

To: Mel Bolling,
c/o Jay Pence
Teton Basin District Ranger
P.O. Box 777,
Driggs, ID 83401.

(b) (5)

Re: Comments for Scoping Grand Targhee Master Development Plan Projects

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scoping of the EIS for the Grand Targhee Master Development Plan Projects. The proposed projects and expansion of the resort SUP will have a significant impact on the west slope of the Tetons and on the adjacent communities. Please consider the following for analysis in the EIS:

- 1). An independent economic analysis of the rationale for SUP expansion. The request for expansion of the SUP is based on a need to increase the size of the resort terrain and facilities to compete with other regional destination resorts. The analysis in the MDP does not address what resorts GTR is competing with and uses broad industry wide averages for comparison and justification for expansion and additional facilities. A focused analysis on other competing regional resorts is warranted. GTR as a regional destination resort is not competing with Jackson Hole Mountain Resort, Big Sky or Sun Valley. It is the only regional resort in southeast Idaho and it is incorrect to compare its facilities to national/international resorts. It is important the rationale and justification for the proposed resort expansion is sound.
- 2) Impacts on the west slope of the Tetons viewshed. Additional facilities; roads, lifts, restaurants, trails, will impact the views of the Tetons from the west and the main peaks of the range. An analysis of these impacts should include a social-economic assessment of impacts to Teton Valley residents.
- 3) Impact to dispersed recreation in Teton and South Leigh Canyons. There is extensive and growing dispersed recreation in Teton and South Leigh Canyons. The impacts of the SUP expansion and additional facilities on these recreation users should be considered including noise, and viewshed impacts.
- 4) Impacts on wildlife. Mid-elevation slopes on the south side of Teton Canyon already have winter range restrictions on winter travel. The expansion of the SUP on to south slopes of the Canyon would impinge into possible wildlife winter range and maybe in conflict with existing travel restrictions. This needs to be assessed in the EIS. There are other species of concern (lynx, wolverine) in the Teton Range will need to be assessed.
- 5) Impacts on water resources. The MDP includes a yet to be determined number of additional groundwater wells to provide water for snow making and additional facilities on the mountain and in the base area. These wells will capture water that would normally discharge to springs along the base of the Freds Mountain and Peaked Mountain blocks. The discharge from these springs have existing water rights and are fully allocated. The availability of the necessary water resources to support the SUP and facilities expansion should be assessed. Waste water disposal via septic systems on limestone and drilling of water supply well on the summit of Freds Mountain are also problematic and should carefully be assessed. There are major feasibility issues that need to be considered before granting approval for these facilities.

6) Parking and traffic. The MDP proposes with the SUP expansion to almost double the resort comfortable carrying capacity (CCC) and repeatedly points out that that terrain, lift and on mountain facilities capacity are linked to base area capacity. Parking with the current facilities is problematic during holiday periods, weekends and powder days. The MDP analysis only calls for a slight increase parking to meet the needs of doubling the CCC. Because of the linkage between SUP expansion on public lands and the base area a more comprehensive assessment of the effects of doubling the CCC on parking and traffic is warranted. Future parking and transportation issues are poorly addressed in the MDP and need further careful analysis.

6) Scope of alternatives considered. Please assess a full ranges of alternatives in the analysis including:

- A) No action- no new facilities and expansion of SUP
- B) Limited new facilities lifts, restaurants with in existing SUP
- C) All proposed new facilities with in existing SUP
- D) Limited expansion of SUP boundaries and lifts and facilities limiting impact on viewshed
- E) All MDP proposed facilities and SUP expansion