Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/29/2026 11:00:25 PM
First name: shaun
Last name: kelly
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Given the 4 options presented in the Brian Head Resort Expansion Draft Environmental Impact Statement dated July 29, 2026, Alternative #4 would be my recommendation.

Given the uniqueness, natural beauty, and delicate balance of recovery or the high desert comfortable carrying capacity of the western edge of the Markagunt plateau, a soft touch should be applied to any development down the ridge from Brian Head Peak (Brian Head Peak pod and Sid's Peak East Ridge pod) and the first big bench below it (where the Mace's Run trail resides). As this is the American people's land, any development and support should enhance all the recreational activities, not just downhill skiing for profit (particularly at the expense other activity). This would include a pragmatic method to recover from any development gone awry, if possible.

Suggestions:
1 - Any development in the Sidney Peak East pod should be limited to one path to the top of Sid's Peak Lift (most of which is already established) and one path from Sid's Peak Lift 2 base staying on the west side of the lift to connect with the road to the Sid's Peak Lift near its northern switchback. All utility needs will be in these two roads (including any snowmaking infrastructure). The same would apply to the Summit Lift: one road that doubles as an easy ski route from the top down to the bottom of the Dragon's Back Lift and the junction back to the Aspen Meadows area. Again, any utility needs will be in the road (including any snowmaking infrastructure). Extra care will be applied as to maintain the beauty of the upper bench area where Mace's Run trail lies and its local wildlife habitat (in my case, the pika, marmot, deer, and flowers). Access to the eastern slopes in the Sidney Peak East pod may be acquired via SnowCat and/or hiking from the Summit Lift. Exhibit only proper lighting design wherein unneeded light is eliminated (use International Dark-Sky Association standards as a minimum guide).

2 - The same would apply to the Dragon's Back Lift; one road / ski route from the lift top towards Aspen Meadows area and the road from the top of the Summit Lift to the Aspen Meadows area. All utility needs, including snowmaking, will lie within the road. As described before, extra care will be taken for minimal disturbance to the high desert environment (an excuse of expense to do so is not acceptable to shortcut this).

3 - Avoid any development and/or activity that makes any of the USFS land look like the open mining pit photo on page 193 of the Brian Head Resort Expansion Draft Environmental Impact Statement dated July 29, 2026.

Another concern is if there is enough actual water, not just water rights. The Brian Head area has had water level issues with 300,000 skier visit days and less. Is there actually enough water to expand use to the projected 1,000,000 skier visits Brian Head Resort stated as their goal a couple of years ago (in ~8 yrs now)?

Suggestion:
1 - Require a full water analysis (make Melissa happier). Additionally, add a clause that if water table drops below a certain draw down level, then the resort snowmaking is cut off until water levels are restored.

While the following does not apply directly to Alternative #4 of the Brian Head Resort development option, I wish to reiterate my earlier comment from the NEPA response last year (2025) as follows: "Deleting the southern snowmobile access from the south end of Brian Head Town toward High Mountain heavily impacts that activity. Having the only route opportunity being forced through Brian Head Town abruptly shortens the season and the beauty as the trail through town is often destroyed by dirt and debris from clearing the roads for vehicles. The

opportunity to interact with pedestrians and vehicles at the many road crossings is a problem. suggestion: redesign a snowmobile route that crosses to the south, over the top of the Sugarloaf Lift and Brown Canyon Lift."

Thank you.