



APPENDIX D – 1ST PUBLIC MEETING COMMENTS



Summary Of Public Comments Concerning the Isberg Recreational Area Collected on 12/07/06 at the First Public Meeting

Topics	Summary of Comments from the 1st Public Meeting	# of Comments
Trail Layout and Design	Supports maintaining the existing trails for multi-uses	11
	Supports maintaining & improving trails connectivity	8
	Supports developing & managing trails for individual uses. General concern with segregating uses for safety and providing trails for different specific types of uses.	15
	Buffers should be constructed adjacent to property owners	1
	FNSB should include 100 mile loop and FE ditch trail	2
	Design trails to minimize impacts from erosion/damage due to motorized use.	5
	Supports single track ski trails, mountain bike trails, and loop trails.	2
	Dog walking trails (for unrestrained dogs) should be considered	3
	Coordinate destination of trails with fire breaks	1
	Make it possible to get from neighborhoods to trails. Like Switzerland, rugs across road crossings	1
	Trails will be used by horses	2
	Keep views changing along trails, create "unexpected views"	2
	Don't mix through traffic with local users/kids	1
	Trail use has affected permafrost hydrology	2
	Opposes lighting trails	1
Remember GVEA needs to be consulted for trail use along their power line.	1	
Facilities	Playground and warming hut would be nice.	3
	Opposed to providing lighting	5
	Consider a nature center	2
	Plan for a deck near #4 overlook (parking)	1
	Expand one side of Isberg or run a bike path along road.	3
Parking Area	Need parking for users	1
	Place parking area near Cripple Creek/Isberg intersection.	5
	Coordinate parking with School District	1
	Supports upland parking.	2
	Suggested parking across from Fiddle Way	1
	Opposed to parking across from Fiddle Way; house nearby	1



	Parking problem will probably limit users	1
	Suggests small pull off with no lights instead of a large lot	1
	Parking at area 2 is steep for parking	1
	What would be done for security? (Wild parties in woods)	1
	Use user groups to get volunteer labor / funds	1
	Opposes summer motorized use	2
Other	Incorporate and improve Alder creek trail system	1
	Purchase/trade land to acquire adjacent vacant land/trail access	12
	Keep it more of a local use system	1
	Don't underestimate the growth potential of this area,	1
	Think ahead, 20 years, preserve open space	2
	Micro climate is extreme in this area. Cripple creek road is sometimes 20 degrees warmer than 100 mile loop trail below same property	3
	Consider Children	6
	General concern with respect for wildlife habitat	2
	Didn't feel motorized users were tearing up the trails	2
	Expand one side of Isberg or run a bike path along road.	3
	Supports maintaining rustic atmosphere of area.	3
	No development is the best option, less funding, less maintenance required	1
	Recreation area may increase traffic and may call for increased maintenance of Isberg Road.	2



Design
Alaska

ISBERG RECREATION AREA MASTER PLAN
SIGN UP SHEET
PUBLIC MEETING
December 7, 2006

NAME	ADDRESS	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL	PHONE
Paul Schmidt	FNSB - 809 Pioneer Drive Fairbanks, AK 99707	FNSB	pschmidt@cf.fairbanks.ak.us	459-1074
Eric Engman	1760 Blingness	Fishy/lyp/and/mar	engman@alaska.net	455-7501
Ellen Allen	3020 Isberg	resident	ellen@ellenmitchell.com	479-7762
Alice Little	2615 Havelin	citizen	ynette_slov@gci.net	474-8682
Jim Little	2604 Alaskan Lane Ln	resident	jim.little@alaska.net	978-2396
Tina Eriksen	1686 Bluegrass	?		451-0817
Jim Brader	PO Box 74263	ITPC, trail user	jimbrader@msqnet.net	452-4986
Carol Meyer	4200 Aspenwood			474-8820
Candyn Leonard	1307 Chena Ridge	resident	wildleonard@ak.net	479-5008
Bob McDonald	2197 Edgely Rd	"	wmedonald@alaska.net	456-2115
Jerome Jackson	8932 Dorado	FMSB	MEOTARRR@GCI.NET	479 7057
Mary Ann Nickles	215 Dunbar Ave 99701	Parkside Adventure	ma.nickles@alaska.net	
Erk Gutgesell	PO Box 82333 99708	Resident	erikgutgesell@yahoo.com	978-6015
Frank Thorne	288 257 99726	Resident Ester		451-9892
Jim Herriges	1044 Breckinridge Rd 99709	NSA	herriges@gci.net	455-8007
Christine Jensen	4003 Ridgeway 99709	resident	jensen_112@yahoo.com	474-0070
Alice Stickney	P.O. Box 273 Ester, 99705	Resident, Ester	baigalica@gci.net	479-3425
Patricia Bussins	P.O. Box 471 Ester	Resident	patricia@alaska.net	455-7996
Susan Cook	PO Box 85059 99705	Resident	susan.todd@uaf.edu	474-6030
Ariana Graf	1686 Bluegrass Dr 99709	resident	ariana@expeditionsschool.com	451-0817
Steve Masternan	1645 Violin Circle	"	ssmasternan@hotmail.com	457-3792

Please Print Clearly



ISBERG RECREATION AREA MASTER PLAN
SIGN UP SHEET
PUBLIC MEETING
December 7, 2006



NAME	ADDRESS	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL	PHONE
LISA HILL	1644 FESTIVAL DR.	Neighbor	lisa.hill@bannerhealth.com	479-2127
Charles C. Degehard	834 Featherline Ave	Design Alaska	ccdegehard@designalaska.com	907-452-1241
Byron Broden	2000 Wasp Dr			488-9298
Robin Smith	1795 Seward Range PO Box 6061	res. dent	smithrka@acsalaska.net	479-6039
James Allen	PO Box 82851		jake_allen@yahoo.com	
Brian Charlen	PO Box 297	Resident	bschijor@yahoo.com	479-3665
LARRY BOWMAN	PO Box 81290 F-6465 99708	"	bobman@acsalaska.net	451-6113
Ritchie Musick	4231 Aspenwood	Resident/Neighbor	ritchie.musick@gci.net	479-5336
Betty Connor	1540 Bluegrass	Resident	bconnor1@hawaii.ntl.net	
Nickolas Nugent	182 Crest Drive	Nordic Ski Club Wild Alaska ETM	nugent@ficsleska.net	457-4269
ROBERT GILLIN	286 PLAZA HAWK		WALLIS@AKSALASKA.NET	458-1050
Christine Timm	1500 Samaha One P.O. Box 495 F38C		cbeder@hotmail.com	479-2128
Jake Timm	1577 Festival Dr.	neighbor	Shawman@mindless.com	374-3399
Elizabeth Brown	1399 Chem Ridge Rd.	resident	cool-garden3@hotmail.com	479-6833
Douglas Yates	Box 221 EPER 99725	FEKS Cycle Club	dayton@mmsouthnet.com	
JAN SMITH	1725 BLUEGRASS	NEIGHBORHOOD	javeth@aci.net	479-9442
LARA FORRIER	PO BOX 51539 NP	INTERHOSE COUNCIL	lforrier@comcast.net	488-8080
Kathleen Boyle	1720 Dulcimer	skit 60-	Kboyle@sdalaska.net	455-4173
Jon Underwood	1400 College	Trail rider & builder	jonu@deserfeed.com	451-5572

Please Print Clearly



Design
Alaska

ISBERG RECREATION AREA MASTER PLAN
SIGN UP SHEET
PUBLIC MEETING
December 7, 2006



NAME	ADDRESS	AFFILIATION	E-MAIL	PHONE
Laney Hall	2285 3rd St	live on chena	lchallen@gsi.net	452-0593
Terry Rhoads	2711 Moskito Road	live on Chena Ridge		455-6032
Randy Kiehlund	1742 Flaxspich	Crippled back avoid	ffkkrupf@edn	479-5688
Joe Swinney	1239 Chena Ridge	live on chena ridge	mark.sisim@army.mil	353-1244
MIKE MUSICI	PO BOX 161 ASPENWOOD	also attending	mike.musi@fci.mst	479-5336
ADAM EADESTAD	PO Box 8157 Fairbanks	live in the area	fgsmel@uy.edu	459 8126
Hal Meyer	4250 ASPENWOOD	live in area	ashenwood@anadsci.com	479-8520
Paul Rauschen	Box 81464 Fairbanks		phagg@yaho.com	479-6737
Karen Charlier	3190 24th Rd. Fairbanks		paull.rauschen@nps.gov	457-6640
Kristin Fischer	1178 Cypress St Fairbanks		kcharlier@hotmail.com	479-5994
Lisa Holzappel	1577 Festival Dr Fairbanks	live off Isberg Rd	KristinF@alaska.net	374-3398
Jeb Timm	240 W 5th Ave Fairbanks	National Park Service	lisa.holzappel@nps.gov	907-644-3586
Bruce Jamieson	1500 Sonata Dr Fairbanks	live 50' from trail	owalanche@fastmail.fm	479-2128
Steve Clau Fice	Box 181 Ester Fairbanks	live	bjamieson@alaska.net	479-4673
Bill Simpson	Box 83628, Fbx 99708 Fairbanks	Fbts Cycle Club	clautice@alaska.net	479-9833
Jim Allen	PO Box 84499 Fairbanks	neighbor	w.r.simpson@gmail.com	479-3363
Carolyn Kremers	1780 Festival Dr Fairbanks	live of loop - ski/cycle club	Jim.Allen@usf.edu	479-3341
Karen Berglund	PO Box 84223 Fairbanks	live in the area	ckremers@mosquito.net.com	458-8805
Brian Keelan	9697 Fairview Road Fairbanks	my wife and I own the triangle of land between the	mikekeelan@gmail.com	455-6480
	3916 Hockdown Way Fairbanks	all lots		479-5490

Please Print Clearly



Isberg Recreation Area Master Plan

Public Meeting Comments 12-7-06

James Allen

Commented on how existing trails are multiuse and seem to be working and urged that they stay multiple use / New trails could be designated as single or limited use / As adjacent property owner, encouraged buffers between new trails and property lines

Unknown

Trailheads should include parking to limit / Eliminate parking on road shoulders

Unknown

Liked the goals and objectives as expressed / Wants designated loops limited to skiing/walking / Wants some trails to exclude motorized use so they are safer for kids and dogs and protected from ATV's

Paul Reuscheu-

Snowmachiner – needs to be able to cross property from North to South and East to West. Currently uses 100 mile loop trail corridor and trail which drops off from Isberg/Chena Ridge through Allen property to powerline trail to Oboe court.

Ritchie Musick

Borough should consider acquiring adjacent property (contentment estates) and include 100 mile loop trail and Chena Ridge FE Ditch Trail into the Isberg Plan and expand it / Currently runs dogs in the property

Conner

Love the area because it is not overdeveloped, but support reasonable level of development / Concerned about light pollution as the Northern Lights viewing is currently wonderful.

Unknown (lives on Bluegrass)

Support land swap or acquiring adjacent property (contentment estates) / Would like to see a small playground with warming hut

Unknown

Support acquiring adjacent property / Contentment estates land would be fabulous for park land / Currently the property is used in many different ways / Want to keep it multiuse / Concerned about new users and parking lots / Design trails with safety in mind (i.e. snowmachines vs. walkers)

Jon Underwood

Mostly non motorized user / Supports one of the new loops to be a designated mountain bike trail

Frank Carrol

Used trails for 30 years / Wants to keep going through property on snowmachine to get to other areas / Supports acquiring adjacent property / Suggested using the future fire station lot as parking lot / Supports upland parking area

Larry Hall

Skier of Cripple Creek/Isberg Trails / Would support parking area near Cripple Creek / Isberg Road junction / Supports developing standards for multiuse trails / Commented how ruts in lower trails limit use in other seasons / Encouraged seasonal restrictions on ATVs to allow for other uses / Supports maintaining access to Rosie Creek Trails



Eric (from Bluegrass)

Motorized and Non-motorized user / Didn't feel that motorized users were tearing up the trails / Supports keeping the multiuse trails multiuse / Commented how the area is at least partly in the Fairbanks Management Area for bow hunting and is used for hunting / Would not support all 15 ft wide trails

Bill McDonald

Motorized user, skijorer, and classical skier / Internally conflicted on classical ski trails vs. multiple use and suspected that conflict would need to be solved in this plan also

Unknown

Supports a variety of trails, not just wide / Curious about impact on wildlife in area – moose calving area in headwaters of Cripple Creek / Snowmachines seem to be fine on trails / ATV's are rutting up some trails (design trails to accommodate, if allowed)

Carol Meyer

Supports Multiuse / Supports acquiring adjacent property

Eric (another who lives on Bluegrass)

Supports multiuse trails / Uses the powerline trail / Doesn't want lighting

Unknown

Major skier / 25 yr trail user, notices the increased use / Encourages planning for the future / Supports setting aside areas for special use – i.e. small loop for kids non motorized / Some trails aren't designed for skiers (too steep) / Design new trails appropriately / May need to reroute existing trails / Lowlands are colder / Supports parking up higher / Suggested parking across from Fiddle

Unknown

Opposes parking off Fiddle – people already parking along road / Commented on how “if we build it they will come” so how nice do we want to make it?

James Allen

Supports acquiring adjacent property (contentment estates) / Commented on how the theme seems to suggest a more rustic park development in regards to trail width and lighting

Unknown

Wants safe parking / No trail lighting / Wants warming hut / Supports multiuse especially on thoroughfares / Supports narrow and wide ski trails including skate skiing / Supports upper elevation ski area for kids

Jim Brader

Snowshoer / Wants connecting trails to stay the same / Multiuse trails may not stay safe into the future with increased use / Encouraged using trail design to limit use – speed limit through design

Kristin Fischer (Festival Dr)

Would like a little observation deck by #4 on the map (overlook) / Look into increased maintenance of Isberg Road / Concerned about security/parties/litter and balancing that with the rustic nature of the park / Suggested having a Nature Center at the School site

Nick Nugent

Supports Single-track Mountain Bike Trail as it can be used for other uses in other seasons – skiing, snowshoeing / Commented on how letting all trails be multiuse has been a dismal failure in Anchorage and was reported on a year ago by the papers / Suggested designing trails to segregate uses according to speed / Suggested that limited parking may limit number of users



Carolyn Kremers

Appreciate concern for lighting and supports no lights / Supports acquiring adjacent property (contentment estates) or Timberland/Graceland / Encourages looking ahead 7 generations and thinking ahead to save open space / Commented how the acquisition of more land would support wildlife as there are many species which exist there currently

Unknown

Grew up in Switzerland / Trails allowed people to go from place to place without using cars in Switzerland rugs were put across roads to allow skiers to cross / Park is a jewel and helping neighbors get to it safely would be good

Tim Estes (Bluegrass)

Dog walker and encourages the designation of an off leash trail area / Suggested that in the future the multiuse trail situation may not remain so peaceful

Ariana Graf

Encouraged expanding Isberg Rd to accommodate walkers

Unknown

Also supports expanding Isberg Rd / Would like a tree buffer between Isberg Rd and parallel trail / Wants to allow off leash dogs

Brian Charlton

Uses area 4-5 times a week / Comments how folks currently park on Oboe, near his house and thinks that is fine / Suggested that around 50% of current users are dog walkers – all off leash / Supports coordinating parking or development with school district / Supports the concept of nature trails / Supports beginner trails in uplands / Isberg Rd at spot #2 is steep for parking / Suggested coordinating fire breaks/protection with trail construction / Supports speed limits as this is a managed trail system vs. an open trail system / Supports multiuse trails which are designed to be sustainable / Suggested that Black Spruce and ATV's may not mix well / Dog walkers are most prevalent use now because 4 wheelers have rutted lower trails so much they aren't safe for skiers with such low snow. / Supports signs for yielding / Suggested investigating what ATV's and motorcycle riders were looking for in an experience / Supported beginner loops and bike trails / Supported the cross trails/connectors concept / Suggested setting different classes of trails (i.e. foot traffic, seasonal, etc) / Commented that horse use exists in area / Thanks adjacent property owners for allowing trails to cross their property

Jerome Jackson

Commented on need for funding and suggested that user groups could donate hours of volunteer work / Lot of support locally could translate into many hours

Alice Stickney

Lives across Parks Highway / Supports acquiring adjacent property / Commented how the Chena FE Ditch Trail is already disappearing into houses / Suggested incorporating/linking Alder Creek Trail from Ester Area, but trail rutting issues would need to be addressed / Commented how borough could possibly keep some of bottom land lots from being developed and reserved for trails

Unknown

Supports the rustic nature and keeping it a local use area / Didn't see the need for ATV or Motorcycle use / Mostly uses it currently for Skiing and snowshoeing / Supports acquiring adjacent property to enable connecting to Ester on the North



Hal Meyer

Used area for 22 years for both destination and experience on trails / Access to area is most important issue / Prefers “no action” option / Likes challenge of different types of trails / Development will then require management to correct destructive use or perform maintenance / Has attended OHV workshops Outside and gave an example of how some trails could be managed even with a split day ½ motorized use and ½ non motorized use / Supported keeping access from across Cripple Creek near Oboe Ct. / Would like to see just a small pull off with no lights instead of a large parking area

Bill Simpson

Supports multiuse, but planning for increased users by having plan for trail designations / Commented how there has been a massive collapse of the trail near #5 probably due to the trail and that the underlying hydrology should be paid close attention to when developing the trail system / Commented that the microclimates in the area are extreme / The inversion is significant enough that even the parcel reserved for the school may be warm enough for young skiers

Brian Keelean

Support acquiring adjacent property / Supports no lights

James Allen

Agrees with virtually all comments / Encourages thinking for the future to avoid use conflicts / Supports skiing, biking, hiking trails / Supports facilities for kids / Supports acquiring adjacent property / Supports safety and access

Unknown

Agrees with no lights / Supports single track Mountain Bike Trails

Unknown

Supports single track trails in uplands / Supports separate winter and summer loops which avoid lowlands in summer / Hasn't experience conflicts between users currently / Supports sustainable trails as a few people a few times with ATV's can ruin the trails for everyone else

Steve Masterman

ATV's impact trail negatively / Encouraged careful consideration of their use

Kent Slaughter

Winter trail user / Supports multiuse through trails / Supports easy ski trails up high / Commented on importance of unexpected views along trail and including landscape architecture into trail layout

Steve Ulvi

Don't underestimate growth of area / Most people on snowmachines are heading through toward big country / Keep 100 mile loop trail as through trail / Remember GVEA needs to be consulted for trail use along their powerline / Supports a through trail during the summer starting at Isberg/Chena Ridge through Allen Property on upper loop down towards Oboe Ct / Supports trail use segregation now

END OF PUBLIC MEETING COMMENTS



Topics	Summary of Comments Received by E mail / Letter First Public Comment Period December 2006	# of Comments
User	Walkers, Hikers, Runners	5
	Berry Pickers and Mushrooms Pickers	3
	Snowshoers	11
	Nordic Skiers non-specific	10
	Classic Cross Country Skiers	4
	Skate Skiers	1
	Ski Jorers	7
	Dog Musers	2
	Horseback Riders	4
	Mountain Bikes Riders	6
	Motorcycle Riders	3
	ATV Riders	1
	Snow Machine Riders	8
	Dog Walker	3
Trail Layout & Design	Supports addressing the general concern with effects of using wetland or lowland trails during the summer. Mitigate erosion, trail braiding, and rutting through the use of sustainable trail designs	8
	Supports maintaining multiuse nature of area	5
	Support for user specific trails; skijoring, classic skiing, mountain biking, dog walking, etc. With support for skill level specific trails for beginner to expert	7
	Support multi use trails (this includes motorized and non-motorized travel)	10
	The FNSB Trail Advisory Commission urges the borough to recognize the importance of through trail travel as well as local recreational trail use in the Tanana Lakes and Isberg Recreation Area	1
	Opposes lighting on the trails	2
	Recommends hardening the 100 mile Trail for year-round access	2
	Safety considerations for intersections	1
Facilities	Warm up hut and restrooms	2
	Ice Skating Rink	1
	Keep wilderness-like experience little or no development	2
	Signs and maps for the trails	1
	Playground	2
Parking Areas	Supports parking at Oboe Court and Isberg Road	4



Topics	Summary of Comments Received by E mail / Letter First Public Comment Period December 2006	# of Comments
	Option 2 would be dangerous because of traffic on Cripple Creek Road	2
	Yes- on having a developed parking lot	5
	No- on having a developed parking	2
	Parking on upper Isberg Road is dangerous	1
	Encourage and request that trail head parking plans include sufficient area for truck and horse trailer parking.	1
Operations/Management	Separate motorized and non-motorized users	6
	Supports motorized users and requests equal treatment	3
	General concern with segregating users based on speed - recommends lower speed inner loop trails and higher speed outer loop trails – separate where possible	8
Other	Maintain rustic atmosphere with minimal development	4
	Create a green belt connecting to other areas	4
	Graceland/Timberline and Contentment Estates land be bought by the Borough and included into the Isberg Recreation Area, as dedicated major through trails.	11
	Concerned that road traffic generated by the recreation area will exacerbate the situation of service area taxpayers footing the bill for non-local road users	2
	Allow emergency access for motorized rescues on non-motorized trails	1
	Supports private property buffer	1
	Maintain neighborhood access	3
	Wider shoulders along Cripple Creek Road/ Isberg would make for safer travel for local children who are traveling to the recreation area.	1
	Fairbanks Cycling Club and locals are interesting in helping develop trails	4
	Some kind of arrangement for local people to volunteer to help maintain the trails, perhaps with Borough helps to fund larger equipment if needed.	2
	We feel that naming this facility the ‘Cripple Creek Recreation Area’ is more apt than ‘Isberg Recreation Area’.	1



E mail and Written Comments

First Public Comment Period December 2006

-----Original Message-----

From: Skip Via [mailto:skipvia@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2006 9:47 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg park proposal

Hi John;

The Vias strongly and enthusiastically support the development of the Isberg Recreation Area. This is a wonderful multi-use area that serves the west end of Fairbanks and could be a draw for all of Fairbanks should it be developed well.

We'd also like to add our support for working the Yellow Eagle mining property into the recreation area concept. The lake on this property would make an excellent skating park in the winter and could be used for canoeing in the summer. There are many trails already present and many historical objects of interest, including a gold dredge. This property is currently for sale.

Thank you for this opportunity to voice our support.

Skip Via
Mary Via
Zach Via
Willie Via
PO Box 25128
Ester, AK 99725

-----Original Message-----

From: Anthea M. Craven [mailto:fnamc@uaf.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2006 10:04 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg Recreation Area Master Plan

Mr. Haas,

I am aware of this meeting because my son, Colin Craven, is interested in seeing the Isberg Recreation area developed as a multi-use area. I live very nearby and walk with my dog in the woods daily. However I am quickly losing my ability to walk my dog off leash in the woods where she can and I can get the exercise we need because of the rapidly vanishing woods and increased residential housing developments. Walking along the roads with her on a leash is not a prospect that I want to entertain because it will not be pleasureable for either of us and definitely not the needed exercise for her.

Unfortunately I am not able to attend the public meeting to be held on Thursday, Dec. 7th and therefore I am taking this opportunity to send you my input via email. Specifically, that I am very interested in seeing that walkers with dogs on the trails is a type use that I'd like to see retained in the plans for this multi-use area.

Thank you very much - Anthea Craven



-----Original Message-----

From: roy earnest [mailto:radroy@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 07, 2006 12:41 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Graceland/Timberline and Contentment Estates

Hello Mr. Haas,

I would like to put forward the idea that many have had that the Graceland/Timberline and Contentment Estates land be bought by the Borough and included into the ISBERG RECREATION AREA.

The area has been a very contention location for developers and neighbors and the positive outcome could be a real plus for everyone involved. Please include this email into record. I will look forward to checking the Borough website for an update to the meeting. Thanks so much,

Roy Earnest

-----Original Message-----

From: JEROME JACKSON [mailto:MEDCTRRX@GCI.NET]
Sent: Friday, December 08, 2006 10:38 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg REc Area

Mr. Haas,

Just a few notes to add to the comments from yesterday's public meeting.

1) The Primary Trailhead/parking needs to be near #2 not down toward #1 (please see map)

If you want the best possible trailhead, you must take advantage of the near constant inversion of temperatures that the Fairbanks Area Offers. I have coached hundreds of young skiers in the last 11 years and the Junior Nordic Program has provided instruction to thousands. The young kids do not enjoy being cold, and it is only through the benefit of an inversion that makes skiing enjoyable for them.

At Birch Hill, we'll enjoy a temperature 20 degrees warmer than in town, and there is very few days each winter(usually only about a week that it is too cold for the young ones to ski. The Trailhead at #2 could make the difference between a wonderful recreation area for 6months a year versus one that can little be used by young ones and families. I live in Cripple Creek, and have experienced the difference a couple of hundred feet of elevation makes in temperature.

2)For the benefit of all borough residents, The trail system needs to be professionally designed. I have hunted,ran,skied, and hiked these trails and know every one of them. They are not exceptable for many user groups.

3) There must be access for snowmachiners and Fourwheelers to transverse the area, have access to trails off of Sonota to Rosie Creek and the Hundred mile trail.

4) Let it be known, the Myself and many other Cripple Creek residents are ready to provide volunteer work to help build and maintain these professionally designed trails. Many other clubs would be willing to provide labor. If you coordinate this, you may also find that some organizations could actually donate some funds.....even some individuals might provide donations to their pet project.

5) Talk to DOT about the idea of rugs accross roads to provide trail access. What a inexpensive way of connecting trails versus tunnels and bridges (ala Anchorage)

Thank You,
Jerome Jackson
3932 Dobro
pob 81383
Fairbanks,AK 99708



-----Original Message-----

From: Lezlie Wilfer [mailto:wilfer@awcable.com]
Sent: Friday, December 08, 2006 11:51 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg Recreation Area

Hello Mr. Haas,

Thank you for your emails regarding input for the Isberg Recreation Area. I was not able to attend last night's meeting and wanted to express my family's interest in seeing horseback riding included in the development of a trail system for the proposed rec area. We reside at 4.6 mile Chena Ridge (3520 Starship Lane). Our family owns 4 horses which we have kept on our property since October 2000. We frequently ride off our property using Northridge, Dragline, and Moonshine roads; and the Chena-Ester Ditch trail. I would encourage and request that trail head parking plans include sufficient area for truck and horse trailer parking.

I am a 4-H horse leader through the Tanana District 4-H Horse Program. My club, Golden Heart Riders, currently has 18 members between the ages of 10 and 17. We frequently ride as a club at Chena Lakes and participate in competitive trail riding (sanctioned through the North American Trail Ride Conference) held annually at Chena Lakes Rec Area or in the Two Rivers community. We are always looking for new areas with accessible trails to ride.

The proposed Isberg development would be a tremendous asset to the community and provide an in-town location for horse owners to ride!

Thank you for this opportunity to comment!

Sincerely,
Lezlie Wilfer

Phone call Message:

This morning the caller walked her dogs on the trails in the upper area of the project site and found that a motorcycle had ridden up and down the trails last night or this morning. This action rutted the trails and brought up dirt and leaves to cover the snow and make them difficult or impossible to ski upon.

She supported the multi-use concept at last night public meeting. She changed her mind today. She did not think it possible to share the trails with motorcycles as they have a negative impact on other uses.

John Haas
FNSB Parks & Recreation
459-1198 or jhaas@co.fairbanks.ak.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Nelson Spindler [mailto:yukoncst@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2006 8:32 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: RE: info about Isberg park area

John:

Here are my thoughts as a current Isberg trail user. I cross-country ski on the trails in winter and I walk on the trails in summer. Things I would like to see developed at the Isberg Park:

1. A designated cross-country ski loop, at least 2-3 km long. Designated for skiing mainly to keep the trails in good shape and ski-able because much of the area is pretty steep. I don't mean high-end competitive skiing like Birch Hill, but for people on the West End of town to enjoy for exercise and outdoor recreation.



2. Remaining trails multi-use, snowmobile, walking, dog-mushing, trying to maintain harmonious compatibility wherever possible.
3. A vehicle parking area where 15-20 cars could park, trail entrance signs and an information kiosk, providing locations and permitted uses of the various trails.
4. Some kind of arrangement for local people to volunteer to help maintain the trails, perhaps with Borough help to fund larger equipment if needed.
5. For summer motorized use, designated trails that are hardened against degradation from erosion using sustainable design concepts.

What I would not want to see:

1. Trail neglect combined with motorized uses followed by heavy rainfall that allows erosion to destroy the trails for future use.
2. A very large development with lots of buildings, roads, etc.
3. An area that gets overrun by four wheelers and dirt bikes, precluding uses by people who do not want to walk in mud or ski on trails torn up by 4-wheelers driving on a ski trail. I do support multi use trails when users are considerate of one another!
4. A very large recreation pavillion like at Birch Hill. The community only needs (and can only afford to maintain) one of those.

I appreciate the opportunity to provide input. Please put me on your mailing list. thanks!

Mike Spindler and Pam Nelson
1761 Chena Ridge Rd.
Fairbanks, AK 99709

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter Williams [mailto:pzw42@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2006 8:51 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg - multi-use!

Dear Mr Haas,

Thanks for your work for our community.

I'm a 23-year resident of Fairbanks and a user of the Isberg trails. I ride my sno-go and ski on the trails during the winter and ride my motorcycle on the trails in spring and summer. I enjoy all these things and have never had a problem with other users - being skiers or dog-walkers or equestrians or even the dreaded 4-wheelers. We all smile and wave and then we are gone our separate ways. I support some restricted areas like Burch Hill or UAF trails, but Isberg should be a multi-use area just like it is now.

Thanks again,

Peter Zane Williams

-----Original Message-----

From: Bobby Gillis [mailto:bgillis@acsalaska.net]
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2006 6:58 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: RE: Isberg Recreation Area Update

Dear Mr. Haas,

Thanks for making such a concerted effort to solicit input from all potential user groups in the planning of Isberg Recreation Area.



Some items on my "wish list" I would like considered are:

Isberg Recreation Area should remain multiple use (this includes motorized and nonmotorized travel)
All existing trails currently open to motorized use remain so after the recreation area is established
If segregated, new trails should reflect a balance between nonmotorized and motorized use
Any new motorized or multi use trails should be designed targeting a range of difficulties from wide trails able to accommodate four wheelers to narrow, sinuous trails for advanced motorcyclists and mountain bikers
Any new nonmotorized trails should be designed in the same fashion (echoing John Underwood's comment concerning mountain bike trails)
Special-use permits should be available for organized activities

I appreciate the opportunity to put in my two cents.

Sincerely,
Bob Gillis
bgillis@acsalaska.net

-----Original Message-----

From: John Estle [mailto:sportalaska@gci.net]
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2006 4:41 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg Recreation Area Comments

There need to be different trails for different user groups.
Non-motorized users, in general, would prefer trails without motorized users. Motorized users can recreate more freely on trails that they know are designed primarily for them.

If a trail is designed for use by more than one user-group, then those user groups must be compatible. For example, the use of a groomed cross country ski trail by cross country skiers is not compatible with use by skijorers and their dogs, walkers, or snowshoers. Those users damage the groomed surfaces, and thus degrade the recreational experience of the skiers.

If all the trails are going to be multi-user trails, then I believe it will have a negative impact on the number of users. People will only recreate if it is enjoyable, and making trails for many users, with built-in conflicts, is not the way to go.

This area can be a great area that will attract many users from all over the borough, not just from the Cripple Creek/Chena Ridge area. However it will only reach its potential if the trail systems are designed wisely, with the needs of all user groups taken into consideration, and specific trails designated for specific groups, or for a number of groups of compatible users.

John Estle, SportAlaska
PO Box 71055
Fairbanks, AK 99707-1055
e-mail: sportalaska@gci.net
URL: www.sportalaska.com

-----Original Message-----

From: Peggy Raybeck [mailto:paycheck39@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2006 10:16 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg Trail Plan

Greetings John,



FNSB Department of Parks and Recreation Isberg Recreation Area - Master Plan

I generally favor multi-use trails, especially out of town, but prefer both multi-use and restricted trails in the Isberg area, which is close to town and would probably get heavy use.

I am a skijorer, and strongly support providing some groomed trails for skijoring wide enough to skate ski. Birch Hill is a great facility for skiing, but doesn't allow dogs. At Isberg, I would like groomed trails from beginner to advanced level, with mostly intermediate level up to 7% grade. Perhaps this could be done by providing alternate access to by-pass really steep hills.

Currently I skijor Creamers, ADMA and Chena Lakes trails, and have for 12 years. My dogs are active sprint dogs and get pretty bored with the same trails. I also skijor snowmachine trails off Goldstream, Chena Hot Springs Rd, White Mtns, etc, for variety and different experience, but often can only take one dog at a time depending on trail conditions, and it's a long drive. Since I have 8 dogs and am 64 years old, I really like the groomed trails where I can take 2 or 3 at a time with little worry of injury.

Another plus for skijorers in the Isberg area would be the possibility of holding ASPA (Alaska Skijor and Pulk Assn) events there. We had one race on trails between Isberg and the Parks Hwy last year which was well attended and lots of fun. And, I saw several skijorers on the trail in the weeks following the event.

Thank you so very much for this project and your work with it.

Peggy Raybeck
2129 Odonata Ct
Fairbanks, AK 99709

peggy@alaska.net
457-4775

-----Original Message-----

From: phyllis haggland [mailto:phaggland@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2006 9:27 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Re: Isberg Recreation Area Update

John, Thank you and your colleagues for communicating with the neighborhood and public. As I mentioned on the phone I think most of us want to be gracious and tolerant to all the user groups. However, I believe that as popularity and population density increases there will be more and more conflict between these users groups. Bottom line -- I would urge multi-use but designated trails-- or parallel trails in some locations if it could be done without destroying the "wilderness" aspect.

We've lived in the area since 1971 and I could bore you with stories on end about how the area has changed. Worst of all I've seen trails become unsafe for skiers, walkers with dogs, children. The high horsepower groups tend to drive out the old, young and slow. It was fine when we all knew each other but attitudes alter when strangers appear. Another concern is the trail destruction that 4 wheelers and motorcycles cause. Someone's fun should not made it impossible for others to use and enjoy the area.

Thank you all again for your efforts. If I can be of any help please let me know. Regards, Phyllis Haggland

-----Original Message-----

From: Jeff & Ginger Hamlin [mailto:hamlinz@acsalaska.net]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2006 9:28 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: trails

Hello,

I'm writing in support of the trail development in the Isberg rec.

area. I'm an avid skijorer & would like to see the borough develop & maintain more of these trails for skijoring as well as for skate skiing.



It is very important that the borough continue to support trail development & preservation of those trails that have historically been available for public use. The newly developed trail at Old Murphy Dome is exciting to see. Please continue to support trails for skijoring use! Thank you!

Ginger & Jeff Hamlin

-----Original Message-----

From: timothyestes@alaska.net [mailto:timothyestes@alaska.net]

Sent: Friday, December 15, 2006 8:35 PM

To: John Haas

Cc: Paul Schmidt

Subject: Isberg recreation area

First of all, thank you so much for hosting the public comment session on the 7th. I attended and made a comment that I would like to clarify a little.

I had mentioned that dog walkers are a user group to think about. My concern with dog walkers is that some other user groups don't get along with loose dogs, specifically mushers and horseback riders. My family cherishes our dog walks and we sure don't want to make anyone else mad.

My thought is that if us dog walkers (and there are many out here) had a trail to ourselves, or for only those who don't mind running into dogs, that might be a decent solution to keep the mushers happy.

Thanks again for hearing the communities opinions.

Tim Estes
1686 Bluegrass Drive

-----Original Message-----

From: Ellen Million Graphics [mailto:emillion@ellenmilliongraphics.com]

Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2006 4:34 PM

To: erskin@designalaska.com

Cc: John Haas

Subject: Cripple Creek/Isberg Recreation Area Plan comments

20 December, 2006

Greetings!

We are the Allens, and are writing this letter to offer input following the public meeting for the Isberg/Cripple Creek recreation area master plan. We own the land along the eastern border of the area, and are frequent and avid users of the existing trail system. Our most relevant comments are listed below:

Private Property Buffer

Naturally, our first concern is the proximity to our land of the proposed trail and trail-head/parking lot on the easternmost edge of the recreation area. This proposed trail comes very close to our property line; clearly within view of our house (and outhouse). The foliage in this area is birch, with little undergrowth, and you can see quite some distance through the forest. In our opinion, a buffer from private property lines to any new trail, in open woods, of 500 feet, is ideal and desirable. A buffer of 300 feet is the minimum buffer that we feel will still afford most of the rustic wilderness trail experience that users are seeking, and at the same time grant most of the privacy that we desire.

New Uplands Trail Proposal; high-challenge, non-motorized trail

In our opinion, the above mentioned proposed trail should be designated a non-motorized, high-challenge trail for snow-shoeing and skiing in the winter, and hiking and mountain biking in the summer. Ideally, this trail would be narrow and one-way, to cater safely to the high-speed adventure-seekers who specifically requested such a trail and wished for it to be located in the uplands.



This would be a perfect location for such a trail, as the terrain is quite steep and less suited for easier, general-use trails. Please see the attached map for ideas on how this trail can be located to provide adequate buffer while also providing the type of trail requested at the public meeting.

Proposed Upper Trail-head/parking lot

We oppose the proposed upper trail-head/parking lot, as it would create increased roadway traffic between this upper 'drop-off' point, along the windy and narrow section of Isberg Road, to the lower parking area, and also as the proposed upper trail-head/parking lot provides only very steep access to the proposed trails. Perhaps the area adjacent to the Isberg Rd/Fiddle Rd intersection would be a more appropriate place for this upper trail-head/parking lot? This would reduce traffic through the most dangerous section of Isberg Road while at the same time provide less steep access to the proposed trails.

Proposed Lower Trail-head/parking lot and easy trails on school lot

We are very much in favor of a trail-head/parking lot to be shared with the FNSB school district on their proposed elementary school lot, and are also in favor of easy-level trails at this location. This area is just above the swampy ground yet still has potential for minimal elevation changes to be designed into a new trail. Groomed, non-motorized trails in short easy loops would be very welcome in this area, and the suggested idea of a community playground also has a lot of appeal!

Additionally, a trail head/parking lot located close to the Parks Hwy/Cripple Creek intersection would be welcome as this would limit traffic through the subdivision while still providing access for visitors to the recreation area.

Keep Trails Rustic, but Safe

We are very strongly in favor of keeping all existing trails in their current multi-use, rustic state. We are very strongly against a developed park with any structures, paving, lighting, etc (this includes the proposed deck at #4). Structures tend to be attractive nuisances if constant enforcement cannot be provided. We do not want to lose what we have, rather to augment our existing experience with the addition of new trails. Lighting in particular would be very unwelcome. It makes sense to us that only new trails be restricted to designated uses, in order to prevent user conflicts. We also suggest that the middle of the existing three parallel trails (see map) be designated one-way, as it has severe vertical curvature with very poor visibility and poses a safety hazard when being used by high-speed motorized transportation in both directions at the same time. Sight visibility at all intersections where motorized vehicles are allowed should be increased!

Facility Name

As the majority of the subdivided land surrounding this facility is named 'Cripple Creek', and as Cripple Creek is the name of the creek running through the facility, we feel that naming this facility the 'Cripple Creek Recreation Area' is more apt than 'Isberg Recreation Area'.

Acquire Graceland and Contentment Estates, Dedicate Major Through Trails

It was also proposed at the meeting that the borough make an attempt to acquire the properties of Graceland and Contentment Estates. We cannot overstate that this is a fantastic idea, and would be an excellent use of this otherwise unappealing land. Every effort should be made to add these properties to the recreation area! Additionally, the 100 Mile Trail and Ester Chena Ditch Trail should have easements dedicated to them and, of course, remain multi-use.



Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for taking the time to listen to our input and consider our suggestions!

Be well,
James and Ellen Allen

Attached: map and copy of this letter
<http://www.ellenmilliongraphics.com>

-----Original Message-----

From: steven sheehy [mailto:woemkrab69@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2006 2:20 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg trails

Hi John. heard you wear looking for some input on the Isberg trails. I am a dog owner with seven dogs in my kennel. I do a lot of skijoring and mushing. last year was the first time on those trails. They are great trails as they are, but the big problem for the first time user was signage or a map of the trails. It would be nice if most of the trails were just wide enough for skating with easy to moderate terrain, and mostly one way, also if the parking area was close to the start area so dog owner don't have to walk their dogs far, or at all. ADAM Musers hall has a good start area. Buildings and rest rooms are nice but last on the list.

Thanks
Steven Sheehy

-----Original Message-----

From: Kathy Gage [mailto:kathygage@fairbanksparking.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2006 10:24 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg Recreation Area

Hi,
I just learned about the recreation area and I am pleased that there will be a place for all the family to ride. We are into all the sports recreational vehicles my sons ride motorcycles, ATV's and the new rhino by Arctic Cat and of course snow machines. So any place that would be a legal riding area would be a nice and very good to have as long as all parents abide by all rules with their children. I would very much like to sign any petition so that this can take place.

Thank you,

Kathy Gage
Fairbanks, Alaska

-----Original Message-----

From: Christine Matson [mailto:cmatson@nortechengr.com]
Sent: Friday, December 22, 2006 2:26 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg Rec Area

Hello John Haas,

As an active board member of the Fairbanks Cycle Club, I would urge the Borough to design the trail system to encourage both cycling and skiing. Winter cycling is a growing sport, and trails are an excellent place for winter cycling, as it keeps us off the icy roads and away from traffic.



Summer use of the Isberg area should include planning for cycling. The Fairbanks Cycle Club has started a summer youth program, similar to the popular Junior Nordic Ski Program. The 2007 season will be the third year for our youth program. The summer cycling program encourages kids to ride their bike responsibly, wear helmets and helps families who wish to exercise with their children. Currently the group meets at Birch Hill or the UAF trails. Implementing a trail system at the Isberg Rec Area that would provide fun short loops for the youth cycling group would serve many purposes. First, it gives families on that side of town the option of meeting in a safe location to ride with kids, so they do not have to drive over to Birch Hill. Other benefits are fun local trails for kids to explore on their own as well as a place for adults who wish to ride.

The Borough might consider adding some "feeder trails" or access routes to the Isberg Rec Area if possible. For example wider shoulders along Cripple Creek Road/ Isberg would make for safer travel for local children who are traveling to the recreation area.

The Fairbanks Cycle Club is prepared to help with planning and has volunteers who would pitch in to assist with this project. We hope you will move forward with this recreational area and develop it as soon as possible!

Please let me know if you have any questions or if the Fairbanks Cycle Club can provide any help on this project.

Thank you for your time.

Happy Holidays,

Christine Matson
FCC Treasurer

-----Original Message-----

From: cfabbri@mosquitonet.com [mailto:cfabbri@mosquitonet.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 26, 2006 8:15 AM
To: John Haas; Patrice@designalaska.com
Cc: cfabbri@mosquitonet.com
Subject: Isberg Input

Dear John and Patrice,

Please accept these comments regarding the Isberg Recreation Area. If possible, please confirm receipt of the attached input and include them with the results you are compiling today (Dec. 26). Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Cindy Fabbri

December 18, 2006

John Haas
Fairbanks North Star Borough
(907) 459-1198
jhaas@co.fairbanks.ak.us

RE: Isberg Recreational Area

Dear John,

Thank you for accepting these comments as a part of the community input process on the Isberg Recreational Area. As an adjacent property owner, I have some insights on current use and am appreciative of the opportunity to have input on any future plans for the area.



Currently, the area is multi-use (i.e. skiing, ski-jouring, dog-mushing, snow-machining, dog-walking, etc.) though the number of users on the trails at any given time is minimal. This minimal use and the undeveloped nature of the trail system provide a wilderness-like experience in a residential area. As a local user, it is the undisturbed nature of the area that makes it such a pleasure to be out on the trails here. The importance of having a locally accessible area, where nature is the emphasis should not be overlooked in the “development” process. In addition, the desire for infrastructure by certain groups or users should not automatically trump the desire for no infrastructure that is considered essential by others.

In addition to the human users, the Isberg area is a haven for wildlife – especially moose. This area is a corridor for wildlife, moving up and down the valley, from the Tanana flood plane/Bonanza Creek Area up through Ester. Though I do not have specific data on this, I believe the existence of this corridor contributes to keeping moose off Cripple Creek Road, as well as the Parks Highway. Maintaining an uninterrupted corridor, should be considered in the planning process – for the safety of local drivers and the moose. I would like to suggest a long-term plan to create a green belt connecting Bonanza Creek - Cripple Creek - Ester - Fairbanks.

Beyond identifying current users there is the question of development. I would like to add some key issues that did not appear to be identified in the investigation report. First and foremost, there is the issue of access. I would like to raise some concerns about proposed access to the area through Tract B (option 2). It is my belief that developing access through this particular parcel is not in the best interest of the users and in fact may be a hazard to all people traveling in the area. The location of Tract B on Cripple Creek Road is at the base of a hill and at a bend in the road. It is typical for vehicles to be moving at 55 miles an hour on this stretch of Cripple Creek. I am concerned that an access at this point would create a hazard for both the potential stopped/turning traffic, as well as for the vehicles passing by. Evidence of this concern is demonstrated in the borough decision to require all Cripple Creek subdivisions, subsequent to the first one, to be established on loop roads – where driveway access is on the loop roads and not directly onto Cripple Creek Road. Access through Tract B would create stopped and turning traffic at a point on the major thoroughfare, where it would be difficult to stop at best and a severe hazard at worst.

Another issue that was not identified in the draft plan, regarding access development at Tract B, is as follows. While “close proximity to adjoining land owners” is identified as a “con” for other options, it is not listed as a “con” for option 2 (Tract B). Development of this area would negatively impact the adjacent lots through loss of privacy, noise pollution, and possible trespass. These impacts are inconsistent with the stated goals and objectives for the recreation area.

Additionally, as a land-owner on the low-lying side of the valley, I can vouch for the super-saturated state of the land here. The ground is very wet from spring break-up, throughout the summer and into autumn. Creating a parking lot, facilities, and trails through this zone would require extensive earthwork and ongoing maintenance. It is impossible to stay dry, walking through this area, when it is not frozen/winter. For this reason and the others stated above, I would recommend access to the area at a point of higher elevation.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these comments. I look forward to ongoing discussions about how this community envisions and plans for the future of this area.

Sincerely,
Cindy Fabbri

Cc: Patrice Buck, Staff Engineer
 Design Alaska



-----Original Message-----

COMMENTS/INPUT ON THE PROPOSED ISBERG RECREATION AREA

By Norm Piispanen

Adjacent property owner

Trail user

Commissioner – Cripple Creek Road Service Area

As a property owner and trail user, the proposed IRA is an excellent idea, and is a very appropriate use of the subject property. It would benefit the residential areas adjacent to it and would provide recreational trail opportunity for residents of the entire community. Availability to motorized and non motorized use would be very appropriate. No use category should effectively argue for exclusive use.

To make it useful to adjacent residents there should be adequate direct access into it. Making local residents access the area via specific developed parking areas off Cripple Creek and Isberg Roads would be unnecessarily inconvenient. Along the south edge this would include access directly off the ends of Bluegrass, Fiddle and Festival. Land west of Tract K would work well for Bluegrass residents. Hoedown Way and Tract N would work well for Fiddle residents. Something into Tract N could work for Festival residents, though it would be steep.

As a Road Service Area commissioner, road traffic generated by the recreation area will exacerbate the situation of service area taxpayers footing the bill for nonlocal road users. The collector nature of Cripple Creek and Isberg Roads (as well as Festival Drive) results in substantial non local traffic between Chena Ridge Road, the Parks Highway, Rosie Creek Subdivision and Becker Ridge Road. When Cripple Creek and Isberg Roads need significant maintenance, it will be beyond the capability (and reasonable responsibility) of the Cripple Creek Road Service Area.

Adequate off road parking should be provided for recreation area users. Parking currently occurs on the shoulder of Cripple Creek Road near the Parks Highway, on the shoulder of Oboe Court and adjacent Isberg Road, on the shoulder of Fiddle Way, on two stabilization berms along the north side of Isberg Road, and in the remnants of the cul de sac where Isberg Road used to end. With one possible addition, a combination of the parking areas proposed in the Investigation Report should provide adequate parking. Hoedown Way and Tract N should be considered for off road parking. The portion of the recreation area that would be most heavily used during summer could easily be reached from there. Parking could be provided in a lot with a short access road rather than in a wide spot in the road. Also, the old cul de sac should be obliterated to make it unusable for parking. The sight distance to the west, from it, is dangerous.

Thank you,
Norm Piispanen

479-2894

piispanen@gci.net

-----Original Message-----

From: Sorensen [mailto:sorensen@alaska.net]

Sent: Tuesday, December 26, 2006 8:09 AM

To: John Haas

Subject: DEVELOPMENT OF THE ISBERG RECREATION AREA.

We are sorry that we could not attend the December 7th meeting for the development of the Isberg Recreation area because of work and school commitments. However, our family: Steve Sorensen P.E., Janet Sorensen L.P.T., Anna Sorensen (adult), and Carrie Sorensen (teenage minor) as equestrians and skiers all support horse and non-motorized multi use trails in the planning and development of the ISBERG RECREATION AREA.

Sincere Regards,
Steve Sorensen



-----Original Message-----

From: Douglas Yates [mailto:dayates@mosquinet.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 26, 2006 2:25 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Re: Isberg Recreation Area Update

The Isberg Rec. Area is a great project and I look forward to watching it develop. It's a place to focus outdoor recreation on the west side of town, taking pressure off Birch Hill and reducing driving times for those seeking similar challenging terrain. It also makes use of land that's largely unsuitable for other uses, implicitly acknowledging that some land, particularly north-facing aspects, are better off undisturbed.

As an off-road cyclist in the summer and a X-C skier, I am familiar with the area's trails and the opportunities that development will bring. In my review of the area, combined with knowledge of mt. biking's international appeal, I suggest the design team plan trail design and staging areas to accommodate the sport's requirements. The growing popularity of mt. biking, and the opportunity to create an event venue gauged for the activity, gives the Isberg project special emphasis. Obviously, much of the economic activity generated by an influx of affluent trail bike enthusiasts will accrue locally.

Designing the site solely for skiing, especially given changing conditions in Fairbanks winters and resulting light snow years, unduly limits the area's potential.

Among the Fairbanks community are a number of people well-versed in trail design for competitive mt. biking, as well as XC-skiing. According to people I've spoken to, harmonizing ski trail requirements with those of cycling present no major obstacles. Several are members of the Fairbanks Cycle Club and ought to be specifically sought out for their recommendations. The FNSB Trails Advisory Committee is another resource; at least one of its members has skills in off-road bike trail design.

Regarding previous use: The creation of the Isberg project is bound to be an imposition to some people, however, the area should not cater to snowmachines or 4-wheelers. Occasional transit of the area for longtime nearby residents should be allowed. A transit-only trail should be designated for that purpose. Isberg should not be designed or managed for fuel-driven machines. Safety is threatened by a mixture of vehicles and muscle-powered traffic.

Adjacent properties: I concur with several people who are advocating to include the nearby Timberline and Graceland acreage in the project boundaries. There are many reasons why this makes sense. I look forward to the planners' response of this suggestion and further discussion among this department, residents and the borough assembly.

Douglas Yates
Box 221
Ester, Alaska 99725

-----Original Message-----

From: mike stredny [mailto:mikestred@acsalaska.net]
Sent: Monday, December 25, 2006 12:53 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Re: Isberg Recreation Area Update

Hey John , finally had time to answer some of your mail over the weekend . Thanks for putting some plans out there for the Isberg Rec. area , there are lots of possibilities . It was something to listen to the ideas batted around during the public meetings . I liked the idea of retaining the local feel of Isberg with more local needs of skiing , hiking, bike riding and greenspace recreation , even a school classroom rec. area with a more borough like multiple use 100 mile loop trail connection for everyone [snowmachines and non-motorized] . That way we can have neighborhood trails connected to a larger trail system while retaining the local feel of our smaller trails . Again the possibilities are endless but please try to do several ones well instead of all of them half way. Thanks again for the chance to comment , Mike Stredny



-----Original Message-----

From: Dana Moudry [mailto:drm@gi.alaska.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 28, 2006 11:36 AM
To: John Haas
Cc: drm@gi.alaska.edu
Subject: isberg trails comments

Hi,

I don't know whether it is too late to comment on the Isberg trails.

I am excited to know that a trail system is in the process of being planned for that area. Currently I live in the beginning of Chena Ridge road, and a few years ago I skied with my dogs from Chena Ester Ditch Road (and the trail it connects to) to the area that is now known as the Isberg Trails area. I have not done that since a new house was build very close to the former trail, but my first comment, while on this subject, would be that it would be wonderful to have access to the Isberg Trails both from Isberg Road and from another location (specifically for me, if possible, the Chena Ester Ditch Road and that area). I realize that is a long shot but wanted to write it down nevertheless.

For the Isberg trails themselves, I would plan on using them to go skiing with my husband and daughter (a toddler, in a sled behind the skis), and skijoring with my dogs. We use the Rosie Creek / Rosie Creek Farm trails relatively frequently, so I will base my comments for the Isberg Trails relative to those.

The width of a trail: a snowmachine width is fine, though having some trails wider (so that one can skate-ski) would be nice.

Multi-use: get people out the door, don't limit the trails to one activity. (Of course, the access to Rosie Creek Trails got torn up by four-wheelers on September/October, and is still very bad, so limiting access during that period would have been very beneficial to the trails...)

Lengths: I would love to be able to go for a quick 1/2 - 3/4 hour ski, or a two hour ski - several interconnecting trails where one could chose what length of a loop to do would be nice.

Facilities: not necessary, though probably a parking area would be nice if the trails get popular, as might possibly be a warming hut (and in that case also toilets).

Thank you,
Dana

Dana Truffer-Moudra
Geophysical Institute, U of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK 99775
drm at gi.alaska.edu 907.474.6639 (f:7360)

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Herriges [mailto:herriges@pci.net]
Sent: Monday, January 01, 2007 11:37 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg planning input

Hi John,

I'm finally getting around to writing down some input for what I would like to see at Isberg Recreation Area. I hope it might still be useful.

Please pass it along to the folks at Design Alaska.

Here's my answer to Karl Kassel's invitation to tell "Santa" what I would like to see at Isberg:



I love the White Bear Loop at Birch Hill and would like to have a similar trail at Isberg to regularly skijor and ski on. It wouldn't need to be as wide as the White Bear, but I would like it to be wider than the 8" in the design specs for skating without worrying about catching a tip at the edge (which isn't fun at skijoring speeds). I'd ask Santa for 10' wide trails. The trail will have to wind around some to get 10K or so of distance in this smaller area, but my dogs would hope that the trails wouldn't wind back around upon themselves too much (eg. not as much as the Tower Loop at Birch Hill), or they'll start thinking about making short cuts. The trail should be designed to be safe at speeds upwards of 20 miles per hour, and consider that a skijorer can't stop as fast as a skier. The trail would stay mostly at higher elevations where it is typically warmer, although linking trails could be found in the lower elevations.

I would like the trail to be available at all times for skijoring and occasionally for skijoring events and competition.

On occasions, I would like to be able to ski with my dogs running loose along with me, if that didn't interfere with other users. I would also like to be able to walk my dogs loose in the summer or hook them up to my bike and bikejor.

A couple of suggestions which occurred to me while listening at the public meeting:

I would suggest not relying too much on the current trails there. If they fit into a good design, that's great, but designing trails that best meet users needs and will be sustainable in the long term is most important. I would suggest at least consulting with someone who has experience in designing ski trail systems.

Although most people spoke in favor of maintaining current uses at Isberg, I think most recognized that all uses will not be able to be allowed on all trails. It will be a challenge to make everyone happy in the limited area available. I would support acquiring adjacent property for that reason.

Good luck with the challenge.

I'll be out of town until January 20th, but will be happy to provide further input by email or after I return.

Jim

-----Original Message-----

From: Jack Willard [mailto:jwillard@cgfr.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 02, 2007 11:39 AM

To: John Haas

Subject: RE: Isberg Recreation Area Update

John I want to send you my comments as we talked on the phone. We thanks this is a great project for the area and look forward to the use of the area. As a Emergency response agency for the area we have one major concern and that is access to the area for emergency's. We have both four wheelers and snow machine that pull rescue sleds for transport of patients. We will need the ability to access all of the trails for emergency response. If I understand some of the trail will be restricted to non-motorized traffic and we understand that but we need some type of access to the area. If there could be a gate or a barricade that can be unlock and moved for emergency use and trail maintenance that would be great. If this will work I can get you the size of opening we will need to get your equipment in so we don't have to hand carry someone on a stretcher for a long distance and slow our response time. If there is anything else I can do to help please let me know.

Fire Chief Jack Willard
Chena-Goldstream Fire & Rescue
P.O. Box 80487
Fairbanks AK 99708
chief@cgfr.com
(907)479-5672
FAX(907)479-5858



-----Original Message-----

Here are my extensive comments. I have more but no time to write them all down. I look forward to seeing your design ideas.

Brian Charlton

Comments on the Isberg Recreation Area development Plan – 1-3-2006

To Design Alaska and FNSB Parks and Recreation,

My name is Brian Charlton. I live on Oboe Ct, along the western edge of the Isberg Recreation Area (IRA). Not only am I an avid user of the trails, I also have been performing maintenance on the existing trail system (grooming, clearing obstacles). First, I would like to thank you for your efforts towards creating a plan for the Isberg Recreation Area (IRA). I was lucky enough to attend the recent public meeting on the IRA at which many people shared their visions and ideas for the IRA. The turnout was outstanding and the comments appeared supportive and informative. I appreciated the opportunity to share my thoughts at the meeting and would like to continue sharing my ideas with your planning teams.

The IRA represents an opportunity for developing a multi-use motorized trail system, which has not been done formally within the Interior. While it is a great challenge to meet the needs of the diverse groups interested in sharing this area, I do believe it is possible. We have a great community here and I look forward to working towards creating a wonderful recreation area.

Destination Trails

Sometimes called destination trails, the trails that run along the edges of the IRA are very important thoroughways for many winter and summer users. Winter appears to have the most diverse user groups with skiers, bikers, mushers, ATVs and snowmachiners traversing the park to access Rosie Creek, Ester, and Chena Ridge. Both of the existing thoroughways, the 100-mile trail and the power line trail (including the upper loop trail), should be maintained in some form. The 100-mile trail needs many improvements to support year-round use. Seasonal use restrictions would be very helpful in making this trail usable year-round.

The area traversed by the power line thoroughway could support year round multiple-use. A meandering trail with a durable surface would add greatly to the experience of traveling through the IRA. Ideally this trail would be rerouted to take advantage of the beautiful forest spaces and potential views. It could also be used as a connection corridor to other crucial entrance points along Isberg Rd. This trail would need to be wide enough to allow safe head-on passing and would likely require some type of speed limit. In addition to this trail it would be important to construct a non-motorized trail, following a somewhat different route, with access to the upper portion of the IRA. Both of these trails should closely follow the southern boundary of the IRA to allow for improved access. If it is decided to maintain the current power line trail as the thoroughfare, the portion crossing the small creek needs to be improved and potentially rerouted as it has been steadily deteriorating from ATV use.

Beginner Trails

One of the popular topics at the meeting was the development of a beginner trail system. Beginner trails are a key element of any trail system and likely receive the greatest use. Beginner trails need to be relatively short in distance, with very gradual inclines and declines. There are few areas within the IRA that contain the type of terrain necessary for quality year-round trails suitable for beginners. The upper portion of the IRA, while potentially warmer, is quite hilly and is better suited for more challenging trails. The best area for beginner trails is located on the uphill end of the school site along Isberg Rd. This makes sense for several reasons: 1) The IRA boundary reaches to Isberg Rd allowing access. 2) The topography here is quite flat making parking easier and providing the ideal beginner trail terrain. 3) This area does experience inversions when compared to low-lying areas of town. 4) These trails could easily be incorporated into future school programs. 5) There are several different forest types in a short distance which could allow for an informative nature trail. 6) Existing trails are close-by permitting access to the rest of the area. 7) Having the trails on the uphill portion will also allow for year round use due to better soils/drainage than the lower portion of the school site. 8) Potential for sharing a parking area with the School District may also help reduce costs. I hope you consider utilizing this spot when incorporating beginner trails into the plan.



Parking Points

The primary parking for the IRA would be best located adjacent to the beginner trails. While it would be possible to access these trails from other potential parking areas, these areas do have limitations to consider. The Ester Fire Department has expressed interest in letting their land be used as parking for the IRA, which could also double as a playground. A logistical challenge of using this area centers on crossing Oboe Ct. Creating the road crossing further down Oboe Ct and away from the entrance to the parking area would reduce pedestrian vehicle encounters. However, summer access to the upper trail system from this point would require construction of new trails to avoid the rutting conditions found on existing trails.

A parking area on Cripple Creek Road (1 and 2 on your report) would be a great way to limit traffic within the Cripple Creek Service Area. However the trails in this area are very marginal for summer use due to the unstable soil and lowland terrain. Before access is created, these trails must be hardened and improved or use restrictions enacted to allow for sustainable use. The lowland topography near the Cripple Creek access points make this area very suitable for beginner-level winter trails.

There is also value in hardening the 100-mile trail to allow year round trail access from Ester to Cripple Creek and beyond. Doing this would greatly reduce the rutting of this trail making it capable of supporting early season winter use as well as year round uses by those currently restricted by summer ponds and mud. I often speak to long time users of this area who talk of the times when they were able to run this section of trail in the summer.

Trail restrictions

Multiple use can happen within the IRA. The challenge is in coordinating uses so as not to negatively impact other uses. It is obvious that some uses are compatible and others are not. I believe that much potential conflict can be eliminated by designing trails dedicated to specific uses and good signage. The following include several potential trail classifications; Single track ski/walking trails (no assisted power i.e. dogs and motors) and bikes in season. Beginner trails, with the same rules as single track but wider tread to allow for skating. Advanced trails: Skiers, skijorers, dog mushers, bikers and foot traffic in season. Motorized year-round: open to all users all year. Motorized winter-only: open to all users in winter, only foot traffic in summer. Winter travel when ground is sufficiently frozen.

ATVs

ATV use within the IRA is popular. The plan for this area must include some trails capable of supporting year-round motorized use. I believe constructing a year-round multiple-use trail following contours with rolling grades, beautiful forests, scenic vistas, and a secluded feel would be attractive to many users including ATVs. The upland soils of the IRA should be capable of supporting ATV use on sustainably designed trails.

One major issue related to ATV use is trail degradation. The well-drained sloping hillside found in the upper elevations of the IRA can support fairly intensive trail use. In contrast, the soils found in the lower elevations can deteriorate quickly due to their high moisture contents and thick organic layer. The use of ATV's in these areas creates nearly impassable ruts and water for much of the year. Basically, the current use of ATVs in these poor soils severely limits the trail options for all user groups. The soils in the lower portion of the IRA cannot support ATV use without major trail reconstruction including trail hardeners (i.e. geoblock).

Winter use of ATVs on trails also causes rutting. These ruts make the trail dangerous for non-motorized users such as skiers and runners. Currently some ATV users attempt to mitigate their impacts by dragging the trail behind them. This is very helpful though not fully effective. Winter ATV use is not compatible with groomed winter trails. Separating groomed winter trail uses from transportation corridors would go long ways towards alleviating potential conflicts.

Snow machines

Most snow machine use within the IRA is destination traffic. As stated before it is very important to maintain the continuity of trails passing through the IRA. Only the most carefully driven snow machines do not impact groomed winter trails. Therefore an attempt must be made to separate these trails as well. Ideally, the ATV and snow machine corridors will be the same.

Motorized interactions with non motorized

An important consideration when planning for multiple-use is how to manage interactions between different user groups, with safety the most important consideration. Areas in which motorized trails come into contact with non-motorized should be minimized. These areas should be designed for safe passage including caution signs, trail etiquette notices, speed limits, etc.

I think connecting the main parking area near the school site with the upper transportation corridor would be a great idea. The increased traffic through this area would reduce potential parking lot vandalism and the increased sight distances would make all users easily visible to each other.



It would provide transportation access to the trail system and future school access from surrounding neighborhoods. These same theories could be applied to other potential access points as well.

Nordic Skiing

The FNSB currently maintains world-class Nordic skiing facilities. The Nordic skiing plans for this area should be more “experience trails” rather than “training trails”. While challenge is a part of every skiing experience, the users of these trails are not racers. Quite a few people spoke at the public meeting in favor of maintaining beginner level trails (mentioned earlier), single-track classic trails (good summer hiking trails of course) as well as the rustic feel of the trails (narrow and woodsy). These desires can be maintained by keeping trail widths down and following contours to keep trail grades less steep. No trails wider than 8 ft should be built within the IRA.

Skijorers

I am an avid skijorer and this is my main motivation in performing maintenance on the current trails. Skijoring can be done on both classic and skating trails. However, the speeds achieved are more conducive to skate skiing. Skijoring on the narrow trails is not conducive to beginner trails. Beginner level trails should be off limits to skijoring/mushing. Well-designed gradually sloping trails as mentioned in the Nordic skiing section would suit the needs of skijorers perfectly. Creamers Field and Chena Lakes currently provide trails for beginner level skijorers. Creating a trail system that includes more advanced skijor terrain would diversify the type of trails Fairbanks has to offer.

Dog mushers

Dog mushing also needs to be included in the uses of these trails. I personally know of at least six people who regularly mush within the IRA. The trail needed for dog mushing varies greatly by the number of dogs run. Some teams travel 6mph while others may reach 20mph or more. Most mushing trails are not much wider than a snow machine. Grades need to be gentle enough to control speeds so as not to injure any dogs and corners need to be gradual enough to dodge trees. Most dog mushers planning on traveling more than 6 miles are likely to use the IRA trails as thoroughfares as well.

Horses

I wish I had a better term than horse users but here we go. I know people with horses currently use the IRA. Are horse users able to use the same trails as motorized users? What are the impacts of horse use on non-motorized trails? What are the seasonal limitations for equestrian use? Local horses currently use the Birch hill trails with apparently little impact. It seems as though unrestricted summer trails should be open to horse users.

Playground

The idea of a playground was also brought up at the meeting and is a wonderful idea. As stated at the meeting, “This is a young neighborhood.” A picnic area in addition to the playground would do a lot to bring the community together. The play/picnic area would be better constructed away from the trailhead. It’s a challenge to direct young minds towards the trail and the distraction of play equipment can overwhelm the best children. Perhaps this area would be better suited for the corner of Oboe Ct. and Isberg Rd. where the ground is flat and access off of Oboe Ct. is quite safe. Of course it would still be trail accessible from the parking area due to its location along the multi-use motorized trail.

Mountain Biking

While listening to people mention their desire a downhill mountain bike trail I pondered the winter uses of such a trail. In summer the steep downhill trail could return uphill via a more gradual route in conjunction with other existing trails. In winter the trail direction would reverse and it could be used as an uphill for snowshoers.

Lights

It was mentioned at the meeting by many residents that a lighted trail system is not desired and I strongly agree. Those who use trails at night wear headlamps or carry flashlights. It would however be wise to light any major parking area.

Moose Calving

It was also mentioned at the public meeting that this area is known as a productive moose calving ground. I could attest to this as I have seen several sets of moose triplets and twins since I’ve lived here. This is a seasonal activity, which also attracts predators. Warnings and use restrictions may need to be posted if wildlife encounters begin to cause problems.

THE END



FNSB Department of Parks and Recreation Isberg Recreation Area - Master Plan

Thanks for considering my ideas and opinions on the IRA. I appreciate you taking the time to read my many comments. I trust you will consider all comments received and do your best to design a successful multi-use recreational area. I look forward to seeing your draft ideas and being a part of further planning processes related to this project. Feel free to contact me any time at bskijor@yahoo.com.

Sincerely,
Brian Charlton

-----Original Message-----

Fairbanks North Star Borough

Memo

To : Karl Kassel Parks and Recreation Director

Through: Bernardo Hernandez Community Planning Director

From: John Morack, Trails Advisory Commission Chairman

Date: December 18, 2006

At our last meeting, the Fairbanks North Star Borough Trails Advisory Commission unanimously agreed to forward the following comments concerning the proposed Tanana Lakes and Isberg Recreation Areas.

The 100-Mile Loop Trail, which is identified in the comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan, runs through both the Tanana Lakes and Isberg Recreational Areas. Additionally, there are several; existing neighborhood trail within these areas. The Trails Advisory Commission urges the borough to recognize the importance of through trail travel as well as local recreational trail use in both projects.

Cc Jim Whitaker, Mayer



Summary of Public Comments Concerning the Isberg Recreational Area Collected on 03/20/07 at the Second Public Meeting

Topics	Summary of Comments from the 2 nd Public Meeting	# of Comments
Trail Layout and Design	Supports maintaining existing trails as motorized and new trails as non-motorized	1
	Supports having a ski loop for kids near the Isberg Parking Area	1
	Concerned by potential damage to wet trails caused by ATV use in summer	1
	Encourages classic only ski loop	1
	Consider lighting trail near Oboe Court	1
	Supports multiuse trails concept	1
	Concerned with safety at trail intersections	1
	Supports including loop trail around small pond in north west center of IRA	1
Facilities		
Parking Area	Supports ATV off-load ramps at trailheads	1
	Recommends separating motorized users from dog teams at parking lots	1
	Believes Isberg parking will get highest use by families in the winter	1
	Recommends changing main parking from Oboe to Cripple Creek location	3
Operations/Maintenance	Encourages collaboration with ski club for trail grooming	1
	Consider segregating users by time	1
Other	Encourages purchase or acquisition of adjoining parcels	1
	Supports finding a safe alternative for crossing the Parks Highway	1
	Opposes the inclusion of lights at the park	3



Sign In

<u>Name</u>	<u>Email Address</u>	<u>Phone</u>
1. Cindy Fabbri		
2. Trent Mackey		
3. Robert Siftar	wildalaska@mosquitonet.com	
4. Jack Willard	chief@cgfr.com	
5. Bobby Gillis	bgillis@acsalaska.net	
6. Phil Hoffman	phoffman@cgfr.com	
7. Ritchie Musick	ritchimusick@gci.net	
8. Chanda Meek		
9. Ellen Million Allen	ellen@ellenmilliongraphics.com	
10. Emily Bernhardt		
11. Mary Ann Nickles	manickles@alaska.net	
12. Bill & Betty Connor	bconnor1@hawaiintel.net	
13. Phyllis Haggland	phaggland@yahoo.com	
14. Mikie Musick	mikiemusick@gci.net	
15. Robyn Yount	akghost2000@alaska.net	
16. Kim Gutgesell	Kim_Gutgesell@hotmail.com	
17. Bill Simpson	w.r.simpson@gmail.com	
18. Bill McDonald	wmcDonald@acsalaska.net	
19. Ariana Graf	aviana@expeditionsschool.com	
20. Jim Herriges	herriges@gci.net	
21. Tim Ceahran	tceahran@ptialaska.net	
22. Carolyn Foelsch	kbdesign@alaska.net	
23. Les Graves	aka_les@hotmail.com	479-6172
24. Paul Schmidt	pschmidt@co.fairbanks.ak.us	459-1070
25. Toby Risnen	toby_risnen@us.army.mil	488-2564
26. Colin Craven		451-2181
27. James Allen	jalce_allen@yahoo.com	451-5485
28. Christine Matson	cmatson@nortechengr.com	
29. Brian & Emma Charlton	bcskijor@yahoo.com	479-3665
30. Carol Meyer	aspewood@alaska.com	474-8520
31. Hae Meyer		
32. Dan Yount	akghost2000@alaska.net	474-8701
33. Mary Keelean	mkeelea@gmail.com	479-5490
34. Tim & Ariann Graf estesen	ariana@expiditionschool.com	451-0817
35. Jim Allen	jimallen@uaf.edu	474-6132
36. Dana Truffer Moudra	truffers@gmail.com	479-7545



Isberg Recreation Area Master Plan Public Meeting Comments 3-20-2007

COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

Christine Matson on ~~behalf~~ behalf of the Fairbanks Cycle Club:

Like the trail plan. Think it is important to keep the motorized users off the non-motorized trails - suggest using bollards, etc. to keep them out.

The Fairbanks Cycle Club would like to offer volunteers and trail design input. Please contact cmatson@nortechengr.com to set up a meeting or to let us know what is needed.

All types of users should be encouraged to use the trails, with certain trails set aside for non-motorized use, like the boardwalk to the lake idea. Looks like there is plenty of parking to keep user vehicles off the road which is good.

With so many trailheads you will need lots of signage - so users know what they can/can not do.

Encourage the Borough to follow through and develop this area.



COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

The main parking lot should not have any lights. Lights will significantly and negatively change the neighborhood.

Trails should not be lighted.

A suitable site for main parking would be on Cripple Creek as opposed to Obac.





COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

The Main - fully developed parking would be better planned @
 ③ located in the canyon - The Criffle Creek area (Not Obse)
 The Obse main parking is too close to neighborhoods
 Check your sources about the need to have lighting - No lighting
 is much preferred by every one we talked to - Those people
 who come to the area FROM other parts of the Borough = Come because
 there are natural trails, No lighting is why other users love it



COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

Restrooms ① No lighting
 ② Change Main Parking from Obse to Criffle Creek
 ③ Alternate USE for area } 1st 2 weeks / month = No Motorized
 } Only Non-motorized
 } 2nd 2 weeks Day 16 - 31 = Any one
 } including (motorized)





COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

AS THE CONCEPT WAS EXPLAINED TO ME, THE TRAILS ARE BEING DESIGNED FOR MOTORIZED AND NON-MOTORIZED ACCESS HOWEVER THAT DOES NOT LIMIT TRAIL USE TO EITHER USE (MOTO CAN USE NON-MOTO AND VICE VERSA). I LIKE THIS CONCEPT AS I DO NOT WISH TO SEE ACTIVITY RESTRICTED TO ONE INTEREST GROUP. AS A MEMBER OF THE TRAIL I WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST THAT ALL TRAIL INTERSECTIONS, REGARDLESS OF DESIGNATED USE, HAVE A VISIBILITY CLEARANCE TO MINIMIZE ACCIDENTS AT INTERSECTIONS. PLEASE DO NOT CLEAR WIDE SWATHS FOR VISIBILITY AS THEY WOULD EVENTUALLY BECOME WEEDS AS TRAILS MAYBE JUST TOPPING THE EXISTING VEGETATION SO BACK AT EACH CORNER WOULD PROVIDE ENOUGH VISIBILITY TO SEE ONCOMING AND SIDE TRAIL TRAFFIC



COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

With the main parking lot - On Obse - Please plan a vegetative buffer between Isberg + the Parking Area to minimize impact on the neighborhood ambience. Thanks!





COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

- ① In the previous concept discussion there were several who request more limited but classified ski specific trails. Multi (non-motorized) use trails to mean skis and also you (dog) which trail to utilize as classified trails. Perhaps the trail design (ref #3) & when the parking lot might be available for classes only.
- ② Signing on Chena Ridge and winter use of the trails with snow machines to go to both Minto Hill, Ester and Gering Dome. But your responsibility not clearing the Parks to do so is not the safest thing to do. Perhaps the highway and DOT might consider an easement or easement to safely separate the Parks from the highway area.
- ③ Would it be possible to have a loop trail around the water bodies at items #5?
- ④ Drive the road with snow machine perhaps the loop trail ref #1 above might be suitable for lighting.
- ⑤ Skiing trails may be needed to be marked to prompt users to keep the trail clear of droppings.

You guys do GREAT WORK!!

Bill McDonald
wmcdonald@accs.alaska.net



COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

Jim Alley
1780 Festival Dr
477-3341 / 477-6132
Jim.Alley@usda.gov

- ① Children: It seems the "loops" kids esp young kids might use are down in low cold areas by Dobe.
- ② There are trail heads on dead end streets, "Banjo" and "Hoedown" roads are not built, is this needs planning so people do not expect no cars will part of the trail head. I will these be catchers? Will parking be allowed? Given the area by Aboc is a 'cold spot' in relation to up higher - where the temp can be 10 degrees plus warmer. I think kids and families will opt for non-motorized use up higher at the other trail access points.
- ③ User conflict - esp in the future, will be avoided if existing main trails are motorized, and new trails (non-motorized) trails are preserved for safety as non-motorized.
- ④ Encourage collaboration with the ski club for grooming as at UAE or Birch Hill, to allow continued use over high use periods. Strongly encourage study of the experience of Hillside and other discharge need these trails; encourage specialized trails for skijoring gear use - ski only - etc.
- ⑤ For kids - parking area ~~ref #2~~ on map will be high use - it's warmer than ~~area~~, can this loop be a kids loop ski area in the seen.
- ⑥ How will erosion in summer wet lands be handled with ATV use? There is potential for serious habitat and land damage.
- ⑦ Discourage straight line trails along section line - ~~on~~ non-motorized - encourages motor use.
- ⑧ Encourage acquisition of adjoining land.





COMMUNITY COMMENTS:

- Considered ATV offload sites at trail heads. At a minimum trailer parking
keeping us separate from mountain bikes would find motorized
vehicles disruptive to their preparation

- Flag use on ATVs would assist in collision avoidance.





Topics	Summary of Comments Received by E mail / Letter Second Public Comment Period March 2007	# of Comments
Trail Layout and Design	Consider non-motorized only trails for eastern most trails and uplands	1
	Maintain multi use trails and rustic atmosphere	3
	Supports designing new trail specifically with mountain biking in mind.	1
	Generic safety concerns: segregate speed with out disregarding any one user group, minimize non motorized trail crossings of motorized trails, and consider one-way trails	4
	Supports construction of new non-motorized trails	1
	Opposes motorized trail along section line going east to Isberg Road	1
	Supports maintaining access points from various neighboring locations	1
	Proximity of accessible trails to the school site is desirable	1
	Signs and maps for the trails are important elements	1
Facilities	Supports adding playground to main parking area	1
	Picnic Shelter is a bad idea for main parking lot	1
	Warming hut is a good idea for main parking lot	1
	Recommends no lighting away from main parking area or low-light infrastructure only at parking. Minimize the use of lighting to reduce light pollution	5
Parking Areas	Supports small parking area at the upper trail head	1
	Supports parking near Oboe Court and Isberg Road	2
	Opposes parking and trailhead off Cripple Creek Road	2
	Supports parking and trailhead off Cripple Creek Road	2
Operations/Maintenance	Limit motorized use during warm weather to uplands and/or limit motorized vehicles	3
	Support seasonal trail use restrictions to maintain the trail quality. Expressed a concern with trail degradation due to summer use of fragile trails.	8
Other	We feel that naming this facility the 'Cripple Creek Recreation Area' is more apt than 'Isberg Recreation Area'	2
	Purchase/trade adjacent parcels to acquire trail access (Graceland/Timberline and Contentment Estates) to be included into the Isberg Recreation Area. Maintain and improve connectivity with existing trails including 100 Mile Loop and FE Ditch	9
	Consider private property development buffers with adjacent properties (200 ft min)	1
	Suggests using volunteers for building and maintenance of the trails	2
	General support for project	5



E mail and Written Comments
Second Public Comment Period March 2007

-----Original Message-----

From: Martha Raynolds [mailto:mraynolds@gci.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2007 10:55 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: comments on Isberg Recreation Area plans

Dear John Haas & FNSB Parks & Rec. -

I just had a chance to peruse the information on the Isberg Recreation Area on the "Ongoing Projects" web site. Wow! The plans, as shown on Design Alaska's drawings, show a first-class facility that will be a tremendous year-round recreational asset to all the residents of western Fairbanks.

I would encourage the Borough to look into securing the trail connections through adjacent private lands. A connection to the 100-Mile Trail and the Tanana River would further enhance the Recreation Area.

Best regards,
Martha Raynolds

--

Martha Raynolds
mraynolds@gci.net
(907) 479-3726

-----Original Message-----

From: Jon Underwood [mailto:jonu@alaskafeed.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2007 4:36 PM
To: John Haas; Paul Schmidt
Subject: RE: Isberg Recreation Master Plan Public Comment

Hi John & Paul,

Thank you for all your work on this project- I am really excited to see this developing! Unfortunately I missed the meeting. I hope you got a lot of participation. Here are my comments/questions.

I like the parking lot trailhead design, very functional & accomodates trailers.

Are the new trail loops still conceptual?

Are there existing trails that need to be re-routed?

I notice a couple of trails exit the park (motorized trail on east side, non-mot. multi-use on southwest side). Do these have easements across adjoining property?

I would like to restate that I hope one of the new trail loops can be designed specifically with mountain biking in mind. This sort of trail can still be used for walking, snowshoeing, skiing etc. but would have a different line & feel from one designed without bikes in mind.

Also, I would like to suggest a mountain bike skills area near the trailhead. There are a lot of good management guidelines in IMBA's new "Managing Mountain Biking" book along with suggestions about how to make an area more interesting to bikes without really adding expense or changing the trail to any great degree.



Hitching posts for horses at trailhead?

Some of these trails would have to be winter use only- maybe? Unless heavily amended?

Jon Underwood

-----Original Message-----

From: Steve Reidsma [mailto:sreidsma@alaska.net]

Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2007 11:20 AM

To: John Haas

Subject: ISBERG TRAILS

Hello

I am currently moving from Basin Street near Isberg road (off Chena Ridge) to Ridgeview (off Fiddle). I have been using the "isberg rec area" trails for 5 years now (and will continue in the new location), dropping down from Basin through a section line to the valley bottom. I usually skijor, waiting for the snowmachines to make first tracks down there. I usually ski in the evenings, not seeing anyone else on the trail. I would like to see this area as a park, continue multi-use, no lighting away from the parking lots.

The valley grades down into black spruce wetlands and alder creek, which can be very susceptible to summer motorize damage. I ask that summer trails have motorized use confined to the upland slopes of the park. This should not turn into an ATV bug bogging area.

The large graceland parcel would add significantly to the area and to the existing trails. I hope that there is a way to keep access to the existing trails shown on the map (10 mile and the FE trail). I tend to use the trails down across Alder creek, using the powerline, and use upper slope trails to get down to the gold dredge by ESTER. Access points from BASIN ST, STARSHIP and other locations would continue to make this a great neighborhood asset.

Steve Reidsma
3781 Ridgeview Dr
Po box 83233
Fbks, 99708

-----Original Message-----

From: ruth@gi.alaska.edu [mailto:ruth@gi.alaska.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2007 2:32 PM

To: John Haas

Subject: Isberg Recreation area

Recently read through the plan for the Isberg Recreation area. One suggestion: Limit use by motorized vehicles. They tend to tear up the trail, create pollution, and the noise created by the machines will most likely be a nuisance to residents of the area. Otherwise, looks good.

Ruth Freeburg
Geophysical Institute
UAF



-----Original Message-----

From: Kim Gutgesell [mailto:kim_gutgesell@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 1:53 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: RE: Isberg Recreation Master Plan Public Comment

I would like to suggest changing the name to "Cripple Creek Recreation Area".

I feel the name will influence which road people will use. If Cripple Creek is in the name, more folks would use the Parks Highway to Cripple Creek to access the rec area. This would eliminate an increase in traffic on Isberg.

Thank you,
Kim Gutgesell

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Simpson [mailto:w.r.simpson@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2007 10:24 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Re: Isberg Recreation Master Plan Public Comment

Hello John-

I attended the public meeting and enjoyed speaking with you and the other planners of this area. I liked the master plan for the Isberg Recreation Area. Features I found appealing with the plan were:

The planned construction of new non-motorized trails. The existing main trails (orange on the map) are sufficient to allow motorized users to cross the area in a reasonable manner. The area is too small to have reasonable length motorized loop trails, and I think most motorized users said they only want to cross the area. I think interested groups and local residents will help with construction of these new non-motorized trails.

The location of the primary trailhead is probably best for the area because that location is safest in which to park and has reasonably flat land. The proximity of those accessible trails to the school site is nice for when that school is constructed. You might consider having these trails not cross the motorized trail along the powerline so many times. I think this location would be excellent for a playground when the parking is developed.

Some things that I think should be considered are:

The other low land in this area, particularly the "contentment estates" low land that is bordered by the Chena Ridge FE ditch trail and the 100 mile loop trail, would be excellent for addition to this recreation area. That land is not good for residential but would fit with the trails of the recreation area. Please consider recommending expansion to include this land, and consider how the master plan might be affected if there was expansion in this area.

Consider recommending that the motorized uses be seasonally restricted so as to not be destructive to the trail system and to maintain the quality of the area. Currently the 100 mile loop trail gets destroyed nearly annually by a very small number of motorized users who try to use during wet times in summer/fall. Those users prevent other users from using the trail for months of the winter. A seasonal trail restriction on the motorized uses would be very helpful in maintaining the trail quality.

Best regards,

Bill Simpson

Bill Simpson
Fairbanks, AK
907 479-3363



-----Original Message-----

From: Jake [mailto:jake_allen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2007 5:17 PM
To: erskin@designalaska.com; John Haas
Subject: Isberg Recreation Area Master Plan Comments

Greetings Erskin and John,

Thank you very much for the second public meeting, attached are our written comments.

Jake and Ellen

26 March, 2007

Greetings!

We are the Allens, and are writing this letter to offer input following the second public meeting for the Isberg/Cripple Creek Recreation Area master plan. We own land along the eastern border of the area, and are frequent and avid users of the existing trail system. Our most relevant comments are listed below:

Private Property Buffer

In our written comments from the first public meeting, we asked for an ideal buffer between trails and private property borders of 500 feet, and an acceptable buffer of 300 feet. The reason being that the foliage in this area is birch and aspen, with little undergrowth, and you can see quite some distance through the forest. I am sure that trail users wish to see and hear property owners as little as property owners wish to see and hear trail users.

However, upon further review of the situation, and in talking to some of our neighbors, we wish to change this comment. A buffer between trails and private property borders of 200 feet seems to be the buffer size that best satisfies issues of privacy, rustic trails, and land use. Please provide a minimum buffer between trails and private property borders of 200 feet, no less.

Proposed Upper Non-motorized Trails

Thank you very much for making the eastern most trails, in the upland area, non-motorized only trails. We very much appreciate this. This fills a public desire, as spoken of at the public meetings, and also makes it a lot easier for us to be happy with the smaller buffer written about above.

Motorized Trail Shown Outside of Recreation Area

The most recent proposed trails map shows a motorized trail outside of the recreation area. This trail is shown on a section line that dead ends on its east end against the steep roadway embankment of Isberg Road. The continuation of this section line on the other side of Isberg does not exist as the section line easement through Lot 1A, Block 3 of Hardrock Hills has been abandoned (see DNR master plat for this area). In order to use this trail as shown on the proposed trails map, one would have to either cross private property, or bomb down the side of a very steep and somewhat tall embankment, creating a safety concern. We ask that you remove this trail from the proposed trails map as the section line easement is not continuous, and as safe use of this trail as shown involves crossing private property, and also as this trail is not within the physical borders of the Isberg/Cripple Creek Recreation Area. Also, this access is not needed with the new upper trail-head/parking lot. We feel that the motorized trail should be connected to the upper trail-head/parking lot rather than run through a dead end section line easement.

Proposed Upper Trail-head / Parking Lot

In our written comments from the first public meeting, we opposed the proposed upper trail-head/parking lot. However, upon further review of the situation, and in talking to some of our neighbors, we wish to change this comment. Although this is not an ideal location for a trail-head/parking lot, it seems to be the only reasonable location available to serve the top of the proposed facility. So long as this does not become a large parking lot with lighting and structures, we find it acceptable.



Proposed Lower Trail-head / Parking Lot and Easy Trails

We are very much in favor of the trail-head/parking lot to be shared with the FNSB school district on their proposed elementary school lot, and are also in favor of easy-level trails at this location. The suggested idea of a community playground also has a lot of appeal!

Possible Additional Trail-head / Parking Lot

Additionally, a trail head/parking lot located on Cripple Creek Road close to the Parks Hwy/Cripple Creek intersection would be welcome as this would limit traffic through the subdivision while still providing access to the recreation area for visitors. It would be better for visitors to be able to park somewhere close to the highway than to have to drive through the subdivision to get the Isberg Road Lower Trail-head / Parking Lot.

Keep Trails Rustic, but Safe

We are very strongly in favor of keeping all existing trails in their current multi-use, rustic state. We see that the most recent proposed trail map shows existing trails now marked as either motorized or non-motorized. Please keep all existing trails open to motorized and non-motorized multi-use. Any new trails can of course be of restricted use, but those trails we have should stay as they are today. Please, we do not want to lose what we have, rather to augment our existing experience with the addition of new trails. It makes sense to us that only new trails be restricted to designated uses, in order to prevent user conflicts.

We are very strongly against a developed park with any structures, paving, lighting, etc (this includes the previously proposed deck at #4). Structures tend to be attractive nuisances if constant enforcement cannot be provided. Any lighting at all would be very unwelcome, except perhaps at the lower trail-head/parking lot.

We also suggest that the middle of the existing three trails that parallel the s-curves on Isberg Road be designated one-way, as this center trail has severe vertical curvature with very poor visibility, and poses a safety hazard when being used in both directions at the same time. We also ask that motorized vehicles be allowed to use this trail as it is a lot of fun, but a bit much to ski on.

Facility Name

As the majority of the subdivided land surrounding this facility is named 'Cripple Creek', and as Cripple Creek is the name of the creek running through the facility, we feel that naming this facility the 'Cripple Creek Recreation Area' is more appropriate than 'Isberg Recreation Area'.

Acquire Graceland and Contentment Estates, Dedicate Major Through Trails

It was proposed at the first public meeting that the borough make an attempt to acquire the properties of Graceland and Contentment Estates. We see this has not yet been feasible, and understand the expense that would be required, but still want to support any possibility of Graceland and Contentment Estates being added to the Isberg/Cripple Creek Recreation Area. Additionally, the 100 Mile Trail and Ester Chena Ditch Trail should have easements dedicated to them and, of course, remain multi-use.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for taking the time to listen to our input and consider our suggestions!

Be well,

James and Ellen Allen



-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Charlton [mailto:bcskijor@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2007 12:39 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg Rec Area Comments

To FNSB and Design Alaska,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the site plan proposed for the Isberg Rec Area. At first I was concerned to see many of the motorized trails remaining in their current locations. Areas in which trail degradation has been increasing making these trails unacceptable for other uses. Then I realized that these won't be our main trails for non-motorized travelers. Their degradation will have the greatest impact on those causing it.

One major issue that was mentioned in your scoping was seasonality of uses. Unfortunately, there was no mention of this on the site plan. How will this be handled. It won't take long before summer uses on unstable soils (i.e. black spruce) degrade trails and make them unusable for future summer use and difficult to use in low snow seasons. This NEEDS to be addressed.

Is there any signage planned for trails, trailheads, and intersections to help educate users. I common theme I have heard on other trails is "Yield to those in the least control"

What about horses? Where do they go? Non-motorized I assume. What about trail degradation/dog interactions?

Anyways, I think that what you may have done is try to keep this area rustic by not imposing any rules/regulations on the trails. It's a nice thought and I hope it works. However, I think you need a contingency plan for what will be done when trails begin to degrade due to incompatible uses. A "we'll just let it happen and let users deal with it" approach is unacceptable.

That said, I look forward to working on constructing many of these trails. It will be nice to have more varied options than we currently have.

Thanks for your time,
Brian Charlton
Resident and avid trail user.

-----Original Message-----

From: phyllis haggland [mailto:phagglan@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2007 8:52 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Re: Isberg Recreation Master Plan Public Comment

Mr. Haas, Thanks to you and your team for all the work you have done on the Isberg Recreation Area. I agree with and support your Themes and trail design. Thank you for not turning the area over to a great deal of motorized use. I have two concerns: 1. could dog mushers and skijorers be encouraged to use the motorized trails (or special trails) because of their speed? 2. is it possible to close trails and areas seasonally if use is tearing up the environment? Thank you, Phyllis Haggland

-----Original Message-----

From: Alice Stickney [mailto:bigalice@gci.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2007 2:10 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: comments on the Isberg Rec Area plan

Hi John,

I couldn't make the meeting as I was out of town, but I like the plan as it is developing. I think it is great that the new proposed trails are non-motorized multiuse, while still having the older loop trails be multiuse for everyone. Are these former trails going to be stabilized? Increasing summer 4-wheeler and motorcycle traffic will wreak havoc with these, as is already happening.



Also, I would like to put in a plug for acquiring the land between and including the 100 mile trail and the old FE trail (shown in white on your map) that is in the parcels known as "contentment Estates".

Alice Stickney
PO Box 273
Ester, AK 99725

-----Original Message-----

From: cfabbri@mosquitonet.com [mailto:cfabbri@mosquitonet.com]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2007 10:24 AM
To: John Haas
Cc: Patrice@designalaska.com
Subject: Isberg Rec Area Comments

Dear John,

Please find attached comments on the Isberg Recreation Area Master Plan. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration of this input.

Sincerely,
Cindy Fabbri & Burr Neely

Cindy Fabbri and Burr Neely
P.O. Box 274
Ester, AK 99725
(907) 457-2365
cfabbri@mosquitonet.com

March 29, 2007

Fairbanks North Star Borough
Department of Parks and Recreation
Attn: John Haas
809 Pioneer Drive
Fairbanks, AK 99707
(907) 459-1198
jhaas@co.fairbanks.ak.us

RE: Isberg Recreation Area Master Plan Comments

Dear John,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Isberg Recreation Master Plan. We appreciate your efforts in incorporating public input and trust this letter will be reviewed and its points considered prior to final implementation of the Master Plan.

We are writing to encourage the borough and Design Alaska to reevaluate the location of the proposed secondary trailhead parking lot on Cripple Creek Road. Primarily, a parking lot/pull out off Cripple Creek Road in this location raises serious safety issues. Cripple Creek is a busy road, and traffic in that area regularly is in excess of the speed limit, especially the eastbound lane that is rounding a blind corner and picking up speed for the long, straight downhill stretch. The borough already recognizes the safety issues due to high volume traffic on Cripple Creek Road as it made subdivisions in the area build loop roads, such as Owl Loop, so that driveways would not directly access Cripple Creek Road and create a safety issue. By building a parking lot/pull out at the proposed location indicated as Point 3 on the New Trails Map, the borough is introducing a safety hazard it has already made an attempt to minimize. A pull-out means increased side traffic on Cripple Creek Road, loose dogs, stray kids, and an increased potential for accidents on the fastest stretch of the entire road.



Secondly, a trailhead in this area seems somewhat redundant. Is it the best long-term investment to develop a trail head and off-road parking area less than one mile from primary trailhead at Oboe Court? Two trailheads would lead to the same area. It would make sense to spread out the trailheads as much as possible and provide access to different areas within the Recreation Area boundary, particularly if the borough intends to expand the recreation area in the future.

Thirdly, a trailhead in the area will lead to increased traffic along the trail. Though the trails are suggested as non-motorized, the borough will be unable to enforce that regulation, and the new trail head will potentially lead to increased motorized trail users in the area. This creates on-trail safety concerns, but, more importantly, it will lead to increased noise and traffic by motorized trail vehicles and diminish the “rustic experience and rural atmosphere” that you are attempting to provide. Summer four-wheeler traffic will also increase, damaging the vegetation and trails in Tract C that will lead to increased maintenance costs for the borough.

Finally, a new parking area on Cripple Creek road will result in loose dogs and trespassing on adjacent private property to the east and west of Tract B. This is another regulation violation that the borough will be unable to enforce. Summarily, a trailhead parking area at the proposed location raises significant safety issues, appears redundant in accessing the same area as the mail trailhead, will increase misuse of the area by motorized trail traffic, and will lead to confrontations between trail users and property owners.

We suggest that no parking lot be constructed at Point 3 on the New Trails map, and provided a narrow trailhead with simple through access to the 100 mile trail. This option would maintain the connectivity to the neighborhood via a discreet trail marked for non-motorized use (neighborhood residents would likely just walk down from their homes, not drive). Easy trails where families and children can use the recreation area should be based out of the main trailhead and parking area at Oboe Court to minimize pedestrian traffic adjacent to Cripple Creek Road. There are already existing trail loops off Oboe Court and minimal new trails would need cutting. Further, if the borough does develop a school on its designated educational property next to Oboe Court, it makes long-term sense to have the family/children area based out of Oboe Court, not a dangerous trailhead on Cripple Creek Road.

If another parking lot is really necessary, Tract C near the northeastern portion of the recreation area is a much more attractive location. Traffic is moving much slower here as cars are just entering or exiting the Parks Highway. Also, if the borough plans to expand the recreation area toward Ester creating a valley-long green belt, a parking area at Tract C is an ideal location as it provides access to the 100-mile trail and other areas that are not directly accessible from the Oboe Court trailhead. Furthermore, every effort should be made to limit light pollution from parking lots, through no-light or low-light infrastructure.

We understand planning and addressing public comments on development projects is a challenging process for both the planners and the neighborhood residents. We know and applaud that the Recreation Area is designed for the benefit of the entire borough, and encourage the borough in acquiring more land and creating more green recreation areas. However, those that know the most about the trails, places for good access, and places where potential issues may arise are the local residents, and we hope both the borough and Design Alaska will continue to listen to and take advantage of the local knowledge.

Thank you for your candid review and consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Cindy Fabbri and Burr Neely

Cc: Patrice Buck
Staff Engineer, Design Alaska



-----Original Message-----

From: Gail Davidson [mailto:spirit1@ptialaska.net]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2007 1:16 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg Trail plan

Hi John,

In general, the plan is exciting and good to see. I have one comment. The parking lot at Oboe is rather large and a bit overwhelming for those of us who already spend a lot of time down there. But what strikes me most is the gathering area/picnic shelter. Although a (future planned) warming hut would be really nice for putting on ski boots, a shelter is a waste of money. It is not useful in the cold, and though it might keep rain off, I wouldn't expect to see much use of the trails from the bottom in summer. The area is very swampy and would need tall boots for walking around. Mountain bikes will put large dents in the trails. No one with any brains or experience would have picnics there due to the high density of bugs. Four wheelers on the wet ground have already done bad things to the 100-mile loop by making it uneven; I worry about them running around on non-motorized trails because no one is watching, but that is a different issue in the planning process. So, in summary, the shelter does not seem worth erecting and paying for.

Sincerely,
Gail Davidson

-----Original Message-----

From: Carolyn Kremers [mailto:ckremers@mosquitonet.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 01, 2007 12:36 AM
To: John Haas
Subject: Isberg Recreation Area master plan--public comment

Dear John Haas and the Isberg Recreation Area master plan committee,

Attached is a letter which I would like to submit as public comment on the IRA master plan. Also attached is the realty advertisement mentioned in the letter.

Please let me know if you have any trouble opening the letter.

Thanks very much!

Carolyn Kremers
Fairbanks, AK

March 31, 2007

Dear John Haas and the Isberg Recreation Area master plan committee

I am writing to express my support and thanks for your work so far on the Isberg Recreation Area master plan, and to submit my public comment.

I attended and spoke at the first public meeting on December 6, 2006, but was unable to attend the second one. I have read the Investigative Report posted on the Parks and Recreation website, viewed all of the images there, and read the list of "Public Scoping Themes" distributed at the second public meeting on March 19

I am pleased to see that the preferences and concerns expressed by the public at the first meeting are summarized well in the scoping themes list. I wish to comment on two of these themes: 1) minimize lighting, and 2) acquire adjoining private property to increase recreation area size.



1) As was mentioned by many people who attended the first meeting, the darkness, quiet, privacy, and rustic nature of the IRA land and surrounding areas are highly valued by area residents and should be protected and preserved.

The hillsides and forests of this region face north and northwest and provide beautiful views of spring sunsets; approaching rain storms and snow storms; stars, planets, and phases of the moon; and fall and winter northern lights. The power and beauty of these natural phenomena should not be diminished by artificial light. Please do everything possible to avoid and/or minimize the use of artificial light on trails and at parking areas, etc. Fairbanks already produces much light pollution. The IRA presents an opportunity to demonstrate that thoughtful planning and regard for natural habitats can result in little or no need for use of artificial light.

2) Many people at the first meeting suggested that Parks and Recreation and the Fairbanks North Star Borough make every effort to acquire some of the large parcels of land that adjoin the IRA and that are not conducive to large-scale residential development, because of such factors as lack of safe public access, significant wetlands, steep slopes, and pre-existing trails used by snowmachines, dog-teams, and skiers. Two of these parcels are Contentment Estates (~328 acres) and Graceland/Timberline (Tract A: ~90 acres; Tract B: ~30 acres).

I urge you to consider purchasing (or trading land for) these two parcels. It is unlikely that either will be developed soon, due to the factors listed above. However, the assessed value of these lands will undoubtedly rise, as the IRA becomes completed. The time to purchase (or trade land for) these properties is now.

An example of how these land values are already rising is Graceland/Timberline Tract A (~ 90 acres). This property is co-owned by Hans Axelsson and Henrik Wessel. They are unable to subdivide the property because it has no safe legal access, some of the property slopes steeply, and much of it is wetlands. The owners have been allowed to build just one driveway into the property. According to the FNSB Property Database, in 2005 the assessment of Graceland/Timberline Tract A was \$56,514. In 2006, the assessment rose to \$70,820. The property is currently listed for sale with Dave Somers Realty for \$299,000 (see the attached web advertisement). It is highly possible that Axelsson and Wessel would be willing to sell the property for much less than this (or to trade it for other land), if approached by Parks and Recreation or the FNSB.

Graceland Tract B (~30 acres) already belongs to the FSNB.

Contentment Estates (~328 acres) is owned by Joseph W. Dinkins who, like Axelsson and Wessel, has been unable to subdivide the property and may be willing to sell or trade. This property is all wetlands/permafrost

Please consider purchasing (or trading land for) Contentment Estates and Graceland Tract A (and add Tract B to it), as a way of increasing the size of the Isberg Recreation Area, protecting existing trails on these parcels, and protecting/preserving the extensive wetlands which these parcels contain.

Please also preserve/protect the darkness and privacy of the IRA region by avoiding and/or minimizing the use of artificial light on trails and at parking areas, etc.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Kremers

PO Box 84223

Fairbanks, AK 99708

(907) 458-8805

ckremers@mosqitonet.com



-----Original Message-----

From: Frank and Judy Williams [mailto:fljw@alaska.net]
Sent: Saturday, March 31, 2007 3:42 PM
To: John Haas
Cc: Frank and Judy Williams
Subject: Isberg Recreation Area -

John,

I want to express strong support for the planning for the Isberg Recreation Area - especially the scoping themes as presented on the Borough's web site. I am especially supportive of the Borough positioning itself to expand the area, provide for people walking, dog walking, and cross country ski trails. Recently I've walked some of the existing trails in that area and really enjoyed the experience. As you and the planners know, there is considerable need for parking and access. The areas marked on the current (March 31st) map provided on the web site show a main area and two other areas. I checked all of them out, and think all three are needed early in the development of the recreation area. Parking on the adjacent roads is a bit dangerous, and I'd think intrusive for those living at the end of Oboe Court.

Please let me know if I can help support you in getting the concept presented to and passed by the Assembly.

Frank Williams
3868 Chigmit Drive
PO Box 80550
Fairbanks, AK 99708

479-5465

-----Original Message-----

From: Eric Troyer and Corrine Leistikow [mailto:etcl@acsalaska.net]
Sent: Friday, March 30, 2007 10:22 PM
To: John Haas
Subject: Re: Isberg Recreation Master Plan Public Comment

John,

Below (and attached in Word) are my comments on the Isberg Recreation Master Plan.

Eric Troyer

Isberg Recreation Area comments

John,

Im really glad you have this draft plan posted on the web. I wasnt able to make the public hearing, so Im glad to have a chance to look things over. I am happy to see this draft plan. Its wonderful to see the possibilities for this new recreation area. I have some comments and quite a few questions. A lot of my questions have to do with presentation of the material. I dont necessarily need answers to all my questions, but I hope you take them into consideration for future release of plans regarding the rec area.

The site plan appears to have a good variety and number of trails. It makes me want to get out there already!

Its good to see that a variety of trail users were considered in regards to trail design.

Whats the scale for the site plan? It has no scale indicator in the legend.

Whats the total trail mileage for each type of trail as proposed in the site plan? It would also be good to include kilometers since that measurement is so common in cross-country ski areas.

How were the trail routes decided? Was someone with knowledge of trail design involved? If so, does this person have knowledge of all the types of trail use represented? If not, were people with that knowledge consulted?

There are not as many motorized multi-use trails as I thought there would be. Im not a motorized trail user, but Im concerned about the reaction from motorized users. Are they being fairly represented?

Who will maintain these trails and the associated facilities? Will that be addressed in the master plan or at some other time in the future? If the latter, when?



I dont understand how the Trail Sections and Who Uses the Trails? documents relate to the site plan.

The Trail Sections document seems fairly clear, but I have to assume some things. The Accessible/Hardened Trails seem to be the basic design for Accessible Trails Non-motorized on the site plan. Is the Non-Motorized Loop Trail in the Trail Sections the basic design plan for all the Non-Motorized Multi-use trails in the site plan? If not, to which trails will it apply? A loop trail is suggested in the site plan, but it appears to be motorized multi-use. What design standards will be applied to the other non-motorized multi-use trails? The same questions can be asked about the Motorized Multi-use Trail Main Loop in the Trail Sections.

The Non-Motorized Loop Trail calls for a 16-foot-high minimum clearance. Why does it have to be this high? Is this to accommodate horseback riders? If so, that isnt clear.

The Motorized Multi-use Trail Main Loop calls for a 0% - 2% Cross Surface. This doesnt seem to follow the new sustainable trails design standards. With little cross slope, those trails will tend to collect water in the summer. Even if they are on hills, without any cross slope water could drain down the middle causing erosion problems.

What trail design standards were used in coming up with the Trail Sections document? It would be nice to know the source.

I think I understand the point of Who Uses the Trails? However, how do all these trail measurements relate to the trails? Were all these different measurements taken into account when the measurements for the Trail Sections document were decided upon? Also, was a survey done on trail use and potential trail use? Are all the trail users in Who Uses the Trails? going to be equally represented?

Im glad to see that many trails are planned for the higher and drier sections of the recreation area. Such trails will make the area a nice year-round multi-use area. (It would be nice for the map to show which trails will be dry enough for year-round use.)

Despite all my comments and concerns, I am happy to see this master plan. This recreation area will be a great boon to the Fairbanks area. Im really glad to see the borough moving forward with this project.

Thanks for giving me a chance to comment. Im really excited to see planning for this rec area going forward.

Eric Troyer



References

1. Design Alaska, Inc. prepared for Fairbanks North Star Borough Department of Parks and Recreation. *Isberg Recreation Area Investigation Report*. November 13, 2006.
2. Fairbanks North Star Borough, Community Research Center. *Community Research Quarterly, A Socio-Economic Review, Volume XXIX, No. 2*. Summer 2006.
3. Fairbanks North Star Borough. *Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan*. Last update 5-30-06.
4. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Trail and Waterways. *Draft Trail Planning, Design, and Development Guidelines*.
5. State of Alaska, Department of Natural Resources. *Alaska Recreational Trails Plan*. October 2000.
6. Ulvi, Steve. National Park Service, Alaska Region, Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program, Technical Report. *Isberg-Cripple Creek Recreation Area, Fairbanks North Star Borough, An Assessment of Soils, Vegetation and Trails*. September 27, 2006.
7. United States Department of Agriculture. *Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) survey map and associated data at <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov>*.
8. United States Forestry Service. *Trail Planning and Management Fundamentals*. 1/2004.