

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/3/2025 9:56:56 PM

First name: Steve

Last name: Frank

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As explained in my earlier letter of April 4, 2025, regarding the Grand Targhee Master Development Plan draft EIS, I stated that the US Forest Service needs to reject Alternative 2 (proposed action) and accept Alternative 3 - No SUP expansion into the South Bowl and Mono Trees areas and to reject the restaurant option at the top of Freds mountain. My argument at the time was based on damage to the flora and fauna of environmental concern as described in section 3 of the EIS. I am writing this second letter because since early April and with greater scrutiny of the EIS, many addition deficiencies have been identified in the EIS. However; my primary concern with the proposed draft EIS remains with the damage that would occur to the flora and fauna with SUP expansion into the mono tress and south bowl areas, and for this reason alone, alternative 2 should be rejected.

Stepping back to the very concept of Targhee expansion, one must ask is there even a need for expansion and what purpose will the expansion serve? An excellent argument can be made to expanding base area operations, but the argument falls apart when trying to justify expanding the ski area boundaries with the SUP or building a restaurant at the top of Freds mountain. The socioeconomic analysis (section 3.4 of the draft EIS) does not justify why Targhee, a ski area already larger than Jackson hole mountain resort but with less than a third the number of skiers, would need to expand in the first place? Alternative 2 of the draft EIS does not make sound economic sense. Building a restaurant at the top of Freds with all the logistical issues of trying to operate such an amenity makes no economic sense - let alone the creation of terrible eye-sore visible up and down the valley. Anyone enjoying the beautiful view of the Tetons will also, unavoidably see a large, obtrusive structure blocking the view of the Tetons. This would be very sad. Clearly, the only purpose for alternative 2 of the EIS is to enrich wealthy investors and will do nothing for the local community except add demands to the infrastructure and congestion of Teton Valley, Idaho.

Every year the water supply and waste water treatment of eastern Idaho becomes more and more stressed. The EIS does not adequately address how the increased water demands of the expanded ski area will impact Teton valley and what mitigations will be implemented. Likewise, the increased traffic resulting from the expansion was not adequately or accurately analyzed in the EIS. The list of deficiencies in the draft EIS continues, but the end result remains the same - alternative 2 of the EIS will only benefit wealthy investors. Reject alternative 2 of the Targhee expansion plan.