

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/19/2022 8:33:33 AM

First name: Victoria

Last name: Moore

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am the owner of a family property in the Condon Area. Though not totally opposed to an extension project for the Holland Lake Lodge, I am concerned about the size of the proposal (tripling the capacity and potentially opening the lodge year round).

Holland Lake is indeed a popular spot with locals, I would say a NECESSARY recreation spot for families or those who cannot hike into more distant mountain lakes - but the Lodge is NOT ; we go to the public access beach at the campground (though small and often over-crowded in the summer). The Lodge is private and closed to locals (even though it is located on public land). The argument in the HLL proposal that a new lodge will benefit locals is untrue. Not to mention the additional traffic the project will generate along the Holland Lake Road.

During summer, the locals who wish to canoe or hike around Holland Lake often try to go at "off hours" (early in the morning, week days, etc) to avoid the crowds. With the expansion of the Lodge's water sports activities and lodge capacity, this effect will be exacerbated. The wildlife associated with the lake would be, of course, affected far more than the local inhabitants in terms of disturbance, noise pollution, etc.

The 20-foot buffer zone between the lakeshore and the project is ridiculously small (a distance you can walk in a few seconds). The proposal treats the lakeshore like a private beach, which it is not. Set-back distance should be at least 200 feet. All the lodge structures should be screened from the view from the lake and a large buffer of protective vegetation along the lake shore should be maintained (except for the historic Old Lodge whose lawn could be "grand-fathered" in).

The floating platforms are another problem. They move the Lodge's private use of public land out onto the water, encouraging the transition of the lakefront near the lodge into a swimming-water sports oriented, private "beach".

The project should be revised to a more "humble" extension - doubling capacity is largely enough. Why do you need rooms with king-sized beds in a rustic mountain retreat? Why do you need two rooms in the lakeshore cabins? All proposed cabins should be "bunkies" with low-consumption showers. Why do you need air-conditioning in log structures in Montana? The number of parking spaces should be reduced by half. And where is the covered bicycle parking area in the project plan?

Finally, the project should revise its ambitions in terms of future environmental changes. The project should increase its use of renewable energies (for example, by installing heat pumps - which by the way can also cool the air during the summer, and by installing solar panels wherever possible). Why not favor composting toilets over water-consuming flush toilets in the "bunkies"? The Lodge should be required to provide nature-awareness or climate-change programs for its guests and could partner with the Forest Service and local associations like Swan Valley Connections to furnish this service. A stand in the gift shop with Forest Service brochures is not my idea of "environmental education". HLL should commit to using local produce and local businesses as much as possible (local circular economy).

I therefore urge the Forest Service to reject the current proposal and to request that a reduced and more nature-conscience project be resubmitted to the public.