

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/21/2023 9:36:10 AM

First name: Britt

Last name: Watters

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for coming up with additional alternatives following the public comments on the original 4 alternatives. As a long time resident (35 years) of Juneau, I have spent a lot of time at the glacier in all seasons, as a hiker, skier, biker, bird watcher, and general nature gawker. I understand the USFA's goal in crowd management. Over the years, it has become less pleasant for me to go to the glacier area during the summer when the tourist season is in full swing due to the crowding, navigating the bus traffic and trying not to breathe the exhaust fumes.

I also appreciate the USFA's stated goals of protecting the unique characteristics and outstanding beauty of the area and to protect the area from environmental impacts associated with increased visitation.

Out of all the current alternatives, I would support #6 because:

1. No motorized commercial boats traveling back and forth across the lake to a pristine glacial moraine set up as a "remote visitors center". There are so many reasons why this is not a good idea that others have already commented on (e.g., see Laurie Craig's comments), I won't repeat them here, but will add that the safety risk to non-motorized boaters on the lake from the traffic itself and the waves generated is not insignificant. As well, boats running back and forth in the middle of a wilderness scenic view would be annoying to most people.

2. Bus parking lot is enhanced and the use of electric shuttles. While not removing bus exhaust entirely, it does keep it farther from the lake and where people congregate at visitor center area. This plan also reduces the pain of multiple big buses trying to navigate in a small zone.

3. New Visitor Center would blend into the natural surroundings, and link to the current center. The alternatives with the big boxy building in the viewshed are not acceptable. Nor is losing the iconic pavilion. Visitors and locals both like the pavilion. It would be a shame to lose it.

As far as the trails into Dredge Lake, I agree with many others who have commented that an extensive "improvement", meaning road-sized trails would be a detriment to the area. I'm a cross-country skier, and don't need a groomed trail in there. In fact, the natural wildness of the trails in winter is a special treat. If the Lakeshore trail is a go, I'd hope it is done in a manner that keeps it wild, and not disruptive to wildlife activity along the lake.

I do not support making a built trail to loop the Nugget Falls trail. The beach is a wild place, close to the nesting Terns, and often flooded. It would be nice to have better crossing over the creeks instead of slippery boulders, but other than that, it's fine as it is.

There should not be food service offered to visitors. The rangers have worked very hard over the years to discourage people from bringing food out there to protect the bears and people. There's no good way to enforce that if it's being sold in the area.

MGRA is a very special place to locals. We don't have to try to give tourists an experience that is so sophisticated, it doesn't feel like Alaska. I think that would be disappointing to many tourists who paid to travel to "the last frontier", to find the wild has been smoothed over and glamorized for their supposed comfort. And at what cost to those of us who call this wonderful place home?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I hope the final decision will be one that is least impactful to the natural environment and peacefulness of the MGRA.