

Sherwins Working Group

Meeting #4 (August 11, 2009, 4–7 p.m.)

Mammoth Lakes Library: Ellie Randol Reading Room



Meeting Agenda

4:00–7:00 p.m.

4:00–4:10

Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping

- **Review of overall process status/progress/next steps:** Austin McInerny introduced himself and welcomed the group to the fourth Sherwins Working Group (SWG) meeting. He noted that two Volunteer Work Groups were formed at the close of the last full SWG meeting on July 14, and that each group had met twice between July 14 and August 11 to draft summer and winter proposals that represent a combination of recommendations made previously by the larger group. He stated that the task for this evening's meeting was for the full group to compare the seasonal proposals from each Volunteer Work Group to identify similarities and differences, and to use these proposals as the basis for creating a single proposal for each season that can go out to the community for a public feedback process. Mr. McInerny focused the group's attention on the winter and summer Combined Opportunity Tables provided as a handout and explained that, as the group worked through the items, Kim Stravers would capture their final recommendations, rationales, notes, and questions in a separate column. Ms. Stravers' laptop screen was projected at the front of the room so that participants could ensure accuracy in her notes and determine a level of support for each recommendation. He explained also that Matt Peterson would capture the group's final recommendations on the clean "base map" in the center of the opposite end of the room, between the maps produced by each group for the relevant season.

Mr. McInerny outlined the public feedback process, noting that the community would have approximately three weeks to review the SWG's draft proposals and accompanying narratives (the products of this evening's meeting) and then supply input on a feedback form, which the partners are in the process of drafting. The form will be part of a larger "road show kit" that will help SWG members exhibit the draft proposals to community members and encourage feedback. Staff will collect and process the public feedback and will submit the compiled input to the SWG in advance of the September 22 meeting. Mr. McInerny reminded the group that



the September 3 meeting had been cancelled to allow more time for the public review process.

Participants in the Volunteer Work Groups were asked to share their feelings about that process. Most stated that the breakout group work was productive and necessary, though some concern was expressed regarding a lack of adequate time to finish the work (feeling rushed) and the difficulty in “speaking for” users not present at those meetings.

4:10–4:20

Meeting #2 and #3 Summary Review and Adoption

- **Review and adoption of Meeting #2 Draft Summary:** The meeting summary was accepted as written, by consensus.
- **Review and adoption of Meeting #3 Draft Summary:** The meeting summary was accepted as written, by consensus.
- **Report out from field-trip leaders (Greg Norby and Steve Speidel):** Mr. Norby reported that the group he led toured primarily the eastern edge of the meadow so that he could provide information regarding current and proposed Mammoth Community Water District (MCWD) activities in the study area, which the group could incorporate into their discussions regarding the SWG proposals. (Mr. Norby is the general manager of the MCWD.) He referenced his field notes, which were available as a handout and also as a download from the SWG Web page.

Mr. Speidel reported that the group he led (accompanied by U.S. Forest Service staff) explored the lower elevations of the meadow to conceptualize opportunities for connection over the western edge to Old Mammoth Road. The group followed a trail near the beginning of the Mammoth Rock Trail, which went from easier to more-difficult terrain in a short distance. Historic use was evident in the stream corridor, and the group noted that the steep grade of the east-facing slope would potentially require switchbacks in design of a connector trail. He noted that the terrain and tread width would likely limit use to foot traffic.

Mr. McNerny thanked the two groups for their efforts and advised the larger group that they should consider setting up additional field trips as they craft the final proposal. He added that the SWG blog is a useful tool to coordinate these activities.

4:20–5:20

Volunteer Work Group Presentations: Winter Season



- **Report from small groups who worked between meetings on winter season map:** In the interest of time, Mr. McNerny instead provided a quick overview of the breakout-group process and what each group had accomplished. He noted that each group had met twice for a total of five hours and had developed proposals for both summer and winter. Many similarities exist between the groups' proposals, particularly for winter; there are more differences for summer. Mr. McNerny referred the group to the Volunteer Work Group notes, available as a handout as well as on the SWG Web site.

Mr. McNerny then reviewed the master map legend created by Jon Kazmierski. The group expressed confusion about some of the symbology, so the following clarifications were made:

- The “squiggly lines” on winter map represent the general snowboarder/skier egress path from the Sherwins.
- The pluses are Mammoth Community Water District (MCWD) wells.
- The diamonds refer to the legacy Blue Diamond Trail System for cross-country skiing and snowshoeing, which neither group discussed in their proposals.
- OSV closure area: The Lakes Basin is open to OSV users after April 15. A request was made to add this information in parentheses next to the symbol in the legend. It also was suggested that the post-April 15 OSV boundaries be represented on the maps.
- Wilderness areas: It was requested that these areas be depicted on the maps.
- Trail Type 4: This is a non-motorized trail type. It was noted that it would be too difficult to represent use types on each trail type in the map.

Mr. McNerny emphasized that these maps, as they currently exist, are internal drafts not meant for public release.

- **Winter Map and Opportunity Comparison Table Evaluation:** Mr. McNerny asked the group to review the worksheet, provided as a handout, to compare and contrast both proposals. He explained that the goal of this review and discussion is to develop the map and narrative of proposed winter recreation features within the study area to share with broader community. Mr. McNerny led the group through discussion of each individual item on the Winter Opportunity



Comparison Table; please see the revised Winter Opportunity Comparison Table (08/11/09) for details and results.

5:20–6:30

Volunteer Work Group Presentations: Summer Season

Due to the length of time required to finish evaluation of the winter recommendations, the group agreed to table the summer map work until the meeting originally scheduled for September 3, 2009 from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. (previously cancelled) at Sierra Meadows Ranch.

6:30–6:55

Activities Prior to Meeting #5

- **Schedule focused site visits (who, when, where):** Mr. McInerny encouraged the group to schedule additional site visits/field trips between tonight and the September 3 meeting to further the summer map work to come.
- **Identify volunteers willing to present proposals to interested parties/organizations to solicit feedback:** Mr. McInerny asked that volunteers e-mail Ms. Stravers within the week if they are interested in helping with this process.
- **Identify which particular organizations should be contacted for presentations and assign volunteers for follow-up:** Mr. McInerny asked that the group brainstorm a list of parties to contact and e-mail it to Ms. Stravers.
- **Discuss format and strategy for soliciting broader community feedback on proposal (e.g., public library display):** Mr. McInerny reported that the partners were working on a feedback form and outreach plan for this effort and will have more information to provide at the September 3 meeting. He noted that the outreach will take place in September and that the group will address community input at the September 22 meeting. He asked also that the group brainstorm and e-mail to Ms. Stravers a list of potential display locations in addition to the library. It was suggested that the feedback form contain opportunities to capture demographic information.

6:55–7:00

Meeting Wrap-Up

- **Review of what has been decided:** Mr. McInerny congratulated the group on finishing the winter map proposal.
- **Next steps/meeting schedule:** Mr. McInerny reminded the group that they would meet next on Thursday, September 3, from 4 p.m. to 7 p.m. at Sierra Meadows Ranch, to evaluate the summer map proposal.

