

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/2/2022 9:59:34 AM

First name: Vickie

Last name: Honzel

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Please add the following to my earlier comments.

The mission of the Forest Service is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations. This is why developers keep saying that the new Lodge will be there for "generations to come". They choose words carefully to tie the Lodge expansion proposal into the USFS mission statement. It sounds good. Proponents also focus on viability and profitability of the business side of the Lodge and tout that the proposed expansion increases public access to recreation in the area. (Side note: the trailhead work in the plan may be done without building a new hotel, welcome center, cabins, etc.) Negative impacts of this Lodge expansion on the viability and survival of the pristine character of the Swan Valley ecosystem are glossed over or not even mentioned in public information pieces. There are significant negative impacts that will come from this proposal, and they threaten the very existence of the ecosystem, the reason why people love it here. These negative impacts must be analyzed at least by Environmental Assessment, but a full EIS is really preferable and justified. There's too much at stake not to do so. The American public's Swan Valley ecosystem was here before the Holland Lake Lodge was built and later, after being destroyed by fire, rebuilt. Our ecosystem, one of the last existing in tact ecosystems anywhere, needs to last for generations, more so than the Holland Lake Lodge. Flathead National Forest Service Supervisor Steele says they are evaluating environmental impacts. Right. Sure they are. Categorical Exclusion intended. That should be fine. Supervisor Steele and Project Manager Mavor need to focus a bit more on the first part of the mission statement, "... to sustain the health....of nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations." Let's make that happen with EA, EIS, not categorical exclusion. But first, let's see what they're plan is. We know the one submitted isn't going to be approved. It's way too big. Go back to the drawing board, POWDR. Or better yet, pay the penalty and go away.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I look forward to the public meeting this week and might want to comment again afterwards.