

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/21/2025 2:58:19 AM

First name: Cynthia

Last name: Orcutt

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to express opinions regarding the proposed expansion of the Grand Targhee resort.

I have waited to submit this letter until I had the opportunity to read the letters from Teton County, Wyoming and Teton County, Idaho. I agree with most of the comments in both letters.

I also wanted to read the letter prepared by VARD (Valley Advocates for Responsible Development). VARD is a nonprofit organization in Teton Valley that does an excellent job reviewing and commenting on proposed developments in the valley. I knew their comments would be thoughtful, and they were. I support the alternative approach that they are proposing, which includes a combination of Alternative One and a modified Alternative Three - with development inside the SUP only.

My biggest concerns regarding this development fall into two categories;

1. tax revenue cost sharing between the two counties and
2. Traffic control and management.

TAX REVENUE SHARING BETWEEN COUNTIES

It seems with the current proposal that all of the tax revenues from GTR will flow to Teton County Wyoming. However, most of the offsite impacts will be felt by Teton County Idaho and my understanding is that Teton County Idaho will receive nothing financially with the current plan. In fact, in the traffic study prepared by the SE group from Frisco, Colorado, they state that the last GTR development plan approved in 2019 indicated that the GTR would pay for offsite road improvements from Stateline Road up to the resort. In other words, there was to be nothing to reimburse Teton County Idaho for repair and upkeep to roads, traffic control and parking that may be necessary due to the GTR development.

I would like to see a MOU developed between the two states whereby Teton County, Idaho receives an appropriate portion of the tax revenue from GTR to compensate for offsite impacts due to the development.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL

I have read the traffic and parking technical report for the Grand Targhee Master development Plan developed in August 2023 by SE Group.

While the report analyzes traffic counts and parking impacts for all five alternatives, there is a major omission in this analysis, and that is the lack of any analysis of 2500 N or 2000S. This is odd as the traffic study states that some of the traffic will be using Ski Hill Road to access GTR, but those guests coming from Utah, Boise, Pocatello, or Idaho Falls will be using 2500 N. A smaller number will use 2000 S. Both of these roads will feed into Stateline then to Ski Hill Road. Completely ignoring both of these roads in terms of this analysis creates an incomplete picture of the true traffic situation. The traffic study should be amended to include these two roads.

There is discussion regarding remote parking areas that would be fed by shuttles that travel to the resort. The Teton county, Wyoming letter likens the solution to the Simpson lot - the remote parking lot for the Jackson Hole resort. I was left to wonder if the Teton County, Wyoming Commissioners were recommending that this lot should

be built in Wyoming. If so, that means that all the traffic must funnel through Teton Valley and up through Driggs to get to this remote parking area. A better solution would be a remote parking lot located somewhere off Route 33, however, the location of this must be carefully studied. Any large parking lot and shuttle buses will impact neighborhoods. Similar to the lot in Wilson, it would be good to have some sort of open space compensation, similar to R Park, as part of the development. The Wilson R Park has trails, open space, water, amenities, art, and public rest room facilities. A similar facility next to any remote parking lot would be good for the town of Driggs and Teton Valley and help mitigate the impact of a large parking lot leading GTR guests.

In almost every alternative, the traffic intersections analyzed fall into failing categories due to development, however, there is no discussion about what to do about this. There is no discussion about additional traffic lights, turn lanes, bypasses- any solutions. All the report does is identify the problems. GTR should be required to develop a complete traffic management plan that identifies solutions to the problems outlined in the traffic report, their cost to implement and maintain.

Until the traffic and parking report includes analysis of the accurate region of impact, outlines where remote parking lots will be located and proposes a design for these lots, and identifies solutions and costs to failing traffic intersections, this project should not be approved.

Thank you again for the opportunity to express my opinion.