



## Winter Concerns

### OSV Concerns

<b>Winter Concern 1: Realign boundaries for OSV Restrictions to Follow Topographic or Other Definable Boundary</b>			
7	Winter	4	Is the line of demarcation for restricted OSV use and unrestricted osv use “signs” or “terrain”?
266	Winter	4	The no OSV zone needs to be further back from the motocross track to allow snowmobiles access to lower bowls near the back of the motocross track.
59	Winter	4	On the Winter Proposal, I am concerned with the OSV Unrestricted area including the most easterly blue diamond cross country ski trail and the sloping hills on the east side of Sherwin Creek Road down to 395. Could specific trails and areas be identified for motorized vehicles which would still allow for close-by but separate ungroomed cross country skiing? These slopes are a favorite of many touring skiers.
235	Winter	4	Furthermore, the line of OSV exclusion, as represented on the SWG map, excludes the Tele Bowl Area with no clear topographic boundary to deter people from riding in that inviting area directly adjacent to the motocross track. Again, are there conflicts? Is there any rationale for this?
<b>Winter Concern: 2 Provide Corridors for OSV Access</b>			
171	Winter	1	I think there should be a western access point for snowmobilers who live in the bluffs and in old mammoth and in snowcreek, so there would be less vehicles at the access lots and less traffic on our roads.
293	Winter	2	This area has been multiuse with no apparent conflicts. - It is available now for non-motorized snowplay. - This moraine is typically used by OSV users to access backcountry skiing + snowboarding terrain. This is an open area with great visibility for all users to be able to extend courtesy to each other. - There is already a proposed snowplay area adjacent to SCVIII (#15) which does not affect this corridor.

**Winter Concern: 2 Provide Corridors for OSV Access (cont'd)**

204		4	This is a great opportunity to designate OSV/MOTORIZED use areas for future considerations, yet it is being viewed more as a way to further restrict MOTORIZED/OSV use. Imagine a trail system that connected the Sherwin riding area to the Shady Rest OSV Trail System. There could be possible fuel stations, or OSV services could be feasible future considerations at the Sherwin or Shady Rest sites, while current and future OSV recreationists could enjoy a legitimate OSV trail system around the Mammoth area.
231	Winter	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please recommend that should a hotel operator at Snowcreek VIII wish to provide OSV rentals and/or staging, that a corridor be provided to connect to proposed OSV staging area at Borrow Pit
232	Winter	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please recommend that should an HOA or property owner grant a public facility for OSV staging, provisions for a corridor be provided to connect to OSV winter staging area at Borrow Pit.
54		4	I specifically request the working group eliminate the line 4 "no-fly-zone" and provide, instead, for reasonable speed and noise restrictions in this area. I request OSVs be provided regulated access on, or immediately next to, path 5A and all areas surrounding path 9A (thus establishing a regulated public ingress/egress/touring area near developed projects).
296	Winter	5c	I live on Tamarack Ln. It is very nice to drive a couple of seconds to be able to snowmobile.
350	Summer	17	How about possible weekday hours for snowmobiles for SnoBoard drop offs??



**Winter Concern 3: Provide a Clear Rationale for Changing Historic OSV Use Through Closures and Restrictions**

51		4	<p>While the Map indicates there would be "restrictions" on the northeast side of line 4, the Narrative indicates a zero OSV use policy. "Restrictions" would be more appropriate. Creating a "no-fly zone" for OSVs is inconsistent with the goal of a diversified use of public lands. The stated purpose for the no-fly-zone is to eliminate the "POTENTIAL" for conflicts of use. Wiping out one side of the potential conflict is certainly the easiest and least creative way to avoid that potential conflict. Yet neither a rationale nor actual historical data has been provided to support the need for such a large swath of public land to be set-aside for a zero-tolerance (of OSVs) policy. The group has provided no support, nor presented a narrative, to indicate that OSV use in this area has been historically abusive or a public nuisance. Nor has the group communicated that OSVs have presented an actual danger to other participants on public lands sufficient for the wholesale elimination, not regulation, of their use.</p>
235		4	<p>Regarding the idea of restricting OSV use to the east of the borrow pit: the only reason to do this that makes any sense is because there will be an alternative amenity in the area that's not compatible with snowmobile use. Certainly it makes sense to have snowplay or dog-walk areas restricted, and slow zones in busy areas, but without the presence of a regularly-groomed XC trail system, there's no good reason to boot snowmobiles from the area. The only rationale cited is the prevention of "potential conflicts." Since the meadow area is currently used by OSV's w/ no conflicts, why will there be potential conflicts in any other scenario that one that includes a groomed system?</p> <p>Re: the "quiet area" rationale: nobody made people buy those homes and condos adjacent to OSV area, and there were snowmobiles there before there were any houses. Since the main beneficiary from such a restriction would be the neighboring HOA's and Chadmar, if they want it, they should shoulder the load of grooming etc, perhaps include public access to trails on the golf course.</p> <p>A true amenity would have to be added to make the OSV restriction pencil out in light of historic use and the already heavily restricted local OSV access. Furthermore, the line of OSV exclusion, as represented on the SWG map, excludes the Tele Bowl Area with no clear topographic boundary to deter people from riding in that inviting</p>



## Winter Trail Concerns by #

<b>Winter Concern 4: Reconsider the Viability of the Proposed Snowplay Area at #15</b>			
133	Winter	<b>15</b>	It would also be nice if parking could be provided at 5A for the snow play area #15. It would greatly increase use of the play area.
189	Winter	<b>2, 15</b>	It is not necessary to have 2 snowplay areas in such close proximity to each other. Snowplay area #15 is much less desirable than #2. #15 is proposed to be located directly adjacent to the future Snowcreek VIII 4-5 star hotel which is not an appropriate adjacent use to a Mountain Hotel of that caliber. This use would destroy the view of the Sherwins from hotel rooms and hotel common areas. Additionally, the location at #15 is much more difficult to access for children and families than #2 as it is a long distance away from the Burrow pit staging area (#1) through difficult terrain. Snowplay area #2 is directly adjacent to the burrow pit staging area (#1), proposed parking, and also typically has better snow conditions and terrain for sledding.
271	Winter	<b>15</b>	This are may be to close to the residents of Snowcreek V and the "run-out" area at the bottom may be very small. There are existing fences that would need to be considered also. The #2 area may better serve the snowplay needs.
<b>Winter Concern 5: Re-evaluate Feasibility of Grooming Proposal for #9 and #10</b>			
16	Winter	<b>9a , 10a</b>	The area is so windblown, the cost of maintaining any trail system in this area will be substantial.
<b>Winter Concern 6: Expand Grooming on the #9a</b>			
70	Winter	<b>9a</b>	Why not plan to groom the entire 9A loop? Sherwin skier/boarders may cause damage to the grooming but I think the impact would ultimately be ltd, and may help to focus down hill traffic on their way out. TO have a loop to x-country/walk etc. makes for a much more use friendly/enjoyable experience etc.
<b>Winter Concern 7: Consider Phased Implementation of Old Mammoth Road Winter Closure Trailhead Parking</b>			
245	Winter	<b>OMR/Minaret area</b>	There could be an opportunity for some public along the street parking for winter use with a minimal amount of widening as an interim option.

