

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/3/2022 6:13:19 PM

First name: Jeff

Last name: Fanning

Organization: Liquid Alaska Tours

Title: President

Comments: Thank you for your time in presenting these options and encouraging comment on plans for new infrastructure at the MGRA. We are willing and happy to be a part of the planning process for any selected alternatives to help ensure their best implementation, regardless of which alternative is selected. My comments today come from the perspective of our guiding company currently operating on Mendenhall Lake and in the West Glacier Unit. In general, we are supportive of any and all improvements to the MGRA, however, we are concerned with aspects of alternatives 2 and 3 in regards to ferry service on Mendenhall Lake to the West Glacier Unit and the supporting infrastructure required. We submitted an RFEI outlining necessary infrastructure from our perspective, but our suggested items were not included in these plans. Outlined below are 3 points, which in our opinion are paramount to future plans at the MGRA and need to be addressed should either alternative 2 or 3 be selected. Based on the alternatives as they are currently written, we have to support alternatives 1 or 4. Should different alternatives be proposed in the future, we would like to participate and provide our perspective as a guiding company currently operating in these areas.

Point #1: Existing terrain in the West Glacier area next to the glacier is not suitable for the average visitor to the Mendenhall Glacier. Unless ferry passengers are completely guided with qualified outfitters, increased visitor flow to this area will require more infrastructure than is currently included in this plan. The conditions of this area require special equipment, knowledge of the landscape, and crowd control for hazardous areas. Our guest to guide ratio is 8:1 in order to ensure everyone's safety. Hazards exist everywhere, which are not apparent to the naked-eye. The alternatives do not account for enough infrastructure improvements to these areas to handle the increase in capacity being proposed. Should alternative 2 or 3 move forward, you will need more infrastructure in this area to handle the masses and/or require every ferry passenger to participate in guided services. Since this process solely outlines basic infrastructure and not implementation, we suggest keeping this point in mind when the time comes for implementation.

Point #2: If alternative 2 or 3 is selected, we propose adjusting dock infrastructure to accommodate small boats and canoes currently used by guiding companies operating on the lake and in the West Glacier Unit. The alternatives do not mention small boat infrastructure and we ask they be built to include docking space for multiple small boats at all docking facilities. With ferries operating on the lake and dock infrastructure taking over the existing areas we operate in, the small boats will need places to dock/beach alongside any ferry infrastructure.

Point #3: The capacity proposed in alternatives 2 and 3 include ferrying 49 passengers every 30 minutes. The demand for the ferry service will far outweigh these capacities. The majority of visitors to the glacier are cruise ship passengers who have very limited port times and narrow time frames to participate in a ferry trip across the lake. A ship carrying 5,000 visitors often has only 5 hours in port. The massive amounts of infrastructure required to make alternatives 2 and 3 a reality will accommodate only a small percentage of total visitation to the glacier.

Thank you for your time and dedication to this process. Please contact me should you have any follow up questions.