

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/27/2026 3:06:45 PM

First name: Tambi

Last name: Katieb

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Like many other families that live locally, I object to the commercialization and planned ruination of Sweetwater Lake and the immediate environment as planned through the proposed action "alternative 2" for Sweetwater Lake.

Having been involved in the 1041 permitting of Sylvan Lake state park for water and wastewater systems, I can attest to the limited public involvement in that process and the profoundly negative impacts that the State has brought to Brush Creek through overdevelopment of Sylvan State Park.

Let me be clear about this, the State will not have to abide by ANY local land use restrictions or mitigation/impact fees for public safety agencies or road impacts (be those in Garfield or Eagle Counties).

Once Sylvan Lake state park was improved, the State unilaterally redesigned what was a quiet piece of shore front into a overcrowded "Fishermans Paradise" with no respect to riparian zones or adequate setback to the shoreline, and total disregard for the additional vehicle trips created up Brush Creek Road. What was truly a serene place that my wife and I were married at became a bustling city park that belongs in Denver no in the wilds of Eagle County. The greatest insult here is it is the State of Colorado and USFS doing this with intent to a wild place, one that deserves less development and more protection against human impacts. That was the genesis of the fight to preserve the Lake. How did we end up here ? !

Further, the EVLT original campaign flier solicited community support by proposing :

"The property-if acquired-will provide new public access to the iconic Sweetwater Lake and surrounding public lands. The 488-acre parcel is an important community asset, but public access was revoked after development plans for 240 homes, a hotel, and golf course failed to materialize.

Protecting Sweetwater Lake means:

- Creating sustainable public recreational access to Sweetwater Lake for fishing, horseback riding, boating, and camping.
- Maintaining access to surrounding public lands including Flat Tops Wilderness, White River National Forest (the most visited National Forest in the U.S.), and the Ute trail.
- Conserving critical habitat for elk, deer, osprey, bald eagles, and other wildlife.
- Protecting the Upper Colorado Watershed."

Where did the concept of preservation go ? As a consulting land planner, I'd much rather have had the private development go through a public hearing process with local governments to assess impacts and mitigation. The proposed intensity of Alternative 2 would fail on so many points of any local planning and master plan process it wouldn't make it out of the hearing room.

The DEIS falls short of any traffic and wildfire assessment it is a joke and, had a private development entity proposed it, would be thrown out of any hearing room for insufficiency. Yet, here we are in the DEIS suggesting that those problems can be dealt with in the future by taxpayers of Garfield and Eagle Counties including creating 'emergency preparedness' plans to land helicopters in for an emergency because the site is over an hour away from any first responders ? This is "sustainable development" by what actual defined standard - other than the resort consulting team opinions in the DEIS?

Do any federal or State officials remember the Derby fire and its impacts during and afterwards to public safety? If Brush Creek Road and West Brush Creek road are barely able to handle the traffic going to Sylvan lake, imagine the disasters and emergency situations you create here through selecting an incredibly dense and developed alternative (Alternative 2) that does not mitigate any of its impacts through road improvements, fire safety etc.

What about bird nesting sites and closures? The USFS literally closes the majority of Lime Creek Canyon to all public access and sport climbing because of a few Peregrine Falcon nesting sites, and the only climbers that regularly violate that closure are ones that drive here as a destination from the Front Range or other long distances, and didn't check the website and ignore the signs because there is no personnel there regularly.

How do you close a fully developed State Park in a more remote location in any comparable way to protect these raptors? The answer is you can't and you won't and we lose more wildlife and valuable nesting sites because the human disturbances will prove to be too great to overcome. All been done before, and every agency person involved in this process knows that Alternative 2 will create another intense City Park in a wild place and that can never be mitigated.

Based on the alternatives and analyses available, I urge you to select the "no action" alternative as it best achieves the goals of the original Sweetwater Lake campaign.

It should also be pointed out that the trend for Public Agencies (County, State and Federal) seems to be to allow yourself years of time to produce a document, then -by - design rob the public of a reasonable amount of time to actually review thousands of pages and provide detailed comments.

Eagle County is doing this with its land use code update right now, allowing only a few days to comment on years of process, and now you are following that lead with a 90 day review period on this terribly important decision and thousands of pages of analyses?

Don't be rushed by the State or anyone else, do your job and honor the public you serve - slow down and allow this to be a real public process. Many area residents that started this campaign to preserve Sweetwater Lake as a conservation area, allow limited public access, support a local outfitter, and protect the many beautiful and irreplaceable aspects that will be devastated by selection of the proposed alternative.

The State cannot be allowed to simply replace a private development threat without the same level of detailed analysis and scrutiny of pros/cons/impacts and acceptable and planned mitigation measures. In this case, the proposed alternative does not meet NEPA standards and 'punts' impacts and mitigation to other agencies that do not have a clear plan or budget to respond, and therefore it should be rejected and the "no action" alternative the only reasonable alternative to achieve preservation goals selected. Thank you.