

From: Alissa Ehrenkranz and Patrick Dominick
PO Box 6297
Jackson Wyoming 83001

June 20 2025

We support NO expansion of the ski area. A restaurant on Fred's Mountain would be a miserable, saddening eyesore from as far as Tetonia, ID! Take a step back and consider the interconnectivity within the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem (north of Yellowstone Park to Pinedale WY and Ashton to Cody). The only difference between the Targhee area and the Grand Canyon of Yellowstone Park or Old Faithful is that administrative borders call one area a park and the other area is a National Forest. Nevertheless, the intrinsic value to wildlife and enjoying nature is the identical, because of the interconnectivity of wildlife, vegetation and water. So please understand you are dealing with land as valuable as Yellowstone or GTNP. The land is our "Amazon Rain Forest". My detailed comments are listed below.

1. Targhee has not shown an adequate need to privatize more public lands. Statistics show they have the ability to increase skier days by 200% on the existing property. The costs of an expansion would be born by wildlife and the neighboring community.
2. Boundary expansion through privatization of public land will eliminate secure habitat for grizzly bears, resulting in increased human-grizzly conflict and increased probability of grizzly removal (death).
3. Bighorn Sheep, a small vulnerable, population would: lose 54 acres of high-quality winter habitat essential for survival-lose access to the Apostle mineral lick, an important resource
4. In the case of expanding into South Bowl, wolverines would lose denning habitat a detriment to their survival.
5. In the case of expanding into Mono Tree, the Canada lynx would lose more than 200 acres of habitat a serious detriment to their survival.
6. The proposed tree clearing and lift installation will impact many protected species — GTR is seeking Forest Plan amendments to impact known nesting territories for peregrine falcons, boreal owls, flammulated owls, and American goshawks (and habitat for three-toed woodpeckers)
7. Expansion requires a re-zoning of both South Bowl and Mono Trees (from visual maintenance to special use permit for private economic activity). Let's not privatize our precious public lands.
8. The proposed boundary expansion would eliminate critical secure habitat for grizzly bears, increasing human-bear conflicts and raising the risk of bear mortalities.
9. Construction and operation in the Mono Trees areas would fragment lynx travel corridors and diminish habitat.
10. Expansion of the resort boundary in South Bowl would destroy high-quality winter habitat essential for the survival of the vulnerable Teton bighorn sheep herd. Increased activity in this area would deter bighorn sheep from critical access to the Apostle mineral lick, which is vital for their survival.
11. Any Alternative that expands resort capacity would increase traffic congestion on Ski Hill Road, creating safety hazards and deteriorating the quality of life for Alta and Driggs residents. Existing infrastructure will be overwhelmed, particularly in winter months when road conditions are already hazardous. Actually, increase in skier days should require a shuttle system from Driggs and eliminate individual car use.
12. Resort expansion would worsen the critical shortage of affordable housing for workers in Teton County, Idaho, displacing long-term residents. And, escalate second-home purchases, driving up real estate prices and further marginalizing local families.
13. Any Alternative that expands resort capacity would put unsustainable pressure on community services like emergency response, fire, and medical care, none of which are scaled for this level of growth.
14. The proposed water withdrawals for snowmaking would diminish local aquifers already stressed by agricultural and residential use, with downstream impacts to the community.

From: Alissa Ehrenkranz and Patrick Dominick
PO Box 6297
Jackson Wyoming 83001

June 20 2025

15. Visual impacts from large-scale new development would erode the scenic values that residents and visitors cherish, undermining the rural identity of Teton Valley. To report this is equal value to national park land.
16. Expanded resort boundaries would limit public access to favorite backcountry skiing, hiking, and biking trails traditionally available to the community.
17. Waste management from increased visitation is likely to strain the capacity of local landfills and create new litter and pollution problems.

In summary, this is a very, very, bad idea. This equates to massive destruction of public land for a sport that is for the most part elite and for the ultra-wealthy!! Please say NO.