

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/8/2022 9:09:37 PM

First name: Dr. Bev

Last name: Agler

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan. I use the area daily in the winter to x-country ski, and I was initially excited by the mention of a bridge to the Dredge Lakes area. I also use the Dredge Lakes area extensively for birding. I love to go on the lake in the winter when it is frozen. I find that so unique to have my own glacier in my backyard.

Upon reflection and consultation of the plan, I am not convinced that connecting to a 14-ft wide trail around the edge of the lake is a very plausible idea to enhance visitor experience and adjust to the frequent flooding due to the recent jokulaups.

My initial reactions to the plan are where are plans to accommodate the locals? I watched the video and heard the word local once. What I heard was that there were going to be motorized craft on the lake (noisy), so visitors could "touch" the ice. Oh really? How dangerous is that? Why would we ever promote something that is discouraged the rest of the year due to the danger. The glacier is constantly shifting and to put in some visitor's head that they can walk up to it? But I also heard that "oh, we will just pull out the floats in the winter and put them in the parking areas." Hmm, those parking areas are full of vehicles all winter due to the fact that those "locals" do use the area extensively. So now the USFS is going to fill them up with the unnecessary floats for unnecessary motorized watercraft? I just think this is a bad idea. Potential pollution to an extremely fragile area. I use the Dredge Lakes and Nugget Falls area in the spring (April - June) for birdwatching. Juneau has some of the premier and most pristine areas for birding in Alaska. Yet I see in the plan a possible Dredge Lakes perimeter trail. I have run several searches on the EIS or plan or whatever this two volume document is, but I cannot find a description of this trail. As far as I am concerned, this is a bad idea for the birds and the fragile habitat contained therein. This will increase foot traffic in one of the few spots where a local can get away from the tourists. There are already tours on the glacier side and the foot traffic is causing more social trails and damage to fragile plants. Birds that were frequently found in that area have not been seen as readily lately (chipping sparrow). Covid gave great insight to what the area could be like without hundreds of people every day. It was really nice to be able to walk to Nugget Falls and bird along the way.

I support:

1. Limiting visitation. Shouldn't we start with this? Shouldn't we start thinking about how much is enough? Many national parks are requiring reservations to reduce impacts. I lived in Acadia NP for 17 years, and it had 3.5 million visitors per year. It now requires reservations for Cadillac Mt and Ocean Drive. It requires visitors to take a tram on OD. When can we do those things?
2. Making Nugget Falls a loop trail. There are already a number of social trails near the beach, and this creates a hazard if the glacier were to calve.
3. Fixing West Glacier Trail, which is unsafe due to receding of the glacier.
4. More restrooms. More in the women's please. We take longer. Design so some can be open in the winter. Locals need to use the restrooms too when we recreate on the ice.
5. Moving the buses further away and putting in an electric tram for visitors to be moved up to the glacier to reduce confusion and congestion in the first parking area. This will minimize traffic.
6. Keeping buses from stopping behind parked cars. I have not been able to leave when I parked early in the morning only to return and find a bus parked in the middle of the parking area.
7. Improve a few of the trailhead parking lots, such as the one on Back Loop by the river.
8. Providing sanitation/restrooms and trash cans at trailheads. There are none that I know of, except port-a-potties in a parking lot near glacier. Nothing at trailheads, not even by USFS headquarters. Where are people going? In the woods, spreading People are supposed to pick up after their dogs, but they don't have a way to dispose of the poo, and there is nothing for the humans to do.
9. New parking, but not at the Center. Put the parking farther away and make people take a tram or walk.
10. Keep the view open. NO big new center, no big new photo bridge. What is that for anyway? Can't they walk around?

I DO NOT support:

1. Three docks

2. Motorized watercraft. They potentially damage the important sockeye salmon habitat in the area, one of only three sites in Juneau, affecting the bear population and us, humans. As a fishery biologist, I find it incontrovertible that the USFS would do anything to affect the sockeye habitat of the region.

3. Paving over Zig-zag pond, which is a great warbler area. From what I can see from the plans, there are 75 parking spaces, the new plans will only have 71? What is up with that?

4. Commercial use of Dredge Lakes.

5. Putting floats in winter parking areas.

6. The new gazebo warming station, visitor lodge, whatever that thing is. I do not see why it needs to block the view. Can't it be placed near the mountain and out of the view. Why are we only given one choice, rather than 4 when it comes to this building?

7. Filling ponds and wetlands for parking! These are precious and we can never restore them to what they once were no matter how hard we might try. Can't we learn from the lower 48 numerous disasters with wetlands? I worked on a USFWS refuge in Connecticut. They were spending 5 million for each of 10 parcels and then another 5 million per parcel to restore the salt marsh that was destroyed but then found to be so necessary to fish populations.

8. All this BIG construction. Not only will many of these things block views, interfere with salmon and bear populations, which is why the visitors are there, but the construction itself will change the landscape and be noisy and drive the animals away.

Can't changes be made that keep the footprint small? Changes that fit into and blend with the natural landscape. This is the USFS after all, whose mission is to meet all needs and not just those of the commercial community. USFS is to do multiple use, and it feels as though the Alaskan leave no trace is missing from this plan. If you had to go back to the drawing board to design a plan 4, then I suggest you look at a plan 5 with figuring how to blend things into the environment, using solar panels, heat pumps. What is going to be "green" in this plan? If I were a visitor from Europe, this would look like Euro Disney to me. These plans do not resemble Alaska, they resemble over the top cruise ship, overpopulated, loved-to-deathness. How can we take a step back and approach this with a view as to how this would be something I would like to show my friends what the glacier looks like without all the hubbub, etc.?

Thank you,
Dr. Bev. Agler
1921 Wickersham Ave
Juneau, AK 99801