

**TOML TOURISM & RECREATION DEPARTMENT/MLTPA
MASTER-PLAN TASK FORCE**

Meeting #1: SCOPING AND DELIVERABLES

March 6, 2007, 2–3:30 p.m.

Tourism & Recreation Department conference room

Summary composed by Kim Stravers, Acting Executive Director, MLTPA

AGENDA ITEM #1: WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Task Force members in attendance:

Alex Fabbro, Board member, MLTPA Foundation
Dieter Fiebiger, TOML Tourism & Recreation Commission
Ruth Harrell, TOML Tourism & Recreation Commission
Craig Knight, VP of Development, Mammoth Mountain Real Estate
John Milne, Assistant Engineer, TOML
Mike Schlafmann, Deputy District Ranger/Winter Sports Specialist, USFS
Steve Speidel, Principal Planner, TOML
Danna Stroud, Director, TOML Tourism & Recreation Department
John Wentworth, President, MLTPA Foundation

Others present:

Jay Deinken, Vice President, MLTPA Foundation
Kim Stravers, Acting Executive Director, MLTPA Foundation
Dana Taussig, Intern, MLTPA

AGENDA ITEM #2: TASK FORCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND SCHEDULING

- Meeting #1: Scoping and Deliverables, March 6, 2007
- Meeting #2: Teams and Tasks, March 13, 2007
- Meeting #3: Chronology and Budget, March 20, 2007
- Meeting #4: Draft Proposal Presentation, April 3, 2007

AGENDA ITEM #3: MLTPA BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

- MLTPA Mission Statement:
“MLTPA will plan, steward, interpret, promote, and sustain a system of four-season trails and public access in Mammoth Lakes and the immediate Eastern Sierra region, while protecting its natural resources. We do this by collaboratively engaging government agencies, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and concerned citizens, and creating a forum for all trail users to be involved, connecting people to nature.”
- November 2006 Strategic Conference and Public Meeting
- GIS Inventory Contract
-

1. **Why a nonprofit?** MLTPA is an important part of the private/public/nonprofit partnership triangle. As a local nonprofit with considerable community support and hands-on knowledge of the area, without holding jurisdictional or financial interest in it—as well as being an entity that has already been hired by the TOML to complete a trails and public access project—MLTPA is in a unique position to coordinate a team of outside specialists in the context of planning. MLTPA seeks only to facilitate and supervise this project; the actual planning documents will come from the professional trail designers we bring into the fold.

AGENDA ITEM #4: UNDERSTANDING THE SCOPE OF THE MASTER PLAN

- **Geographic Scope:** The current lay of the land, in both size and functionality, and how we envision it for the future. Maps were shown that illustrate the seven “spheres of influence” within the Planning Area; the Planning Area itself; the Town Boundary; and the Urban Growth Boundary; as well as where points of public access already identified by MLTPA fall relative to these boundaries.
- **Jurisdictional Scope:** Who is responsible for the lands contained in the Planning Area, and how do they interact? Maps were shown that illustrate the Planning Area as broken into its respective regions by jurisdictional ownership: USFS, including wilderness areas, MMSA, and national monuments; TOML; and the LADWP. Reference was made to the Peer Resources report, specifically in regards to the different jurisdictional configurations of our sister resorts and how Mammoth Lakes, being completed surrounded by national forestland, has a unique opportunity. Fiebiger pointed out that we are in a different, perhaps easier, position from places such as Jackson Hole, WY, where local ranchers’ interests came into play.
- **Trails & Public Access Stakeholders:** Which groups have an interest in the Planning Area, and how? Identifying and working with user groups and interested individuals is the task before us. These stakeholders are:
 - Recreation User Groups + Individuals
 - Citizens by Community District
 - Public Agencies
 - Business Interests
 - Real-Estate Developers
 - Second Homeowners
 - Property Lessees on Federal Land
 - Visitors + Tourists
- Milne pointed out that, typically, there is very little engagement between second homeowners and the communities in which those second homeowners have a stake; Wentworth related that there are many means by which we can engage this important group (email, websites, etc.), and

that the second homeowners here have been involved in MLTPA's efforts since the outset.

- **Trails & Public Access Master-Planning Team:** Who will lead and participate in the actual on-the-ground planning of the Planning Area? Outside consultants vis-à-vis MLTPA: MLTPA is looking to be a part of the team in the appropriate manner, which should be comprised of:
 - Project Management and Coordination
 - Community Outreach
 - Local Planning Documentation
- The outside consultants (Alta Planning + Design for urban planning; Trail Solutions for on-the-dirt planning) will be responsible for generating the deliverables. MLTPA will serve as the coordinating and supervisory entity: collecting data that will be shared by the team members; facilitating information flow between the jurisdictional partners, design team, and community; and ensuring that deadlines are adhered to.
- **Community Scoping and Tools:** How will the Master-Planning Team identify and engage the community throughout the planning process?
 - Engaging the Community:
 - Outreach
 - Public Meetings
 - Web-based Outreach
 - Media Outreach
 - Data Collection and Analysis
 - GIS Services:
 - Coordination and distribution of appropriate public documents and planning materials
- Milne asked if it would be appropriate for the TOML to host all of the GIS information that will be used in the planning process. Wentworth explained the value in having a neutral party collect and format this information so that each design team works with the same data set. Additionally, MLTPA can perhaps devote more energy to corralling GIS information from all the necessary parties, such as the TOML, USFS, Mono County, DWP, etc.
- **Pending Concerns for Trails and Points of Public Access:** How will the area's ongoing development, and its related Town policies, impact trails and public access?
 - **Proposed Developments/TOML Land-Use Policies/Threat of Build-Out:** The memo that Town Manager Rob Clark distributed to the Planning Commissioners in anticipation of their joint meeting with Council on March 7 stated that the build-out of the town's available land is imminent, and that Planning Commissioners and Council will need to work quickly and effectively in developing land-use policies, etc., so that

opportunities are not lost forever as regards trails, public access, and other community benefits.

- Milne mentioned that, as regards the southern boundary of town, access is being addressed with Snowcreek via a road around the perimeter of the development, represented on the June 2006 Draft Physical Development and Mobility Plan; however, as Wentworth pointed out, the Mobility element's map of proposed routes was pulled from the GPU Progress Draft. With this feature absent, no efforts are being undertaken at this time as regards trails and public access. The immediate creation of a trails and public access master plan will be critical in the next few months, as all 11 proposed projects will be granted or denied approval in the next year. Wentworth stressed the importance of not dealing incrementally with trails and public access issues as they interface with impending development, and that a master plan will set the standard and assist Council in executing policy.
- Knight offered that there needs to be connectivity between homes in town and the public lands that surround the town, but that this effort should not focus on protecting and improving every single point of access as identified by MLTPA in the GIS Inventory Project. He suggested that the major or central points be determined by proximity to population centers (for example, the resort corridor) and parking areas.
- **Environmental Assessment Scoping:** Initial scoping of environmental assessment requirements: Wentworth stated that both Alta Planning + Design and Trail Solutions have identified the need to conduct the Environmental Assessment process simultaneously with the planning process, so that by the time the plan is written, the Environmental Assessment is also complete, rather than conducting the EA, which could take as long as the planning, after the planning process is complete. Schlafmann noted that it doesn't matter who the lead agency is, TOML or USFS. Trail Solutions has also indicated that there is a possibility that the CEQA process will cover all of the items required for the NEPA process, and therefore only CEQA will have to be conducted.
- **Budgetary Scoping:** Assessing funding opportunities from the private, public, and non-profit sectors: MLTPA will pursue a variety of budgeting strategies to accommodate the master-planning process.
- **Signage and Wayfinding:** A cohesive, uniform signage and wayfinding system is a large element of the master-planning process, and can be lined up with the TOML's continuing branding and marketing efforts. Fiebiger stressed the importance of color-coding and made reference to examples he had provided the TOML in the past.

AGENDA ITEM #5: DEFINING DELIVERABLES

- **Performance Goals:** In broad terms, what are the primary goals of the master-planning process?

- Improve Facilities
- Improve Access
- Increase Use
- Enhance Safety

- **Planning Process Deliverables:** Once the master-planning process is complete, what kinds of tenable products will the Master Planning Team be able to deliver? Items include:
 - Trail User Group GIS Maps and Database
 - Summary Report of Potential Projects
 - “Best Practices Guide” for Trail Upkeep
 - Program and Policy Report
 - Environmental Assessment
- Again, Wentworth stressed that the design professionals will produce these deliverables—MLTPA will not be writing these documents.
- **Sample Final Product Deliverables:** Jackson Hole Master Plan (Alta Planning + Design); Santa Clara River Reserve Recreation and Open Space Management Plan (Trails Solutions); Santa Clara River Reserve Final Environmental Assessment (Trails Solutions)

□

□

- **End Discussion:**

2. It was agreed by all Task Force members that, in the context of presenting the master-planning proposal to the Council during the mid-year budget hearings on May 16, a starting point for the project should be identified, and that this starting point, or Phase One, should be both an easy success as well as financially viable. Designing “from the inside out,” or starting with lands within the Urban Growth Boundary, was agreed upon as the best first phase. Also agreed was that the master plan must be scalable, such that smaller projects can be pulled out for implementation without disrupting the entire plan, but that sight of the entire plan is never lost. Specific comments follow, organized by speaker:

- **John Milne**
 - Trails and public access-related grants are available to MLTPA if it is aligned with a sponsoring government agency, as it is attempting to do. Available grants may be matched to specific phases of the master plan to assist with funding. Suggested approaching the TOML about committing to a certain amount of available matching funds each year.
 - Trails and public access projects are ongoing for TOML Public Works staff. A master plan that gives cohesion between different projects, such as the Lake Mary Road Bike Path and continued implementation of the 1991 Trails Plan, would be beneficial.
- **Craig Knight**

- Questioned how the TOML was being brought into these discussions; cautioned that it is critical that the Town is part of the process so there are no surprises. **Danna Stroud** identified John Milne and Steve Speidel as TOML staff representation within the Task Force, and mentioned Community Development Director Mark Wardlaw and Town Manager Rob Clark's inclusion in discussions, as well as Councilmember Neil McCarroll's participation in MLTPA Board meetings.
- Scope and budget are the two main concerns; it's important to focus on what can be accomplished now, yet have short-, mid-, and long-range plans.
- Identifying problem areas now can assist Council in addressing proposed development as it impacts these areas.
- **Mike Schlafmann**
 - Recommended that MLTPA keep the proposal as simple and straightforward as possible, with specific phases and a time frame, and to anticipate questions Council will ask. Made reference to Rob Clark's memo where he stated that this is a one-time opportunity to protect community benefits as they relate to land use.
 - Starting within UGB for Phase One makes sense because it's where we all live (connecting homes to public lands), and we have prior successes to build on. Focus on mobility within and around town (connecting residents to schools, transit centers, etc., by way of "feet first") as well as mobility out to public lands.
 - It's impossible to project how much the entire master plan will cost, but figures can be assigned to specific phases.
- **Danna Stroud**
 - Since the Ranch Road gate issue last winter, Council has assigned significance to trails and public access. The political will to adopt and implement a master plan is there, but it may be important to frame proposal in terms of concrete concepts (i.e., getting children to school).
 - Two-fold budgetary needs: funding of master plan, and operational funding. Task Force efforts will frame the proposal that goes to Council so that funds may be identified in the budget for the master plan. Monies are limited, so it's important to gain Council's support and commitment, as that will possibly reprioritize how the budget is spent and prevent Council from reassigning priority to other projects as they arise. We are trying to create a shift in how the TOML is thinking about and programming the future; rather than have a number of individual plans go only so far and then become inactive, a master plan will be implemented on an ongoing, integrated basis.

- Opportunity for the TOML with performance zoning conversations with developers to obtain commitments and easements
- **Steve Speidel**
 - As part of Phase One, update/reevaluate 1991 Trails Plan. Also consider creating “no-protest agreements” with developers to allow planning to continue without impeding developer designs.
- **John Wentworth:**
 - For Phase One, it’s important to immediately identify “hot points,” or critical public access points and areas that are in immediate danger of being compromised by the development activity mentioned in Rob Clark’s memo.
- **Alex Fabbro**
 - Don’t make the master plan so broad that it’s overwhelming, or so focused that perspective is lost and incrementalism prevails. Backup options are necessary for each phase. Planning should begin with connecting population centers to frontcountry, and keeping people out of their cars in town.
- **Dieter Fiebiger**
 - In-town Phase One is attainable because we already have some steps there.
 - Mentioned working with developers to get something in writing stating their involvement and openness to work with master plan (easements, etc.).