

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/6/2023 7:16:30 PM

First name: carole

Last name: bookless

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I continue to object to expansion of impacts of tourism in this area.

In regard to the new EIS information, I was surprised to read that there were no impacts to minority residents (described as over 50%) or low income residents in the study area, because the Threadneedle and Kanata Deyi area have exactly that demographic and they would be impacted by traffic and air pollution.

I do not object to Alternative 1 in respect to needed repairs and upgrades only.

One question that I did not find answered in the documents is how many vehicle/bear collisions occur per year in this area. Vehicle/bear collisions were noted in the EIS as a reason to change the status quo. I have not heard of any collisions at all, let alone a big problem. But if it is a problem, then reducing traffic to this area should be an option added to this proposal.

I would like to see a proposal to eliminate all bus traffic to the visitor center in favor of a remote parking lot (nearer or at one of the commercial shopping areas) and shuttle to the visitor center. Supporting local businesses by bringing tour busses to Valley commercial areas for transfer would be a better benefit to our community and the park than bringing more visitors directly to the glacier where there are no food/grocery/shopping services. I believe tourists might appreciate this as well.

I find it astounding that there are proposals to increase habitat destruction with more trails, visitor centers, docks, etc in this sensitive area.