

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/27/2020 8:52:47 PM

First name: Katie

Last name: Tackman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to offer my comments regarding the proposed development adjacent to Mission Ridge Ski area. After reading the USFS Mission Ridge Expansion Project: Draft Environmental Analysis, there are a few observations and comments I would like to make.

First of all, I grew up skiing at Mission Ridge, and love that I drive 15 minutes to a ski hill, especially one with a small community like Mission. Even now, on days I go up alone, I rarely ski alone, finding or making a friend to ski with for the day. We are so blessed to have the combined Mission Ridge, Forest Service, and other public lands so close for such a recreational asset. In addition to the ski area, there are a number of trail and road access points nearby that make recreation possible both inside and outside the resort in all seasons.

I am concerned that the expansion of the privatization of Mission Ridge would limit the access for other users as Mission attracts an overabundance of outside guests. Already, it is almost impossible to reach nearby trails on the weekends (as Mission uses most available parking up the mountain for overflow) and with MORE guests, I anticipate almost impossible access for both with more regularity. Currently, the Special Use Permit (SUP) issued to the Mission Ridge Resort in 1984, which will eventually expire in 2038, is for non-exclusive use of the land by the ski area, and requires the land to be open to the public for all lawful purposes. However, even today, with the Ridge closed for COVID-19, there is a gate in place preventing motorized vehicles to park in the main lot, treating the area like private property, limiting access for outside enthusiasts needing an outlet during this difficult time. This contradicts the SUP terms and conditions in article F which states ... "remain open for all legal purposes." It is easy to infer that based on current management practices, and lack of involvement from the Forest Service, we can expect similar treatment with the potential expansion.

Already, Mission Ridge has constructed a one way in, one way out road to serve the construction of their expansion. Similar to the lack of supervision from the Forest Service to regulate the privacy of the Ridge, the road construction is no different. That road is shameful, and goes against the advertised goal of land stewardship of both the Forest Service and Mission Ridge. It breaks every rule in the book, from stream crossing protocol, side cast management, disregarding tree size restrictions, riparian zone protection, and slope stabilization. This doesn't even begin to account for the wildfire hazards such a road creates.

My primary concern is directed towards the human safety and resource use issue a one way in, one way out road would present. After several years as a Forest Service employee and working throughout the Okanogan/National Forest Land, performing fire ecology and entomology research, the Twisp River Fire fatalities really hit home. I attended the same college as one of the victims, and the whole community felt the loss. The Twisp River fatalities are a result of a one way in, one way out road, and having driven up it myself many times, I would not want to risk getting stuck on such a road during a fire. With 900 proposed condos, there is no doubt in my mind that the Forest Service will be called to provide resources to protect such a structure rich area, when (not IF) it is threatened by a fire. The last thing I want is to risk the lives and resources of the U.S. Forest Service for a preventable safety hazard.

My other primary concern comes from carrying capacity. Currently Mission Ridge is on 2080 acres, and can barely accommodate skiers on the weekend, or on any given powder day. With only four lifts (one of which is often out of service for part or all of the day) the lines can already take 30 minutes or more. Only an additional 19 skiable acres will be added with only a few minor lifts. Most of the expansion will be in place to house 900 condos to hopefully attract 5000 or more guests. 5000 guests or more who need access to water, sewage, food, snow-making, and parking. Does the surrounding Forest Service Land and surrounding watershed, have the ability to accommodate the water for the additional snow-making to cover additional acreage, water, sewage, and

additional guests taking up a housing area the size of Cashmere? Already, watersheds throughout the West are struggling to meet the needs of it's communities, and the Wenatchee Valley is no different.

Mission Ridge claims that without overnight accommodations it "can't meet the needs of families looking for a full service vacation experience," I would like to point out that Mission Ridge is only 15-20 minutes from Wenatchee, which can accommodate such visitors, at the benefit to the entire valley, with a variety of LOCAL business owners, instead of one OUTSIDE owner. Most out of town visitors come from the West Side or other large cities who have daily commutes that exceeds 15-20 minutes, which would make Wenatchee a minor detour to stay throughout a trip. This might limit the economic gain of one person, however this will take away the benefit from the rest of the Wenatchee Valley. Even the increase of jobs would primarily be, part time, minimum wage, seasonal jobs, which isn't a sustainable economic gain for the community as a whole.

Raised in the Wenatchee Valley, with an intention to stay here, I would like to see our amazing resources available for my children in the future. The Forest Service states it's their mission "to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the nation's forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations." However, I don't see the Mission Ridge Expansion a safe or sustainable option environmentally or economically for our valley now, or in the future.

Thank you for your consideration!