

CONTENTS OF THE ANNOTATED DRAFT  
MT. WASHINGTON COMMISSION (MWC) MASTER PLAN,  
JULY 5, 2022

(Page 1-2) **Statutory Requirements:**

- Comment on protection of ecological integrity of Mt. Washington Summit
- & Other Requirements

2) **Purpose of Master Plan**

- Critique of impossibility to maintain ecosystem integrity, while promoting more summit development by private and public commercial interests

3) **Membership of MWC**

- Land health is not represented; public is inadequately represented
- Calls for new Commission that represent land health and public interest

3-4) **Congestion:**

- \* Hidden assumption of the Master Plan: There will be more commercial development on and near the summit that will exacerbate current intolerable congestion.

4) **Jurisdiction over Lizzie Project**

- MWC wants to focus only on 60-acres of Mt. Washington State Park (MWSP), and ignoring the impacts of summit-related activity on MTW outside MWSP.
- The White Mountain National Forest, the abutter of the Lizzie project, seems to be evading its responsibility to protect the entirety of Mt. Washington.
- The Coos County Planning Board must approve the site plan.

4-5) **Process:** MWC falsely represents its MP process.

5-7) **The Environmental & Climate Assessment (E&CA):**

- The most important issue and greatest failing of the Master Plan. The E&CA must be properly performed by independent scientists before writing the MP. The MWC has ignored repeated requests from Commission members and the public to conduct the E&CA first. As a result, the pro-development Draft Master Plan is written in near-total ignorance of current conditions and future threats and challenges. For this reason, the Draft MP must be rejected and the updated Master Plan must be developed until completion of a comprehensive, independent E&CA.

7-9) **Summit Congestion will be exacerbated by the Draft Master Plan.**

9) **General Maintenance:** The Draft MP acknowledges the shabby condition of the Mt. Washington State Park after half a century of State management of the MWSP.

**9-10) Funding of the Division of Parks and Recreation:**

- The Division of Parks and Recreation (DPR) manages state parks. The NH Legislature refers to find it adequately, so DPR runs the summit cafeteria and souvenir store. The greater the visitation—and ensuing congestion—the greater the DPR revenue. DPR benefits financially from increasing the congestion on the summit.

**10-11) Education/Outreach**

- This section is mostly oriented toward entertaining motorized recreationists. At the April 25 meeting the DPR stated it cannot afford to hire nature interpreters.

**13) General Goals**

- This section fails to acknowledge ecological and climate damage caused by current visitor levels.

**13) Accessibility and Inclusiveness:**

- This section fails to require visitors to refrain from degrading ecosystem integrity or exacerbating Climate Change.

**13-14) • Mention of respecting indigenous people ignores the fact that Abenaki believed it was a sacrilege to climb, let alone drive or ride a carbon-spewing Cog railway, Mt. Washington.**

**14) Trails**

- The State and Cog propose a paved “Summit Perimeter Trail.” This must be opposed.

**14-15) Yankee Building**

- The Draft Master Plan discusses replacing the decrepit Yankee Building with a new building that could cost \$15 million, perhaps more. Activities in Yankee Building could be relocated off the Summit and the building could be demolished.

**15-16) Water and Waste**

- The current waste water treatment plant has been out of compliance with its permit since at least 2018. The State proposes to expand it and restroom facilities to accommodate increasing growth in visitation and congestion. It refuses to seriously consider reduce visitations below the Summit carrying capacity.

**16) Energy Efficiency and Sustainability**

**16-17) Implementation of Master Plan**

**17) Conclusion**