

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/14/2025 10:48:02 PM

First name: Jacqueline (Mishka)

Last name: Aznoe-Morales

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I had entirely planned on writing something much more in-depth and with facts but I have a mother with dementia and have had to shift gears these past few weeks. I have been to nearly every meeting since Christian put Holland Lake Lodge up for sale and was the girl with the huge folder where I printed everything out. This area MEANS A LOT to me.

I've read through some of the comments and other responses made by other members of the Save Holland group as well as just concerned citizens in general so I know you will be full of a lot of rules and regulations that I definitely think should be taken under advisement. I'm going to approach this more logically, as I don't have time to go through every nuance and am just hopeful that you are paying attention to the copious amount of response you are getting - one of those I think was nearly 60 pages long.

What I feel I have heard (and am in agreement with) from all the meetings that have been held on the SPU for Holland is this ...

1. We do not want the footprint changed from the original SPU ... no more acreage, no more new buildings. This lake is not big enough to handle a big operation like say McDonald Lodge in Glacier. I do not understand why this cannot be stated in the issuance of a new SPU, unless the intention is to expand operations further down the road. Which I unequivocally oppose.
2. Things have been mismanaged dreadfully - the buildings are falling apart and in somewhat disrepair, fences put in that shouldn't have been, signs that should not be there, there used to be a barn that is absolutely falling apart - and this has created an incredible mistrust that there is not any oversight at the property at all.
3. I have worked in events for almost 20 years. I am not opposed to events or weddings. However, I also do not understand why the SPU cannot state what the MAXIMUM capacity is for the lodge for events - and I definitely do not feel it should be anywhere close to 200 people. Leaving so many nuances open to whatever Operating Plan is presented each winter for the following year vs. simply setting forth rules and guidelines for the use of the property which would help to ensure that the property is not misused and the public's trust is not abused.
4. I do feel that the wastewater treatment plant should be fixed and fully operational before any sort of new SPU is issued or, at the very least, put into effect. The lodge and/or restaurant needs that facility in order to fully operate and it feels very much like putting the cart before the proverbial horse.

I realize you didn't make the rules but it sincerely makes no sense to me how someone can apply and obtain a SPU without first presenting, at the very least, their Operating Plan and honestly why a Master Development Plan isn't a necessary part of making a decision on issuing a SPU. There isn't any other business I know of where you would not have to be able to present a clear, thought out, very well presented plan and state of intention before you are able to obtain licenses or permission to build etc. It feels shoddy at best and shady at worst. And I know that I would want that to be part of the process if I was to make such a big decision as to what to do with a national treasure such as Holland Lake.

I love the lodge and Holland Lake. I am extremely sad that it has been closed and that this national treasure is falling apart. However, I do feel it is very important and imperative that things are handled correctly moving forward. With a new owner and a new SPU, there is an opportunity to ensure that things are straight and clear from the get-go.

I do not support the issuance of a new SPU without the following:

- a). Wastewater treatment plant is completely functioning or, at the very least, it is stated that Holland Lake Lodge be responsible for bringing in a compost or other sort of system until the treatment plant is functioning
- b). SPU is spelled out with a maximum event guest allowance (my recommendation would not be more than 100/150 pax)
- c). SPU is spelled out with a noise and light ordinance for special events
- d). SPU has a limited yearly use (May-Nov, for example) and, if the SPU is going to allow for a year long use that a Environmental Impact Statement is done to ensure that it would not negatively impact the area (as it has not been utilized year round as far as I know in my lifetime)
- e). Any new applicants (or current applicant) be asked to present a detailed Operating Plan - not something with vague language (i.e. "maintenance and reconstruction of buildings" ... what kind of maintenance? Reconstructing what and to what extent?) before the issuance of a SPU ... I do realize the understanding is that, without an SPU, then the applicant is not a permit holder but this just literally makes no sense - how can you issue a SPU when you do not truly know what the permit holder is planning to do and how they plan to do it? And how can the public assess whether they are in agreement with what is going to happen when intentions are unclear at best?

Thank you for taking the time to review my letter.

Warmest Regards,
Mishka