

**GMUG National Forest Snodgrass Responsive Statement**  
**March 2, 2010**

Page 9 - *"It is our view that the negatives, for the use of Snodgrass Mountain for lift-served skiing, outweigh the positives. ... We emphasize that, while no single factor or concern leads us to reject the proposal, the accumulation of negatives considered altogether, does. ... We further believe that a review of public comments even further supports our reasoning to reject the proposal to develop lift-served skiing on Snodgrass Mountain."*

Page 11 - "We received letters and emails from nearly every party that could possibly have an interest in this issue. We have heard from political entities, organizations for or against, residents and visitors, retired and out of area participants in the Snodgrass issue over the years. It would be difficult to design a more thorough solicitation for public comment and opinion."

Page 31 - *"If intermediate terrain is the limiting factor in why the ski area has consistently experienced a decline in skier visits, then the small amount of terrain offered by Snodgrass will likely not provide the increased numbers they claim."*

Page 32 - *"Had CBMR implemented all projects already considered through NEPA and approved on the existing mountain, visitation trends may not be as shown on page 12 of their appeal. The substantial outcry from the business community asserting the need for Snodgrass to heal an ailing local economy does not appear to rely on factual information. ...In short, if the local economy is struggling with the existing mountain, expanding onto a fundamentally unsuitable mountain may not be the answer."*

Page 36 - *"In the appeal, CBMR argues there is 'overwhelming support' both before the Decision, and as reflected in the reaction to the Decision. We find to the contrary. 'Polls' conducted are unscientific and not reliable. ... The sharp reaction on both sides, provoked by the Decision, and the community discussion that ensued, revealed even deeper division than we understood. Yes, the amount of support for CBMR was surprising, however the outpouring of thanks to us for the decision made, and even substantive support for that decision, was substantial."*

Page 14/15 - *"As relates to comparison with other ski area decisions ... few ski areas have a long history of questionable development. For over 30 years there have been challenges and questions raised regarding the development potential of Snodgrass Mountain for downhill skiing. The challenges and questions arise in part because of the geographic separation of Snodgrass Mountain from Crested Butte Mountain where skiing occurs today. Such separation calls into question the availability and ease of public access. Challenges and questions also arise because of the inherent limitations of Snodgrass Mountain itself. Such limitations include geology, slope and terrain, avalanche potential, likely boundary management challenges due to proximity to existing and planned communities, roadless designation, lynx habitat, and potential conflicts with existing recreational use ... Also of concern is the potential for adverse impacts to Rocky Mountain Biological Laboratory."*