

**Joint DRED-UVLSRPC Public Hearing and
Mount Sunapee Advisory Committee meeting on
Commissioner Rose's draft decision on the Mount Sunapee Resort MDP/EMP 2015-2019
May 5, 2015 at 6 p.m. at Sunapee Lodge, Mount Sunapee Ski Area (Draft)**

The hearing began at 6:08 p.m. Nathan Miller, Executive Director of the Upper Valley-Lake Sunapee Regional Planning Commission (UVLSRPC) welcomed the public and introduced the state legislators. The Mount Sunapee Advisory Committee (MSAC) members and Mount Sunapee Resort introduced themselves.

Commissioner Rose thanked everyone for attending. He summarized the public involvement activities on the Master Development Plan & Environmental Management Plan 2015-2019 (MDP/EMP) held thus far. The purpose of tonight's hearing is to solicit public comment on his draft decision and proposed changes to the MDP/EMP. Copies of his "[DRAFT MOUNT SUNAPEE MDP/EMP 2015-2019 STATEMENT](#)," dated April 16, 2015 were available. He encouraged everyone to review the [Summary and Response to Written Public Comment](#) available on the [Department's website](#), as it provides the Department's response to public comment and his thought process for his draft decision.

Commissioner Rose sought to bring a balanced approach in his recommendation that the MDP/EMP be amended and approved with a series of conditions. He highlighted key points of his decision:

a) Although there is good basis for a combination of public and private ownership of land for ski areas, he did not think it the right model for Mount Sunapee. He proposes that all lands and facilities associated with the West Bowl ski area be transferred to the State and no cost to the State: approx. 150 acres of ski terrain, including all facilities necessary for the ski operation, such as facilities, lifts, trails and parking, see map 1. [[LINK](#)]

b) The State's intention to expand the ski area goes back decades, but where old growth forest was found in the East Bowl, Mount Sunapee Resort proposed to expand skiing in the West Bowl, which they own. The Natural Heritage Bureau (NHB) found no old growth forest within the West Bowl, but did find mature trees and an exemplary natural community in Polygon D. Commissioner Rose sought to avoid impacts where possible, and otherwise minimize or mitigate impacts to the exemplary natural community in Polygon D. He proposes the removal of ski trail WB6 to be rerouted outside of Polygon D, as well as the narrowing of the chairlift M and associated trail WB4 to reduce the impacts from 4.6 acres to 1.6 acres in the Polygon. He also proposes the donation of approx. 52 acres for conservation purposes to further offset the natural heritage impacts, of which 10 of the 52 acres were considered by NHB as worthy of inclusion within the exemplary natural heritage community, see map 2. [[LINK](#)]

c) To expand the Sunapee-Pillsbury Greenway, Commissioner Rose proposes the donation of an additional 208 acres of land to the state at the time the West Bowl development begins. This will meet the request of former DRED Commissioner George Bald, who called for the expansion of at least 100 acres of land to be added to the Greenway, see map 3. [[LINK](#)]

d) Commissioner Rose stated that there will be no private or residential development within the West Bowl lands transferred to the State. He recognized the Town of Goshen's Mount Sunapee Recreation District ordinance that would prohibit development on the abutting private land. And, that it is the decision of the Town of Goshen as to whether development may be allowed within its Recreation District through the grant of a variance or change in town ordinance. Commissioner Rose proposes a 20-ft setback from the state park boundary for any development within the West Bowl expansion. This requirement, along with the Town's setback ordinances if development were ever approved, would further ensure that abutters to the state park are not granted special rights or access to the West Bowl ski area.

Commissioner Rose said that the lease agreement has benefited the State: skier visits have doubled since 1998; the lease payments have enabled Cannon Mountain to improve its facilities, increase its skier visits and contribute revenue to the State Park Fund which supports the self-funded state park system and has helped to bring the park system back from operating in the “red.” The state park system is now able to improve its facilities and increase visitation. The draft decision takes a balanced approach to the MDP/EMP that respects the natural resources, enhances the public recreational experiences, brings economic benefits to the region and State, and promotes travel and tourism: it meets the statutory responsibilities of all four divisions of the department.

The Commissioner’s next steps are to consider and review public comment on his draft decision and to make his final recommendation on the MDP/EMP. A recommendation for the West Bowl expansion and the associated changes to the lease agreement would require Governor and Executive Council (G&C) review and approval. He thanked the attendees for their participation in the public process.

Mr. Miller explained the procedures for the hearing. Comment forms for written comments are available at the information table, or can be sent by email at MountSunapeeComments@dred.nh.gov. Written comments are due at DRED by 4 p.m. on June 5, 2015.

1. Drew Kellner, Brookline & Sunapee. His mom taught him skiing. He held up a photo of his mom skiing at age 5 in 1947. His family is four generations of skiers. Both conservation and preservation are needed and he thinks the decision related to the East Bowl and the West Bowl strike the correct balance. He encourages G&C approval.
2. Paul Johnson, Newport. He grew up skiing and has fond family memories of the experience. He lives here to be near Mount Sunapee. He is a fan of the West Bowl expansion and supported the privatization of the ski area because the State did not operate it well. Skiing helps get kids to the outdoors.
3. Catherine Bushueff, Sunapee, Friends of Mount Sunapee (FOMS). She opposes the expansion. As a former business owner, the proposal is bad planning and bad economics, with no vision. The state park is treasured, and more development is in excess over the traditional uses of hiking, fishing and camping that should be captured. DRED should assess all impacts, including environmental impacts, prior to its final decision. Property taxes will rise: discouraging young families and entrepreneurs from coming in. The local economy has been stagnant. The proposal is a misuse and bad use of public resources.
4. Jim Williams, Sunapee. He opposes the expansion.
5. John Lunn, Newport. His property has a view of Mount Sunapee. He opposes the expansion. The public benefits being touted are wrong and local businesses are not supported. The Resort keeps skiers’ spending onsite. Rooms & meals tax is not a benefit, but a responsibility. The owners have sued the State five times and the Town of Newbury was sued once, resulting in thousands of hours of State labor for legal work. What will happen if the owners are not satisfied with the new lease agreement?
6. Brenda Shapiro, Sunapee, FOMS/self. She moved to the area for the skiing, but does not want it overly developed. Young families cannot afford to ski. She is opposed to the West Bowl expansion. Prices will go up, making skiing an elite sport. Brook Road is a state road that will cost the state for its upgrade, without federal dollars. Commissioner Rose responded to her question, that the traffic study would be updated as part of the state and local permitting process.
7. Kathy Hubert, Newport. Commissioner Rose answered her question, that the West Bowl base lodge and parking lot detailed plans would be developed during the engineering and permitting process. She opposes the decision. She is dismayed that it did not address the lease ownership issues and that DRED was negligent on many the transfers of ownership of the lease. CNL has stated that it may sell its assets when the REIT expires in June, 2015. CNL only wants to increase stockholder profits. Liens have been placed on the lease.

8. John Pfieler, Bradford. He is a Selectman, but is speaking for himself. He grew up near Sugarloaf, which has hundreds of condos, and he thinks nature and a ski area can come together. He thinks Sunapee is gorgeous and that the decision will benefit the mountain, skiers, and employees. The Resort has 650 employees. He wrote in support with the Bradford Board of Selectmen. The Resort has done a nice job with grooming and snowmaking. The expansion will provide jobs. He looks forward to his grandchildren skiing Sunapee.
9. Will Abbott, Holderness, Society for the Protection of NH Forests (SPNHF). The SPNHF is concerned about the natural resources of the state park and public recreation. They see the positive changes detailed in the draft decision, but think more precise information is needed about the timing and conditions of land ownership and transfers before the shovel hits the ground. The State addresses non-exclusive access to the ski area, but it needs to fully explain how it will monitor access. While the donated lands are to protect the exemplary natural communities, he called for permanent protections of these natural communities.
10. Kathryn Hurd, Sunapee. She opposes the expansion. She grew up in Goshen on Brook Road. As a hiker, she appreciates the wilderness areas of Mount Sunapee State Park. How can the park be sold and developed for the benefit of private investors? The greenway trail and the park lands should be preserved for the years to come, not developed for the benefit of a select few.
11. Jay Flanders, Newbury. He has not seen economic benefit to the area during the last 16 years under the lease. Goshen has not gotten the taxes. The condition of Campground Road raises questions about responsible stewardship. There are lines of skiers when you get off a lift. Newbury residents should get discounted ticket prices. He questions the cutting forests for a ski area.
12. Dawn Emory, Goshen. She opposes the expansion. Parks should offer a wide variety of recreation: one type of recreation should not be at the expense of other types of recreation. As a biology teacher who teaches forest ecology, she provides hands on experience to students which is often a turning point for encouraging a college education as future foresters and state park employees. The expansion will forever alter the living laboratory. Public use of areas that have been protected for over 100 years is a sell out to developers.
13. Elizabeth Lyons, Sunapee. She opposes the decision. The Pillsbury-Sunapee highlands should be protected. The NHB found the exemplary natural communities to be of statewide significance, and the proposed changes to development in Polygon D will still result in cutting through the exemplary natural community. Protecting these communities is the responsible way to manage natural resources. The environmental reports in the EMP are dated, and recent climate change should be considered when assessing the impacts to the watershed. The traffic study is outdated. Comments from the UVLSRPC called for all development to be described in the MDP, including any proposed development on lands beyond the West Bowl.
14. Chris Kane of Kane Conservation in Concord, speaking for himself. He has studied the West Bowl lands. The upper slopes of Mount Sunapee were originally purchased by the SPNHF to protect them. The West Bowl has never been logged and contains exceptionally rare communities. It is well documented that fragmentation of the exemplary natural community and its biodiversity will have a detrimental effect. Mount Sunapee State Park is a jewel, and its natural resources should remain undeveloped.
15. Deb Flanders, Newbury. She opposes the expansion as bad economic development and a bad use of lands. As a former U.S. ski team member and coach, she worked at ski resorts in the West. Global warming is causing increased cost to ski operations. Skiing is not a growth industry and jobs are low paying. An independent environmental assessment is needed. The conservation lands are already protected, paid for with tax dollars. More development is not better. The Resort should complete its other development plans first.

16. David Brown, Sunapee. He opposes the decision. The traffic study indicates infrastructure for the build-out of 250 residential units. The study contains errors of fact and needs to be retracted. The State is locking itself into an obligation. Nine years spent in the lawsuit has taxed the efforts of the State's legal team. Additional time is needed to understand the intent of the lands that will be held by the Resort to meet density requirements. Density requirements are related to residential build-out, not ski development.
17. Katelyn Bushueff, Sunapee. She opposes the expansion: it is the first step in the Resort's series of real estate and commercial development. Many young people have moved away. The mountain coaster will not appeal to the younger generation.
18. Peta Brennan, Goshen. Opposes the expansion. The Goshen selectmen supported the concept of the expansion, and the town supported the Recreational District in anticipation of the West Bowl expansion. Although the Resort says they have no plans for condo development, a 2007 Union Leader article reports that the operator/Muellers requested the expansion of the ski area to include a slopeside village.
19. Margo Steeves, Newbury. She opposes the expansion. Her children grew up on the rope tow. Her family can't afford to ski at Sunapee. She thought it sad that they now travel to Gunstock to ski.
20. Steve Edes, Lebanon and Newbury. He had opposed the lease and opposes the decision as short-sighted. What happens when the lease is up? West-facing ski slopes are not viable and will not be viable when the State takes back the operation. It should not be left to Goshen to have to fight against development. The lease agreement should not be extended when the State does not know who it's extending the lease to and has no say in who takes over the lease.
21. Fred Smith, Goshen. He has a dramatic view of the West Bowl area and supports the expansion. He would like to see the ski trails developed in his lifetime. He showed a booklet entitled "NH Troubadour," the 1934 Christmas edition published by the NH Development Commission to promote skiing. Our forefathers had promoted skiing in NH.
22. Heidi Bartlett, Newport. She opposes the West Bowl expansion.
23. Jolyon Johnson, Sunapee, FOMS. He owns the 30-acre parcel abutting the West Bowl in Goshen. The decision is morally, ethically and legally wrong. How can a decision be made without detailed plans and a complete analysis? The west slope is an unfragmented forest and its development will destabilize the sensitive natural areas. The State is not capable of the complicated counter that is intended to create and protect the state park and natural heritage resources. The State Park should not be for sale.
24. Sheldon Pennojer, Greenfield. He is in favor of the balanced approach. He has started a ski area and loves the outdoors. As a trustee of a land conservation group, he connects the land to the people by bringing the outdoor experience to more people. A balanced approach should be approved: it provides additional lands for passive recreation and also allows the expansion of skiing.
25. Mary Schissel, Newport. She is a skier, but opposes the expansion. Enough is enough: the expansion will cause degradation of the remaining land. A mountain coaster is not needed in the middle of green space: no more "games" to attract visitors – nature should be enough of an attraction.
26. James "Joe" Leland, Goshen. Opposes the expansion due to impacts on the environment and the summit hiking trail. The development will impact the exemplary natural community and spoil the forest. Impacts on the water quality of Lake Sunapee need to be studied. The Resort says they have no plans for condo development, but such development is the standard operating model for the industry. The Resort is a magnet for skiers, but it is a self-contained system and does not benefit the surrounding businesses.
27. Lisa Bozogan, Wilmot. Opposes the expansion because damage to the forest and exemplary natural community cannot be mitigated. Stop using the state park for corporate profit.

28. Dan Banks, Wilmot. Opposes the decision. The expansion eliminates the summit trail. The mountain coaster is an abusive use of the state park. Who is financing the development? The delay in the transfer of lands is to enable the Resort to obtain financing. His question is: Are you going to allow use of the state park as the basis for private financing?
29. Hal Krueger, Newbury. Views the issue on “two hands.” On the one hand, the decision seems thorough and fair by minimizing the West Bowl development and its impacts, and benefiting the local and state economy. The Resort has shown excellent loyalty to the local community and has implemented energy conservation improvements. The MDP is based on “what if” planning scenarios. Actual development will require time for permitting. There are a lot of rumors and facts going around. The other hand needs to know when to fold.
30. Janet Krueger, Newbury. She thanked the Commissioner for a well-thought out decision that addresses the public concerns. The expansion has been discussed ad nauseam. Act now. We should move on to other important issues, such as the current drug problem and political financing.
31. Catherine Corkery, Concord, NH Sierra Club. Mount Sunapee is recognized as a national treasure of historical importance and special meaning. The Sierra Club will be submitting written comments. They are concerned about the impacts to the summit trail and year-round access to hiking trails. The exemplary natural communities should be a priority for its diversity and rarity. The 10 year timeline for the transfer of lands is unusual and raises concern. The Sierra Club is opposed to the decision, as currently written.
32. Frank Weldon, New London. He has skied since the 80’s and his family is the 3rd generation of skiers. He supports the proposed improvements. The ski area is home to the New England Handicapped Sports Association and hosts the veterans ski program – participants love the experience. The Resort has been good stewards: improving the attractiveness of the mountain. Let’s move forward.
33. Steve Russell, Newbury. Opposes the draft decision, especially the expansion and mountain coaster. It ignores the NHB findings with the blasting of holes to support the lift towers and by fragmenting the natural community that will not recover. It eliminates the current trail use of the park by negating the effective use of the summit hiking trail by interrupting the trail with ski trails. The repurposing of the West slope exclusively for skiers only serves those in the top 14% income level. Private, exclusive access will occur despite the prescribed setbacks.
34. Sue Russell, Newbury. What has happened to the idea of the common good on common property? Mount Sunapee has been entrusted to the committee and the agency. When the state rented out the ski area, it lost sight of the common good: that parks are for the majority of people to enjoy, not just a benefit afforded to the few and to the renter. Keep parks for the common good: for the people of NH. The decision does not adequately address the multitude of uses by the people of NH.
35. Ellen Winkler, Goshen. She opposes the expansion.
36. Loa Winter, Newbury. She opposes the expansion: bigger is not better. Enough is enough. Let’s keep what we currently have.
37. Kevin Onwela, Lempster. He is a skier and has worked in the ski industry. NH citizens protest everything from wind farms, the Northern Pass, and the Kinder-Morgan pipeline. Some say the conservation lands are worthless because they are already restricted by easements, but the state will hold all rights to the land when it is transferred, and DRED, through Commissioner Bald, said it wanted additional lands for the Sunapee Highlands. These 200 acres represent lands the state has asked to own. He approves the decision.
38. Doug Graham, Sunapee. Supports the decision. He is a resident of the area and serves on ski patrol as a volunteer. Mount Sunapee is a good public-private partnership. Anyone could have purchased the remaining private lands now owned by the Muellers. There are other residential developments around the

park that currently advertise “ski in-ski out.” We are into the second year of the approval process of the plans: decide either way and move on.

39. Dan O’Halloran, North Sutton, Citizens for Mount Sunapee’s Future (CMSF), speaking for himself. The decision is excellent and does a thorough job. He appreciates that all feedback was considered. He supports the decision.
40. Gary Stansfield, Goshen. He opposes the decision. It runs counter to the 100 year effort to protect lands. The exemplary natural communities are protected by law. The decision jeopardizes the natural community in the West Bowl as evidenced by the need for test plots. Destruction is not stewardship. Studies should be completed before approval is given. We are 17 years into the lease and the economy is still stagnant. Part-time, low wage jobs do not constitute a career path. The park is being monopolized by skiing and hijacks the hiking trails. He invited the Commissioner to see the old trees.
41. Frank MacConnell, Newport, Skinner Ski & Sport, CMSF. He supports the decision as a tourism-based business owner. People want the ski trails and lift. The project does benefit local businesses. Five town selectboards have written in support. The decision strikes the right balance. The leaseholder will pay for the improvements. He thanks the Muellers for doing a good job and being good stewards. Let’s move forward.
42. Hess Gates, Sunapee. Supports the decision for several reasons. The year-round jobs have helped families. The Resort has been a consistent, responsible environmental steward over the last 17 years. They are a good neighbor and have supported the disabled vets programs. The state is getting financial support for two NH ski area for the price of none. A competitive Sunapee means an improved Cannon, which benefits the taxpayers. He appreciates the effort by DRED to hear public comment. He urges the G&C to approve the decision.
43. Tim Bushueff, Sunapee. He opposes the decision. Look to the true visionaries who protect lands. Development is not environmentally friendly. Economic benefits are not realized through low paying jobs while maximizing investor profits. NH should take the lead in developing entrepreneurial, sustainable eco-tourism. It should not follow the status quo of ski industry development.
44. Lydia Hawkes, Goshen. She opposes the expansion and the mountain coaster. The Resort has not completed its approved projects. In 2007, one of the chairlifts failed, but it is still in service. To say there is no old growth forest by defining old growth as over 300 years, and to set up test plots to study impacts to the forest is absurd. Look at the current widening of ski trails caused because the trees are dying. The West slope trees have never been touched, the summit hiking trail will be impacted. The West Bowl needs protection, not exploitation. Since the 1998 lease, the regional economy has not improved. Four ski trails, a lift, and a lodge will not improve the economy.
45. Jennifer Shaw, Sunapee. She opposes the decision and wonders if we are just “going through the motions.” The proposed donated lands are already protected by conservation easements. We don’t need a Disney-style mountain coaster that is a permanent, all-season structure. If the Resort is supposed to be an economic engine, why are there so many closed businesses in its shadow along Route 103? The price tag of the expansion is the condos. The 20-ft. buffer is absurd. You [Commissioner] have the power to decide: condo development will be on your watch.
46. Josh Bushueff, Claremont. He opposes the decision as having a regressive effect rather than being progressive in attracting young people to the region and providing affordable recreational opportunities.
47. Holly Flanders, Newbury and Park City, UT. A former Olympian, she learned to ski at Sunapee. She opposes the expansion. After 8 years working at a ski area in Park City, she has seen the area become overcrowded and congested with declining quality of life. What do we want to have here? Is it worth cutting old growth forests? The increased traffic? The quality of life declining for the many to benefit a

few? Don't jeopardize what we have; preserve the status quo. The jobs don't provide economic vibrancy or a livable wage.

48. Susan Parmenter, Sunapee. She is a skier and works at Sunapee. In answer to her question, Commissioner Rose said the hiking trails are maintained by volunteer Friends Groups. She said the summit trail needs work. She opposes the West Bowl expansion. According to RSA 216-A:1, the first priority of the state park mission is to protect and preserve unusual scenic, scientific, historical, recreational, and natural areas within the state. The expansion is a direct violation of the law. Intelligent stewardship continues the forest protection efforts of the 1900's. This forest has survived hurricanes, yet it will be cut down for a quad chair lift? The mountain coaster does not belong in a state park. She speaks for the continued legacy of preservation and stewardship of the natural resources. In this time of climate change, development will hasten the demise of the forest.
49. Susan Lichty, Lempster. She opposes the decision as it is bad economic development and is a bad plan. She enjoys NH state parks as affordable recreation, but she and other families can't afford to ski at Sunapee. Skiing is now for the rich from out of state. The decision allows the Resort the right to retain the land for mitigation purposes, which is clearly for condo development. The local boards do not have the power to fight large corporate interests. The mountain coaster is absurd: Mount Sunapee is not an amusement park. Keep Mount Sunapee as Herbert Welsh intended.
50. John Wirkkala, Goshen. He opposes the draft decision. Mount Sunapee was part of his youth, having skied there, enjoyed family picnics and band concerts at no charge. The Resort does provide beneficial skiing, but more plans are needed for other types of recreation. The decision is premature. We are all aware of the real estate development plans. The State needs to provide the initial studies to help Goshen address the impacts of real estate development.
51. Virginia Schendler, Goshen. Opposes the decision. The local governments have been misled by short-term promises. The West Bowl development will result in the loss of older forest habitat. The 250 unit condo development will increase real estate taxes and the cost of infrastructure for the enhancement of private profit. Why is the REIT divesting its interests in ski resorts?
52. Maura Gorman, New London, CMSF. She is struck by how the same concerns are still being talked about as when the State was considering leasing the Sunapee ski area. The proposed plan is the next step for the ski area. It balances the environment with the economics. DRED has done an incredible job with the private-public partnership.
53. Keith Chrisman, Sunapee. He opposes the decision. With declining skier visits, the expansion is not justified. What is the end game for the state park? At the end of the lease, what will the park look like?
54. Guenter Hubert, Newport. He referred to the UVLSRPC letter that stated that it was essential for Goshen and Newbury to have complete information on the real estate development. If the operator has no plans for real estate development, they should clearly say so. He has reviewed the RKG report and will provide written comments on its inaccuracies. His calculations on the impacts caused by the condo development would put Goshen in the red.
55. Robert Stewart, Newbury. Opposes the decision. Okemo's RFP admits that thorough environmental analysis is needed prior to development. He is concerned about all potential impacts. Having an earth science degree, he thinks there will be an adverse effect on a treasured resource. The environmental impact studies are not comprehensive enough, especially regarding impacts to the watershed. He is also concerned about impacts to the hiking trails.
56. Alan Shulman, New London. He provided a poster as a visual representation of the before and after effect that the West Bowl ski lift and trails will have on the forest. The ski development will result in forest

fragmentation, creating scattered islands of trees. A forest environment is no longer possible where there is human development. He opposes the expansion.

57. Audrey Sylvester, Bradford. She opposes the decision as it will ruin the forest and enable invasive species to take hold. A “wounded” forest environment will cause a decline in the animal population and affect the flora. The economics are not viable. Deterioration of the original forest goes against the first stated priority of the state park system. And, RSA 217-A:7 says that to the extent possible actions carried out by state agencies shall not jeopardize the continued existence of any exemplary natural community. DRED should be protecting Mount Sunapee.
58. Emily Steward, Newbury. She opposes the decision as bad economic development. Just look at Ludlow: it has become unaffordable. The proposed plans are lacking in a complete environmental study. The mitigation plans are not reasonable: you are robbing Peter to pay Paul.
59. Linda Dennis, Newport, FOMS founding member. She is in opposition. The plan goes against the state park mission. It will not move the economy forward; instead we are saddled with a declining job market. The expansion will diminish NH’s scenic beauty by cutting through the forest. DRED should uphold the state laws to protect the forest. The plans fail to look beyond the 5 year timeframe. Public conservation lands should not be used to mitigate private development. The decision speaks to the spectator’s interests by allowing mitigation.
60. Charlie Hirshberg, Sunapee. He is a ski instructor and supports the West Bowl expansion. The Resort provides direct and indirect impacts to the local economy. The Commissioner’s decision lessens the impacts to Polygon D and he believes minimizing impacts to the hiking trails can be effectively done. The environment assessments are important and necessary. The expansion adds lands to the state park and preserves a greater area. Every citizen has a right to use the state park, and ski trails can co-exist with other uses of the park.
61. Gerry Gold, New London, SRKGC member/volunteer. In 1993, there was an effort to develop a hiking trail network in the region. The trails are maintained by volunteers, but the number of volunteers is inadequate to meet the maintenance needs. He takes no position on the decision, but asks if the summit trail will continue to exist. He is concerned about the continuity of the greenway and trails. He would like to see the decision clearly address the summit trail, the year-round use of trails, and require an MOA (Memorandum of Agreement) for trail maintenance by the Resort. The 2014 court decision brought the hiking trails into the expanded leasehold area.
62. Mary Davidson, Newbury and Lebanon. As a past Olympian with future Olympians in her family, she is opposed to the expansion. She was saddened by the lease of the ski area and thinks that public lands should not be given out to private interests. Young people should take on the management of the ski area, not corporations.
63. Susan Paton, Acworth. She is a skier and hiker and supports the expansion. Most parks are not used beyond the formal viewing area, so more ski and hiking trails will get more people using parks. Competition between ski areas is fierce with many resorts expanding their facilities. The Muellers have made Sunapee a great family ski area, but expansion is needed to compete. The economic value outweighs the economic disaster if the ski area is closed.
64. Kathleen Shulman, New London. She asks: What is the public trust that we are obligated to pass on to the next generation? We no longer have the same quality of life as what we grew up with. Skiing is not the best use of land: our task is to protect pristine lands. Good stewardship and the right balance are to say “no” to development, not to mitigate for it. No public lands should be used for private profit.
65. Dianne Rochford, Newport, read a letter written by Jeffrey Heath, who is a descendant of a family whose land was taken by eminent domain. He wrote of the loss of water supply, and of ground water

contamination from the waste water lagoons. Since the lease, the operator proposed to expand the spray fields. Research is needed on the current infrastructure, especially regarding the effluent and sewage system, and the impacts of extreme weather on the water resources. Until the impacts are better understood, DRED should delay its decision or deny the expansion. He opposes the decision.

66. Lionel Chute, Washington. He opposes the West Bowl expansion. It is in direct conflict with Gov. Hassan's Earth Day proclamation and with RSA 217-A. The NHB looked at all four polygons within the West Bowl and all four areas will be impacted by development. Polygon A, with a tree dating back to 1699, will be bisected; Polygon B has a 256 year old Spruce; Polygon C will be affected; and Polygon D, although not determined to be "old growth," is probably an old growth forest having never been logged. There are only 12 exemplary natural communities left in this area, including one of the only documented examples of a particular type of exemplary natural community. The development plans will cut a swath through the exemplary natural community located in Polygon D.
67. Ken Dennis, Newport. He opposes the West Bowl expansion and the mountain coaster. He opposed the letter of support from the Newport Board of Selectmen: it was sent without resident input.
68. Hilary Flanders, Warner. She opposes the decision. Her land bordered the access road and was taken by eminent domain. The state should be ashamed that the park is being used for corporate gain. The rewards benefit only a few, not for all. A job paying \$8/hour would not keep me here. The expansion will not foster the local community and is not good for the long term goals of the park.
69. Sam Shain, New London. He is 15 years old and is a trailwright of SRKG. The idea of stewardship of natural resources being sacrificed for capital gain was a shock. NH is one of the most densely forested states. The West Bowl development will not get young people into the park. Destroying nature is a stupid idea. Without the trees, the forest would no longer be alive, and it was here longer than any of us. This is unethical and immoral: you can't own nature; we are a part of it. To do this to make money is not how we can survive. He is opposed.
70. Dana Seero, Boston and Goshen, on Brook Road. The proposed development influenced the decision to purchase housing here. Other ski areas are seeking the same skier group, and the objections voiced here would apply to any ski area. Many other local ski areas have closed down. The West Bowl decision is an innovative way to balance recreational needs and the environment.
71. Betsy Edes, No. Hampton. She opposes the decision: it jeopardizes the integrity of the forest and local community. The costs outweigh the economic benefits. The lessee is a fragmented organization. It's not right to pass the fight onto small communities. Don't pass the buck to Goshen. The benefits of state parks should be to the local community, not to private interests.
72. Nellie Dinger, Greenland. She opposes the decision. She no longer skis at Sunapee. She is concerned about the environmental impacts to the watershed caused by runoff from the West side slopes and forest fragmentation. It is not fair to leave Goshen to fight large corporate interests.
73. Jim Carrick, Goshen. He is opposed. Brook Road is in the worst condition and is not considered in the State's 10-year transportation plan. The cost for Goshen's police and rescue will be high. The proposed parking lot for 300 cars will require more police. His estimates show that Goshen would be \$300K in the red. Cars will cut through on small town roads. As a former planning board member, the town needs help from the State as development goes in.
74. Steve Wolf, New London. He has been a skier since 2000 and is 100% in support. The decision is well thought out. The season passes are affordable to middle income folks. He has made many friends on the slopes and looks forward to skiing in direct sunlight. His daughters worked at Sunapee where they developed a strong work ethic and received scholarships. He has been to ski resorts in UT and WY. Mount Sunapee will never be like Park City UT, the terrain will not support that kind of development.

75. Mike Adams, Goshen. He opposes.
76. Rick Van de Poll, Sandwich. He is an ecologist and speaks on old growth forests at conferences. He has reviewed the studies, and respects the comments on forest fragmentation. However, the research on Polygon D indicates that it is not old growth forest. The impacts to the polygons A through C will be very small. The impact of ski development to the upper portions is insignificant compared to impacts that are caused by the timber industry. He supports the decision as it will create permanent mitigation for conservation lands protected in perpetuity.
77. Zach Graham, Sunapee. He is in support having skied for 22 years; the Resort has been responsible in protecting resources. The expansion is an investment in the operation and local businesses depend upon investment in the mountain. This will benefit the residents and local businesses.
78. Mike Sullivan, Goshen. He was opposed to the lease in 1998. It was a decision that was based on lies. We are just going through the motions here, and this decision is still based on the lie that the Muellers are not in it for condo development. The expansion is the “baby step” way to go and will open a Pandora’s Box. We won’t be able to afford the taxes. He is overwhelmingly against.
79. Eric Rinehimer, Weare. He drives past Pat’s Peak to ski at Sunapee. He loves Sunapee and is a ski instructor and hikes the mountain. He meets great people from all over and enjoys sharing Mount Sunapee with them. It is part of his family’s lifestyle and all four make it affordable. The Resort supports local business.
80. Kerry Rochford Hague, Newport. Grandfather skied Sunapee before it was a state park. Opposes the expansion for fear of it becoming a “resort town.” A strong community includes affordable housing. State parks require stewardship. What’s next when the one lift and four ski trails are determined as not enough?
81. Rebecca Rice Robinson, Sunapee. She is opposed to the expansion. She reminds the state of what active listening means: to be open minded and hear both sides so that information may come in in a new way. The scientific, economic and emotional comments are all valuable. She is a hiker, not a skier, but has heard that skiing is not as it used to be. Fish and Game and Audubon report that wildlife is disappearing. She disagrees with the expansion, especially when it is for private, corporate gain.

Commissioner Rose thanked everyone and said the public process is what makes New Hampshire great. He welcomes additional written comments due by 4 p.m. on June 5, 2015. He thanked the MSAC and looks forward to hearing committee input at their meeting on June 2, 2015. He thanked Mount Sunapee Resort and the DRED staff. He appreciates the public sentiment: that Mount Sunapee is a special place that requires responsible stewardship. The hearing was adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Submitted by T. Tango-Lowy, Hearing clerk.