

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/21/2025 4:23:11 AM

First name: Linda

Last name: Merigliano

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing in support of alternative 3 (no expansion into South bowl or mono trees along with a reduction in the footprint of facilities at the top of dreamcatcher and sacajawea lifts). There are numerous reasons why expansion of the SUP boundary would negatively affect the human and natural environment and many others have offered more thorough comments regarding these impacts. I will only add two points:

1. All proposed actions must help achieve the purpose and need. For expansion into South bowl, the pDEIS states that action is needed due to the increased risk of skiers traveling into avalanche terrain that is not adequately managed. Additionally the DEIS states that GTR is striving to maintain its market niche. There is an unstated assumption that lift-served terrain is necessary to fulfill these purposes. However, ample evidence suggests that unique accessible backcountry terrain is highly sought amenity at resorts. Additionally there are several options to manage risk in backcountry areas adjacent to resorts (e.g. one needs to look no further than JHMR for an example). Building lifts and roads is not only environmentally damaging but will serve to just invite more people into terrain that is more difficult to control compared to the rest of the mountain. In short, adding lifts, roads and facilities in South bowl is unlikely to meet the stated purpose and need and may actually increase risk.
2. I am highly concerned about the visual impact of the access road and lift into South bowl. This area was obviously important visually to be allocated a visual management prescription in 1997 due to its prominence from many viewpoints in Teton Canyon and the Jed Smith wilderness. While the DEIS rightly acknowledges the need for a forest plan amendment, there is little discussion about why visuals is suddenly not important. If it was important in 1997, what changed?