

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/26/2023 5:30:08 PM

First name: Jason

Last name: Haldeman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I believe an interconnect between the two resorts would be beneficial to the resorts and the town in alleviating some of the traffic between resorts. In the MDR, the ski bridge would be constructed to allow use of the existing forest road 2N10. Would this still be accessible to public access as normal? Currently the road is only closed to the public during the winter months, typically November through May. If there happens to be early season ski operations would this road be closed to the public? I am not in favor of closing this access point to public vehicular traffic for BBMR operations.

The area of the expanded SUP and the ridgeline in general has seen many changes over the last decade from thinning of trees, fires, and construction of many bike trails in the area. I have noticed a decrease of wildlife in these areas and changes in patterns of the wildlife that remain in the area. An expansion of BBMR activities with the expanded SUP would only increase the effects on the wildlife and environment.

I am not in favor of an expanded SUP as drawn as it will most likely have negative effects on the wildlife and habitat and limit other outdoor activities not supported by the resorts. I do however support the expansion of runs 16-19. These runs basically exist already without snowmaking operations.

As per the MDR the "density analysis of Big Bear represents a well-balanced lift and terrain network" and that Big Bear has a terrain index of 91 percent. "This high index number indicates that Big Bear has a well-balanced and efficient terrain network." Creating more runs and disturbing more forest and wildlife will only increase the index number to 92. Does not seem to be much of a benefit.

As drawn in the MDR the runs 13, 14 and 15 that would be created in the expanded SUP are narrow, 60', 70' and 67' wide, less in width of comparable runs such as line Skyline Creek at Snow Summit and would seem not to support many skier/riders which could present safety concerns. Only providing justification for the interconnect lifts.

Any upgrades within the existing SUP seem reasonable along with expanding Bear Mountain's summer operations. In the construction of a restaurant at the top of Chair 9 at Bear Mountain, I would hope that consideration would be taken so that the building itself would be not so visible from the valley floor.

As provided the current parking is not enough to accommodate BBMR's existing CCC of 12810 guests. This becomes a problem for all the valley residents and visitors. An expansion of any kind should address parking, traffic and local infrastructure issues before moving forward with an expansion that will increase the amount of people the resorts draw.

I would not expect most businesses to ask for input when trying to expand operations, but the locals of the area are truly impacted by decisions made in regards to Big Bear Mountain Resorts. More community input should be considered in projects of this magnitude.