameter to be drive into the lake bed to stability the dock. This will reduce damage to the shoreline as well.

17. Boat lifts should be allowed and should not count toward the total square footage allowed for a dock. I could see some reasonable limitation on the number of boat lifts allowed per private property, such as 1-2 maximum.

Thank you for considering my comments in your plan.

Sincerely

Comment 34 of 97 - submitted on 08/24/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Department of Natural Resources,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area Public Comment Period regarding docks in Nancy Lake. I am a private property owner on Nancy Lake.

I spoke with Brandon McCutcheon, DNR Plan Project Manager during the comment period prior to formulating these written comments. Mr. McCutcheon was very professional, helpful and timely in his response.

Enclosed are my comments:

1. All existing docks owned by private landowners, connected to their private land, on Nancy Lake should be grandfathered. DNR's requirements for docks have been unclear, and unknown to most property owners.
2. DNR should provide routine information to property owners about permit requirements. I have owned property at Nancy Lake since 1997 and this is the first time I have received any correspondence from DNR about dock requirements.
3. DNR should require people to remove docks that are not connected to land they do not own. DNR should verify that any dock connected to private land is owned by the landowner before grandfathering the dock. There are cases on Nancy Lake where people have attached docks to property that they do not own. DNR should not grandfather these docks, and should require those docks to be removed.
4. DNR should revise its regulations at 11 AAC 12.140 and 11 AAC 18.010 to clarify

dock construction standards and permit approval criteria and/or issue clear written guidance documents to landowners.

5. DNR's plan to issue establish clear and consistent standards for future dock permits is a good idea, however, the process for applying for the permit and obtaining the permit should be streamlined, cost effective, and efficient.

a. The permit application form should be simple, and a copy should be sent to each property owner.

b. The application fee should be no more than \$20.

c. DNR should produce a clear list of standards to be used for DNR staff to use to determine whether the permit can be approved. That list of standards should be placed in regulation and included on the permit form so that the property owner is very clear what is required, and so that the approval criterion does not change once this process is developed.

d. DNR should approve the permit within 15 calendar days.

6. Mr. McCutcheon mentioned that ADF&G also requires dock permits for Nancy Lake. I recommend that DNR and ADF&G coordinate the permit process, so that only one permit is required for each dock from the State of Alaska. It is inefficient for the state, and cumbersome for property owners to have multiple, uncoordinated permitting requirements from the State of Alaska.

7. I agree that Moorage of Boats at privately owned docks and along private property should not require a separate or additional permit. An approved dock should automatically include moorage of boats.

8. Documents 2 and 3 state that: "A riparian property owner has a modified right to wharfage. Such owners have a right to construct a dock to provide access to navigable water; however, DPOR has the responsibility to ensure that the dock does not unduly impede use of the water body by other people." DNR's proposed recommendations do not explain what criteria will be used by DNR to determine whether a dock "unduly impedes the use of a waterbody." This needs to be clarified.

9. Define the term "encapsulated commercially available floatation." This term needs to be defined to more clearly establish the approved floatation devices allowed in dock construction. DNR should allow existing, clean barrels (e.g. 55 gallon plastic vegetable oil drums, or other well cleaned drums) to be used to provide for opportunities to recycle and re-use existing materials that are clean and not harmful to the environment. I do not support a proposal that may eliminate recycle and reuse opportunities.

10. Please clarify that it is not DNR's intention to require the use of plastic commercially made docks. Those docks in my opinion are aesthetically unattractive and inconsistent with the more rustic, wooded dock look more traditional to Nancy Lake.

11. Please clarify that pressure treated wood is allowed to be used in dock construction. Mr. McCutcheon explained that pressure treated wood would be allowed; however, the final decision would benefit from this clarification.

12. Please clarify that a new dock can only be permitted and attached to property you own, and that a dock cannot be attached to another person's private property. The permit approval process should include verification of land ownership. There are docks in Nancy Lake that are attached to private property that is not owned by the dock owner. These docks should be removed unless the landowner has given consent.

13. There should be a setback requirement for a dock from the property line. For example, the dock should be setback at least 10' from the property line.

14. Please clarify that there is no public access allowed to docks constructed by a private owner and connected to private property, and that those docks are private property.

15. DNR has proposed conflicting standards. DNR has proposed a maximum dock size of 450 square feet, and a 10' maximum width and 40' maximum length which would be 400 square feet. I support a maximum dock size of 450 square feet, but do not think there should be a restriction on the dock shape. Most docks have a small gang plank extending from the shore to limit the impact to the shoreline. A narrow gang plank has less impact. The gang plank is then connected to a dock in a "t" shape configuration, typically oriented at a 90 degree angle to the gang plank to limit the dock extension into the waterbody. DNR is proposing that docks extend out 40' into the water. A dock configured in a "t" shape using a gang plank connection to the shore would not extend out that far into the water. It is recommended that DNR establish a maximum dock size, but allow the dock owner the discretion to construct the dock to limit the shoreline impact, and design the dock shape to make the most sense for the water depth and its use.

16. Docks installed on Nancy Lake require anchoring because of boat wakes. DNR should allow pilings to be driven into the lake bed to stability the dock. I can tell you from experience; it is not possible to anchor a dock only at the shoreline. It is recommended that the permit allow auger style pipes of up to 4" in diameter to be drive into the lake bed to stability the dock. This will reduce damage to the shoreline as well.

17. Boat lifts should be allowed and should not count toward the total square footage allowed for a dock. I could see some reasonable limitation on the number of boat lifts allowed per private property, such as 1-2 maximum.

Thank you for considering my comments in your plan.

Sincerely

Comment 35 of 97 - submitted on 08/24/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To whom it may concern:

The purpose of this letter is to offer the comments of the Alaska Quiet Rights Coalition (AQRC) on the proposed management recommendations and alternatives offered for Nancy Lake State Recreation Area (NLSRA) issues. Our comments are limited to the alternatives and recommendations dealing with the access issues; we have no comments on the boat storage and dock issues. AQRC has previously provided scoping comments as part of this planning effort.

AQRC is a state-wide non-profit organization dedicated to protecting natural sounds and natural quiet on our public lands for the benefit of non-motorized recreationists, cabin and business owners and wildlife. We advocate for a fair and balanced allocation of trails and areas for non-motorized recreational opportunities on public lands.

From our perspective, it appears that DPOR, through its actions in liberally issuing special permits and allowing private citizens to develop an ATV trail on public land, has created (or at least greatly contributed to) the very resource-damage problems this planning effort is meant to address. Moreover, these management lapses have not been in conformity with the regulations or the 1986 Plan. We support DPOR's efforts to resolve these issues, and encourage the Division not to accede to the voices and political pressures urging DPOR to continue to violate its regulations and the 1986 Plan, by allowing continued ATV access to private inholdings, both within and outside the NLSRA boundaries.

We support Alternative 1 on the grounds that it is the only alternative which gives DPOR management control of the identified summer access issues. This support is premised on the assumption that the gate is not locked and the public is welcome to drive a car on Lynx Road. This opening partially satisfies the fundamental concern that an area set aside for "public recreation" must be managed in the public interest; not managed solely for the interests of the private inholdings. In fact, we believe that public access is required if DPOR intends to start investing public funds in this area, as proposed.

We fully support the proposed prohibition against ATVs throughout NLSRA in order to protect the resource itself, which has been damaged by ATV use. This prohibition is equally important in order to protect the values set forth in the 1983 Plan and reaffirmed in the recent DPOR survey data. Both the owners of the private inholdings and the public recreationists at large value the setting NLSRA provides for a variety of recreational activities in a quiet, natural and remote location. Furthermore, we support the provision in Alternative 1 that only minimal maintenance of the Lynx Lake Road is planned, because this in turn will reduce the number of drivers on the road and again will help maintain the natural values. We support the plan to improve, and where necessary, re-route, the Butterfly Trail to a Class 3 terra trail in order to protect the wetlands and surface resources. While horse and bicycle uses are appropriate on a non-motorized trail, we do urge that DPOR develop standards, similar to those developed to determine when snowmachines are authorized on public lands, to determine when those two uses could be authorized seasonally so that they do not damage the trail.

We do not think DPOR ever had, or currently has, any legal responsibility to allow access through NLSRA to owners of private property located outside the boundaries of NLSRA. There is no such language in the authorizing legislation establishing this SRA and no implication has been made in the information available on the website that such a promise was ever made to these land owners. Your research has shown that neither applicable land use plans nor the plats for the subdivisions in which these lots were located contemplated or authorized access through NLSRA for private purposes. In fact, access was specified via plane, snowmachine or a road that has never been built.

By issuing access permits, and allowing ATV traffic and the storage of barges, DPOR has given an unauthorized gift to these landowners over the years: a no-cost, convenient way to access their properties, to the detriment of a legislated public special-use area. Only Alternative 1 appears to partially curtail this access by disallowing long term storage of personal property and moorage of boats on certain lakes. We strongly oppose the provisions in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 which continue to accommodate these landowners' convenient access to their properties through NLSRA, because the proposed improvements mean that public funds would be largely spent for private benefit. As you are aware, private persons may not gain prescriptive easement rights on public lands. We request that a legal opinion be obtained from the Attorney General's Office that analyzes the legal requirement for management of NLSRA in conformity with exiting law and regulations, and the questionable status of private landowners who insist on a right to continue to gain access to their properties through this special-purpose site.

The quiet, natural setting of NLSRA will become increasingly valuable over the years as increased populations in the Mat-Su Borough and Anchorage seek non-developed, quiet natural places to recreate. We believe the provisions included in Alternative 1 offer the best hope for preserving the values of this public recreation land. Authorizing ATV use within NLSRA, as proposed in the other three alternatives, would mean that the values of this land, deemed special enough to be set aside from general use under Consitutional authority, would be sacrificed for the private benefit and personal convenience of a few individuals.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely yours

Comment 36 of 97 - submitted on 08/24/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom It May Concern,

On July 24, 2012 landowners/in-holders on Lynx Lake Alaska joined together to communicate a united response to the State of Alaska, Nancy Lake State Recreation Area Management plan proposed changes. Our group 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.

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.

If the NLSRA plan should require relocation of the gate, it should not be located any closer to Lynx Lake than just past the proposed Chicken Lake Loop trail turnaround/parking area and trailhead. This would allow for increased public access to other lakes within NLSRA that do not currently have the level of use and activity that Lynx Lake currently supports.

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."

The development of a large parking lot along the NE shore of Lynx Lake and allowing for "day-use" would be in direct opposition to these stated goals. Day use cannot be imposed without strict enforcement. Past budgeting and staffing at the NLSRA has never provided for the kind of 24/7 park staff enforcement level that would be necessary at Lynx Lake to protect the park resources. In the past the public use cabins have been subject to fire, vandalism and unauthorized use by people who did not pay the "honor system" rental fees that are now collected on-line.

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.

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.

The revised 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. 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.

E. 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.

F. 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.

G. 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.

The revised plan needs to bear in mind the number of Alaskans who 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 the church camp introduces hundreds of Alaskan children and adults to the priceless outdoor experience of camping and recreating on Lynx Lake. The camp holds a special session for deaf

campers which necessitate heightened safety measures which cannot be compromised by the introduction of unrestricted public boat access to the lake. The development 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 the hundred of campers who recreate at the Midnight Sun Bible Camp.

We the members of Stewards of Lynx Lake respectfully submit these important considerations for inclusion in the proposed NLSRA management plan update.

Marjorie D. Bellringer, Jim L. Freitag, Barbara E. Russell, David P. Russell, Mr. & Mrs. Peter Gunnarson, Bill & Terese Columbus, Maxine & Ken Andrews, Ernie & Sharon Eastman, Dave & Denise Perala, Larry Smith, John & Maurine Loopstra, Verne & Stephanie Braman, Margaret Walker, Garrett Walker, Aron B. Freitag, Aaron S. Kirkland, Kurt Eriksson, Bob Hoffman, Midnight Sun Bible Camp

Comment 37 of 97 - submitted on 08/26/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom It May Concern,

As one who has regularly used and enjoyed Lynx Lake and the NLSRA for more than twenty-four years, I am concerned with the changes that have been presented in the NLSRA Management Plan Recommendations/options. My main concern 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.

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 outside 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.

I believe 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.

If the NLSRA plan should require relocation of the gate, it should not be located any closer to Lynx Lake than just past the proposed Chicken Lake Loop trail turnaround/parking area and trailhead. This would allow for increased public access to other lakes within NLSRA that do not currently have the level of use and activity that Lynx Lake currently supports.

It is my understanding 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."

The development of a large parking lot along the NE shore of Lynx Lake and allowing for "day-use" would be in direct opposition to these stated goals. Day use cannot be imposed without strict enforcement. Past budgeting and staffing at the NLSRA has never provided for the kind of 24/7 park staff enforcement level that would be necessary at Lynx Lake to protect the park resources. In the past the public use cabins have been subject to fire, vandalism and unauthorized use by people who did not pay the "honor system" rental fees that are now collected on-line. I believe that drive-up access to Lynx Lake would tremendously increase the unregistered, unpaid drop in use of these cabins, remove them from being a remote wilderness experience, and change them to more of a party location than a camping location.

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.

The revised plan needs to consider the number of Alaskans who currently 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.

E. 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.

F. 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.

G. Continue the existing practice of limiting public use boat access to Lynx Lake to canoes and similar non-motorized vessels and those with small portable outboards 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.

The revised plan needs to bear in mind 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 the church camp introduces hundreds of Alaskan children and adults to the priceless outdoor experience of camping and recreating on Lynx Lake. The camp holds a special session for deaf campers which necessitate heightened safety measures which cannot be compromised by the introduction of unrestricted public boat access to the lake. The development 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 the hundreds of campers who recreate at the Midnight Sun Bible Camp.

I respectfully submit these important considerations for inclusion in the proposed NLSRA management plan update. My recommendation is that the traditional use of and access to Lynx Lake be continued with the little or no change.

Thank you

Comment 38 of 97 - submitted on 08/27/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Subject: Summer Access to Lynx Lake Road & Butterfly Lake Trail

We have just finished reading the four new proposals that the DNR are considering to improve the access to Butterfly Lake and park property that is now serviced by the Lynx Lake Road. We do not believe any of these new proposals will be a benefit to us as participants the Midnight Sun Bible Camp. Over the last 35 years we have worked to improve the camp trying to help make it a place where young and old can enjoy a quiet, safe place of learning and relaxation away from the busy life of town and

traffic. We have been involved with improving the road including putting in bridges, putting fill gravel in the swampy areas, and grading it. Among other things we have tried to accommodate the park service and land owners, by helping to build a parking area for Butterfly Lake land owners and making improvements on a public dock on Lynx Lake.

We really think as long as the road across our property in being used for access to these other properties, we would like to see the locked gate remain and the 1983 agreement stays in force. When the general public is allowed, it cuts down on the security and privacy of the camp and more road maintenance will be required.

Please consider waiting to make any changes to the 1983 agreement until more alternative trails are built that do not cross our property.

Sincerely

Comment 39 of 97 - submitted on 08/27/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom It May Concern,

Dave and I (Denise) Perala were fortunate enough to purchase a piece of property (lot 1 of Downing Subdivision, a subdivision of Lot 12 USS.4649) on Lynx Lake (Nancy Lake State Recreation Area) in 1993. Before that we portaged in to Lynx Lake for 8 years. We enjoyed the challenge of the portage and the beauty of the wilderness.

Dave and I have been to almost all of the meetings you have held on the issues of Lynx Lake Road. We have looked at all of the maps, recommendations and heard all of the remarks and replies. As we all know, or should know, Lynx Lake Road was here before statehood. As for property owners, there are families that have been here for thirty to fifty years, some even longer, by inheriting their families cabins and properties before this even became a State recreation area. Dave and I believe the gate is there to help protect the park from vandals, partiers, poaching and a dumping ground for garbage, etc. All of the parks Dave and I have visited throughout the state have gates. Just look around and you will see two to three gates up in one area. Just like anything or anywhere, if a person wants in, a lock or gate will not stop them but it does deter almost all. If we do not have a gate can you imagine what would happen back here? I'm sure the State Troopers have better things to do than drive eight miles down the beaten path to break up a fight or an out of control party that not even a camp host can control. If the gate goes you must have someone out here 24/7 to control the area and make sure wildlife is not threatened. The land owners of Redshirt Lake voted not to have a road into the state recreation area where there are four to five public use cabins. All we ask is to keep the gate where it is. But we do have a few suggestions:

1. Make a tenting area on Duck Lake at mi. 3.5 along Lynx Lake Road. Easy access and not far from the main road. Great for canoeing and fishing.
2. If you must move the gate, we suggest Chicken Lake Cross Trail. This way they can get to Frasier Lake with more tenting area and easy access to Lynx Lake. It is close to the tenting area and a much shorter portage. We have walked through that area and it looks like they have already widened the trail out.
3. As for the 70 vehicle parking, we oppose this proposition. We suggest to you to

let the land owners continue to use the same launch as they have done in the past eighteen years. Put in a separate launch for the public. Where the land owners launch now is not on private property. Dave and I own the property adjacent to the current Lynk Lake boat launch and we have no problem with the land owners parking and launching to get to their cabins. There are only five to seven vehicles there at a time; we can make this work.

Let's not forget, as stewards of Lynx Lake, we are looking into the future to keep this gem a happy, beautiful place for the future canoers, kayakers, tenters and most of all, our wildlife to have a safe haven.

Sincerely, Stewards of Lynx Lake, Dave and Denise Perala

Comment 40 of 97 - submitted on 08/27/2012 at 12:00 AM:

As a property owner on Nancy Lake thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment on these proposed changes the proposed revisions of the Nancy Lake State recreation area need to be adjusted.

1. DNR's requirements for docks have been unknown to me and I have been a property owner since 1995, I believe that the property owners I have spoken with were also not aware of these requirements.
2. All existing docks in the state recreation area should be grandfathered as is. All existing docks should be issued a grandfathered permit, as this would allow both the property owner and the DNR to help bring all structures into compliance with the new standards. Giving an existing dock an as is survey would be the bases of where things are at the time of the grandfathered dock.
3. Under your proposed new standards, "iv. Only encapsulated commercially available floatation will be authorized." There needs to be more flexibility in this area, clean nylon or plastic drums are readily available that can meet the needs of flotation and preserving the quality of the state waters. Pressure treated wood should be allowed in the construction of the above water parts of the dock.
4. "vii. No part of the structure shall exceed 10 feet in width or extend more than 40 feet in to the water body beyond Ordinary High Water Line (OHWL)." I can understand the 40-foot into the water body requirement, this makes sense as to not interfere with the Navigable water way. Although the width of 10 feet is too constricting as you already have the 450 square foot requirement. Any configuration that works with the shoreline should be acceptable.
5. Either auger style pipes of not more than 4 inches or driven in piling are needed to stabilize these structures and help prevent damage to the shore line.
6. Any dock that is not connected to the shoreline should not be allowed, as these structures could be dangerous to persons on the lake.
7. Commercial boatlifts adjacent to the dock should be allowed. These should not count toward the total square footage allowed for the dock. Mooring your watercraft to a dock should not require any permit.
8. Clear and well published standards need to be mailed to all land owners in the future. A pamphlet that Cleary defines the standards and how you get the permit would be very helpful.

9. There needs to be a 10-foot set back of all structures from the property line and only the landowner could receive a permit.

10. Dock permits should be transferable to any new property owner as well. If there are other agencies within the state of Alaska that require permitting (ADF&G) they should be combined into one permit to save both the land owner and the state money and confusion.

Thank you for considering my comments in your proposed plan.

Comment 41 of 97 - submitted on 08/28/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To whom it may concern:

I attended the recent meeting sponsored by the DPOR at the Campbell Creek Science Center in Anchorage. At the meeting, four alternatives were presented regarding the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area usage and development.

Brandon McCutcheon opened the meeting saying that a state recreation area has a different purpose than a park in that a recreation area was designed more for commercial or other development. He did not support his statement with any facts. Before his statement is regarded as fact, I would like him to back the statement he made with something in Alaska Law or regulations. Failing that support, he has no basis for his statement and the recreation area should get the same preservation protection as a park.

All of the four alternatives presented call for the removal of the Lynx Lake road gate. I have attended most of the meetings regarding the NLSRA from the year 2000 to the present date. Of all of the issues raised in those meetings, I have never heard nor read comments from anyone who proposed removing the gate. The road cannot handle a lot of traffic without suffering significant damage especially if boats are being towed. Boaters could now tow their boats to Lynx Lake which is an intersection for all of the trails in the Nancy Lake Canoe Trail System. Increased power boat traffic would endanger the park visitors who canoe the trail system--which is the hallmark of the park.

If the gate is removed, the parking lot at the end of the road could be closed by the Church Camp to persons who use the road to access their property south of the park. The alternatives suggest that a bypass road be established. However, Superintendent Bissell has stated many times in the previous park meeting that he does not even have the funds to police and monitor the damage caused by his permitting of the ATV's currently allowed in the park. The cost of a road crossing two creeks and expansive wetlands would be enormous. Removing the gate before obtaining the funds and building the alternative road would deny users, who park at the end of the road, customary access to their property and would be a sign of very poor planning.

I feel the planners' four alternatives presented at the recent meeting should be scrapped as they demonstrate short-sightedness by not addressing the impact on the park with the opening of the gate. The planners have not demonstrated any financial support for their plan and, from the meetings I have attended, no public support either. Sincerely

Comment 42 of 97 - submitted on 08/28/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Attached are my comments and review on the current draft proposal for Nancy Lake State Recreational Area.

I am still disappointed in the overall treatment of the current property holders by DNR to those that owned their property prior to the creation of the park that made them in holders. I feel our rights and properties values will be diminished with implementation of any of the current proposals except for the option of do nothing, continue the current management plan.

As we discussed in our last meeting, we will revoke the limited easement across our property that give the public access to the Butterfly trail and canoe access to Lynx Lake if the current gate is removed.

Please acknowledge receipt of this e-mail and the attached letter.

Sincerely

I am writing to you on behalf of the Midnight Sun Bible Camp, located on Lynx Lake inside NLSRA. The camp is owned and operated by the Anchorage Church of Christ located in Anchorage Alaska.

The camp has operated at this location since 1960. One year was lost due to the 1964 earthquake and people having to make repairs to their homes. The camp organization has been around long before that, starting out on the Kenai Peninsula in the 1950's.

The camp is used by approximately 400-500 people throughout the year, from children to adults. It is attended by people from all over the state. Parents who were former child campers here now send their own children from all over the lower 48 and in some cases, other parts of the world.

The reason is because of the experience of time spent at camp. The location was selected for its remoteness and absolute stunning beauty of the Alaskan wilderness. Campers here are moved by the peacefulness and wildlife experiences. Campers come here to remove themselves from the world and its many distractions. God's word is taught here as was declared in our patent with the federal government for the use of this land for that purpose.

I have both reviewed and attended one of the workshops provided by the Department of Natural Resources for twenty-year review and its proposed updates.

These are the points that most impact our facility:

- The removal of the Park Service gate on Lynx Lake road
- Allowing unrestricted vehicle access to Lynx Lake and our facility
- Allowing additional unrestricted size and amounts of watercraft on Lynx Lake
- Failure of the DNR to protect the privacy rights of the in holders
- Failure of the DNR to provide even limited security to in holders as it has for many years

The DNR has failed to provide statistical data on the amount of public requests to

access the gate on Lynx Lake road. My own experiences over the past 19 years would indicate that it is very limited in quantity. Opening the park road to Lynx Lake for vehicle access for this reason alone is insufficient. The road ends at our property. We already have issues with trespassing on our property, especially by those on motorcycles, ATV's or snowmachines, to whom the gate means nothing. The possibility of allowing unrestricted access to our facility may create a dangerous situation where the safety of adults and children would be compromised. I have personally had to escort a pickup truck load of rowdy young males off the property late at night after they breeched the gate and drove into the heart of the camp's location. The same will be true by allowing high speed boats on the lake with unaware operators when children are present in canoes or during swimming activities. Vandalism, already an issue for us, and would surely increase as those so inclined would be able to determine when the camp is unoccupied and can strike knowing that they can act with impunity. This will only increase with easier access. The current gate does provide some deterrent to those that would harm us.

As a follow up to our meeting on August 23, 2012 let me remind you of our position if the gate is removed.

With the gate removed, we will be forced to install a secure gate and revoke the current limited public access agreement with the DNR providing access across our property to the Butterfly trailhead, which is also located on our property. This will force hikers to completely circumvent our property and hike on non-existent trails through wet lands and generally swampy areas.

The camp has a long history of providing aid to park visitors, offering shelter, food, water, first aid and even a flush toilet to those so impaired. Increasing public access to Lynx Lake will place an additional burden on our facilities and will lead to the denial of use of the camp not just by road but also by water, except in emergencies, to the general public.

Because of these reasons and the lack of DNR support for the existing property owners in all of the proposals except for the Current Management option of 'do nothing, leave it as is', we can only support that option and none of the alternatives.

Therefore, it is imperative that the gate on Lynx Lake road remain in its current location with access restricted to only the property owners on Lynx Lake and for access to those on Butterfly Lake as it currently is.

The current parking lot might be expanded with trail access to one of the nearby lakes, providing that NLSRA will provide trash clean-up and supervision, lest this becomes a dumping area and attract even more bears to the gate. Currently the residents of both Lynx and Butterfly Lakes provide a cleaning service as a service for all.

Day use options described for Lynx Lake are not enforceable (daily locking of a gate) and will lead to abuse and to the detriment of those around that area including other park guests and not just landowners. Better would be a camp reservation system that might allow controlled access with payment. This would filter some of the problem users out.

The other current alternative plans as proposed by DNR will lead to degradation of the wilderness experience and deny the use of our property as it was originally and

currently used for.

It is not necessary for this to become another "Big Lake" type of mess, South Rolly Lake, or even Nancy Lake, where DNR has allowed the overuse and abuse of its facilities.

NLSRA is already unique with its canoe trail system. We would support the further development of this unique feature as no other park in the South-central area has this as a primary method of access into the heart of the park.

On behalf of Midnight Sun Bible Camp

Comment 43 of 97 - submitted on 08/28/2012 at 12:00 AM:

HI I WOULD LIKE TO VOTE FOR ALTERNATIVE 4 IN THE NANCY LAKE STATE RECREATION AREA.

Comment 44 of 97 - submitted on 08/28/2012 at 12:00 AM:

I have had the fortunate privilege of spending time in the sanctuary of Lynx Lake. The Bellringer family built their cabin in the 1960s - long before the lake was included in the N.L.S.R.A. It has been a precious heritage handed down over generations. What makes Lynx Lake so magical is the peace that surrounds it. The wildlife is spectacular: the calls of the loon, moose feeding in the marsh areas, seeing fish in the water, eagles flying above, ducks having their families. Of all the twenty-five countries (and counting) that I have travelled in this world, nothing compares to Lynx Lake. It would be a terrible shame for public road access to be granted here. Public access is available through the canoe trails in the summer time and in the winter time snow machine access is available to the public. Is it necessary to open it up to more people, more boats, more litter? Why change it? There are plenty of other lakes in the area that are larger that have public access, boat launches, and easier road access. Instead of changing access to Lynx Lake and making it very similar to all the other lakes in the area, wouldn't it be more appropriate to keep the retaining gate in order to limit access and to keep Lynx Lake as it is? One thing that has always set Lynx Lake aside from all the others is the peacefulness and solitude that is felt on there. It has been untouched thus far; however with more human access, there will be fewer sightings of animal and the peace which is so sacred now will be gone. Please keep Lynx Lake the way it is now. Sincerely

Comment 45 of 97 - submitted on 08/28/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom It May Concern,

As one who has regularly used and enjoyed Lynx Lake and the NLSRA for more than forty-five years, I am concerned with the changes that have been presented in the NLSRA Management Plan Recommendations/options. My main concern 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.

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 outside 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.

I believe 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.

If the NLSRA plan should require relocation of the gate, it should not be located any closer to Lynx Lake than just past the proposed Chicken Lake Loop trail turnaround/parking area and trailhead. This would allow for increased public access to other lakes within NLSRA that do not currently have the level of use and activity that Lynx Lake currently supports.

It is my understanding 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."

The development of a large parking lot along the NE shore of Lynx Lake and allowing for "day-use" would be in direct opposition to these stated goals. Day use cannot be imposed without strict enforcement. Past budgeting and staffing at the NLSRA has never provided for the kind of 24/7 park staff enforcement level that would be necessary at Lynx Lake to protect the park resources. In the past the public use cabins have been subject to fire, vandalism and unauthorized use by people who did not pay the "honor system" rental fees that are now collected on-line. I

believe that drive-up access to Lynx Lake would tremendously increase the unregistered, unpaid drop in use of these cabins, remove them from being a remote wilderness experience, and change them to more of a party location than a camping location.

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.

The revised plan needs to consider the number of Alaskans who currently 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.

E. 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.

F. 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.

G. Continue the existing practice of limiting public use boat access to Lynx Lake to canoes and similar non-motorized vessels and those with small portable outboards 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.

The revised plan needs to bear in mind 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 the church camp introduces hundreds of Alaskan children and adults to the priceless outdoor experience of

camping and recreating on Lynx Lake. The camp holds a special session for deaf campers which necessitate heightened safety measures which cannot be compromised by the introduction of unrestricted public boat access to the lake. The development 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 the hundreds of campers who recreate at the Midnight Sun Bible Camp.

I respectfully submit these important considerations for inclusion in the proposed NLSRA management plan update. My recommendation is that the traditional use of and access to Lynx Lake be continued with the little or no change.

Thank you

A signed copy of the letter from Stewards of Lynx Lake was also submitted.

Comment 46 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

if thestae park system cant protect itself from atvs than it might just need to go the way of the coastal manegment zone,either keep 4 wheelers from destroying the park or look for other work

Comment 47 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

Thank you

Comment 48 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA: Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's....at all!

Thank you

Comment 49 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA: Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's. Keep in mind the devastation that ATV's have caused to the Eska Creek Falls trail.

Thank you

Comment 50 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA: Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

Thank you

Comment 51 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Please keep this lovely area preserved as a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's. Having this quiet place so close to Alaska's urban center will be wonderful treasure for future generations.

Thank you

Comment 52 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To whom it may concern:

I have worked at the camp (Midnight Sun Bible Camp) for several years. I use to pull water skiers on the lake. If more boats were using the lake during the time the camp is in session it would hamper the skiing. One of the purposes of the camp is to give the campers a rest from everyday life. In the past one problem has been with individuals coming, not campers, and creating a less than desirable atmosphere.

I would like to see the camp as it is, not having the added problems.

The safety of all individuals would be a concern, we have bears and firearms may come into play.

Thank you for your consideration of these matters.

Comment 53 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

I am opposed to removing the locked gate on Lynx Lake Road.

I feel that unrestricted access to this area would raise serious environmental concerns including trash dumping, adversely affect wildlife habitat, increase fire danger & the narrow road restricts safe vehicle operations.

In closing, I would support the continued locked, managed gate as it now is on Lynx Lake Road. This has worked very well for all the years it has been in place. I support current management.

Thank you

Comment 54 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA: Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

Thank you

Comment 55 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the changes to the Nancy Lake Recreation Area that are presented as alternatives in the new draft management plan.

My husband and I have owned a five acre lot on Lynx Lake for over thirty years. In July I attended one of the public meetings regarding development of the proposed 20 year plan for the Recreation Area. I am concerned that the proposed options presented in the planning documents will negatively affect the NLSRA, and

ultimately, will destroy the "wilderness experience" that the canoe trail system provides to Alaskans and many visitors from outside the state. I consider myself a steward of Lynx Lake, and am proud of the small role I play in keeping the lake and our own property in essentially the same condition as when we first canoed on it over 30 years ago.

The canoe trail system is the 'crown jewel' of the NLSRA. I believe the canoe trail system should be protected and kept undisturbed for the future. All changes to the Recreation Area should be considered in the context of our responsibility to assure that future generations have an opportunity to enjoy this unique area. Any change that detracts from that goal should be viewed with great skepticism. A major factor in the preservation of the trail system and the "wilderness experience" is the current policy of limited access to Lynx Lake. Removing the locked gate, widening and graveling Lynx Lake road, establishing additional large parking areas near the lake, and building a large bridge over the water connection between Candlestick Lake and Echo Ponds will diminish the sense of remoteness now enjoyed by those using the canoe trail system. The proposals that have been presented as 'alternatives' are not in the best interests of the Recreation Area or the canoe trail.

I support the enhancement of outdoor recreational opportunities for the public (such as improved maintenance of the canoe system trails, portages, and public use cabins), but changes in the nature of the current 'alternatives' should be thoughtfully balanced against the potential threat of vandalism, litter, illegal use of firearms and fireworks, and most importantly, encroachment upon the wildlife habitat.

Sincerely yours

Comment 56 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

I am opposed to removing the gate on Lynx Lake Road. That would eliminate access management, opening the road to the general public via any 4 wd vehicle or whatever is driven back there.

The property owners would lose - they have nothing to gain.

The wildlife loses - & who can defend them?

The environment / land / tundra / streams lose - who can defend it? It is the habitat of these animals.

Fire danger would increase, trash would increase, road condition would deteriorate. It is a narrow, curvy road. Accidents would increase.

Present key only access via the locked gate has worked very well. I support "current management."

Comment 57 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

There are too few canoe areas in Alaska with no noise pollution.

ATV's are noisy. ATV's are smelly.

The increased hunting pressure would be dangerous to the Canoe enthusiasts.

Thank you

Comment 58 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Hello,

I would like the existing non-motorized-in-summer status kept for the canoe trail system. Cabin owners can get stuff to their property in the winter by snowmachine, and not scar up the country. Fourwheelers in general have about a million other places we can ride. How many canoe trail systems exist in the state?

Thank you

Comment 59 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 02:10 PM:

When deciding on the 20 year master plan, you should ask yourselves this question: Do we want more guns and fireworks in the Nancy Lake Recreation Area and particularly along the route of the canoe trail?

Scientific studies have shown that canoeists and kayakers using the canoe trail seldom bring guns and fireworks into the recreation area. However, people who enter via Lynx Lake road often bring guns and fireworks with them. Usually, these folks come in on pickups and ATVs.

These people have a right to some recreation too, and since it is a recreation area, it is only fair that they should be able to come to Lynx Lake and shoot their guns and blow off their fireworks. From long experience, I can confidently predict that they will also bring and leave behind a lot of beer bottles, beer cans, used shells and cartridges, and other trash. This will provide plenty of extra work for Park personnel, and eventually could even lead to a staff increase.

If you want the Nancy Lake Recreation Area to become a place where people can come to sight in their weapons and shoot off the fireworks they just bought in Houston, then you should definitely remove the boundary gate and allow unlimited access.

Otherwise, leave the gate as it is.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest Eastman, Inholder, US Survey 4649, Lot 6

Comment 60 of 97 - submitted on 08/29/2012 at 02:51 PM:

When deciding on the 20 year master plan, you should ask yourselves this question: Do we want more guns and fireworks in the recreation area?

Scientific studies have shown that users of the canoe trail seldom bring guns and fireworks into the recreation area. However, people who enter via the Lynx Lake road often bring guns and fireworks with them. Usually, these folks come in on pickups and ATVs.

These people have a right to a little recreation too, and since it is a recreation area,

it is only fair that they should be able to come to Lynx Lake and shoot their guns and blow off their fireworks. From long experience, I can confidently predict that they will also bring and leave behind a lot of beer bottles, beer cans, and other trash.

If you want the Nancy Lake Recreation Area to become a place where people can come to sight in their weapons and shoot off the fireworks they bought a few miles down the road, then you should definitely remove the boundary gate and allow unlimited access.

Otherwise, leave the gate as it is.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest Eastman, Inholder, US Survey 4649, Lot 6

Comment 61 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

Thank you

Comment 62 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

We think it would be a real shame to allow atvs into Nancy Lake state park. It is noisy enough during the winter with all the snow machines running around. The wet conditions at Nancy Lake will cause huge mud holes to form that will fill with water and never dry up. Of course, there will be absolutely zero enforcement of whatever lame rules are put into place and the atv trails will soon become like a huge spider web as the "mavericks" decide they don't have to stay on the main trail. This park provides a needed refuge for the animals. Why screw up a nice place? Have you ever been out on state lands where atvs have just torn up the ground and ruined hiking for anyone who wasn't wearing hip waders? Allowing atvs into Nancy Lake state park is a terrible idea. Please don't allow it to happen.

Comment 63 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Attention Alaska Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation:

Thank you for considering my input. As you well know, all terrain vehicles do significant damage to wetland areas which require much effort to rehabilitate once damaged. Given the sensitive nature of this Nancy Lake State Recreation Area, allowing additional all terrain vehicles access to the already existing exceptions to snow machines when there is enough snow pack and ATV access to people who own property beyond the NLSRA boundary, I strongly recommend not increasing any ATV or other motorized activity within NLSRA boundaries.

Sincerely

Comment 64 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's. The result of allowing motorized vehicles would be serious and permanent damage to the surrounding area.

Thank you

Comment 65 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear DPOR,

Please see the attached response letter regarding proposed management actions and alternatives for the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area. These comments reflect the collective thoughts and recommendations of property owners and homeowners of the Nancy Lake Homeowners Association.

We greatly appreciate your commitment and consideration to help us oversee our adjacent resources.

Thank you, NLHOA

Dear, Alaska DNR, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation (DPOR):

In collective review of the Proposed Management changes to the NLSRA, The Nancy Lake Homeowners Association recommends the following changes to the compatible/incompatible use standards.

Requested change to:

Document 3 - Proposed Management Recommendations

1. Docks and Structures

Private and Commercial Structures

The surface area of all structures combined on and within a water body is limited to not more than 450ft², and a 100ft² adder for lots with more than 299 ft of frontage, for any single lot that is within or contiguous with the legal boundary of NLSRA. Boat lifts/watercraft lifts, trampolines, and other seasonally removable objects excluded.

No part of the structure shall extend more 40 feet into the water body beyond Ordinary High Water Line (OHWL), with exceptions on a case-by-case basis approved by DPOR.

DPOR to take no longer than 30 days for permit approval/review, and ensure property owners have a variance mechanism for individuals with special circumstances whom are trying to comply with the "intent" of the regulations.

DPOR to make Dock Permit Application and Material Specifications readily "Findable" on DNR Website, and additionally provide links and/or documents to Nancy Lake Homeowners Association for discovery on NLHOA website.

Marina

A type of development that typically includes structures for launching, retrieving, and mooring boats and may include fuel services. This type of use is compatible within NLSRA for one marina to be developed on Nancy Lake as that use has

occurred in the past. Nancy Lake Home Owners Association to be given notice of plan and other pertinent materials, and have input before a permit is issued.

3. Moorage of Boats Adjacent to Private Uplands

Boat Moorage

i. Commercial barges

b.) The barge must be moored within the riparian interest of the upland private property while work is being performed. (Additionally, provisions allow for barge mooring on private shoreline while not in use)

Additionally:

- We as a group are concerned about water level fluctuation as determined by the Bridge/Culvert on the Lynx Lake Road access. This structure, as approved by the State of Alaska, has caused unnatural "Highs and Lows" due to this obstacle. As DPOR moves forward with Lynx Lake Road access alternatives, we ask for your utmost consideration in providing a better design for proper water level management with control structures. Controlling water level on Nancy Lake will also assist with dock maintenance and reduce deterioration.

- We also feel the DPOR should have some plan for removal of abandoned or derelict docks from the public "right-of-way". Possibly, a 90 day removal/fix-it notice to the closest land owner to find the potential owner.

Sincerely

Nancy lake Homeowners Association, Willow, AK

Comment 66 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To whom.....

I have lived in Willow since 1978. I have used the trails in and around Nancy Lake, Lynx Lake, Butterfly Lake, Skeetna Lake and on and on and on. I trained for an Iditarod, a Yukon Quest and lots of other Sled Dog Races. I have skied these trails, in training runs for the Iditaski. I have walked these trails. I have a cabin at Butterfly Lake. There has NEVER been any legal use of ATV's, 4 Wheelers, or other motorized vehicles in this area until the last few years. John Wilber, the Nancy Lake Ranger has given tickets to any ATV riders who would ride the Lynx Lake trail extension tearing up the swamps (excuse me wet lands).

Your 4 pronged plan is deeply flawed. It is based upon bad information, improper assumptions, and dare I say very limited input.

I suggest you start again, use local input, and get more broad based suggestions on how to proceed.

Comment 67 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners,

Please consider keeping ATV's out of the summer canoe trail.

I am an ATV owner, but realize that there are some places that ATV's should not go to because they disrupt the environment and create scars in the woods that will not

heal up in our lifetimes.

Comment 68 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners,

Please do not continue to allow ATVs in the NLSRA. The damage is already so severe that it will take years to create passable canoeing and hiking trails in the park again. Not to mention the constant stream of garbage left by the individuals operating ATVs in the park, which cannot be legal, even by your standards.

Alaska is an enormous state where there is ample opportunity for individuals to use ATVs. There is no need for them to do so in the NLSRA, where a large community of families and neighbors have been respectfully enjoying the park for 30 years, and have been able to maintain the trails and public use areas in their original quality that entire time.

Allowing ATV's in the park destroys any opportunity for any other form of recreation, and destroys one of the greatest things about the state of Alaska; the availability of non-motorized recreation in areas where wildlife still abound.

Comment 69 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Please keep the canoe trail a roadless area and ATV's should NOT be allowed to use it.

Thank you for considering non-ATV use.

Comment 70 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Planners: I have used the Nancy Lake canoe trail system for just over 30 years, and was surprised to learn that the State is considering opening the area to ATV usage. I strongly oppose doing so. As you know, the Nancy Lake area is considered "pastoral", which is apt. No one who has experienced the tranquility of being on those lakes in a canoe can possibly want to see the area destroyed and polluted by the noise and interference imposed by ATVs. I respectfully request your denial of this gross imposition.

Comment 71 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Thank you for considering public input for the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area. I have enjoyed these pristine lands for many years.

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

Thank you

Comment 72 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Regarding Document 4, the 4 alternatives for the Lynx Lake Rd and Butterfly Lake Trail:

I cannot support ANY of the alternatives in this poorly prepared document, for the following reasons:

- COMPLETE LACK OF OPINIONS FROM RECREATIONAL USERS OF NLSRA: I reviewed the 1983 management plan and found the plan addressed many issues in the NLSRA in a very thoughtful way, something this plan review is sorely lacking. Prior to drafting the 1983 plan, a survey was conducted of recreational users of the NLSRA. The survey results showed a very high value was placed on the opportunity for the quiet, peaceful experience the SRA offered. Having been a recreational user of NLSRA since 1983, a property owner on Butterfly Lake since 1986, and having lived on or near Nancy Lake since 1985, I have not been asked my opinion in the form of survey. There have been a few meetings regarding the ATV use on the Butterfly Lake trail, all of them contentious in nature, but never a survey regarding what we and all recreational users value most in this SRA. Also, I am a board member of the Nancy Lake Homeowners Association and a member of the Hardship Lane Homeowners Association (west side of the lake) and can state we have never had a presentation by DPOR at one of our meetings regarding this plan update and revisions.

- A JEWEL OF THE ALASKA STATE PARK SYSTEM: The State of Alaska DNR Parks website has listed the NLSRA as a "Jewel of the State Parks". The website currently states "The recreation area's clear waters are ringed with unspoiled forests, and provide tranquil settings for canoeing, fishing, hiking and camping". It is DPOR's responsibility to hold true to this statement, to protect this park from those that want to forever change its nature and environment, so that our children and their children can experience the same "unspoiled forests" and "tranquil settings" as we have been fortunate to experience.

- ATV USE INCOMPATIBLE WITH THE NATURE OF NLSRA: The drafters of the 1983 plan concluded that, based on the results of the surveys and their own opinions of the nature of this special SRA, that ATV use was found to be incompatible with the nature and environment of the NLSRA. A peaceful backcountry experience is NOT enhanced by the sound of ATVs plowing through the woods. And if you think you can limit and control that ATVs will travel only on specific trails, you are being extremely naive. ATV users believe in the name of their vehicles - All Terrain Vehicles - and will go all over the park lands. "Unspoiled forests" will no longer exist!

- FALSE FACTS: It is not true that there has been historical permitting of ATV access into the NLSRA. The permits started to be issued (illegally) in 2000, with only 1 known permit issued prior to that date.

- EXISTING RULES REGARDING DEGRADATION OF PARK HABITAT: There are existing rules that are very strict about the use of snowmachines in the NLSRA when there is inadequate snow cover, to prevent the degradation of the ground and habitat. Why do you think ATVs differ from snowmachines? ATVs are driven in all seasons. Have you seen the complete degradation of the ground and habitat on the Butterfly Lake trail? There are sensitive bogs along that trail that we hike around. The ATVs have plowed through those sensitive areas, forever scarring them. Apparently that rule only applies to certain areas of the SRA and to snowmachines only.

- NLSRA CREATED FOR RECREATIONAL USE, NOT TO BENEFIT PRIVATE LANDOWNERS: As an owner of property on the other side of the NLSRA I bought my land fully understanding that this was remote property, accessible in a very limited way. I think it is absurd for anyone, and especially DPOR, to forever change this "Jewel" in order

for a private landowner to have better access to their land. The NLSRA was created for recreational users, as is stated on your own website. Providing a trail to benefit private landowners, and allowing ATVs in the park so they can access their remote private land, is wrong. And worse of all, the general public will be required to bear the expense of these changes that will benefit only a few private landowners. Who exactly is suppose to pay for these upgrades?

- LYNX LAKE ROAD GATE: The gate has served the purpose of preventing vehicle traffic into the SRA while allowing adjacent landowners safe parking. There is no reason the gate should be removed or moved from its present location. If anything, the area around the gate should be made more ATV-proof to prevent their illegal incursion into the SRA.

- UPKEEP, MAINTENANCE, AND MONITORING: There are so many parts of this SRA that are lacking maintenance and attention. This plan addresses repairing canoe and boat access areas on various lakes. Why isn't that part of the regular maintenance of the park? Why would that need to be part of an update to the management plan? How about addressing the items in the SRA that really do need updating, such as a proper destination site at Red Shirt Lake so hikers have a spot for a picnic or a place to pitch a tent? Fix and maintain what you have now. Also, the plan does not address who will monitor these new ATV trails to make sure they are being used as you seem to think they will be. Who will do that and at what additional cost to the general public? I have been on those trails for over 20 years and have never seen a park ranger. Are you planning to add staff?

- CONCLUSION: This document needs to be sent back to the drawing board. Opinions need to be gathered from the RECREATIONAL USERS of the NLSRA. Be consistent - if snowmachines degrade the ground when there is no snow cover, ATVs do too. Start to think like protectors of our park, that it was created for recreational users and not for surrounding property owners. Maintain and monitor what you have now. DO NOT forever change this Jewel!

Comment 73 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

August 27th, 2012

Resource Assessment and Development Section(Department of Natural Resources(550 W 7th Ave., Suite 1050(Anchorage, AK 99501

RE: Nancy Lake SRA Proposed Management Recommendations and Alternatives

To Whom It May Concern,

This letter is in response to the proposed management recommendations and alternatives documents for the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area (NLSRA). I have lived in the Willow area for 33 years and have enjoyed canoeing, hiking, fishing, dog mushing and snowmachining within the NLSRA. It's canoe trail system and its quiet and pristine qualities are big reasons I live nearby. The following are my comments on each of the recommendations and alternatives.

Docks and other structures: I support the recommended findings and standards with the exception of dock area. I suggest lowering the recommended 450' sq. to 400' sq area to be consistent with the Alaska Coastal Management Program standards and due to the density of narrow lake frontage lots in most subdivisions.

Existing unpermitted structures: I support the recommended findings and standards.

Moorage of boats adjacent to private uplands: I support the recommended findings and standards.

Property Storage and Boat Moorage at Red Shirt Lake: I support the recommended findings and standards.

Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail, Summer Access Alternatives: My comments on these alternatives, taken as a whole, reflect a management plan that increases public access to the Lynx Lake area but still protects the quiet and pristine qualities needed for the most popular activities within the SRA, remote camping and canoeing. I also believe that my suggestions below will lead to a much more consistent management throughout the NLSRA.

1. Access for property owners and recreating public, I support Alternative 1 only if power boats are not allowed on Lynx Lake. This is to preserve the unique character of the NLSRA and the integrity of the canoe trail system. For Lynx Lake Road, public vehicular access.

- Public access through the boundary gate and to the Baines Lake Parking area increases recreational opportunities.

- An open gate creates parity between inholders and the public which will improve management and enforcement of unauthorized ATV use.

For the Butterfly Lake Trail, non motorized access.

- When asked what they liked most about the NLSRA, public comments mentioned quiet, natural setting, remote canoeing and camping. Among the least liked were motorized use. (Management Plan Update, 2010, p.1).

- Future land development may create hundreds or thousands of private parcels whose owners will seek access via the Butterfly Lake Trail (Document 2, p. 14). This could have tremendous impacts to the NLSRA in the future and threaten those qualities unique to the area and most valued by the public.

- DPOR does not have a responsibility to provide motorized access to private land. (Document 2, p. 13). Reasonable access can be accommodated by float plane, snowmachine, canoe, ski, bike and foot.

- Consistent ATV regulations throughout the NLSRA simplifies enforcement of unauthorized ATV use.

- Non motorized access will help minimize impacts of private moorage and storage on Butterfly Lake.

Lynx Lake Road: I support Alternative 1.

- Public did not support higher level of development (Management Plan Update, 2010, p. 2).

2. Butterfly Lake Trail: I support Alternative 1 but using the bicycle design standards

instead of pack and saddle.

- Rerouting the trail will lesson impact to natural resources especially wetlands.
- Public did not support pack and saddle use (Management Plan Update, 2010, p. 2).

3. Developed parking areas: I support Alternative 1 with these important exceptions.

- Eliminate the Boundary Parking Area. If the public has access through the gate, there is no purpose for parking here. Parking will be available at the nearby Chicken Cross Park Trailhead.
- The Lynx Lake Boat Parking should be located several hundred yards from the lake with access by a portage type trail. Limiting motorized access will protect the quiet natural settings and the integrity of the canoe trail.
- Provide an inholder boat access on the existing site but reroute around private property. Separated access points for the public and inholders will mitigate conflicting use and protect storage of property.

5. Boat Moorage and Personal Property Storage, I support Alternative 1. This needs to be done through NLSRA specific regulations for the benefit of property owners and protection of the natural resources. If the access to water edge on Lynx and Butterfly Lakes is by non motorized means as described above, mooring and storage will be consistent throughout the NLSRA, including Red Shirt Lake.

I also support more intensive oversight of the Lynx and Butterfly Lake areas either by additional ranger funding or providing for campground hosts.

I appreciate this opportunity to comment on these documents and look forward to further involvement in the NLSRA management planning.

Sincerely

Comment 74 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and DO NOT allow ATV's. ATV use in wet/muskeg areas leaves permanent damage, which is both unsightly and detrimental to the natural ecosystem. We non-motorized users should have at least some places where ATVs are not allowed, and our parks are the best chance for that. We are the minority, I fear, but we deserve to be heard.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Comment 75 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

Thank you

Comment 76 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Please do not allow ATV's in Nancy Lake State Recreation Area. Keep it as a canoe trail.

Thank you

Comment 77 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

Thank you

Comment 78 of 97 - submitted on 08/30/2012 at 10:04 PM:

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.

We don t believe any one of the proposed management recommendations and alternatives are the right choice for Lynx Lake Road and Butterfly Lake Trail summer access. Alternative 1 is much too restrictive to in-holders. Alternative 4 does nothing for the overall conservation of the most remote natural areas of NLSRA. We do support a reroute of the Butterfly Lake Trail around the Anchorage Church of Christ property. We feel that the Butterfly Lake Trail should continue to be accessed by property owners with ATV s by special use permit. Under the supervision of DPOR, permit holders should be allowed to improve the trail. It is our feeling that if more leeway was given to permit holders to maintain the trail, improvements could be done at little cost to the state.

As in-holders in the NLSRA we believe it is our right to have irrevocable access to our property by means of ATV via the Butterfly Lake Trail.

David and Heidi Marsh

Comment 79 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear reader -

I have been informed about the possibility of adding ATV access to Nancy Lake State Recreation Area in your forthcoming management plan. I strongly urge you to retain the Nancy Lake area as a canoe and non-mechanized trail area. I have paddled there since 1985, and assure you that the addition of ATV's will greatly decrease its desirability and functionality for the large majority of users of the area. Where I live

(next to the San Juan islands of Washington State) we have banned jet skis from our county's recreational waters, a move that was originally controversial but that has in the long run paid enormous tourist and habitat benefits. The ban on small motorized craft has been incredibly effective in maintaining the pristine and tourist-attractive aspects of our region, and has paid many economic benefits in addition to the environmental gains.

I urge you to continue to ban ATV's in the new management plan for Nancy Lake SRA. Thank you for your efforts on behalf of Alaska's wild resources.

Comment 80 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners,

re: Recommendations and Alternative Documents for NLSRA

We use the Nancy Lake Area often. Please keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's. This canoe area is a treasure for the state. It is one of the few portage/lake areas. Please keep it special.

Comment 81 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

Thank you

Comment 82 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To: Mat-Su State Parks Advisory Board

I hope the state's management team will genuinely consider a property owner's input and not immediately disregard it as "contentious." I have been greatly privileged to own property on Lynx Lake for over twenty-five years. I, along with hundreds of canoeists who paddle yearly through Lynx Lake, enjoy its scenic tranquility and wildlife sightings and sounds. I am committed to maintaining this recreational experience for generations to come. My experience and knowledge gained throughout the years of being at Lynx, have led me to make the following points and observations.

I think it is important for the state' team to consider Lynx Lake separately from the Park's other lakes when making their plans, to do otherwise might result in misleading conclusions.

For instance, management presented the growth of docks and other structures as an issue to address, citing a current count of 416 docks. However, the number of docks specific to Lynx Lake is only 13.

Another problem management seeks to address is access requirements for property owners, management states, "... if private property were developed it could result in hundreds or thousands of owners seeking access." Again, management has grouped Lynx with Skeetna, Butterfly and Delyndia in making this assessment. According to the "1983 Nancy Lake Master Plan" there are only eleven properties shown on Lynx Lake. Since that time just one property has been subdivided resulting in four

additional properties. Whereas the subdivided property's long shoreline lent itself to be easily divided, the remaining properties have limited shorelines, making future subdividing infeasible.

Lynx Lake is not a boisterous lake. Its waters are calm and there is not the constant roar of jet skies and power boats. Canoeists and campers are able to recreate in an environment that provides a haven for loons to nest on its shores and a resting spot for migrating swans.

Currently there exists a serene equilibrium between the wildlife and canoeists who come here to enjoy them. I think management's future plans will completely change the character of the lake, replacing canoeists and wildlife with people who would rather experience thrilling water rides.

Comment 83 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To: Mat-Su State Parks Advisory Board

I would describe Lynx Lake as a narrow lake surrounded by a forest of birch and spruce trees. A lot of animals and birds live here. Loons build their nests on the shore and sometimes you can see a loon swimming with a baby loon on its back. I have also seen beavers building a lodge and even a mother moose liking its just born calf. In the fall, when its quiet and the water is very still, groups of swans stop by for a rest before they continue on their journey.

I think that if people brought in boats to race them around, it would create a lot of noise and scare the animals. And the wake would destroy the loon nests. The animals would leave Lynx Lake and you would never hear the hooting of the owls, or the "ko-ho" of the swans or the loons talking to each other.

Thank you

Comment 84 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's.

Thank you

Comment 85 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom it May Concern:

These are my comments on the Proposed Management Recommendations and Alternatives for the Nancy Lake State Recreation Area (NLSRA).

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.

Overview comment

Specific comments are below, but in general, I would like to note that over the years, as evidenced by the problems and controversy of the past several years and also as described in the Proposed Management Recommendation documents one through four, NLSRA has not been properly managed. Examples include problems related to docks and other structures, ATV use to access private property, use of public land for private storage, etc. Through failure, among other things, to follow Alaska Administrative Code and to ensure that permits are obtained where required, DPOR has allowed small, manageable problems to become large, unmanageable problems. This has been to the detriment of NLSRA's natural resources and the quality of the visitor experience.

Hopefully, the new NLSRA Management Plan, both in the scope and clarity of its content and in the manner it is used by DPOR to manage the NLSRA, will prevent these types of problems from recurring.

Therefore, I recommend that this new NLSRA Management Plan include clear and enforceable rules necessary to protect the natural resources of the NLSRA and its quiet natural setting that folks appreciate and may continue to enjoy. The new Plan should also include specific language that describes in detail the precise mechanism that DPOR must develop and implement to ensure that any activity (e.g., dock construction) that requires a permit is properly evaluated, permitted, and conforms to the requirements of the NLSRA Management Plan. The new Plan should also include specific and detailed language that requires DPOR to effectively monitor for compliance with the new Plan's provisions and for DPOR to enforce those provisions.

Docks and other structures

The proposed maximum size limit of 450 square feet is too large. The Proposed Management Recommendations ("PMR"), with respect to dock construction, should, in addition to the points listed in document3, specify a maximum square footage limit of 320 and the dock design that is flat, low profile with no second story or structural attachments other than a swimming ladder. The Proposed Management Recommendations should also limit the number of docks to one per parcel. I agree with the 10 foot maximum width of a dock, but I suggest that, in addition, DPOR consider inserting language that requires a certain amount (or percentage of a parcel) of the shoreline be kept intact and unobscured, such that the view of the shores from out in the lake is predominantly the natural shoreline.

I object to grandfathering in the non-conforming structures, although, unfortunately, I don't see a way around it. The fact that, according to the 2009 inventory, only 23 of 416 docks had been permitted should be a wake-up call to DPOR. Also troubling is the statement (see document2, page 4): "Some structures, however, are of a size and type that it is doubtful they would have been permitted even if the owner had applied for an authorization." This is a good example of my statement above that DPOR has not properly managed NLSRA and has let small, manageable problems become large, unmanageable problems.

There is a clear need for DPOR to develop and put in place an effective monitoring and enforcement mechanism that would ensure that permits for docks (and other structures) are obtained where required and that all docks and other structures comply with the rules. The new NLSRA management plan should include language requiring DPOR to develop and implement such a system.

Existing Unpermitted Structures

This need, described immediately above, for an effective permitting system applies also to "2) Existing Unpermitted Structures." The new NLSRA management plan should include language requiring DPOR to develop a system for ensuring that permits are obtained when required and that structures conform to the required standards.

Property Storage and Boat Moorage at Red Shirt Lake

The Proposed Management Recommendations (document3 page 5) do not adequately address the potential for fuel spills. Bears can puncture metal fuel cans and move them about, near or into the water. Metal cans can rust and leak. I don't know the types of containers that are available or how they can be secured. But fuel spills are a bad thing, and the PMRs do not effectively protect against them. Additional thought is needed on this issue in order to develop requirements sufficient to protect against fuel spills.

The Proposed Management Recommendations (document3 page 5) do not adequately address bear issues (e.g., there is no prohibition of food storage and no requirement for the use of bear proof containers). The new NLSRA Management Plan should address the risk (to the bears and to people and property) represented by conditioned or habituated bears and provide practical and effective methods and rules to prevent that from occurring.

There is no mention in the PMRs of the need to protect the shoreline from erosion and other damage. The new Plan should discuss the importance of protecting the integrity of the shoreline and include stipulations necessary to achieve that goal.

The statement (document3 page 5) "The storage of personal property and moorage of boats by property owners at this site will require an authorization from DPOR" should include a clause that makes it very clear that the authorization may be revoked at DPOR's sole discretion at any time for any reason.

With the sentence (document3 page 5) "If a future determination finds that the resources of NLSRA are being unduly impacted by these uses, authorizations for this use may be capped, reduced, or eliminated", I fear that DPOR is setting itself up for the same kind of problems in the future that it is now facing with Docks and other structures, and with existing non-conforming structures. This is a vague, subjective statement that is open to varying interpretations. DPOR should put itself on firm ground such that it is clear that it can revoke an authorization at its discretion.

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

Alternative 1 is clearly the only appropriate and viable alternative. I would support Alternative 1, with modification, as explained below. I support Alternative 1, sometimes with significant modification, for all 5 of the sub-categories.

Access for property owners and recreating public

First, I note that NLSRA was established for public recreation; not private access.

"The Nancy Lake State Recreation Area was established July 6, 1966 by the Alaska

Legislature. The legislation is contained in the Alaska Statutes under Article 14, AS 41.20.491. In 1970, the legislation was amended to adjust park boundaries, which reduced park acreage, and to permit the borough to extract gravel from lands within the park which had been previously selected by the borough. By those acts, all state-owned lands and waters within the boundaries of the recreation area were reserved for public recreation and from all uses incompatible with public recreation." (page 3 of the 1983 plan)

This is inconsistent with statements on page 10 of document2: "Statutes specific to NLSRA do not specifically address access for private property owners or the recreating public. The statutes do provide that the area is to be managed as public recreation land and that incompatible uses shall be designated by regulations."

According to the 1983 Plan, state statute reserves NLSRA exclusively for public recreation; anything else is an incompatible use. According to document2, on the other hand, statute says that incompatible use is to be determined by regulation. This inconsistency is not explained.

Because providing access to either inholdings or through the NLSRA to private properties outside the NLSRA is not public recreation, there is some question as to the legality of permitting ATV access and of providing any infrastructure that would facilitate such access, and so Alternative 1, the only one of the four that declares ATV use as incompatible, appears to be the only viable alternative.

Legal questions aside, prohibiting ATV use is the only practical alternative from a management standpoint. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would allow ATV use on Butterfly Lake Trail, without authorization. (1) This would make the management and control of ATV use next to impossible. There would be no cap on the number of ATVs (2); no practical way (without significantly more staff and funding) to keep ATVs on the trail; no practical way to protect the natural resources of NLSRA; no way to protect the quality of the experience of other NLSRA users; and it would open the door for trespass on and damage to private property inholdings. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would result in severe adverse effect on the integrity of NLSRA and be an enormous management headache, and are simply out of the question.

Another reason that Alternative 1 is the only appropriate option is that (see 2010 update number 2 "2010questionsummary") the top 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."

Lynx Lake Road

I support a modified Alternative 1.

I think it is appropriate to allow vehicles on Lynx Lake road, but only for the private property owners. (3) Opening the road to the general public would have adverse impact on the NLSRA resources and the quality of the backcountry experience that NLSRA is known for. The impacts of jet skis and other motor craft are potentially enormous. It would have significant adverse effect not only on NLSRA users but also on the Lynx Lake property owners. I see no reason to open the road up to the general public.

In fact, the only reference to Lynx Lake in the 2010 update number 2

"2010questionsummary" is that the public opposed development in the Lynx Lake Rd/ Butterfly Lake trail area. The new Plan should maintain the status quo and limit the vehicular use of Lynx Lake Road to private property owners (as defined in footnote 3).

With respect to Lynx Lake itself, I recommend that the lake be designated as non-motorized. This designation would be consistent with the public's desire for a quiet natural setting and remote canoeing and camping. This non-motorized designation is desirable now, but would be crucial if DPOR insists on opening up Lynx Lake Road to the general public.

Butterfly Lake Trail

I have not seen the rationale and need for rerouting and upgrading the Butterfly Lake Trail. This would be an expensive project, and would be put to better use in part by improving and fixing the bad parts of the existing trail, with the remaining funds spent on monitoring and enforcement throughout NLSRA. Absent a compelling need, public support, and a favorable cost/benefit relationship, I object to the rerouting of the trail.

If DPOR insists on rerouting the trail, these are my concerns:

First, the horse idea needs more thought. I am not sure if horses would be allowed in the winter. Equestrian use occurs in the winter throughout much of Alaska, and certainly in the Mat-Su, and much damage to trails can result. I think that horses should be prohibited in winter because they posthole, ruining the trail for skiers and mushers. Also, passing horses with a dog team (or vice versa) is difficult and dangerous. To prevent potentially serious user conflicts, the new Plan should prohibit equestrian use in the snow months.

I do not know what a Class 3 trail is, but, as with most trails, it is likely to be soft during breakup as the soils thaw out. Horses should be prohibited on NLSRA trails during breakup as should bicycles.

Also, if use on the trail becomes heavy, such that user conflicts arise or resource damage occurs, the new Plan should clearly state DPOR's authority to step in and appropriately resolve the situation, including capping or prohibiting certain uses if necessary.

As with all trails, there should be a trailhead kiosk that provides the "rules of the trail," including trail etiquette.

Developed Parking Areas

I support a modified Alternative 1. The new parking areas are predicated on the opening of the Lynx Lake Road to vehicle use by the general public. It follows, if the new Plan limits vehicular use of Lynx Lake Road to private property owners only, that the new parking areas are not needed. They should therefore be removed from the new Plan. The PMRs provide for far too much parking, with correspondingly large impacts on the natural resources of the NLSRA and the quality of the backcountry experience of other users.

I have canoed length of Lynx Lake, and although the lake has private cabins, my experience was not significantly impaired. 66 new parking spaces in the vicinity of

Lynx Lake is significant, and would be accompanied by motorized use of the lake. Unrestricted motorized use on the lake would dominate existing use. Canoeing Lynx Lake would potentially become an unpleasant experience, something to endure rather than to enjoy.

Boat moorage and private storage

I support a modified Alternative 1.

First, a question on page 15 of document 2 states "Access to private properties would be maintained; however, the method of access would change - i.e. access on Butterfly Lake Trail would be restricted to pack and saddle, bicycle, or pedestrian." If access to private property on Butterfly Lake is by "pack and saddle," where do the horses hang out while the property owner is visiting his/her property? The horses would have to go back to where they came from, stay at the moorage/private storage area, or be taken to the private property owner's property either by some sort of barge or over public and/or private land.

DPOR should reconsider its proposal to continue to allow private storage at Butterfly Lake. My fundamental concern is that since access was not originally intended to be through the Butterfly Lake trail, why is private storage considered legitimate? Given that Alternative 1 defines "'beyond' NLSRA" as those parcels that are inholdings or are contiguous with the NLSRA boundary on Skeetna and Butterfly Lake, would the storage permission be limited to folks owning those parcels? Is there any limitation to the number of parcels or the extent of the materials allowed to be stored? What is there to prevent continuation of the huge mess and shore erosion that is occurring now? It seems to me that by allowing private storage in this place, DPOR would be setting it up for a serious management problems in the future. I recommend that DPOR disallow private storage at Butterfly Lake.

Should DPOR choose to proceed with its proposed permission for private storage, it must have a mechanism in place for limiting the number of parcels involved to a manageable and appropriate number, it must limit the materials each property owner to a limited space, it must have a practical method of monitoring and enforcing the rules.

In addition, I have the same concerns about private storage at Butterfly Lake as I have discussed above under Property Storage and Boat Moorage at Red Shirt Lake, namely safe fuel storage, bear issues, protect the shoreline, and the need to state unequivocally in the new plan that DPOR has the authority to revoke a storage permit at its sole discretion at any time for any reason.

The Lynx Lake portion of this section is predicated on allowing vehicular access by the general public. It follows that the new boat launch development is not needed.

Conclusion

Alternative 1 is a reasonable start in providing appropriate management policy and guidance. Alternative 1 is the only alternative that is basically consistent with the purposes for which the NLSRA was established, how it is used by the recreating public, and (according to 2010 update number 2 "2010questionsummary") what the public likes and dislikes most about the NLSRA. None of the other alternatives are appropriate for the NLSRA, and should not be considered.

Alternative 1, however isn't perfect, and I recommend that it be modified as detailed within this comment letter.

Particular attention should be directed to my comments on the proposed opening of Lynx Lake Road to vehicular use by the general public. This would be a dramatic change with significant adverse impact, especially if the lake was not designated as non-motorized. The Proposed Management Recommendations and Alternatives documents do not discuss the adverse impacts of this action, nor do they explain the rationale for the proposal in light of public preferences to the contrary. I expect that if DPOR fully (and objectively) takes a hard look at this proposal, it would realize that it is bad policy and abandon the idea.

I also hope that this new Plan lays a solid foundation for the effective management of NLSRA, such that the problems of the past do not recur. This means, among other things, employing a permitting system that works and establishing an effective mechanism for monitoring and enforcement. DPOR should ensure that this occurs, such that everyone plays by the rules and small problems do not become large and unmanageable..

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Comment 86 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To Whom it may concern:

The Nancy Lake Recreation Area currently offers a variety of outdoor experience opportunities for all. This includes the following:

- High impact areas like Nancy Lake for the high action crowd,
- A large public campground on South Rolly Lake for those who like to drive to their get away destination, and
- The Nancy Lake canoe trail system for those who enjoy the peacefulness of being with nature.

- o The general public uses the canoe trail system to access lakes that are not on the public road system.

- o Accessing these lakes via the canoe trail system provides a peaceful experience that often includes encountering moose, loons, grebes, eagles, muskrat, beavers, otters, swans, and the list goes on.

- o The Nancy Lake Canoe system is one of Southcentral Alaska s greatest treasures.

* This summer we met a couple who annually rent a public use cabin on Lynx Lake just for the remote experience.

The Nancy Lake canoe trail system currently provides access (via boat) to Lynx Lake for the general public. Opening Lynx Lake Road to the general public will change the current experience people get from the canoe trail.

- Installation of a parking lot on Lynx Lake to provide the general public with driving access to the middle of this system disrupts the entire experience people are trying to obtain when using the trail system.

- Increased traffic and boat use on Lynx Lake will bring noise, litter, and damage the fragile ecosystem of the area.
- With increased highway vehicle access will come increased camping in non-designated camp sites.
- Non-designated campsites will result in increased fire danger as well as unauthorized latrine areas. Lynx Lake experienced this (overnight camping with fire ring) on Blueberry Island already this summer.

We recommend the following for preserving the nature of the canoe trail system, including Lynx Lake:

Lynx Lake Road:

- Preferred: Keep the road as is with the gate remaining at the current location.
- Option 1: Move the gate to provide public access to the Chicken Lake trail.
- Develop a small (5 car) parking lot for those wishing to use the Chicken Lake trail to access the canoe trail.

Lynx Lake boat launch:

- Don't open the road to provide general public access to the boat launch. The public can access Lynx Lake for boating through the canoe trail.
- Continue to allow inholders to launch and moor their boats (without fuel containers) at the current boat launch. Several inholders cannot drive to their property and must transport families, pets, and gear to their cabins by boat.
- Continue to allow inholders to use motorized boats on Lynx Lake.

Suggestions for further development in the Nancy Lake Recreation Area

The Nancy Lake Parkway provides the best access to the recreation area, and this is the area where further development should be concentrated:

- It would be a huge cost savings to develop and promote the use of areas along the Parkway than it would be to upgrade the existing Lynx Lake Road for general public access.
- Improve and promote day use areas and access to North Rolly and Rhein Lakes. Both of these lakes are stocked with rainbow trout for angling pleasure from boats or shore.
- If the goal is to increase usage of the canoe trail system, install and maintain more authorized campsites along the entire trail system with latrines, developed fire rings, tent sites, and bear proof containers for storing food.

The Nancy Lake Recreation area canoe trail system provides quiet access to one of the greatest jewels of Southcentral Alaska. Development that promotes high impact on the system will have irreversible negative impacts on that area.

Thank you for taking time to review these comments. If you have any questions about these comments, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely

Comment 87 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

I have been a user of the Nancy Lake State Rec Area for over twenty years. This area is non-motorized in summer and should continue to be designated non-motorized in summer. State Parks made a mistake when they issued permits to allow ATV use by people who own property beyond the Nancy Lake boundary. These ATVs have already caused damage, and permitting some ATV use just invites requests for additional ATV use and makes it difficult to enforce the rules.

There are always access issues with remote parcels in Alaska, and people know that when they purchase land in the backcountry. Alaska State Parks is not obligated to provide easy access to people who own land adjacent to or near lands managed by State Parks, and State Parks should not allow park and recreation area lands to be derogated in order to give people easy access. State Parks has an obligation to protect the resources of the parks and recreation areas for the people of Alaska. State Parks does not have an obligation to provide access through the park.

Many of the problems and unreasonable demands for NLSRA are due to the fact that State Parks did not adequately enforce its own rules and regulations. It is absolutely imperative that this plan includes enforceable provisions and that State Parks then enforce them.

In general, I support Alternative 1, but with some revisions. ATVs should not be allowed in the NLSRA - ever! ATV access should not be permitted and infrastructure that would facilitate ATV access should not be built.

Furthermore, the trail should remain a canoe trail in summer. I do not support the idea of allowing horses on the trail. Horses are incompatible with other users in both summer and winter, and equestrian use destroys trails unless those trails are fortified to take horse travel. If horses are to be allowed, there must be provisions to design and construct separate horse trails. Bicycle use can also be a problem on trails that are not designed and built to handle them. The plan should allow State Parks to close trails to bicycle use at times when they will damage the trail, such as during break-up or after heavy rains.

The Lynx Lake Road should not be opened to the general public. Doing so would make enforcement of non-motorized regulations impossible. Thus, there is no need for a new parking lot on Lynx Lake Road, and the parking lot should be removed from the plan.

Docks on the lakes need to be small and unobtrusive. Each property should be limited to one dock. Docks should be no larger than 200 square feet, one story, and not enclosed (e.g., not turned into boat houses.) Existing structures should not be grandfathered in. Each nonconforming existing structure should be reviewed by State Parks and the owner required to make modifications to conform to the rules that were in place when the structure was built. If the owner had applied for the required permit, these structures would be in compliance. It is not the public's fault that the owner did not get the required permit; therefore, it is the property owner, not the public who should pay the price.

The plan should list and require best management practices to protect the lake and lake shores from erosion, fuel spills, bear break-ins, etc.

I appreciate this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely

Comment 88 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

ATV use should not be allowed in NLSRA. They have never been allowed for use by the general public and their use by private property owners in and adjacent to the park has only been allowed by permit in the past few years. They have not been a traditional use that should be grandfathered in - it is only in the past few years that their use has been widely permitted. I have been visiting Butterfly Lake for the past 30 years and never saw an ATV or ATV tracks until the past few years. Indeed the only user I am aware of before Parks started permitting their use was ticketed by rangers and had his machine disabled by them.

ATV use is contrary to the natural values promoted by the establishment of the rec area. NLSRA is best known for its hiking and canoe trail system, which would be severely compromised by summertime motorized vehicle traffic. The hiking trail from Lynx Lake to Butterfly has been severely degraded by ATVs in the past few years making foot travel much more difficult. The solution is not to upgrade the trail to support motorized traffic but simply to prohibit it, like it traditionally was.

The use of ATVs on the trail has led to the summertime transport of building materials and large quantities of fuel. Almost all of the cabins in the area were built prior to the wide-scale issuance of ATV permits. Materials and fuel were traditionally hauled out in winter when the chance of damage to the trails and lakes was minimized. This is how remote cabins are built all over Alaska. It is only a matter of time before a barge laden with drums of gasoline or fuel oil capsizes and severely pollutes Butterfly Lake, destroying fish and waterfowl habitat.

Allowing even limited, permitted ATV use in NLSRA will lead to greater ATV access by the general public seeking "equal access" to public lands, causing greater degradation to the terrain and "natural" experience. Motorized summer access to Butterfly will allow easier access to non-property owners for the purpose of thievery and vandalism. State Parks cannot adequately police current regulations; Why should we believe that rangers will be able to keep NLSRA free from widespread recreational use of ATVs?

I bought my property on Butterfly Lake because, although close to the road system, it was in NLSRA and thus (I thought) assured of being kept free of yahoos on their motorized toys.

The current document lists 4 alternatives - ALL of which propose increasing access to Lynx Lake and beyond. When asked why none of the alternatives consider leaving things the way they are, we were told in the public meeting that that was an assumed alternative. That is certainly not clear from the document. If true, it should be explicitly presented that way, as a fifth, "do nothing" alternative. I see no compelling reason to increase access to the general public - by removing the Lynx Lake gate, by increasing public parking, or by other means. It appears that State Parks is attempting to turn NLSRA into another Big Lake. There are plenty of

motorized recreational opportunities within the Mat-Su but fewer and fewer "natural" experiences available. Isn't that what we set aside Parks and Rec Areas for?

Better road access within NLSRA is going to foster day-users dragging in ATVs and power boats to recreate with. It would make sense to prohibit not only ATVs but Jet Skis too. And serious consideration should be given to a limit on boat motor horsepower (perhaps even an all-out ban on motorized boats). These may not be a problem now but will be with increased public access.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hope I am mistaken to believe that you have already decided which way this process is headed.

Comment 89 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

do not allow atv use in the park-
keep the quiet for canoers and hikers.

i have enjoyed the park since the early eighties, as it has been- motor free and atv free --and a trail that was walkable- not ditched and smashed as it is now- get a backbone and do your job- protect the park!!!

Comment 90 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

The NLSRA south of Willow is a wonderful canoe loop that weaves through 17 lakes and ties into the Little Su. It was designated and has long been non-motorized in summer (snow machines are allowed when winter snow cover is adequate). I have navigated this trail by canoe-- it is wonderful, beautiful, and a great trail for non-motorized canoes, hikers, etc. ATV use in summer causes serious and permanent damage.

Please-- NO ATV's. We once rented a cabin at Nancy Lake, many years back. We HIKED in and we HIKED out. It is not necessary to use summer motor-vehicles on the trails.

Again-- please, NO ATVs in summer on this great canoe trail.

Comment 91 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Require only DOT, CARB, or no-spill containers be used for fueling gasoline to eliminate or reduce fuel spills; regular Jerry cans will not do. Allow lakeside fuel delivery service, commercial or coop to reduce fuel spills and increase convenience. The State can ask for help in monitoring lake parameters, levels, temps, DO, PH. and ice depth in winter. Have a well defined method of obtaining a dock permit; state if F&G permits are also required; state if dock permit numbers are required. Owner's name or permit numbers should be on all docks, so floating derelicts can be identified and returned for the owners' disposal. Encourage State Grooming help on a winter lake trail. Fish runs historically were huge; the management plan should have a plan for developing the stocks. The Park should be a good neighbor and notify those who encroach on the public land setbacks. Record a document with the Recorder Office if continued no-compliance. Enforce Quiet hours. Make it clear that permits are required for heavy equipment working on winter ice. Dock permittees should provide a level of proof that they are the upland land owner (someone built in front of my lot! Now it is my dock.) The portion of the creek outlet from our Lake should be included in the river management plan, or in the Park plan.

Recommend option #1 on Lynx Lake Rd: Leave it alone.

Flotation for docks shall not be composed of foam unless it is commercially encapsulated or encapsulated with concrete; 'peel and stick' foam coverings are not acceptable.

Docking structures must be located at least 20 feet from the abutting property line or the imaginary extension thereof into the water. Location of a docking structure closer than 20 feet to abutting property line is allowed if written, notarized concurrence is obtained from the affected abutter(s). One Dock structure per frontage.

Define Boat slips: A "boat slip" is defined as a space 25 feet of length by 8 feet of width along a structure to which a vessel can be secured. The number of allowable slips equals two slips for the first 75 feet of shoreline frontage plus one boat slip for each additional 75 feet of frontage. Length of frontage is an average of two distances: the linear (natural navigable) frontage and distance measured pin-to-pin across the water side of the property. (NH)

Allow for no-cost group recreational gatherings.

Additional recognition of the historic basis of the area and road should be acknowledged.

Alternative 1 for the road is my preferred choice.

Comment 92 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To whom it may concern,

I believe the Nancy Lake Canoe trail should not become an ATV trail. They are a terrible mode of transport over the landscape and not necessary.

Comment 93 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's. PUH-LEEZ.

Thank you

Comment 94 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

To whom may concern,

I have looked over the alternatives that you have provided.

I may say that there are some good ideas and some that are not so good, here are our thoughts.

We are for:

1. Limited upgrade for Lynx Lake Rd up to the gate only.
2. Increasing parking at the gate.
3. Leave the gate where it is.

4. Adding several more rental cabins Lynx, Duck, Candlestick, Chicken, Butterfly, Skeetna, lakes and etc.
5. Fix up the old cabin at Candlestick Lake.
6. Improve portage trail maybe some camp sites.
7. Property owner access with ATVS only.
8. Property owners to work with park service to improve trail to Butterfly Lake at for the most part at land owners cost. Regarding run off, drainage, parking at Butterfly, improving surface of the trail, boat launch areas and shore line issues.

We are opposed to:

1. Spending many millions of dollars to put a road in to Butterfly.

To construct a road in the wet lands if not allowed to go through the Church of Christ property. We are very much opposed to this idea!

2. Denying ATV access for property owners in the park.

Sincerely

Comment 95 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Hello Planners,

I would like to keep the Nancy Lakes canoe trails just that: canoe trails. Please do not continue to allow any ATVs. I live in the area and love to visit this wonderful and accessible recreation area.

Comment 96 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Dear Planners:

Here is my comment about the Recommendations and Alternatives Documents for NLSRA:

Keep it a canoe trail in summer and do not allow ATV's there during the summer.

Thank you

Comment 97 of 97 - submitted on 08/31/2012 at 12:00 AM:

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on your proposals. I have been a user of the park for over 33 years as a canoeist, bow hunter, fisherman, and skier. I have snow machined and mushed dogs there. My wife and I purchased an inholding at Skeetna Lake back in 1983. The area was set aside as a recreation area because the majority of the state's population can access a beautiful, quiet chain of lakes in summer to fish, canoe, and camp only an hour or two from home. While Anchorage and especially the Mat-Su Borough have changed tremendously since the park was created, NLSRA thankfully has not until the past 10 years.

In 2000, management policy changed to allow motorized access to inholders and others living outside the park. A subset of the still-limited number of permit holders - 31 property owners with 131 keys - have managed to create havoc with their use of motorized vehicles, storage of boats on state property, degradation of the park's habitat and ambiance, and resulting user conflicts. Your document correctly

recognizes that the cry for more of this kind of access will increase, perhaps exponentially; thus the hard look at options for the future in the public planning process. I appreciate your tackling the issues of dockage and other structures, but the major changes to the park will result from your proposals to deal with access issues to Lynx Lake, Butterfly Lake, and beyond. I will limit my comments to my concerns with your four proposals, and then provide a fifth alternative that I think better serves the recreation area and the public, and is more in line with your management objectives and guiding principles.

You state two guiding principles on page 14 of Document 2: parity and providing the minimal development necessary. Who can argue with fairness? As to keeping development minimal, we all know how difficult it is to get money for infrastructure, not to mention maintenance. Limited development is a virtue when spending public funds.

However, more important than these principles is the purpose of the recreation area that the principles seek to support: provide a maximum level of outdoor recreation opportunities based on the natural values of the unit and its ability to sustain use without significant adverse effects on natural systems. (Alaska State Park System: Statewide Framework 1982). To continue from the document: The management of a state recreation area allows for carefully planned and controlled resource modification to enhance outdoor recreational opportunities as long as the intensity of modification does not diminish the unit's natural and cultural values. (Emphasis is mine.)

These are clear criteria for objectives for evaluating the four alternatives: To have planned, controlled modifications [to management] that don't adversely affect natural systems or values, and which adhere to the principles of fairness and limited development. How do the alternative measure up?

Lynx Lake Road

All four alternatives provide unrestricted access to Lynx Lake on the existing road. This recommendation seems to be based on the principle of fairness—eliminating a privileged class of "inholders" who have private access to the park's center. However, the repercussions of unrestricted access at Lynx Lake are enormous.

1. Cost of upgrading/maintaining the road. Even "minimally maintaining" the road (Alternatives 1 and 2) is a huge undertaking on a road that is barely one lane wide at present. Making and maintaining a "standard road" (Alternatives 3 and 4) would cost millions. You are violating your second principal (limited development) to support your first (fairness).

2. Impacts to Lynx Lake and its users. Unrestricted access to Lynx Lake would generate an enormous increase in motorized recreation on the relatively small lake. I have been the chain more than one hundred times and, except for water skiing at the church came on a couple of occasions, have always found the lake serene and motor-free. That would all change. Even a handful of additional power boaters (or jet skiers) would completely alter the natural values of this lake. How many boaters can the nesting loons or grebes tolerate? How much fishing pressure can the lake handle? Who will regulate how many boaters are too many? Lynx integral in the chain of lakes trail system: canoeists and campers will find themselves at a crowded,

noisy lake in the middle of their quiet recreational experience, an unavoidable user conflict if the road is opened up.

3. Management. Unlimited access leads to unlimited management problems. Who will control the boat numbers, boat speeds, horsepower, trash, vandalism, and user conflicts? How? More staffing? More planning meetings?

The proposal of unlimited access on Lynx Lake Road seems to be driven by a management concern to be "fair," not by public outcry demanding access to the lake. But the proposal is not fair - not to Lynx's wildlife, not to Lynx property owners, and not to the park's non-motorized recreationalists. It completely fails the cost principal, and most importantly, it violates the park's overriding purpose: to sustain recreational opportunities based on natural values without significant adverse effects on the system. Leave the unrestricted public power boating access to Big Lake.

Butterfly Lake Trail

All four alternatives entail major rerouting and upgrading of the trail the Class 3 trail in Alternative 1 to the 24' road all the way to Butterfly in Alternative 4. Like the Lynx Lake Road recommendations, this one varies from costly to prohibitively expensive. All of them include the big-budget Butterfly Lake Access Reroute. Most worrisome is that Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 allow unrestricted motorized access along this route to Butterfly Lake. Inasmuch as this planning process has been precipitated by problems caused by motorized use of the existing Butterfly Lake "trail" by just a couple dozen, recently-allowed permit holders, what will happen to the park with unrestricted uncontrolled access? Recall that the overriding objective for the area is to provide recreation based on the park's natural values without causing adverse impacts. Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 so obviously fail this standard that they can't be considered seriously. The two guiding principles are violated as well: the proposed costly trail upgrades, construction and rerouting are the antithesis of limited development, and the proposal is not fair to the public that has long-used the park: those looking for a quiet place to camp, boat, fish, and enjoy nature.

Alternative 1 is the only alternative that doesn't degrade the park with unrestricted ATV use. However, the propose Butter Lake Reroute trail is a significantly longer and more expensive trail than the one that currently exists. Why is it necessary? The Echo Ponds are one of the most sublime sections of the entire canoe trail, and you propose to put a bridge over the middle of them? And who is this new trail for?

My Preferred Alternative

This alternative is superior to the four you suggested because it follows the park's management objectives and two guiding principles, and it can be implemented without a huge increase in the budget. In addition, it addresses the user conflicts that began in 2000 when ATV access in and through the park was permitted.

1. Lynx Lake Road Access: Since the park owes no access rights to anyone outside or contiguous to the park, eliminate all passes and keys to everyone unless they have property that is totally inside the park boundaries. The only remaining inholders in this area include those on Lynx Lake, a few on Butterfly Lake and one property on Skeetna Lake (mine). The Lynx Lake Road is to remain gated at the park boundary.

2. Purchasing inholdings: The park should purchase the Skeetna and Butterfly Lake inholdings as they become available. I will sell mine (Skeetna) right now; I can't speak for the Butterfly owners.
3. ATV use: No ATV use is allowed in the NLSRA. Mitigation actions should be undertaken to restore the Butterfly Lake trail and make it a useable walking trail.
4. Boat storage on Butterfly Lake: Limit storage to canoes only. Canoes can be pulled up on shore and ideally stored in an area in the woods that is not visible to the public. Spaces could be leased for a reasonable annual fee. Landholders could then canoe to their properties where any motorized boats can be stored (since they are allowed on this lake).

Advantages of my Preferred Alternative

1. Parity (fairness): ALL park users access the park the same way: The Nancy Lake Parkway or the Little Susitna River. The only exceptions are those limited few with inholdings on Lynx Lake whose properties were privatized before the park existed and who built the road (no one can argue with the fairness of their continued use of that road). The other technical (totally within the NLSRA boundaries) inholdings in this part of the park (Butterfly and Skeetna) become part of the park, as they should be, with the state's goal of purchasing them. Park managers will not have to deal with pressure from increasing numbers of people wanting access as lots are subdivided outside the park boundary in the future - as they would have to with all the other alternatives.
2. Cost: The cost of this alternative is extremely low. It is limited to mitigating impacts to the Butterfly Lake trail (which has to be done in any case) and purchasing a few properties on Butterfly and Skeetna Lakes. At least two of the properties have cabins that potentially enhance the park's recreational opportunities (the other alternatives include building new cabins; here are two already constructed). In addition, there are no roads, parking lots or trails to build and maintain.
3. Management: This alternative eliminates the plethora of future management headaches involved in opening up Lynx Lake Road and a trail to Butterfly. It eliminates present user conflicts and the increasing degradation caused by ATV use. Finally, it is the ONLY alternative that meets the criteria of the purpose and development guidelines in the State Parks' "Statewide Framework" publication. It enhances the recreational opportunities, sustainably, and with fewer adverse impacts on the resource than the park presently deals with. It is the only alternative that doesn't diminish the natural values of the recreational area. It treats all users equally. And it requires very little additional funding. Thus it is the only alternative that is immediately workable.

The managers of NLSRA have a huge responsibility in protecting a very special area for the public to enjoy in perpetuity. The growth in the surrounding area in the past thirty years is a harbinger of the pressures that will be put on this park in the future. Your responsibility to future generations calls for a conservative approach to managing this area, placing the preservation of the natural resource as a first priority. The current problems that resulted from ignoring this guideline -- and giving certain parties ATV access into and across the park - can be solved, using fairness and prudence. Unfortunately, the suggested alternatives would exacerbate

impacts to the park's natural character, and they are too costly to implement, at least with the current state of funding. Please consider my suggested alternative as a solution that is workable.