



Sherwins Working Group: Meeting #2
June 16, 2009, 6–9 p.m., Sierra Meadows Ranch
DRAFT Meeting Summary

- **6:00–6:10 p.m.: Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, and Housekeeping:** Facilitator Austin McInerny welcomed the group and then asked participants to go around the room, introduce themselves, and share any relevant news with the group. Cory Rice reported that the new sharing policy in the skatepark, which permits BMX riders to use the facility on a limited basis, has caused a bit of tension between user groups, and that he hoped that the Sherwins Working Group (SWG) process could perhaps provide some solutions to alleviate some of this stress.
 - **Review of overall process:** Mr. McInerny reminded the group that meeting materials will continue to be sent to them for review via e-mail well in advance and also will be posted on the SWG Web page on mltpa.org. He then reviewed the process outline with the group, reiterating that a total of six meetings will have been conducted between now and October, when the group's proposal is due to the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), and that this process is iterative and will build from meeting to meeting. He described the meetings as follows: Meeting #1, held on May 9, 2009, provided an explanation of the process, general discussion, and exploration/definition of terms of art and science used in this type of planning. This meeting, Meeting #2, will focus on reviewing the SATSS maps refined with input from the first meeting and which are now considered SWG maps. He noted that the large Summer and Winter Opportunities and Constraints maps on the wall were incomplete, but that they were not needed for this session. The purpose of Meetings #2 and #3 is to break into small groups to generate, then refine, ideas for the area and to review the tools used to evaluate such concepts so that Meetings #3 and #4 can be used to craft a unified vision. The goal of meeting #4 is to come up with a map featuring variations for summer and winter that can be put up for public discussion and comment; Meeting #5 will be spent reviewing these comments and refining the proposal. Between Meetings #5 and #6 the group will have developed a proposal that everyone is comfortable with. At the end of the process the USFS will take the proposal through NEPA environmental analysis for implementation down the road. Mike Schlafmann, USFS Deputy District Ranger, clarified that there is a public process with NEPA, but that the goal is to use this process to publicly vet the proposal so that NEPA will be relatively short and straightforward. Mr. McInerny clarified that there will be one consensus proposal going to the USFS, though the group may decide to evaluate a number of variations internally to reach the final draft.
 - **Role of outside meetings and discussions:** Mr. McInerny advised the group that processes concurrent with the SWG will continue (the Turner Propane tank farm, etc.), but that the work of the SWG will not be affected by them. He reminded



the group that no one person can represent him- or herself as a spokesperson for this group in any other process. Mr. Schlafmann clarified that one of the conditions of approval for the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan is that Snowcreek will work with the SWG process to attain implementation of its proposal.

- **Web site/process blog:** Ms. Stravers explained that the blog is up and running, and that she will put a link on the SWG Web page with instructions on how to use it. Participants can set up field trips, study sessions, or between-meeting workshops with one another, or pose questions to the group to generate discussion, but no one is obligated to use the blog.
- **6:10–6:20 p.m.: Meeting #1 Summary and Charter Adoption**
 - **Review and adoption of Meeting #1 Summary:** Mr. McInerney reminded the group that complete summaries of each meeting will be made available in a timely manner, and asked if there were clarifications to be made to the summary of Meeting #1, or concerns to be addressed. The group had a brief discussion to clarify certain elements, such as the source of the current maps, communication with homeowners' associations, and use of pie charts and other user-survey products, but no changes were suggested to the summary. Using a "thumbs up, thumbs down, thumbs sideways" voting method, the summary was accepted by consensus.
 - **Review and adoption of Working Group Charter:** Mr. McInerney reviewed the modifications made from the previous meeting's input and asked if questions or changes should be made. There were none, and the group accepted the document by consensus. Mr. McInerney sent the signature page around the room and asked each participant to sign it as a good-faith effort, emphasizing that the charter is not a legally binding document and that there are no consequences for declining to sign it. NOTE: The signature page was not returned to the partners at the close of the meeting; if it cannot be located, a new version will be circulated at Meeting #3.
- **6:20–6:40 p.m.: Existing Conditions and Opportunities & Constraints Maps**
 - **Review of updated maps and presentation of base maps:** Mr. McInerney pointed to the Opportunities & Constraints maps hanging on the wall and explained that they are work-in-progress updates to the SATSS maps; all input from Meeting #1 has not yet been added. New versions of these maps will be distributed once they are complete, so anyone who has not yet commented on these maps should await the new set. He indicated that MLTPA has handed off all of the GIS data to USFS employee Jon Kazmierski, who will manage the data from this point forward. Smaller versions of the Summer and Winter Existing Conditions maps were provided for each participant.
- **6:40–7:00 p.m.: Planning and Decision Criteria for Evaluating Options within Opportunity Zones**
 - **Description and discussion of what an "opportunity zone" is:** Mr. McInerney described opportunity zones as areas within the study area that indicate where various types of activities are possible on the ground, for summer and winter, in a



general sense. Though it's natural to want to jump to a specific solution, such as a specific trail alignment, this process will first be focused on determining what folks do in certain areas and why—why you head to the west end of the meadow for bird-watching, for example, rather than the east, or why a particular part of the study area better lends itself to mountain biking than another.

- **Review and revise criteria and develop scoring mechanism:** Mr. McInerny walked the group through his “first cut” of criteria against which opportunity zones and specific solutions may be measured, stressing that the group is free to modify, delete, or add to this list. He noted that the actual scoring system is up to the group; some examples of potential systems are rankings from 1 to 5, “low” to “high,” or “pro” and “con.” The group engaged in general discussion of the presented criteria; Mr. McInerny created a “solutions parking lot” on the butcher paper to capture comments that are specific management techniques or solutions, such as weather-dependent closures, but not ranking criteria. He noted that the criteria may be applied at different levels if the group so desires, but the group agreed to weigh each criterion evenly at this time. The group suggested the following changes:
 - To criteria #3 (“Trail design should be incorporated into plans for natural drainage channels, street rights-of way, and landscape corridors, power right-of-ways, and other open spaces. [symbiosis]”), add “wildlife protection.”
 - In criteria #1 (“Trails and staging areas need to be easily accessible to the public in order for the trails to receive high use. [accessibility]”), ensure that “ADA accessibility” is inherent.
 - In general, add “public safety,” “historical use/prior agreements,” “economic value” (with definition), “availability of activity in opportunity zones outside of the study area,” and “symbiosis between user groups.”

Mr. McInerny announced that the group would have until June 30 to submit further thoughts and suggestions regarding the criteria and ranking system, noting that employing no more than 10 criteria is ideal. Comments should be submitted to Kim Stravers (MLTPA) via e-mail at kimstravers@mltpa.org.

- **7:00–7:30 p.m.: Identify Desired Experience and Opportunities and Corresponding Concerns**
 - **Review list of activities (by season) that are common in the planning area, based on SATSS information and feedback from meeting #1:** The group suggested the following changes to the activities list:
 - Change “biking, unpaved” to “biking, on trail.”
 - Add “illegal at present” to both camping designations; BMX; special events/weddings; hot-air ballooning; kite-boarding; sleigh rides; winter and summer biathlon; and cultural/historic exploration.

Mr. Schlafmann clarified that legal standing of uses, such as camping and off-leash dog walking, may change and should not prevent inclusion of desired or presently occurring activities in this list. Mr. McInerny advised the group that



comments and further changes to the activities list must be submitted to Kim Stravers via e-mail no later than June 30.

- **Round-Robin presentation of what various recreational activities seek/desire in terms of their experience within planning area (homework to be done prior to meeting):** See above.
 - **Group discussion to identify which activities may present challenges to one another:** It was agreed that the group has a pretty good sense of this already.
 - **Come to group consensus about which activities need to be included in Planning Area:** See first bullet point.
- **7:30–8:40 p.m.: Initial Opportunity Zone Delineation:** Mr. McInerny passed out Existing Conditions maps for summer and winter and provided a brief overview of the exercise, asking that participants use the first five minutes to identify on the summer map what they, individually, consider the opportunity zones for different activities in the study area and why, then to share these findings with their tablemates so that they could jointly develop a concept to share with the larger group. Each group was asked to draw this joint concept on one of the giant maps and to choose a reporter to explain their findings to the larger group. The groups were allotted 30 minutes for each season, but the partners decided midway through the exercise to have the groups focus solely on the summer maps. Each group’s descriptions are included in the attached “Group Summer OZ Descriptions” (PDF).
 - **8:40–8:55 p.m.: Activities Prior to Meeting #3:** Mr. McInerny directed the group to complete the following tasks before the July 14 meeting:
 1. Reconvene in small groups (the same or different configurations) to refine the summer opportunity zones and to develop rationales for them.
 2. Reconvene in small groups (the same or different configurations) to develop draft winter opportunity zone articulations.
 3. Group reporters are to e-mail Kim Stravers their summer opportunity zone descriptions.
 - **Potential site visits (who, when, where):** Mr. McInerny encouraged participants to use the SWG blog to coordinate site visits to the study area with other group members. Mr. Schlafmann invited the group to include the USFS on their trips if they like. Mark Davis indicated his interest in leading a mountain bike ride on Mammoth Rock Trail, in the vicinity of Lake Mary, and on the Flume Trail (aka the Panorama Vista Trail). Jim Barnes expressed interest in leading a hike to explore the mining roads en route to Solitude Canyon for potential trail development. Greg Norby shared that the Mammoth Community Water District will lead orientation trips during the first or second week of July from the end of Tamarack toward existing district wells to discuss planned activity; it was suggested that a discussion of birding in that area be incorporated. Steve Speidel indicated his interest in leading a hike on some more difficult terrain (deer trails, etc.) to the southwest of the study area. Mr. McInerny encouraged field-trip participants to take photos and share them with the larger group via the blog.

The following key action items were agreed upon:

- MLTPA will distribute a description of identified Opportunity Zones shortly after the



- meeting.
- Groups should meet before the next meeting and refine their Opportunity Zones and, if possible, apply criteria to their proposal. Goal is to create maps identifying Opportunity Zones and to describe how their proposal meets the stated needs of the various recreational interests.
 - Each group needs to be prepared to present their map and rationale at the next meeting.
- **8:55–9:00 p.m.: Meeting Wrap-Up**
 - **Review of what has been decided:** See “Activities Before Meeting #3,” above.
 - **Next steps/meeting schedule:** Mr. McInerney reminded the group of the next meeting date, July 14. Ms. Stravers indicated that MLTPA would inform the group of the meeting location as soon as possible, and reminded participants that the next meeting will run from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

