

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/7/2025 4:26:00 PM

First name: Matt

Last name: Hail

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I write as a very concerned local. I have been in Teton Valley for close to 20 years and am an active rider at Grand Targhee and a local developer. And still, the proposed Grand Targhee expansion is incredibly problematic for Teton Valley, particularly for critical wildlife and wilderness habitat.

Development in Teton Valley is at an all-time high and that development encroaches on wilderness and wildlife habitat, though in slow, piece-mail ways. The Targhee expansion project as proposed would have catastrophic impacts on local wildlife, erasing critical habitat for key species. The "South Bowl" area is the north slope of Teton Canyon where there is vital winter, birthing, and summer range; important migratory pathways; and mineral licks for many ungulates like bighorn sheep, mule deer, elk, mountain goat, and moose. The bighorn sheep population in Teton Valley is at risk of localized extinction and the loss of this habitat could be a death knell for this unique species in Teton Valley. Additionally, other species utilize this important area including cougar, wolverine, black and grizzly bear, coyote, and even potentially wolf and lynx. The Forest Service previously agreed to work with the Wyoming Department of Fish and Game to improve this critical wildlife habitat. The upper Mill Creek Canyon impacted by this expansion proposal in the "Mono Trees" area contains some of the last local wilderness security habitat for elk, deer, and moose; winter range for moose; and nesting habitat for raptors including goshawks, great gray owls, and boreal owls.

The current DEIS does not provide adequate data regarding impacts to wildlife regarding this expansion. In some cases, the data is insufficient and in others, it is missing. This project cannot be allowed to move forward without critical assessment to impacts. And I believe that data will show that this project has impacts too great to wildlife to allow. I suppose Alternative 1 of no action or alternative 3 with no boundary expansion, but development allowed within the current boundaries.