

Fish and Numbered Lakes Management Plans

Table of Public Comments Regarding the *Issues and Preliminary Recommendations* (March 2006 draft)

Notes: The table is organized by name of commenter. Column 3 records explicitly-stated statements of support or opposition to the overall draft or its goals. "N.C." in Column 3 means the commenter did not specifically state their position to the overall draft. In most cases their views can be inferred, but we didn't want to make assumptions.

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Ambrose, Robert		Favor	Non-motorized		Development pressures all around make these parcels most valuable in their natural state Talkeetna is defined by closeness to wilderness Motorized impacts on the environment is dramatic everywhere they are able to access. Motorized users have vast terrain is accessible by road for these mechanized pursuits, there is no justification for allowing these activities in environmentally delicate parks in residential neighborhoods.
Benischek, Ross	4-20	Favor	Non-motorized		Numbered Lakes wetlands and open water vulnerable to damage by motor vehicles. The numbered Lakes area should be conserved for later generations to enjoy as a nature experience. When all the roads are paved, when the Knik Arm Crossing and a high speed rail line connects to Anchorage, all residents of this area will be thankful to be able to experience nature so close to their home and town.
Benjamin, Aaron	4-12	Oppose	Motorized		This land should not be locked up for "special interest groups" but kept open for all users as it has been historically. There are enough non-motor areas.
Birdsall, Cary	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized	Numbered Lakes kept as natural as possible	No motorized or commercial interests. Moose, bears need an intact refuge amid increasing development. Majority in Talkeetna value preservation and are not speculative developers
Blumner, Zach	4-17	Favor	Non-motorized	Keep pristine, quiet	Prohibit motorized vehicles to minimize environ-motorized degradation Valuable for bears, loons Conscientious stewardship of unspoiled lands such as these is our duty... to creating a legacy for our descendants
Bonnett, Brendan	4-12	N.C.	Non-motorized		Motorized users have proven themselves incompatible with all other interests, just too big an impact.
Borge, Joyce	4-13	N.C.			Serve community not just area property owners Serve long-term future, serve youths and adults; provide space to ride, walk, ski, boat, swim

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Brazeau, James	4-15	N.C.	Non-motorized		My students and children need a place to observe and study nature without the interference of motorized vehicles or a pack of horses led by commercial outfitters. There are enough other places for commercial use.
Brazeau, Melissa	4-15	Favor	Non-motorized	Limited public access; hiking and skiing trails	Managed as natural areas and designated as NON-MOTORIZED. As a Girl Scout leader...there is nothing more irritating than trying to teach the youth of our community about preserving and maintaining wild areas, only to witness four-wheeler tracks on top of smashed plant life and through sensitive steam beds.
Brazeau, Sydney	4-15	N.C.	Non-motorized		Motorized vehicles are a hazard to trail users, cause exhaust, and damage the natural habitat.
Brock, Deborah	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized	Allow places/features to be discovered	Recreational snowmobiling and the concept of a natural area are the antithesis of each other. In both parcels, there is too little historical motorized use for anyone to argue that their form of recreation is being taken from them. No commercial use. Commercial activity would create instant and intense "demand". This is not consistent with the goals for the area. Permit holders should be should be required to build the trails BEFORE bringing in groups of people. <i>Could</i> support visits by local school classes or Community Enrichment classes, and the activities of local youth groups.
Burgett, Caroline	4-17	Favor	Non-motorized		Increasing population puts pressure on fish and wildlife habitat. Maintain and manage nature's sanctuary for human recreation enjoyment. No commercial or motorized use.
Burr, Jenni	4-13	N.C.	Work out a solution for motorized users.		Marginalizing certain user groups by saying their activity will not be allowed in any of our parks only serves as a divisive FORCE. Snowmachine prohibition is not enforceable; therefore not effective. Be creative and meet all recreation users' needs. Seek all opinions.
Butler, Randy and Donna	4-13	N.C.			Question Lake: public access would jeopardize our security, peace and quiet and the right to the enjoyment of our property. Borough parcel does not abut the Spur Road.

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Carbone, Howard & Noelle	4-19	Favor	Non-motorized except on corridors to reach private land on a permit basis	Commercial use should be allowed but not involve any structures except trails.	<p>The intrusive noise, pollution, tracks, and the motorized vehicles themselves would disturb wildlife and impact the ecology of the area. This would violate three of the four main community goals of this plan.</p> <p>Almost the entire Upper Susitna area is open to motorized use, so there are plenty of other areas to go, many of which are more conducive and less sensitive to motorized use.</p> <p>Limited, responsible commercial use of these parks is consistent with the Talkeetna Comprehensive Plan, to maintain Talkeetna's economic base of recreation and ecologically sound tourism. (Nine points for responsible commercial operations are detailed in this letter).</p> <p>There is no other place for small-group eco-tourism activities in the Talkeetna area; all the area's trails are muddy, multi-use trails, or lead to private property.</p> <p>A reasonable amount of commercial use can help to "sell the plan" to borough. If it is too restrictive, the plan may not pass at all.</p>
Correira, Linda	4-17	N.C.			<p>Surprised at some of the restrictions being proposed.</p> <p>With as much land in the Fish and Number Lakes area I would think that we could accommodate a diversity of community recreation without harming much of the environment.</p>
Correira, Bill	4-13	N.C.		In general: groomed ski trails, parking areas, legal access	<p>Preschoolers need playgrounds</p> <p>Youth need sites for skiing, skateboard, ATV/dirt bikes</p> <p>Seniors need walking trails with benches</p> <p>Neighbors' meetings are useful</p>
Correira, Bill 2 nd comment	4-17	N.C.			<p>Include a diversity of recreational interests.</p> <p>The neighborhood needs more time and facts to consider the options.</p>
Correira, L	4-13	N.C.		In general: various facilities for diverse users	Benches and trails for seniors; wooded areas for skiers, walkers; safe motorized rec areas; family camping areas protected wildlife areas
Curtis Lisa	4-13	N.C.		See note at right	In general: peaceful, pristine natural areas as well as a designated trail system and parking
Ebling, Elinore 1 st comments	4-13	N.C.		In general: keep portions natural, improve portions to meet all users needs	Community needs easy trails for seniors, horse trails, canoeing, snowmachining, hunt/trap, snowboarding, dirt bikes

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Ebling, Elinore 2 nd comments		N.C.	Allow motorized if needed for hunting & trapping	Trails for senior population	Access to Question Lake should be part of this plan, not delayed
Ernst, Rick	4-18	N.C.	Non-motorized		Multi-use Borough trail on Comsat road didn't work. We have enough room in our Borough to support separated trails for all these user groups. Need to ensure quiet places.
Esther, Linda	4-18	N.C.	Non-motorized		I strongly support management goals that will designate these spaces Natural Areas, FOREVER. I request that this designation of the Fish Lake and Numbered Lakes areas explicitly EXCLUDE the use of motorized vehicles-at all times of year, as well as any kind of commercial activity. There are so few places similarly protected in this area.
Foster, Peg and Kevin	4-13	N.C.	Non-motorized	Fish Lake; continue current access as long as possible; limited development; no trails Question Lake: no access Numbered Lakes: no access or facilities	Keep these areas as they are: no signage, quiet, undeveloped, natural. Surrounding development increase their value in natural state. Snowmachiners have many other areas.
FitzGerald, Billy	4-20	Favor	Non-motorized		Motorized travel corridors can serve multi-uses better than motorized destination areas: e.g., the Ridge trail in Larsen Lake area handles both. If the Numbered Lakes area were to be opened to ATV's and snowmachines it would become a destination for these users and would destroy the area for all other users and, more importantly, it's value as habitat for wildlife and it's nature as a pristine watershed.
Fleming, Cheri	4-19	Favor	Non-motorized		The opportunities for snowmachines in Talkeetna are nearly unlimited. Would like quiet, safe place for non-motorized.
Fleming, Kathleen	4-19	Favor	Non-motorized	No facilities at Numbered Lakes	Fish Lake: access from Spur Road not from north Numbered Lakes: no set ski tracks, no grooming, no snowmachines at all, no altering of the land or flora to accommodate people. It is such a joy to be out...on a voyage of discovery, finding magical spots on your own, not guided by a trail. As far as commercial use on either of these parks, I see no problem with small guided groups (5 person maximum).

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Fortunoff, Laurel	4-18	N.C.	Non-motorized		NON motorized areas to protect the natural wildlife habitat. No commercial activity.
Frier, Teresa	4-14	N.C.	Motorized: but okay to restrict it during low snow		This is not an area that non residents would find desirable as a snow-machining destination. Shouldn't local management plans benefit the largest segments of the local population when it does not harm the "natural setting"?...and not [just serve] the few property owners who would like a larger "off limits" backyard?
Golton, Anita,	4-17	Favor	Non-motorized; travel corridors not desirable	As few facilities as possible	Snowmachines & ATVs don't respect the non-motorized areas at XYZ and use them anyway. There are many private properties without road or trail access in Alaska and creating roadways for motorized traffic to reach only a few parcels seems excessive and would enable abusers of such trails access to easily reach an area that could otherwise remain pristine.
Golton, Esther		N.C.	Non-motorized		Leave Question and Numbered Lakes as pristine as possible
Gould, Melanie	4-19	Favor	Non-motorized	no commercial activity	This community is all for keeping the few remaining wild places wild
Grula, Bette	4-16	Favor	Non-motorized		Designate non-motorized and non-commercial Protect habitat; manage as "wilderness"
Hackley, Pat & Kenworth, Jamie		N.C.	Non-motorized		I agree with the non-motorized, low impact plan for this area. Also, no hunting or trapping
Hamler, Tami	4-12	N.C.	Non-motorized		Quiet is valuable and increasingly rare
Harrell, Dave	4-16	N.C.	Non-motorized		Values quiet. there is a vast amount of terrain open to those who choose to use engines
Hayes, Amy	4-15	N.C.	Non-motorized		Would like to see the quality and diversity of the ski trail system improved for the benefit of the children Hard to escape snowmachine noise
Hogan, Brenda	4-13	N.C.		In general: parking areas, toilets, regular maintenance	We need designated trails for non-motorized activities separate from designated motorized areas

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Hudson, Chuck	4-21	N.C.	Motorized	<p>No trails at either Fish or Numbered Lakes: game trails let people get around.</p> <p>Public access to Question Lake with parking and a dock</p>	<p>If there is no parking, no facilities are needed. Phased approach to facilities.</p> <p>Create more parking close to the lake at Christensen Lake and Question Lake. Provide access for the disabled at these two lakes.</p> <p>Public meetings are uncomfortable because it stirs resentment among neighbors with opposing views.</p> <p>No more parks. Alaska has 9 million acres of National Parks locked up.</p>
Ickes, Jeanne	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized		<p>Next generation should have same quiet recreation and wildlife viewing opportunity at Numbered Lakes as my children have</p>
Johnston, Dave	4-20	N.C.	Non-motorized		<p>I can understand some neighbors wanting a local snowmachine area for their kids... But it's not hard to imagine family snowmachiners from Wasilla and Anchorage discovering the area. It could well become a destination, especially when snow is lacking in other places.</p> <p>And even if the area were only for locals, machines and times have changed significantly. With paddle tracks, tuned exhausts and huge engines, snowmachines have devolved from the old family pick-up to muscley dirt bikes. Kids don't just putt around exploring, as nearby families observed recently. Neighborhood kids made spaghetti tracks as statements to stake their claim.</p> <p>I've thought of options for compromise for user groups in the "Numbered Lakes" area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- a trail for local kids to reach less populated land further east -- designating some lakes for motorized use, others non-motorized -- time share (i.e. Tues, Thurs, Sat for motors, etc.) <p>But when the impact from one group (snowmachines) is so much greater than from others, it's difficult to envision successful compromise. Even snowmachiners find untrammelled snow, sparkling with diamonds, laced with animal tracks, more attractive than an area that has already been flattened (even if it's just to provide them with a clean blackboard to write on).</p>
Joplin, Jo	4-12				<p>Extend planning process to allow more comments from Chamber of Commerce members regarding how these parks can meet visitor needs.</p>
Juergens, Nancy	4-14		Non-motorized		<p>Non-motorized parkland is important as development increases.</p>

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
King, Gordon	4-13	N.C.		Fish Lake: if access to east end of lake is provided, keep trail 150 above waterline and terminate it at a viewing area, but don't have a launching point for any boats near the east end. Erect signs to keep people out of the inlet channel and marsh to help protect wildlife.	<p>There are no simple solutions to the complex problem of having unrestricted or even limited access to a fragile wildlife area. If preservation of the habitat is of paramount importance, as I believe it is, the only practical solution would be for the Borough to provide trail access on the north side of the lake and 150 ft. above the waterline that dead-ends at a wildlife viewing/observation area. The area must have time restrictions and shall not be an access point for launching any type of water craft.</p> <p>The 2 ½ acres of Borough land on the south shore is near swan nesting and eagle perching areas: would support a conservation easement on it.</p>
Kogl, Sandy	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized	<p>Minimal development of parking areas and access points when necessitated by demand.</p> <p>Numbered Lakes: no trails unless needed to protect resources.</p> <p>Fish Lake: trails should be minimally brushed/cut, mainly for skiers.</p>	<p>The spring-fed contained nature of Numbered Lakes is unique; has the potential for providing outstanding freshwater habitat for study and sustained enjoyment for future generations.</p> <p>Quiet recreation.</p> <p>Protect Numbered Lakes from human overuse. Exclude commercial use.</p> <p>Question Lake: lease a driveway on Borough land to landlocked property owner.</p>
Krepel, Mike and Jenny		N.C.	Motorized We don't mind motorized use if it kept away from quiet areas and activities.	Access not needed at this time Eventually develop recreation trails, camping, picnic areas, etc.	<p>We DO NOT want this park land designated "kept natural", if this meant we could not ever go back and add a playground, running trails or whatever. We would <u>eventually</u> like to add some designated use to this land. Ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Natural surface running trails, ski trails Walking trails - smooth surface for all abilities Camping, picnic areas Canoe trails Skateboard park Sledding hill, snowboard hill Basketball court

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Krueger, Steve	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized; claim of current use at Numbered Lakes is overstated	<p>Keep relatively undisturbed; no trails, trashcans or other facilities</p> <p>Bikes probably at Fish Lake, not Numbered</p> <p>No camping</p>	<p>Keep these parcels “below the radar.”</p> <p>Preserve the habitat features and wildlife that distinguish these lands amid surrounding development</p> <p>No commercial use: would saturate the area with nature lovers</p> <p>Numbered Lakes is not used by snowmachiners except a few neighbors. Snowmachiners failed to come to the public meetings.</p> <p>Numbered Lakes has potential for outdoor lab/educational site. Create/choose a non-profit ecological group to manage it, but Talkeetna Nordic Ski Club</p>
Larson, Karey	4-14	N.C.	Non-Motorized		<p>No motorized access, there are many places in Alaska and in the Talkeetna area where people can ride their snowmachines already. The whole river system, over to Trapper Creek to Petersville Road and all the way to the mountains and across Alaska.</p>
Loeb, Charlie	4-19	N.C.	<p>No ATVs in Numbered Lakes</p> <p>Status quo at Numbered Lakes: minimal motorized access</p>		<p>My mantra is "no new access without new management."</p> <p>Borough funding is unlikely, and the community generally isn't interested in building those things ourselves, so it seems that the Numbered Lakes will remain a de facto "natural area" regardless of what the plan says. it seems your project could resolve the Question Lake access issue and otherwise endorse the status quo (which is a natural area with minimal motorized access).</p> <p>Question Lake: It is important to have public access to the lake, but not until there are funds to maintain the area, enforce rules, keep it clean, etc. As the area becomes more populated, it would be a nice spot to have a playground, picnic area, and neighborhood community center, in addition to a canoe dock (no boat ramp).</p> <p>ATV use would be disastrous in the Numbered Lakes and should be specifically prohibited even if un-enforced.</p> <p>I do not see how this plan can be the venue for resolving motorized/non-motorized issues in the Numbered Lakes area, at least for snowmachines. Use is slight and the area is unlikely to become a destination (being small and mostly wooded). Given the distances that snowmachines travel, the community as a whole needs to come up with a transportation/recreation plan that provides for non-motorized/motorized transportation and recreation throughout the Talkeetna Community Council area.</p>

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Longo, Jerome	4-19	Favor	Non-motorized		
Mannix, Arthur	4-18	N.C.	Non-motorized	Cross country ski-trails	<p>Currently, in the Upper Susitna, motorized recreationists have literally hundreds of square miles of terrain more readily available to them than do non-motorized users. Local Parklands - which we are currently considering - are postage stamp-sized compared to the immensity of terrain open to snowmobiling.</p> <p>If these Parklands aren't designated as non-motorized, there will be little that distinguishes them from the other surrounding lands.</p> <p>Through my own experience, in 28 years of living here, I feel that trail development, coupled with a non-motorized designation, is the most effective way to utilize these Parklands while protecting their uniqueness.</p>
Mannix, Chris	4-19	Favor	Non-motorized Except for authorized use for maintenance & construction	<p>Parking at Fish Lake; A small parking lot (5-6 cars?) should be built when trail development occurs on the Fish Lake parcel.</p> <p>Trails at Fish Lake; adopt trail standards and develop a trail system as resources allow. Minimal other facilities</p> <p>Trails at either location could be designed for bikes</p>	<p><u>Be consistent with Talkeetna Comp Plan Goals (p. vii):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) "To guide development in a manner which enhances Talkeetna's natural appeal" 2) "To protect and conserve the wilderness values and natural resources of the lands surrounding Talkeetna." 3) "To maintain Talkeetna's major recreation and ecologically sound tourism economy and avoid conflicting activities." <p><u>Trails at Fish Lake:</u> There is demand for more groomed ski trails but resources are stretched. In the interim, an "Oosik"-type trail - narrow, with minimal tree removal is a real possibility.</p> <p><u>Access and Trails at Numbered Lakes:</u> Build access only when needed to control environmental degradation or solve parking hassles. The demand for an intimate natural experience in the Numbered Lakes can be met with proper trail design whether done professionally or by trained volunteers. Trail design should meet "sustainability" standards (listed).</p> <p>There are other options for snowmachines: including Fish, Benka , Question and Christensen Lakes; and CC is working to preserve Talkeetna Loop Trail and trails to the east,</p> <p>Small-scale "eco-tourism" is appropriate for park lands in Talkeetna, including the Fish and Numbered Lakes parcels. It is in keeping with the stated goals of the TCP and could create businesses with a vested interest in keeping the park lands healthy.</p>
Mannix, Karen	4-19	N.C.	Non-motorized		There is PLENTY of motorized terrain, and less and less non-motorized. The areas set aside are very disproportionate in favor of motorized use; and unfortunately for considerate

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
					snowmachiners, the ones that ruin existing non-motorized trails taint the group at large. The nature of skiing in this area is to drive less and ski more...that's WHY people ski...these areas are close to Talkeetna (accessible).
Marble, Scott and Diane	4-11	N.C.	Non-motorized		Family values quiet, safe recreation separated from motorized use
Mason-Bouterse, Susan	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized		Snowmachine use (on Question and other lakes) has increased exponentially: hard to avoid them or the noise, tracks, etc. I believe it is our sacred charge as stewards of this incredible earth, to ensure that natural, non-commercialized areas remain and are protected.
Matthews, Mike 1 st comment	4-13	N.C.		In general: parking, trails for motorized rec;	Snowmachine trail network among neighborhoods. Parking for access will become more important.
Matthews, Mike 2 nd comment	4-18	N.C.	Motorized		We chose this community to live in so that we could enjoy the beautiful creation in respectful and unrestricted ways. We do not want to have to travel elsewhere just to recreate when we have been doing these things essentially in our backyards. This closing of the land into a park type restriction will greatly impact our family and their future families as well as many of our neighboring families. Some people seem to want to seal off a huge chunk of now public lands for a private sanctuary and buffer zone that would exclude the use of motorized access.
Matthews, Paxson	4-17	N.C.	Motorized		I had a blast snowmachining and sledding on the lake and swamp. Please don't take these lakes away from us.
McKelvey, Kate	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized		I support the goals expressed by our community at public meetings and in our Talkeetna Comprehensive Plan (to preserve natural setting & habitat and allow low-impact recreation) Non-motorized, no commercial
Mercer, Barbara	4-20	Favor	Non-motorized		I place a very high value on the peaceful and natural character of the Talkeetna area in general and specifically on the Fish and Numbered Lakes areas. No commercial.
Moore, Doug	4-04		Motorized; snowmachining at traditional levels	No winter parking; helps to limit use; Limited facilities: too expensive to maintain	The lack of access points and terrain naturally prohibits over-use of snowmobiles by non-locals. Parking areas should not be maintained for this area in winter. Traditional levels of snowmachining haven't created over-use.
Moore, Mike	4-18	N.C.	Motorized		The closing of this public land to motorized traffic only is completely one sided. Let us devise plans that take into consideration the rights of all potential users of this area, not just one user group with the intent of locking up as much land for their own interests as they can.

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Nelson, Cecilia	4-20	Favor	Non-motorized		We don't need anymore snowmachine trails. Non-motorized, no commercial.
O'Connor, Ed	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized		Unless non-motorized, these lands won't be distinguished as parkland.
Okenok, Brian	4-11		Non-motorized		All the details of management can be worked out over time if two primary actions are taken in this plan: Get them classified/designated as "Park" lands; Close them to motorized use.
Okenok, Brian	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized	<p>Fish Lake: parking near Spur Road on ROW, foot trail and foot bridge; Only a small, low profile dock to protect the shoreline from erosion where an access trail leads people to the lake; Keep trails away from sensitive wildlife areas;</p> <p>Numbered Lakes: no trails at this time; future trails for protection of habitat.</p>	<p>Fish Lake: supports realigning the ROW outside the park or along northern part taking topography into account.</p> <p>There is no good reason to allow for motorized use in either the Numbered Lakes area or the Fish Lake area. Both are too small, too close to neighborhoods and too sensitive to being harmed by motorized use.</p> <p>Number one priority at Numbered Lakes is habitat protection. At this time no formal trails. In the future narrow foot paths may have to be constructed to protect sensitive habitat as the area gets increased use. Wetlands that any trail crosses should have board walks and streams will need bridges. Trails should not be built to parallel lake shores or streams, but instead should be routed well back in the woods with side trails that lead to a lake shore or stream side for viewing. This would help protect birds from being disturbed and leave the creeks open for feeding bears.</p> <p>No fires or shooting or disruptive activities.</p>
Okenok, Diane	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized	<p>Fish Lake: parking near subdivision, A hardened foot trail and bridge across the creek and down to the lake would be appropriate. Ski and hiking trails.</p> <p>Numbered Lakes: see note at right</p>	<p>Fish Lake: the wetlands and drainage at the south end of fish lake should be closed to boat and walking traffic because of it critical and sensitive nesting area for swans and other birds. The present legal right of way through the park lands should be vacated and a well designed alternative route established.</p> <p>Numbered Lakes: 4-foot wide ski trail is acceptable, but "I also do not object to a "no established trails" rule." No motorized trails. No summer trails.</p> <p>Rules at Numbered Lakes No overnight camping, no horses, no bikes, no motorized boats or vehicles/ Protect this area as a natural views cape and sound scape and a place to enjoy the natural environment It is a fragile wetlands ecosystem that must be protected from overuse by people.</p>

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
					<p>Numbered Lakes: a 4 or 5 car parking area should be established first on the hilltop on Turner's road off of the Spur Road: Barge and the E. access should be undeveloped until the time it is needed. No established summer trails. A ski trail, 4 ft. wide, placed where it does not require tree cutting.</p>
Okenok, Jim	5-1	N.C.	Non-motorized	<p>Fish Lake: 50' x 50' area adjacent to lake to house an outhouse and perhaps sm. dock</p> <p>Numbered Lakes: ski trails and ski/foot path bridges over open water; trailhead parking in winter</p>	<p>Access at Fish Lake: best option is a road off the Spur Road at the NW that provides limited parking along its length and access to a foot trail that would lead to a spot on the lake where the public could access. There is no need for a "boat launch" at this time and the lake will soon have a "plan" limiting use to non powered boats only. Access by the public at the site south of the culvert will soon be limited to foot traffic only or cut off all together if use becomes objectionable. A public access point on the lake needs to be established.</p> <p>Lakefront Facilities Fish Lake: Only a brushed out area 50' X 50' adjacent to a suitable location on the lake at the end of a trail from the road access suggested above is needed. At this point only an outhouse and perhaps a small dock are needed.</p> <p>Trail at Fish Lake: Only the access trail is needed at this time. A recreational winter ski trail might be appropriate at some future time.</p> <p>Access to Question Lake: Leave it at that until there is a Lake Plan.</p> <p>Numbered Lakes Access: Only a winter ski trail is needed now, at some point an improved trail would be nice.</p> <p>Facilities at Numbered Lakes: Ski trail and foot path bridges will be needed, some trail head parking in winter especially.</p> <p>Trails at Numbered Lakes: Winter use by skiers would not require trail improvement except a bridge where there is open water at a couple locations, or so I expect.</p> <p>Rules at Numbered Lakes: Area really ought to be re-designated a preserve and most positively be NON-MOTORIZED. That means snow mobiles and 4 wheelers.</p> <p>Other Comments: Fish Lake "Park" area really ought to be protected rather than developed with even the most modest rec facilities, and the lake shore left untouched.</p>

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Ostermack, Rollie		Favor	Non-motorized		As the Talkeetna Comprehensive Plan suggests, we need to protect these areas both for their wildlife habitat and compatible recreational values now, while we still can.
Page, Joe	4-13	N.C.	Non-motorized		As a twenty-five year resident of Pilgrim's Pond (the large pond on the northern edge of the proposed Fish Lake Recreation area) I would report a profound lack of snow machine activity in this area. The Number Lakes area has also enjoyed a lack of snow machine traffic over the years. More pristine, this area has all the appropriate qualities for being a perfect "quiet refuge". Please keep it that way
Palmer, Caitlin	4-15	N.C.	Non-motorized		Maintain as much of their current peaceful, undeveloped character as possible.
Perkins, Grete	4-17	Favor	Non-motorized		The planning meetings were advertised well in advance and have been well attended by interested area residents. SILENCE may very well be one of the most precious commodities we can give to future people sharing these areas
Radano, Pete	4-17	N.C.	Non-Motorized		I am a strong supporter for these areas to be recognized and designated as Natural Areas in accordance with the goals outlined in our own Question Lake Management Plan. Because of the unspoiled character and great diversity of wildlife that these areas support, I strongly support the motion to keep these areas non-motorized - countless destinations that provide infrastructure for such activities; great need to keep these areas "as is" particularly with increasing development pressures, subsequent reduction of habitat and protected areas.
Ramsey, Linda	4-16	Favor	Non-motorized		The characteristics of natural beauty and wildness that bring both tourists and residents to the area are in peril of destruction if we do not take care now to preserve wildlife corridors such as these two lakes, and protect them from motorized vehicles.
Reichert, Joe	4-17	N.C.	Non-motorized except for maintenance and access corridor		By providing for trails and encouraging public recreational use in a non-motorized way our community will gain outdoor opportunities. As a ranger and a dad, a local snowmachiner as well as skier I value many uses. In my opinion the best use for these borough lands would be to designate them as non-motorized.
Rivers, Larry	4-13	N.C.	Motorized		Oppose limited access and restriction of snowmachines, power boats, float planes and other traditional public use. There has been a steady blocking of resources in the Talkeetna area, initiated by a few who wish to restrict everything except their personal "human powered" activities. Certainly they serve their own interests in this, while blocking the use of the areas by other large sections of the population.

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Robinson, Jeff	4-17	Favor	Non-motorized	Numbered Lakes: Informal winter trails with routes that vary. Identify sensitive areas to avoid.	<p>Numbered Lakes: snowmachine use has been highly infrequent. In fact, there had not been a single snowmachine track in the Numbered Lakes all this winter until the day before the first public meeting in March. Recent trespassing on our land and neighboring land by kids on snowmachines left broken trees and obliterated ski trails. This is what must be prevented in the Numbered Lakes. Winter trail routes vary from year to year depending on conditions. This adds variety and has been very successful over the years, with increasing numbers of people favoring this approach.</p> <p>Go-slow approach to trail development. A careful trail plan for increased use should be developed for the future. Sensitive areas should be identified and strategies developed to limit adverse impacts. As an example, I know of a small lake that has a high density of waterfowl nesting. Unleashed dogs during nesting season could be very harmful.</p> <p>Both areas offer outstanding opportunities for educational programs for all ages.</p>
Robinson, Pam	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized Explore ways to allow limited snowmachine use		<p>Talkeetna Comprehensive Plan and trails plans recognize the need to protect the habitat of these parcels.</p> <p>Development pressures make these parcels refuges for wildlife and humans.</p> <p>Allow reasonable public access consistent with the main goals of protecting habitat and natural character.</p> <p>Maybe allow snowmachines to continue traditional low-level use along corridors or by permit. Community/Borough should obtain access rights for snowmachines on existing multi-use trails and corridor to Bald Mountain</p>
Salasky, Shoo	4-14	N.C.	Non-motorized		<p>There are MANY places allowing (and even catering to) motorized travel...and very few (if any) places managed for the quiet, untrammled solace they offer.</p> <p>If these parks aren't designated as non-motorized, there will be little that distinguishes them from any other lands around here.</p>
Salasky, Shoo 2 nd comments		N.C.	Non-motorized	Numbered Lakes: no developed trails No parking on Spur Road; okay off the new access road	<p>Keep trails as is with no planned trails; keep only those trails dictated by wild game travel, minimal human muscle powered travel (NON-motorized), and current snow conditions; encourage use of primitive choke points to guide routes (wild game already do this, thankfully!)</p> <p>Add Spur Road parcel only if Borough can be guaranteed to manage it compatible with the Numbered Lakes natural character: no parking on Spur Road</p> <p>No commercial</p>

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Sanders, Ed	4-27		Non-motorized		Any ATV or snowmachine use will destroy the wildlife habitat that we are trying to protect.
Sayre, Cari	4-17	Favor	Non-motorized		The introduction of noisy, motorized recreation zeroes out all other uses of the land. In other words, it is impossible to enjoy a quiet nature walk or ski, communing with nature and looking for wildlife if there are ATVs or snowmachines zooming around. There are really plenty of other places that motorized recreation is allowed, but the places retained solely for quiet recreation are few and far between.
Schrieber, Rick		Favor	Non-motorized		Non-motorized is essential to accomplish this plans stated goals.
Sheldon, Roberta	4-16	Favor			The rate of private development creates a sense of urgency to protect these public lands for habitat and sensitive public recreation This is small acreage compared to the aggregate of private land surrounding them Don't allow commercial uses
Sheldon, Robert		N.C.	Motorized; Opposes any ATV or motorized restriction		<u>Restricting access is divisive</u> These areas are vast and inaccessible by foot for most of the general population. People from out of town will likely never experience these properties should these new and silly restrictions be put in place. Why lock out the general population? As it stands now the areas specified as well as the XY lake area are hardly visited by folks in the summer due to their remoteness. In the winter hundreds of, if not a few thousand, people use these areas via snowmobile. ([f restricting uses to protect habitat] why not exclude dogsleds and skiing? From my experience defecating doggies and people leave far more 'material' in these areas. <u>Community value and financial consequences to the community.</u> There will be direct financial benefit to those living adjacent or across the lakes [increase in property values]by way of a shrinking inventory of available land for general public use.
Shoulders, Gus	4-13	N.C.		In general: skateboard park, more ski trails, freestyle bike course	Need more places to ski and snowmachine
Sisul, Tom	4-16	Favor	Non-motorized		Nothing destroys the pristine nature of an area more than to have snowmachines or four wheelers running all over the area. If done right, these parks will benefit all residents and visitors.

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Smith, Corrine, Button Paul	4-19	Favor	Non-motorized		Numbered: We see one or two sets of snowmachine tracks in the area each winter...negligible effect on wildlife. Designating this area for motorized recreation would in effect advertise its location and existence and increase motorized use in the area. This area should remain non-motorized and non-commercial.
Smith, Doug 1 st comments	4-19	N.C.	Non-motorized		Regarding people who want to keep these parks open to unlimited snowmachine access so their kids can ride there: In the long run, this just <u>narrows</u> these kids' options. Kids are having fun, but they'd be just as happy riding in a gravel pit with some jumps and steep hills as they would be in a natural area... when their adrenaline needs are met, they could have the option of putting on some skis and checking out some streams and lakes at 3 miles per hour instead of 30. The number of commercial vendors has exploded since CIRI and Princess have moved in, and their effects on places that used to be as quiet and untrammled as the Numbered Lakes are pretty sad. A river bar can handle their impacts a lot better than a swamp can. If every operator were as good as Howard Carbone, there would be less of an issue, but we've had <u>plenty</u> of wildlife-baiting "nature guides," operators who won't pick up their own trash, and worse. It's better to eave this Pandora's Box closed so we don't have to open the box of mitigation measures.
Smothers, Michelle		N.C.		Need toilets and trashcans at the shoreline. Interpretive signs, camping, trails, boat launch, floating dock	Did this planning process try to reach the motorized users, the elderly, young, or infirm? Some residents who favor habitat protection want to lock other user groups out of public land. Allow commercial use such as guided walks, motorized and non-motorized boat rentals.
Stagg, Ted 1 st comments	4-10	Favor			A successful Lake Management Plan for Fish Lake will be vital to protection of the wetlands on the eastern end. No camping at Fish Lake; If the approx. 2 1/2 acre piece of odd shaped land between my property and Fish Lake...is opened and advertised as part of the "Park" and open to camping, etc., then it will be used and abused and my property will be greatly impacted. Would like to resume efforts to purchase this land from MSB.
Stagg, Ted 2 nd comments	4-26	N.C.	Non-motorized except for travel corridor for property owners east of Fish Lake		

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Sturgis, Jason	4-20	N.C.	Allow snowmachines at Fish Lake; prohibit ATVs		Allow snowmachines at Fish Lake if they don't tear up the ground; prohibit ATVs because of probably soil/vegetation damage; Protect sensitive habitat at east end of Fish Lake; Don't limit floatplane use.
Strassenburgh, John 1 st comments	4-8	Favor	Non-motorized		Sent photos and narrative showing snowmachine trespass on private, posted property; Broken and bent black spruce; Snowmachine tracks on a beaver lodge on Borough land; Protect Numbered Lakes by prohibiting snowmachining
Strassenburgh, John 2nd comments	4-8	N.C.	Non-motorized	<p>Parking for Numbered Lakes not on Spur Road but at top of hill</p> <p>Consider corner of Riven and Barge for access point. Keep parking away from homes.</p> <p>Question Lake: no access across Borough panhandle</p>	<p>The adverse impacts that snowmachines have on air and water quality, vegetation, natural quiet, wildlife distribution and survival, other visitor enjoyment, and public safety are well known and well documented.</p> <p>If snowmachine use were not prohibited in TNLNA impacts would be concentrated because the area is so small, because the widespread presence of open water in the winter and lack of enforcement, and because of the unusually rich biological value of the area.</p> <p>Snowmachine use invites intrusion onto private property, and conflicts with intent of the Borough Trails Plan</p> <p>Commercial use should be prohibited [at Numbered Lakes].... The problem stems from recurring, repetitive use by one or more operators. It is one thing to have one group of 4 people per week; it is altogether different, no matter how responsible and conscientious the operator may be, to have two or more groups per day (per operator). In the future, I would support educational groups, at such time when there are durable trails to a specific destination (e.g., a viewing platform)... [and a]stewardship plan in effect ...</p> <p>Consider oversight [of Numbered Lakes] by a non-profit to oversee and act as a liaison with the Borough and community, in a manner similar to the role that the Denali Ski Club plays with Talkeetna Lakes Park.</p> <p>Question Lake: water access is legitimate. A road would only benefit a few owners; diminish other values</p>
Suzer, Jerry	4-4	N.C.	Non-motorized		Shore access should be ADA compliant; thinks motorized use on lake should be allowed but not allowed on MSB uplands.
Tanner, Yukon	3-15	N.C.	Non-motorized		Boat and ski activity only; no camping, day use only

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Tanner, Yukon	4-19	N.C.	Motorized	<p>Parking for trucks and trailers to unload; Snowmachines at all three areas;</p> <p>Fish Lake: outhouse, multi-use trails for snowmachines and mushing</p>	<p>Need legal access to Question Lake</p> <p>Numbered Lakes should be multi-use including snowmachining and mushing.</p> <p>Numbered Lakes boating: canoes only.</p> <p>Preservation of nature for human enjoyment is the priority.</p>
Teich, Cathleen	4-16	N.C.	Non-motorized		<p>Snowmachines have only caused problems this year...someone has moved onto the lake this year, use of snowmachines on the lake has destroyed ski trails and caused a lot of irritating noise. This is not the traditional use here. Up until this year, the traditional use of this lake and the surrounding area (fish lake and the numbered lakes) has been cross country skiing and snowshoeing. I was going to snow shoe an area last weekend, but that area had been completely chopped up by irresponsible snowmachining. Snowmachiners should have access...but separate from skiers.</p> <p>The snowmachiners have full access to the Petersville area now. They have basically taken over the area. No skiers go into that area anymore to my knowledge.</p> <p>The numbered and fish lakes areas are habitat that seems to be too important to risk trashing by snow machines. It would endanger people who ski.</p>
Terstegge, Lynn	4-27	Oppose	Motorized; possible certain corridors or zones		<p>Don't railroad this process through without community awareness and discussion.</p> <p>Don't want people tromping through fish-spawning areas, This isn't a place for snowmachine races: some channeling of motorized use might be acceptable.</p> <p>Wilderness is important but you need a way into it to enjoy it.</p>
Terstegge, Martin	4-19	N.C.	Motorized		<p>I feel we have enough closed areas. This closure is being pushed by local adjacent land owners. I have a problem with a minority attempting to lock up an area so they can have there own private parklands.</p>
Trump, Jim	4-18	Favor	Non motorized		<p>In the last fifteen years or so that I have spent time in the Numbered Lakes area, I've seen one or two snow machine tracks at best in the winter. This area has not been used for recreational snow machining in the past. To allow recreational snow machining now, would be detrimental to the area and this plan. It would disturb the natural area.</p> <p>Along with the numerous community members who attended the last two planning meetings, I strongly support this plan going forward as is.</p>

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Trump, Kathy	4-18	N.C.	Non-motorized		Numbered Lakes natural setting is rejuvenating. We owe it to the planet and the wildlife to fight for a little bit of wilderness to pass on. No motorized or commercial.
Ulvestad, Dave	4-19	N.C.		none	I would like to go on record as opposing the proposed development at Question Lake and the Numbered lakes area for the following reasons; The MSB has yet to maintain existing facilities in the area, they suggest that they have and I would like to know based on what; The roads in our area and other areas within the borough are in desperate need of maintenance, they have no business building new roads until they demonstrate they can maintain the ones they have; The areas being considered for development are salmon spawning grounds and nesting areas for several migratory birds that are identified in the proposal but evidently will be ignored; You believe "volunteers" will police and maintain access to the parking areas, are you joking?; Because the MSB sold property without legal and physical access you now want tax payers to develop and maintain new access, why should we have to do this? We didn't buy it or sell it; There will be no supervision to prevent overnight camping, camp fires, litter control, sanitation control and on and on and on. Who pays for damage due to wildfire in the event that a campfire gets out of control; You suggest that nothing will be done until funding is available, I would suggest that nothing be done until funding is set aside for maintenance for the future as well. It's not difficult to believe that once constructed, funding for maintenance will dry up and will be unavailable as it has for numerous MSB facilities. Kepler Bradley lake area as an example.
Ulvestad, Laura	4-19	N.C.			<p>By the borough's own admission, this [Question Lake] facility will be prone to "unsupervised, unscrupulous uses", yet the only action they're prepared to take is providing signage at the access point. Posting the rules won't work unless they are enforced. Who will enforce the rules? How will they enforce the rules?</p> <p>Who will clean up the mess which will surely ensue at this facility? Human excrement is hazardous material and should not be handled by untrained, ill-equipped volunteers.</p> <p>The Question Lake Management Plan provided for landlocked lakefront owners to lease a portion of the borough parcel. Does this not provide the same access as a public facility would/</p> <p>Which AK Statute requires public access to the west shore of Question Lake?</p>
Valentine, Beth	4-18	N.C.	Motorized		Snowmachining is a non-issue, only because most of these areas are surrounded by private property and snowmachiners need to enter through either their own property or relatives or friends, so it is not like a snowmachiner is driving to a public destination or is it open to just anyone in the area. Banning snowmachining in this area would take away from our families recreational rights, the reason we are raising our kids in the area, the reason our parents raised us in the area and the reason why we live here. I really believe there is room for both skiers, dog sledders, and snowmachiners. There are specific groomed trails already

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
					<p>in place and a State Park 30 miles away.</p> <p>We just hope that the people making these decisions will understand that there is a huge amount of families that love to snowmachine in the area.</p>
Valentine, Chad	4-18	N.C.	Motorized		<p>The plan has merit in some areas, but to limit the use of snowmobiles in the winter does nothing but set aside more local land for one user group. It is time to share some of these public lands.</p> <p>Hunting and trapping are not discussed, these are still very viable activities.</p> <p>Lastly, it has been mentioned that, if I had gone to the meetings, my needs in regards to snowmobiling would have been accommodated, there in lies the problem. It is not about “me” or them it is about the future and the community (and the public). If you are not at a meeting you do not have a say in the process. “I” do not want to be accommodated, I want my kids to be able to use the property (hunting, snowmobiling, skiing, snowshoeing) just as the community has been doing for many many years.</p>
Valentine, Dan	4-16	N.C.	Motorized		<p>I do not support the proposal to make this a non-motorized park area. Motorized use has existed in this area for over 30 years, and it can be managed to continue to do so, along side uses like cross-country skiing and, snowshoeing. The newly created Talkeetna Area Lakes Park already limits motorized use; I do not see the need to increase land unavailable to recreate on by snowmobiles.</p>
Valentine, Erica McCall	4-16	N.C.	<p>Motorized</p> <p>Motorized use to support hunt/trapping</p> <p>Maintain current use patterns</p>	<p>Allow equestrian use</p> <p>Provide trails/access suitable for toddlers and seniors</p> <p>Maintain current use patterns</p>	<p>Public notice inadequate: says her household was not notified;</p> <p>Review period is too short because of spring activities;</p> <p>The draft document does not clearly state dates, times and routes for commenting;</p> <p>Wants neighbor or small-group meetings, and unbiased resident as a point-of-contact;</p> <p>High equestrian ownership in Talkeetna, Trapper Creek and Y;</p> <p>Talkeetna area needs trails and toilets that serve toddlers, elders, mobility impaired;</p> <p>Designate areas for specific user groups, including limited mobility users and groomed ski trails; XYZ Lakes is enough non-motor area</p>
Valentine, Logan	4-18	N.C.	Motorized		<p>I have lived in this area all my life and would like to keep snowmachining with my friends and dad back there. I also ski with Jr. Nordic but we don’t use this area, we use the ski hill overlook trails and other trails near Talkeetna and at the High School and the river.</p>
Valentine, Janet	4-13	N.C.	<p>Motorized</p> <p>Continue use as is</p>	<p>In general: secure vehicle parking; toilets; access to lakes;</p>	<p>Don’t’ lock up land for a few users, serve all ages</p> <p>Youth need a motorized recreation area for all seasons</p>

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Miriam, Valentine	4.14	N.C.	Mixed,	See notes	<i>Miriam held two “neighbor to neighbor” meetings for more discussion on the management of these lands. These discussions addressed the broader issue of recreation in the Talkeetna area, as well as the specific use of Fish and Numbered Lakes. A summary of these meetings is below; see the full hardcopy compilation of comments to see the results of both meetings.</i>
<p><i>Forms of recreation in Talkeetna are very diverse: snowmachine, ski, ice fish, mush and ski jor, snowshoe, canoe and kayak, hunt / trap / target and skeet shooting, boating / rafting hike / walk / jog / running, swim, dog walking, softball, ice skate, snowboard / sled, camp ride ATVS, sport fish, fly, bird watching</i></p> <p><i>Recreation needs for Talkeetna: Playgrounds designed for the needs of young children; Easy walking trails; Benches along trails; Restrooms; Skateboard park; Designated motorized area for summer use that could also accommodate non-motorized activity (odd/even day schedule for dirt bikes and motocross bicycles); ATV access corridor, Appropriate area for go carts; Walking trails with a destination; ATV/snowmachine routes for kids to get to school; Horse trails that could also be multi-use, non motorized; Mushing corridors; Variety of groomed ski trails in the woods; Legally accessible, open areas for kids to snowmachine; Waterskiing; Area to wander without trails in the summer and winter, A place for kids to safely hang out: basketball court, swim area, skateboard area, Dedicated spaces/trails for walking, sledding, snowboarding, snowmachine trail, horse trails, running trails, Recreational management component with an educational focus, Appropriate places for ATV use, Money for creating and maintaining motorized trails</i></p> <p><i>Current Uses: <u>Numbered Lakes</u> - Hunting, Snowmachining: used to access other areas, trapping and hunting, recreational use in area, Skiing, Trapping, Snowshoeing, Walking area both summer and winter, Access for hikers going to Spruce Lake, Dog walking area (seasonal), Birding, Mushing (difficulties with open water), Canoeing</i></p> <p><i>Current Uses: <u>Fish Lake</u> - Float planes, Hunting, Canoeing, Snowmachining: means of access to other areas, groom ski trails, recreating on the lake, Kayaking, Trapping (need to verify), Skiing, Birding, Mushing, Ski joring, Ice fishing, Snowshoeing, Swimming, Paddle boating</i></p> <p><i>What qualities and improvements are important to you to have in our community parks? Legal access; accommodate senior population e.g. ski trails, ability to snowmachine in and out of Talkeetna and to visit neighbors and family in the area; Parking areas off the main road that are large enough to accommodate horse trailers and that “feel safe”; Bathrooms. <i>Specific feedback on Numbered Lakes: Leave it “as is”, allow for snowmachining; Large enough space to accommodate multiple uses</i></i></p> <p><i>Why don’t you come to public meetings? Energy already focused on other community issues/organizations; Poor experience in the past: feeling marginalized, contrary opinions not accepted; Commuters: not physically in community to attend meetings; Not interested, getting complacent, what is the need? Why bother? Busy with kids activities</i></p> <p><i>How can we improve the public process so that you would be more apt to participate?</i> Go to established groups: PTA groups, artists guild, peer helpers, chamber, play groups; Paper surveys: concise, on-line; Use the community to write it up – don’t lose power by passing off the process to government; more and better notification, more neighbor-to-neighbor small group meetings, more upfront effort to explain process & involve all parties</p>					

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Vaughan, Deborah	4-15	Favor	Non-motorized		I support the Fish and Numbered Lakes Management Plan. I support the goals for managing them as natural areas. I especially support the areas should be designated as non-motorized.
Wagner, George	4-17	Favor	Non-motorized		<p>I strongly support the Fish and Numbered Lakes Management Plans and the goals for managing them as natural areas.</p> <p>I have owned and operated snow machines for over 40 years, having bought my first machine in 1965. However, I don't think they belong everywhere. The very nature of the spring fed creeks and ponds in the Numbered Lakes area, that are open all winter, is what makes this area so fragile and vulnerable to today's snow machine technology. Snow machine activity here is increasing every year. It is critical that these areas should be designated as <u>non-motorized</u> and all commercial activity be prohibited.</p> <p>These areas should be managed for what they do best - provide a window into a natural world, continue as a haven for wildlife and provide a valuable habitat for salmon reproduction.</p>
Walker, Bill	4-17	Favor	Non-motorized		I support the goals of maintaining the character of the area, providing access and protecting the wildlife. I would like to see the area designated for non-motorized recreation. With ever-increasing motorized recreation throughout the valley, it is appropriate to have a small area, such as this, set aside for non-motorized recreation.
Walsh, Kate	4-13	Favor	Non-motorized use	Leave as natural as possible	I am writing to give my support for keeping the areas of Fish Lake, Numbered Lakes and Question Lake as non-motorized areas. We need to have areas as pristine as possible in the Talkeetna area. I lived in Colorado and Wyoming and saw what can happen when snow machines are allowed to trample through wet-lands and small lakes and across streams. We cannot afford to let that happen here. Please consider leaving the areas as natural as possible
West, Jack	4-18	Favor	Non-motorized		<p>I strongly support the goals for managing the Fish Lake and Numbered Lake areas as "natural" areas.</p> <p>I also strongly believe that these areas should be designated "non-motorized" and that *no* commercial activity should be allowed.</p>
Williams, Keith and Heidi	4-13	N.C.		No public access at Question Lake	We currently live on property that is in our family trust that is adjacent to the proposed Question Lake public access area. We chose that area because of the limited number of people and the quiet, private lake. Now with the proposed public access, a road and parking lot would be near our front yard. This would have a negative impact on our property and the other property owner's around the lake. If there is public access to the lake we will no longer want to build a home there. We hope that there will be no public access to Question Lake so we can continue to enjoy it as we have in the past.

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
Winona, Phillip	4-27	N.C.	Motorized		Don't let tree-huggers sew up more land. Opposes any more non-motorized areas.
Wolf, Ellen	4-19	Favor	Non-motorized	<p>Numbered Lakes: no signs or parking on Spur Road</p> <p>Build several parking spots simultaneously to disperse use</p> <p>No developed trails</p>	<p>It's frustrating because those who wanted to talk about this [snowmachines], could easily have brought these concerns to the table so we could [discuss it]. At both meetings, the traditional use of snowmachines in the Fish Lake area by Brad Smith and Ron Zieman was brought up and discussed in a serious, good-faith manner. The decision to allow for a limited process whereby these fellows with a proven historical use could apply for a permit to continue this use seems like an excellent solution. It is too bad this discussion didn't take place for the Numbered Lakes.</p> <p>The traditional pattern of use by locals is an important aspect of keeping these areas in their natural state and protecting wildlife habitat... I'm sure Howard is careful to tread gently when he takes his clients out for a nature walk and I appreciate that. But I do not see this kind of commercial use as compatible with the overall goals for managing these areas. On the other hand, I do support leaving room for non-commercial educational experiences to take place, once there is an oversight body in place to delineate specific requirements and rules for such use.</p>
Wood, Ruth	4-13	N.C.		In general: natural, quiet, woods, solitude, unbroken snow	Neighbors' meetings are useful but can't replace public meetings
Wood, Ruth		N.C.	Non-motorized; but a permit system could accommodate the very few people that now use the Numbered Lakes	<p>Put the parking (Numbered Lakes SW area) away from Spur Road parcel</p> <p>Add an option for parking on Birch Creek Boulevard via an easement granted by the owners of the parcel abutting Birch Creek and Barge</p>	<p>The most important criteria for the Numbered Lakes is that they be designated non-motorized. Snowmachiners need vast amounts of space. There is no way to keep snowmachiners traveling a corridor from leaving the designated trail and trashing the open areas. If snowmachining were allowed, trespass onto private property would be a problem.</p> <p>Dog mushing is not a current or recent use at Numbered Lakes.</p> <p>Drop the Question Lake parcel and access to Question Lake from this plan because use of that parcel is already addressed in the Question Lake Management Plan. There was incorrect representation in the draft of the "to and along" easements.</p> <p>Include the MSB parcel on the Spur Rd. adjacent to the south end of the Numbered Lakes in the park, and put the parking east of this parcel in the Natural Area.</p>

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
					The repetitive use from a commercial operation, no matter how conscientious, that brings people every day would lead to negative impacts. [Opposes commercial use at Numbered Lakes] but if allowed, they must be limited in size, location, and subject to cancellation if damage occurs.
Wright, Laura	4-17	Favor	Numbered Lakes: Non-motorized		Has seen almost no snowmachine use in 10 years at Numbered Lakes. Motorized vehicles would overrun this is a small amount of land and is surrounded on three sides by <u>occupied</u> private land. Wetlands, salmon spawning, bears vulnerable to motorized use.
Wright, Mary Bethe	4-19	Favor	Non-motorized		I fully support the goals laid out by the local community. These areas are beautiful wild areas that are experiencing and will continue to experience the relentless pressure of development as this area of our state sees more and more population growth. The Mat-Su Borough has a unique opportunity to have the vision to set aside some areas for non-motorized uses and to limit or exclude commercial development.
Zarella, Larry		N.C.	Non-motorized		In the past I have noticed very little use or demand from the motorized community to use this small area. I think to designate the area as natural and non-motorized would benefit the majority of residents here.
Albert, Lawrence (attorney representing a landowner on Question Lake)	4-23	N.C.			Plan needs to show existing cabin and “trail” across Borough panhandle parcel at Numbered Lakes in Section 19. There may be a gate on Borough property blocking this trail. Correct the plan’s characterization of no evidence of development at Numbered Lakes. Panhandle may merit separate consideration. Client didn’t receive meeting notification. The draft plan’s elimination of some of the potential public and private access options may be piecemeal planning. Comprehensive planning that includes access to private property guards Borough against arbitrary decisions and improper motives. Draft plan understates easements to Question Lake. Text should acknowledge additional section lines relating to Sections 29, 30, Waterborne access is not an equal alternative to a section line. Borough has limited authority to block public access construction along state easements (cites statutes) Draft plan doesn’t offer explanation that use of Question Lake shoreline easement is “most likely not allowed” for roadway purposes.

Name	Date	Favor or oppose draft plan?	Motorized recreation issue	Type of facilities for Fish or Numbered Lakes or for community parks in general	Main points (summarized or verbatim excerpts)
					<p>Property owners who have an official role in approval of this plan should disclose potential conflict of interest.</p> <p>Client presents four options for road or off-road vehicle trail from Barge Road to private property on Question Lake.</p> <p><i>Notes to reviewers - Contact Ron Swanson at MSB for more information on the specific concerns raised in these comments</i></p>
Albert, Lawrence	4-27	N.C.			<p>Apply Borough's comprehensive planning principles: address public and private access.</p> <p>New route proposed across Borough land to client's property on Question Lake: see map</p> <p><i>Notes to reviewers - Contact Ron Swanson at MSB for more information on the specific concerns raised in these comments</i></p>