Hello,

I don't believe this plan for the new visitor center facilities gives enough space to wildlife, and I generally feel it is overblown in terms of footprint, cost, and overall scope. While I generally agree that the Forest Service should attempt to provide public land access to as many people as possible, I also feel that the quality of that access will suffer with increased visitation. Ultimately, cruise ship tourists will find a way to experience Southeast Alaska's natural environment even if they don't all get to come to the MGVC. I don't feel that these plans will increase the quality of the visitor experience. I do feel as though they will put further strain on the area's wildlife, as the plans will create more user conflict between uneducated tourists and bears trying to move through the greatly expanded developed areas. The goal of any new development should be to decrease the interactions between bears and people, and to put more space between the two groups while still allowing the bears to access crucial habitat. The portions of this plan that call for additional trails are virtually the only portions I support. For humans - increase spatial access, while not decreasing quality of experience. For wildlife - increase access to habitat while also keeping humans at a distance.

Thanks, Lou