

Appendix F: Additional Participant Comments

At their final full-group meeting on November 3, 2009, and via the post-meeting group e-mail sent to the SWG by MLTPA on November 4, 2009, process facilitator Austin McNerny encouraged SWG members to submit additional comments or concerns about the Summer Proposal, Winter Proposal, or both for inclusion in SHARP. The intent was to recognize that although 100 percent consensus was reached by the SWG regarding the content of both seasonal narratives and maps and their readiness for submittal to the Inyo National Forest, certain group members might have personal opinions or preferences about specific proposal features that they would like to express as part of the SWG process. Three individuals submitted comment letters for inclusion in SHARP (Phyllis Benham, Terry Plum, and Mary K. Prentice); Terry Plum's comments are already included as part of the SWG Community Feedback Process commentary¹; the correspondence of Phyllis Benham and Mary K. Prentice follows.

¹ See "Appendix E: SWG Community Feedback Process" for details.

From: Phyllis Benham <pbenham1@verizon.net>
Subject:
Date: November 9, 2009 1:08:31 p.m. PST
To: Kim Stravers <kimstravers@mltpa.org>

Kim: Here are my comments to be included in the Individual Portion and in the SHARP document.

1. That there be a clear buffer zone between motor-ized and non motorized recreation. That this line be on a North - South line to allow access to Solitude Canyon, and one that delineates and integrates the Sherwin Bowls into the non-motorized zone.
2. That there be signs clearly marking the Boundary.
3. That the enactment from multi use to non-motorized goes into effect as soon as the Winter Staging Area is open.
(rationale- the area is suitable for all non-motorized activities without grooming in place)

Sincerely,
Phyllis Benham
P.O. Box 1823
Mammoth Lakes, Ca 93546

**SWG Individual comment letter
(to be included in SHARP)**

Mary K. Prentice

I signed the SHARP document last week because I believed that the vast majority of the document was truly a group consensus and a great start to recreation planning in the Mammoth lakes area by its citizens.

The process was almost good but not quite.

The “group consensus” on winter recreation was definitely flawed. After holding a group consensus from April until after the Oct 13, 2009 meeting the “group consensus” was dramatically changed by a small subcommittee which did not report back to the whole committee until the final meeting Nov.3, at which no further changes were to be accepted.

The rationale for completely deleting the North/South motorized./non-motorized boundary line was public response to the group consensus. The entire 6 month process had been completely open to participation by all user groups for their input.

But some, rather than expressing their opinion in the working group, disagreed by phone or letter. It can certainly be argued that many who agreed with the consensus had no reason to complain or comment.

It was never discussed or agreed by the group to accept other public input to the group consensus except through the open meeting process. It was always understood that when the group reached its consensus the Forest Service would proceed with a normal public comment period.

The big flaw with the process is that “the group consensus” was changed substantially by people never in attendance sharing their opinions at the group meetings.

Because of the flawed process I am submitting below what I believe would have been the group consensus were it not for last minute persuasions.

This is submitted only for the record. I realized that there is no way of changing the consensus at this time. However, there was consensus at the final meeting to:

- 1. Clearly sign the boundary lines between motorized and non/motorized areas.**
- 2. Determine final South East boundary line to allow OSV access to Solitude Canyon.**

I would add 2 other conditions:

- 3. I agreed with the boundary if the GPS Blue Diamond trail directly South East of the barrow pit staging area was included in the non motorized area.**
- 4. That the non-motorized policy goes into effect at the time that the winter Staging Areas is Opened.**

For the Record

(Group consensus until Oct 13, 2009)

WINTER MAP ID DESCRIPTIONS

4. (CONSENSUS OMMITTED IN FINAL DOCUMENT)

CONCEPT: Separation of motorized and non-motorized use areas in Mammoth Meadow and the Sherwins. A boundary line projected from the borrow pit staging area North to the Urban Growth Boundary and South to the top of the Sherwins will delineate motorized use to the East and non-motorized use to the West. The exact boundary placement to be determined by further study and public input.

RATIONALE: For the enjoyment and safety of both motorized and non motorized users a separation of use areas is clearly important. The separation of use areas has been tested and is successful in the Shady Rest area. It is the rationale behind the separation of users at Barrow Pit staging area. (ID #1). Further rationale is concern for nearby residential, hotel and visitor quality of enjoyment of a quiet, visually unimpaired and clean air winter environment. Winter wildlife is also a primary concern for a designated non motorized area.