

**Stuart Brown**

---

**From:** Adelbert Carlen <chefac03@att.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 31, 2016 5:19 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** Re: MAMMOTH CREEK PARK AND PLAYGROUND WORKSHOP - APRIL 5

Dear Stuart, we are unable to attend your meeting on April 5th, but there is something I would really love to see at this integrated park.

I grew up fishing on that creek in the 50s and 60s that experience is a fond memory for me.

So I would like to see a couple of Wheelchair accessible fishing points for adults and or kids under the age of 16 with disabilities.

Thanks for reading

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

On Wed, Mar 30, 2016 at 2:54 PM, Stuart Brown  
<[listserv@civicplus.com](mailto:listserv@civicplus.com)> wrote:

[View this in your browser](#)

Good afternoon,

The Recreation Commission wants to hear how you want to play at **Mammoth Creek Park** on **April 5, 2016 in Suite Z at 12:00pm** (Minaret Village Mall). With your help, we can create a recreation destination that the entire community of Mammoth Lakes will actively enjoy, value and ultimately be proud to call YOUR Park.

Join us on April 5 at 12:00pm to learn more about enhancing the park and playground. Participate in an interactive workshop with representatives from leading playground manufacturers. Come and talk to us about integrated and interactive playground elements, playground themes, surfacing, shading, landscaping ideas and aesthetic values.

Light snacks and refreshments will be served. For more information about Plan Mammoth Creek Park please contact Recreation Manager & Public Information Officer, Stuart Brown at (760) 934-8989 ext. 210 or visit [www.planmcp.com](http://www.planmcp.com).

Tell us how YOU want to PLAY at Mammoth Creek Park!

\*\*\*\*\*

This complimentary message is being sent to opt-in subscribers who might be interested in its content. If you do not wish to continue receiving these messages, please accept our apologies, and unsubscribe by visiting our website at: <http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/list.asp?mode=del>

Please note, we will not sell or give your e-mail address to any organization without your explicit permission.

You are receiving this message because you are subscribed to Public Service Announcements on [mammothlakes.civicplus.com](http://mammothlakes.civicplus.com). To unsubscribe, click the following link:

March 18, 2016

Town of Mammoth Lakes; Parks and Recreation Commission, Planning Commission, Town Council, Michael Baker International, etc.

RE: Scoping of the EIR, MUF/Mammoth Creek Park West.

“If you don't know where you are going,  
you'll end up someplace else.”  
— Yogi Berra

For the record, I own residential property immediately adjacent to the proposed project and own commercial property in the immediate vicinity. In the past 34 years I have lived in close proximity to and commuted through this project area extensively. I am essentially in favor of the project *if* the project can be designed to mitigate a variety of issues and concerns. And I would emphasize that a limited budget is *NOT* cause for a statement of overriding considerations.

I find many of the “enthusiasts” of the project including much of the Town staff have a cursory appreciation for the inherent qualities of the site. And because the site appears to be larger than it really is, many have overestimated what can be reasonably placed there. It is also the closest intrusion of a commercial-type facility to the main (and natural) tributary of Mammoth Creek that the community has ever seen. This should require extra diligence in the future development of this site.

The site is extremely valuable for its location, the natural resources (namely the creek), the topography, solar aspect and views. No other town-owned site has all of these attributes. That alone makes this EIR process compelling. What is done on this site is of critical importance to the community. It cannot be poorly planned or executed. A comprehensive and thorough EIR is critical. The Town is essentially the proponent *and* the lead agency. Any stone unturned will create future liability (we learned that with the airport EIR). Building the “trust” that you seek with the local property owners will only be achieved with a thorough EIR process.

I have attended some of the preliminary meetings and am aware of the general “scoping” concerns. But these are my specific concerns;

### **Traffic / Transportation / Circulation / Public Safety**

Site specific traffic / circulation studies from both winter and summer should be compulsory. To rely on a “memorandum” from Michael Baker International based on the Mobility Element is totally inadequate. While the Mobility Element is valuable and amazingly detailed, it failed to address this site and this “intersection” of traffic and the cumulative impacts of this site.

There are very specific concerns that a simple (and potentially arbitrary) “memorandum” cannot address. The MCPW location is located on one of the major thoroughfares in Mammoth Lakes. The proposed MUF includes 125 parking spaces and year-round usage. All of that proposed traffic is through one driveway. That driveway is located on a significantly “blind curve” or bend in Old Mammoth Road that does not have clear sight-lines. This sight-lines change seasonally based on winter snow pack and the leafing of aspens and willows along the creek. That

driveway ingress/egress to MCPW from Old Mammoth Road does not include dedicated left and right turn deceleration lanes.

The blind curve section of Old Mammoth Road and the driveway to MCPW are located in a 40 mph zone where many north-bound autos are exceeding the speed limit. That is undeniable, I have commuted on this stretch of road literally thousands of times.

Further, there is a convolution of other activities and distractions right in this immediate vicinity; children's play areas, pedestrians of all sorts including many with leashed and unleashed dogs, in warmer months fisherman (including many local kids), cyclists using formal and informal paths, skateboarders, horses, special events, informal picnics and gatherings, photo takers, and on and on. There is a broad variety of seasonal activity already at the MCPW location. There are far greater considerations than basic motorized vehicle counts.

The Sierra Meadows Equestrian Center has experienced increasing business in the past few years so traffic entering and exiting Sherwin Creek Road has increased. Many of these vehicles include large vehicles with horse trailers. Recreational users utilizing Sherwin Creek Road and beyond has increased so much that the Town felt the need to improve the parking lot. And again, all in a road that has poor sight-lines. And Mammoth Creek Road east of Old Mammoth Road is experiencing increased traffic. And this has been mentioned as "overflow parking" for MCPW.

The traffic and circulation impacts are clearly significant. They need to be extensively evaluated. Public safety issues abound and are significant. A simple "memorandum" from the producer of the EIR is not adequate. And coming for one week (or one afternoon) to study the traffic and circulation tells a minute fraction of the story. The patterns are constantly changing based on the season and weather. The Mobility Element doesn't specifically address any of this.

And I emphasize, there is an unfenced children's playground with significant spillover right in the middle of all this. And even worse, a site specific traffic study will likely show that the preponderance of drivers exiting MCPW will desire to turn left which only exacerbates the compromised sight-lines and speeding traffic. These are all significant cumulative impacts. How will all of this be mitigated with a simple memorandum? How will all of this be mitigated at all? The 1999 EIR made many traffic "assumptions." This project cannot rely on assumptions. Mitigations need to rely on accurate and comprehensive studies. It is truly an accident waiting to happen.

And why isn't a transit bus pull-out or transit hub been incorporated into this plan? Have the planners forgot that public transportation is one of our critical General Plan goals? We have bus lines driving right by MCPW. This is a glaring and significant omission. An active public transportation component must be incorporated into this plan. And on a 40 mph two-lane road with poor sight-lines a simple bus stop will be dangerous. Old Mammoth Road has many transit bus pull-outs. This would be at a minimum. And with the proposed winter usage of this proposal, a covered or enclosed transit stop would be preferable.

## **Noise**

So far the concerns over noise have been focused on the proposed ice rink itself and the mechanical equipment associated with it. This is for good reason. This has already been the

subject of much input. Clearly the dasher boards needs to be of the noise dampening variety. The ice rink related mechanical equipment needs serious mitigation including adequate enclosures (possibly underground) and potential berming to the residential areas. And hours of operation need to be within reason.

But the added parking lot has the potential to be an even bigger noise nuisance to the surrounding properties. Parking lots create all sorts of ambient and uncontrollable noise. Especially when they are poorly or haphazardly designed. So far I have seen no significant proposed mitigation measures. The planners have placed the new parking lot right on a residential property line. This is where it is being dumped simply because the project appears to be (is) underfunded and this is the least expensive route. This is truly cause for distrust. In the past the Town has respected the development of non-residential uses next to longstanding residential property. A buffer of some sort has always been required. (Example: The Church of Latter Day Saints project next to condo projects.) And does it make sense to design the parking lot to resemble a drag strip? That alone is a public safety concern. More inadequate planning.

So how should the EIR require the project to mitigate the significant noise created by the new parking area? Berming and trees can help with the visual impacts but really do little for noise, especially for second story residential units. This part of the plan needs significant "alternative" analysis. In reality the parking should be aligned with Old Mammoth Road like the 1999 plan. This is another serious liability of the plan. The Town needs to do this right or not do it at all.

As planned, this new parking lot will also be prime for abuse and mayhem. The transient nature of the community invites this. "No Overnight Parking" signs will be ignored. This will become a perfect place for the classic Mammoth motorhome squatters (and their noisy generators). And in reality, under the current Town budget, the parking lot will not be policed. The EIR truly needs to assess whether new funding sources for additional police department staff should be required based on this project and the proposed location. Or does the facility need a private security component? Without proper policing the parking lot (as planned) and immediate area is bound to become a public nuisance to the surrounding residential areas.

Is there a draft operational plan for this facility? Or do they just plan to "wing it?" Doesn't that need to be incorporated into and considered in the EIR? If the Town can justify that the owners of nightly rentals in Mammoth Lakes need stricter regulation then this facility needs a detailed operational plan. And that plan and the resulting impacts needs to be evaluated in the EIR. The potential negative impacts to the surrounding residential properties is significant.

### **Visual / Environmental**

Many of the potential visual impacts have been previously scoped. The 3-D modeling is very helpful but not very specific. The building and site aesthetics need to meet or exceed what the Town would require of any private developer. Design review is imperative. Again, this is one of the jewel locations within the town limits of Mammoth. The lack of funding should not be an excuse to allow a substandard project. The design review process must have the upmost scrutiny.

Because of the proximity to the residential areas, the lighting needs critical attention by designers. And the roof materials are of significant concern. The facility roof will be large. The

solar impact and potential glare is significant. That needs to be mitigated. Which brings another issue....

Why isn't this project considering the use of solar power/panels? Isn't there grant money or subsidies or low interest loans for this type of solar installation? It would appear that once again the contrived urgency and lack of adequate funding has the Town on a hellbent path to ignore the obvious. The EIR needs to consider and evaluate the use of solar power derived onsite to power this facility. This is a serious environmental concern. The long-term savings to the Town could be significant.

### **Environmental / Water Quality**

Look at the Mammoth Creek corridor. This is the closest intrusion to the sole tributary of Mammoth Creek by a commercial-type facility. The facility is proposed to use a variety of chemicals and potential toxic elements that may find their way into the creek. And they are likely be marginally managed and maintained. What detailed mitigations will be in place and who will monitor (short term low-wage Town Parks & Rec. employees?). While we are selling recreation in this community, maintaining the pristine beauty of the surrounding natural environment is even more important. Mammoth Creek is one of our top natural resources. More people likely visit the creek than will ever use this proposed facility.

Parking lot runoff is a real concern in proximity to the creek. The new Canyon Blvd. storm drain system has the latest engineering but the storms of the past winter have proven they need regular human attention to prevent overflow and havoc. There are a multitude of downstream resources including prime fish habitat and a fish hatchery that need the upmost protection. The community simply doesn't need Mammoth Creek to become a polluted mess. A polluted or compromised creek would be the ultimate black-eye. What mitigation measures will be in place to ensure excessive runoff or some other disaster is avoided? Again, where is the draft operational plan? This needs to be part of the EIR evaluations. This is profoundly significant. And again, the urgency and underfunded nature of the project makes this an especially disconcerting "trust" issue.

### **Archeological and Cultural**

The Town is confident that it can maintain this facility at this location in a safe and professional manner. But I question that. There is a substantial piece of art at the entry to MCPW that the Town has poorly managed and maintained over the past 20 years. This piece was originally designed, approved and implemented with beautiful stained glass panels inside the replica Devil's Postpile pillars. It was envisioned as a showcase entry statement to the Park. It was approved by the Town. The Town has been a poor steward of this art piece. They have let it be vandalized and deteriorate. They have done nothing to preserve it in its original condition. It was designed to be a cultural draw to this location and set the tone for what the park stood for. I doubt if few people even realize it is there. If this is a precursor to how the Town will manage a larger facility, it is a frightening prospect. It makes me think the project should be bonded (like a private developer) so if the Town cannot maintain it there are the resources to restore MCPW to it's present condition.

### **Alternative Sites**

In compliance with CEQA, there are numerous sites that need to be assessed as alternate sites. Obviously the existing site of the ice rink adjacent to the library. The Community Center site on Forest Trail. The Bell Parcel. I'm sure there are others. Quite frankly, the best part of the MCPW is that the Town owns it and it has no debt on it. The site is not the best location for this project. The site is undersized for this large venue and ambitions of staff. And MCPW likely has higher and better uses.

The existing ice rink site adjacent to the library is a good one because of the proximity to the schools. The MUF is really just an extension of the schools as it is proposed. Nobody seems to want to express that. The long term lease negotiation with the school district has been poorly executed. A professional mediator should have been (or should be) utilized to bring common sense to the transaction and get past the egos of the respective bodies. The Mammoth property owners are essentially paying for that otherwise vacant land through property tax bonds. Ironically (and sadly) the majority of Mammoth property owners will never utilize a day of the school district's resources but fund it substantially. It is time for the school district to "do the right thing" and be cooperative and find some mutually beneficial ground. The school board wants us to support their continued parcel tax in June. They lack public "trust" also. A professionally mediated negotiation should be mandatory under "Alternative Sites" component of the EIR.

The old Community Center site on Forest Trail could be an optimal site to align this development into a public/private partnership. Ironically, this is very close to the proposed ice rink/events center in the 1993-94 North Village Specific Plan. And ironically too, the substructure of that facility was designed to be the primary public parking lot for the Village. The EIR needs to assess that since the Town is pursuing a public parking lot in the Village. It is not too late to make this happen. But the impatience of the crowd stands in the way.

Ultimately, The Town needs to be held to the same development standards they have demanded of private developers in the past 25 years. That includes acceptable aesthetics, mitigations and operational plans. Anything else would be clear hypocrisy. And liability.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Paul Oster  
P.O. Box 2618  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

760 934-3026  
pauloster@earthlink.net



**Stuart Brown**

---

**From:** Elizabeth Tenney <e10ney395@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 17, 2016 11:35 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Cc:** Michael Raimondo; Shields Richardson; John Wentworth; Colin Fernie; Jo Bacon; Dan Holler; Grady Dutton; Haislip Hayes; Stuart Brown; Sandra Moberly; Mickey Brown  
**Subject:** MUF options: comments / issues for EIR scoping

All--  
*An ice rink in Mammoth Creek Park West, something I've been hoping to see for over 20 years! I was never clear on how or why the rink ended up on MUSD property with TOML paying hefty rent to have it there.*

*This is a fantastic opportunity to increase and improve outdoor recreation amenities for visitors and for locals, and the Town already owns the site. I was gratified to read the project's goals, which included providing an all-important "sense of place." This "recreation destination" may be an even bigger draw than the very successful Rock 'n' Bowl.*

*Although I now spend the winter in Reno, I miss Mammoth, I miss snow, and I'm a huge hockey fan. For those reasons plus force of habit after 14 years of serving on Planning Commission, I've studied the three preliminary design options very closely. My public comments for the EIR follow.*

*(Sandra and Stuart: I'd be so appreciative if you would forward these comments to the commissioners.)*  
--ET

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

**PUBLIC COMMENTS for EIR for MUF at Mammoth Creek Park West**

**TO:** Town of Mammoth Lakes Town Council, Recreation Commission and Planning Commission; Dan Holler, Grady Dutton, Haislip Hayes, Stuart Brown, Sandra Moberly, Mickey Brown  
**FROM:** Elizabeth Tenney, Mammoth resident (part-time)  
**DATE:** March 17, 2016  
**RE:** Proposed options for Multi-Use Facility at Mammoth Creek Park / EIR scoping issues

**I COMMENTS**

**a) Neighbors' concerns**

Condo owners to the west currently enjoy a sizeable sagebrush buffer between their units and the MCP playground, although the property belongs to the Town of Mammoth Lakes and is meant for community use. Concerns about noise and light from the MUF can be mitigated with a barrier (structural) wall--a berm won't do it--between the MUF and property to the west. On the north edge of the parcel, the proposed parking stalls help to mitigate neighbor impact.

I favor Option 3 (5791) with a built structure the full length of the rink side that faces the condos. Option 3 will mitigate noise and light for the condo owners and mitigate wind for MUF users.

Options 1 (5789) and 2 (5790) show the open-sided rink's "viewing area" (bleachers?) facing west toward the backs of the condos, a very strange configuration considering just the noise factor alone plus both options 1 and 2 ignore the views.

**b) Need more effective use of space**

All three options are unnecessarily crowded because of the very large setbacks on the western edge. My rough estimate shows Option 1 to have an ~80-foot setback and options 2 and 3, 60-foot(?) setbacks. These excessive setbacks really crowd the park and its potential--the activities and landscaping possible there. Since buildings will not be tall, if a "good neighbor" wall (or integrated structure as designed in Option 3) is built between the rink and the condos, would not a 20 or 30 foot setback be sufficient? I certainly think so. Mammoth Creek Park needs that extra 40 or 50 feet. Example: the hardscape areas, as proposed, are very tight.

The Town owns the property. The Town is providing recreation for the greater good of the whole community, residents and visitors. This amenity will attract visitors year-round. Mitigating noise and light is sufficient. Such huge setbacks are unnecessary, in my view.

**c) Sense of place is key**

In Option 3, spectators at hockey games or any user of the MUF can see the spectacular view south to the Sherwins across Snowcreek Meadow. That view is second only to the Mountain in saying "Mammoth." East-West is best orientation for the MUF to maximize the views and sense of place.

I understand funding is not yet available for this project and the final budget will be tight. As we often noted on Planning Commission, good design doesn't have to be expensive or complicated; it just has to be good. Design also should blend with and complement Mammoth's stunning natural surroundings. Simple and rugged materials in the right scale and proportions can do the job. Done right, the MUF end result will have a strong sense of place. This is Mammoth.

I urge you to include integrated, well-planned lighting using wall washers, shielded fixtures at doorways, down-directed lights at steps and along pathways, etc. Lighting is an inexpensive way to make simple building design distinctive while enhancing sense of place.

**d) Lighting the rink**

The original approved design of the rink's roof had simple hanging shielded fixtures. I would recommend using similar fixtures in the MUF. By shining directly on the rink, the ice and players are brightly lit yet spectators will be able to watch the games without squinting because of glare. There would also be no off-site light trespass.

Glare is not only irritating, it's a huge problem for public safety. I commend Town Council for wisely adopting in 2003(?) an anti-glare outdoor lighting ordinance requiring shielded, down-directed, full-cutoff outdoor lighting fixtures with no light trespass onto neighboring property. The ordinance has made a big difference in Mammoth's resort town ambiance as well as in pedestrian safety.

**II SCOPING ISSUES FOR EIR ANALYSIS**

**a) Parking requirements**

As I recall, when Rock 'n' Bowl was approved, Planning Commission voted to reduce the parking requirement to encourage use of the transit system. Anticipated use of Mammoth Creek Park (MCP) should increase dramatically with completion of the MUF.

- What will be the impact on Old Mammoth Road (OMR) traffic?
- Is this project over-parked?
- How were parking req'ts. analyzed?
- What could be the MUF's impact--positive or negative--on the transit system?

**b) Bus turnaround**

- Is the current bus stop on a curve on OMR adequately located to handle significant additional park users?
- Should the current MCP parking area be re-configured so buses can pull in and drop off passengers and their gear inside the park?

- How many parking places would be lost for that to happen?
- What are the trade-offs between unloading at a bus stop on a curve vs. pulling into the parking lot to unload?

**c) Size of setbacks**

Rather than an arbitrary but big as possible setback from neighbors on the west property boundary, I think an actual assessment of impacts from noise and light for each option should be done using different size setbacks to determine which is optimal (for park use and for the neighbors).

- What would be the actual impact of noise and light during hockey games and special events for Options 1, 2 and 3 at 20', 40', 60', and 80' setbacks from the west property line?
- How much difference in noise and light impacts does having a structural barrier as a buffer (as in Option 3) make vs. having an open-sided rink facing the condos as in Options 1 and 2?

**d) Energy use**

- What are the anticipated annual costs for MUF operation and maintenance using different energy sources?
- How will the compressor be powered? At what cost?
- How will lighting be powered? At what cost?
- How can renewable energy be used on the site?
- Will the parking area and pathways be plumbed for future geothermal snow melting?
- What's the cost analysis and payback on drilling a well onsite for geothermal snow melt vs. conventional snow removal?
- The site has a southern exposure. Will the roof be designed to accommodate solar panels?
- What is the optimal pitch to enable snow to slide off the panels?
- What is the payback time for utilizing solar on this project?
- What is the payback time for utilizing wind energy on this project?
- What would be the LEED certification analysis, costs and savings, for this project?

The MUF can be the beginning of an exceptional and memorable recreation experience in an important Mammoth Lakes park. The issues raised above need, in my view, consideration to insure a successful and sustainable outcome.

Elizabeth Tenney  
 217 Alexander Lane  
 Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546  
 (summer)

(winter)  
 2760 Markridge Drive  
 Reno, NV 89509

**Stuart Brown**

---

**From:** Pam May <pmay@tvusd.k12.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 14, 2016 10:10 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** MCP

A dog park would be a perfect addition to the MCP west improvement plan.  
Plan 1 is our favored option for the site.

--

Pam May - Principal  
Rancho Elementary - TVUSD  
31530 LaSerena Way  
Temecula, Ca 92591  
(951)695-7150

**Statement of Confidentiality:** The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee. The information may also be confidential and/or legally privileged. This transmission is sent for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction, or dissemination of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message and its attachments, if any.

E-mail is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC SS 2510-2521 and is legally privileged.

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Jennifer Chase <jentravis2@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 13, 2016 9:00 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** comment for upcoming plan your park meeting

I apologize that I am unable to attend the upcoming plan your parks meeting and appreciate the opportunity to comment. I also appreciate the posting of comments from previous meetings on the web as I do periodically review the plans and status of the project. Given the current information available, I absolutely disagree with moving forward with any of the alternatives for the multi-use facility/ice rink.

I have visited many community centers in many places, and what makes the great ones really stand out are the ones where everything is together in a centralized location. The town website states in reply to comments from the last meeting, "*Other options in Town to provide a public pool, gym, recreation center may be considered*". To me, it is unacceptable that we move forward with one facility without at least having a solid plan regarding what these other facilities are going to look like and where they will be.

How far away will these facilities be from one another, within walking distance from another or across town? If all these facilities are located across town from one another we simply promote more driving, less community interaction, and more difficulty for parents moving children around from one activity to another. We don't have to build it all right now, but to be able to give proper input, these "other ideas" the town has for these much needed facilities needs to be shared and discussed as well.

PLEASE consider the big picture – we have the opportunity to create something really special. Without a known location and vision for all the future town facilities being identified – pool, ice rink, community center, playground and recreation center – I simply cannot support moving forward on any of it yet. Don't get me wrong, I would love for the town to break ground on a nicer ice rink that can stay open with more regularity soon! But to me, the plans as currently proposed simply look like half of a plan and I would love to see the other half.

Thanks for your consideration of my comments-

Jen Chase

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Janice Davenport <janicedavenport1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 08, 2016 5:18 PM  
**To:** Stuart Brown  
**Cc:** Michael Raimondo; Shields Richardson; Jo Bacon; Colin Fernie; John Wentworth  
**Subject:** RE: COMMUNITY CENTER PROGRAMMING WORKSHOP FOR MAMMOTH CREEK PARK

Hi Stuart,

My husband and I met with John Wentworth a couple of weeks ago. John gave very good reasons for not having the ice rink at its present location. However, he did not provide us with any compelling reasons to build another ice rink. My husband mentioned the concept of "sunk cost." John didn't know what it was. It's basically the idea that just because you've spent money on a project doesn't mean you have to spend more if the project doesn't make sense. I asked John about benefit/cost analyses - that wasn't answered.

The town is spending a lot of money on planning for a project that may not happen. You have no idea where the funding is going to come from. At the meeting I attended, a swimming pool and a gym were put on the list of ideas but, according to John, those will never happen. Perhaps if you told everyone what might be included and what will definitely not be included, you will lose more support.

Another comment John made was that the mountain is for sale (is it actually for sale or is it like every business in Mammoth - it's for sale if the right offer comes along?) and then he said but no one would buy it for \$1 billion because of climate change. I took this to mean that no one will buy the ski area because it's not viable - there will be no snow so skiers won't come here. But if skiers and families don't come, who is going to use the ice rink? I don't believe people are going to come to Mammoth just to ice skate. So, if the town ends up building an ice rink for the skaters in town, where does that put other groups of people who want to have a decent swimming pool or tennis courts? How are the ice skaters/hockey players a more deserving group than others in town?

Perhaps it's time to get a ballot measure to see if the people of Mammoth Lakes really want to spend millions of dollars on an ice rink. Our town has so much debt, why incur more? The problem with a ballot measure is that a lot of people who will be impacted by the MUF can't vote because they're second home owners - they get to pay property taxes but they can't vote. By the same token, a lot of people who can vote are renters, who don't pay property taxes. So, unless their rent goes up should a bond measure be passed to pay for this project, they don't care about who pays for the project. Definitely not a good situation.

I've worked for 30 years in a variety of businesses and I can honestly say I have never seen anything like this. The town is spending lots of money it can't afford to decide on a MUF when it isn't even clear that the MUF should happen.

Janice Davenport

P.S. John - I appreciate your taking the time to meet with us. It sounded as though you have a lot on your plate. Also, what is the cost of removing the old ice rink? It's obviously not going to be moved so has anyone estimated the cost of demolishing it? That should certainly go in the budget.

-----Original Message-----

From: Stuart Brown [mailto:listserv@civicplus.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 10:54 AM  
To: janicedavenport1@gmail.com  
Subject: COMMUNITY CENTER PROGRAMMING WORKSHOP FOR MAMMOTH CREEK PARK

Good morning,

The Town has begun the process to plan, design and construct complementary Community Multi-Use Facilities at Mammoth Creek Park. The project includes three major components: a multi-use facility, complementary community center, and a playground with accessible components. The Recreation Commission is the Town Council's designated lead advisory body for this project and wants to hear how YOU want to PLAY at Mammoth Creek Park!

#### Community Center Programming Workshop

The Recreation Commission is seeking community input for programming needs and space alternatives for the proposed Community Center at Mammoth Creek Park West. Tell us how you want to play at the Community Center at the Interactive and facilitated workshop on Monday, March 14 at 6:00pm or Tuesday, March 15 at 9:00am. These are the same workshops and will take place at the existing Community Center located on Forest Trail adjacent to The Village at Mammoth. Light snacks and refreshments will be served.

Staff has collated all comments, suggestions and responses from the Multi-use Facility Summer/Winter Programming Workshops for Mammoth Creek Park on February 22 and 23 in Suite Z and has posted them online. Thank you for your input - every comment counts!

#### Mammoth Creek Park Preferred Site Alternative Presentation

The Town is also seeking broad public input regarding the preferred site alternative for the Community Multi-Use Facilities at Mammoth Creek Park and invites the public to attend a presentation on Friday, March 18, 2016 from 4:00-6:00pm at Suite Z in the Minaret Village Mall (above Starbucks).

Stay Involved...

Additional information about the workshops, including programming and space alternatives can be viewed online at [www.planMCP.com](http://www.planMCP.com). If you cannot attend the workshops, please consider completing the Facilities Programming Worksheet online in English or Spanish (return via email) – we want to know what you're passionate about!

Keep up to date with the plan Mammoth Creek Park project by subscribing to receive project emails or text notifications via the Town's 'Notify Me' list. You can also send an email with comments or recommendations regarding the project to: [planmcp@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov](mailto:planmcp@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov).

Help us create a recreation destination at Mammoth Creek Park that the entire community of Mammoth Lakes will actively enjoy, value and be proud to call their park!

\* \* \* \* \*

This complimentary message is being sent to opt-in subscribers who might be interested in its content. If you do not wish to continue receiving these messages, please accept our apologies, and unsubscribe by visiting our website at:

http:// [http://ca-mammothlakes.civicplus.com/list.asp?mode=del] www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us  
[http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/] /list.asp?mode=del [http://ca-  
mammothlakes.civicplus.com/list.asp?mode=del]

Please note, we will not sell or give your e-mail address to any organization without your explicit permission.

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Bruce Torrence <myoldphotos@me.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 03, 2016 9:28 AM  
**To:** Stuart Brown  
**Subject:** MCP

Hi Stu: I've heard that the town is looking for input regarding the various amenities that would be included at the MCP facility. One of the country's fastest growing sports is Pickleball. Without going into great detail about the sport, I will state that it is played on a tennis type court (whether indoors or outside) that is 22 feet wide and 44 feet long. Very similar to a badminton size court. Many tennis courts, through the country are being converted to, or being double striped (so the court can be used for tennis and/or pickleball). If you're not familiar with the sport, you can go onto the internet to see how it is played. So, I'm asking the town to consider adding a pickleball court at the MCP. The court could, also, be used for other sports, such as badminton. Has a date been set for opening the Whitmore pool? Best, Bruce

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Alana Levin <alana@highsierratri.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 22, 2016 5:52 AM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** Re: TELL US HOW YOU WANT TO PLAY AT MAMMOTH CREEK PARK!

I am unable to make the meeting but my interest would be a year round 50meter lap pool (swimming facility) Ideally open roof in the summer and closed roof in the winter.

I know it's expensive; let's see if the High Sierra Triathlon Club can be a part in making this happen.

Alana Levin  
760.717.0176

On 2/17/16 1:31 PM, Stuart Brown wrote:

[View this in your browser](#)

Good afternoon,

The Town of Mammoth Lakes has begun the process to plan, design and construct complementary Community Multi-Use Facilities at Mammoth Creek Park. The project includes three major components: a multi-use facility, complementary community center, and a playground with accessible components. The anticipated opening date of the multi-use facility is October 2017.

The Recreation Commission wants to hear how you want to play on the ice and at the RecZone on **Monday, February 22 at 6:00pm** and **Tuesday, February 23 at 9:00am** (same workshop). Both workshops will be held in Suite Z, above Starbucks (Minaret Village Mall). Light snacks and refreshments will be served.

*What is your winter passion?* Tell us how you want to play at the Mammoth Ice Rink! Winter programming includes: recreational skating, ice skating lessons, figure skating programs, Youth/adult hockey programs, leagues and tournaments, broomball, curling or special events.

*What is your summer passion?* Tell us how you want to play at the Mammoth RecZone! Summer programming includes: roller skating, youth/adult street hockey programs, leagues and tournaments, small-sided soccer, volleyball, basketball, badminton, dodgeball, tailgate games (horseshoes, bean bag toss, washer toss), skate ramps, special events/music, birthday parties or community events (art shows, markets, festivals).

With your help, we can create a *recreation destination* that the entire community of Mammoth Lakes will actively enjoy, value and ultimately be proud to call YOUR Park.

For more information about *Plan Mammoth Creek Park* please contact Recreation Manager & Public Information Officer, Stuart Brown at (760) 934-8989 ext. 210 or visit [www.planmcp.com](http://www.planmcp.com).

Keep up to date with the plan Mammoth Creek Park project by subscribing to

Lesley Bruns  
PO Box 9431  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546  
818 424-5552 ◊ lesleybruns@outlook.com

February 20, 2016

Stuart Brown  
Recreation Manager and Public Information Officer  
Town of Mammoth Lakes  
P.O. Box 1609  
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546  
(sent via email)

Re: Mammoth Creek Park West planning

Dear Mr. Brown,

I attended the Jan. 29 "Plan Your Parks" meeting. It's unfortunate that audience feedback took so much time that there was no comprehensive comparison made of the three different Mammoth Creek Park West plans. However, the designs don't seem that different. All of them retain the current parking areas and playground and situate the MUF and Community Center at the west end of the parcel and add a large parking area in the north section. It would have benefited the community if town planners had prepared options with greater variety and had attempted to minimize the negative impacts to nearby homeowners. It feels as though TOML has presented the three worst options as a negotiating scheme, so that an improved plan might meet less resistance.

I have many concerns about the proposed designs. By placing the major structures and parking lots at the north and west ends of the parcel, the greatest noise and visual impacts will be borne by nearby homeowners. These plans require the removal of almost 70 Jeffrey pines (vital habitat for birds and small mammals along the creek corridor) and will create an industrial environment in our park. I'm alarmed that these plans place equipment storage and machinery in the very spots that are closest to homes. Also, condo owners at the north side of the property will now be directly adjacent to a large parking lot. When town staff was asked why parking was not placed at the roadside portion of the park, the response was: "It's not that nice to drive by a park and see a parking lot." But it's okay to ruin the view of those who live and vacation here?

Some of those present (including myself) wanted to see a plan that put large structures closer to the road. We were told that it's too costly to move the playground and people enjoy the grass and rocks at the front of the park. It's hard to understand how we're considering a development that will cost millions of dollars, but there's no way to integrate a playground and grassy play area in a sensible way.

I was surprised to learn that town planners don't know how much money will be available for these facilities. How do you plan a recreation center when you don't have a budget? Also, we were informed that it's easier for Parks and Recreation to service multiple facilities at one location rather than spread them out. It's discouraging to hear that MCPW will cease to be a park and will be jammed full of buildings for the convenience of Parks & Rec.

If I had to pick the best of the worst, I would select Option 3 – because it appears to have the smallest footprint. But these plans could be so much better. If I were planning our park, I would eliminate the Community Center and build an enclosed MUF (with large windows) integrating some of the Community Center features. Two community centers serving a town of 7000 residents is a luxury, not a necessity. Place large structures and loud equipment closer to the road and retain as many trees and as much open space as possible. Don't rush the process to meet an arbitrary timeline. Respect the concerns of local homeowners who have invested in this community and placed their trust in our elected officials.

Mammoth Creek Park is a valued public asset and provides important riparian habitat. Please do everything possible in your planning to make sure it retains the feeling of a park, and doesn't become an overbuilt urban environment.

Sincerely,

Lesley Bruns

cc: Mammoth Lakes Town Councilmembers

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Doug Jastrab <djastrab@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 18, 2016 1:28 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** MUF @ Mammoth Creek Park West

OK, I get it. You have decided to “pave paradise” and put a bunch of buildings in the park. Not exactly what I would have done but I guess the town council has decided. I would have gone for a quieter version i.e., more picnic tables, increased playground area, a small stage etc. to keep it more “park like”. Oh well.

I have been looking at the 3 alternatives and I like #3 because it seems to take advantage of the best of the views. Maybe you could move the “pump room” to a location behind the NE viewing area since I am thinking that this will be a constant noise maker. That could lessen the objections from the people at La Vista Blanc. Heck, why not slide the rink over to the west where the support room, the pump room, zamboni garage and electrical are currently positioned and move it all behind the NE viewing area (and if needed, a little to the east of that NE viewing area). Probably have a lot less noise concerns with the neighbors and potentially have more of a view.

I was at the last meeting and there were two comments that I really agree with. One was something to the effect of do it right, don't want it to look like a "farm machinery shed" and the other was having to do with making it “world class”. Couldn't agree more. I say spend as much money as it will take to make it right...probably more than is currently budgeted.

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Claudine Bovich <cbovich@me.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 17, 2016 4:32 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** Park

Plans look great. An Ice Rink is a must for great use of the park during the winter months and for tourism.

Thanks,  
Claudine Bovich  
Owner Mountainback

Sent from my iPad

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Dennis Brown <depbrown8@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 17, 2016 2:59 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** Comments to MCP planning process

The thing that struck me the most when I saw the 3 proposed options was that none of them tried to locate the noise source (the skating rink) closer to Old Mammoth Road, thereby mitigating some of the neighborhood's opposition to the rink being located in the park. I suppose this was possibly driven by a requirement to minimize any disruption to existing facilities (restroom, existing parking area) or the fact there were some very big rocks in the way that would be difficult and expensive to remove/relocate. Was this rink location ever considered, and if so, why didn't it make the cut?

If the location ends up in one of the 3 proposed locations, I would like the planners to consider designing a roof structure such that the rink area could be enclosed at some future point in time when more funding might be available. Doing this would reduce the noise generated while offering the option to allow that rink area to be used for artistic performances (plays, music, etc.) during the summer season. This could be done with movable partitions that would allow flexibility to the structure when wind and rain occurred. The Jazz Jubilee tried to put most of it's venues in tents or indoors to solve this problem.

Another thought was to build the interior of the roof with sound absorbing materials to help further reduce the noise.

I don't know if the Mammoth Performance Center will ever be built, but this MCP might be a solution to some of the Town's performance venue needs.

Sincerely, Dennis Brown

---

This email has been sent from a virus-free computer protected by Avast.  
[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Stephanie Thompson <stephaniet4328@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 09, 2016 4:56 AM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** Save mammoth creek park

I hope that the town council listens to the people who live in mammoth lakes and decide that mammoth creek park west is not the best place for the new rec center. I have lived in mammoth lakes since I was born in 1995. Mammoth creek park west has been a part of my childhood and now is a regular part of my adult life. In the summertime I enjoy walking my dogs along the creek and appreciating all the beautiful trees that surround. I like to fish in the creek as well as enjoy my lunch breaks in the peace and quiet that is so easily attainable at the park. I could not imagine development taking place in this small escape in the middle of town. It is used for so many things in the summer, yoga in the morning on the grass is a favorite of mine.

I love the idea for a new recreational facility and growing up, I frequently made trips to south Lake Tahoe and always loved the recreation center that their town had. You could swim and ice skate all in one, I thought that it would be so cool and useful for Mammoth to have a rec center like S. Tahoe so when I read all the articles about what mammoth lakes was planning for the future I was excited. Then the decision was made for the new facility to be put in a place that clearly is not wanted by most year round residents. I am so disappointed that I can not support the great plan for a new rec center simply because of where the recreation commission wants to start building. I believe there is still time to change plans and get the support from the community this project deserves.

-Stephanie Thompson  
1(760)709-6988  
Mammoth Lakes, CA

Sent from my iPhone

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Terri Brown Guerra <tis4terri@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 04, 2016 1:04 PM  
**To:** Stuart Brown  
**Subject:** Re: Thank you for attending the Jan. 29 planMCP Public Meeting!  
**Attachments:** MathothParkPlan\_04.jpg

Attached please find a quick digital rework of your existing plan with the Berm. I respectfully submit this plan as a "**preferred alternative**" to your existing plans.

This plan will have much less of visual impact on the surrounding homes. Only the end condo at Chateau Blanc will be majorly impacted visually by buildings. Of course lights and noise are another matter. Noisy events that run later than 9pm should not be located next to residential property and this needs to be taken into account when planning the use of this facility.

I hate to see the Town's money and resources wasted on legal proceedings. You will likely be met with less resistance from the surrounding property owners if you put as much green space (park area) as possible between them and the view blocking structures and/or unsightly parking lot. The amount of money your save on legal fees could likely pay for the relocation of the playground and green areas: It also seems like a good idea to move the kids play area away from the road and the increased traffic that this facility will generate.

Thank you for your time and consideration

Regards,

### **Terri Brown Guerra**

714-732-3309

[Tis4Terri@gmail.com](mailto:Tis4Terri@gmail.com)

On Thu, Feb 4, 2016 at 11:35 AM, Stuart Brown <[sbrown@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov](mailto:sbrown@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov)> wrote:

Dear Recreation enthusiast,

The Town of Mammoth Lakes would like to personally thank you for being part of your town's recreation future by attending the first *plan Mammoth Creek Park* public workshop on Friday, January 29 to review the proposed site alternatives.

Staff has collated comments and responses from the workshop and has posted initial responses online at: [www.planMCP.com](http://www.planMCP.com) under the "[January 29 Public Meeting](#)" - *Facilities Planning and Design* Tab.

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Jennifer Langlo <jennifer.langlo@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 29, 2016 12:59 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** Plan Your Park Public Meeting, Jan. 29th

Good Afternoon,

1. I will not be able to attend today's public workshop (I have to work) regarding the planning of Mammoth Creek Park, but I am very interested in being involved in the process. I hope to attend future meetings.
2. I am very excited that the TOML will finally have a permanent ice rink with a roof, as well as a much needed new community center.
3. My input on design is that I think that it would be ideal if the construction could be as "Green" as possible. Not only is it better for the environment, but it is also a great marketing tool for our town. I can elaborate more on the subject if you would like.
4. **My main two cents are regarding** other possible uses for the park in addition to the 3 main components:
  - a. **Number 1, a community garden.** This is not something that will make the TOML any income, but it would benefit those who live here. I have done some research on the challenges, including the short season that we have, as well as the wildlife. There would have to be a fence around the area high enough so that deer can not go in. I could be involved in this project, as a volunteer of course. I will be learning to write grants this summer, and I am certain that I could get some grant funds for the project. We have a few years. Also, I could spearhead a citizens group for those besides me interested. I am sure that Andrea Walker, owner of Steller Brew, would be interested.
  - b. **Number 2, an enclosed dog park.** This is not as important to me, but I think it would be ideal for the TOML to have a dog park. It is confusing, even to me, where I can or can not have my dog off leash. I take my dog to the "unofficial" dog parks in Mammoth: Horseshoe Lake (in the summer) as well as off Sherwin Creek Road year round. My problem is that I have a lab, who loves everybody and wants to go say hi, but is wet and dirty after swimming in the lake, and then goes up to tourist who do not want to get wet. From my experience, the owners are responsible: we clean up the dog poop, and no one that I know of has let an aggressive/mean dog off leash. At least animal control is not up there giving tickets to the dog owners. If the TOML is OK with these unofficial dog parks, then it is OK with me too, and I don't think that we need an official dog park. However, I think it is a huge perk to have one. There are more and more tourists who travel with their dogs. When my husband and I travel with our dog, we always research where the dog park(s) are and go to them. It's social for the dogs, as well as for the people. If this is something of interest, I could be very much involved in the planning process.
5. Neither of the above two things necessarily need to be at the new Mammoth Creek Park. For instance, the community garden could be located at one of your other parks. (Shady Rest or ?) Or-I just now thought of this: where the old community center is. I'm not sure what you will be doing with the building itself, or the property. Just some thoughts.
6. Thank you so much for your time!

Jennifer L. Sheldon  
[jennifer.langlo@yahoo.com](mailto:jennifer.langlo@yahoo.com)  
760-914-2226

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Tim Hirrel <timhirrel@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 27, 2016 5:44 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** Mammoth Creek Park

You call those alternatives? The only difference is re-arranging of the same components. Real alternatives would include real choices of what the park would contain. As the town may realize, the community tennis courts are essentially unusable. Before duplicating a very usable existing ice rink, how about developing a near term plan for usable tennis courts? Mammoth Creek Park would be an excellent location for tennis courts while the location of the deteriorated existing courts would be a better location for an ice rink (in part, because of the elevation differences). I urge the town to open up consideration of some real alternatives for what Mammoth Creek Park should be used for.

Regards, Tim Hirrel  
Resident

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Dreamqueen6908@aol.com  
**Sent:** Monday, January 25, 2016 11:05 AM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** MUF

To the Town of Mammoth Lakes,  
Just a quick note of observation.

Upon walking through the Mammoth Lakes Park today its noticeable that the surrounding condo complexes that have show opposition in the MUF all use the Park for snow storage.

Perhaps they are concerned that if the MUF is built that they will have to start paying for snow storage. Might not have anything to do with their concerns of the birds and squirrels, but with the availability that they have had for many years of free snow storage.

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Antonette Ciccarelli <antocicc@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 25, 2016 9:24 AM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** new facility plan

I think our new facility should have a gym. There is nowhere our children can get together to play basketball, pickleball, or volleyball after school. The school gyms are used by school teams and then not open for the students to use and not all students have access to Snowcreek.

Our students need a place to get together, stay active, and stay out of trouble. You should check out the middle school in the morning before school to see all the children in the gym before school starts doing various activities. Mr. Hensley has an amazing program for the students every morning. It would be great for our community to have after school programs like that or simply an open gym.

Antonette Ciccarelli

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Lisa Okamoto <lisabokamoto@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 20, 2016 5:32 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** plan

Hello,

I looked at the website for planning MCP. I did not see mention of a public pool. Is this something that is being considered? I know Whitmore has been threatened on a few occasions with closure, so I can't help but wonder if part of the thought is to include a pool in the planning.

Thank you,  
Lisa Okamoto

**Stuart Brown**

---

**From:** Ashley Flamson <ashflamson@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 19, 2016 2:07 PM  
**To:** planmcp

Good afternoon! I've lived in Mammoth for almost 28 years. I love it here. I am raising my daughter here along with my husband. We enjoy the outdoors and all the activities this wonderful town has to offer. I would LOVE to see the town have a gym. It would be a great opportunity for our kids to have a place to go for camps that aren't at the Middle and High schools. What an amazing idea that the town could offer a community gym!!! Thank you for your time.  
Ashley Campos

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Heidi Presson <heidipresson@earthlink.net>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 19, 2016 1:33 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** Mammoth Club Volleyball: Plan your parks

Unfortunately, we will be unable to attend the 1/29 meeting to plan the Mammoth Creek Park. We will be travelling to a Volleyball Tournament in Anaheim that takes place on Saturday the 30<sup>th</sup> and Sunday the 31<sup>st</sup>.

Our club has grown from one travel team last year to four travel teams this year. We have two 14s and under teams, one 16s and under team and an 18s and under team. Our absolute biggest complication and challenge is finding gym space for practices and tournaments. Therefore, we would love to see some sort of community gym that would be available for scrimmages, practices and tournaments. I believe that high school and college teams would travel here for high altitude training for both volleyball and basketball.

I will put the work out to the Volleyball Club about this workshop. Hopefully, we can find a representative that will be able to attend.

Thanks for all you do!

Heidi

***Heidi Presson®***

Riffel Real Estate  
DRE#01459477  
760 937 7494 mobile  
760 934 7424 fax  
[www.RiffelRealEstate.com](http://www.RiffelRealEstate.com)  
[HeidiPresson@earthlink.net](mailto:HeidiPresson@earthlink.net)

## Stuart Brown

---

**From:** Sarah Vigilante  
**Sent:** Friday, January 15, 2016 4:41 PM  
**To:** planmcp  
**Subject:** Park Feedback

I think the multi use facility should go in the vacant lot that was just cleared over by the village.

### Sarah Vigilante

Personnel and Risk Analyst  
Town of Mammoth Lakes  
p: 760.934.8989 x263  
f: 760.934.7493  
e: [svigilante@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov](mailto:svigilante@townofmammothlakes.ca.gov)  
w: <http://www.townofmammothlakes.ca.gov/>

*The Town of Mammoth Lakes: the best place to work in the Eastern Sierra!*



*Disclaimer: Public documents and records are available to the public as provided under the California Public Records Act (Government Code Section 6250-6270). This e-mail may be considered subject to the Public Records Act and may be disclosed to a third-party requester.*