

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/19/2025 11:15:40 PM

First name: Mark

Last name: Hanson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear USFS:

After pouring over the exhaustive DEIS and many related comments, I find myself in support of Alternative 2, allowing for boundary expansions into South Bowl and Mono Trees as well as a host of other important and well planned projects within the existing boundary.

I don't make this decision lightly as many legitimate concerns have been raised (and quite a few sensationalized opinions) that merit concern, principally Big Horn Sheep habitat and White Bark pine impacts.

Nevertheless, by my reading of the DEIS, all the impacts can be mitigated and managed appropriately.

Another legitimate concern are impacts on Teton County, Idaho and the costs of providing community services .

While there reportedly aren't direct tax benefits flowing to Idaho, there are many indirect revenues that certainly help offset costs. It is my opinion that State of Idaho representatives and our county commissioners have to be more creative in finding monies to manage these costs and solutions do exist.

Lodging taxes, Short-term rental fees and State & Federal Highway grants are but a few examples of potential funding sources.

It also needs to be stated that growth in Teton Valley is the result of many factors, of which GTR is only a part of. In fact, GTR expansion and improvements are forecasted to increase skier visit days but not significantly affect valley population growth. The growth is coming hot and heavy regardless of what happens with the proposed expansion and I feel the resort should be allowed to grow accordingly.

There has also been many comments related to ski industry growth, many of which are factually incorrect. Skier visits across the US are not only trending upwards but also that growth is trending towards places like GTR, which provide the type of experience many are seeking. Regardless of industry trends, I believe we all expect skier visit growth at GTR.

Might we be better off putting our energies into managing valley growth more effectively and fighting many of the ill planned subdivision proposals?

Further, characterizing GTR's growth and development proposals as simple greed is unfair. GTR has proven to be a conscientious service provider, generous community member and employer and an exemplary steward of our public lands over and over again. The proposed changes will be in process for many years to come and will take significant investment on the part of ownership to come to fruition.

Folks also need to understand that ownership in the lands in question will not change so calling it a 'land grab' is not appropriate. The USFS will continue to own and oversee each proposed project under a special use permit, just like 121 other resorts in the U.S. We should not conflate the proposed boundary expansion with what the US Senate's budget bill proposes.

Also, comments that claim the changes only benefit rich owners are also unfair. All of us who choose to ski, hike, ride bikes, listen to music, take scenic chair rides, etc. stand to benefit, unlike many valley developments which truly do only serve the developer.

We cannot deny that resort activities have impacts. But, as an individual who has likely spent as much time at GTR as anyone these past 33 winters, I believe ski resorts and GTR in particular, strike an important balance between human needs and protecting the environment. Giving people year round access to enjoy the natural environment is an important part of that balance and I have had the remarkable privilege of seeing perhaps thousands of people come to appreciate the beauty of the Tetons because of Grand Targhee.

Alternative 2 gives GTR the best chance to continue providing this unique access to folks for years to come.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mark Hanson

Driggs, Idaho