

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/16/2025 8:07:43 PM

First name: Robert

Last name: Mann

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I have had the opportunity to review the proposed EIS for Grand Targhee (GTR) and would like to submit my public comments to the various alternatives outlined in the EIS.

My primary objection to the proposal is the desire of GTR to expand the size of their SUP into South Bowl and Mono Trees. The ultimate question; has GTR established the need to expand into these areas and is that need so great that it offsets any negative environmental, economic, and social impacts caused by the expansion as outlined in the draft EIS. As pointed out in the draft EIS, GTR is characterized as a ski area with low density skiing and short lift lines. GTR is at this time primarily a day ski area as opposed to a destination resort due to a lack of bed space and other resort type amenities associated with established destination resorts like Jackson Hole, Vail, and Aspen.

Why would a ski area known for low density skiing/lack of lines need to expand the size of their SUP. From my review of the EIS, this question is not properly addressed or answered. The assumption that it needs to do so to remain competitive is inadequate. The draft EIS in Section 3 projects various ski area visitation growths based upon the different alternatives. This is pure speculation and is not clear how these numbers are derived or the validity of these projections. As a general proposition, skier visits in the US remain stable and why GTR should be a national exception is not addressed. As I am in favor of Proposal #3, I believe there are many improvements to the ski area experience that can and should be made to GTR. Let GTR make those improvements and then come back in 5 or 10 years and make the case that ski area expansion is necessary because of on hill overcrowding. Recently, GTR installed the Colter lift, a fine addition to the ski area, but with the additional terrain and uphill capacity, the ski area feels even less crowded and I have yet to see a line on the Colter lift.

Let GTR install additional lifts within the existing SUP, let them install additional on hill amenities and services and if the resort experiences a surge in skier visits that makes over crowding a legitimate concern, then let them return for an addition to their SUP. As the last master plan was only approved in 2019, its clear that things can be done in a more incremental manner to better assess the needs of GTR in a continually evolving marketplace.

As for the need to improve the existing facilities and infrastructure, yes GTR should be allowed to install additional snowmaking to remain competitive and viable as the climate continues to change. Adding on hill lodges and food services is needed and would enhance the skier experience. And adding to summer offerings is something that will help GTR remain competitive and economically viable into the future. These are improvements that can be made in an already disturbed area with minimal incremental environmental impacts.

For these reasons I would urge the adoption of Alternative #3 as outlined in the EIS.

Thank you.

Robert Mann

Jackson, Wyoming.