

Sherwins Working Group
Meeting #8 (November 3, 2009, 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.)
Westin Hotel Conference Room



Draft Meeting Summary
4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

4:00–4:05 **Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping:**
Sherwins Working Group (SWG) facilitator Austin McInerny welcomed the group to their final meeting and thanked the Westin for free use of their facility. Group members went around the table and quickly reintroduced themselves. Mr. McInerny thanked the group for their commitment to the process and gave special acknowledgement to the volunteers involved in the many breakout-group meetings held since the previous full SWG meeting on Oct. 13. Mr. McInerny gave a brief overview of the meeting and walked the group through the agenda, noting that the overall goal of the evening was to finalize the Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (SHARP) outline and preamble for final preparation and submittal to the USFS by partner team staff.

4:05–4:10 **Non-SWG Public Comments:** N/A

4:10–4:45 **Review and Completion of Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (SHARP) Document**

- **Overview of SHARP outline [Attachment 1]:** No comments were offered by the group, which approved the outline by consensus.
- **Discussion and finalization of preamble [Attachment 2]:** Mr. McInerny asked breakout-group members to identify themselves to the larger group, noting that these volunteers had participated in shaping the preamble as currently written. The group reviewed the preamble and made suggestions regarding word choice, editing, and simplifying the language so that it would be more easily understood by the general public, which Kim Stravers (MLTPA) agreed to incorporate into the final version for submittal with the SHARP package. Mr. McInerny asked the group members to review the current draft after the meeting and to submit any comments and/or suggested changes to Ms. Stravers within one week (due Nov. 10) so that the target finish date for SHARP, Nov. 17, could be met.
- **Process for completing document:** Mr. McInerny reiterated the target delivery date for the SHARP final package as Tuesday, Nov. 17. He noted that partner staff would be putting together the final documents.



- **Instructions for submitting additional participant concerns for inclusion in SHARP document:** Mr. McNerny announced to the group that members were welcome to submit additional comments expressing their thoughts or concerns about specific items in either narrative in letter format, and that these letters would be included in the final SHARP package. He acknowledged that although the group had come to consensus on the narratives and maps, some members may still wish to see some tweaks made, and that it was important that these individuals have the opportunity to share their opinions. He asked that the group submit additional comments to Ms. Stravers within one week (Nov. 10).

4:45–5:00

Process Evaluation/Feedback

- **Distribution of and instructions for completing evaluation form regarding how to improve collaborative process [Handout]:** Mr. McNerny passed out evaluation packets to the group and encouraged them to fill out the forms and rate his performance and the success of the process. He emphasized that the forms are anonymous and that feedback from this group will be extremely useful to the partner team as they refine this planning model for potential future efforts. He noted that the envelopes were stamped with pre-paid postage and requested that participants mail them within the coming week, though there is no hard deadline for submittal.

5:00–6:00

Presentation of Summer and Winter Narratives/Maps [Attachment 3]

- **Report from SWG Reconciliation Sub-Group meetings:** Volunteers from the Reconciliation Team identified themselves to the group while Mr. McNerny highlighted the major issues they tackled during the three breakout meetings held since the last full SWG meeting: Summer Map ID #9a and #9b (equestrian trails) and Winter Map ID #4 and #18 (OSV boundary). He emphasized that the intent of the Reconciliation Team was to take the consensus results of the Oct. 13 meeting and wordsmith the narratives to reflect those revisions. Mr. McNerny then walked the group through each season's proposal, noting that this exercise was meant to be mostly informative in nature and was not an invitation to revisit consensus decisions already made.

SUMMER: The group reviewed the major changes made to the Summer narrative and identified a few revisions to be made by partner staff in crafting the final SHARP package. Mr. McNerny read an e-mail from SWG participant Stacy Corless supporting the process as a whole and acknowledging the hard work that went into the proposals. The group indicated full



support for the Summer Proposal given that the following changes were made:

1. Label Mammoth Rock Trail, the Panorama Dome trails, and the Sherwin Lakes Trail (USFS system trails) on the Summer and Winter maps, as they are referred to extensively in the narratives.
2. Assign one new Map ID # to both the Summer and Winter Proposals to include all of trails identified in #1 above, describing them in the narrative with the following text: "...as depicted as USFS system trails on these maps." Explain in the rationales that the group did not consider these elements separately in their proposal because they were assumed to already be part of the Inyo National Forest's system and therefore would not change status as official, recognized trails.
3. Include the information in #2, above, in an "Assumptions" section of the SHARP report, near the Existing Conditions discussion.
4. Include an Existing Conditions map in the SHARP intro near the Existing Conditions section.
5. Place Summer Map ID #8 icons in multiple places on the Summer map, as was done with Map ID #9b.
6. On the Summer map, move Map ID #19 off of the trail in Solitude Canyon to clarify that the intent is to study the area, not that particular trail, and add a Map ID #19 icon to Panorama Dome to clarify that the proposal number extends to this area as well.
7. On the Summer map, add a Map ID #29 icon to the southern portion of the "wishbone" trail near Solitude Canyon.
8. Make consistent reference to other Summer Map ID #s in the concept and rationale portions of the Summer narrative as opposed to simply listing relevant Map ID #s in the notes sections.

WINTER: The group reviewed the major changes made to the Winter narrative and identified a few revisions to be made by partner staff in crafting the final SHARP package. Significant discussion was had regarding Winter Map ID #18; breakout-group members emphasized that the change looks drastic graphically, but that it produces an effect similar to the now-omitted Map ID #4 and was crafted in response to the volume of public feedback received on the first draft of the proposal as well as to ensure a logical, defensible rationale for the OSV closure. The group agreed that specific reference to enforcement signage should not be added to the text and that this concept is fully covered by Map ID #13. Mr. McNerny read an e-mail from Alana Levin supporting the process as a whole and acknowledging the hard work that went into the



proposals. Ms. Stravers represented full support on behalf of MMSA and Ms. Paranick-Poiset, who had to leave the meeting early. The group indicated full support for the Winter Proposal given that the following changes were made:

1. Make consistent reference to other Winter Map ID #s in the concept and rationale portions of the Winter narrative as opposed to simply listing relevant Map ID #s in the notes sections.
2. Emphasize the southern boundary of the developed recreation area identified in Map ID #18 and align it with Mammoth Rock Trail.
3. Increase the size of the Mammoth Rock label.
4. Add the following text to Winter Map ID #18: “The SWG recognizes that implementation of this feature will likely limit OSV access to the face of the Sherwins; however the intent is to allow OSV access to Solitude Canyon via a sustainable route that takes into account variable snow conditions and topography and that maintains a clear demarcation between activity areas. Further study is required to determine the exact boundary alignment that will achieve the goals described above.”

6:00–7:00

Next Steps, Prioritization Exercise, and Celebration

- **Review of what happens next with SHARP:** Mr. Schlafmann provided an overview of the next likely steps for SHARP and the SWG. He announced that the Turner Propane tank farm project will continue, with the paving of Sherwin Creek Road to the gravel pit scheduled for next summer, and that these plans will influence the implementation timeline and specific features of the group’s proposal. The USFS has hired a landscape architect to begin trailhead design at the borrow pit to coincide with the Turner Propane project. The Mammoth Meadows Restoration Project is focused on hydrologic function and is not addressing trails at all; however, the current open public comment period is an opportunity for the SWG to suggest that they would like to see the Meadows Restoration play a role in moving SHARP forward, or that the restoration project should address trails. Mr. Schlafmann stated that the most important next step, in the USFS’s opinion, is identification of priorities within SHARP so that they can focus staff energy on specific potential items (analysis, design, and implementation). He noted that there’s an opportunity through MLTPA as a convener to form a Technical Advisory Group to keep tabs on the implementation of SHARP, help provide support to USFS staff as they detail proposal features, flesh out top priorities, etc., with the intent of getting something done with the plan next summer, such as a trailhead or signage and



wayfinding. Mr. Speidel noted that, from the Town's perspective, some SWG ideas are already helping to influence additional improvements and projects such as the Lake Mary Road Bike Path (LMRBP). Generally the Town is looking at opportunities for other public rights-of-way to provide continued and improved public access to public lands via the Trail System Master Plan and General Plan. Mr. Schlafmann emphasized that this group, whether they know it or not, has had tremendous influence on other projects, such as an additional bus stop being added along the LMRBP. He will reassess the SWG time frame he laid out earlier in the year and will condense the group's recommended priorities, which would be determined next in the meeting agenda, into an implementation package that includes the technical review process, design standards, cost specs, and other information. He added that the project developers who had visited a meeting of the SWG a few months back were impressed by the group's work and are interested in using the SWG as a model for similar collaborative planning in Shady Rest.

- **Prioritization exercise:** Mr. McInerny asked the group members to identify their top five summer and winter priorities from the narratives by placing a sticker dot on the Map ID # listed on the butcher paper for each season. He noted that this exercise will represent the first approximation from the SWG and that when SHARP is complete the group members should share it with their respective clubs and other interested parties so that they can submit their own set of priorities and recommendations. Priorities can be broad, such as recommending further study for an area, or specific, such as recommending implementation of a specific trail or trail section. The results of this exercise will be included in SHARP.
- **Group photo:** The SWG and partner team gathered for a few celebratory snapshots, to be included in the final SHARP report where appropriate.
- **Group celebration!** At the close of the meeting, the group enjoyed cake and champagne to mark the conclusion of a lengthy and successful planning effort.

