Guided Capstone Presentation

Belal Siddiqui

Problem Identification

- → Big Mountain ski resort's pricing strategy has been to charge a premium above the average price charged by the resorts in its market segment.
- → After installing an additional chair to help increase the distribution of visitors across the mountain, the operating costs have increased by \$1,540,000 this season.

Problem Identification

- → Management believes Big Mountain is not capitalizing on its facilities, relative to its position in the market, and wanted a new, data-driven pricing and investment model for the next season.
- → This model should help the business in selecting a **better value for the ticket price**, and also guide them in making **future facility investment plans** to maximize revenue over the coming year.

Recommendation & Key Findings


- → **Ticket price** suggested by modeling: **\$95.87**, with a mean absolute error of \$10.39.
- → Modeling clearly shows there is **room for increase in the ticket price** charged by Big Mountain, when being compared with prices set by the rest of the market, based on the facilities provided.
- → To cover the additional operating costs of \$1,540,000 this season, caused by the installation of the new chair, an increase of at least \$8.80 in the ticket price is required (based on 350,000 expected visitors buying 5 day tickets, on average).
- → Changing the ticket price based on calculations made in the previous point, would raise the ticket price to about \$90. This figure lies in the range predicted by our modeling.

- → Linear Regression and Random Forest models were analysed for this project.
- → Random Forest displayed a lower cross-validation MAE compared to that of Linear Regression.
- → Random Forest performance on the test set is more consistent with the cross-validation estimates.
- → Random Forest also exhibits **less variability** (58-84%) compared to that of Linear Regression (44-82%).

Hence, **Random Forest** is chosen as the model to be used going forwards.

Scenario 1: Closing Runs

- → According to the model, **closing 1 run will** make no difference on the revenue.
- → Closing 2 and 3 runs successively will lead to a reduction in support for the charged ticket price, and hence, the revenue.
- → If business decides on closing 3 runs, they can go ahead and close down 4 or 5 runs, as this will **not lead to any further loss** in revenue.
- → Closing more than 5 runs will lead to a significant drop in revenue.




Scenario 2: Increasing the vertical drop by adding a run and installing an additional chair lift

- → An increase of 150 ft in the vertical drop, after adding a run and a chair lift, increases support for the ticket price by \$1.99.
- → Over the season, this change could lead to an increase of about
 \$3,475,000 in the total revenue.


Scenario 3: Increasing snow making cover, along with changes suggested in the previous point

- → An increase of 2 acres in the snow coverage is too small to make any difference in the projected revenue.
- → Big Mountain is already very high up the league table of snowmaking area. Investing in more coverage will not significantly affect its position among its competitors.



Scenario 4: Increasing longest run to 3.5 miles, with an increase in the snow coverage of 4 acres

- → An increase of 0.2 miles in the longest runs will not lead to an increase in the projected revenue.
- → Big Mountain already has one of the longest runs in the country. Resorts with longer runs are rare.



Summary & Conclusion

Big Mountain is already charging the highest ticket price in the state of Montana.

This is a testament to Big Mountain not compromising on the quality and quantity of the facilities provided by them.

Therefore, changing the ticket price to a value, which accurately reflects that this is the best resort in the state, makes business sense.

