

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/10/2025 6:07:12 PM

First name: Elizabeth

Last name: Bowhan

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Based on the environmental, wildlife, community, and water impacts identified in the DEIS and the lack of full impact assessment, I support Alternative 3, no boundary expansion of Grand Targhee with no restaurant on Fred's Mountain. If the decision allows a restaurant, at the very least, require that it be located below the ridgeline so the wilderness view will not be spoiled from all directions.

I own a house in Driggs and live there part-time. I hike and ski these mountains routinely. Targhee does not need to expand and expansion is not in the public interest. Jackson Hole hosts twice the number of skiers with less skiable acreage than Grand Targhee. Expansion of Targhee will result in the public having less access to public land. Only people who purchase expensive lift tickets will have access to the expanded area, not the public and people are using it.

The impact on habitat for bears, wolverines, cougar, lynx, bighorn sheep, deer, elk, moose, raptors, owls and other wildlife will be irreparable. Expansion will impact habitat on both sides of the Teton Range and needs further study. I have been lucky enough to see a wolverine and am devastated when I think of the destruction to their denning areas that will occur with expansion. How is the loss of the existence of wildlife being monetized? How many lift tickets are they worth?

The community impacts will be destructive too. Housing is an expensive proposition in Driggs and Ski Hill Road is too busy now! Upgrades to Grand Targhee will impact the Teton Valley communities enough. Expansion would increase the Driggs and Teton, County Idaho housing issues, traffic issues beyond the areas ability to cope and easily double the traffic on Ski Hill Road with Idaho receiving no financial benefit. If Targhee expands my taxes will increase and I and others will advocate for Teton County, Idaho to make Ski Hill Road a toll road. Has the impact of that been studied? The consequences of a need to expand Ski Hill Road and the cumulative impact on wildlife and the community needs further study.

Eastern Idaho is in dire straits with water. Every drop is precious and is being counted for the Water District that is forming. The full impact of less water on agriculture and tourism must be provided to the public and the Idaho WaterMasters before a decision is made. This should include the cumulative impacts of climate change and the need for sewage treatment with an expanded population both on the mountain and in the Teton Valley. Millions of gallons of water should not be taken from the Idaho side of the Teton drainage for snowmaking in Wyoming. Idaho sees no benefit from either upgrading or expanding a ski resort located in Wyoming. The feasibility and impacts of taking water from the Wyoming side should be presented as an alternative.

I really can see Grand Targhee from my kitchen window. I do not want to see any expansion, nor a restaurant on top of that mountain spoiling the view of wilderness for the entire valley and wilderness area. Tourism is a huge industry here. Have the long-term and cumulative tourism impacts of spoiling this view being assessed and monetized? It will definitely impact my peace of mind and that of others. The impact of that needs to be addressed, and not flippantly.

I understand that the Targhee expansion violates the Wilderness Act of 1963. If a suit is filed, does Targhee bear the cost, or is the cost taken out of my tax money and what are the full impacts of that?