Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/11/2026 6:00:00 AM
First name: Patricia
Last name: Boyd
Organization:
Title:
Comments: To: Kim Pearson, Forest Supervisor Caribou Targhee National ForestFrom: Patricia Esnard BoydThe following are a review of my objections to the Grand Targhee Expansion as submitted 6/14/2025. It is my understanding that you are consideringapproving a partial acceptance of GTR[rsquo]s plan to include but not limited to the Mono Trees area. At this time NONE of my concerns have been addressed.I have owned property and ultimately now live in Teton Valley Idaho for 32 years. I find it necessary to repeat my concerns.I oppose GTR expansion for the following reasons:A. Teton County Idaho Community Impacts:1. Increased traffic on all roads leading to the Ski Resort specifically but not limited to Ski Hill road will degrade the road and the cost for repair will be incurred by Teton County ID. Not by GTRa) The DEIS has not done a complete traffic and safety analysis on year-round use.2. Community services (EMS, Fire, Teton Valley Hospital, Search and Rescue) will become overburdened and Teton County ID. citizens will pay the monetary as well as physical cost.3. 866 acres of pristine public lands will be privatized. This will severely restrict existing backcountry trails and recreation. It will remove our basic freedoms involved with enjoying public lands.a) The DEIS has not done a complete analysis of recreation displacement impacts.4. Visual impacts from ski runs, lifts, and facilities will erode the scenery and solitude of Teton Valley ID, Grand Teton National Park and the Jedediah Smith Wilderness.b) Specifically the proposed hotel and restaurant complex on the ridge top of Fred[rsquo]s Mountain will be an out of place eyesore to the Teton Valley community and disrupt night sky viewing.B. Physical Environment Impacts1. Construction of ski runs, roads, housing etc. will destroy pristine alpine ecosystems.a) Old growth and threatened Whitepine forests destroyed.b) Watersheds irreparably damaged.c) Ground water displacement having geological impact is NOT reviewed in the DEIS.2. The DEIS has not done a water sustainability analysis that considers current and future climate conditions.a) The DEIS does not take into account Idaho State Water Rights Legislation impacting Teton County Idaho.b) GTR will use wells which access the Teton Valley ID. Aquifer, thus creating a possible conflict with Idaho State Legislation.c) New restaurants and a massive increase in snowmaking within the ski area will greatly impact water supply for Teton Valley ID.d) The DEIS has not studied the probable contamination of groundwater, creeks and rivers from pollutants from petroleum products runoff, i.e. ski wax, cars, oils. etc.e) GTR has not done a complete waste water treatment analysis for hotel, condos and restaurant and the impact of waste on the groundwater.f) There will be 178 acres in a designated [ldquo] Aquatic Influence Zone[rdquo] by the proposed GTR expansion.C. Wildlife Impact1. Habitat for grizzly bears, lynx, wolverines, marten, Bighorn sheep and mule deer, will be fragmented or destroyed potentially violating Endangered Species act.2. Tree clearing and construction within the expansion contradicts Forest Expansion Plan Standards, for protecting goshawk habitat, flammulated owl nesting areas, arboreal owl nesting site, three toed woodpecker habitat and peregrine falcon eyries.D. The Need For Expansion Is Not Supported By Data.1. GTR expansion is in violation of the 1963 Wilderness Act.2. GTR expansion contradicts Forest Plan Standards of 1997 and requires changes to the aforementioned Plan to be implemented.3. GTR directly impacts Endangered Species.4. Comparing GTR with Jackson Hole Mountain Resort, these are the following facts:a) GTR has 2,600 skiable acres as of 2025 and an average of 200,000 annual skiers.b) JHMR has 2,500 skiable acres with an average of 500,000 annual skiers.5. GTR has room to expand and flourish within its present boundaries. Resort Boundary Expansion outlined in the DEIS, specifically alternatives 2,4, and 5, violate Conservation Priorities in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem.If Alternative 3 is considered, it is imperative that GTR follows all proposal upgrades within it[rsquo]s present boundaries and DOES NOT IMPLEMENT the complex on the ridge top of Fred[rsquo]s Mountain.