

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/15/2025 12:53:48 PM

First name: Lou

Last name: Parri

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

As a skier at GTR since the mid 1980's, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed expansion at the resort.

Purpose and Need: The DEIS fails to address skier demand both on a national basis and specifically for GTR. Skier visits have fluctuated over the last several years w Vail Resorts having a 3% reduction in visits this past season.

Regarding GTR, the low density of skiers per acre causes me to question the need to add more terrain and expand the SUP. It is stated that the average number of skier visits for the last 10yrs is 207,090, w the median number of visits of 195,151. Also, when reviewing the skier visits over the last 10 yrs (table 3.1-2) there is significant fluctuations in visits. Base on the above information, I believe that it is not in the public's best interest to expand the SUP.

GTR Financial Stability: Analysis of the resort's financial status is paramount. The proposed expansion appears to require significant investment and possible risk. This issue must be examined given that the resort has completed its land exchange, the establishment of an inholding.

Loss of Public Access: South Bowl and Mill Creek are areas that will result in limitations for public access. MC is used by hikers, horseback riders and mountain bikers. SB is used by backcountry skiers. The Teton Canyon area is a high use area and by expanding the SUP, recreational terrain will be further limited. This will lead to concentrated use and negative impacts to the resource.

Visual Impacts: This analysis minimizes the impact to the visual resource. The South Bowl development will be visible from multiple locations in the JSW, national forest and GTNP. The DEIS minimizes visual concerns by noting limited duration of viewing. The wilderness experience will be degraded as a result of any view experience that includes access roads, ski lifts, etc.

When considering the Guest Facility on Fred's Mtn., the analysis again minimizes the visual impact from Teton Valley. It is mentioned that non-glare materials will be used such. Such materials were used on the Dreamcatcher lift and there is reflection from the lift shack windows. In the land exchange EIS it was noted that the facility on Peaked would be in an area where it would not be viewed form the valley, national forest or wilderness. This directive should be applied to the facility on Fred's Mtn and other on mountain guest facilities.

Socio-economic Concerns: Direct and indirect impacts to Teton Valley Idaho will be significant. As noted in the DEIS, all tax revenues generated by the resort will go to Wyoming. Idaho will endure many of the social and infrastructure costs.

In addressing population growth, the DEIS uses a 1.1% estimate while Teton Co. Idaho in their Impact Fee document uses a 3.75% growth factor. Why is there such a discrepancy between the DEIS and TC Idaho?

While it is noted that there will be increased demands on the social infrastructure, schools, healthcare, emergency services, etc. no actual analysis of costs and other impacts is specifically addressed.

Impact related to housing costs has not been addressed. A comparison of resort communities similar to Teton Valley will offer valuable planning information.

Ricks Basin: There is no demonstrated need to develop a road or other facilities in this area. A concern of mine is any development is a harbinger of another land exchange and expansion of the present inholding for the purpose of residential/commercial development.

Conclusion: Based on the above noted concerns, I believe that Alternative 1, The No Action Alternative serves

the best public interest.