

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/9/2022 7:21:02 PM

First name: Thomas

Last name: Paul

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am strongly opposed to Alternatives 2 and 3. Alternative 4 has some acceptable aspects but it too relies on too much development, paving, large parking areas and contorting the natural environment to accommodate cruise ship visitors. None of the alternatives seem protect the values of the natural landscape and avoid turning this beautiful world class area into a circus that has no regard for the attraction it purports to present to the public. My comments are focused on the proposal for motorized boat access to the glacier (a resounding NO), the new mall-like visitor center, and the proposals for massive new parking lots.

Putting motorized boats on the lake is a terrible idea. There is no way you will be able to provide enough boat capacity for all the people who want it. How would you decide who gets to go? What happens if a boat is disabled or sinks in the lake? What enormous rescue/salvage infrastructure would be necessary to prepare for these eventualities? None of that is outlined in the EIS. Also the infrastructure required to support any visitors taken to the glacier by the boats will likely pollute and spoil the environment at the glacier. How can you really expect that 2,000 people a day trundling over the newly exposed areas at the glacier face are not going to degrade them and destroy the instadial stumps among other treasures. The construction of a "hardened" path alone will cause damage there.

There does not seem to be the realization in this plan that all the proposed improvements degrade the experience of enjoying the magnificence of the landscape and the wonder of a mostly uncluttered natural area. In your focus on chasing the glacier you are missing the greatness of the whole glacier valley environment. The plan reveals a single-minded focus on getting people to the glacier, while not acknowledging that would contribute to the climate change conditions that are causing the glacial retreat. Instead, you should draw visitors' attention to the grand landscape now exposed by the glacial retreat, plant succession, the grand mountains, Nugget Falls, the loss of natural wonders and risks to them posed by climate change. You need to admit the glacier is toast but that the valley and landscape it created is still a wonder worth visiting and preserving.

I also object to the plans for greatly increasing paved parking areas. The proposed 20+ car parking at the Powerline Trail entrance is silly. Who is going to use it? Not cruise ship passengers. In the 40 years I have been using the area there have never been more than half a dozen cars parked in the area to access that trailhead. Likewise, the parking area proposed for Crystal Lake trail head is ridiculously large and will destroy the nice roadside screen of trees that separates the trail's beginning from the noise and view of traffic. The giant bus and car parking area that will destroy the pond and creek in Alternative 2 near the current parking lots is an outrage in its insensitivity to the natural values of the area. In fact, the pervasive theme of Alternatives 2 and 3 is that the natural attributes of the area are subservient to the need to make a giant theme park that makes visitors feel like they are home in regular paved-over America rather than a special place in Alaska that could still be mostly unspoiled. It also will bring more fossil fueled vehicles into the proximity of a glacier that is fast disappearing because of human use of fossil fuels. I am surprised you do not seem to be aware of the irony of your proposals.

The proposed new visitor center in place of the current pavilion looks like nothing so much as a mall surrounded by large stretches of paving. What is the obsession with paving as much as possible in the plan? Why do visitors need another center in which to congregate?

Some of the plan's provisions are okay. Expanding and improving the walking trails in the recreation area is an excellent idea. Improving the access to the glacier from the west glacier trail is good as well.

Frankly the alternatives appear to be designed by people who have no local familiarity with the recreation area or appreciation of it and have constructed them sitting at drafting tables with no realization of the impact they will

have on the natural environment. The plan seems committed to making the area able to accommodate any number of visitors that come along. There is no realization that at some point visitor numbers may need to be limited or the reasons people come to this wonderful area will be destroyed. Also, has any accounting been made of what it will cost to maintain over time the grand visions and infrastructure in these alternatives?

I hope you will give the opinions of local residents equal weight with those of the commercial interests that are clearly pushing these massive developments. Residents are the ones who value the area the most. Commercial interests just see the money to be made from it.

Keep the "improvements" modest and make respect for the existing natural area the guiding principle in any changes.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.