

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/30/2026 5:48:45 PM

First name: Daniel

Last name: Chelist

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The document appears to conflate comfortable carrying capacity (CCC) with visitation, claiming CCC can increase without requiring additional parking, even though the visitation data used is nearly a decade old. It also fails to adequately address the housing and parking needs associated with an increased seasonal workforce, despite asserting that local employment opportunities will grow without requiring new housing. This assumption contradicts the reality that most winter employees come from out of the area. One of the last remaining wildlife corridors in the region would be further fragmented by new ski terrain and infrastructure, yet wildlife surveys appear limited almost exclusively to the spotted owl, overlooking the many migratory birds and other species that rely on this habitat. The analysis acknowledges that warming temperatures will require more artificial snowmaking, yet still proposes expanding terrain that would demand even more water which is an increasingly scarce resource. Additionally, the project would remove numerous old-growth trees, with no clear ground-truthed inventory of what would be lost, raising questions about the Forest Service's commitment to preserving mature forest ecosystems. With federal funding being cut, it is unclear how the promised monitoring and mitigation would realistically be carried out, leaving the public to rely on assurances from the resort operator. Much of the analysis is qualitative or based on outdated data, making it difficult to determine the true significance of the impacts. The plan also fails to acknowledge that the area between the two resorts that currently used for snowshoeing and other winter recreation would no longer be available for those activities, reinforcing the perception that the Forest Service prioritizes paying resort guests over broader public access. Finally, the need for a Forest Plan amendment is questionable, as it appears to contradict the Forest's previously approved purpose and vision.