

Appendix D: Complete SWG Meeting Records

This appendix contains all of the materials distributed, via e-mail or on site, for each full-group meeting, field trip/site visit, and breakout group/study session of the Sherwins Working Group. Materials are organized chronologically and are separated by cover pages for each meeting, which detail the documents following it.


Please note that the documents in this Appendix are grouped to present a reflection of the results of the meeting at which they were generated. Materials produced by breakout groups and field trips were used as in subsequent full-group meetings during the SWG process; such materials have been omitted from the full-group meeting packets appearing in this Appendix to avoid unnecessary repetition.

Winter Field Trip #1

March 21, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. SWG flyers
2. SWG press release
3. SWG process overview
4. Workshop comments transcription
5. Morning sign-in sheet
6. Morning session photos
7. Afternoon session sign-in sheet
8. Afternoon session photos



The SATSS Working Group 2009

Building on the success of work recently completed as part of the Town of Mammoth Lakes Trail System Master Plan Update, the United States Forest Service (USFS), the Town of Mammoth Lakes (TOML), and the Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA) are convening a working group to collaboratively identify a preferred alternative for implementation in the SATSS study area.

The SATSS Working Group will address the following:

- Step 1: Identify Issues and Concerns
- Step 2: Define and Describe Opportunities by Area
- Step 3: Identify Thresholds for Resources and Social Conditions
- Step 4: Inventory Existing Resources and Social Conditions
- Step 5: Identify Alternative Opportunity Area Allocations
- Step 6: Identify Management Actions for Each Alternative
- Step 7: Evaluate and Select a Proposed Alternative for Analysis through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

The SATSS Working Group will meet four to six times over the coming months and will conduct two orientation field trips to evaluate both summer and winter opportunities.

The SATSS Working Group will be led by an impartial facilitator, accountable to all participants, who will also manage the process.

Participants in the SATSS Working Group will:

- Represent all stakeholder groups or interests, not simply themselves
- Represent all necessary interests or be supportive of the discussions
- Share responsibility for both the process and the outcomes
- Make decisions through consensus
- Mutually agree to the ground rules

The SATSS Working Group is an opportunity for all parties with interests in the Sherwin area to work collaboratively to chart an effective course forward for the benefit of a defining landscape of the Mammoth Lakes community.

If you'd like to participate in the SATSS Working Group, please contact MLTPA at (760) 934-3154, or send an e-mail to info@mltpa.org. Thank you!





March 18, 2009

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Kim Stravers, MLTPA Development and Community Relations Director, at (760) 934-3154 [office], (949) 632-7882 [cell], or kimstravers@mltpa.org

USFS TO HOST SHERWIN AREA TRAILS SPECIAL STUDY (SATSS) WORKING GROUP AND WINTER FIELD TRIP

Mammoth Lakes, CA—The United States Forest Service (USFS) has announced plans for the formation of a community-led “working group” to assist in further development of the Sherwin Area Trails Special Study (SATSS). The effort will kick off with a winter-specific field trip on Saturday, March 21. The Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA) will be working with the USFS and the Town of Mammoth Lakes (TOML) to provide convening and logistical support to bring together outdoor-recreation user groups, private land- and business-owners, local agencies, and other interested parties together with the USFS for this unique effort.

SATSS was initiated in 2008 to collaboratively and proactively address issues of recreation use, natural resource conservation, and real estate development as they interface along the southern boundary of the Town of Mammoth Lakes. The study is a complement to the recent Town of Mammoth Lakes Trail System Master Plan Update 2009, and will be included as Attachment B in the Final Plan. Though the geographic focus of SATSS is within the Town’s municipal boundary, the land is managed by the USFS.

“From its inception, the SATSS process has represented an opportunity to finally address the historic challenges that still confront this community along our southern border,” says MLTPA CEO John Wentworth. “This is the right effort, at the right time, and for all the right reasons.”

The upcoming SATSS Winter Field Trip will be split into two identical sessions to allow for maximum participation—9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.—and will include an indoor workshop to discuss ideas raised during the tours. The Winter Field Trips will be repeated on April 4. These field trips will serve as a “first step” in the establishment of the SATSS Working Group, which is designed to gather additional information from the community at large and to set the tone for the following series of meetings (four to six are anticipated) that will shape the group’s trails-management proposal. An additional summer-focused field trip will be open to the public and is tentatively scheduled for mid-July 2009.

“The initial SATSS report received earlier this year provides the foundation for the working group to begin its development of a proposal,” says USFS Mammoth and Mono Basin Deputy District Ranger Mike Schlafmann. “Because there are so many interests and so much opportunity to do something great with trails and access in the Sherwin area, we (the Forest Service) feel it is important to provide opportunity and support the interested public in helping us come up with a solid proposal. I am looking forward to helping the public work collaboratively towards a proposal for the future we can all be proud of.”

Those wishing to take part in the SATSS Winter Field Trip should meet at the Sierra Meadows Ranch parking lot on Sherwin Creek Road approximately 15 minutes before the scheduled tour departure time. To RSVP, or for more information, please contact MLTPA at (760) 934-3154 or info@mltpa.org.

The Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA) is a 501(c)3 public benefit corporation dedicated to trails and public access issues in Mammoth Lakes, California, and the immediate Eastern Sierra region. MLTPA partners with local jurisdictions and agencies, businesses, nonprofits, and individuals to connect people to nature and to provide a forum for all trail users to be involved.

###



Sherwin Working Group

Objective:

- **Collaboratively developed proposal for trails and public access in the SATSS area.**

Sideboards:

- Participants represent stakeholder groups or interests, and not simply themselves,
- All necessary interests are represented or at least supportive of the discussions,
- Participants share responsibility for both process and outcome,
- An impartial facilitator, accountable to all participants, manages the process, and
- The intent is to make decisions through consensus rather than by voting.
- Ground rules will be mutually agreed upon by all participants, and not established solely by the Forest Service or other sponsoring agency.

Forest Service will:

- 1. Act as convener for each meeting and take responsibility for meeting organization, agenda coordination and notes.**
- 2. Identify clear process and decision-making side-boards such as required analysis processes (i.e. NEPA), and FS decision-making steps.**
- 3. Act as a technical advisor and provide technical input throughout the process including resource data, GIS, recreation data and process information.**
- 4. Agency leaders will support the process and provide sufficient resources to convene the process.**
- 5. The Forest Service will ensure the facilitator's neutrality and accountability to all the participants.**
- 6. The Forest Service with Participants will ensure plans are made for implementation of the SATSS Working Group Proposal from the Beginning of the Process**

Proposed Process Steps:

Step 1 – Identify Issues and Concerns

- Purpose is to identify those public issues and managerial concerns that relate to distinctive features and characteristics of the Sherwins area.
 - Sherwin Draft Special Study provides a framework for identification of public concerns and issues.
 - Primary task is step 1 is review and validation of SATSS data.
- Product is a narrative write up addenda to SATSS identifying unique values and special opportunities in management of the Sherwins area and problems requiring special attention.

Step 2 – Define and Describe Opportunity Zones

- Purpose of this step is to define a series of opportunity zones for the Sherwins area. An opportunity zone provides a qualitative description of the kinds of resource and social conditions acceptable for that zone and a description of the type of management activity considered appropriate.
 - Opportunity zones provide an opportunity to focus discussion on trade-offs from an interest based perspective rather than an emphasis on individual uses. This step allows us to begin building a framework for collaboration.
 - Opportunity zones provide a finer scale container for discussion of interests and a determination of appropriate uses.
- Product is a narrative description of resource, social and managerial conditions defined as appropriate and acceptable for each opportunity zone.

Step 3 – Select Indicators/ Threshold for Resource and Social Conditions

- Purpose of this step is to identify indicators – specific variables that, singly or in combination are indicative of overall opportunities.
 - This step provides an opportunity for a discussion about limits of acceptable change and to clarify expectations (i.e. dog walker may desire a location with specific characteristics, equestrians with different characteristics and so on. However each interest will have a threshold of acceptability)
- Product is a map/ narrative of existing conditions for each indicator.

Step 4 – Inventory Existing Resource and Social Conditions

- Purpose of this step is to validate assumptions/ conclusions in the first two steps with the broader public.
 - This step the people at the table in a collaborative process to engage the broader public and ensure perspectives are broad, inclusive and account for the concerns of those who may have entered the process late or have been unable to participate.
- Product is a refined map and list of existing conditions for each indicator throughout the Sherwin area.

Step 5 – Identify Alternative Opportunity Zone Allocations

- Purpose of this step is to decide what resource and social conditions are to be maintained or achieved in the Sherwin are. This is a prescriptive step – it is concerned with establishing what should be, and input from the public and Forest Service informs this step.
- Products are maps and tabular summaries of alternative opportunity zone allocations.

Step 5 – Identify Management Actions for each Alternative

- Purpose of this step is to identify the differences, if any, that exist between current conditions and objectives in opportunity zones by alternative.
- Product is a list or map of management actions by alternative needed to meet opportunity zone objectives.

Step 6 – Evaluate and Select a Preferred Alternative

- Purpose of this step is to identify a preferred alternative. This will be the SATSS collaborative groups proposal.
- Product is a proposed final allocation of opportunity zones and selection of management/ facilities program for analysis in NEPA and implementation.

**SATSS Working Group
Winter Field Trip #1
March 21, 2009, 9–11 a.m.**

Workshop Comments Transcription

The following comments were recorded by Kim Stravers (MLTPA Foundation) on butcher paper.

- I. OSV/OHV
 1. Make an effort to get motorized users engaged in SATSS
 2. Explore opportunities for some separation of motorized/non-motorized
 3. Wilderness Bill
 4. Travel Management Plan
 5. Prior decisions re: Lakes Basin, etc.
 6. Possibly form subcommittee to address these and similar concerns
- II. XC Ski
 1. Snowcreek Master Plan proposes fee-based system on golf course in winter
- III. Miscellaneous
 1. Assess existing data and identify gaps
 2. Obtain information about sensitive areas
 3. Goal is to have a complete proposal by September 2009
 4. Possible charette that includes representatives from all user groups, with commitments
 5. USFS will help to source facilitation
 6. MLTPA to report on all meetings to all groups
 - a. Minutes
 - b. Video?
- IV. Needs
 1. Sierra Meadows Ranch trails-related study
 2. 2004 Winter Needs Assessment
 3. List of user groups/activities
 4. Snowcreek VIII EIR
 5. Proposed Sherwin Ski Area information
 6. Full SATSS package from consultants, including additional comments supplied to USFS from TOML
 7. Grazing permit information
- V. Time Commitment
 1. Approximately 60–80 hours, ending in September
 2. Range of meeting times (evenings, weekends, etc.) to maximize participation
 3. “Kickoff” meeting last weekend of April?
 4. Develop meeting agendas to make meetings efficient

SATS women want Rn FT.

3-21-09 - 7:00 AM

W Ann

Phone

E MAIL

M.K Prentice	934-0355	MKPE@PGCABLE.com
Phyllis Benham	934-8283	Pbenham1@verizon.net
Malcolm Clark	924-5639	WMALCOLM.CLARK@GMAIL.COM
Sharon Clark	924-5639	SHARONR.CHARK@GMAIL.COM
Margi the Berner	924-2140	jungberner@mac.com
Yong Jung	4	4
Dennis Brown - <small>Pres. Ranch @ Snowbird Owners Assoc</small>	934-7477	debpbrown@verizon.net
Stacey Crockett	934-3478	Stacey@mammoth-arts.com
Douglas Will	924-5667	doguwill@ATT.NET
Ali Fenberg <small>ELITE PLANNING PARTNER</small>	920-0389	alifenberg@yahoo.com
Nate Greenberg	937-1209	nate@savalanche.org
Chad Lande	310-365-8400	chadlande@chadnor.com
Jay Deinken	934-8771	jdeinken@hotmail.com
Noelle Deinken	11	ndeinken2@hotmail.com
JEFF OLSON	ALTA PLANNING + DESIGN	www.altaplanning.com
Marshall Minobe	Mobility Commission	
Ryan Berry	914-2152	bermysmr@hotmail.com
Chris Walters	315-6829	mxwallyes4@charter.net
John Teller	9143071	
Pete Beck	934 9332	fpbeck@913@
Jhel Bowman <small>SENIOR PARTNER</small>	934-6630	jb Bowman@MammothBaseCamp.com

Brent Allen (760) 937-4766
Andrew Murphy (760) 914-2082

AIW@QNET.COM

Murf275@hotmail.com

TOM HELLER 914 0194

TOM@MAMMOTH LAKES FD. COM

Stephanie Wolff ^{note} 934 4417

Stephanie@mammothpetshop.com

FRANK KELLY

924-3227 MEADOW SAFETY fjkelly2@verizon.net
NON-MOTORIZED VEHICLES



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_002.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_004.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_006.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_020.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_022.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_034.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_040.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_054.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_063.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_066.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_072.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_078.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_096.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_108.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_131.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_135.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_140.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_146.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_151.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_152.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_153.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_160.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_177.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_AM_191.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

SATSS WORKING GROUP: WINTER FIELD TRIP #2
 2-4 p.m., 3/2/09

	<u>PHONE</u>	<u>EMAIL</u>
Jesse Langley	(310) 770-4724	jesse@cardinalinvestments.com
Elaine Smith	934 4963	elairemammoth@earthlink.net
Hans Ludwig	-	hansvonludwig@gmail.com
Steve Schwined	760 760/497-4245	STEVE@MAMMOTHLAKES.COM



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_100.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_107.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_111.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_116.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_117.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_120.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_121.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_62.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_63.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_65.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_70.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_74.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_77.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_79.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_82.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_03_21_PM_87.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

Winter Field Trip #2

April 4, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. SWG flyer
2. SWG press release
3. SWG process overview
4. Workshop comments transcription
5. Morning and afternoon session (first half) sign-in sheet
6. Morning session photos
7. Afternoon session sign-in sheet (remaining half)
8. Afternoon session photos



The Sherwins Working Group 2009

Building on the success of work recently completed as part of the Town of Mammoth Lakes Trail System Master Plan Update, the United States Forest Service (USFS), the Town of Mammoth Lakes (TOML), and the Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA) are convening a working group to collaboratively identify a preferred alternative for implementation in the territory immediately to the South of the Town of Mammoth Lakes, best known simply as the Sherwins.

The Sherwins Working Group will address the following:

- Step 1: Identify Issues and Concerns
- Step 2: Define and Describe Opportunities by Area
- Step 3: Identify Thresholds for Resources and Social Conditions
- Step 4: Inventory Existing Resources and Social Conditions
- Step 5: Identify Alternative Opportunity Area Allocations
- Step 6: Identify Management Actions for Each Alternative
- Step 7: Evaluate and Select a Proposed Alternative for Analysis through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

The Sherwins Working Group will meet four to six times over the coming months and will conduct two orientation field trips to evaluate both summer and winter opportunities.

The Sherwins Working Group will be led by an impartial facilitator, accountable to all participants, who will also manage the process.

Participants in the Sherwins Working Group will:

- Represent all stakeholder groups or interests, not simply themselves
- Represent all necessary interests or be supportive of the discussions
- Share responsibility for both the process and the outcomes
- Make decisions through consensus
- Mutually agree to the ground rules

The Sherwins Working Group is an opportunity for all parties with interests in the Sherwin area to work collaboratively to chart an effective course forward for the benefit of a defining landscape of the Mammoth Lakes community.

If you'd like to participate in the Sherwins Working Group, please contact MLTPA at (760) 934-3154, or send an e-mail to info@mltpa.org. Thank you!





April 2, 2009

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Kim Stravers, MLTPA Development and Community Relations Director, at (760) 934-3154 [office], (949) 632-7882 [cell], or kimstravers@mltpa.org

USFS TO LEAD SECOND ROUND OF WINTER FIELD TRIPS IN SUPPORT OF THE SHERWINS WORKING GROUP

Sherwin Area Trails Special Study (SATSS) report leads to formation of community-based planning opportunity in Mammoth Lakes

Mammoth Lakes, CA—In mid-March 2009, the United States Forest Service (USFS) announced plans for the formation of a community-led working group to build upon the Town of Mammoth Lakes' "Sherwin Area Trails Special Study (SATSS)" and to come up with a proposal for trails and public access in the Sherwins region. The effort continues with a second round of winter-specific field trips/workshops on Saturday, April 4 that will mirror those held on March 21, to allow community members who were unable to attend the first sessions the chance to participate. The Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA) will be working with the USFS and the Town of Mammoth Lakes (TOML) to provide convening and logistical support to bring outdoor-recreation user groups, private land- and business-owners, local agencies, and other interested parties together for this unique effort.

SATSS was initiated in 2008 to collaboratively and proactively address issues of recreation use, natural resource conservation, and real estate development as they interface along the southern boundary of the Town of Mammoth Lakes. The study is a complement to the recent Town of Mammoth Lakes Trail System Master Plan Update 2009, and will be included as Attachment B in the Final Plan. Though the geographic focus of SATSS is within the Town's municipal boundary, the land is managed by the USFS.

"From its inception, the SATSS process has represented an opportunity to finally address the historic challenges that still confront this community along our southern border," says MLTPA CEO John Wentworth. "This is the right effort, at the right time, and for all the right reasons."

The upcoming Winter Field Trip will be split into two identical sessions to allow for maximum participation—9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.—and will include an indoor workshop to discuss ideas raised during the tours. These field trips will serve as a "first step" in the establishment of the Sherwins Working Group, which is designed to gather additional information from the community at large and to set the tone for the following series of workshops (four to six are anticipated) that will shape the group's trails-management proposal. An additional summer-focused field trip will be open to the public and is tentatively scheduled for mid-July 2009.

"The initial SATSS report received earlier this year provides the foundation for the working group to begin its development of a proposal," says USFS Mammoth and Mono Basin Deputy District Ranger Mike Schlafmann. "Because there are so many interests and so much opportunity to do something great with trails and access in the Sherwin area, we [the Forest Service] feel it is important to provide opportunity and support the interested public in helping us come up with a solid proposal. I am looking forward to helping the public work collaboratively towards a proposal for the future we can all be proud of."

Those wishing to take part in the Sherwins Working Group Winter Field Trip should meet at the Sierra Meadows Ranch parking lot on Sherwin Creek Road approximately 15 minutes before the scheduled tour-departure time. To RSVP, or for more information, please contact MLTPA at (760) 934-3154 or info@mltpa.org.

The Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA) is a 501(c)3 public benefit corporation dedicated to trails and public access issues in Mammoth Lakes, California, and the immediate Eastern Sierra region. MLTPA partners with local jurisdictions and agencies, businesses, nonprofits, and individuals to connect people to nature and to provide a forum for all trail users to be involved.

###



Sherwin Working Group

Objective:

- **Collaboratively developed proposal for trails and public access in the SATSS area.**

Sideboards:

- Participants represent stakeholder groups or interests, and not simply themselves,
- All necessary interests are represented or at least supportive of the discussions,
- Participants share responsibility for both process and outcome,
- An impartial facilitator, accountable to all participants, manages the process, and
- The intent is to make decisions through consensus rather than by voting.
- Ground rules will be mutually agreed upon by all participants, and not established solely by the Forest Service or other sponsoring agency.

Forest Service will:

- 1. Act as convener for each meeting and take responsibility for meeting organization, agenda coordination and notes.**
- 2. Identify clear process and decision-making side-boards such as required analysis processes (i.e. NEPA), and FS decision-making steps.**
- 3. Act as a technical advisor and provide technical input throughout the process including resource data, GIS, recreation data and process information.**
- 4. Agency leaders will support the process and provide sufficient resources to convene the process.**
- 5. The Forest Service will ensure the facilitator's neutrality and accountability to all the participants.**
- 6. The Forest Service with Participants will ensure plans are made for implementation of the SATSS Working Group Proposal from the Beginning of the Process**

Proposed Process Steps:

Step 1 – Identify Issues and Concerns

- Purpose is to identify those public issues and managerial concerns that relate to distinctive features and characteristics of the Sherwins area.
 - Sherwin Draft Special Study provides a framework for identification of public concerns and issues.
 - Primary task is step 1 is review and validation of SATSS data.
- Product is a narrative write up addenda to SATSS identifying unique values and special opportunities in management of the Sherwins area and problems requiring special attention.

Step 2 – Define and Describe Opportunity Zones

- Purpose of this step is to define a series of opportunity zones for the Sherwins area. An opportunity zone provides a qualitative description of the kinds of resource and social conditions acceptable for that zone and a description of the type of management activity considered appropriate.
 - Opportunity zones provide an opportunity to focus discussion on trade-offs from an interest based perspective rather than an emphasis on individual uses. This step allows us to begin building a framework for collaboration.
 - Opportunity zones provide a finer scale container for discussion of interests and a determination of appropriate uses.
- Product is a narrative description of resource, social and managerial conditions defined as appropriate and acceptable for each opportunity zone.

Step 3 – Select Indicators/ Threshold for Resource and Social Conditions

- Purpose of this step is to identify indicators – specific variables that, singly or in combination are indicative of overall opportunities.
 - This step provides an opportunity for a discussion about limits of acceptable change and to clarify expectations (i.e. dog walker may desire a location with specific characteristics, equestrians with different characteristics and so on. However each interest will have a threshold of acceptability)
- Product is a map/ narrative of existing conditions for each indicator.

Step 4 – Inventory Existing Resource and Social Conditions

- Purpose of this step is to validate assumptions/ conclusions in the first two steps with the broader public.
 - This step the people at the table in a collaborative process to engage the broader public and ensure perspectives are broad, inclusive and account for the concerns of those who may have entered the process late or have been unable to participate.
- Product is a refined map and list of existing conditions for each indicator throughout the Sherwin area.

Step 5 – Identify Alternative Opportunity Zone Allocations

- Purpose of this step is to decide what resource and social conditions are to be maintained or achieved in the Sherwin are. This is a prescriptive step – it is concerned with establishing what should be, and input from the public and Forest Service informs this step.
- Products are maps and tabular summaries of alternative opportunity zone allocations.

Step 5 – Identify Management Actions for each Alternative

- Purpose of this step is to identify the differences, if any, that exist between current conditions and objectives in opportunity zones by alternative.
- Product is a list or map of management actions by alternative needed to meet opportunity zone objectives.

Step 6 – Evaluate and Select a Preferred Alternative

- Purpose of this step is to identify a preferred alternative. This will be the SATSS collaborative groups proposal.
- Product is a proposed final allocation of opportunity zones and selection of management/ facilities program for analysis in NEPA and implementation.

**Sherwins Working Group
Winter Field Trip #2
April 4, 2009**

Workshop Comments Transcription

The following comments were recorded by Kim Stravers (MLTPA Foundation) on butcher paper.

Session #1: 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.

- I. Paved road out to gravel put to allow for:
 - A. Staging for OSV
 - B. XC ski
 - C. Snowplay area (tubing, sledding, etc.)
 - D. Access to Sherwins? Bardini?
- II. "People go where they're shown to go."
 - A. Signage
 - B. Mapping
 - C. Education process
 - D. "Everyone should be given a quality experience."
- III. Kickoff all-day workshop: May 9 (Saturday)

Session #2: 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

- I. Process is not limited to "system trails"; "use" or "social" trails are part of the discussion.

SHERWINS WORKING GROUP
WINTER FIELD TRIP
APRIL 4, 2009

please print clearly

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	E-MAIL ADDRESS	PHONE	9-11 A.M. OR 2-4 P.M.
KENNING JENSEN	JENSEN	ksj7@cox.net	934-7176	9-11
Chick	Mey.vern	cmey.vern@verizon.com	802 548-4358	9-11
DANVA	STROUD	dstroud@visitationmark.com		9-11
CY WALKER	WALKER	BOX 831	934-7279	9-11
Marge	Papp ^{mpapp22} @verizon.net	Box 1436	934-0082	9-11
Jim	Miller	P.O. Box 87	934-6811	9-11
Julien	Levors	JulienLevors@hotmail.com	914-104	9-11
Maya	SWARTZ	mayar@mammalib.org	934-5215	9-11
CAREG	NORBY	CAREG@northwest.org new DST CA, US	934-2516	9-11
MK Prentice				
Mark	Davis	box 2274	934-1674	2-4
Tammy	Nguyen	thbennett@chadmar.com	512-0122	2-4
JO	Bacon	jo.bacon@verizon.net		
Tim	VILLANUEVA	tim@boudin.org	8724413	2-4
Cory	Rice	cory@navarone.com	934-2471	2-4
Gene	Zeiner	genezeiner@ca.rr.com		2-4
Stacy	Corless	stacy@maisoftware.org	920 0190	2-4

Turner
Prentice
@aol.com



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_02.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_07.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_13.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_31.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_36.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_46.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_57.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_60.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_61.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_69.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_72.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_74.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_77.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_84.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_95.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_AM_52.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

SHERWINS WORKING GROUP
 WINTER FIELD TRIP
 APRIL 4, 2009

please print clearly

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	E-MAIL	PHONE	9-11 A.M. OR 2-4 P.M.
------------	-----------	--------	-------	-----------------------------

MARCUS PALCHAK		mpalchak@disabledsportsouthern.sierra.org	760-934-0791	2-4 PM
DAVE	Stefanides	dave@ocar.org	949-351-6620	
Barbara	Stefanides	b_stefanides@hotmail.com		
Jim	Barnes	jjimmybarnes@yahoo.com	935-4864	
Alana	Levin	Aleevi@highSierraTri.org	924 924-3757	
Cory	Rice	ricecory@hotmail.com	562-480-3647	2-4
Jon	Watson	geospace@pacbell.net		
	Far West Ski Association		760.723.6539	



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_001.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_003.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_006.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_007.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_015.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_017.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_036.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_046.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_061.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_064.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_067.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_088.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_089.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_095.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_103.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_108.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_118.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_122.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_128.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_143.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_148.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_155.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_162.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_04_09_PM_009.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

SWG Full-Group Meeting #1

May 9, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Process description
3. Charter and participant commitments
4. Sign-in sheet
5. Photos



Meeting Agenda

- 10:00 - 10:10** **Welcome from Working Group Conveners**
- Inyo National Forest (Mike Schlafmann)
 - Town of Mammoth Lakes (Danna Stroud)
 - Mammoth Lakes Trails-Public Access (John Wentworth)
- 10:10 - 10:40** **Agenda Overview and Introductions (Austin McNerny)**
- Name and organization (if any)
 - Why did you come to meeting?
 - What do you hope for from this process?
- 10:40 - 11:00** **Conveners' Perspective & Desire (Mike Schlafmann)**
- What is needed / desired from process
 - Description of challenge confronting management
 - Brief overview of effort to date
 - Relationship of this discussion to future NEPA process
 - "Sideboards" that must be considered during this discussion
- 11:00 - 12:00** **Process Detail - "How do we do this?" (Austin McNerny)**
- Review of Draft Charter / Ground Rules (Handout-forthcoming)
 - Membership Roles and Responsibilities
 - Decision-Making Process
 - Proposed Work Plan (Handout-forthcoming)
- 12:00 - 12:45** **Lunch Break / Informal Dialogue**
- Review of Charter - "Is this going to work for you?"
 - Discussion to decide who is able / willing to participate
 - Those willing to participate return after lunch
- 12:45 - 1:15** **Review of Lunch Dialogue Outcomes (Austin McNerny)**
- Will current composition provide necessary range of interests?
 - If "yes", determine meeting schedule / location / needs
 - If "no", discuss who is missing and how to move forward



**Meeting #1 (May 9, 2009)
Mammoth Lakes Library**



Meeting Agenda – cont.

1:15 - 2:15

**Review of Sherwin Area Trails Special Study Report “SATSS”
(Steve Speidel)**

- Focus on what, if anything needs to be added or revised in SATSS Existing Conditions or Opportunities & Constraints?
- Existing Conditions Memo (15 min.)
- Opportunities & Constraints Analysis Memo (15 min.)
- Alternatives Memo (30 min.)
 - Levels of change/intensity (A-C)
 - Equestrian preferred lacking
 - Ideas to move forward with
 - Motorized/Non-motorized
 - Winter/Summer conditions

2:15 - 2:30

Stretch Break

2:30 – 3:30

Identify Issues and Concerns (Austin McInerny)

- What, if anything, needs to be added or revised in SATSS Existing Conditions or Opportunities & Constraints?
- What issues and managerial concerns relate to distinctive features and characteristics of the Sherwins area?
- “Product” is a narrative addenda to SATSS identifying unique values and special opportunities in management of the Sherwins Area and problems requiring special attention

3:30 - 4:00

Meeting Wrap-Up

- Review of what has been decided
- Next steps / meeting schedule





Sherwins Working Group Process Description

Objective: Collaboratively developed proposal for trails and public access in the Sherwin Area Trails Special Study area (SATSS).

Proposed Process Steps: At each step, the Working Group will hold a facilitated meeting to discuss relevant matters and develop draft products. Between meetings, it is imperative that Working Group members review materials and discuss matters with concerned parties in order for subsequent discussions to be productive. Each meeting will provide time to share concerns identified since the last meeting and to revise products accordingly. The overall process is iterative and products will evolve based on reflection and constructive dialogue. The Inyo National Forest will ensure plans are made for implementation of the Working Group's proposal by undertaking appropriate next steps upon completion of the Working Group's efforts.

Step 1 – Identify Issues and Concerns

- Purpose is to identify those public issues and managerial concerns that relate to distinctive features and characteristics of the Sherwin area.
 - Sherwin Draft Special Study provides a framework for identification of public concerns and issues.
 - Primary task of step 1 is review and validation of SATSS data.
- Product is a narrative write-up addendum to SATSS identifying unique values and special opportunities in management of the Sherwin area and problems requiring special attention.

Step 2 – Define and Describe Opportunity Zones

- Purpose of this step is to define a series of opportunity zones for the Sherwin area. An opportunity zone provides a qualitative description of the kinds of resource and social conditions acceptable for that zone and a description of the type of management activity considered appropriate.
 - Opportunity zones provide an opportunity to focus discussion on trade-offs from an interest-based perspective rather than an emphasis on individual uses. This step allows us to begin building a framework for collaboration.
 - Opportunity zones provide a finer-scale container for discussion of interests and a determination of appropriate uses.
- Product is a narrative description of resource, social and managerial conditions defined as appropriate and acceptable for each opportunity zone.

Step 3 – Select Indicators/Threshold for Resource and Social Conditions

- Purpose of this step is to identify indicators – specific variables that, singly or in combination, are indicative of overall opportunities.
 - This step provides an opportunity for a discussion about limits of acceptable change and to clarify expectations (i.e., dog walker may desire a location with specific characteristics, equestrians with different characteristics, and so on; however, each interest will have a threshold of acceptability).
- Product is a map/narrative of existing conditions for each indicator.

Step 4 – Inventory Existing Resource and Social Conditions

- Purpose of this step is to validate assumptions/conclusions in the first two steps with the broader public.
 - This step has the people at the table in a collaborative process to engage the broader public and ensure perspectives are broad, inclusive and account for the concerns of those who may have entered the process late or have been unable to participate.
- Product is a refined map and list of existing conditions for each indicator throughout the Sherwin area.

Step 5 – Identify Alternative Opportunity Zone Allocations

- Purpose of this step is to decide what resource and social conditions are to be maintained or achieved in the Sherwin are. This is a prescriptive step – it is concerned with establishing what should be, and input from the public and Forest Service informs this step.
- Products are maps and tabular summaries of alternative opportunity-zone allocations.

Step 5 – Identify Management Actions for Each Alternative

- Purpose of this step is to identify the differences, if any, that exist between current conditions and objectives in opportunity zones by alternative.
- Product is a list or map of management actions by alternative needed to meet opportunity-zone objectives.

Step 6 – Evaluate and Select a Preferred Alternative

- Purpose of this step is to identify a preferred alternative. This will be the Sherwin Working Group’s collaborative proposal.
- Product is a proposed final allocation of opportunity zones and selection of management/facilities program for analysis in NEPA and implementation.



Sherwins Working Group

Charter and Participant Commitments

PURPOSE: The Sherwins Working Group (Working Group) is an independent, community-based body of stakeholders. The primary goal of the Working Group is to develop a preferred alternative for public access for the Sherwin Area Trails Special Study (SATSS) area that provides for safe and environmentally responsible use. The Working Group seeks to minimize conflict between different forms of recreation and between recreation of all types and the environment.

Working Group recommendations will be based on the best information available to the group. Recommendations will be submitted to the Inyo National Forest and other relevant entities as appropriate to the implementation of those recommendations.

The Inyo National Forest is committed to considering recommendations of all stakeholders and recognizes the unique contributions the Working Group could make to the overall consideration of alternatives.

COLLABORATIVE SCOPE: Collaboration could include, but is not limited to, discussion of the following:

- Review and possible addition to the already completed Sherwin Area Trails Special Study (SATSS) and its supporting documentation
- Identification of additional issues and concerns to be addressed in development of a proposed recreation plan for the study area
- Identification of “opportunity zones” within the study area that provide a qualitative description of the kinds of resources and social conditions acceptable for that zone and of the type of management activity considered appropriate
- Discussion about limits of acceptable change and to clarify expectations regarding what various user groups will desire for the study area
- Identification of the differences, if any, that exist between current conditions and objectives in opportunity zones
- Discussion of a proposed final allocation of opportunity zones and selection of management/facilities program with the intent of finding common ground – developing consensus – and documenting where agreement is reached. Topics of non-agreement are also documented.
- Discussion on any other issues that the group chooses to tackle, where they think there is potential to reach consensus resolution

MEMBERSHIP: Members of the group are defined by their personal knowledge, association, constituency or organization involved in or related to activities in the Inyo National Forest. Members have a local perspective, topical on-the-ground knowledge, and the ability to work collaboratively with people with views different from their own. Participants share responsibility for both process and outcomes of the Working Group.

MEMBER ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- As appropriate, act as a liaison and communicate information to and from their organizations.
- Offer the perspective of a good citizen, an independent thinker and a trustworthy individual.
- Build trust among all stakeholders.
- Contribute data/information to clarify issues and eliminate false assumptions.
- Will not represent individual views as views of the Working Group or make confidential conversations public.
- Work to ensure acceptance and implementation of agreements made by the Working Group.

ATTENDANCE: Attendance at meetings is important for the continuity of the group. Those unable to fully participate will be asked to re-evaluate their membership.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Consensus seeking: This is a consensus-seeking process. The full group will consider all decisions or recommendations. To determine a degree of consensus, members will note their level of support for items, ranging from Unqualified Support to Strong Support, General Support, Qualified Support, or Fundamental Disagreement. Issues without a broad degree of support will not move forward as representing the views of the Working Group. The level of support for various items will be recorded. If an item receives a level of Fundamental Disagreement, the group will be asked to continue working until it appears a resolution is not attainable, or move on to an area where more agreement is possible. At that time the members will note the nature of the disagreement and make a determination as to the best way to proceed in the particular issue area.

Minor and major decisions: Not all decisions will have the same level of impact. Simple voting may be adopted for procedural or non-policy matters.

Select decision process in advance: Proposals for action should include the decision process to be used in considering the item.

Members are expected to always contribute their best personal thinking, regardless of the initial positions of their sponsoring organizations. Collaboration cannot be effective unless all parties, including sponsoring organizations, are open to modifying their initial positions. Members are responsible for promoting understanding of Working Group recommendations by the organizations they represent.

GROUND RULES

1. Use standing meeting ground rules (see below).
2. When discussing the work of the Working Group, meeting attendees will avoid attributing statements to individuals.
3. Items presented as confidential will not be disclosed in other forums or used in a way to disadvantage any member of the group.
4. Members shall act in good faith in all aspects of this consensus-building process.
5. Members shall communicate their interests and positions.
6. Members shall not engage in personal attacks or stereotyping.
7. Members shall refrain from impugning the motivations or intentions of others.
8. Members shall not make commitments they do not intend to follow through with.

9. Members shall act consistently in the Working Group and other forums where similar issues are being discussed, including with the press.
10. Members agree to provide requested information to other members or explain the reason why not.
11. Meeting participants attending without an official Working Group role will be provided with audience seating and given a specific time in the agenda to address the group.

STANDING GROUND RULES

There will be continuous opportunities for group discussion. You are asked to subscribe to several key agreements to allow for productive outcomes:

USE COMMON CONVERSATIONAL COURTESY - Don't interrupt; use appropriate language, no third-party discussions, etc.

HUMOR IS WELCOME AND IMPORTANT, BUT humor should never be at someone else's expense.

ALL IDEAS AND POINTS OF VIEW HAVE VALUE - You may hear something you do not agree with or you think is "silly" or "wrong." Please remember that the purpose of the forum is to share ideas. All ideas have value in this setting. The goal is to achieve understanding. Simply listen; you do not have to agree.

PARTICIPANTS MAY CHANGE THEIR MIND - During the course of the session, some participants may change their perspective regarding one or more items. Group members reserve the right to change their mind and not be held to a previous position.

50-MILE RULE - Most of the participants have demanding responsibilities outside of the meeting room. Your attention is needed for the full meeting. Please turn cell phones, or any other communication item with an on/off switch, to "silent." If you do not believe you will be able to participate fully, please discuss your situation with the facilitator.

BE COMFORTABLE - Please feel free to help yourself to refreshments or take personal breaks. If you have other needs, please let the facilitator know.

SPELLING DOESN'T COUNT - Writing on a vertical surface (like blackboards or flipcharts) actually increases the number of spelling errors – ideas are more important than spelling.

HONOR TIME - We have an ambitious agenda; in order to meet our goals it will be important to follow the time guidelines given by the facilitator.

AVOID EDITORIALS - It will be tempting to analyze the motives of others or offer editorial comments. Please talk about YOUR ideas and thoughts.

VOTING - We are not voting unless we say we are voting. Silence is not consent. Decision-making will be clear.






COMMITMENT TO PROCESS & GROUND RULES

By signing this document, you agree to participate in the Working Group in good faith and to work constructively and in conformity with the ground rules and the spirit of the effort.

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

MTG. #1

Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: 05/09/09

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Brent	Allen	Eastern Sierra 4WD Club	
Jim	Barnes		
Pete	Beck		
Phyllis	Benham		
Brigitte	Berman	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Secretary)	
Ryan	Berry		
Rachel	Bowman	Mammoth Base Camp at Sierra Meadows Ranch (owner)	
Dennis	Brown	Ranch at Snowcreek HOA (President)	
Lesley	Bruns		
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	
Sharon	Clark		
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo	
Stacey	Crockett	High Sierra Equestrian Club	
Mark	Davis	IMBA	
Noelle	Deinken	Public Arts Commission	




CONFIDENTIAL: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE OUTSIDE THIS GROUP

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: 05/09/09**

Alex	Fabbro	395 Fat Tire Council	
Ali	Feinberg		
Dave	Geirman	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Nate	Greenberg		
Jennifer	Heintzelman		
Thom	Heller	Mammoth Lakes Fire Protection District	TAA
Mark	Hendrickson	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Zach	Hickman		
April	Holly		
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	
Doug	Jung	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Fran	Kelly		
Martin	Kleinbard		
Kraig	Kupiec		
Chad	Lande	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jesse	Langley	Cardinal Investments (The Sherwin)	
Julien	Lecorps		

CONFIDENTIAL: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE OUTSIDE THIS GROUP

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: 05/09/09**

Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	
Hans	Ludwig		
Ron	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	
Chuck	Megivern		
Marshall	Minobe	Mobility Commission	
Andrew	Murphy	Chadmar/Snowcreek	
Tammy	Nguyen	Chadmar/Snowcreek	
Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	
Marge	Papp	Turner Propane	
Rebecca	Paranick-Poiset	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Cory	Rice	Wave Rave Snowboard Shop	
Jennifer	Roeser	McGee Creek Pack Station	
Brandon	Russell		
Maya	Schwartz	Cerro Coso Community College	
Steve	Schwind		
Elaine	Smith	High Sierra Striders	

CONFIDENTIAL: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE OUTSIDE THIS GROUP

5.9.2009 Sat. cl. Parsons suggestions 301@yahoo.com

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: 05/09/09**

Jim	Smith	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
Joel	St. Marie		
Barbara	Stefanides		
Dave	Stefanides		
Bill	Sauser	Mammoth Snowmobile Association/TOML Tourism & Recreation Commission	
Autumn	Talsky	Mammoth Mountaineering Supply/Alpine Approach	
John	Teller		
Tim	Villanueva	Bardini Foundation	
Cy	Walker		
John	Walter	Advocates for Mammoth	
Chris	Walters		
Jon	Watson	Far West Ski Association	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	<i>Will</i>
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	<i>Stephanie A Wolff</i>
Gene	Zeiner		
<i>Patty</i>	<i>Schwartzkopf</i>	<i>Individual & Realtor</i>	<i>Patty Schwartzkopf</i>

*924-0225 W
914-1914 C
patty@qnet.com*

CONFIDENTIAL: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE OUTSIDE THIS GROUP

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: 05/09/09**

<i>Property owner</i>			<i>Terry Deum</i>
<i>Andrew</i>	<i>KASTOR</i>	<i>HIGH SIERRA SPORTS</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>
<i>DAVID</i>	<i>NEAL</i>	<i>Reel Mammoth Adventures</i>	<i>Dalton</i>
<i>Mike</i>	<i>McKenna</i>	<i>EASTERN SIERRA Hatchery Foundation</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>
PARTNERS			
<i>Mike</i>	<i>Schlafmann</i>	<i>USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>
<i>Jonathan</i>	<i>Cook-Fisher</i>	<i>USFS: Mammoth and Mono Basin Winter Sports Specialist</i>	
<i>Austin</i>	<i>McInerney</i>	<i>Center for Collaborative Planning</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>
<i>Danna</i>	<i>Stroud</i>	<i>TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director</i>	
<i>Steve</i>	<i>Speidel</i>	<i>TOML: Principal Planner</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>
<i>Mark</i>	<i>Wardlaw</i>	<i>TOML: Community Development Department Director</i>	
<i>Jen</i>	<i>Daugherty</i>	<i>TOML: Assistant Planner</i>	
<i>Jim</i>	<i>Miller</i>	<i>Turner Propane</i>	
<i>John</i>	<i>Wentworth</i>	<i>MLTPA: CEO/Board President</i>	
<i>Kim</i>	<i>Stravers</i>	<i>MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director</i>	<i>Kimberly Stravers</i>
<i>Lara</i>	<i>Kirkner</i>	<i>MLTPA: Operations Director</i>	
<i>Justin</i>	<i>Mulbay</i>	<i>MLTPA: GIS Coordinator</i>	

*(760) 924-0438
Neal2Fish@QNet.com*

CONFIDENTIAL: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE OUTSIDE THIS GROUP

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: 05/09/09**

Bill	Taylor	MLTPA: Treasurer	BT
Joyce	Turner	MLTPA: Board member	
Jim	Smith	MLTPA: Board member	
Jay	Deinken	MLTPA: Vice-President	
Will	Aldrich	MLTPA: Board member	

CONFIDENTIAL: DO NOT DISTRIBUTE OUTSIDE THIS GROUP



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_134.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_140.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_150.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_158.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_175.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_180.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_184.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_224.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_236.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_239.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_253.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_05_09_mtng01_255.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

SWG Full-Group Meeting #2

June 16, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Charter and participant commitments (revised)
3. Sherwins-area outdoor recreation activities list
4. Draft planning and decision criteria
5. Meeting summary
6. Sign-in sheet
7. Photos

Sherwins Working Group
Meeting #2 (June 16, 2009, 6-9 pm)
Sierra Meadows Ranch (Old Sherwins Restaurant)



Meeting Agenda
6:00 – 9:00 pm

- 6:00 - 6:10** **Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping**
- Review of overall process (**handout**)
 - Role of outside meetings and discussions
 - Website / process blog
- 6:10 - 6:20** **Meeting #1 Summary and Charter Adoption**
- Review and adoption of Meeting #1 Summary (**attached**)
 - Review and adoption of Working Group Charter (**attached**)
- 6:20 - 6:40** **Existing Conditions and Opportunities & Constraints Maps**
- Review of updated maps and presentation of base maps
- 6:40 - 7:00** **Planning and Decision Criteria for Evaluating Options within Opportunity Zones**
- Description and discussion of what an “opportunity zone” is
 - Review and revise criteria and develop scoring mechanism (**attached**)
- 7:00 - 7:30** **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 (**attached**)
 - 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)
 - Group discussion to identify which activities may present challenges to one another
 - Come to group consensus about which activities need to be included in Planning Area.



Meeting #2 (June 16, 2009, 6-9 pm)
Meeting Agenda – cont.



7:30 - 8:40

Initial Opportunity Zone Delineation

- Ultimate goal is to develop Opportunity Zones that provide for stated recreational desires while taking into account existing resource, social, and managerial conditions. This activity is an opportunity to “test” this process out and become comfortable working together. Outcome will be very “rough” maps and will allow for initial discussions and considerations.
- Break into smaller groups for each season (winter/summer).
- Small groups identify Opportunity Zones on maps that are appropriate for desired recreational activities and existing resource, social, and managerial conditions
- Each group develops brief qualitative description of identified opportunity zones and presents back to the large group “what are the opportunities and why?”
- Repeat for other season

8:40 – 8:55

Activities Prior to Meeting #3

- Potential site visits (who, when, where)
- 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

Meeting Wrap-Up

- Review of what has been decided
- Next steps / meeting schedule





Sherwins Working Group

Charter and Participant Commitments

PURPOSE: The Sherwins Working Group (Working Group) is an independent, community-based body of stakeholders. The primary goal of the Working Group is to develop a preferred alternative for public access for the Sherwin Area Trails Special Study (SATSS) area that provides for safe and environmentally responsible use. The Working Group seeks to minimize conflict between different forms of recreation and between recreation of all types and the environment.

Working Group recommendations will be based on the best information available to the group. Recommendations will be submitted to the Inyo National Forest and other relevant entities as appropriate to the implementation of those recommendations.

The Inyo National Forest is committed to considering recommendations of all stakeholders and recognizes the unique contributions the Working Group could make to the overall consideration of alternatives.

COLLABORATIVE SCOPE: Collaboration could include, but is not limited to, discussion of the following:

- Review and possible addition to the already completed Sherwin Area Trails Special Study (SATSS) and its supporting documentation
- Identification of additional issues and concerns to be addressed in development of a proposed recreation plan for the study area
- Identification of “opportunity zones” within the study area that provide a qualitative description of the kinds of resources and social conditions acceptable for that zone and of the type of management activity considered appropriate
- Discussion about limits of acceptable change and to clarify expectations regarding what various user groups will desire for the study area
- Identification of the differences, if any, that exist between current conditions and objectives in opportunity zones
- Discussion of a proposed final allocation of opportunity zones and selection of management/facilities program with the intent of finding common ground – developing consensus – and documenting where agreement is reached. Topics of non-agreement are also documented.
- Discussion on any other issues that the group chooses to tackle, where they think there is potential to reach consensus resolution

MEMBERSHIP: Members of the group are defined by their personal knowledge, association, constituency or organization involved in or related to activities in the Inyo National Forest. Members have a local perspective, topical on-the-ground knowledge, and the ability to work collaboratively with people with views different from their own. Participants share responsibility for both process and outcomes of the Working Group.

MEMBER ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- As appropriate, act as a liaison and communicate information to and from their organizations.
- Offer the perspective of a good citizen, an independent thinker and a trustworthy individual.
- Build trust among all stakeholders.
- Contribute data/information to clarify issues and eliminate false assumptions.
- Will not represent individual views as views of the Working Group ~~or make confidential conversations public.~~
- Work to ensure acceptance and implementation of agreements made by the Working Group.

ATTENDANCE: Attendance at meetings is important for the continuity of the group. Those unable to fully participate will be asked to re-evaluate their membership.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Consensus seeking: This is a consensus-seeking process. The full group will consider all decisions or recommendations. To determine a degree of consensus, members will note their level of support for items, ranging from Unqualified Support to Strong Support, General Support, Qualified Support, or Fundamental Disagreement. Issues without a broad degree of support will not move forward as representing the views of the Working Group. The level of support for various items will be recorded. If an item receives a level of Fundamental Disagreement, the group will be asked to continue working until it appears a resolution is not attainable, or move on to an area where more agreement is possible. At that time the members will note the nature of the disagreement and make a determination as to the best way to proceed in the particular issue area.

Minor and major decisions: Not all decisions will have the same level of impact. Simple voting may be adopted for procedural or non-policy matters.

Select decision process in advance: Proposals for action should include the decision process to be used in considering the item.

Members are expected to always contribute their best personal thinking, regardless of the initial positions of their sponsoring organizations. Collaboration cannot be effective unless all parties, including sponsoring organizations, are open to modifying their initial positions. Members are responsible for promoting understanding of Working Group recommendations by the organizations they represent.

GROUND RULES

1. Use standing meeting ground rules (see below).
2. When discussing the work of the Working Group, meeting attendees will avoid attributing statements to individuals.
- ~~3. Items presented as confidential will not be disclosed in other forums or used in a way to disadvantage any member of the group.~~
3. Members shall act in good faith in all aspects of this consensus-building process.
4. Members shall communicate their interests and positions.
5. Members shall not engage in personal attacks or stereotyping.

6. Members shall refrain from impugning the motivations or intentions of others.
7. Members shall not make commitments they do not intend to follow through with.
8. Members shall act consistently in the Working Group and other forums where similar issues are being discussed, including with the press.
9. Members agree to provide requested information to other members or explain the reason why not.
10. Meeting participants attending without an official Working Group role will be provided with audience seating and given a specific time in the agenda to address the group.

STANDING GROUND RULES

There will be continuous opportunities for group discussion. You are asked to subscribe to several key agreements to allow for productive outcomes:

USE COMMON CONVERSATIONAL COURTESY - Don't interrupt; use appropriate language, no third-party discussions, etc.

HUMOR IS WELCOME AND IMPORTANT, BUT humor should never be at someone else's expense.

ALL IDEAS AND POINTS OF VIEW HAVE VALUE - You may hear something you do not agree with or you think is "silly" or "wrong." Please remember that the purpose of the forum is to share ideas. All ideas have value in this setting. The goal is to achieve understanding. Simply listen; you do not have to agree.

PARTICIPANTS MAY CHANGE THEIR MIND - During the course of the session, some participants may change their perspective regarding one or more items. Group members reserve the right to change their mind and not be held to a previous position.

50-MILE RULE - Most of the participants have demanding responsibilities outside of the meeting room. Your attention is needed for the full meeting. Please turn cell phones, or any other communication item with an on/off switch, to "silent." If you do not believe you will be able to participate fully, please discuss your situation with the facilitator.

BE COMFORTABLE - Please feel free to help yourself to refreshments or take personal breaks. If you have other needs, please let the facilitator know.

SPELLING DOESN'T COUNT - Writing on a vertical surface (like blackboards or flipcharts) actually increases the number of spelling errors – ideas are more important than spelling.

HONOR TIME - We have an ambitious agenda; in order to meet our goals it will be important to follow the time guidelines given by the facilitator.

AVOID EDITORIALS - It will be tempting to analyze the motives of others or offer editorial comments. Please talk about YOUR ideas and thoughts.

VOTING - We are not voting unless we say we are voting. Silence is not consent. Decision-making will be clear.



Sherwins Working Group

Process Description – Meeting Overview

Objective: Collaboratively developed proposal for trails and public access in the Sherwin Area Trails Special Study area (SATSS).

Proposed Process Steps: At each step, the Working Group will hold a facilitated meeting to discuss relevant matters and develop draft products. Between meetings, it is imperative that Working Group members review materials and discuss matters with concerned parties in order for subsequent discussions to be productive. Each meeting will provide time to share concerns identified since the last meeting and to revise products accordingly. The overall process is iterative and products will evolve based on reflection and constructive dialogue. The Inyo National Forest will ensure plans are made for implementation of the Working Group's proposal by undertaking appropriate next steps upon completion of the Working Group's efforts.

Meetings 1-2: Inventory of resources, the current situation, and the best available science and information.

Meetings 1-2: Identification of public issues, management concerns, opportunities, and threats.

Meetings 2-3: Establishment of planning and decision criteria for evaluating and selecting the preferred alternative.

Meetings 3: Formulation of alternatives which address the significant issues and concerns. (Note: additional work to happen between meetings 2 and 3).

Meetings 3: Evaluation of the consequences, benefits, and affects of each proposed alternative. (Note: additional work to happen between meetings 3 and 4)

Meetings 4: Selection of a preliminary alternative based upon a full and reasoned analysis.

Post-Meetings 4: Public input and review of preliminary alternative.

Meetings 5: Modification of preliminary alternative and identification of preferred components. (Note: possible additional work to happen between meetings 5 and 6)

Meetings 6: Final revisions to preferred alternative and description/rationale and presentation of final product to Forest Service and Town of Mammoth Lakes.

**Sherwins Working Group
Outdoor Recreation Activities List for the SATSS Study Area**

Automobiles	Nordic Skiing, Groomed, Fee Area
	Nordic Skiing, Groomed, Public
Backcountry Kicker Zone	Nordic Skiing, Ungroomed, Public
Backcountry Ski/Snowboard	
Biking, Paved	OHV, ATV
Biking, Road	OHV, Motorcycle
Biking, Unpaved	OSV, Trail
Birding	OSV, Open Area
Camping, RV	Pets, Summer Open Area
Camping, Tent	Pets, Summer Walking
Climbing	Pets, Winter Open Area
	Pets, Winter Walking
Disabled Access	Running, Cross-Country
Dog Sledding	Running, Trail
Equestrian, Commercial Packing	Snowplay, Fee Area
Equestrian, Packing	Snowplay, Public
Equestrian, Commercial Trail Riding	Snowshoe, Trail
Equestrian, Trail Riding	Snowshoe, Open Area
Fall-Color Viewing	
Fishing, Streams and Creeks	Vistas
Frisbee Golf	
Hiking/Walking, Paved	Wildflowers
Hiking/Walking, Unpaved	Winter Camping
	Winter Walking/Hiking, Groomed
	Winter Hiking/Walking, 4-Season
MMSA Interface	

Planning and Decision Criteria for Evaluating Options within Opportunity Zones



D R A F T

Note: these are to be discussed during the 6:40 pm agenda topic. Prior to the meeting, please consider whether there is something missing from this list, whether you think there should be any specific revisions, and what a sensible method for assigning values to the criteria might be (e.g., a scale of 1-10 or high, medium, low, etc).

1. Trails and staging areas need to be easily accessible to the public in order for the trails to receive high use. [accessibility]
2. Trail systems should connect existing open space areas and community recreational amenities, employment centers and shopping areas. [connectivity]
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]
4. The recreational preferences and the transportation needs of the area must be met by the proposed trails and amenities. [demand]
5. Plan should list priorities for implementing new trails and take into consideration previously constructed trails and regionally planned trails. [priority]
6. Trails should provide for multiple uses, including, where feasible, ADA accessibility. [variety]
7. When possible, trail systems should offer loops, allowing the individual to avoid backtracking, while minimizing chance of user conflict. [functionality]
8. Trail design should consider aesthetic, educational, scientific, historical, scenic and cultural features of interest. [uniqueness]
9. Trails should not create or add to environmental degradation. [sustainability]
10. Trails and amenities should be designed in order to require minimal upkeep [maintainability]





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. McInerny 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.



MTG. #2

Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #2 Sign-In Sheet (06/16/09)

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Brent	Allen	Eastern Sierra 4WD Club	
John	Armstrong	Eastside Velo (President)	
Jim	Barnes		
Pete	Beck		
Phyllis	Benham		
Brigitte	Berman	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Secretary)	
Ryan	Berry		
Rachel	Bowman	Mammoth Base Camp at Sierra Meadows Ranch (owner)	
Dennis	Brown	Ranch at Snowcreek HOA (President)	
Lesley	Bruns		
Jon	Carlton		
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	arrived late (HP)
Sharon	Clark		
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	
Stacey	Crockett	High Sierra Equestrian Club	
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area Mountain Bike Organization (MAMBO)	
Alex	Fabbro	395 Fat Tire Council	
Ali	Feinberg		
Karen	Ferrell-Ingram	Eastern Sierra Land Trust	
Dave	Geirman	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #2 Sign-In Sheet (06/16/09)**

Nate	Greenberg		
Jennifer	Heintzelman		
Thom	Heller	Mammoth Lakes Fire Protection District	
Mark	Hendrickson	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Zach	Hickman		
April	Holly		
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	here (18)
Doug	Jung	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Andrew	Kastor	High Sierra Striders (president)	
Martin	Kleinbard		
Kraig	Kupiec		
Chad	Lande	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	<i>Chad Lande</i>
Jesse	Langley	Cardinal Investments (The Sherwin)	
Dave	Laverty	Triad/Holmes Associates	<i>[Signature]</i>
Julien	Lecorps		
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	<i>[Signature]</i>
Hans	Ludwig		arrived late (18)
Ron	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	
Chuck	Megivern		<i>[Signature]</i>
Mike	McKenna	Hot Creek Hatchery Foundation (Board member)	<i>[Signature]</i>
Marshall	Minobe	Mobility Commission	<i>Marshall Minobe</i>
Andrew	Murphy		
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	
Tammy	Nguyen	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #2 Sign-In Sheet (06/16/09)**

Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	<i>Greg Norby</i>
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	<i>Maggie Palchak</i>
Marge	Papp	Turner Propane	
Rebecca	Paranick- Poiset	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	<i>Rebecca Poiset</i>
J.	Parsons		
Terry	Plum	Tamarack Street homeowner/area property owner	
Monica	Prelle		
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range <i>Mammoth Nordic</i> of Light Chapter	<i>M. K. Prentice</i>
Cory	Rice	Wave Rave Snowboard Shop	<i>Cory Rice</i>
Jennifer	Roeser	McGee Creek Pack Station	
Brandon	Russell		
Maya	Schwartz	Cerro Coso Community College	
Patty	Schwartzkopf	Tamarack Street homeowner	<i>Patty Schwartzkopf</i>
Steve	Schwind		
Elaine	Smith	High Sierra Striders	
Jim	Smith	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	<i>RP representing HMSA</i>
Joel	St. Marie		
Barbara	Stefanides		
Dave	Stefanides		
Bill	Sausser	Mammoth Snowmobile Association/TOML Tourism & Recreation Commission	
Autumn	Talsky	Mammoth Mountaineering Supply/Alpine Approach	
Bill	Taylor		
John	Teller		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #2 Sign-In Sheet (06/16/09)**

Tim	Villanueva	Bardini Foundation	
John	Walter	Advocates for Mammoth	
Chris	Walters		
Jon	Watson	Far West Ski Association	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	<i>[Signature]</i>
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	<i>Stephanie Wolff</i>
Gene	Zeiner		

PARTNERS

Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	present <i>(KS)</i>
Jonathan	Cook-Fisher	USFS: Mammoth and Mono Basin Winter Sports Specialist	present <i>(KS)</i>
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	present <i>(KS)</i>
Austin	McInerney	Center for Collaborative Planning	present <i>(KS)</i>
Danna	Stroud	TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director	present <i>(KS)</i>
Steve	Speidel	TOML: Principal Planner	present <i>(KS)</i>
Mark	Wardlaw	TOML: Community Development Department Director	
Jen	Daugherty	TOML: Assistant Planner	
Jim	Miller	Turner Propane	
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	present <i>(KS)</i>
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	<i>Kimberly J Stravers</i>

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

NAME / CLUB AFFILIATION	PHONE #	EMAIL ADDRESS
CLAYTON MENDEL	760-793-7131	Cwmendel@gmail.com
✓ HENNING JENSEN	760/934-7176	hsj1@cox.net
✓ Mary K Prentice	760 934.0355	MKP@NPGCABLE.COM
Forrest Cross / ESAC	760-937-4680	forrest@esavalanche.org

88 760934

88 760934

88 760934

88 760934

88 760934

88 760934

88 760934



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_011.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_120.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_173.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_178.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_182.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_183.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_204.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_216.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_261.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_272.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_556.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_06_16_mtng02_564.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

SWG Full-Group Meeting #3

July 14, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Draft planning and decision criteria
3. Sherwins-area outdoor recreation activities list (revised)
4. Definitions of select terms
5. TOML Trail System Master Plan trail types
6. Summer Opportunity Zone group notes (compilation)
7. Summer Opportunity Zone Group 2 notes
8. Meeting summary
9. Sign-in sheet
10. Volunteer Work Group sign-up sheet
11. Photos

Sherwins Working Group
Meeting #3 (July 14, 2009, 4–7 p.m.)
Sierra Meadows Ranch (Old Sherwin’s Restaurant)



Meeting Agenda
4:00–7:00 p.m.

- 4:00–4:10** **Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping**
- Review of overall process status/progress
 - Web site/process blog update
- 4:10–4:15** **Meeting #2 Summary and Charter Adoption**
- Review and adoption of Meeting #2 Draft Summary (**attached**)
 - Recirculation of Working Group Charter signature page
- 4:15–4:25** **Planning and Decision Criteria for Evaluating Options Within Opportunity Zones**
- Review of comments received on draft criteria
 - Discussion and development of refined criteria and proposal evaluation mechanism
 - Revised criteria to be distributed after meeting for further review and use by small groups
- 4:25–5:45** **Opportunity Zone Delineation: Winter**
- Clarification regarding intent and purpose of opportunity zones. Need for broad thinking in terms of both activity scope (opportunity zones vs. specific trails) and uses (what’s best for the area and its users as a whole vs. focus on one’s preferred activity and taking measures/forming options designed to protect them)
 - Report from small groups who worked between meetings on Winter Opportunity Zone map
 - Group to provide brief qualitative description of identified opportunity zones and describe “What are the opportunities and why?”
 - Meeting participants to provide feedback, including identification of where they see potential user conflicts and possible strategies for resolving conflicts
 - Following report-outs, small groups to form and use time to build upon or create new concepts for winter zones



5:45–6:40

Opportunity Zone Delineation: Summer

- Report from small groups who worked between meetings on Summer Opportunity Zone map
 - Each small group to provide brief qualitative description of identified opportunity zones and describe “What are the opportunities and why?”
 - Meeting participants to provide feedback, including identification of where they see potential user conflicts and possible strategies for resolving conflicts
- Following report-outs, small groups to form and use time to begin reviewing various opportunity zone proposals and developing “blended” map. Intent is to develop proposal that could serve as base for map for proposed recreation features within study area. Remember: Not everyone will get everything they want; need to begin thinking, proposing, and evaluating with this “selflessness” in mind.

6:40–6:55

Activities Prior to Meeting #4

- Schedule potential site visits (who, when, where)
- Maps and descriptions of identified Opportunity Zones to be distributed shortly after Meeting #3
- Identify small group of volunteers to meet to refine Opportunity Zones for summer and winter based on opportunity and constraint data and, if possible, apply criteria to their proposal
 - Goal is to create maps identifying refined Opportunity Zones for both seasons that take into account identified opportunity and constraint data and concerns raised by all groups and begins identifying possible recreational features appropriate to the various zones
 - Volunteer work team will describe how refined proposal provides for the stated needs of the various recreational interests
 - Work will be presented at August 11 meeting and will serve as the basis for developing proposed “on-the-ground” recreational features (trails, access points, etc.)
 - Forest Service staff are available to assist with effort. Cooperation and work are essential at this time.

6:55–7:00

Meeting Wrap-Up

- Review of what has been decided
- Next steps/meeting schedule



Planning and Decision Criteria for Evaluating Options within Opportunity Zones



D R A F T

Note: these are to be discussed during the 6:40 pm agenda topic. Prior to the meeting, please consider whether there is something missing from this list, whether you think there should be any specific revisions, and what a sensible method for assigning values to the criteria might be (e.g., a scale of 1-10 or high, medium, low, etc).

1. Trails and staging areas need to be easily accessible to the public in order for the trails to receive high use. [accessibility]
2. Trail systems should connect existing open space areas and community recreational amenities, employment centers and shopping areas. [connectivity]
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]
4. The recreational preferences and the transportation needs of the area must be met by the proposed trails and amenities. [demand]
5. Plan should list priorities for implementing new trails and take into consideration previously constructed trails and regionally planned trails. [priority]
6. Trails should provide for multiple uses, including, where feasible, ADA accessibility. [variety]
7. When possible, trail systems should offer loops, allowing the individual to avoid backtracking, while minimizing chance of user conflict. [functionality]
8. Trail design should consider aesthetic, educational, scientific, historical, scenic and cultural features of interest. [uniqueness]
9. Trails should not create or add to environmental degradation. [sustainability]
10. Trails and amenities should be designed in order to require minimal upkeep [maintainability]



**Sherwins Working Group
Outdoor Recreation Activities List for the Sherwins Area**

Automobiles

**Backcountry Kicker Zone
Backcountry Ski/Snowboard**

Biathlon, Summer

Biathlon, Winter

Biking, Paved

Biking, Road

Biking, Trail

Birding

BMX

Camping, RV (illegal at present)

Camping, Tent (illegal at present)

Climbing

Cultural/Historic Exploration

Disabled Access

Dog Sledding

Equestrian, Commercial Packing

Equestrian, Packing

Equestrian, Commercial Trail Riding

Equestrian, Trail Riding

Fall-Color Viewing

Fishing, Streams and Creeks

Frisbee Golf

Hiking/Walking, Paved

Hiking/Walking, Unpaved

Hot-Air Ballooning

Kite-Boarding

MMSA Interface

Nordic Skiing, Groomed, Fee Area

Nordic Skiing, Groomed, Public

Nordic Skiing, Ungroomed, Public

OHV, ATV

OHV, Motorcycle

OSV, Trail

Pets, Summer Open Area

Pets, Summer Walking

Pets, Winter Open Area

Pets, Winter Walking

Running, Cross-Country

Running, Trail

Sleigh Rides

Snowplay, Fee Area

Snowplay, Public

Snowshoe, Trail

Snowshoe, Open Area

Special Events/Weddings

Vistas

Wildflowers

Winter Camping

Winter Walking/Hiking, Groomed

Winter Hiking/Walking, 4-Season



Sherwins Area Outdoor-Recreation Activity List DEFINITIONS OF SELECT TERMS

NOTE: *This document provides working definitions for outdoor-recreation activities which, unlike, say, Nordic skiing, are perhaps not 100 percent intuitive. Please refer to the SWG Activities List for a complete listing of terms.*

Automobiles: Non–green-stickered autos, trucks, Jeeps, SUVs, and other vehicles driven on paved or unpaved surfaces for sightseeing, four-wheeling, general access, or other activities

Backcountry Kicker Zone: An area where snowboarders and/or skiers build jumps (“kickers” or “booters”) to air off of; typically used for film and/or photo shoots, but also popular as regular recreation

Biking, Paved: Riding on a paved pathway that is often part of a system, such as the Main Path

Biking, Road: Riding on street surfaces with or without formal bike lanes; not to be confused with general bicycle travel (commuting/mobility)

Biking, Trail: Riding on an unpaved surface, such as a trail, fire road, or singletrack

Climbing: All forms of rock climbing (aid, traditional, sport), including bouldering

Cultural/Historic Exploration: Visiting sites of cultural and/or historical significance, for pleasure, education, or other purposes

Hiking/Walking, Paved: Foot travel on a paved pathway that is often part of a system, such as the Main Path

Hiking/Walking, Unpaved: Foot travel on an unpaved surface, such as a trail or fire road

Kite-Boarding: A sport similar to windsurfing whereby a skier or snowboarder is harnessed to a special kite that allows him or her to be propelled on snow by wind power

MMSA Interface: A public or private boundary that adjoins Mammoth Mountain Ski Area, which recreation users cross in the course of an activity (i.e., the Twin Lakes parking lot, where a mountain biker may travel from the MMSA Bike Park to



the parking lot to access the Lakes Basin, Town, or other trails, such as Panorama Vista)

OHV, ATV: Off-Highway Vehicles (green stickered), including trikes, quads, and Rhinos

OHV, Motorcycle: Motorcycles that are not street legal (classed as Off-Highway Vehicles/green stickered), such as dirt bikes and motocross bikes

OSV, Trail: Over-Snow Vehicles (green stickered), such as snowmobiles

Pets, Summer Open Area: An area where pet owners take their pets (usually dogs) to play off-leash in the summer months

Pets, Summer Walking: A trail or pathway where pet owners walk their pets (usually dogs) on a leash in the summer months

Pets, Winter Open Area: An area where pet owners take their pets (usually dogs) to play off-leash in the winter months

Pets, Winter Walking: A trail or pathway where pet owners walk their pets (usually dogs) on a leash in the summer months

Running, Cross-Country: Running on a combination of paved and unpaved trails and open areas

Running, Trail: Running on unpaved trails




Winter Walking/Hiking, Groomed: Foot travel on paved trails and pathways that are cleared, compacted, or otherwise groomed in the winter months

Winter Hiking/Walking, 4-Season: Foot travel on unpaved trails and open areas that are not cleared, compacted, or otherwise groomed in the winter months



Trail System Master Plan Trail Types – Summer

Paved Surfaces

	<p>Multi-Use Paths (MUPS) Existing Near-Term Long-Term/Planned</p>	<p>Also known as Class I bike paths, accommodate two pedestrian and wheeled traffic including: bicyclists, joggers, dogwalkers, and skaters. 10' recommended width, 12' in heavy use areas, typically not along roadway</p>
	<p>Bike Lanes (Class II) Existing Near-Term Long-Term/Planned</p>	<p>Portion of roadway designated for bicycle use, 5-6' in width</p>
	<p>Bike Routes (Class III) Existing Near-Term Long-Term/Planned</p>	<p>Signed routes that are shared motor vehicles, motor vehicles will typically have to change lanes to pass a bicyclist</p>
	<p>Promenades Existing Near-Term</p>	<p>Wide pedestrian walkways, clearly distinguished from Multi-Use Paths with sidewalk coloring or paving, low speed bicycle and pedestrians</p>

Soft-Surface Trails

	<p>Type 4 - Shared Multi-Use</p>	<p>Tread width: 8'-12', allows for passing, grades less than 5%, native or imported materials, good sightlines</p>
	<p>Type 3 - Shared Non-Motorized</p>	<p>Tread width: up to 48", allows for passing, native materials, grades up to 10%, clearances and turning radius accommodates all users</p>
	<p>Type 2 - Preferred Mountain Bike</p>	<p>Tread width: less than 36", minimal allowance for passing, native materials, overhead obstacles may be present over 6', Obstacles expected, grades occasionally over 8%</p>
	<p>Type 2 – Preferred Equestrian</p>	<p>Tread width: less than 30", minimal allowance for passing, native materials, head clearances over 12', obstacles expected, grades occasionally over 10%</p>
	<p>Type 2 – Preferred Hike</p>	<p>Tread width: less than 36", minimal allowance for passing, native materials, Overhead obstacles may be present, grades occasionally over 10%, may include stair steps</p>
	<p>Type 1 – Route only</p>	<p>Narrow single file trail, obstacles frequent or continuous, grades may be over 25%</p>

Trail System Master Plan Trail Types - Winter

Winter Use - Multi-Use Paths (MUPS)

	Cleared/Plowed	Paths that are cleared of snow to provide a similar level of use during all seasons
	Groomed for Nordic Use	Multi-use paths groomed for nordic use
	No winter maintenance	Multi-use paths with no winter maintenance

Soft Surface Trails (Over Snow)

	Type 4 – Shared Multi-Use	Motorized and non-motorized users, Tread width: 15'-20', can accommodate two-way groomed tracks, grades less than 5%, good sight lines throughout
	Type 3 – Shared Nordic/Skate	Tread 9'-12', allowance for passing, nordic tracks on right side, grades less than 5%, clearances and turning radius accommodates novices and children
	Type 2 – Preferred Snowshoe/Hiking	Tread width: 24"-36", machine groomed corduroy, packed surface, grades occasionally steeper than 10%, supports dog walking
	Type 2 – Preferred Nordic	Tread width: 12" to 18", corridor width 5'-6', machine-groomed or user packed, grades occasionally steeper than 10%, supports advanced trails
	Type 1 - Route Only	Narrow trail or route, single-file travel, user created tread, Route may not be groomed or maintained, no removal of trees to create, minimal signage, grades may be steeper than 25%

Trail System Master Plan Facilities

 	<p><u>Tunnels</u> Existing Proposed</p>	<p>Under-crossings are the preferred type of grade separated crossings for Multi-Use Paths, 18’ diameter pipe is recommended for allowance of snowcats for winter maintenance</p>
	<p><u>Barriers</u></p>	<p>Gates, seasonal closures</p>
	<p><u>Bridges</u></p>	<p>Designs vary based on usage</p>
	<p><u>Portals</u></p>	<p>Include trailheads, lodging, restaurants, and should be served by frequent public transportation</p>
	<p><u>Parks</u></p>	<p>Self contained recreation facilities, generally have same facilities as trailhead, serve as trailhead and also have amenities unique individual park</p>
	<p><u>Trailheads</u></p>	<p>Should provide: Automobile and Bicycle Parking, trash/recycling, restrooms, signage</p>
	<p><u>Access/Egress Point</u></p>	<p>Have same characteristics a GIC points, but have been formalized, and access is legal and regularly maintained</p>
	<p><u>Key GIC Point</u></p>	<p>GIC Points are the basis for selecting Recreation Nodes, may include official and unofficial locations where recreation transition occurs</p>

Additional symbols used throughout the Trail System Master Plan

	<p>1991 TOML Future/Alternative Trails</p>		<p>Parks and Open Space</p>
	<p>Private Dirt Trails</p>		<p>Campgrounds</p>
	<p>Recommended Boardwalk</p>		
	<p>Existing Sidewalks</p>		
	<p>Near-Term Sidewalks</p>		
	<p>Long-Term/Planned Sidewalks</p>		
	<p>Existing MMSA Bike Trails</p>		
	<p>Existing USFS Trails (INF)</p>		

Table 6-2. Trail Type Classifications

Trail Type	Tread Width	Trail Corridor	Surface	Average Grade*	Max Grade*	Outslope (soil)	Turn Radius	
							Climbing	Switchback
Type 4 Shared Multi-use	1-way: <8' 2-way: 12-20'	12-16' (w) 12'-15' (h) 22' (w) 12-15' (h)	Native soil and rock	<= 5%	10%	2-5%	15-20 ft*	>=10 ft
Type 3 Shared NM	24"-48"	4-8' (w) 10-15' (h)	Native soil	<= 5%	15%	3-8%	7-15 ft	3-8 ft
Type 2 Bicycle	12"-36"	2-6' (w) 6-8' (h)	Native soil and rock	<= 10%	25%	3-8%	> 7 ft	2-8 ft
Type 2 Horse	8"-30"	4-8' (w) 12-15' (h)	Native soil	<= 5%	15%	3-8%	> 10 ft	3-8 ft
Type 2 Hike	18"-36"	3'-5' (w) 7-8' (h)	Native soil and rock	<= 8%	25%	3-8%	> 7 ft	2-8 ft
Type 1 Route or Foot path	6"-30"	Varies by terrain	Native soil and rock	varies	25%	N/A	N/A	N/A

* Grades may exceed recommendation over rock surfaces.

Table 6-7. Winter Trail Type Classifications

Trail Type	Tread Width	Trail Corridor	Surface	Average Grade	Max Descending Grade	Max Climbing Grade	Turn Radius
Type 4 Shared Multi-use	1 or 2-way Nordic: 15-20'	18-25' (w) 10' (h)	Groomed Tracks and Corduroy Snow	<= 5%	10%	8%	>=20 ft
Type 3 Shared Nordic/Skate	1-way Nordic: 9-12'	12-15' (w) 7'-9' (h)	Groomed Tracks and Corduroy Snow	<= 5%	15%	10%	>=15 ft
Type 2 Snowshoe/Hiking	36-48"	5-6' (w) 6-8' (h)	Groomed Corduroy or Packed Snow	<= 10%	20%	20%	2-8 ft
Type 2 Classic Nordic	12"-18"	5-6' (w) 6-8' (h)	Groomed or Trekked-in Tracks	<= 10%	15%	20%	8-15 ft
Type 1 Route	12"-30"	2-4' (w) 6-8' (h)	Power or packed Snow	varies	N/A	N/A	N/A



**Summer Opportunity Zone Exercise
Group 1 Notes
Submitted 6/16/09**

- BMX area somewhere more appropriate in pit
- Connected to Town path to staging area/pit
- Staging area at tank farm (signage, interpretive)
- Better loop opportunities on Mammoth Rock (non-motorized)
- Bicycle/non-motorized loop in whole area, especially Panorama Dome/Panorama Vista (Flume Trail) area
- Interpretive sites/connecting better/signing
- Non-motorized trails on Sierra Meadows Ranch/signage, loop opportunities
- Mammoth Meadow access
- Kerry Meadow/Mammoth Meadow restoration?
- Day use only (except for permit), quiet, open space preservation for destination drives, bikes, hikes: ecological value, botanizing, birding, interpretive, education





Summer Activity Zones
Sherwins Area
Proposal by Team #2
(Submitted 6/22/09)

In order to accommodate as many outdoor recreation activities as possible while considering their various degrees of mutual compatibility as well as their environmental impact in the respective areas, we suggest establishing three opportunity zones:

- 1) The first zone would be for **mixed use, inclusive of motorized use**. This would accommodate practically all activities listed in the handout as amended at the 6/16/09 meeting. We find that this zone can most appropriately be placed in the area east of a north-south line that is east of the proposed Turner Propane tank farm and south of Sherwin Creek Road.
- 2) The second zone would be for **all non-motorized use, inclusive of mechanical use such as biking (i.e., all listed activities other than motorized ones)**. This zone would consist of two parts: The first part would be the area north of Sherwin Creek Road, which is currently used for equestrian purposes in particular. The second part would be the area south of and including Mammoth Rock Trail, as well as the area west of Old Mammoth Road
- 3) The third zone would be **limited to non-mechanized use** and consist of the most environmentally sensitive area: the meadow itself. This zone will be available for equestrian use, hiking, pet walking (off leash), running, and study and preservation of fauna and flora. This zone will consist of the area north of Mammoth Rock Trail and west of a north-south line that is east of the proposed Turner Propane tank farm, ending at Old Mammoth Road.

We envision a main staging area at the proposed Turner Propane tank farm as well as trailhead parking for non-mechanized use at the end of Tamarack Street and at the proposed Snowcreek VIII hotel.

Once a consensus is reached regarding the zones, more detailed decision-making must be addressed as to specific trails, consolidation and restoration of existing ones, and establishment of new ones—for instance, south of Mammoth Rock Trail and a switchback connector from the meadow to Mammoth Rock. It must also take into consideration improved access to trails less accessible today, several of which have historical interest.





**Summer Opportunity Zone Exercise
“Group 3 Summer Use Notes”
Submitted 6/16/09**

UNPAVED

1. Biathlon (near motocross track)
2. Non-motorized trail connectivity from upper Mammoth Rock Trail to: a) Panorama Dome; b) Lakes Basin
3. Non-motorized (specifically excluded activities such as equestrian) connectivity from lower Mammoth Rock Trail to: a) The Bluffs/Panorama Dome/Lakes Basin; b) Shady Rest
4. Non-motorized connectivity from lower Mammoth Rock Trail to Shady Rest (probably separate from equestrian trail)
5. BMX/challenge park (contained track) near proposed Turner Propane tank farm and/or motocross (pipe water if necessary)

OTHER

1. ADA paved/hardened opportunities from the proposed Turner Propane tank farm to the meadows/Hidden Lake
2. Recognize birding area near The Bluffs





**Summer Opportunity Zone Exercise
Group 4 Notes
Submitted 6/26/09**

Panorama Dome Area: This area has excellent existing biking trails and potential for more. The soils in this area are the best around for bike trails; they are actually real dirt and not loose pumice or jumbled rocks. The trails in the area would be open to multi-use.

Sherwins Access Trail: Currently there is only a use trail accessing the Sherwins Ridge area. This area has great hiking potential because it is the easiest way to access the top of the ridge. It would be good to have a formal trail instead of the current use trail.

Mammoth Rock Trail: This is a great multi-use trail. It is important because it connects Mammoth Mountain Ski Area (MMSA) to the south portion of Mammoth Lakes. It is also a great multi-use trail. Currently, it isn't possible to access the meadow area from the Mammoth Rock Trail. There is potential to create multi-use connections from the Mammoth Rock Trail down into the meadow area. Currently the easternmost portion of the Mammoth Rock Trail is very sandy and not the most enjoyable on a bike; it would be great to have an alternate bike portion on the east side.

There was also interest from some in our group to see a connector trail from the Mammoth Rock Trail to the south up to the top of the Sherwins. The access trail would include at least hiking and possibly biking.

Mammoth Meadow (off the end of Tamarack Street): This area was seen as a great location for hiking and dog walking. There are currently several trails around the meadow. There is abundant wildlife and a peaceful and serene environment. Would like to see this area remain non-motorized; also, a small parking area off the end of Tamarack Street for non-motorized use.

Motocross Track: Currently motorized use is allowed on the track only during the annual Mammoth Motocross event (approximately 10 days). Could this be allowed all summer? Also, behind the motocross track are some old mining roads. The roads are outside of the study area, but access to these old roads occurs through the area. Potential for mountain bike and hiking trails.

Sherwin Lakes Trailhead: Important trailhead for hiking.





Mammoth Creek: Fishing access is an important use along the banks of Mammoth Creek throughout the study area.

Tank Farm/Gravel Pit: This area would make a great parking/staging area. The area surrounding the tank farm is currently used by people walking their dogs off-leash. It would be good to keep this area as an off-leash spot for dog walkers. Also, there was some interest in putting a BMX track in the area near the parking lot. The lack of water could be an issue, though.

In general, we discussed the use of motorized vehicles to the east of the parking area and non-motorized use to the west of the parking area. The meadow areas to the west of the parking area are more environmentally sensitive areas and therefore should remain non-motorized. Most of the motorized use currently is to the east of the parking lot. There are many existing roads that OHV users currently utilize between Sherwin Creek Road and Mammoth Creek.

A future use that we would like to see is a continuation of the bike path from Old Mammoth Road along Sherwin Creek Road to the gravel pit, then along the southern portion of the Snowcreek VIII and Snowcreek V property to the end of Tamarack Street. This would allow access from the Old Mammoth portion of town to the eastern portion of town without having to utilize Old Mammoth Road. This path would also be a great spot for an ADA-accessible trail for disabled folks as well as parents with strollers, etc.

There were not any equestrian people represented in our group. We do recognize the need for equestrian access to the meadow and areas around Mammoth Creek.





**Summer Activity Zones
Sherwins Area
Proposal by Team #2
(Submitted 6/22/09)**

In order to accommodate as many outdoor recreation activities as possible while considering their various degrees of mutual compatibility as well as their environmental impact in the respective areas, we suggest establishing three opportunity zones:

- 1) The first zone would be for **mixed use, inclusive of motorized use**. This would accommodate practically all activities listed in the handout as amended at the 6/16/09 meeting. We find that this zone can most appropriately be placed in the area east of a north-south line that is east of the proposed Turner Propane tank farm and south of Sherwin Creek Road.
- 2) The second zone would be for **all non-motorized use, inclusive of mechanical use such as biking (i.e., all listed activities other than motorized ones)**. This zone would consist of two parts: The first part would be the area north of Sherwin Creek Road, which is currently used for equestrian purposes in particular. The second part would be the area south of and including Mammoth Rock Trail, as well as the area west of Old Mammoth Road
- 3) The third zone would be **limited to non-mechanized use** and consist of the most environmentally sensitive area: the meadow itself. This zone will be available for equestrian use, hiking, pet walking (off leash), running, and study and preservation of fauna and flora. This zone will consist of the area north of Mammoth Rock Trail and west of a north-south line that is east of the proposed Turner Propane tank farm, ending at Old Mammoth Road.

We envision a main staging area at the proposed Turner Propane tank farm as well as trailhead parking for non-mechanized use at the end of Tamarack Street and at the proposed Snowcreek VIII hotel.

Once a consensus is reached regarding the zones, more detailed decision-making must be addressed as to specific trails, consolidation and restoration of existing ones, and establishment of new ones—for instance, south of Mammoth Rock Trail and a switchback connector from the meadow to Mammoth Rock. It must also take into consideration improved access to trails less accessible today, several of which have historical interest.





**Sherwins Working Group
Meeting #3 (July 14, 2009, 4–7 p.m.)
Sierra Meadows Ranch (Old Sherwin’s Restaurant)**

DRAFT SUMMARY

4:00–4:10 **Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping:** Mr. McNerny introduced himself as the Sherwins Working Group (SWG) facilitator. He asked participants to introduce themselves and to note any group affiliations and/or special interests they have in the study area.

- **Review of overall process status/progress:** Mr. McNerny stated that this particular meeting would focus on map work. It is the third of six community-based meetings to develop a recreation alternative for the Sherwins area. He suggested that the only way this group will have its proposal done by October is for the SWG participants to break into smaller working groups to complete a number of tasks between now and the next meeting, scheduled for August 11.
- **Web site/process blog update:** Mr. McNerny noted that the blog has been made available but that there has been little activity. He encouraged the participants to use the blog to set up between-meeting sessions, field trips, and other get-togethers.

Mr. McNerny reviewed the meeting agenda with the group and spoke briefly about the SWG process, goals, and expectations. The purpose of the SWG is to brainstorm, share different needs and desires, and then come to consensus on a proposal that the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) will take through the environmental review process. Group work has been divided into summer and winter conditions as a means of achieving clear decisions. During Meeting #2 the four sub-groups did a lot of work on Summer Opportunity Zones; the new maps (both small versions on tables and large versions on easels) represent the outcomes of these efforts as interpreted in GIS by Jon Kazmierski (USFS staff). The outdoor-recreation activities list also has been updated from the previous meeting’s notes. The numbers on the maps correspond to the constraints from the Opportunities & Constraints document on each table (opportunities were left off of the maps for visual clarity). The master legend document is the key for all maps.

In the following exercise each group will review the winter base maps and build upon them to create a first draft of Winter Opportunity Zones. Each group will choose a reporter to present their findings to the larger group. Participants may stay with the groups they formed in the previous meeting or create new ones. The updated Summer Opportunity Zones maps will be reviewed next. At the end of this meeting the group will discuss next steps in anticipation of the last three meetings. After this evening the pressure will be on participants to move from general concepts to refined specifics (trail types, etc.). Once volunteers have been selected to carry out the between-meeting work, they will set one meeting for next week to





focus on representation/treatment of specific uses (such as mountain biking, as displayed on the map developed by Clayton Mendel, shown). The following week's meetings will be focused on representatives from these smaller groups blending those uses into maps that can be presented at the August meeting. The trail-types document on each table is derived from the Trail System Master Plan Design Guidelines and will assist participants with planning facility and trail details in the future.

4:10–4:15 Meeting #2 Summary and Charter Adoption

- **Review and adoption of Meeting #2 Draft Summary:** To allow additional time for participants to review the summary, this task was deferred to the next meeting. Mr. McInerny reminded the group that the final, adopted version of the summary will be available on the SWG Web page and that materials are sent out in advance to allow review prior to the meetings.
- **Recirculation of Working Group Charter signature page:** Mr. McInerny briefly explained the significance of the Charter for the benefit of new participants and noted that the signature page from the previous meeting had gone missing. A replacement signature page was circulated and signed by group members.

4:15–4:25 Planning and Decision Criteria for Evaluating Options Within Opportunity Zones

- **Review of comments received on draft criteria:** Mr. McInerny reported that only two participants had provided feedback on the draft criteria presented at the previous meeting. No further comments were made; the document will be reviewed in more detail at the August meeting.
- **Discussion and development of refined criteria and proposal evaluation mechanism:** Tabled to August meeting.
- **Revised criteria to be distributed after meeting for further review and use by small groups:** Mr. McInerny asked the group to review the criteria document and submit any comments to him or to Kim Stravers by July 30.

4:25–5:45 Opportunity Zone Delineation: Winter: Having explained the mechanics of this exercise in his opening remarks, Mr. McInerny asked the group to break into smaller subsets and begin drafting Winter Opportunity Zones, paying careful attention to providing rationales for decisions. SWG Partners mixed with the three groups to help move the activity along.

- **Clarification regarding intent and purpose of opportunity zones. Need for broad thinking in terms of both activity scope (opportunity zones vs. specific trails) and uses (what's best for the area and its users as a whole vs. focus on one's preferred activity and taking measures/forming options designed to protect them):** Mr. McInerny stressed the importance of working in a zone-based, rather than solution-based, manner at this time.





- **Report from small groups who worked between meetings on Winter Opportunity Zone map:** Mr. McNerny reported that at least two groups had met after the June meeting to work on winter concepts. Though a formal report was not given, those participants were encouraged to share their findings and ideas with their current Winter Opportunity Zone groups.
- **Following report-outs, small groups to form and use time to build upon or create new concepts for winter zones:** Reporters from each group presented their concepts to the larger group. SWG Partners provided feedback for each group's presentation. See "SWG_Mtg 3_Winter OZ Notes_Group Comp_rev.pdf" for summaries of these presentations.

5:45–6:40

Opportunity Zone Delineation: Summer: Mr. McNerny asked the group to form four groups rather than three and to continue the exercise with the summer maps, which have been revised from the previous meeting's group work. Participants were asked to either add to these new maps or to revise them.

- **Report from small groups who worked between meetings on Summer Opportunity Zone map:** Mr. McNerny reported that some participants met after the June meeting to refine the summer concepts. Though a formal report was not given, those participants were encouraged to share their findings and ideas with their current Summer Opportunity Zone groups.
- **Following report-outs, small groups to form and use time to begin reviewing various opportunity zone proposals and developing "blended" map. Intent is to develop proposal that could serve as base for map for proposed recreation features within study area.**
Remember: Not everyone will get everything they want; need to begin thinking, proposing, and evaluating with this "selflessness" in mind: Reporters from each group presented their concepts to the larger group. SWG Partners provided feedback for each group's presentation. See "SWG_Mtg 3_Summer OZ Notes_Group Comp_rev.pdf" for summaries of these presentations.

6:40–6:55

Activities Prior to Meeting #4

- **Schedule potential site visits (who, when, where):** Mr. McNerny again encouraged the group to use the blog to set up between-meeting field trips. He reported that Clayton Mendel went on a field trip to the Solitude Canyon area with a few other participants before this meeting, with GPS units, to work on summer mountain-bike opportunities. These concepts were inputted into Google Earth and then exported into a file usable by Jon Kazmierski in GIS. Mr. Mendel presented a large map printed from this file





and briefly explained a few key features, such as a “High Pass Trail” connecting to the Lakes Basin. Mr. McNerny stressed that this map of desired mountain bike trails was being shared as an example of how various proposals could be shown on maps for discussion with the full group and that it was not intended to represent what the full Working Group desires at this time.

- **Identify small group of volunteers to meet to refine Opportunity Zones for summer and winter based on opportunity and constraint data and, if possible, apply criteria to their proposal:** Mr. McNerny explained that the goal is to create maps identifying refined Opportunity Zones for both seasons that take into account identified opportunity and constraint data and concerns raised by all groups and begins identifying possible recreational features appropriate to the various zones. The volunteer work team will describe how their refined proposals provide for the stated needs of the various recreational interests. Work will be presented at the August 11 meeting and will serve as the basis for developing proposed “on-the-ground” recreational features (trails, access points, etc.). USFS and MLTPA staff is available to assist with this effort. These proposals, once reviewed and approved by the larger group at the August meeting, will be made public for community feedback that will be considered at Meeting #5 in September in anticipation of preparing a final proposal for Meeting #6, also in September. Mr. McNerny and select participants set two meetings for the following week—Tuesday, July 21, and Wednesday, July 22, from 5–7 p.m. at the USFS Mammoth Ranger Station Conference Room—and volunteers indicated their meeting preference on a sign-up sheet. The meeting(s) to be held the week of July 26 will be determined at these initial meetings. Ms. Stravers promised to e-mail to the group the Meeting #3 Draft Summary and a compilation of tonight’s group notes before July 21.

6:55–7:00




Meeting Wrap-Up

- **Review of what has been decided:** Maps and descriptions of identified Summer and Winter Opportunity Zones will be distributed shortly after Meeting #3. Breakout groups will meet July 21 and 22 and again the following week (see above).
- **Next steps/meeting schedule:** Ms. Stravers reminded the group that the next meeting is set for Tuesday, August 11, from 4–7 p.m. and will be held in the Ellie Randol Reading Room of the Mammoth Lakes Library.







Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #3 Sign-In Sheet (07/14/09)






MTG.
#3

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Brent	Allen	Eastern Sierra 4WD Club	
John	Armstrong	Eastside Velo (President)	
Jim	Barnes		
Pete	Beck		
Phyllis	Benham		
Brigitte	Berman	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Secretary)	
Ryan	Berry		
Rachel	Bowman	Mammoth Base Camp at Sierra Meadows Ranch (owner)	
Lesley	Bruns		
Jon	Carlton		
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	
Sharon	Clark		
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	
Stacey	Crockett	High Sierra Equestrian Club	
Forrest	Cross	ESAC	
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area Mountain Bike Organization (MAMBO)	
Alex	Fabbro	395 Fat Tire Council	
Ali	Feinberg		
Karen	Ferrell-Ingram	Eastern Sierra Land Trust	
Dave	Geirman	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Nate	Greenberg		
Jennifer	Heintzelman		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #3 Sign-In Sheet (07/14/09)**

Thom	Heller	Mammoth Lakes Fire Protection District	
Mark	Hendrickson	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Zach	Hickman		
April	Holly		
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	
Doug	Jung	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Andrew	Kastor	High Sierra Striders (president)	
Martin	Kleinbard		
Kraig	Kupiec		
Chad	Lande	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jesse	Langley	Cardinal Investments (The Sherwin)	
Dave	Laverty	Triad/Holmes Associates	
Julien	Lecorps		
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	
Hans	Ludwig		
Ron	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	
Mike	McKenna	Hot Creek Hatchery Foundation (Board member)	
Chuck	Megivern		
Clayton	Mendel		
Marshall	Minobe	Mobility Commission	
Andrew	Murphy		
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	
Tammy	Nguyen	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jennifer	Noerdlinger		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #3 Sign-In Sheet (07/14/09)**

Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	
Marge	Papp	Turner Propane	
Rebecca	Paranick- Poiset	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
J.	Parsons		
Terry	Plum	Tamarack Street homeowner/area property owner	
Monica	Prelle		
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Cory	Rice	Wave Rave Snowboard Shop	
Jennifer	Roeser	McGee Creek Pack Station	
Brandon	Russell		
Bill	Sausser	Mammoth Snowmobile Association/TOML Tourism & Recreation Commission	
Patty	Schwartzkopf	Tamarack Street homeowner	
Steve	Schwind		
Elaine	Smith	High Sierra Striders	
Jim	Smith	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
Joel	St. Marie		
Barbara	Stefanides		
Dave	Stefanides		
Autumn	Talsky	Mammoth Mountaineering Supply/Alpine Approach	
Bill	Taylor		
John	Teller		
Tim	Villanueva	Bardini Foundation	

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #3 Sign-In Sheet (07/14/09)**

John	Walter	Advocates for Mammoth	
Chris	Walters		
Jon	Watson	Far West Ski Association	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	
Gene	Zeiner		
PARTNERS			
Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	
Jonathan	Cook-Fisher	USFS: Mammoth and Mono Basin Winter Sports Specialist	
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	
Austin	McInerney	Center for Collaborative Planning	
Danna	Stroud	TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director	
Steve	Speidel	TOML: Principal Planner	
Mark	Wardlaw	TOML: Community Development Department Director	
Jen	Daugherty	TOML: Assistant Planner	
Jim	Miller	Turner Propane	
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	

POST MGA 3 VOLUNTEERS

5-7 pm

conference room

NAME

PHONE

7/21

Alana Levin 760.717.0176
 Stacy Corless 760 980 0190
 MAGGIE PALCHAK 760 793-3023
 LESLEY BRUNS 760 934 0190
 Mark Paw 760 34 1674
 GREG NORBY 530-510-3516

Alana@highSierraTri.org
 mpalchak@disabledsports.com
 lestravel@hotmail.com
 MinbiLemay@earthlink.net
 GREGNORBY@GMAIL.COM

7/22

Malcolm Clark 760-924-5639
 CLAYTON MENDEL 760-793-7131
 Hans Ludwig 793 5612
 (also avail for 7/21)
 Chuck Megivern 807 598 4358

WITALCOLLYN.CLARK@GMAIL.COM
 CWMENDEL@GMAIL.COM
 hansludwig@gmail.com
 cmegivern@gmail.com

* Need to consult calendar will be @ 1 meeting or more
 Dave Neal (260)914-0465



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0025.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0105.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0155.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0752.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0186.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0256.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0305.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0327.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0337.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0355.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0367.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0526.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0534.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0919.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0596.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0892.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0663.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_07_14_mtng03_0959.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

Volunteer Work Group #1, Meeting #1 July 21, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting summary
2. Sign-in sheet



Sherwins Working Group Volunteer Work Group Meeting #1
Tuesday, July 21, 2009
5 p.m. to 7 p.m.
Mammoth Ranger Station Conference Room

USFS staff Mike Schlafmann (facilitator) and Jon Kazmierski (mapping/data support) led the meeting. Kim Stravers (MLTPA) recorded the following notes.

Participants:

- Lesley Bruns
- Mark Davis
- Alana Levin
- Dave Neal
- Maggie Palchak
- Doug Will
- Stephanie Wolff

Mr. Schlafmann distributed the compiled group map notes from the previous full Sherwins Working Group (SWG) meeting on July 14 and asked the participants to review them, noting that the purpose of this Volunteer Work Group effort is to meld the maps and narratives created by those sub-groups into a combined proposal with rationales—a “reconciliation of differences”—for each season. The full SWG will consider the Volunteer Work Group’s summer and winter proposals at the August 11 meeting. Mr. Schlafmann also distributed the Trail System Master Plan Trail Types document, explaining that this will guide the group in determining specific amenities for each seasonal proposal.

The group began with the winter conditions map, focusing on the opportunity zones first. The compiled notes were not revisited in detail, but served more as a checklist for the group’s discussion and work.

Specific recommendations:

1. **Separation of use:** OSV and non-motorized use should be separated. Separation should be attractive to both groups (ease of use). The moraine that comes around the east side of the borrow pit is a good natural boundary (see map); however, there is significant concern that using this as a delineator will not adequately address the OSV community’s desires and needs. Any one use cannot negatively impact another user group’s enjoyment of the area. It was noted that this area is a unique backcountry ski amenity, while better opportunities for OSV may exist elsewhere, outside the study area.





2. **Motorized (OSV) staging area:** Separation to accommodate OSV trailering and use may occur farther along Sherwin Creek Road or at the trailhead planned at the borrow pit (see Recommendation 6).
 - Motorized OSV route out Sherwin Creek Road to the east (winter trail type 4, shared multi-use)
3. **Stacked-loop non-motorized trail system:** The group agreed on a system with multiple connections to identified access points (see Recommendation 4). The main trail follows this path, roughly: from the borrow pit trailhead along existing summertime roads; a small connector brings you to the ditch; follow the perimeter of the meadow to the private property line (Snowcreek) and follow this boundary back to the trailhead (winter trail type 3, groomed with winter trail type 2 adjacent/parallel). There are several opportunities to bridge over and create a series of smaller loops (winter trail type 3, groomed, with winter trail type 2 adjacent/parallel). The system will be groomed to encourage use (more accessibility/ease of use) and will be open to dogs, cross-country skiers, hikers, and snowshoers. There was some discussion about Nordic-only loops. This would be designated “off-leash” but animals must be under radio or voice control. Facilities will be placed along the trail at access-point intersections to assist with compliance (trashcans, poop-bag dispensers, signage with public information about pet cleanup and obedience). There was discussion of avalanche hazards around Hidden Lake, but the group agreed that a groomed trail may still be feasible in this area. After discussion, a groomed trail connecting the meadow to the staging area at the Old Mammoth Road winter closure (see Recommendation 8) was deemed impractical due to the steepness of the slope on the south side of The Bluffs and private property access on the north side of The Bluffs.
4. **Access points:** The group identified the following access points, to be incorporated into the system described above: Tamarack Street; Ranch Road public easement; Snowcreek VIII. Connectivity to future Snowcreek VIII cross-country ski trails is an ongoing consideration.
5. **Snowplay area:** Situate the snowplay area at the moraine that is nearest the borrow pit trailhead. This area is ideal because of slope, terrain, and aspect (north-facing). Parking should be very close to this area to accommodate use by families with small children.
6. **Non-motorized staging area at borrow pit:** In order to accommodate snowplay as described in Recommendation 5, non-motorized parking should be at the southern end of the borrow pit. Such an arrangement could allow the other half of the trailhead parking area to be designated for OSV users and include a turnaround or other OSV-specific parking features.
7. **Facilities:** Facilities to be installed at the borrow pit trailhead include bathrooms, an interpretive area, and a beacon basin.
8. **Trailhead at Old Mammoth Road winter closure:** The group agreed that the existing closure location is appropriate to house a non-motorized staging area. The parking must be expanded to 10 to 15 spots to accommodate increasing use. The group agreed that a





bathroom would be desirable at this location, but that it should be equally accessible to summer and winter users; the specific location therefore requires further consideration.

9. **Connection from Old Mammoth Road trailhead to meadow:** Due to slope angle, it is not feasible to groom such a connector, but it may be treated as a blue diamond trail (ungroomed with signage only). This is a non-motorized trail.
 - Winter trail type 3 or type 2.
10. **Grooming on Old Mammoth Road to Lakes Basin:** A connector should be groomed from the staging area on Old Mammoth Road to the road's intersection with Lake Mary Road, following the existing road alignment and open only to non-motorized users.
 - Winter trail type 3 or type 2
11. **Nordic-only area:** A Nordic skiing-only area can be designated beginning north of Sherwin Creek Road and extending to the TOML Main Path near Cerro Coso Community College. If snow conditions and resources allow, a Nordic track may be set.
 - Winter trail type 3, groomed
12. **Kite-skiing/kite-boarding:** This use can be accommodated northwest of the borrow pit staging area, on the golf course, if Snowcreek allows it.
13. **Public transit to trailheads:** A trolley/bus stop should be added at the Old Mammoth Road trailhead; the road must be widened to accommodate this. Other trolley/bus stops should be added at the borrow pit staging area and at the Snowcreek VIII hotel. The group agreed that this recommendation requires additional discussion.
14. **Signage:** A signage and wayfinding system should exist throughout the study area, including educational and interpretive opportunities.

Additional Notes:

Winter biathlon zone: This may be better accommodated at Shady Rest or in the Lakes Basin, but will be tracked.

The group agreed to reconvene Tuesday, July 28, from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the Mammoth Ranger Station Conference Room to draft a summer map.



Group # 1

Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:

Meeting # 3 Sign-In Sheet (07/14/09) VOLUNTEER WORK GROUP MEETING # 1

July 21, 2009

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Lesley	Bruns		<i>Lesley Bruns</i>
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range	
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo	
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area	<i>Mark Davis</i>
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	<i>Alana Levin</i>
Hans	Ludwig		
Bob	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	
Chuck	Megivern		
Clayton	Mendel		
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	<i>Dave Neal</i>
Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	<i>Maggie Palchak</i>
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	<i>Douglas Will</i>
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	<i>Stephanie A Wolff</i>
PARTNERS			
Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	FACILITATOR
Jonathan	Cook-Fisher	USFS: Mammoth and Mono Basin Winter Sports Specialist	
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	

JON KAZMIERSKI: USFS : DATA/MAPPING ✓

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #3 Sign-In Sheet (07/14/09)**

Danna	Stroud	TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director	
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	

Volunteer Work Group #2, Meeting #1

July 22, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting summary
2. Sign-in sheet



**Sherwins Working Group Volunteer Work Group Meeting #2
Wednesday, July 22, 2009
5 p.m. to 7 p.m.
Mammoth Ranger Station Conference Room**

USFS staff Matt Peterson (facilitator) and Jon Kazmierski (mapping/data support) led the meeting. Kim Stravers (MLTPA) recorded the following notes.

Participants:

- Malcolm Clark
- Stacy Corless
- Henning Jensen
- Hans Ludwig
- Chuck Megivern
- Clayton Mendel
- Greg Norby
- Mary K. Prentice

Mr. Peterson provided the following outline to the group to guide the evening's work:

- Goal
 - A proposal
 - Map
 - Rationale
- Agenda/process
 - Intros
 - Review maps
 - Work on map
 - General zones
 - Specific features
 - What?
 - Where?
 - Why?

Mr. Peterson explained that the purpose of this Volunteer Work Group effort is to meld the maps and narratives created by the sub-groups formed in the previous full Sherwins Working Group (SWG) meeting into a combined proposal, with rationales, for each season. The full SWG will consider the Volunteer Work Group's summer and winter proposals at the August 11 meeting.





Participants introduced themselves to one another and re-formed the three sub-groups that created the previous meeting's Winter Opportunity Zones map work. Mr. Peterson asked each group to review their map and related narratives so that they could provide a quick overview to the larger group. The full group would then compare their notes and maps to find commonalities that will help them to draft the combined proposal.

Group 2 map review highlights:

- Develop winter closure on Old Mammoth Road as a trailhead with parking, signs, and possible restrooms and ADA facilities; this accommodates existing and potential future uses and diffuses use from the main staging area at the borrow pit.
- Develop a connector from the meadow to the Old Mammoth Road trailhead; it doesn't have to be groomed, but should be signed.
- Create a trail from the meadow to the Lakes Basin to tie into Tamarack Ski Center and other opportunities; this may incorporate the connector described above.
- Delineate motorized/non-motorized use: boundary drawn north to south, approximately from the borrow pit; motorized to the east and non-motorized to the west.
- Develop the borrow pit area as a major trailhead with parking, restrooms, and a beacon basin; needs to accommodate all users (OSV trailers, etc.)
- Develop trailhead signage to explain conditions and uses and offer other educational opportunities at Lake Mary Road, the Old Mammoth Road closure, and the borrow pit, as well as in the meadow and along the primary hiking route on Sherwin Ridge.
- Allow off-leash dog-walking to the east of Sherwin Creek Road. Concerns about possible OSV conflict noted.
- Opportunity exists to create more groomed cross-country ski trail system that ties into the proposed cross-country ski area within Snowcreek VIII.
- Situate the snowplay area at the borrow pit trailhead; snow removed from plowing might be incorporated into sculpting features.
- Develop a groomed trail connecting the borrow pit to Mammoth Creek Park at the bridge.
- Develop a groomed path from the meadow to the borrow pit, which could possibly contribute to a non-motorized loop with groomed connectors into Snowcreek VIII, the Ranch Road public easement, Tamarack Street, etc.; this would enable Mammoth Creek Park to be used as a secondary staging area for snowshoers, cross-country skiers, and other non-motorized users.

Group 1 map review highlights:

- Recommendations were very similar to Group 2's.
- Delineate motorized and non-motorized uses; Nordic trails with OSV are incompatible uses, so the southeast section of the study area would be motorized. Create a buffer zone between the two areas to reduce conflict/impact on quality of experience.
- Develop a connector to facilitate backcountry skiers' egress at the Ranch Road public easement.





- Grooming for Nordic skiing is possible in the non-motorized zone; consider aligning trails with golf-cart paths and other summer trail alignments.
- Develop a trailhead at the borrow pit, with parking.
- Consider situating the snowplay area at the borrow pit; use the plowed snow to sculpt features, as snowpack can be thin in this area.
- Develop a trailhead at the Old Mammoth Road closure with facilities (parking, etc.); both water and wastewater lines are currently situated nearby, which could be made available for facilities depending on discussions with Mammoth Community Water District and other agencies.
- Ensure connectivity into Snowcreek VIII and Snowcreek V via both trails and public transit.

Group 3 map review highlights:

- Recommendations were similar to Group 1 and Group 2, especially with regard to access/egress points and trailheads/staging areas.
- Separation of motorized and non-motorized use is critical; a specific boundary alignment was not suggested.
- Develop a separate motorized staging area (OSV use) farther east on Sherwin Creek Road to avoid congestion and use conflict with non-motorized parking.
- Consider a designated kite-boarding zone in the current driving range area.
- Preserve Solitude Canyon for motorized use.
- Consider Snowcreek V OSV access; previously requested access to the Lakes Basin is not feasible due to permitting (typical April 15 opening date for OSV use) and snowpack.

Volunteer Work Group #2 Specific Recommendations:

1. **Non-motorized staging area at the borrow pit:** Develop a major trailhead at the borrow pit. Facilities will include parking, bathrooms, signage, and a beacon basin/education space.
2. **Motorized staging area beyond the borrow pit:** Develop a separate, OSV-specific staging area farther down Sherwin Creek Road, past the non-motorized staging area, to reduce or eliminate use conflict and to provide OSV-specific facilities (a graded turnaround at the end of the lot might be desirable, for example). Facilities will be limited to signage; users will access the additional facilities at the main, non-motorized staging area.
3. **Motorized/non-motorized boundary:** Delineate motorized and non-motorized use with a boundary that runs north to south, aligned with the main staging area at the borrow pit. The motorized area should include access to the motocross track area and to Solitude Canyon. Inclusion of the Tele Bowl area needs further discussion.
4. **Snowplay area:** Situate the snowplay area on the moraine close to the borrow pit; the aspect is north/northwest, which helps retain snow, and the area is large





- enough to accommodate potential increased future use. This site is also close enough to and visible from the trailhead parking lot, which will encourage use by families. This location may be less than ideal, but seems to offer the best opportunity so far. Parking lot and facilities in Recommendation 1 above could be situated at the base of the moraine to decrease distance from play area to parking.
5. **Off-leash dog area:** Designate a zone that is north of Sherwin Creek Road and east of the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) stables. Staging areas/trailheads and other developed or use-designated areas are leash-on. This area is close enough to the parking lot to facilitate quick and easy use by dog owners. Other off-leash areas may be considered later.
 6. **Non-motorized staging area at end of Tamarack Street:** Develop a secondary trailhead that facilitates current/neighborhood use. Facilities will be limited to parking (six to eight vehicles) and signage, and there will be no grooming. Terry Plum's development application will impact facilities.
 7. **Access/egress at Ranch Road public easement:** Present appropriate signage to guide backcountry skiers and snowboarders to the public easement for Sherwins egress. This area is possibly seasonal (winter only).
 8. **Non-motorized staging area at Old Mammoth Road closure:** Develop a staging area that will be secondary to the major trailhead at the borrow pit. The area is smaller, but will take pressure off of existing parking at the Lakes Basin. Facilities will include signage, parking, and bathrooms.
 9. **Non-motorized staging area at Lake Mary Road winter closure:** Develop a secondary staging area east of Lake Mary Road, above the bridge, that will relieve existing pressure on Lake Mary Road parking for Sherwins and Tamarack Ski Center access. Facilities will be limited to signage.
 10. **Improved trail to the Sherwins from Lake Mary Road:** Develop a simple system trail to make a visible, guided connection. Currently there is only a use trail (not officially recognized, not maintained), which is causing erosion to the slope as well as damage to sensitive soils on plateau. Signage will be needed at the trail access point.
 - Winter trail type 1, with no winter maintenance.
 11. **Access/egress point from Snowcreek VIII:** Formalize access/egress point proposed near the flagship hotel as identified in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan by placing signage, as there are 20 public parking spots planned for the site as well as a public transit stop.
 12. **Snowplay area near Snowcreek VIII:** Consider situating the a snowplay area here as an alterative to the borrow pit location, as it is also on a moraine, is more north-facing/has better snow than the other location, and is near the flagship hotel and proposed access/egress point, which may facilitate use by guests and other visitors. Another possibility is to determine if Snowcreek is amenable to a designated snowplay area on the golf course; it has potential to bring additional





customers to their development, and snowplay on grass would require less snow than snowplay over sagebrush.

13. **Ungroomed half-loop trail:** Articulate an ungroomed half-loop trail from the borrow pit trailhead along the base of the Sherwins to the Tamarack Street trailhead, where it will connect with the groomed half-loop described in Recommendation 14 to form a closed loop.
 - Winter trail type 2 (preferred Nordic, but snowshoeing and hiking allowed), no winter maintenance.
14. **Groomed half-loop trail:** Develop a groomed half-loop trail (corduroy, but no Nordic track) that connects the access points from Tamarack Street to the borrow pit, with spurs to Snowcreek VIII, the Ranch Road public easement, and other access/egress points as described above. Will connect to the ungroomed half-loop described in Recommendation 13 to form a closed loop. Align over summer-use trail to reduce impact. Possibility to subcontract with Snowcreek for grooming services since they will already be grooming in the area.
 - Winter trail type 2 (preferred Nordic use with no Nordic track, but snowshoeing and hiking allowed), groomed.
15. **Grooming on Old Mammoth Road:** Groom over existing road alignment from the Old Mammoth Road winter closure trailhead to the intersection of Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road. Possibility to work with Tamarack Lodge for grooming since it connects with the Tamarack groomed system.
 - Winter trail type 3, groomed.
16. **Groomed Sherwins egress trail:** Articulate proper Sherwins egress from the east side of Hidden Lake to the Ranch Road public easement via a groomed path. Purpose is to provide direction to backcountry skiers coming off of the Sherwins and to ensure use of egress rather than walking through neighborhoods.
 - Winter trail type 2 (preferred Nordic), groomed
17. **Ungroomed connector from meadow to Old Mammoth Road winter closure trailhead:** Articulate an ungroomed connector between these two points with signage; will be aligned with summer-use trail.
 - Winter trail type 1, no winter maintenance.
18. **Groomed connector from borrow pit to Mammoth Creek Park at bridge:** Develop a groomed (corduroy, but no Nordic track) connector between these two points that goes through the off-leash dog area described in Recommendation 5 and around the USFS stables. This will facilitate use of Mammoth Creek Park as an alternative non-motorized staging area and provide a compacted surface for dog-walkers.
 - Winter trail type 2 (preferred snowshoe/hiking, but Nordic allowed), groomed.





The group agreed to meet Wednesday, July 29, from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. at the Mammoth Ranger Station Conference Room to draft the summer map proposal. Group members may instead meet with Group #1 on Tuesday, July 28, from 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. if this date and time won't work for them.



Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Breakout Meeting ~~#1~~ Sign-In Sheet (07/22/09)

Group #2

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Lesley	Bruns		
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range	<i>Malcolm Clark</i>
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo	<i>Stacy Corless</i>
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area	
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	<i>Henning Jensen</i>
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	
Hans	Ludwig		
Ren	Majumdar	Mammoth Powersports	
Chuck	Megivern		<i>Chuck Megivern</i>
Clayton	Mendel		<i>Clayton Mendel</i>
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	
Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	<i>Greg Norby</i>
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	<i>MK Prentice</i>
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	
PARTNERS			
Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	
Jonathan	Cook-Fisher	USFS: Mammoth and Mono Basin Winter Sports Specialist	
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	<i>MP</i>
Danna	Stroud	TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director	
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	<i>Kimberly Stravers</i>

Jon KAZMIERSKI : USFS : DATA/MAPPING ✓

Volunteer Work Group #1, Meeting #2

July 28, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting summary
2. Sign-in sheet



**Sherwins Working Group Volunteer Work Group #1 Follow-Up Meeting
Tuesday, July 28, 2009
5 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
Mammoth Ranger Station Conference Room**

USFS staff Jonathan Cook-Fisher (facilitator) and Jon Kazmierski (mapping/data support) led the meeting. Kim Stravers (MLTPA) recorded the following notes.

Participants:

- Lesley Bruns
- Malcolm Clark
- Mark Davis
- Maggie Palchak
- Doug Will

Mr. Cook-Fisher introduced himself and asked the group members to introduce themselves, share how long they've been in Mammoth, and identify their main recreation interests in the study area. He then outlined the evening for the group, stating that they would first review the four summer maps from the previous Sherwins Working Group (SWG) full meeting and then develop a proposal to take to the full group at the August 11 meeting. He emphasized that the participants will drive the process and that the USFS is present for support.

The group reviewed small, handout versions of the four Summer Opportunities & Constraints maps developed at the July SWG meeting, with the intent of incorporating select recommendations into one map. Mr. Kazmierski noted that the accompanying narratives also should be reviewed to ensure that issues not appearing on the maps are addressed. The group had a brief discussion about process and methodology, agreeing that thus far the groups in previous meetings have produced a mix of opportunity zones and specific recommendations in their proposals. The group agreed to the following points:

- Connectivity is a critical issue, as is separation of uses.
- The summertime definition of "motorized" is "restricted to existing roads and trails."
- The definition of "non-mechanized" is "no mountain biking."
- "Non-motorized" will include mountain biking unless otherwise indicated.
- Summer-use trails and winter-use trails (as developed at the previous Volunteer Work Group meeting) should be aligned to facilitate grooming, find efficiencies with signage and wayfinding, and minimize environmental impact.

Specific recommendations:





1. **Non-motorized trail along Mammoth Creek:** Consolidate multiple use trails/rehabilitate existing informal trails into one system trail to create one multi-use non-motorized opportunities (fishermen, walkers, etc.) along Mammoth Creek. The trail, which should be native-surface, will begin from the south side of Mammoth Creek Park, heading east toward Sierra Meadows Ranch and beyond. It was not determined along which bank of creek the trail should run. The trail should accommodate non-mechanized use only with the exception of bicycle access from Mammoth Creek Park to the Hayden Cabin. This trail mitigates existing trail proliferation and environmental impact and provides connectivity for bicycles from the park to a point of historical interest.
 - **Summer Trail Type 2 (preferred equestrian/preferred hiking)**
2. **Non-motorized connector to Shady Rest:** A non-motorized trail connector should be developed from the borrow pit staging area (see Recommendation 3) to Shady Rest. It would run adjacent to Sherwin Creek Road down to Sherwin Creek Campground, then east to the footbridge and northwest toward Mammoth Community Water District and Shady Rest. Both the crossing at Highway 203 and the side of Sherwin Creek Road on which the trail will be aligned have yet to be determined. This trail achieves connectivity between two heavily used recreation areas without forcing users onto Old Mammoth Road.
 - **Summer Trail Type 3 (shared non-motorized)**
3. **Non-motorized staging area at borrow pit:** A formal staging area should be constructed at the borrow pit, as described in the winter proposal. Non-motorized parking should follow the winter configuration and be sited at the southern end of the borrow pit. Such an arrangement could allow the other half of the trailhead parking area to be designated for OHV users and include a turnaround or other OHV-specific parking features. Facilities to be installed at the borrow pit trailhead include bathrooms and an interpretive area.
4. **ADA-accessible backbone trail:** A soft-surface “backbone” trail that is ADA-accessible should be constructed to depart from an appropriately designed access point at the borrow pit staging area. The trail will either mimic the alignment of the “stacked-loop system” described in the winter proposal, or simply connect the east end of the meadow to the west. More discussion is needed.
 - **Summer Trail Type: TBD; partial paving possible**
 - a. **Alternative ADA access at Tamarack Street staging area:** In addition to or in place of an ADA-accessible trail from the borrow pit staging area, an ADA-accessible experience could be developed at the Tamarack Street staging area described in the winter proposal. The group noted that this scenario is dependent on Terry Plum’s development plans and needs further discussion.
 - **TRAIL TYPE TBD; partial paving possible.**
5. **Non-motorized “stacked-loop system”:** The group agreed on a system with multiple connections to identified access points: Tamarack Street; Ranch Road public easement; Snowcreek VIII. The main trail follows the path identified in the winter proposal: from the





borrow pit trailhead along existing summertime roads; a small connector brings you to the ditch; follow the perimeter of the meadow to the private property line (Snowcreek) and follow this boundary back to the trailhead. There are several opportunities to bridge over and create a series of smaller loops. The system will be open to non-motorized use.

- **Summer Trail Type 3 (shared non-motorized)**
 - a. **Loop to the south of the sensitive birding area:** A possible feature of the stacked-loop system would be a separate, non-mechanized loop south of the recognized birding area. This would preserve birding activity and wildlife.
 - **Summer Trail Type 3 (non-mechanized)**
- 6. **Connector to Lakes Basin:** Develop a non-motorized connector trail from the west end of the meadow to Old Mammoth Road at end of Mammoth Rock Trail and continuing to Panorama Dome and the Lakes Basin.
- 7. **Convert existing road to Summer Trail Type 2 (preferred equestrian/preferred hiker):** Convert existing road (4S104 and 4S110) at the eastern end of the study area that runs from Sherwin Creek Road north to just short of Mammoth Creek. The road is currently open to motorized use but lacks connectivity (“dead-ends”) and experiences minimal use. The conversion would help to protect the existing mule deer habitat, which is a tourism amenity (to see deer on the trail is a unique experience). Additionally, this road is part of the existing Sierra Meadows Ranch lease area trail inventory.
- 8. **Connector to Mammoth Creek Park:** Develop a non-motorized trail connecting the borrow pit staging area (see Recommendation 3) to Mammoth Creek Park by way of a Class 1 bike path or other paved ADA-approved trail. The alignment would follow Sherwin Creek Road (side to be determined) to the bridge at Old Mammoth Road, then use the sidewalk to cloverleaf around to the Old Mammoth Road tunnel to access the park. This provides opportunity for disabled users as well as connectivity to the existing Town paved trail system. The group did not complete discussion on this item.

The group agreed to consider reconvening before August 5 at the Mammoth Ranger Station Conference Room to conclude work on the summer map. Outstanding issues to be discussed include:

- Connection from meadow to Panorama Dome
- Accommodation of summer biathlon
- Development of mountain bike trails to and from Sherwin Ridge
- Wildlife preservation in Solitude Canyon
- Preservation of Old Mill site with a walking/interpretive trail
- Off-leash/on-leash dog areas
- Historic elements/Hayden Cabin

Additional notes:

BMX park: After discussion, the group agreed that this experience would be better served at Shady Rest, as the area offers easier access by way of the Town’s paved trail system as well as





better soils for feature creation and maintenance. The park would be inappropriate in the Sherwins area because it lacks access to the water needed to work with the sandy soils and is too far from the staging area to encourage use by teens without vehicles.



**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Volunteer Work Group #1 Follow-Up Meeting Sign-In Sheet (07/28/09)**

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Lesley	Bruns		<i>Lesley Bruns</i>
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	<i>Malcolm Clark</i>
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area Mountain Bike Organization (MAMBO)	<i>Mark Davis</i>
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	
Hans	Ludwig		
Chuck	Megivern		
Clayton	Mendel		
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	
Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	<i>M Palchak</i>
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	<i>Douglas Will</i>
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	
PARTNERS			
Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	
Jon	Kazmierski	USFS: GIS Specialist	
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	<i>Kimberly A. Stravers</i>

Volunteer Work Group #2, Meeting #2 July 29, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting summary
2. Sign-in sheet



Sherwins Working Group Volunteer Work Group #2 Follow-Up Meeting
Wednesday, July 29, 2009
5 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
Mammoth Ranger Station Conference Room

USFS staff Matt Peterson (facilitator) and Jon Kazmierski (mapping/data support) led the meeting. Kim Stravers (MLTPA) recorded the following notes.

Participants:

- Henning Jensen
- Hans Ludwig
- Chuck Megivern
- Clayton Mendel
- Greg Norby

Mr. Peterson welcomed the group and distributed copies of the Trail System Master Plan Trail Types document. He stated that, as with the winter proposal, the intent of this meeting is to identify commonalities between the four Summer Opportunity Zone maps developed at the last full Sherwins Working Group (SWG) meeting and use that information to develop a combined summer proposal for presentation to the full group at the August 11 meeting. The group will use the Trail Types document to recommend specific facilities for each of their recommendations.

The group briefly reviewed notes from their last meeting, during which they'd developed the winter proposal, and focused on the trail types suggested by Mr. Peterson. Consensus was reached on all recommendations except for Recommendation 14; the group agreed that the trail type would be a hybrid of Types 2 and 3 to achieve a "Type 3 without a Nordic track." It was agreed that the trail must be wider than the 18 inches specified in Type 2.

Moving on to summer, the group split into the groups they'd formed at the last full group meeting, as they'd done for winter the previous week, and highlighted the recommendations from each map (see July 14 Summer Opportunity Zone map narratives for specific features).

Additionally, the group agreed to consider a new use, paintballing, at the motocross track. The also identified that a "quieter" or "gentler use" loop trail around the meadow had not been suggested on any of the summer maps, and that it should be considered at this time.

Mr. Peterson had the group begin discussion by incorporating features they group had identified for winter use that overlap with summertime, such as the staging area at the borrow pit.

Specific recommendations:





1. **Non-motorized staging area at the borrow pit:** Develop a major trailhead at the borrow pit. Facilities will include parking, bathrooms, signage, and an education/interpretive space. Motorized parking would stage farther up Sherwin Creek Road in the same area as for OSV users in winter. This trailhead acts as the main staging area for the area, offering the fullest array of facilities. The proposed all-season surfacing on Sherwin Creek Road for the Turner Propane Tank Farm makes this a logical site for development; also, since the area is already disturbed, construction and use impact would be minimal. (Same as winter.)
2. **Access/egress point from Snowcreek VIII:** Formalize access/egress point proposed near the flagship hotel as identified in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan by placing signage, as there are 20 public parking spots planned for the site as well as a public transit stop. (Same as winter.)
3. **Non-motorized staging area at end of Tamarack Street:** Develop a secondary trailhead that facilitates current/neighborhood use. Facilities will be limited to parking (six to eight vehicles) and signage. Terry Plum's development application will impact facilities but also will offer opportunities to develop features such as parking. The area currently experiences a high volume of use, which this trailhead would accommodate, and it would relieve some pressure on the staging area the borrow pit. (Same as winter.)
4. **Non-motorized staging area at Old Mammoth Road winter closure:** Develop a staging area that will be secondary to the major trailhead at the borrow pit. The area is smaller, but it will take pressure off of existing parking at the Lakes Basin and at Mammoth Rock Trail's western end/Panorama Vista Trail's eastern end. Facilities will include signage, parking, and bathrooms. (Same as winter.)
5. **Non-motorized staging area at Lake Mary Road winter closure:** Develop a secondary staging area east of Lake Mary Road, above the bridge, that will relieve existing pressure on Lake Mary Road parking for Sherwins, Lakes Basin, Tamarack, and Mammoth Rock Trail/Panorama Vista Trail access. Facilities will be limited to signage. (Same as winter.)
6. **Non-motorized connector from borrow pit staging area to Tamarack Street staging area:** This trail would serve as the summertime version of the "groomed half-loop" idea presented in the winter proposal (Winter Recommendation 14). The trail is intended for non-motorized use and to be ADA accessible; to best accommodate this, the preferred trail type is a Class 1 bike lane, which is a paved 8- to 12-foot-wide path. The level of use of the meadow will increase dramatically with construction of Snowcreek VIII; paving formalizes the trail and helps to prevent natural-surface "social trail" proliferation. Also, a paved path will tie directly into the existing Town paved-trail system (Main Path), both from the staging area at the borrow pit and at Tamarack Street. The trail will hug the golf course closely and, as a paved amenity, can act as a transition from the Town's urban setting to the meadow's natural environment. Additionally, paving will facilitate grooming in the winter, as not as much snow will be needed as would on a natural surface. To formalize this trail, surrounding existing roads such as 4S100 will need to be closed or converted into the new route. The existing road alignment may be ideal from the hill at





the corner of Snowcreek V toward Tamarack St. A paved trail in a flat area such as the meadow provides a great experience for tourists/families and allows them to connect easily into the larger existing system. The group noted that this could be a costly project and would like more information on construction and maintenance costs. If a paved option is not available, Trail Type 4 is an acceptable second choice.

- 7. Non-motorized connector from borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Creek Park:** Develop a paved multi-use path (MUP) from the staging area at the borrow pit to the bridge at Mammoth Creek Park. The alignment will run either along Sherwin Creek Road or around the USFS stables. This provides connectivity to the existing Town paved trail system at Mammoth Creek Park.
- 8. Mammoth Creek Park bridge improvement:** Improve the existing bridge at Mammoth Creek Park or build a new bridge to accommodate the MUP connector described in Recommendation 7.
- 9. Non-motorized connector from borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Rock Trail:** Develop a Type 2 (preferred MTB) connector trail from the Mammoth Rock Trail midpoint to the south side of the staging area at the borrow pit. This will necessitate rehabilitation of the two existing use trails into one system trail that connects to the existing road on the south side of the borrow pit. This connection will enable users, particularly mountain bikers, to exit the Mammoth Rock Trail before its pumice-y eastern end and make a direct connection onto the trail in Recommendation 7 and to the larger Town trail system, or to the MUP connecting to Tamarack Street staging area.
- 10. Non-motorized singletrack connector from Mammoth Rock Trail to Mammoth Creek:** Develop a Type 2 (preferred MTB) trail connector from the eastern end of Mammoth Rock Trail to Mammoth Creek. The group noted the need to discuss the exact alignment with equestrian users since this area is mainly used by horse riders and there is a desire to avoid conflict.
- 11. Crossing at Mammoth Creek:** Develop a minimal, narrow crossing of Mammoth Creek where it adjoins the trail in Recommendation 10. A flat log is a desirable feature; a more structured or expensive bridge is unnecessary for bikers. This crossing creates connectivity to the Town's Main Path.
- 12. Non-mechanized zone:** Designate the area east of Sierra Meadows Ranch, with the exception of the trail and crossing identified in Recommendations 10 and 11, as non-mechanized (non-motorized where bikes are prohibited). Currently the area is primarily used by equestrians and the group recognized the need for equestrians to have a dedicated place to ride without interference with bikes.
- 13. Non-motorized connector from the meadow to staging area at Old Mammoth Road:** Develop a Type 2 (preferred hiking) non-mechanized connector trail to connect the western end of the meadow to the staging area at Old Mammoth Road identified in Recommendation 4. As the terrain is steep and rough, switchbacks will likely be necessary, which has the benefit of discouraging poaching by downhill mountain bikers. The trail is intended primarily for foot traffic, but equestrian use will be permitted, in order





to preserve the character and “quiet nature” of that corner of the meadow. The trail should be routed over existing use trails if possible.

- 14. Formalize existing loop trail around meadow:** The current social trail that loops around the perimeter of the Hidden Lake meadow should be formalized, as it is extremely popular for all uses. The group recognized the environmentally sensitive nature of this area and noted that boardwalks or other features should be installed to make the trail sustainable. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred hiking) with horses and bikes allowed.
- 15. Direct non-motorized trail to Hidden Lake from Tamarack Street staging area:** As the lake is a big attraction of the meadow and is very popular with all users, not to mention a draw for tourists, formalizing a direct route from the staging area at Tamarack Street to the lake will facilitate use and discourage social trails. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred hiking) and should be coordinated with Mammoth Community Water District Access to the adjacent well.
- 16. Non-motorized connector from Mill City to end of Panorama Vista Trail:** Improve and formalize the existing use trail or build a new trail [Type 2 (preferred MTB)] to connect the system trail at Mill City to the end of the Panorama Vista Trail at the Old Mammoth Road staging area.
- 17. Old Mammoth Road crossing:** Develop a safe crossing of Old Mammoth Road from the eastern end of Panorama Vista Trail to Mammoth Rock Trail. This provides continuity of the system described in Recommendation 16 and others and avoids having bikers cross the road in a blind hairpin, as is the current configuration. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred MTB); the exact alignment is to be determined but could include an under-crossing.
- 18. Non-motorized connector from Old Mammoth Road trailhead to Recommendation 13 and Mammoth Rock Trail:** Develop a Type 2 connector trail that will link into Mammoth Rock Trail and into the meadow via Recommendation 13. The trail should be aligned with the identified existing use trail if possible.
- 19. Formalize and improve access to Sherwins:** As identified in winter proposal, formalize and improve the use trail from Lake Mary Road to the Sherwins. Minimal amenities are needed (likely to be just signage). The trail will be Type 1 (non-motorized footpath) and designed for year-round use; it should follow the existing use trail out to Rock Chute, as that is a scenic overlook for summer hikers. Due to the sensitive nature of the environment on top of the ridge, a trail is needed to prevent further damage from users. The group recognized the need for focus on sustainability with this trail, as erosion is a problem on the slope.
- 20. Non-motorized connector from Recommendation 17 to intersection of Lake Mary Road and Old Mammoth Road:** Develop a non-motorized connector trail that will link the safe crossing on Old Mammoth Road to the road’s intersection with Lake Mary Road. This provides continuity for bicyclists and other users. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred MTB or preferred equestrian).






- 21. Improve connector from Mammoth Rock Trail to Recommendation 14:** Improve the existing trail connection that links the eastern section of Mammoth Rock Trail to the loop trail around the meadow. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred MTB) and will utilize the existing use trail, which is currently in good shape except for the top, which is eroded. This connector will allow mountain bikers to exit the Mammoth Rock Trail before reaching the sandy eastern end and can connect them via the loop trail to the staging area at Tamarack Street.
- 22. Recommendation for further study/assessment:** While the group did not wish to make any specific recommendations, they agreed that further study should be done in the Solitude Canyon area relative to potential for new mountain biking and hiking trails in that area. Possibilities exist for connectivity to Mammoth Rock Trail, the Lakes Basin, and the motocross course area/Sherwin Crest. The group noted that the motocross track area could function well as a mountain bike race staging area, which would offer an alternative to races at the MMSA Bike Park.
- 23. BMX/bike skills zone:** Create a BMX park/bike skills zone near the staging area at the borrow pit. Though the soils are less than ideal, the water available for the tank farm could be used to improve the conditions. The area provides connectivity to mountain bike trails and the Town's paved trail system and is ideal for park construction because it is an already-disturbed zone. The park could overlap or adjoin the snowplay area suggested in the winter proposal. Proximity to the staging area and trail system will encourage use by teens and children who cannot drive to a location.
- 24. Summer biathlon course:** Develop a summer biathlon course in the motocross track area. The site is far enough away from the staging area to avoid heavy use conflict; potential conflict with mountain bike races or the motocross annual event can be resolved with advance notice and scheduling.

Additional notes:

- Separation of motorized and non-motorized use should follow the winter suggestion (north-south line located just west of the borrow pit staging area).
- Dogs: The group agreed that currently there is no conflict between off-leash dogs and other users and makes no recommendation to leash pets at this time. The group did suggest that the option to require leashes in certain areas be kept open to address possible future issues related to increased use of the area.



**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Volunteer Work Group #2 Follow-Up Meeting Sign-In Sheet (07/29/09)**

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Lesley	Bruns		
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area Mountain Bike Organization (MAMBO)	
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	✓
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	
Hans	Ludwig		
Chuck	Megivern		
Clayton	Mendel		
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	
Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	✓
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	
PARTNERS			
Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	
Jon	Kazmierski	USFS: GIS Specialist	
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	
Jonathan	Cook-Fisher	USFS: Recreation Specialist	
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	

SWG Full-Group Meeting #4

August 11, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Mammoth Community Water District Field Trip notes
3. Meeting summary
4. Sign-in sheet
5. Photos

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

4:10–4:20

Meeting #2 and #3 Summary Review and Adoption

- Review and adoption of Meeting #2 Draft Summary (**attached**)
- Review and adoption of Meeting #3 Draft Summary (**attached**)
- Report out from field-trip leaders (Greg Norby and Steve Speidel)

4:20–5:20

Volunteer Work Group Presentations: Winter Season

- Report from small groups who worked between meetings on winter season map.
 - Each small group to provide brief qualitative description of identified opportunities and describe “What did your group develop as proposals and why?” Need to explain the rationale for all proposed recreation features.
 - Please review write-up and maps available from website prior to the meeting.
- Following report out from both groups, full working group to review worksheet to compare and contrast both proposals and identify items where there is agreement and which items where there are differing proposals.
- Goal of review and discussion is to develop map and narrative of proposed recreation features within planning area for sharing with broader community. Remember: not everyone will get everything they want; need to think, propose, and evaluate with this “selflessness” in mind.
- As presented in Charter Document, group may be asked to identify level of approval for proposal using scale of “Unqualified to Strong Support, General Support, Qualified Support, or Fundamental Disagreement.”



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



4:20–5:20 **Volunteer Work Group Presentations: Winter Season - continued**

- If an item receives a level of Fundamental Disagreement, the group will be asked to continue working until it appears a resolution is not attainable, or move on to an area where more agreement is possible. At that time the members will note the nature of the disagreement and make a determination as to the best way to proceed in the particular issue area.

5:20–6:30 **Volunteer Work Group Presentations: Summer Season**

- Same process as described for winter season.

6:30–6:55 **Activities Prior to Meeting #5**

- Schedule focused site visits (who, when, where)
- Determine what, if anything needs to be undertaken to complete maps and narrative for each season's proposal.
- Identify volunteers willing to present proposals to interested parties/organizations to solicit feedback. *Note: Please consider whether or not you are available to help with this effort.*
- Identify which particular organizations should be contacted for presentations and assign volunteers for follow-up. *Note: Please come to the meeting with suggestions as to which groups / individuals you believe should receive specific outreach.*
- Discuss format and strategy for soliciting broader community feedback on proposal (e.g., public library display).
- Develop process for synthesizing feedback and presenting back to SWG at September 22 meeting.
- Discuss process for reviewing constraints against proposals and who will assist with this effort.

6:55–7:00 **Meeting Wrap-Up**

- Review of what has been decided
- Next steps / meeting schedule





**Notes from the Sherwins Working Group (SWG) Field Walk:
Mammoth Community Water District (MCWD) Facilities and Future Activity
in the Meadows Area**

Wednesday, July 22, 2009, at 11:30 a.m.

Walk led by Greg Norby, General Manager, MCWD

- The purpose of the field walk was to provide background information on existing and future MCWD water-system infrastructure in the Sherwins study area and to consider opportunities for integrating future facilities into the recreation/trails system.
- Participants included Greg Norby (MCWD), Stephanie Wolff (Mammoth Pet Shop), Malcolm Clark (Sierra Club), Danna Stroud (TOML Tourism & Recreation Department), Tammy Nguyen (The Chadmar Group), and Mary K. Prentice (Sierra Club).
- The group parked at Stephanie Wolff's house near the end of Tamarack Street and walked from there to the meadow via the existing dirt-road access point.
- The group's walking route basically covered the upper meadows area from the Tamarack Street access point, south along the dirt road, to Hidden Lake, and then up to the end of the meadows, completing the looped trail through the nearby forested stand along the base of The Bluffs and taking the dirt road back to Tamarack Street.
- Observations made by the group included:
 - Amazing wildflower variety
 - Obvious severe erosion gullies along the dirt road to Hidden Lake, likely due to heavy surface-water runoff from the upper meadows area where Bodle Ditch splits into various channels
 - Trail route makes a great loop
 - Lots of variety (sage to meadow to the forested area along base of The Bluffs)
 - Use trail along The base of The Bluffs could be the start of a proposed trail from the meadow up to the Old Mammoth Road area
 - Cross-country ski routes (blue diamond system) are regularly used in winter
- The group discussed the approximate layout of the conceptual Plum family development to get an approximate idea of a possible trailhead location.
- The group stopped at MCWD Monitoring Wells 11 and 12. Well 11 is the obvious artesian well along the dirt road; it was running with a one- to two-foot-high fountain. The well's artesian discharge varies from year to year. Mr. Norby explained that the well's source is thought to be the deep aquifer recharged by snowpack on the Sherwins (not connected to the meadows or to surface water).
- MCWD is working with the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) to permit a pumping test in the meadow (September 2009 timeline), so there may be a drill rig on site and temporary piping across the lower meadow to Snowcreek Golf Course for approximately one to two weeks. Based on the pump-test results, MCWD may pursue a permanent production well at the site. In that case an improved access road would be needed, which could connect the proposed Tamarack Street trailhead to the well site and be designed for recreational





uses. A buried pipeline would be routed under the improved access road, back toward the existing Well 10 near the southwestern corner of the Snowcreek Golf Course.



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.



**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: Meeting #4, August 11, 2009**

First Name	Last Name	Signature	Club or Organization
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Brent	Allen		Eastern Sierra 4WD Club
John	Armstrong		Eastside Velo (President)
Jim	Barnes		
Pete	Beck		
Phyllis	Benham	<i>Phyllis Benham</i>	
Brigitte	Berman		Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Secretary)
Ryan	Berry		
Rachel	Bowman		Mammoth Base Camp at Sierra Meadows Ranch
Lesley	Bruns	<i>Lesley Bruns</i>	
Jon	Carlton		
Malcolm	Clark	<i>Malcolm Clark</i>	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)
Sharon	Clark		
Stacy	Corless		Friends of the Inyo (communications director)
Stacey	Crockett	<i>Stacey Crockett</i>	High Sierra Equestrian Club
Forrest	Cross		Eastern Sierra Avalanche Center (ESAC)
Tom	Daniels		
Mark	Davis	<i>Mark Davis</i>	Mammoth Area Mountain Bike Organization (MAMBO)
Alex	Fabbro	<i>Afabro</i>	395 Fat Tire Council
Ali	Feinberg		
Karen	Ferrell-Ingram		Eastern Sierra Land Trust
Dave	Geirman		Mammoth Mountain Bike Park
Nate	Greenberg	<i>NG</i>	
Jennifer	Heintzelman		
Thom	Heller		Mammoth Lakes Fire Protection District
Mark	Hendrickson		Mammoth Mountain Bike Park
Zach	Hickman		
April	Holly		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: Meeting #4, August 11, 2009**

Henning	Jensen		Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)
Doug	Jung		Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter
Andrew	Kastor		High Sierra Striders (president)
Dave	Katzenmeyer		
Martin	Kleinbard		
Kraig	Kupiec		
Chad	Lande		Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)
Jesse	Langley		Cardinal Investments (The Sherwin)
Dave	Laverty		Triad/Holmes Associates
Julien	Lecorps		
Alana	Levin		High Sierra Triathlon Club
Hans	Ludwig		
Ron	Malm		Mammoth Powersports
Mike	McKenna		Hot Creek Hatchery Foundation (Board member)
Chuck	Megivern		
Clayton	Mendel		395 FTC
Marshall	Minobe		Mobility Commission
Andrew	Murphy		
Dave	Neal		Reel Mammoth Adventures
Tammy	Nguyen		Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)
Jennifer	Noerdlinger		
Greg	Norby		Mammoth Community Water District
Maggie	Palchak		Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra
Marge	Papp		Turner Propane
Rebecca	Paranick-Poiset		Mammoth Mountain Ski Area
J.	Parsons		
Terry	Plum		Tamarack Street homeowner/area property
Monica	Prelle		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: Meeting #4, August 11, 2009**

Mary K.	Prentice		Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter
Cory	Rice		Wave Rave Snowboard Shop
Jennifer	Roeser		McGee Creek Pack Station
Brandon	Russell		
Bill	Sauser	<i>Bill Sauser</i>	Mammoth Snowmobile Association/TOML Tourism &
Patty	Schwartzkopf	<i>Patty Schwartzkopf</i>	Tamarack Street homeowner
Steve	Schwind		
Elaine	Smith	<i>Elaine Smith</i>	High Sierra Striders
Jim	Smith		Mammoth Mountain Ski Area
Joel	St. Marie		
Barbara	Stefanides		
Dave	Stefanides		
Autumn	Talsky		Mammoth Mountaineering Supply/Alpine Approach
Bill	Taylor		
John	Teller		
Tim	Villanueva		Bardini Foundation
John	Walter		Advocates for Mammoth
Chris	Walters		
Jon	Watson		Far West Ski Association
Douglas	Will	<i>Douglas Will</i>	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)
Stephanie	Wolff		Mammoth Pet Shop
Gene	Zeiner		

PARTNERS

Mike	Schlafmann		USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin
Jonathan	Cook-Fisher		USFS: Mammoth and Mono Basin Winter Sports Specialist
Matt	Peterson		USFS: Recreation Planner
Austin	McInerney		Center for Collaborative Planning

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Participant Sign-In Sheet: Meeting #4, August 11, 2009**

Danna	Stroud		TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director
Steve	Speidel	<i>Speidel</i>	TOML: Principal Planner
Mark	Wardlaw		TOML: Community Development Department Director
Jen	Daugherty		TOML: Assistant Planner
Jim	Miller		Turner Propane
John	Wentworth		MLTPA: CEO/Board President
Kim	Stravers	<i>Kimberly C Stravers</i>	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director
Lara	Kirkner		MLTPA: Operations Director
Justin	Mulbay		MLTPA: GIS Coordinator
Joyce	Turner		MLTPA: Board member
Jay	Deinken		MLTPA: Vice-President
Will	Aldrich		MLTPA: Board member

Lisa Patric *Li Pat*

*High Sierra Equine
lisaandchop@
hotmail.com*



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_051.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_074.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_123.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_143.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_155.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_162.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_285.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_317.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_341.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_350.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_361.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_463.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_509.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_613.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_677.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_732.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_763.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved




SWG_2009_08_11_mtng04_633.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

Western Field Trip

August 16, 2009

CONTENTS:


1. Western Field Trip map
2. Western Field Trip notes
3. Photos



Sherwin Working Group - Western Field Trip

August 16, 2009

-  Winter Road Closures
-  Roads
-  Lake Mary Bike Path
-  Field Trip Trail (Type 1-4)
-  Staging Areas
-  Road Crossings
-  GPS'd Trails
-  INF Trails



Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Field Trips – Western Only
4	Included in winter proposal	<p>(4) Non-motorized staging area at Old Mammoth Road winter closure: Develop a staging area that will be secondary to the major trailhead at the borrow pit. The area is smaller, but it will take pressure off of existing parking at the Lakes Basin and at Mammoth Rock Trail’s western end/Panorama Vista Trail’s eastern end. Facilities will include signage, parking, and bathrooms. (Same as winter.)</p>	<p>General Comment from Western Field Trip re Map ID #4: Reaffirm Group #2’s narrative comment and emphasize that several of the comments developed by the western field-trip team identify the need for a robust year-round trailhead at Map ID #4. The opportunity for a public-transit turnaround should be emphasized as well.</p>
26	New Idea	<p>Create a Soft-Surface Trail to Mammoth Rock This area provides excellent views, and formalization of a trail will create a sustainable alignment where several use trails currently exist.</p>	

5

(6) Connector to Lakes Basin:
Develop a non-motorized connector trail from the west end of the meadow to Old Mammoth Road at the end of Mammoth Rock Trail and continuing to Panorama Dome and the Lakes Basin.

(13) Non-motorized connector from the meadow to staging area at Old Mammoth Road: Develop a Type 2 (preferred hiking) non-mechanized connector trail to connect the western end of the meadow to the staging area at Old Mammoth Road. As the terrain is steep and rough, switchbacks will likely be necessary, which has the benefit of discouraging poaching by downhill mountain bikers. The trail is intended primarily for foot traffic, but equestrian use will be permitted, in order to preserve the character and “quiet nature” of that corner of the meadow. The trail should be routed over existing use trails if possible.

(20) Non-motorized connector from Old Mammoth Rd. crossing (Rec. 17) to intersection of Lake Mary Road and Old Mammoth Road: Develop a non-motorized connector trail that will link the safe crossing on Old Mammoth Road to the road’s intersection with Lake Mary Road. This provides continuity for bicyclists and other users. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred MTB or preferred equestrian).

5a. Connecting the meadow to the Old Mammoth Road staging area, Mammoth Rock Trail, Panorama Dome, and the Lakes Basin

- 1) Route Description: The route heads up the south side of The Bluffs through the manzanita, gains the ridge along the firebreak, has a spur to the proposed Mill City staging area, and continues to the west end of the Mammoth Rock Trail.
- 2) This would connect to the trail for a safe crossing of Old Mammoth Road (Map ID #15, described above) and also to a spur trail connecting to the Old Mammoth Road staging area (Map ID#16), as well as the Mammoth Rock Trail.
- 3) Rationale for routing:
 - a. The trail’s aspect provides the most comprehensive and spectacular views of the Sherwins.
 - b. Trail can gain the Bluffs ridge with only three or four long switchbacks, which makes it easier to build and creates a more user-friendly grade.
 - c. The trail would mostly be hidden by manzanita (less visual impact).
- 4) Connects to Tamarack Street and potential staging and facilities
- 5) This trail would relieve congestion on the Mammoth Rock Trail by creating connections and a loop option for users on the Mammoth Rock Trail.

5

5b. Connection from Old Mammoth Road safe crossing (Map ID #15) to intersection of Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road

Several opportunities would be available on this side of the road as opposed to how it is currently represented on the maps:

- 1) Quick snowmelt due to aspect
- 2) Trail would be hidden by manzanita
- 3) Easier to develop/less resource-intensive due to topography and vegetation
- 4) MUCH better viewshed
- 5) Avoids very boggy and wet area and dense aspen and lodgepole vegetation
- 6) Connects to safe crossing at Panorama Vista/Flume Trail and Old Mammoth Road intersection
- 7) Could incorporate historical/interpretive opportunities as the trail passes though the Mammoth City site

5

5c. Pedestrian and bike connections from the intersection at Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road to the Lake Mary Road Bike Path need to be established to provide safe connectivity from the Sherwins region to the Lake Mary Road Bike Path. Existing conditions do not establish a single opportunity for a safe connection between these two points.

12

(5) Non-motorized staging area at Lake Mary Road winter closure: Develop a secondary staging area east of Lake Mary Road, above the bridge, that will relieve existing pressure on Lake Mary Road parking for Sherwins, Lakes Basin, Tamarack, and Mammoth Rock Trail/Panorama Vista Trail access. Facilities will be limited to signage. (Same as winter.)

12 - Staging area at Lake Mary Road winter closure

- 1) Develop a secondary staging area east of Lake Mary Road, above the bridge, that will relieve existing pressure on Lake Mary Rd., and parking for the Sherwins, Lakes Basin, Tamarack XC Ski Center, and Mammoth Rock Trail/Panorama Vista Trail access.
- 2) The Panorama Vista Trail would also be rerouted to start from this staging area. This eliminates pull-out parking that is happening now along Lake Mary Road—a high-traffic, high-speed road.
- 3) The group discussed the need to create a safe crossing at this location, including use of a four-way stop at the intersection, speed bumps, and diagonal parking along the staging area, which could slow traffic.
- 4) Diagonal parking was further discussed, as it would coordinate well with winter use and therefore would be much less intensive and costly to build.
- 5) Creation of this staging area would minimize the use of unsafe roadside pullouts along Lake Mary Road.

12

12a – Develop soft-surface multi-user trail connecting Lake Mary Road staging area to Panorama Vista Trail, Panorama Dome Trail, and the Lake Mary Road Bike Path

- 1) This would be a soft-surface trail that connects from the end of the Lake Mary Road Bike Path (at bridge) and continues on the east side of the road to connect to Panorama Dome Trail.
- 2) Realign northern end of Panorama Vista Trail to parallel the road, with a connection to the staging area and south end of trail. This eliminates the use of a dangerous end of the trail at the Lake Mary Road intersection.
- 3) Build a bridge that connects the Lake Mary Road Bike Path to the soft-surface trail described here. This would be constructed on the east side of the existing bridge where the Lake Mary Road Bike Path currently ends. This will allow bike-path users to use the safe crossing discussed in Map ID #12.

Additional thoughts on both 12 + 12a

12

- 1) This staging area and connector trail also is a way to get users from the lower Sherwins area and Panorama Dome onto the Lake Mary Road Bike Path.
- 2) This also provides safe and accessible connectivity between the Lakes Basin, MMSA Bike Park, Panorama Dome, and lower areas including the meadow.
- 3) Creates a single, safer crossing point for MMSA Bike Park users, Lake Mary Road Bike Path users, and Panorama Vista/Dome Trail users.

14

OI (outstanding issue): Connection from meadow to Panorama Dome

(16) Non-motorized connector from Mill City to end of Panorama Vista Trail: Improve and formalize the existing use trail or build a new trail [Type 2 (preferred MTB)] to connect the system trail at Mill City to the end of the Panorama Vista Trail at the Old Mammoth Road staging area.

Develop a trail connecting Mill City and Old Mammoth Road staging area to the end of the Panorama Vista Trail

- 1) This trail connects the MMSA Bike Park, Lake Mary Road Bike Path, and Panorama Dome Trail back to town without going to Mammoth Rock Trail or creating downhill traffic on the Lake Mary Road Bike Path.
 - 2) Disperse mountain bike activities and take pressure off of Mammoth Rock Trail.
 - 3) Creates the opportunity for a firebreak on Panorama Dome
 - 4) Connection to and interpretive opportunities at Mill City historical site
 - 5) Connection of trails to staging area, town, potential public transportation, and town MUPs
 - 6) Creates an option for trail users to stay off of Old Mammoth Road and also eliminates some road crossings
-

15

(17) Old Mammoth Road crossing:

Develop a safe crossing of Old Mammoth Road from the eastern end of Panorama Vista Trail to Mammoth Rock Trail. This provides continuity of the system described in Map ID #14 and others and avoids having bikers cross the road in a blind hairpin, as is the current configuration. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred MTB); the exact alignment is to be determined but could include an under-crossing.

Develop a safe crossing of Old Mammoth Road: The group discussed the need for users to be able to connect from the trails on Panorama Dome to the Mammoth Rock Trail.

- 1) This area is hazardous because of the blind corners.
- 2) A trail would be built from the western entrance of Mammoth Rock Trail and stay on the uphill (south) side of Old Mammoth Road, utilizing a portion of existing use trail/mine road, then turn parallel to the road to the uppermost hairpin turn of Old Mammoth Road. Here the trail would cross just uphill of the turn (west).
- 3) This is a safe crossing point because uphill traffic has a 180-degree turn to negotiate; therefore, traffic is slow and downhill traffic has a long straightaway in which to see oncoming cars or pedestrians. Cars are naturally slowing here in anticipation of the hairpin turn.
- 4) Minimize use of unsafe and over-utilized vehicular turnouts along Old Mammoth Road.

16

(18) Non-motorized connector from Old Mammoth Road trailhead to Map ID #5 (trail from meadow to Old Mammoth Road trailhead) and Mammoth Rock Trail: Develop a Type 2 connector trail that will link into Mammoth Rock Trail and into the meadow via Map ID #5. The trail should be aligned with the identified existing use trail if possible.

Connection of #5 to Old Mammoth Road staging area

- 1) Spur off of #5 to proposed Mill City staging area and potential public transportation
- 2) This spur could also be created as an ADA trail and provide access to the unique views from The Bluffs.
- 3) Mill City staging area has connections to other trail areas and is a historic site.
- 4) This alignment is primarily on existing/abandoned old roads.
- 5) This alignment will take pedestrian/bike non-vehicular traffic off of Old Mammoth Road.
- 6) Minimize use of unsafe roadside turnouts along Old Mammoth Road.

17

(OI) Development of mountain bike trails to and from Sherwin Ridge

(19) Formalize and improve access to Sherwins: As identified in the winter proposal, formalize and improve the use trail from Lake Mary Road to the Sherwins. Minimal amenities are needed (likely to be just signage). The trail will be Type 1 (non-motorized footpath) and designed for year-round use; it should follow the existing use trail out to Rock Chute, as that is a scenic overlook for summer hikers. Due to the sensitive nature of the environment on top of the ridge, a trail is needed to prevent further damage from users. The group recognized the need for focus on sustainability with this trail, as erosion is a problem on the slope.

17a: Sherwin Ridge access from Mill City, Mammoth Rock Trail, and the Sherwin Meadow

- 1) Makes it possible for safe access to the existing Sherwin Ridge use trail during summer months
- 2) Would eliminate the need for parking/turnout along Lake Mary Road
- 3) Allows pedestrian access to the Sherwin Ridge from a variety of proposed facilities and opportunities, including Mill City, the Mammoth Rock Trail, and from the Sherwin Meadow and the borrow pit.
- 4) Opportunity for interpretive trail and experience at the Mammoth City historic site
- 5) Eliminates need for unsafe turnouts along Lake Mary Road and Old Mammoth Road

17b: Soft-surface trail to Pyramid Peak, located near main avalanche path and Mammoth Rock

- 1) This trail starts on the Mammoth Rock Trail and switchbacks up the avalanche path to the top of the Sherwins.
- 2) This would offer an excellent opportunity for hikers, runners, and mountain bikers to access Sherwin Ridge, great views, and relieve pressure on the Mammoth Rock Trail.
- 3) This trail would be mostly concealed by the aspen growth and would gain the ridge and continue to Pyramid Peak.
- 4) What impact will this trail have on the Mammoth Rock Trail?



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_001.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved




SWG_WestrnSite_081609_014.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_016.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_019.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_022.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_026.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_028.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_033.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_048.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_053.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_066.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_067.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_072.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_080.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_092.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_094.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_112.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_118.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_124.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_142.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_151.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_156.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_187.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_WestrnSite_081609_052.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

Eastern Field Trip

August 25, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Eastern Field Trip notes
2. Photos

Sherwins Working Group: Eastern Field Trip Notes, 08/25/09

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Field Trip Notes: Eastern, 08/25/09
1	<p>(3) Non-motorized staging area at borrow pit: A formal staging area should be constructed at the borrow pit, as described in the winter proposal. Non-motorized parking should follow the winter configuration and be sited at the southern end of the borrow pit. Such an arrangement could allow the other half of the trailhead parking area to be designated for OHV users and include a turnaround or other OHV-specific parking features. Facilities to be installed at the borrow pit trailhead include bathrooms and an interpretive area.</p>	<p>(1) Non-motorized staging area at the borrow pit: Develop a major trailhead at the borrow pit. Facilities will include parking, bathrooms, signage, and an education/interpretive space. Motorized parking would stage farther up Sherwin Creek Road in the same area as for OSV users in winter. This trailhead acts as the main staging area for the Sherwins, offering the fullest array of facilities. The proposed all-season surfacing on Sherwin Creek Road for the Turner Propane Tank Farm makes this a logical site for development; also, since the area is already disturbed, construction and use impact would be minimal. (Same as winter.)</p>	<p>This will be the main trailhead for the study area, and therefore has the potential to become crowded. Be sure to safeguard against the public parking in the area designated for the Turner Propane trucks to service the tanks/turn around.</p> <p>New idea: create a connection from the Borrow Pit staging area to the Sherwin Lakes trailhead in order to provide alternative experiences for hikers and to improve connectivity to other trailheads, resources, and opportunities nearby.</p> <p>Winter-use note: If the snowplay area is situated on the southeast side of the Borrow Pit staging area, parking may need to be extended, or a turnaround that can be used by public transit constructed, so that users will walk from their cars to the toe of the hill; if the parking is too far north, this will discourage use by families with small children.</p>
3	<p>Included in winter proposal; mentioned access in Map ID #7 (Group 1 Recommendation (5))</p>	<p>(2) Access/egress point from Snowcreek VIII: Formalize access/egress point proposed near the flagship hotel as identified in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan by placing signage, as there are 20 public parking spots planned for the site as well as a public transit stop. (Same as winter.)</p>	<p>This access/egress point will allow users to exit Snowcreek VIII and connect directly into the MUP/ADA-accessible backbone trail, which acts as a thoroughfare to other destinations such as the Borrow Pit staging area, Cerro Coso Community College, and the ice rink/library.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Eastern Field Trip Notes, 08/25/09

Map
ID #

Group 1 Narrative

Group 2 Narrative

Field Trip Notes: Eastern, 08/25/09

6

(8) Connector to Mammoth Creek Park: Develop a non-motorized trail connecting the borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Creek Park by way of a Class 1 bike path or other paved ADA-approved trail. The alignment would follow Sherwin Creek Road (side to be determined) to the bridge at Old Mammoth Road, then use the sidewalk to cloverleaf around to the Old Mammoth Road tunnel to access the park. This provides opportunity for disabled users as well as connectivity to the existing Town paved trail system. The group did not complete discussion on this item.

(7) Non-motorized connector from borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Creek Park: Develop a paved multi-use path (MUP) from the staging area at the borrow pit to the bridge at Mammoth Creek Park. The alignment will run either along Sherwin Creek Road or around the USFS stables. This provides connectivity to the existing Town paved trail system at Mammoth Creek Park.

(8) Mammoth Creek Park bridge improvement: Improve the existing bridge at Mammoth Creek Park or build a new bridge to accommodate the MUP connector described above.

Though Snowcreek VIII is planning a MUP along Old Mammoth Road from the development to the intersection with Sherwin Creek Road, which this trail could connect to, routing the trail to the park from the Borrow Pit staging area northwest along Sherwin Creek Road is less desirable due to high traffic volume and vehicle speeds (40 mph) on Old Mammoth Road and because the cloverleaf connection under the tunnel is not obvious to new users.

Despite the public easement on the Snowcreek VIII side and the option of cutting switchbacks into the hillsides on the east side of the road, there is not a lot of room to run a MUP parallel to Sherwin Creek Road, which would force users to travel close to vehicular traffic into/out of the Borrow Pit.

Routing the trail away from Sherwin Creek Road and around the USFS stables allows for a more enjoyable user experience, as there will be no traffic or street noise, and a better view. This also will be safer than traveling next to vehicles.

Routing away from Sherwin Creek Road will lead users into the existing MUP at Mammoth Creek instead of having them cross under (or over, if they don't see the tunnel) Old Mammoth Road. This MUP connects to the library and Cerro Coso Community College, should users choose to continue east.

Sherwins Working Group: Eastern Field Trip Notes, 08/25/09

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Field Trip Notes: Eastern, 08/25/09
7	<p>(4) ADA-accessible backbone trail: A soft-surface “backbone” trail that is ADA-accessible should be constructed to depart from an appropriately designed access point at the borrow pit staging area. The trail will either mimic the alignment of the “stacked-loop system” described in the winter proposal, or simply connect the east end of the meadow to the west. More discussion is needed. Summer Trail Type: TBD; partial paving possible</p> <p>(5) Non-motorized “stacked-loop system”: The group agreed on a system with multiple connections to identified access points: Tamarack Street; Ranch Road public easement; Snowcreek VIII. The main trail follows the path identified in the winter proposal: from the borrow pit trailhead along existing summertime roads; a small connector brings you to the ditch; follow the perimeter of the meadow to the private property line (Snowcreek) and follow this boundary back to the trailhead. There are several opportunities to bridge over and create a series of smaller loops. The system will be open to non-motorized use. Summer Trail Type 3 (shared non-motorized)</p>	<p>(6) Non-motorized connector from borrow pit staging area to Tamarack Street staging area: This trail would serve as the summertime version of the “groomed half-loop” idea presented in the winter proposal (Winter Map ID # 9: Group 2 Recommendation 14). The trail is intended for non-motorized use and to be ADA accessible; to best accommodate this, the preferred trail type is a Class 1 bike lane, which is a paved 8- to 12-foot-wide path. Use will increase dramatically with Snowcreek VIII; paving formalizes the trail and helps to prevent “social trail” proliferation; ties directly into the existing Town paved-trail system (Main Path), both from the staging area at the borrow pit and at Tamarack Street. The trail will hug the golf course closely and, as a paved amenity, can act as a transition from the Town’s urban setting to the meadow’s natural environment. Additionally, paving will facilitate grooming in the winter. To formalize this trail, surrounding existing roads such as 4S100 will need to be closed or converted into the new route. The existing road alignment may be ideal from the hill at the corner of Snowcreek V toward Tamarack St. If a paved option is not available/too costly, Trail Type 4 is an acceptable second choice.</p>	<p>The group supported the option of connecting this backbone trail directly to the Tamarack Street staging area while keeping it as the groomed (in winter) part of a “stacked loop” system. The trail should be ADA-accessible, but the surface (improved soft-surface or paved) is yet to be determined. Alignment over the existing road makes sense, as the area is already disturbed and borders Snowcreek VIII. The path should be built to withstand the weight of maintenance vehicles needed to service the “doggie stations” and trash bins along the pathway, as well as allow for at least golf-cart access to Kerry Meadow for special events; if the road, currently open to vehicles, becomes a MUP, Kerry Meadow will be inaccessible for weddings, etc. Converting the road to a MUP will assist with the wetland restoration of Kerry Meadow. Pathway allows for interpretive opportunities near points of interest such as Kerry Meadow.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Eastern Field Trip Notes, 08/25/09

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Field Trip Notes: Eastern, 08/25/09
10	<p>(2) Non-motorized connector to Shady Rest: A non-motorized trail connector should be developed from the borrow pit staging area to Shady Rest. It would run adjacent to Sherwin Creek Road down to Sherwin Creek Campground, then east to the footbridge and northwest toward Mammoth Community Water District and Shady Rest. Both the crossing at Highway 203 and the side of Sherwin Creek Road on which the trail will be aligned have yet to be determined. This trail achieves connectivity between two heavily used recreation areas without forcing users onto Old Mammoth Road. Summer Trail Type 3 (shared non-motorized)</p>	<p>(10) Non-motorized singletrack connector from Mammoth Rock Trail to Mammoth Creek: Develop a Type 2 (preferred MTB) trail connector from the eastern end of Mammoth Rock Trail to Mammoth Creek. The group noted the need to discuss the exact alignment with equestrian users since this area is mainly used by horse riders and there is a desire to avoid conflict.</p> <p>(11) Crossing at Mammoth Creek: Develop a minimal, narrow crossing of Mammoth Creek for trail described above. A flat log is a desirable feature; a more structured or expensive bridge is unnecessary for bikers. This crossing creates connectivity to the Town’s Main Path.</p>	<p>This connector could fit nicely into the Town’s future plans for expansion of Mammoth Creek Park and its urban recreation facilities. Crossing of the creek would be simple and minimal; potential conflict with equestrian use in this area could be avoided with signage indicating a multi-use crossing, “slow zone,” etc. Wide-open sight lines in this area mitigate conflicts between mountain bikes and equestrians—users can see one another from some distance and prepare for crossing paths.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Eastern Field Trip Notes, 08/25/09

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Field Trip Notes: Eastern, 08/25/09
13		<p>(9) Non-motorized connector from borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Rock Trail: Develop a Type 2 (preferred MTB) connector trail from the Mammoth Rock Trail midpoint to the south side of the staging area at the borrow pit. This will necessitate rehabilitation of the two existing use trails into one system trail that connects to the existing road on the south side of the borrow pit. This connection will enable users, particularly mountain bikers, to exit the Mammoth Rock Trail before its pumice-y eastern end and make a direct connection onto the trail in Map ID #6 (Group 2 Recommendation 7) and to the larger Town trail system, or to the MUP connecting to the Tamarack Street staging area.</p>	<p>Pros: follows alignment of existing road, which currently is a dead-end and appears as a “scar”; a connection from Mammoth Rock Trail to the Borrow Pit staging area makes sense, as it feeds the users directly into a node with facilities.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Eastern Field Trip Notes, 08/25/09

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Field Trip Notes: Eastern, 08/25/09
18		<p>(21) Improve connector from Mammoth Rock Trail to proposed meadow loop trail (Map ID #8): Improve the existing trail connection that links the eastern section of Mammoth Rock Trail to the loop trail around the meadow. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred MTB) and will utilize the existing use trail, which is currently in good shape except for the top, which is eroded. This connector will allow mountain bikers to exit the Mammoth Rock Trail before reaching the sandy eastern end and can connect them via the loop trail to the staging area at Tamarack Street.</p>	<p>This trail will allow the user to connect directly to the Tamarack Street staging area/Old Mammoth Road neighborhood via the backbone trail, or across the meadow and up to the western end of Mammoth Rock Trail, which enhances the user experience by creating loop opportunities.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Eastern Field Trip Notes, 08/25/09

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Field Trip Notes: Eastern, 08/25/09
----------	-------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------

20

BMX park: After discussion, the group agreed that this experience would be better served at Shady Rest, as the area offers easier access by way of the Town’s paved trail system as well as better soils for feature creation and maintenance. The park would be inappropriate in the Sherwins area because it lacks access to the water needed to work with the sandy soils and is too far from the staging area to encourage use by teens without vehicles.

(23) BMX/bike skills zone: Create a BMX park/bike skills zone near the staging area at the borrow pit. Though the soils are less than ideal, the water available for the tank farm could be used to improve the conditions. The area provides connectivity to mountain bike trails and the Town’s paved trail system and is ideal for park construction because it is an already-disturbed zone. The park could overlap or adjoin the snowplay area suggested in the winter proposal. Proximity to the staging area and trail system will encourage use by teens and children who cannot drive to a location.

Borrow Pit pros: parking will already exist for the staging area; if a MUP connection is built between the Borrow Pit staging area and Mammoth Creek Park, non-vehicular access will be easier, which will allow kids who don’t/can’t drive cars to use the facility (they can ride their bikes right to the BMX park); a public transit stop is being considered at the Borrow Pit staging area, which also will encourage younger teens and kids to use the facility (bike racks will facilitate use).

Borrow Pit cons: this is one of the windiest spots in town, which will cause the dirt to blow away if it’s not constantly maintained and which might compromise the quality of experience for users, since the features will include jumps that will be affected by winds; some water may be available at this site, but, due to our native soils being unsustainable as building material, it will require an enormous amount of water to keep the park in acceptable operating condition; the soils are not desirable or sustainable as building material for a BMX park, which would need to be addressed either with an abundance of water (see previous comment) or by importing foreign soils or materials, such as clay, which may be prohibitively expensive.

Shady Rest pros: parking and other facilities already exist; the area is protected from wind; area soils are more desirable and sustainable than those found at the Borrow Pit; the area is already “conditioned” for a high level of use.

Shady Rest cons: the area is already experiencing a high volume of use

Sherwins Working Group: Eastern Field Trip Notes, 08/25/09

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Field Trip Notes: Eastern, 08/25/09
25	(OI) Historic elements/Hayden Cabin		A connector trail built between the Borrow Pit staging area and Mammoth Creek Park could include the Hayden Cabin, which may improve tourism at this historic site. The road that currently runs in to Hayden Cabin from Sherwin Creek Road is not intuitive, despite signage, as there is more than one route. The connection from the Borrow Pit can allow for closure/re-routing of these roads for ease of use.



SWG_EasternSite_082509_010.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_013.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_017.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_029.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_048.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_066.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_073.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_076.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_107.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_117.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_127.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_137.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_156.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_162.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_170.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_184.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_203.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_222.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_234.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved




SWG_EasternSite_082509_244.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_245.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_252.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_266.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_EasternSite_082509_270.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

SWG Full-Group Meeting #5

September 3, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Draft Summer narrative with field-trip notes (revised August 27, 2009)
3. Draft Winter narrative with field-trip notes (revised August 27, 2009)
4. Sign-in sheet
5. Photos

Sherwins Working Group
Meeting #5 (September 3, 2009, 4–7:15 p.m.)
Sierra Meadows Ranch (Old Sherwin’s Restaurant)



Meeting Agenda
4:00–7:15 p.m.

- 4:00–4:10** **Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping**
- Review of overall process status/progress/next steps
 - Clarification of role of non-SWG participants at this point
- 4:10–4:15** **Meeting #4 Draft Summary Review and Adoption**
- Review and adoption of Meeting #4 Draft Summary
- 4:15 –4:20** **Non-SWG Public Comments**
- 4:20 – 6:40** **Volunteer Work Group Presentations: Summer Season**
- Preparation:
 - Please review narrative and maps available from Web page prior to the meeting (http://www.mltpa.org/projects/ongoing/sherwins/sherwins_working_group/). (Narratives were part of the agenda packet sent on Aug. 28; maps will be available on Web site only after Aug. 31.)
 - Goal of review and discussion is to develop map and narrative of proposed recreation features within planning area for sharing with broader community. Remember: not everyone will get everything they want; need to think, propose, and evaluate with this “selflessness” in mind.
 - Report-out from field trips:
 - Western sector, Aug. 16
 - Eastern sector, Aug. 25
 - Site reviews 1 & 2, Aug. 30
 - Report from Volunteer Work Groups 1 & 2, who worked between Meetings 3 and 4 on summer-season narrative and map.
 - Each group to provide brief qualitative description of identified opportunities and describe “What did your group develop as proposals and why?” Need to explain the rationale for all proposed recreation features.



- Following report-out from both groups, full working group to review narrative to compare and contrast both proposals and identify items where there is agreement and which items where there are differing proposals. **(attached)**
 - As presented in Charter Document, group may be asked to identify level of approval for proposal using scale of “Unqualified to Strong Support, General Support, Qualified Support, or Fundamental Disagreement.”
 - If an item receives a level of Fundamental Disagreement, the group will be asked to continue working until it appears a resolution is not attainable, or move on to an area where more agreement is possible. At that time the members will note the nature of the disagreement and make a determination as to the best way to proceed in the particular issue area.
 - 5-minute stretch/snack break will be taken during this conversation.

6:40 – 6:50

Winter-Season Narrative Review

- Report from small groups who worked between meetings on winter-season narrative and map. Goal is to resolve questions presented in narrative from Meeting #4.

6:50 – 6:55

Non-SWG Public Comments

6:55 – 7:10

Activities Prior to Meeting #6 (September 22)

- Discuss intent and purpose of September 22 meeting.
- Discuss format and strategy for soliciting broader community feedback on proposal. Review and discuss feedback form. **(handout)**
- Review list of volunteers willing to present proposals to interested parties/organizations to solicit feedback. **(handout)**
- Review list of organizations to be contacted for presentations and assign volunteers for follow-up. **(handout)**

7:10–7:15

Meeting Wrap-Up

- Review of what has been decided
- Next steps/meeting schedule



SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
1	<p>(3) Non-motorized staging area at borrow pit: A formal staging area should be constructed at the borrow pit, as described in the winter proposal. Non-motorized parking should follow the winter configuration and be sited at the southern end of the borrow pit. Such an arrangement could allow the other half of the trailhead parking area to be designated for OHV users and include a turnaround or other OHV-specific parking features. Facilities to be installed at the borrow pit trailhead include bathrooms and an interpretive area.</p>	<p>(1) Non-motorized staging area at the borrow pit: Develop a major trailhead at the borrow pit. Facilities will include parking, bathrooms, signage, and an education/interpretive space. Motorized parking would stage farther up Sherwin Creek Road in the same area as for OSV users in winter. This trailhead acts as the main staging area for the Sherwins, offering the fullest array of facilities. The proposed all-season surfacing on Sherwin Creek Road for the Turner Propane Tank Farm makes this a logical site for development; also, since the area is already disturbed, construction and use impact would be minimal. (Same as winter.)</p>	None	<p>++ This will be the main trailhead for the study area, and therefore has the potential to become crowded. Be sure to safeguard against the public parking in the area designated for the Turner Propane trucks to service the tanks/turn around. [E]</p> <p>++ Winter-use note: If the snowplay area is situated on the southeast side of the Borrow Pit staging area, parking may need to be extended, or a turnaround that can be used by public transit constructed, so that users will walk from their cars to the toe of the hill; if the parking is too far north, this will discourage use by families with small children. [E]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
2	<p>(4a) Alternative ADA access at Tamarack Street staging area: In addition to or in place of an ADA-accessible trail from the borrow pit staging area, an ADA-accessible experience could be developed at the Tamarack Street staging area described in the winter proposal. The group noted that this scenario is dependent on Terry Plum’s development plans and needs further discussion. TRAIL TYPE: TBD; partial paving possible.</p>	<p>(3) Non-motorized staging area at end of Tamarack Street: Develop a secondary trailhead that facilitates current/neighborhood use. Facilities will be limited to parking (six to eight vehicles) and signage. Terry Plum’s development application will impact facilities but also will offer opportunities to develop features such as parking. The area currently experiences a high volume of use, which this trailhead would accommodate, and it would relieve some pressure on the staging area the borrow pit. (Same as winter.)</p>	<p>G2 did not address ADA accessibility at trailhead</p>	
3	<p>Included in winter proposal; mentioned access in Map ID #7 (Group 1 Recommendation (5))</p>	<p>(2) Access/egress point from Snowcreek VIII: Formalize access/egress point proposed near the flagship hotel as identified in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan by placing signage, as there are 20 public parking spots planned for the site as well as a public transit stop. (Same as winter.)</p>	<p>G2 proposal is more specific</p>	<p>This access/egress point will allow users to exit Snowcreek VIII and connect directly into the MUP/ADA-accessible backbone trail, which acts as a thoroughfare to other destinations such as the Borrow Pit staging area, Cerro Coso Community College, and the ice rink/library. [E]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
4	Included in winter proposal	<p>(4) Non-motorized staging area at Old Mammoth Road winter closure: Develop a staging area that will be secondary to the major trailhead at the borrow pit. The area is smaller, but it will take pressure off of existing parking at the Lakes Basin and at Mammoth Rock Trail's western end/Panorama Vista Trail's eastern end. Facilities will include signage, parking, and bathrooms. (Same as winter.)</p>	G1 did not discuss summer use	<p>General Comment from Western Field Trip re: Map ID #4: Reaffirm Group #2's narrative comment and emphasize that several of the comments developed by the western field-trip team identify the need for a robust year-round trailhead at Map ID #4. The opportunity for a public-transit turnaround should be emphasized as well. [W]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
5	<p>(6) Connector to Lakes Basin: Develop a non-motorized connector trail from the west end of the meadow to Old Mammoth Road at the end of Mammoth Rock Trail and continuing to Panorama Dome and the Lakes Basin.</p>	<p>(13) Non-motorized connector from meadow to staging area at Old Mammoth Rd.: Type 2 (pref. hiking) non-mechanized connector trail to connect the western end of the meadow to the staging area at Old Mammoth Road. As the terrain is steep and rough, switchbacks will likely be necessary, which has the benefit of discouraging poaching by downhill mountain bikers. The trail is intended primarily for foot traffic, but equestrian use will be permitted, in order to preserve the character and “quiet nature” of that corner of the meadow. The trail should be routed over existing use trails if possible.</p> <p>(20) Non-motorized connector from Old Mammoth Rd. crossing to intersection of Lake Mary Rd. and Old Mammoth Rd.: Non-motorized connector trail that links safe crossing on Old Mammoth Rd. to the road’s intersection with Lake Mary Rd. Provides continuity for bicyclists and other users. TRAIL TYPE: 2 (pref. MTB or pref. equestrian).</p>	<p>G1 did not specify trail type</p>	<p>5a. Connecting the meadow to the Old Mammoth Road staging area, Mammoth Rock Trail, Panorama Dome, and the Lakes Basin</p> <p>++ Route Description: The route heads up the south side of The Bluffs through the manzanita, gains the ridge along the firebreak, has a spur to the proposed Mill City staging area, and continues to the west end of the Mammoth Rock Trail.</p> <p>++ This would connect to the trail for a safe crossing of Old Mammoth Road (Map ID #15, described above) and also to a spur trail connecting to the Old Mammoth Road staging area (Map ID#16), as well as the Mammoth Rock Trail.</p> <p>++ Rationale for routing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The trail’s aspect provides the most comprehensive and spectacular views of the Sherwins. - Trail can gain the Bluffs ridge with only three or four long switchbacks, which makes it easier to build and creates a more user-friendly grade. - The trail would mostly be hidden by manzanita (less visual impact). <p>++ Connects to Tamarack Street and potential staging and facilities [W]</p> <p>++ This trail would relieve congestion on the Mammoth Rock Trail by creating connections and a loop option for users on the Mammoth Rock Trail. [W]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
5 (cont'd)				<p>5b. Connection from Old Mammoth Road safe crossing (Map ID #15) to intersection of Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road: Several opportunities would be available on this side of the road as opposed to how it is currently represented on the maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">++ Quick snowmelt due to aspect++ Trail would be hidden by manzanita++ Easier to develop/less resource-intensive due to topography and vegetation++ MUCH better view shed++ Avoids very boggy and wet area and dense aspen and lodgepole vegetation++ Connects to safe crossing at Panorama Vista/Flume Trail and Old Mammoth Road intersection++ Could incorporate historical/interpretive opportunities as the trail passes though the Mammoth City site [W] <p>5c. Pedestrian and bike connections from the intersection at Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road to the Lake Mary Road Bike Path need to be established to provide safe connectivity from the Sherwins region to the Lake Mary Road Bike Path: Existing conditions do not establish a single opportunity for a safe connection between these two points. [W]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
6	<p>(8) Connector to Mammoth Creek Park: Develop a non-motorized trail connecting the borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Creek Park by way of a Class 1 bike path or other paved ADA-approved trail. The alignment would follow Sherwin Creek Road (side to be determined) to the bridge at Old Mammoth Road, then use the sidewalk to cloverleaf around to the Old Mammoth Road tunnel to access the park. This provides opportunity for disabled users as well as connectivity to the existing Town paved trail system. The group did not complete discussion on this item.</p>	<p>(7) Non-motorized connector from borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Creek Park: Develop a paved multi-use path (MUP) from the staging area at the borrow pit to the bridge at Mammoth Creek Park. The alignment will run either along Sherwin Creek Road or around the USFS stables. This provides connectivity to the existing Town paved trail system at Mammoth Creek Park.</p> <p>(8) Mammoth Creek Park bridge improvement: Improve the existing bridge at Mammoth Creek Park or build a new bridge to accommodate the MUP connector described above.</p>	<p>++ Trail type designations are different ++ G2 proposes two possible trail locations ++ G2 proposes bridge improvements</p>	<p>++ Though Snowcreek VIII is planning a MUP along Old Mammoth Road from the development to the intersection with Sherwin Creek Road, which this trail could connect to, routing the trail to the park from the Borrow Pit staging area northwest along Sherwin Creek Road is less desirable due to high traffic volume and vehicle speeds (40 mph) on Old Mammoth Road and because the cloverleaf connection under the tunnel is not obvious to new users. [E] ++ Despite the public easement on the Snowcreek VIII side and the option of cutting switchbacks into the hillsides on the east side of the road, there is not a lot of room to run a MUP parallel to Sherwin Creek Road, which would force users to travel close to vehicular traffic into/out of the Borrow Pit. [E] ++ Routing the trail away from Sherwin Creek Road and around the USFS stables allows for a more enjoyable user experience, as there will be no traffic or street noise, and a better view. This also will be safer than traveling next to vehicles. [E] ++ Routing away from Sherwin Creek Road will lead users into the existing MUP at Mammoth Creek instead of having them cross under (or over, if they don't see the tunnel) Old Mammoth Road. This MUP connects to the library and Cerro Coso Community College, should users choose to continue east. [E]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
7	<p>(4) ADA-accessible backbone trail: A soft-surface “backbone” trail that is ADA-accessible should be constructed to depart from an appropriately designed access point at the borrow pit staging area. The trail will either mimic the alignment of the “stacked-loop system” described in the winter proposal, or simply connect the east end of the meadow to the west. More discussion is needed. TRAIL TYPE: TBD; partial paving possible.</p>	<p>(6) Non-motorized connector from borrow pit staging area to Tamarack Street staging area: This trail would serve as the summertime version of the “groomed half-loop” idea presented in the winter proposal (Winter Map ID # 9: Group 2 Recommendation 14). The trail is intended for non-motorized use and to be ADA accessible; to best accommodate this, the preferred trail type is a Class 1 bike lane, which is a paved 8- to 12-foot-wide path. Use will increase dramatically with Snowcreek VIII; paving formalizes the trail and helps to prevent “social trail” proliferation; ties directly into the existing Town paved-trail system (Main Path), both from the staging area at the borrow pit and at Tamarack Street.</p>	<p>++ G1 proposal is a loop; G2 is just one way from borrow pit to Tamarack St. staging area (uses Mammoth Rock Trail for loop possibilities) ++ G1 trail type not specified; G2 proposes a paved trail ++ G2 did not include Ranch Road as access point in summer</p>	<p>++ The group supported the option of connecting this backbone trail directly to the Tamarack Street staging area while keeping it as the groomed (in winter) part of a “stacked loop” system. [E] ++ The trail should be ADA-accessible, but the surface (improved soft-surface or paved) is TBD. [E] ++ Alignment over the existing road makes sense, as the area is already disturbed and borders Snowcreek VIII. [E] ++ The path should be built to withstand the weight of maintenance vehicles needed to service the “doggie stations” and trash bins along the pathway, as well as allow for at least golf-cart access to Kerry Meadow for special events; if the road, currently open to vehicles, becomes a MUP, Kerry Meadow will be inaccessible for weddings, etc. [E]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
7 (cont'd)	<p>(5) Non-motorized “stacked-loop system”: The group agreed on a system with multiple connections to identified access points: Tamarack Street; Ranch Road public easement; Snowcreek VIII. The main trail follows the path identified in the winter proposal: from the borrow pit trailhead along existing summertime roads; a small connector brings you to the ditch; follow the perimeter of the meadow to the private property line (Snowcreek) and follow this boundary back to the trailhead. There are several opportunities to bridge over and create a series of smaller loops. The system will be open to non-motorized use. TRAIL TYPE: 3 (shared non-motorized)</p>	<p>The trail will hug the golf course closely and, as a paved amenity, can act as a transition from the Town’s urban setting to the meadow’s natural environment. Additionally, paving will facilitate grooming in the winter. To formalize this trail, surrounding existing roads such as 4S100 will need to be closed or converted into the new route. The existing road alignment may be ideal from the hill at the corner of Snowcreek V toward Tamarack St. If a paved option is not available/too costly, Trail Type 4 is an acceptable second choice.</p>		<p>++ Converting the road to a MUP will assist with the wetland restoration of Kerry Meadow. [E] ++ Pathway allows for interpretive opportunities near points of interest such as Kerry Meadow. [E]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
8	<p>(5) Non-motorized “stacked-loop system”: The group agreed on a system with multiple connections to identified access points: Tamarack Street; Ranch Road public easement; Snowcreek VIII. The main trail follows the path identified in the winter proposal: from the borrow pit trailhead along existing summertime roads; a small connector brings you to the ditch; follow the perimeter of the meadow to the private property line (Snowcreek) and follow this boundary back to the trailhead. There are several opportunities to bridge over and create a series of smaller loops. The system will be open to non-motorized use. TRAIL TYPE: 3 (shared non-motorized)</p>	<p>(14) Formalize existing loop trail around meadow: The current social trail that loops around the perimeter of the Hidden Lake meadow should be formalized, as it is extremely popular for all uses. The group recognized the environmentally sensitive nature of this area and noted that boardwalks or other features should be installed to make the trail sustainable. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred hiking) with horses and bikes allowed.</p> <p>(15) Direct non-motorized trail to Hidden Lake from Tamarack Street staging area: As the lake is a big attraction of the meadow and is very popular with all users, not to mention a draw for tourists, formalizing a direct route from the staging area at Tamarack Street to the lake will facilitate use and discourage social trails. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred hiking) and should be coordinated with Mammoth Community Water District Access to the adjacent well.</p>	<p>++ G2 relies on Mammoth Rock Trail to complete the loop. ++ G2 proposes a separate and distinct trail that runs directly to Hidden Lake; whereas G1 proposes a loop system only, with yet-to-be-determined secondary loops.</p>	

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
8 (cont'd)	(5a) Loop to the south of the sensitive birding area: A possible feature of the stacked-loop system would be a separate, non-mechanized loop south of the recognized birding area. This would preserve birding activity and wildlife. TRAIL TYPE 3 (non-mechanized)			

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
9	<p>(7) Convert existing road to Summer Trail Type 2 (preferred equestrian/preferred hiker): Convert existing road (4S104 and 4S110) at the eastern end of the study area that runs from Sherwin Creek Road north to just short of Mammoth Creek. The road is currently open to motorized use but lacks connectivity (“dead-ends”) and experiences minimal use. The conversion would help to protect the existing mule deer habitat, which is a tourism amenity (to see deer on the trail is a unique experience). Additionally, this road is part of the existing Sierra Meadows Ranch lease area trail inventory.</p>	<p>(12) Non-mechanized zone: Designate the area east of Sierra Meadows Ranch, with the exception of the trail and crossing identified in Map ID #10 (Group 2 Recommendations 10 and 11), as non-mechanized (non-motorized where bikes are prohibited). Currently the area is primarily used by equestrians and the group recognized the need for equestrians to have a dedicated place to ride without interference with bikes.</p>	<p>G2 designates area as non-mechanized and primarily for equestrian, except for singletrack trail, whereas G1 prefers equestrian but still allows MTB use</p>	

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
10	<p>(2) Non-motorized connector to Shady Rest: A non-motorized trail connector should be developed from the borrow pit staging area to Shady Rest. It would run adjacent to Sherwin Creek Road down to Sherwin Creek Campground, then east to the footbridge and northwest toward Mammoth Community Water District and Shady Rest. Both the crossing at Highway 203 and the side of Sherwin Creek Road on which the trail will be aligned have yet to be determined. This trail achieves connectivity between two heavily used recreation areas without forcing users onto Old Mammoth Road. Summer Trail Type 3 (shared non-motorized)</p>	<p>(10) Non-motorized singletrack connector from Mammoth Rock Trail to Mammoth Creek: Develop a Type 2 (preferred MTB) trail connector from the eastern end of Mammoth Rock Trail to Mammoth Creek. The group noted the need to discuss the exact alignment with equestrian users since this area is mainly used by horse riders and there is a desire to avoid conflict.</p> <p>(11) Crossing at Mammoth Creek: Develop a minimal, narrow crossing of Mammoth Creek for trail described above. A flat log is a desirable feature; a more structured or expensive bridge is unnecessary for bikers. This crossing creates connectivity to the Town’s Main Path.</p>	<p>++ Trail type designations are different ++ G1 proposes connector to Shady Rest ++ G2 proposes new crossing at Mammoth Creek</p>	<p>++ This connector could fit nicely into the Town’s future plans for expansion of Mammoth Creek Park and its urban recreation facilities. [E] ++ Crossing of the creek would be simple and minimal; potential conflict with equestrian use in this area could be avoided with signage indicating a multi-use crossing, “slow zone,” etc. [E] ++ Wide-open sight lines in this area mitigate conflicts between mountain bikes and equestrians—users can see one another from some distance and prepare for crossing paths. [E]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
11	<p>(1) Non-motorized trail along Mammoth Creek: Consolidate multiple use trails/rehabilitate existing informal trails into one system trail to create one multi-use non-motorized opportunity (fishermen, walkers, etc.) along Mammoth Creek. The trail, which should be native-surface, will begin from the south side of Mammoth Creek Park, heading east toward Sierra Meadows Ranch and beyond. It was not determined along which bank of the creek the trail should run. The trail should accommodate non-mechanized use only, with the exception of bicycle access from Mammoth Creek Park to the Hayden Cabin. This trail mitigates existing trail proliferation and environmental impact and provides connectivity for bicycles from the park to a point of historical interest. TRAIL TYPE: 2 (preferred equestrian/ preferred hiking)</p>		<p>G2 did not discuss directly, although did indicate interest in an east-west mountain bike connector near Mammoth Creek</p>	

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
12		<p>(5) Non-motorized staging area at Lake Mary Road winter closure: Develop a secondary staging area east of Lake Mary Road, above the bridge, that will relieve existing pressure on Lake Mary Road parking for Sherwins, Lakes Basin, Tamarack, and Mammoth Rock Trail/Panorama Vista Trail access. Facilities will be limited to signage. (Same as winter.)</p>	G1 did not discuss	<p>12 - Staging area at Lake Mary Road winter closure ++ Develop a secondary staging area east of Lake Mary Road, above the bridge, that will relieve existing pressure on Lake Mary Rd., and parking for the Sherwins, Lakes Basin, Tamarack XC Ski Center, and Mammoth Rock Trail/Panorama Vista Trail access. ++ The Panorama Vista Trail would also be rerouted to start from this staging area. This eliminates pullout parking that is happening now along Lake Mary Road—a high-traffic, high-speed road. ++ The group discussed the need to create a safe crossing at this location, including use of a four-way stop at the intersection, speed bumps, and diagonal parking along the staging area, which could slow traffic. ++ Diagonal parking was further discussed, as it would coordinate well with winter use and therefore would be much less intensive and costly to build. [W] ++ Creation of this staging area would minimize the use of unsafe roadside pullouts along Lake Mary Road. [W] 12a – Develop soft-surface multi-user trail connecting Lake Mary Road staging area to Panorama Vista Trail, Panorama Dome Trail, and the Lake Mary Road Bike Path ++ This would be a soft-surface trail that connects from the end of the Lake Mary Road Bike Path (at bridge) and continues on the east side of the road to connect to Panorama Dome Trail.</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
12				<p>++ Realign northern end of Panorama Vista Trail to parallel the road, with a connection to the staging area and south end of trail. This eliminates the use of a dangerous end of the trail at the Lake Mary Road intersection.</p> <p>++ Build a bridge that connects the Lake Mary Road Bike Path to the soft-surface trail described here. This would be constructed on the east side of the existing bridge where the Lake Mary Road Bike Path currently ends. This will allow bike-path users to use the safe crossing discussed in Map ID #12. [W]</p> <p>Additional thoughts on both 12 + 12a</p> <p>++ This staging area and connector trail also is a way to get users from the lower Sherwins area and Panorama Dome onto the Lake Mary Road Bike Path.</p> <p>++ This also provides safe and accessible connectivity between the Lakes Basin, MMSA Bike Park, Panorama Dome, and lower areas including the meadow.</p> <p>++ Creates a single, safer crossing point for MMSA Bike Park users, Lake Mary Road Bike Path users, and Panorama Vista/Dome Trail users. [W]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
13		<p>(9) Non-motorized connector from borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Rock Trail: Develop a Type 2 (preferred MTB) connector trail from the Mammoth Rock Trail midpoint to the south side of the staging area at the borrow pit. This will necessitate rehabilitation of the two existing use trails into one system trail that connects to the existing road on the south side of the borrow pit. This connection will enable users, particularly mountain bikers, to exit the Mammoth Rock Trail before its pumice-y eastern end and make a direct connection onto the trail in Map ID #6 (Group 2 Recommendation 7) and to the larger Town trail system, or to the MUP connecting to the Tamarack Street staging area.</p>	G1 did not discuss	<p>Pros: ++ Follows alignment of existing road, which currently is a dead-end and appears as a “scar” ++ A connection from Mammoth Rock Trail to the Borrow Pit staging area makes sense, as it feeds the users directly into a node with facilities [E]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
14	OI (outstanding issue): Connection from meadow to Panorama Dome	(16) Non-motorized connector from Mill City to end of Panorama Vista Trail: Improve and formalize the existing use trail or build a new trail [Type 2 (preferred MTB)] to connect the system trail at Mill City to the end of the Panorama Vista Trail at the Old Mammoth Road staging area.	G1 identified this as an issue needing to be addressed but did not have time to discuss	Develop a trail connecting Mill City and Old Mammoth Road staging area to the end of the Panorama Vista Trail ++ This trail connects the MMSA Bike Park, Lake Mary Road Bike Path, and Panorama Dome Trail back to town without going to Mammoth Rock Trail or creating downhill traffic on the Lake Mary Road Bike Path. ++ Disperse mountain bike activities and take pressure off of Mammoth Rock Trail. ++ Creates the opportunity for a firebreak on Panorama Dome Connection to and interpretive opportunities at Mill City historical site ++ Connection of trails to staging area, town, potential public transportation, and town MUPs [W] ++ Creates an option for trail users to stay off of Old Mammoth Road and also eliminates some road crossings [W]

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
15		<p>(17) Old Mammoth Road crossing: Develop a safe crossing of Old Mammoth Road from the eastern end of Panorama Vista Trail to Mammoth Rock Trail. This provides continuity of the system described in Map ID #14 and others and avoids having bikers cross the road in a blind hairpin, as is the current configuration. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred MTB); the exact alignment is to be determined but could include an under-crossing.</p>	G1 did not discuss	<p>Develop a safe crossing of Old Mammoth Road: The group discussed the need for users to be able to connect from the trails on Panorama Dome to the Mammoth Rock Trail.</p> <p>++ This area is hazardous because of the blind corners.</p> <p>++ A trail would be built from the western entrance of Mammoth Rock Trail and stay on the uphill (south) side of Old Mammoth Road, utilizing a portion of existing use trail/mine road, then turn parallel to the road to the uppermost hairpin turn of Old Mammoth Road. Here the trail would cross just uphill of the turn (west).</p> <p>++ This is a safe crossing point because uphill traffic has a 180-degree turn to negotiate; therefore, traffic is slow and downhill traffic has a long straightaway in which to see oncoming cars or pedestrians. Cars are naturally slowing here in anticipation of the hairpin turn.</p> <p>++ Minimize use of unsafe and over-utilized vehicular turnouts along Old Mammoth Road. [W]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
16		<p>(18) Non-motorized connector from Old Mammoth Road trailhead to Map ID #5 (trail from meadow to Old Mammoth Road trailhead) and Mammoth Rock Trail: Develop a Type 2 connector trail that will link into Mammoth Rock Trail and into the meadow via Map ID #5. The trail should be aligned with the identified existing use trail if possible.</p>	G1 did not discuss	<p>Connection of #5 to Old Mammoth Road staging area ++ Spur off of #5 to proposed Mill City staging area and potential public transportation ++ This spur could also be created as an ADA trail and provide access to the unique views from The Bluffs. ++ Mill City staging area has connections to other trail areas and is a historic site. ++ This alignment is primarily on existing/abandoned old roads. ++ This alignment will take pedestrian/bike non-vehicular traffic off of Old Mammoth Road. [W] ++ Minimize use of unsafe roadside turnouts along Old Mammoth Road. [W]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
17	(OI) Development of mountain bike trails to and from Sherwin Ridge	(19) Formalize and improve access to Sherwins: As identified in the winter proposal, formalize and improve the use trail from Lake Mary Road to the Sherwins. Minimal amenities are needed (likely to be just signage). The trail will be Type 1 (non-motorized footpath) and designed for year-round use; it should follow the existing use trail out to Rock Chute, as that is a scenic overlook for summer hikers. Due to the sensitive nature of the environment on top of the ridge, a trail is needed to prevent further damage from users. The group recognized the need for focus on sustainability with this trail, as erosion is a problem on the slope.	G1 recommended MTB trails to/from Sherwins; G2 recommended a trail to top of Sherwins (not likely to be used by MTBs)	<p>17a: Sherwin Ridge access from Mill City, Mammoth Rock Trail, and the Sherwin Meadow</p> <p>++ Makes it possible for safe access to the existing Sherwin Ridge use trail during summer months</p> <p>++ Would eliminate the need for parking/turnout along Lake Mary Road</p> <p>++ Allows pedestrian access to the Sherwin Ridge from a variety of proposed facilities and opportunities, including Mill City, the Mammoth Rock Trail, and from the Sherwin Meadow and the borrow pit.</p> <p>++ Opportunity for interpretive trail and experience at the Mammoth City historic site</p> <p>++ Eliminates need for unsafe turnouts along Lake Mary Road and Old Mammoth Road [W]</p> <p>17b: Soft-surface trail to Pyramid Peak, located near main avalanche path and Mammoth Rock</p> <p>++ This trail starts on the Mammoth Rock Trail and switchbacks up the avalanche path to the top of the Sherwins.</p> <p>++ This would offer an excellent opportunity for hikers, runners, and mountain bikers to access Sherwin Ridge, great views, and relieve pressure on the Mammoth Rock Trail.</p> <p>++ This trail would be mostly concealed by the aspen growth and would gain the ridge and continue to Pyramid Peak.</p> <p>++ What impact will this trail have on the Mammoth Rock Trail? [W]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
18		<p>(21) Improve connector from Mammoth Rock Trail to proposed meadow loop trail (Map ID #8): Improve the existing trail connection that links the eastern section of Mammoth Rock Trail to the loop trail around the meadow. The trail will be Type 2 (preferred MTB) and will utilize the existing use trail, which is currently in good shape except for the top, which is eroded. This connector will allow mountain bikers to exit the Mammoth Rock Trail before reaching the sandy eastern end and can connect them via the loop trail to the staging area at Tamarack Street.</p>	G1 did not discuss	<p>This trail will allow the user to connect directly to the Tamarack Street staging area/Old Mammoth Road neighborhood via the backbone trail, or across the meadow and up to the western end of Mammoth Rock Trail, which enhances the user experience by creating loop opportunities. [E]</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
19	(OI) Wildlife preservation in Solitude Canyon	<p>(22) Recommendation for further study/assessment: While the group did not wish to make any specific recommendations, they agreed that further study should be done in the Solitude Canyon area relative to potential for new mountain biking and hiking trails in that area. Possibilities exist for connectivity to Mammoth Rock Trail, the Lakes Basin, and the motocross course area/Sherwin Crest. The group noted that the motocross track area could function well as a mountain bike race staging area, which would offer an alternative to races at the MMSA Bike Park.</p>	<p>Potential conflict between wildlife preservation goal identified by G1 and additional trails in Solitude Canyon as recommended for study by G2</p>	

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
20	<p>BMX park: After discussion, the group agreed that this experience would be better served at Shady Rest, as the area offers easier access by way of the Town's paved trail system as well as better soils for feature creation and maintenance. The park would be inappropriate in the Sherwins area because it lacks access to the water needed to work with the sandy soils and is too far from the staging area to encourage use by teens without vehicles.</p>	<p>(23) BMX/bike skills zone: Create a BMX park/bike skills zone near the staging area at the borrow pit. Though the soils are less than ideal, the water available for the tank farm could be used to improve the conditions. The area provides connectivity to mountain bike trails and the Town's paved trail system and is ideal for park construction because it is an already-disturbed zone. The park could overlap or adjoin the snowplay area suggested in the winter proposal. Proximity to the staging area and trail system will encourage use by teens and children who cannot drive to a location.</p>	<p>G1 does not think a BMX park is best placed in study area; G2 proposes BMX park next to borrow pit</p>	<p>Borrow Pit pros: ++ Parking will already exist for the staging area ++ If a MUP connection is built between the Borrow Pit staging area and Mammoth Creek Park, non-vehicular access will be easier, which will allow kids who don't/can't drive cars to use the facility (they can ride their bikes right to the BMX park) ++ A public transit stop is being considered at the Borrow Pit staging area, which also will encourage younger teens and kids to use the facility (bike racks will facilitate use) [E]</p> <p>Borrow Pit cons: ++ This is one of the windiest spots in town, which will cause the dirt to blow away if it's not constantly maintained and which might compromise the quality of experience for users, since the features will include jumps that will be affected by winds ++ Some water may be available at this site, but, due to our native soils being unsustainable as building material, it will require an enormous amount of water to keep the park in acceptable operating condition.</p>

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
20 (cont'd)				<p>++ The soils are not desirable or sustainable as building material for a BMX park, which would need to be addressed either with an abundance of water (see previous comment) or by importing foreign soils or materials, such as clay, which may be prohibitively expensive [E]</p> <p>Shady Rest pros:</p> <p>++ Parking and other facilities already exist</p> <p>++ The area is protected from wind</p> <p>++ Area soils are more desirable and sustainable than those found at the Borrow Pit</p> <p>++ The area is already “conditioned” for a high level of use [E]</p> <p>Shady Rest cons:</p> <p>++ The area is already experiencing a high volume of use [E]</p>
21	(OI) Accommodation of summer biathlon	(24) Summer biathlon course: Develop a summer biathlon course in the motocross track area. The site is far enough away from the staging area to avoid heavy use conflict; potential conflict with mountain bike races or the motocross annual event can be resolved with advance notice and scheduling.	G1 identified this as an issue needing to be addressed but did not have time to discuss	

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
22	(OI) Off-leash/on-leash dog areas	Dogs: The group agreed that currently there are no major conflicts between off-leash dogs and other users and makes no recommendation to leash pets at this time. The group did suggest that the option to require leashes in certain areas be kept open to address possible future issues related to increased use of the area.	G1 identified this as an issue needing to be addressed but did not have time to discuss	
23	The summertime definition of “motorized” is “restricted to existing roads and trails.”	Separation of motorized and non-motorized use should follow the winter suggestion (north-south line located just west of the borrow pit staging area). Restricted to existing roads.	G2 more specific with recommendation	
24	(OI) Preservation of Old Mill site with a walking/interpretive trail		G2 did not discuss	
25	(OI) Historic elements/Hayden Cabin		G2 did not discuss	++ A connector trail built between the Borrow Pit staging area and Mammoth Creek Park could include the Hayden Cabin, which may improve tourism at this historic site. [E] ++ The road that currently runs in to Hayden Cabin from Sherwin Creek Road is not intuitive, despite signage, as there is more than one route. The connection from the Borrow Pit can allow for closure/re-routing of these roads for ease of use. [E]

SUMMER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	Field Trip Notes: Western, 08/16/09 [W] & Eastern, 08/25/09 [E]
26				NEW: Create a Soft-Surface Trail to Mammoth Rock: This area provides excellent views, and formalization of a trail will create a sustainable alignment where several use trails currently exist. [W]
27				NEW: Create a connection from the Borrow Pit staging area to the Sherwin Lakes trailhead in order to provide alternative experiences for hikers and to improve connectivity to other trailheads, resources, and opportunities nearby. [E]

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
1	<p>(6) Non-motorized staging area at borrow pit: In order to accommodate snowplay (Map ID #2), non-motorized parking should be at the southern end of the borrow pit.</p> <p>(7) Facilities: Facilities to be installed at the borrow pit trailhead include bathrooms, an interpretive area, and a beacon basin.</p>	<p>(1) Non-motorized staging area at the borrow pit: Develop a major trailhead at the borrow pit. Facilities will include parking, bathrooms, signage, and a beacon basin/education space.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<p>1. Develop a major shared-use staging area at the borrow pit: non-motorized parking at the southern end; motorized turnaround and parallel roadside parking/launching at the northern end; facilities shared in between (bathrooms, beacon basin/interpretive area, signage).</p> <p>Question: Should the motorized and non-motorized areas be more separated, or does combined staging suffice?</p>	Partial (2)
2	<p>(5) Snowplay area: Situate the snowplay area at the moraine that is nearest the borrow pit trailhead. This area is ideal because of slope, terrain, and aspect (north-facing). Parking should be very close to this area to accommodate use by families with small children.</p>	<p>(4) Snowplay area: Situate the snowplay area on the moraine close to the borrow pit; the aspect is north/northwest, which helps retain snow, and the area is large enough to accommodate potential increased future use. This site is also close enough to and visible from the trailhead parking lot, which will encourage use by families. This location may be less than ideal, but seems to offer the best opportunity so far. Parking lot and facilities at the staging area (Map ID #1) could be situated at the base of the moraine to decrease distance from play area to parking.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<p>2. Snowplay area adjacent to the borrow pit staging area: Situate a snowplay area at the moraine that is nearest the borrow pit trailhead. This area is ideal because of slope, terrain, and aspect (north-facing). Parking should be very close to this area to accommodate use by families with small children. This is in addition to the proposed snowplay area adjacent to Snowcreek VIII (see Winter Map ID #15).</p>	Full

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
3	<p>(2) Motorized (OSV) staging area: Separation to accommodate OSV trailering and use may occur farther along Sherwin Creek Road or at the trailhead planned at the borrow pit—such an arrangement could allow the other half of the trailhead parking area to be designated for OSV users and include a turnaround or other OSV-specific parking features.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motorized OSV route out Sherwin Creek Road to the east (winter trail type 4, shared multi-use) 	<p>(2) Motorized staging area beyond the borrow pit: Develop a separate, OSV-specific staging area farther down Sherwin Creek Road, past the non-motorized staging area, to reduce or eliminate use conflict and to provide OSV-specific facilities (a graded turnaround at the end of the lot might be desirable, for example). Facilities will be limited to signage; users will access the additional facilities at the main, non-motorized staging area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> G1 is less specific as to location of OSV staging area G1 does not identify facilities 	<p>3. Additional off-loading area: Extend a spur on Sherwin Creek Road from the borrow pit staging area that ends in a turnaround that can accommodate a pickup truck with a trailer, but is not limited to/reserved for OSV users. Facilities will be limited to signage; users will access the additional facilities at the main staging area.</p> <p>Note: Keep tank farm and facilities in mind for natural separation of use.</p>	Partial (1)

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
4	<p>(1) Separation of use: OSV and non-motorized use should be separated. Separation should be attractive to both groups (ease of use). The moraine that comes around the east side of the borrow pit is a good natural boundary (see map); however, there is significant concern that using this as a delineator will not adequately address the OSV community’s desires and needs. Any one use cannot negatively impact another user group’s enjoyment of the area. It was noted that this area is a unique backcountry ski amenity, while better opportunities for OSV may exist elsewhere, outside the study area.</p>	<p>(3) Motorized/non-motorized boundary: Delineate motorized and non-motorized use with a boundary that runs north to south, aligned with the main staging area at the borrow pit. The motorized area should include access to the motocross track area and to Solitude Canyon. Inclusion of the Tele Bowl area needs further discussion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 boundary follows moraine, whereas G2 boundary is more north-south • G2 identifies specific amenities/areas considered important for OSV use 	<p>4. Motorized/non-motorized boundary (separation of use): Delineate a motorized/non-motorized boundary that runs roughly north-south along the borrow pit staging area; include Solitude Canyon within the motorized area, but prohibit OSV use in the Tele Bowls.</p> <p>Questions: Has historic OSV use been accommodated?</p> <p>Has traditional “backyard” access for Snowcreek V homeowners/OSV users been accommodated?</p> <p>Is it appropriate to prohibit OSV use in the western section of the study area (the Hidden Lake meadow)?</p> <p>Could an access/egress corridor to the Lakes Basin be open only after April 15, when the Lakes Basin opens to OSV use?</p> <p>Should the Tele Bowls be included in the motorized area? Should the restriction apply only to high-marking?</p> <p>Consider changing “non-motorized” to “restricted motorized” to more accurately reflect proposal intent.</p>	Partial (1)

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
5	<p>(4) Access points: The group identified the following access points, to be incorporated into the system described above: Tamarack Street; Ranch Road public easement; Snowcreek VIII. Connectivity to future Snowcreek VIII cross-country ski trails is an ongoing consideration.</p>	<p>(6) Non-motorized staging area at end of Tamarack Street: Develop a secondary trailhead that facilitates current/neighborhood use. Facilities will be limited to parking (six to eight vehicles) and signage, and there will be no grooming. Terry Plum’s development application will impact facilities.</p> <p>(7) Access/egress at Ranch Road public easement: Present appropriate signage to guide backcountry skiers and snowboarders to the public easement for Sherwins egress. This area is possibly seasonal (winter only).</p> <p>(11) Access/egress point from Snowcreek VIII: Formalize access/egress point proposed near the flagship hotel as identified in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan by placing signage, as there are 20 public parking spots planned for the site as well as a public transit stop.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G2 is more specific as to facilities at each staging area • G1 includes connectivity to Snowcreek VIII Nordic trails 	<p>5a (access point at Snowcreek VIII): Formalize the access/egress point to Snowcreek VIII as identified in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan There is a public transit stop planned for this location, but no extensive parking will be offered by the developer. This may accommodate access to the proposed snowplay area (see Winter Map ID #15).</p> <p>5b (access point at Ranch Road public easement): Formalize the access/egress point at the Ranch Road public easement. No parking is currently available except for that allowed by St. Joseph’s Catholic Church. This access point includes egress across the Snowcreek golf course for skiers and snowboarders exiting the Sherwins. This also will connect to Snowcreek VIII transit stops.</p> <p>5c (access point at Tamarack Street): Develop a secondary trailhead that facilitates current/neighborhood use at the end of Tamarack Street (exact location to be approved by the Town of Mammoth Lakes). Facilities will be limited to parking (six spots, as determined by the landowner) and signage, and there will be no grooming.</p>	<p>5a: Partial (1)</p> <p>5b: Full</p> <p>5c: Full</p>

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
5 (cont'd)				Note: Signage regarding avalanche danger should be considered at this spot; specifics of development will impact alignment of access.	
6	(8) Trailhead at Old Mammoth Road winter closure: The group agreed that the existing closure location is appropriate to house a non-motorized staging area. The parking must be expanded to 10 to 15 spots to accommodate increasing use. The group agreed that a bathroom would be desirable at this location, but that it should be equally accessible to summer and winter users; the specific location therefore requires further consideration.	(8) Non-motorized staging area at Old Mammoth Road closure: Develop a staging area that will be secondary to the major trailhead at the borrow pit. The area is smaller, but will take pressure off of existing parking at the Lakes Basin. Facilities will include signage, parking, and bathrooms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 specifies # of parking spots and desire for year-round use 	6. Non-motorized staging area at Old Mammoth Road winter closure: Develop a non-motorized staging area at the Old Mammoth Road winter closure that will be secondary to the major staging area at the borrow pit. After April 15, parking/staging/OSV access will be allowed. Facilities will include signage, parking, and bathrooms. Question: Should motorized access be prohibited at all times?	Full
7	(9) Connection from Old Mammoth Road trailhead to meadow: Due to slope angle, it is not feasible to groom such a connector, but it may be treated as a blue diamond trail (ungroomed with signage only). This is a non-motorized trail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter trail type 3 or type 2. 	(17) Ungroomed connector from meadow to Old Mammoth Road winter closure trailhead: Articulate an ungroomed connector between these two points with signage; will be aligned with summer-use trail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter trail type 1, no winter maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trail type different (trail type not accurate for G1?) • G2 indicates desire for compatibility with summer trail system 	7. Connection from Old Mammoth Road trailhead to Hidden Lake meadow: Articulate an ungroomed connector between these two points with signage indicating level of difficulty; no maintenance.	Partial (2)

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
8	<p>(10) Grooming on Old Mammoth Road to Lakes Basin: A connector should be groomed from the staging area on Old Mammoth Road to the road's intersection with Lake Mary Road, following the existing road alignment and open only to non-motorized users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter trail type 3 or type 2 	<p>(15) Grooming on Old Mammoth Road: Groom over existing road alignment from the Old Mammoth Road winter closure trailhead to the intersection of Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road. Possibility to work with Tamarack Lodge for grooming since it connects with the Tamarack groomed system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter trail type 3, groomed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 trail type ambiguity 	<p>8. Grooming on Old Mammoth Road to Lakes Basin: Groom over existing road alignment from the Old Mammoth Road winter closure staging area to the intersection of Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road to facilitate connectivity to the Lakes Basin.</p> <p>Questions: Is the road too steep?</p> <p>What level of maintenance will this require?</p> <p>What impact on maintenance and trail conditions will the public utilities have on this connector (Edison, MCWD, etc.)?</p>	Full

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
9	<p>(3) Stacked-loop non-motorized trail system: The group agreed on a system with multiple connections to identified access points (Map ID #5). The main trail follows this path, roughly: from the borrow pit trailhead along existing summertime roads; a small connector brings you to the ditch; follow the perimeter of the meadow to the private property line (Snowcreek) and follow this boundary back to the trailhead (winter trail type 3, groomed with winter trail type 2 adjacent/parallel). There are several opportunities to bridge over and create a series of smaller loops (winter trail type 3, groomed, with winter trail type 2 adjacent/parallel). The system will be groomed to encourage use (more accessibility/ease of use) and will be open to dogs, cross-country skiers, hikers, and snowshoers. There was some discussion about Nordic-only loops.</p>	<p>(13) Ungroomed half-loop trail: Articulate an ungroomed half-loop trail from the borrow pit trailhead along the base of the Sherwins to the Tamarack Street trailhead, where it will connect with the groomed half-loop described below to form a closed loop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter trail type 2 (preferred Nordic, but snowshoeing and hiking allowed), no winter maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 loop extends farther west and includes direct path to Hidden Lake • G2 loop goes more east and south from borrow pit • G2 indicates desire to coordinate with summer trail system for northern half of loop, whereas G1 recommends summer alignment only near borrow pit 	<p>9a (stacked loop trail system): Articulate a stacked-loop trail system from the borrow pit staging area along the base of the Sherwins to the Tamarack Street staging area and back to the borrow pit staging area. The system will connect to the access points identified in Winter Map ID #5 and will offer a series of smaller loops. Sections closer to town (northern side) will be groomed, whereas sections farther out (southern side) will be left ungroomed. As the system will be non-motorized multi-use, a set of parallel trails such as those seen at Tamarack Cross-Country Ski Center will need to be developed (one set Nordic track parallel with a simple groomed trail). The exact alignment of the perimeter trail and the nested loops needs further consideration.</p>	<p>9a: Full 9b: Partial</p>

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
<p>9 (cont'd)</p>	<p>This would be designated “off-leash” but animals must be under radio or voice control. Facilities will be placed along the trail at access-point intersections to assist with compliance (trashcans, poop-bag dispensers, signage with public information about pet cleanup and obedience). There was discussion of avalanche hazards around Hidden Lake, but the group agreed that a groomed trail may still be feasible in this area.</p>	<p>(14) Groomed half-loop trail: Develop a groomed half-loop trail (corduroy, but no Nordic track) that connects the access points from Tamarack Street to the borrow pit, with spurs to Snowcreek VIII, the Ranch Road public easement, and other access/egress points as described above. Will connect to the ungroomed half-loop described above to form a closed loop. Align over summer-use trail to reduce impact. Possibility to subcontract with Snowcreek for grooming services since they will already be grooming in the area.</p> <p>Winter trail type 2 (preferred Nordic use with no Nordic track, but snowshoeing and hiking allowed), groomed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 grooms entire loop and connectors; G2 only grooms northern half of loop • G1 has parallel trails with different trail types • G1 designates area “off leash” and suggests related facilities 	<p>9b (dog policy): Off leash, but dogs must be under voice control. Correct signage and trail-etiquette education is essential. Facilities should be installed along the trail at regular intervals to ensure cleanup compliance.</p> <p>Questions: How does this align with/impact summer loop-trail configuration?</p> <p>Should there be a designated area for dog “business”?</p> <p>Should there be one designated no-dog loop?</p> <p>Should leashes be required in some areas?</p>	

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
10	<p>(11) Nordic-only area: A Nordic skiing–only area can be designated beginning north of Sherwin Creek Road and extending to the TOML Main Path near Cerro Coso Community College. If snow conditions and resources allow, a Nordic track may be set.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter trail type 3, groomed 	<p>(18) Groomed connector from borrow pit to Mammoth Creek Park at bridge: Develop a groomed (corduroy, but no Nordic track) connector between these two points that goes through the off-leash dog area described below and around the USFS stables. This will facilitate use of Mammoth Creek Park as an alternative non-motorized staging area and provide a compacted surface for dog-walkers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter trail type 2 (preferred snowshoe/hiking, but Nordic allowed), groomed. <p>(5) Off-leash dog area: Designate a zone that is north of Sherwin Creek Road and east of the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) stables. Staging areas/trailheads and other developed or use-designated areas are leash-on. This area is close enough to the parking lot to facilitate quick and easy use by dog owners. Other off-leash areas may be considered later.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Map ID refers to an area where the groups propose different and conflicting uses • G1 designates entire area as Nordic-only, whereas G2 has a groomed trail that would allow other users • Trail type designations differ • G2 designates part of area as “off leash,” whereas G1 restricts use to Nordic skiers 	<p>10a (groomed connector from borrow pit to Mammoth Creek Park East at bridge): Develop a groomed (corduroy, but no Nordic track) connector between the borrow pit staging area and Mammoth Creek Park East at the bridge. This will facilitate use of Mammoth Creek Park East as an alternative non-motorized staging area.</p> <p>10b (off-leash dog area): Designate a zone that is north of Sherwin Creek Road and east of the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) stables where dogs may be off-leash and are not required to respond to voice command.</p>	<p>10a: Full 10b: Full</p>

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
11	(12) Kite-skiing/kite-boarding: This use can be accommodated northwest of the borrow pit staging area, on the golf course, if Snowcreek allows it.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> G2 did not designate a specific area for this activity. 	OMITTED: Facilities cannot be proposed on private property, though this is the historic use area for kite-boarding/kite-skiing. This type of use does not have to be restricted to a particular section of the study area.	Full
12	(13) Public transit to trailheads: A trolley/bus stop should be added at the Old Mammoth Road trailhead; the road must be widened to accommodate this. Other trolley/bus stops should be added at the borrow pit staging area and at the Snowcreek VIII hotel. The group agreed that this recommendation requires additional discussion.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> G2 did not discuss 	<p>12. Public transit to staging areas: A public transit stop should be added at the Old Mammoth Road staging area, the borrow pit staging area, and the Snowcreek VIII hotel.</p> <p>Note: Turnaround for transit may be possible with the Old Mammoth Road winter closure staging area parking improvement.</p>	Full
13	(14) Signage: A signage and wayfinding system should exist throughout the study area, including educational and interpretive opportunities.	G2 included signage throughout staging areas and on trails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	13. Signage: A comprehensive signage and wayfinding system should exist throughout the study area, including educational and interpretive opportunities.	Full

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
14		<p>(16) Groomed Sherwins egress trail: Articulate proper Sherwins egress from the east side of Hidden Lake to the Ranch Road public easement via a groomed path. Purpose is to provide direction to backcountry skiers coming off of the Sherwins and to ensure use of egress rather than walking through neighborhoods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter trail type 2 (preferred Nordic), groomed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 did not discuss 	<p>OMITTED: Proper Sherwins egress from the east side of Hidden Lake to the Ranch Road public easement is understood to be covered by Winter Map ID #9.</p>	Full

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
15	<p>(12) Snowplay area near Snowcreek VIII: Consider situating a snowplay area here as an alternative to the borrow pit location, as it is also on a moraine, is more north-facing/has better snow than the other location, and is near the flagship hotel and proposed access/egress point, which may facilitate use by guests and other visitors. Another possibility is to determine if Snowcreek is amenable to a designated snowplay area on the golf course; it has potential to bring additional customers to their development, and snowplay on grass would require less snow than snowplay over sagebrush.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 did not discuss 	<p>15. Snowplay area adjacent to Snowcreek VIII: Situate a snowplay area either adjacent to Snowcreek VIII or on the Snowcreek golf course, if possible. This site is on a moraine, is more north-facing and therefore offers better snow than the borrow pit staging area, and is near the flagship hotel and proposed access/egress point, which may facilitate use by guests and other visitors. This snowplay area recommendation is in addition to the area proposed at the borrow pit staging area (See Winter Map ID #2).</p> <p>Note: A snowplay area is identified in the approved Snowcreek VIII Master Plan.</p>	Full
	16	<p>(9) Non-motorized staging area at Lake Mary Road winter closure: Develop a secondary staging area east of Lake Mary Road, above the bridge, that will relieve existing pressure on Lake Mary Road parking for Sherwins and Tamarack Ski Center access. Facilities will be limited to signage.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 did not discuss 	<p>16. Staging area at Lake Mary Road winter closure: Develop a staging area east of Lake Mary Road, above the bridge, that will relieve existing pressure on Lake Mary Road parking for Sherwins, Panorama Dome, and Tamarack Cross-Country Ski Center access. Facilities to include parking and signage. The area will be open to OSV users after April 15.</p>

WINTER NARRATIVE (rev. 08/27/09)

Map ID #	Group 1 Narrative	Group 2 Narrative	Differences?	SWG Consensus Comments, 8/11/09	Level of Support
17		<p>(10) Improved trail to the Sherwins from Lake Mary Road: Develop a simple system trail to make a visible, guided connection. Currently there is only a use trail (not officially recognized, not maintained), which is causing erosion to the slope as well as damage to sensitive soils on plateau. Signage will be needed at the trail access point. Matches summer proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winter trail type 1, with no winter maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G1 did not discuss 	<p>17. Improved trail to the Sherwins from Lake Mary Road: Develop a simple system trail to make a visible, guided connection between Lake Mary Road and the Sherwins by installing a simple set of signage.</p>	Partial (1)

Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:

Meeting Sign-In Sheet

#5 : 09/03/09



First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Brent	Allen	Eastern Sierra 4WD Club	
John	Armstrong	Eastside Velo (President)	<i>John Armstrong</i>
Jim	Barnes		<i>Jim Barnes</i>
Pete	Beck		
Phyllis	Benham		
Brigitte	Berman	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Secretary)	
Ryan	Berry		
Rachel	Bowman	Mammoth Base Camp at Sierra Meadows Ranch (owner)	
Lesley	Bruns		<i>Lesley Bruns</i>
Jon	Carlton		
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	<i>Malcolm Clark</i>
Sharon	Clark		
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	<i>Stacy Corless</i>
Stacey	Crockett	High Sierra Equestrian Club	<i>Stacey Crockett</i> (maybe true permitting)
Forrest	Cross	ESAC	
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area Mountain Bike Organization (MAMBO)	<i>Mark Davis</i>
Alex	Fabbro	395 Fat Tire Council	<i>Alex Fabbro</i>
Ali	Feinberg		
Karen	Ferrell-Ingram	Eastern Sierra Land Trust	
Dave	Geirman	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Nate	Greenberg		
Jennifer	Heintzelman		

happy to help!

after 5 p.m. or on weekends

Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:

Meeting Sign-In Sheet () #5 : 09/03/09

Thom	Heller	Mammoth Lakes Fire Protection District	
Mark	Hendrickson	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Zach	Hickman		
April	Holly		
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	
Doug	Jung	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Andrew	Kastor	High Sierra Striders (president)	
Martin	Kleinbard		
Kraig	Kupiec		
Chad	Lande	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jesse	Langley	Cardinal Investments (The Sherwin)	
Dave	Lavery	Triad/Holmes Associates	
Julien	Lecorps		
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	
Hans	Ludwig		 will volunteer
Ron	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	
Mike	McKenna	Hot Creek Hatchery Foundation (Board member)	
Chuck	Megivern		
Clayton	Mendel	395 FTC	
Marshall	Minobe	Mobility Commission	
Andrew	Murphy		
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	
Tammy	Nguyen	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jennifer	Noerdlinger		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting # Sign-In Sheet (08/11/09)**




#5: 09/03/09

Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	<i>mpalchak</i> ✓ (time permitting)
Marge	Papp	Turner Propane	
Rebecca	Paranick-Poiset	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
J.	Parsons		
Terry	Plum	Tamarack Street homeowner/area property owner	
Monica	Prelle		
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter <i>MAMMOTH NORDIC</i>	<i>Mary K Prentice</i> yes
Cory	Rice	Wave Rave Snowboard Shop	
Jennifer	Roeser	McGee Creek Pack Station	
Brandon	Russell		
Bill	Sauser	Mammoth Snowmobile Association/TOML Tourism & Recreation Commission	
Patty	Schwartzkopf	Tamarack Street homeowner	<i>Patty Schwartzkopf</i>
Steve	Schwind		
Elaine	Smith	High Sierra Striders	
Jim	Smith	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
Joel	St. Marie		
Barbara	Stefanides		
Dave	Stefanides		
Autumn	Talsky	Mammoth Mountaineering Supply/Alpine Approach	
Bill	Taylor		<i>Bill Taylor</i>
John	Teller		
Tim	Villanueva	Bardini Foundation	

Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:

Meeting Sign-In Sheet


#5: 09/03/09

John	Walter	Advocates for Mammoth	
Chris	Walters		
Jon	Watson	Far West Ski Association	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	
Gene	Zeiner		
PARTNERS			
Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	
Jonathan	Cook-Fisher	USFS: Mammoth and Mono Basin Winter Sports Specialist	
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	
Jon	Kazmierski	USFS: GIS Specialist	
Austin	McInerney	Center for Collaborative Planning	
Danna	Stroud	TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director	
Steve	Speidel	TOML: Principal Planner	
Mark	Wardlaw	TOML: Community Development Department Director	
Jen	Daugherty	TOML: Assistant Planner	
Jim	Miller	Turner Propane	
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	

Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:

Meeting # Sign-In Sheet (~~09/03/09~~)

#5: 09/03/09

Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	
-----	----------	--	--



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_018.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_035.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_055.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_062.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved




SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_065.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_081.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_084.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_197.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_202.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_278.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_289.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_380.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_388.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_562.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_586.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_589.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_616.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_09_03_mtng05_658.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

SWG Full-Group Meeting #6

September 22, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Meeting summary
3. Sign-in sheet
4. Community Feedback Review Team sign-up sheet
5. Photos

Sherwins Working Group
Meeting #6 (September 22, 2009, 4:00 p.m. to 6:45 p.m.)
Sierra Meadows Ranch (Old Sherwin's Restaurant)



Meeting Agenda
4:00 p.m. to 6:45 p.m.

- 4:00–4:10** **Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping**
- Review of overall process status/progress/next steps
 - Clarification of role of non-SWG participants at this point
- 4:10–4:15** **Meeting #5 Summary Discussion**
- Meeting summary not produced (summer narrative developed)
- 4:15–4:20** **Non-SWG Public Comments**
- 4:20–5:20** **Feedback Process Status Report/Review Process**
- Report from any field trips and feedback events held
 - Review of feedback received so far
 - Discussion/brainstorming regarding process for addressing feedback received
 - What is the process for discussing and deciding which items warrant consideration and a revision to the proposal?
 - What is format of response to specific feedback comments received?
 - Decision as to process for reviewing feedback, changing proposals, and agenda for Oct. 13 meeting
- 5:20–5:30** **Stretch/Snack Break**



Sherwins Working Group – Agenda continued
Meeting #6 (September 22, 2009, 4:00 p.m. to 6:45 p.m.)



5:30–6:15

What Happens with SWG’s Proposals?

- Presentation regarding Forest Service’s anticipated next steps once Sherwins Working Group presents final proposals **(handout)**
- Discussion as to “look and feel” of final proposal package to Forest Service
 - What is needed to develop agreed-upon package?
Discuss/review draft outline for deliverable package. **(handout)**
 - Who is willing to help with crafting/reviewing materials?

6:15–6:30

Activities Prior to Meeting #7 (October 13)

- Discuss intent and purpose of October 13 meeting
- Who is willing/able to help with synthesizing feedback received for presentation back to SWG at October 13 meeting?
- Detail work to be done before next meeting and steps to complete work (who/what/where/when)
- Identification of possible final meeting date for presentation of final proposal to Forest Service

6:30–6:35

Non-SWG Public Comments

6:35–6:45

Meeting Wrap-Up

- Review of what has been decided
- Next steps/meeting schedule



Sherwins Working Group

Meeting #6 (September 22, 2009, 4:00 p.m. to 6:45 p.m.)

Sierra Meadows Ranch (Old Sherwin's Restaurant)



Meeting Summary: DRAFT

4:00 p.m. to 6:45 p.m.

4:00–4:10

Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping:

Mike Schlafmann, Deputy District Ranger for Mammoth and the Mono Basin, introduced himself and announced that he would lead this meeting in SWG Facilitator Austin McNerny's absence. Group members went around the table and introduced themselves. Mr. Schlafmann identified the main objectives of this meeting as beginning to review and discuss the community feedback on the Sherwins Working Group (SWG) winter and summer proposals so far received, identifying gaps, ensuring understanding, and determining how to craft feedback into output for the October 13 meeting.

- **Clarification of role of non-SWG participants at this point:** Mr. Schlafmann stated that those who haven't been here throughout the SWG process can participate through the Community Feedback Process, but that they must respect the group's progress to date and refrain from attempting to lead the SWG into new discussions.

4:10–4:15

Meeting #5 Summary Discussion

Mr. Schlafmann explained that a summary for Meeting #5 was not produced, but that the final draft summer and winter narratives were developed instead in anticipation of the SWG Community Feedback Process. He then made the following announcements:

1. On Thursday, Sept. 24, at 8 p.m., Tom Daniels, a resident of the Old Mammoth neighborhood, is hosting a get-together at The Westin to discuss his thoughts on the SWG proposals and to explore opportunities for collaboration with other projects, such as the Lake Mary Road Bike Path.
2. On Wednesday, Sept. 23, in the afternoon, Andy Geisel from *The Sheet* will interview MLTPA about the SWG and the Community Feedback Process. SWG participants are invited to join him at the MLTPA offices; the time is yet to be determined.
3. On Saturday, Sept. 26, MLTPA and Friends of the Inyo (FOI) will host the final event of the Mammoth Lakes Summer of Stewardship 2009 by celebrating National Public Lands Day Inyo Craters. Volunteers should meet at the Inyo Craters parking area at 8:30 a.m. and will receive a free one-day



National Parks pass for their efforts. Additionally, FOI is throwing a member thank-you party that evening at Obsidian Dome.

4. If SWG participants are interested in hosting field trips this weekend, MLTPA will provide support. Group size does not need to be large.

4:15–4:20

Non-SWG Public Comments: None.

4:20–5:20

Feedback Process Status Report/Review Process

- **Report from any field trips and feedback events held:** Ron Malm shared that he recently revisited the proposed borrow pit staging area because he had been hearing from the community that the motorized/non-motorized boundary might need to be moved west a bit to accommodate spring snowmelt. Stephanie Wolff shared that a couple recently visited the display in Mammoth Pet Shop and expressed appreciation and support for the SWG’s efforts. Jim Barnes shared that he had been hearing that folks were surprised not to see more new trails proposed, especially for mountain biking and especially in places such as Panorama Dome. Steve Speidel shared that he has been taking TOML staff out into the field and is looking to get a Public Works/TOML staff comment into the process. Mr. Barnes also shared that people have been asking how the proposals will slow traffic on Tamarack Street, and that one person made a comparison between Whistler and Mammoth as regards their mountain biking opportunities.
- **Review of feedback received so far:** The group reviewed and discussed the comments on the Community Feedback Process spreadsheet, an update of which was handed out at the meeting. Mr. Schlafmann noted that the commenters’ names were removed from this version so that the group could review input more objectively. He suggested that the group try to drill down to the core purpose and intent of each comment, and to recognize that some people may have stated something inaccurately as a result of not having all of the information they need. He added that the group may ask him to provide clarifications on particular points, and the group agreed that they would have Mr. Schlafmann provide a brief summary of the state of the motocross track, as this was recognized as a commonly misunderstood topic. The statement(s) will be posted on the SWG Web site and also made available at the display locations. The group agreed to supply topic suggestions to Kim Stravers by 5 p.m. on Wednesday, September 23.

The group agreed also to adopt Mr. Schlafmann’s suggestion of not responding to each individual who has submitted input, but



to notify all of them as a group that the clarification document has been made available. Mr. Schlafmann also suggested a methodology for reviewing the public feedback that will assist the group with identifying the core issues raised: look at each comment with neutrality, then look at it again and ask “Did we already consider it?”, “Can we look at/do this?”, and “Should we do this?” The group agreed to form a smaller breakout group to apply this methodology to the comments and derive the key issues, and to present their findings to the larger group in advance of the October 13 meeting. Mr. Schlafmann stated that the group can use the Mammoth Ranger Station conference room for this work, that it be scheduled for the 7th or 8th of October, and that Mr. McNerny can facilitate via conference call.

- **Discussion/brainstorming regarding process for addressing feedback received:** The group briefly discussed how to thank those who submit input through the Community Feedback Process and agreed that a mass e-mail could be sent with a link to the SWG’s findings, revised proposal, or other information. The group agreed further that they should provide rationales with the final proposals for why the SWG decided to move (or not move) forward with certain issues/suggestions, but that they would not address each comment individually.

Mr. Schlafmann then moved to a discussion of the format of the final proposal, indicating that he is not expecting anything radically different from what the SWG has already developed with the Summer and Winter Draft Proposals. He suggested, however, that there is some value in adding an introductory narrative. The group agreed to set a subcommittee to draft a preamble to the final proposal that will address issues such as a lack of thorough hard data on recreation usage, how recreation opportunities outside the study area are considered in this proposal, the SWG’s methodology in arriving at their proposal, current and future development pressures, and the SWG’s value system and how it factored into crafting the proposal. Patty Schwartzkopf, Mary K. Prentice, John Armstrong, and Alana Levin volunteered to form this subcommittee and asked for preamble ideas to be emailed to Ms. Schwartzkopf by Friday, September 25.

5:20–5:30

Stretch/Snack Break

5:30–6:15

What Happens with SWG’s Proposals?

- **Presentation regarding Forest Service’s anticipated next steps once Sherwins Working Group presents final proposals (handout):** Mr. Schlafmann identified that the SWG



really hasn't yet been given the chance to get into the technical details of their proposal, such as cost and design specs, because getting down to that level of detail early in the process would have prevented the group from thinking on a broader level. It is, however, part of the next phase of the SWG proposal; the USFS will be hiring a landscape architect to do site-specific design on prioritized projects, and the SWG is invited to be part of this effort as the SWG Technical Review Committee. This group will address issues such as trail grade and cost, among other topics, which will help refine the group's proposal and narrow down implementation options vis-à-vis cost. Mr. Schlafmann explained that the most effective way to begin the implementation process is for the USFS to perform environmental analysis (NEPA) on portions of the plan as funding or other opportunities arise, not on the plan as a whole. The plan will instead serve as a framework document from which projects that will have the most impact at a particular time, such as key connectors or trailheads, will be selected and assessed. To help kick-start this selection process, Mr. Schlafmann asked the group to choose three elements of the current proposal that they would like to see implemented first. The group agreed to send these priorities to Ms. Stravers by October 8 via the SWG Community Feedback Form.

6:15–6:30

Activities Prior to Meeting #7 (October 13)

- **Discuss intent and purpose of October 13 meeting:**
The group agreed, with direction from Mr. Schlafmann, that the next full SWG meeting would be spent making decisions on how to refine the draft proposals given the community feedback sorted by a volunteer breakout group beforehand.
- **Who is willing/able to help with synthesizing feedback received for presentation back to SWG at October 13 meeting?**
SWG members were invited to volunteer to be part of the SWG Community Feedback Review Team, which will sort through the final compilation of community feedback and develop a mechanism for discussing key issues with the larger group on October 13. Those interested were directed to sign up on a paper list circulated by the partners.

6:30–6:35

Non-SWG Public Comments: None.

6:35–6:45

Meeting Wrap-Up

- **Next steps/meeting schedule:**
Ms. Stravers agreed to e-mail the SWG Community Feedback



Review Team volunteers to set the breakout meeting date, which would be October 7 or 8.







**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #6 Sign-In Sheet (09/22/09)**

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Brent	Allen	Eastern Sierra 4WD Club	
John	Armstrong	Eastside Velo (President)	<i>John Armstrong</i>
Jim	Barnes		<i>Jim Barnes</i>
Pete	Beck		
Phyllis	Benham	MAMMOTH MOUNTAIN BIKE CLUB	<i>Phyllis Benham</i>
Brigitte	Berman	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Secretary)	
Ryan	Berry		
Rachel	Bowman	Mammoth Base Camp at Sierra Meadows Ranch (owner)	
Lesley	Bruns		<i>Lesley Bruns</i>
Jon	Carlton		
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	<i>Malcolm Clark</i>
Sharon	Clark		
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	ARRIVED LATE
Stacey	Crockett	High Sierra Equestrian Club	<i>Stacey Crockett</i>
Forrest	Cross	ESAC	
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area Mountain Bike Organization (MAMBO)	<i>Mark Davis</i>
Alex	Fabbro	395 Fat Tire Council	
Ali	Feinberg		
Karen	Ferrell-Ingram	Eastern Sierra Land Trust	
Dave	Geirman	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Nate	Greenberg		
Jennifer	Heintzelman		

PLEASE DON'T WALK AWAY WITH THE PEN. 😊

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #6 Sign-In Sheet (09/22/09)**

Thom	Heller	Mammoth Lakes Fire Protection District	
Mark	Hendrickson	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Zach	Hickman		
April	Holly		
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	
Doug	Jung	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Andrew	Kastor	High Sierra Striders (president)	
Martin	Kleinbard		
Kraig	Kupiec		
Chad	Lande	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jesse	Langley	Cardinal Investments (The Sherwin)	
Dave	Laverty	Triad/Holmes Associates	
Julien	Lecorps		
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	ARRIVED LATE
Hans	Ludwig		
Ron	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	
Mike	McKenna	Hot Creek Hatchery Foundation (Board member)	
Chuck	Megivern		
Clayton	Mendel		
Marshall	Minobe	Mobility Commission	
Andrew	Murphy		
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	
Tammy	Nguyen	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jennifer	Noerdlinger		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #6 Sign-In Sheet (09/22/09)**

Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	<i>Greg Norby</i>
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	<i>M Palchak</i>
Marge	Papp	Turner Propane	
Rebecca	Paranick- Poiset	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
J.	Parsons		
Terry	Plum	Tamarack Street homeowner/area property owner	ARRIVED LATE
Monica	Prelle		
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	ARRIVED LATE
Cory	Rice	Wave Rave Snowboard Shop	
Jennifer	Roeser	McGee Creek Pack Station	
Brandon	Russell		
Bill	Sausser	Mammoth Snowmobile Association/TOML Tourism & Recreation Commission	
Patty	Schwartzkopf	Tamarack Street homeowner	<i>P. Schwartzkopf</i>
Steve	Schwind		
Elaine	Smith	High Sierra Striders	
Jim	Smith	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
Joel	St. Marie		
Barbara	Stefanides		
Dave	Stefanides		
Autumn	Talsky	Mammoth Mountaineering Supply/Alpine Approach	
Bill	Taylor		ARRIVED LATE
John	Teller		
Tim	Villanueva	Bardini Foundation	

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #6 Sign-In Sheet (09/22/09)**

John	Walter	Advocates for Mammoth	
Chris	Walters		
Jon	Watson	Far West Ski Association	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	<i>Stephanie A Wolff</i>
Gene	Zeiner		

PARTNERS

Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	✓
Jonathan	Cook-Fisher	USFS: Mammoth and Mono Basin Winter Sports Specialist	
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	✓
Jon	Kazmierski	USFS: GIS Specialist	
Austin	McInerney	Center for Collaborative Planning	
Danna	Stroud	TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director	✓
Steve	Speidel	TOML: Principal Planner	✓
Mark	Wardlaw	TOML: Community Development Department Director	
Jen	Daugherty	TOML: Assistant Planner	
Jim	Miller	Turner Propane	
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	✓
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	<i>Kimberly A Stravers</i>

Heather deBethrizy Mono county COO

Jo Bacon Town Council JBacon

FERN BACC NWIMW TEAM

roy leun

Stephanie Wolff

Akna Loun (Oct 8th)

Malcolm Clark (cultural evening)

Maggie Polchak (prefer 8th)

Stacey Gresham

CLAYTON MENDEL

Chuck Megison

Jen Girard

Stacey Corless

HANS CUDWITZ

Ron Malin



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_066.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_073.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_080.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_089.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_091.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_093.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_122.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_150.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_156.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_200.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_213.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_227.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_228.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_297.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_323.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_327.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_432.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_22_09_mtng06_443.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

Community Feedback Review Team Meeting October 8, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. SWG Community Feedback Process compiled comments
2. Summer Concerns
3. Winter Concerns
4. Dog Concerns
5. Sign-in sheet

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
1	-	S		-	Kerry Meadow Trail - a popular in town trail is not listed.	ERROR/OMISSION
2	Summer	S	11, 25	11, 25	A ped./bike bridge over Mammoth Creek to provide easy direct access to Hayden Cabin from bike/walk loop and Mammoth Creek park—make it part an integral of the loop.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
3	Both	S, W	5c, 6, 9b	5c, 6, 9b	Provide not only doggie bag stations but also Mammoth Disposal-serviced bearproof trash bins at each staging area for dog waste (and other trash) disposal. Most dog owners seem unwilling to bag waste (even with bags provided) for the extra step of having to drive it to the dump (or let it fester on the floor of the car).	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
4	Both	S, W	5c, 6, 9b	5c, 6, 9b	awesome work all around!! Thank you!!	THANKS
5	Winter	W	?	4	SWG Winter Proposal Map This map proposes huge closures for winter osv access near the town of Mammoth that are currently shown on the Winter Recreation Map as "open use".	POLICY
6	Winter	W	?	-	Currently there are few lodging facilities that promote the 21,000 owners of osv's in the state within the town limits. This issue has not been addressed.	NOT IN SCOPE
7	Winter	W	?	4	Is the line of demarcation for restricted OSV use and unrestricted osv use "signs" or "terrain"?	QUESTION
8	Winter	W	?	4	How to do you propose to enforce the unrestricted areas which are currently used by snowboarders to access the Sherwins?	QUESTION
9	Winter	W	?	-	There is no written document or agreement that the lakes basin is closed prior to April 15th. There was a written agreement approximately 1989 that allowed osv access prior to Thanksgiving and after April 1st to utilize the Lake Mary Road to the Lakes Basin. This issue seemed to evolve into dates which did not allow public input, an EA or any type of discussion.	ADDITIONAL INFO
10	Winter	W	?	4, 10b	The open area off of the Sherwin Creek Road has a blue diamond cross country ski trail through it. This is flat terrain for the most part with gentle hills and popular at times in the past for OSV's.	ADDITIONAL INFO
11	Winter	W	?	4	The huge OSV closure at the base of the Sherwins's between the golf course and the sherwins was proposed by Jim Ognisty, deceased (right-hand man for Tom Dempsey) to allow OSV access to a proposed conference center. This route coincided with the TMT (Trans Mammoth Trail) in the 90's.	ADDITIONAL INFO
12	Winter	W	?	8	Within the TMT, a trail paralleling the Sherwin's was proposed by the mountain ski area to connect to the Old Mammoth road to the lakes basin. I believe the ski area made this proposal with the intention of renting snowmobiles from Tamarack Lodge to parallel the Sherwins and open areas south of Sierra Meadows. Instead, they bought a snowmobile rental company and moved it to the Inn without an EA or any type of public notice. But they were still pushing for this trail.	ADDITIONAL INFO

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
13	Winter	W	?	-	I do not agree with the SWG Proposal for winter recreation on this map. You will stifle and concentrate diversified recreation which is in total conflict with the USFS Land Management Plan which states that diversified recreation must be "dispersed."	OPINION
14	Winter	W	?	-	What is diversified recreation? Snowmobiling, dog sledding, snowplay, cross country skiing, kite skiing, or anything other than downhill skiing.	QUESTION
15	Winter	W	?	1, 3	On the positive side, the parking area for multi-use near Sherwin Creek Rd is good with separate trails. But how do you plan to keep them separate with OSV use unrestricted in the same area?	QUESTION
16	Winter	W	?	9a, 10a	The area is so windblown, the cost of maintaining any trail system in this area will be substantial.	ADDITIONAL INFO
17	Winter	W	?	1, 3	The parking area appears insufficient on the Sherwin Creek Rd. Know that many events have taken place in this area over the years and could again in the future if planned well.	OPINION
18	Winter	W	?	-	Why is Old Mammoth Rd missing from the map?	ERROR/OMISSION
19	Winter	W	?	-	Why doesn't the map show the multi-use trail paralleling Mammoth Creek? The bridge crossing the creek was built specifically to allow use of OSV crossings.	ERROR/OMISSION
20	Summer	S	3 & 7	3, 7	A hard surface connector path between 3 and 7 would be beneficial.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
21	Summer	S	11	11	Consideration should be given to a connection between the Main Path vista point (south east of the college) and #11, the path along Mammoth Creek Road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
22	Summer	S	5c	5c	This segment of path connects a paved path (Lake Mary Road Bike Path) and a paved roadway (Lake Mary Road) and should therefore be paved and fully access ble.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
23	Summer	S	12b	12b	Consideration should be given to extending the Lake Mary Road Bike Path across a bridge over Mammoth Creek (parallel to the existing road bridge). Then extend the paved path southerly along the east edge of Lake Mary Road approximately 350 feet (to just above Twin Lakes Loop) where an undercrossing could be constructed to provide a safe crossing of Lake Mary Road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
24	Summer	S	New item	-	Consider an option for a paved path paralleling Twin Lakes Loop past the Tamarack resort area that would separate bikes and pedestrians from vehicle traffic on Twin Lakes Loop. The current LMR bike path alignment for this area calls for a "share the road" b ke route along the shorefront road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
25	Winter	W	4	4	It a great place to see the Town of Mammoth it away from cross coutry skier	OPINION
26	Summer	S	21	21	Keep it open to MX + allow multiple use	POLICY
27	Summer	S	All	9	Continue to allow multiple use including motorcycles	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
28	Summer	S	21	21	Please give us our MX track back!! The deer will go around, there are plenty of mule deer to get accustom to the change. Any question, please get in touch with me. Thanks.	POLICY
29	Summer	S		9	I come up frequently to ride the Mammoth Lakes area. When I come I spend quite a bit of money. Trail Closures or restricted access will negatively impact my desire to spend time in the area. Don't close or restrict any more trails!	POLICY
30	Both	S, W		W4, S9	Keep areas open for public use. Been off-roading for 40+ years. Family grew up riding there isn't a better sport around for families. Keep areas open	POLICY
31	Summer	S		9	Please do not close any trails or roads in this area otherwise my family and I will be forced to go elsewhere. We like to recreate with our motorcycles here in the summer. [Added signature] Keep our trail free to ride!	POLICY
32	Summer	S	21	21	I've been riding offroad motorcycle in this area for 22 years - our club puts on a dual sport ride here ever Oct. we bring 150 riders to Mammoth - close the trails & our reason for coming here will disappear & so will we - please don't close any more trails - we don't want any new trails - we just want the trails we have - closing public land is not land management but a failure to manage <u>public</u> land! [signed]	POLICY
33	Both	S, W		W4, S9	Need more access to off-road trails	POLICY
34	Summer	S	19	19	I think it's wonderful to use the Motocross track area for multi-use. Including biathalons, mountain biking, hiking, picnicks, etc. However, it would also be nice to use it for it's intended purpose, which is Motocross!! If we keep closing off-road venues and staging areas, laws will continue to be broken. Us off-roaders bring in a revenue to both the city and state. Let's get our money's worth out of our registration fees! This land is your land, this land is my land!!	POLICY
35		NONE		-	Does the Sherwin Working Group focus on the eastside of the Sherwins?	QUESTION
36		W		4	Like the tele bowl access and the winter snow access on Sherwin Creek Rd and out to the base of the Sherwins.	OPINION
37		NONE		-	Excellent work, guys!!	THANKS
38		S, W		W1, W3, S1	My only comment on the summer and winter narratives is the parking will be too crowded at the tank farm/borrow pit site. Snowmobile enthusiasts with their trucks and trailers need a lot more space for parking than Subarus with x-country skis. Could parking not be extended further down the Sherwin Creek Road?	QUESTION
39		NONE		-	Who are the maps from?	QUESTION
40		NONE		-	Very nice display and comment gathering, to who?	QUESTION
41		S, W		-	Why is the community losing the EAST access of the Sherwins too?	QUESTION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
42		S, W		-	A favorite area that the community has walked, biked, hiked, horsebackriding, dogwalking, viewing, stargazing, birding to Kerry Meadow and up to a beautiful viewpoint, also Tele Bowl, and the extremely popular snowplay on Sherwin Creek Rd winter closure area that's easy to access from town.	OPINION
43	Summer	S	1, 2, 6, 7	1, 2, 6, 7	It would be nice to have motorized multi use, perhaps with strict street regulations. This would allow access to surrounding motorized use trails.	POLICY
44	Winter	W	4, mostly but all	4	There are plenty of non motorized areas around and plenty of snowplay areas. Snowmobiles leave no impact on the environment and drive no one away from sledding and playing in the snow. Closing off this much area should put OHV fees down from \$45 a year to \$10 because there is nowhere to ride our \$12000 machines that is a lot of tax revenue for the state.	POLICY
45	Winter	W		-	I question the results of opening more places that are now closed for winter. Our guests often have limited knowledge of winter exposure here in the Eastern Sierra. Unexpected snowstorms, avalanches etc. threaten the lives of those in the back country - Do we need more deaths? Even the ski area (well patrolled) can attest to that. Expensive to maintain and dangerous.	OPINION
46	Summer	S	Map won't open	-	I like mountain biking and would love to go up there to vacation and ride ONLY IF there are lots of trails open to mountain bikers.	OPINION
47	Summer	S		19	open the Solitude Canyon area (item #19 in the Draft Summer Narrative) for the development of new mountain bike trails	OPINION
48A	Summer Winter	S, W	Summer: 2, 7, 8 Winter: 5c, 9a	S2, S7, S8, W5c, W9a	As excerpted and summarized from the approved Sherwins Working Group (SWG) meeting notes of May 21, 2009 relating to Terry Plum's tentative offer to provide pedestrian access across his family's properties between existing Tamarack Street and the Sherwin Meadows area to the south:	ADDITIONAL INFO
48B	Summer Winter	S, W	Summer: 2, 7, 8 Winter: 5c, 9a	S2, S7, S8, W5c, W9a	[Excerpt] Mr. Plum said the access easement he is proposing would be a 4' wide pedestrian only trail. He also plans on granting shared vehicle access easements (which would overlap the pedestrian trail) to only the Town of Mammoth Lakes (ToML) and its Fire Protection District (MLF), the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and Mammoth Community Water District for emergency and/or maintenance purposes only. He further stated no motorized vehicles (other than those of the agencies already noted) would be permitted to cross his family's properties. Upon inquiry, Mr. Plum added a willingness to consider permitting bicycles and horses within the access easement if the USFS allows those uses in the immediately adjacent Sherwin Meadows area, the Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA) publicly supports his proposed Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) which permits building 6 single family homes (1 on Leverage Street in the Bluffs subdivision and 5 between existing Tamarack Street and the USFS lands) on his family's 5.6 acres of properties, and the ToML approves his TPM. Mr. Plum stated he has offered to construct the infrastructure improvements (such as an additional fire hydrant and 3 emergency vehicle turnouts on the existing sub-standard Tamarack Street as requested by MLF, extending Tamarack Street into his family's property as a standard 24' wide public street, trailhead public parking (only if required by the ToML), and the 4' wide pedestrian only trail within his family's private driveways) at his family's cost, and also give the northerly .25 acres of his family's property to the ToML (for snow storage and maintenance).	ADDITIONAL INFO

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
48C	Summer Winter	S, W	Summer: 2, 7, 8 Winter: 5c, 9a	S2, S7, S8, W5c, W9a	<p>Note: The SWG, MLTPA, ToML & USFS already have an email of the SWG May 21, 2009 meeting notes (including attached maps).</p> <p>The SWG draft Summer and Winter Proposal maps show a Multiple Use Path across the Plum family properties. Further, the SWG draft Summer and Winter Proposal narratives note "respecting the private-property owner". Accordingly, please revise the draft SWG Summer and Winter Proposals so those submitted to the USFS are in accordance with my above tentative offers and requirements. Finally, I am very willing and eager to meet with SWG, MLTPA, ToML and/or USFS personnel upon my return to Mammoth Lakes on October 2 to answer any questions and/or discuss any concerns regarding the above. Thank you for your serious consideration to my feedback. Working together, we'll develop a great private/public partnership which ensures pedestrian access between Tamarack Street and the Sherwin Meadows area for generations to come. Sincerely, [signed]</p>	ADDITIONAL INFO
49		W		-	I am in receipt of and have reviewed the Sherwins Working Group Winter Narrative and related map dated September 11, 2009.	ADDITIONAL INFO
50		W		4	As an overview observation, it appears that the working group has calculated that there is no place for OSVs in the Mammoth Lakes Area near Snowcreek Properties. Not only does the plan push all OSV use areas significantly away from the Snowcreek sphere of influence (as defined in its master plan), it provides ZERO oversnow pathways for ingress and/or egress from currently OSV accessible lands to those distant areas which have been designated for this purpose. The plan also adds a burden to any staging area as there is little opportunity for OSV users to arrive at the proposed trail head by means other than by truck and trailer.	POLICY
51		W		4	While the Map indicates there would be "restrictions" on the northeast side of line 4, the Narrative indicates a zero OSV use policy. "Restrictions" would be more appropriate. Creating a "no-fly zone" for OSVs is inconsistent with the goal of a diversified use of public lands. The stated purpose for the no-fly-zone is to eliminate the "POTENTIAL" for conflicts of use. Wiping out one side of the potential conflict is certainly the easiest and least creative way to avoid that potential conflict. Yet neither a rationale nor actual historical data has been provided to support the need for such a large swath of public land to be set-aside for a zero-tolerance (of OSVs) policy. The group has provided no support, nor presented a narrative, to indicate that OSV use in this area has been historically abusive or a public nuisance. Nor has the group communicated that OSVs have presented an actual danger to other participants on public lands sufficient for the wholesale elimination, not regulation, of their use.	POLICY
52		W		4	It is clearly reasonable to designate certain areas and pathways to be restricted to non-motorized use. And it would be understandable had the working group determined a need to restrict OSV speed and/or noise levels based on other permitted uses near an area, the hour of day, etc. Or to place restricted use in certain densely used areas to OSV pathways. But, I believe the current plan demonstrates a clear negative bias against this form of recreational use of public lands.	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
53		W		2, 15	Specifically, while areas 2 and 15 are designated "snowplay" areas (presumably 15 is for the Snowcreek VIII hotel guests) and paths 5A and 9A are designated non-OSV pathways, there is little reason that public lands next to these zones exclude all OSV use. Rather, a more reasoned approach would be to restrict speeds and/or noise levels near these pathways/play areas.	POLICY
54		W		4	I specifically request the working group eliminate the line 4 "no-fly-zone" and provide, instead, for reasonable speed and noise restrictions in this area. I request OSVs be provided regulated access on, or immediately next to, path 5A and all areas surrounding path 9A (thus establishing a regulated public ingress/egress/touring area near developed projects).	POLICY
55		W		4	Again, it is easy to eliminate "potential conflicts" when you completely omit one side in such a large area. But, I have enjoyed touring many seniors, children and non-athletes, on the back of the snowmobiles, through the various areas of the Sherwins and sharing with them the beauty of nature and the various scenic views. Because of there less physical capabilities, they would not have seen this otherwise. They are not purist cross-country skiers or back country snow-shoers. While those non-motorized purist may feel the views and beauty are reserved for them; they are not. They also belong to those whose only access is via OSVs. The public land is to be shared with all who respectfully approach it. I challenge the group to find a two-sided solution providing access to all major areas of the Sherwins.	POLICY
56	Summer	S		18	On the Summer Proposal, I am in full agreement that soft surface trail loops of various lengths are appropriate to this area. However, I cannot find a discussion anywhere in the document regarding separation of bikers, hikers and equestrians. Just as an example, #18 shows several tight turns while ascending to the top of the Sherwin Ridge. I think we can all agree that a switchback for a hiker and a hairpin turn for a mountain biker are completely different designs. How will all groups be accommodated?	QUESTION
57	Summer	S		-	Also, the Trails System Master Plan Draft is suggesting separation of these same groups on the Mammoth Rock trail. Again, I can't find how this is accommodated in the proposal.	POLICY
58	Summer	S		5a, 8, 16	Finally, please explain why there would not be a proposal to put a MUP into the Hidden Lake area. I can understand beginning with soft surface for cost reasons, but also realize that a hard surface extends the "easy" walk or bike ride into this area and would presumably be less likely to erode like the existing user trails. A MUP is also more distinct and visible, which could reduce the formation of additional user trails.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
59	Winter	W		4	On the Winter Proposal, I am concerned with the OSV Unrestricted area including the most easterly blue diamond cross country ski trail and the sloping hills on the east side of Sherwin Creek Road down to 395. Could specific trails and areas be identified for motorized vehicles which would still allow for close-by but separate ungroomed cross country skiing? These slopes are a favorite of many touring skiers.	QUESTION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
60	Winter	W		-	Finally, for the Lakes Basin closure, it might be better to say through the Special Use Permit for Tamarack Lodge rather than state a specific date. It is my understanding that the opening date for OSV's changes each year based on that permit. Has the USFS approved this date? [signed]	QUESTION
61	Winter	W	9A 4 9A 8	9A 4 9A 8	Skiers and backcountry people have trails & ski areas everywhere, why shut down snowmobilers best thing going. The Sherwins are the most epic snowmobile area in Mammoth.	POLICY
62	Winter	W	4	4	With the loss of the White Mt's now this it seems one sided what do us OSV users get SCS	POLICY
63	Summer	S	7 and 6	7, 6	Item 7 is specifically identified with a wheel chair symbol but item 6 is not. This may be misleading since all MUP's are designed to be fully accessible and are usually required to be accessible by the funding agency.	ERROR/OMISSION
64	Both	S, W		-	Both maps seem to be very inclusive of everything I would like to see.	OPINION
65	Both	S, W	22 summer & 9B winter	S22, W9B	I think that this is the most important rule that needs to be. (Dogs under voice command) There is nowhere I ke that in the town.	POLICY
66	Both	S, W	N/A	-	The O.H.V.Registration program has been in California for over 30 years. Every Legal Dirt Bike, ATV, Snowmobile, ect - must be registered with the state. The fees have recently <u>doubled</u> . We pay a lot to the state for the right to use our trails. Exactly how much do rock climbers, hikers, runners, cross-country skiers pay to use the same trails? If you don't think O.H.V. funds benefit us all, think again! Thank you.	OPINION
67	Winter	W	10E	10b	Parking for off-leash dog area?	QUESTION
68	Summer	S	15	15	Close upper Old Mammoth Rd. to vehicle traffic, turn it into M.U.P., improve interpretive trails, signage, etc. at Mill City to Lake Mary Rd.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
69	Winter	W	1	1	Once parking access is developed @ borrow pit I suspect there will be a big increase in use + potential for conflict btwn motorized + non-motorized use. In this light, providing separate + well defined user areas (as is currently proposed) will help to alleviate this potential conflict.	OPINION
70	Winter	W	9A	9a	Why not plan to groom the entire 9A loop? Sherwin skier/boarders may cause damage to the grooming but I think the impact would ultimately be ltd, and may help to focus down hill traffic on their way out. TO have a loop to x-country/walk etc. makes for a much more use friendly/enjoyable experience etc.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
71	Summer	S	Mill City	6, 24	Close the road year round @ closure gate. Make it a bike trail/walking path. Stop the [traffic] @ Mill City and utilize the space you have now and better the experience by eliminating traffic. Also build an interpretive path through the Mill City + Old Mammoth City to increase knowledge of Mammoth Gold Mining History.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
72	Both	S, W		W9b, W10b, S22	Great to have an off leash trail for dogs please!	OPINION
73	Winter	W		4	<u>Sherwin Meadows</u> I love the snowmobile tracks as a path for XC skiing and exiting the Sherwins.	POLICY
74		W		2, 10b	Snow play and dogs go together.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
75		W		10b	I have kids and a dog. Parking area for dogs same as snowmobile? Groomed loop in meadow split use walk/dogs + ski.	QUESTION
76	Summer	S		17, 26	Connect Trails 17 + 26	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
77		W		-	Winter Biathlon area?	NOT IN SCOPE
78	Summer	S	Mill City	4, 6	Modify the plan & use Old Mammoth Rd for the trails. Close the road - and use it now for the trail system.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
79	Summer	S	14/15	14, 15	Keep the water wheel rustic - it's a great place for kids today - don't make it a main thorough-fare. You can still find old iron nails, "garbage" from the 1800s & 1920a. Keep it that way	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
80	Summer	S	Mill City	4, 5a, 5b, 5c	Include pavement area for road bikes.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
81	Summer	S	5	5a, 5b, 5c	Make huge trail head/node @ Mill City, close off upper Old Mammoth Rd. to cars, use this as obvious bike trail, MUP, save \$\$ designing trails + connections when you have the obvious!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
82	Summer	S	19	19	Open Solitude Canyon to mtn. biking - create 1 or 2 long trails - OSV allowed here, allow bikes.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
83	Summer	S	24	24	Separate Mill City historic trail from bike paths - keep this quiet, ped. oriented. Make this an interpretive area - Mmth does not have interpretive area/experience. This is an excellent oppt. to develop + create something like this - connecting historical Mammoth to present day Mammoth.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
84	Winter	W	8	8	this is a corridor for So. Cal Edison + H2O district cat machines - they are regularly going up + down road w/out tillers - ripping up snow - it does not make sense to groom this when it will be cut up - also need to consider existing Tamarack operations + feeding people into this operation + the consequences: more signage, trail pass issues, accessories, etc.	ADDITIONAL INFO
85	Winter	W	10b	10b	where is the parking for the pets-off-leash area	QUESTION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
86	Summer	S		5a, 5b, 5c, 13, 14, 16	More trails, nodes + cnxts. in Old Mammoth Mill City, Rock Trail, etc. in summer might alleviate traffic on Old Mmth Rd. more	OPINION
87	Summer	S		4, 5a, 5b, 5c	Convert Upper Old Mammoth Rd. to wide bike path - close it off entirely to vehicles - use it for emergency vehicles only	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
88	Winter/ Summer	S, W	Solitude Canyon	W4	Un fit for motorized use. No mention of likely trespass into designated Wilderness. Little to no mention of major deer migration corridor and poss ble impacts. No mention of historic bc ski use and possible conflicts.No mention of how ironic it would be (is) to have a place named Solitude Canyon over run by snowmobiles. I fully applaud all the hard work and effort that has gone into this, but Solitude is an unacceptable compromise.	POLICY
89		S, W		W1, W5C, W6, W13, S1, S2, S4	Staging areas with information kiosk including a map and some outline of proposed plan	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
90		S		1, 2, 7, 16	Connecting ADA trails (preferably paved) so folks can begin to use and appreciate the area in a way which is linked to the existing town trail system in progress	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
91		W		4, 13	Designation and implementation of motorized/non-motorized boundaries. This obviously needs to include some kind of educational opportunities –see item 1	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
92	Winter	W	5B	5b	Regarding the dark blue (purple?) line going from 5B into the Snowcreek Golf Course area: 1. What is the purpose of this egress terminating at the Ranch Road public easement if there is no parking available like at 5C and 9A? There is no legal public parking allowed along Ranch Road to Old Mammoth Road or at the St Joseph's parking lot. 2. The narrative descr bes this as "a direct an easy-to-use route" "back to town for skiers and snowboarders exiting the Sherwins" but the rationale doesn't explain how that is facilitated once they get outside the gate area. 3. This line also has no description in the map's legend.	QUESTION, ERROR/OMISSION
93	Winter	W	5B	5b, 12	1. Why aren't any of the public transportation shuttle stops shown on this map? 2. Shouldn't those shown in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan also be included?	QUESTION
94	Winter & Summer	S, W	5C, 2	5c, 2	The placement of the Parking & Disabled symbols need to be repositioned and clarified in the narrative so that they don't imply access to/from Ranch Road. Since there is not winter street parking allowed, where is the space being provided to build an adequately sized parking lot?	QUESTION
95	Winter	W	Various	5a, 5b, 5c	Who provides liability insurance coverage to protect the interests of private property owners where the public is ingressing or egressing over their land e.g. Snowcreek VIII, the Tamarack 5C area, Ranch Road public easement?	QUESTION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
96	Winter & Summer	S, W	5A, 5C, 2	5a, 5c, 2	The Snowcreek influence area, shown as yellow or light tan, does not include the Fairway HOA area. It would be preferable to show both Fairway Ranch and The Ranch at Snowcreek HOAs in a distinct color, defining them a private property. The tan areas of the maps are also not defined.	ERROR/OMISSION
97	Winter	W	5B	5b	1) Purple line extending from Snowcreek Golf Course area does not have a designation. 2) Parking is not allowed in the area so there is no reason for a public easement 3) There is no public transportation once outside gates so narrative for "direct" is unclear. 4) Roads are privately maintained and there is no specification as to who will contribute to maintenance if it is used for public purposes. 5) Snowcreek VIII master plan shuttle stops, etc. are not designated on proposal.	ERROR/OMISSION
98	Winter & Summer	S, W	5C, 2	5c, 2	There is no winter street parking and there is no adequate parking lot for parking and disabled vehicles designated in the narratives.	ADDITIONAL INFO
99	Winter & Summer	S, W	Various	W5a, W5b, W5c, S2, S3	There is a question as to who will provide the liability insurance for these easements.	QUESTION
100	Winter & Summer	S, W	5A, 5C, 2	5a, 5c, 2	There is not an adequate designation as to the Snowcreek Influence Areas, including but not limited to the Fairway HOA Area, Fairway Ranch, and The Ranch at Snowcreek. The tan areas of the map are not designated.	ERROR/OMISSION
101	Winter	W	5B	5b	1) Purple line extending from Snowcreek Golf Course area does not have a designation. 2) Parking is not allowed in the area so there is no reason for a public easement 3) There is no public transportation once outside gates so narrative for "direct" is unclear. 4) Roads are privately maintained and there is no specification as to who will contribute to maintenance if it is used for public purposes. 5) Snowcreek VIII master plan shuttle stops, etc. are not designated on proposal.	ERROR/OMISSION
102	Winter & Summer	S, W	5C, 2	5c, 2	There is no winter street parking and there is no adequate parking lot for parking and disabled vehicles designated in the narratives.	ADDITIONAL INFO
103	Winter & Summer	S, W	Various	W5a, W5b, W5c, S2, S3	There is a question as to who will provide the liability insurance for these easements.	QUESTION
104	Winter & Summer	S, W	5A, 5C, 2	5a, 5c, 2	There is not an adequate designation as to the Snowcreek Influence Areas, including but not limited to the Fairway HOA Area, Fairway Ranch, and The Ranch at Snowcreek. The tan areas of the map are not designated.	ERROR/OMISSION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
105	Winter	W	4	4	<p>The rational you present: 1) <i>Separation of use via a clearly marked boundary will reduce potential conflict between motorized and non-motorized use in the Sherwins area.</i> Through my experience, I have never encountered any conflict with other snowmobiles, skiers, or hikers while using this area on my snowmobile. If anything, I have positive encounters with other, regardless of the method of entertainment chosen. Although I am sure a conflict can/has occurred, this is not the norm. To close an area to 'reduce potential conflict' is a bit extreme. A more appropriate approach would be to devise a code of conduct for people to follow. Using the rational to close the area to 'reduce potential conflict' could be used to close Lake Mary off to kids in the summer because their noise while playing could result in 'potential conflict' with the fishermen.</p> <p>Although the example presented above is a bit extreme, what is occurring is you are choosing one group over another, and thus potentially creating conflict. I think the SWG should really consider the rational presented and apply this to everyday situations in life, and how they would be applied, and if that application would be appropriate.</p>	POLICY
106	Winter	W	4	4	<p>2) <i>Additionally, the Sherwins Range is a unique front-country ski and snowboard amenity.</i> This sentence is 100% true, but you have excluded some important parts. The sentence should read: <i>Additionally, the Sherwins Range is a unique front-country ski, snowboard, snowmobile, snowshoe, cross-country, winter hiking, amenity and generally enjoyed by any winter out-door enthusiast.</i> As in #1 above, again, one group is being selected over another, without providing any reasoning why.</p>	POLICY
107	Winter	W	4	4	<p>3) <i>Plentiful motorized opportunity is on offer to the east and south of the Sherwins area, and the inclusion of Solitude Canyon in the OSV zone enables users to also access Pyramid Peak and other destinations.</i> Likewise, this sentence is correct, but the reality is in the Eastern Sierra, snowmobilers are already restricted from a number of areas that are currently available to non-motorized forms of recreation. This sentence could just as easily read: <i>Plentiful ski & snowboard opportunity are offer to the east and south of the Sherwins area, and the inclusion of Solitude Canyon, enables users to also access Pyramid Peak and other destinations.</i></p>	POLICY
108	Winter	W	4	4	<p>In summary, the rational presented is favoring one group over another, without providing justification why. The rational presented is more of a matter of opinion, rather than based on facts. It is my opinion that if the SWG wants to exclude motorized vehicles from the area define, more defined reasons should be presented, and no group should get preferential treatment in the final recommendation, as is currently the case.</p>	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
109		S, W		W5c, S2	To whom it concerns: Please carefully consider the impact of parking at the end of Tamarack St. If it becomes inevitable, a traffic study must be done and traffic calming measures will be imperative for public safety. Please see comments on the SWG feedback form attached. Thanks. [signed]	OPINION
110	Both	S, W	2 summer, 5c winter	W5c, S2	The idea of Tamarack Street as a staging area/ trailhead is great, and the provision of ADA-accessible parking is also very sound. However, any additional parking in this neighborhood will meet with STRONG opposition from the many full time residents on Tamarack Street. Tamarack Street is a sub-standard 20' right of way (min town standards are 40') that cannot accommodate additional automobile traffic – especially in winter when it remains icy most of the season and snowbanks reduce the usable road surface even further. Additional parking even if just a few spaces will cause a huge increase in car travel on this street. In winter there will be a rush of cars trying to drop a shuttle ride there (with two cars needed to drop a shuttle). All year, once the few spaces are filled the rest of the cars will be rushing back to go elsewhere creating a major hazard for children, horses and pedestrians which use this street year round. A transit stop (or even parallel parking on OMR) at the Old Mammoth Rd end of Tamarack Street adds only ¼ mile of foot travel to the meadow and maintains the current character of this street which is primarily pedestrian and non-motorized. It is a misleading description to say this is a “heavily used access/egress point” (per summer narrative item #2) as the majority of use is currently not via automobile. Perhaps with increased use, a better “improvement” than parking would be a bathroom facility so that the human waste issue which affected the Ranch Road access debate is resolved up front. <i>***This was also presented as a signed petition with 9 other names. "Tamarack St Residents"***</i>	ADDITIONAL INFO
111	Both	S, W	1, 3-28	1, 3-28	All your other work has produced a fantastic plan for improved resources throughout the Sherwins. Thank you for all your efforts!! <i>***This was also presented as a signed petition with 9 other names., "Tamarack St Residents"***</i>	THANKS
112		W		4	Also I want to emphasize that I think item #4 is a fantastic idea and should be implemented immediately. OSV play in the meadow and the front side of the Sherwins is damaging, dangerous, and a nuisance to residents.	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
113	Winter	W	1	1	Combined OK	OPINION
114	Winter	W	3	3	Fine	OPINION
115	Winter	W	4	4	OSV's do not conflict!	POLICY
116	Winter	W	5A	5a	Not needed	OPINION
117	Winter	W	5B	5b	Not needed	OPINION
118	Winter	W	6	6	Not needed	OPINION
119	Winter	W	General	4	Keep access open to snowmobiles to Sherwin's.	POLICY
120	Winter	W	4	4	I have ridden this area for the last 30 years. And would I ke to continue to do so.	POLICY
121		S, W		-	Don't Change Anything	OPINION
122	Winter	W	4	4	Too much stuff is closed to snowmobiling already. This would be a terr ble loss to the snowmobiling community of the Eastern Sierra's. Keep the Sherwins open!	POLICY
123	Winter	W	4	4	This area should definitely stay open to snowmobiling! We hardly have any good terrain like the Sherwin Range to ride in this area as it is, without having to drive to Sonora Pass. That area doesn't get enough snow every year. So it's a nice treat to enjoy when it's got enough snow. "Snowmobiling is already limited", the Forest Service & the Town should promote this sport more in our area. It makes another reason for people to come visit our area and benefits our economy! Snow machines make no impact on the terrain!	POLICY
124	Winter	W	4	4	Spring use of Lakes Basin needs motorized access from here by April 15 the borrow pit routes will be burned off.	POLICY
125	Summer	S	9	9	Low motorized usage is still usage + should be allowed on historical motorized routes.	POLICY
126	Winter	W	1	1	Borrow pit access is a great idea but should not [illegible] #4 + loss of higher altitude motorized access.	POLICY
127	Winter	W	4	4	I l ke to ride out of the Sherwin area and also the lakes basin. To close these off for motorized recreation takes away from all who enjoy these areas - all need to share not just one group.	POLICY
128	Both	S, W	4	4	We see no change in usage necessary for this area. Leaving existing usage allows for all to use these resources. [signed]	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
129	Both	S, W		W13	I'd like to see a signage in more details not just at the beginning of any trail, included the distances of individual trail and maybe also in the middle showing us how far we still have to go (and if we're going the right direction.)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
130	Winter	W		10b	I like the proposed dogs off-leash area but I didn't find it in the summer map?	QUESTION
131	Winter	W		4	Please don't close off any more areas to ORV access, there is no reason there can't be shared use. Sherwin is the only terrain of its kind available to ORV there are countless areas of similar terrain available to non-ORV usage only. If anything impose [illegible] but don't restrict already limited available terrain.	POLICY
132	Winter	W	12	12	It would be nice if public transit stop(s) could be added at Snowcreek 5 also.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
133	Winter	W	5A	5a	It would also be nice if parking could be provided at 5A for the snow play area #15. It would greatly increase use of the play area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
134	Summer	S	1-27	1-27	It's all great! Hope it happens.	OPINION
135		S, W	on 2007 maps at MMSA	W4, S9	East access to Sherwins important, via over the snow at the winter closure on Sherwin Creek Rd to Tele Bowl + out to Kerry Meadows on the dirt road by the old FS pack station on Sherwin Creek Rd or gravel pit access to Kerry Meadow, a very popular in town trail, both summer + winter. The community should not have to lose that.	POLICY
136	Winter	W	All	4	I am opposed to any restrictions to winter motorized travel / recreation on public land	POLICY
137	Winter	W	All	4	The narrative does not detail what was open and is now closed. I cannot determine what is now allowed and what is restricted after this proposal.	QUESTION
138	Winter	W	All	4	It seems better not to go to Mammoth and ride in other areas I like near June Lake, Tahoe. Why ... so many (emotionally created) restrictions and a confrontational attitude between snowmobiles and non motorized recreation. For example people who run their dogs without a leash on the trail and riders must stop. The trail is blocked by skiers (instead of getting to one side and share they turn their skies perpendicular to the trail and stand in the middle of the trail) and dogs bark and bite at the snowmobile, rider and passenger.	POLICY
139	Winter	W	All	4	How do you access the other trail system? Not having connectivity will create the risk for skier / snowmobiler to access the trail to the trails north of the 203 thru already restricted space	QUESTION
140	Winter/Summer	S, W	All	W10b, S22	Make an enclosed dog park so they have a dedicated place for animals to run without a leash.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
141	Winter	W	All	-	It seems odd creating more use of the forest when the political trend today is more restrictions, less use. What development , ski slope, housing, shopping, commercial enterprise are you doing to raw land and offsetting the area with more managed recreational use?	OPINION
142	Winter	W	All	9a	The snow is thin in this area so do not groom.	OPINION
143	Winter	W	4	4	Please do not close this area. For every area that is closed to snowmobiles, a new one never gets opened up. Backcountry skiers have millions of acres available to them where sleds are not permitted, so why keep limiting the access to other users? I thought MLPTA stands for public access! I'm a responsible sled owner, who abides by the rules, and keeps my sled running cleanly and quietly. The majority of snowmobile users in the tele bowls area, are responsible locals, and not the obnoxious and rude tourists that populate the trail system outside shady rest.	POLICY
144	Both	S, W			I oppose the closing of public lands for use only by select groups. Our lands should be for multiple use. The land grabs the wrong way to manage our lands.	POLICY
145		NONE		-	Just a few comments for the area of Sherwin Creek Road. We are working on many other comments for the actual motocross area. Stay tuned!	THANKS
146	Winter	W		4	Snowmobiling in the foothills of the Sherwins has been a long standing tradition for many families for many years and adding the load of enforcement to this area that has been open for riding is another added burden to the already lack of enforcement. Also concentration all the use of snowmobilers into the Shady and Inyo Craters area is an ongoing concern as well. The areas of Sherwin Creek road and South is a minimal impact to the neighboring residents and it gives a port to our town in good winter years. Closing any of these areas to future snowmobiling would be a bad judgment. A large number of our winter visits are snowmobiles and with responsible use and good education this area is well suited for a multiple of users. The Forest Service has much of that area open to multi-use and it should remain with that designation.(including motorized)	POLICY
147	Summer	S		9	The area of the Sherwin Creek campground and the gravel pit on Sherwin Creek road needs to remain open to multi-use (including motorized). In the summer months large numbers of people use these areas to get access to the system of some 3000 miles of legal established roads and trails. Any change in this area would be devastating to the access for many many of our users. The designation in this area needs to remain approved for motorized to accommodate the need.	POLICY
148		NONE		-	Hi John, I have reviewed the Sherwins Working Group proposal and commend you, Austin, and the USFS for a job well done! I know there were diverse interests throughout the process. I will get final comments from both Roy and Mike and just have a couple clarifying questions right now so as not to bog down the official comment process. Please feel free to comment or answer so I can make sure my final comments are appropriate and helpful to you and the USFS.	THANKS

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
149	Summer	S		1	Since the gravel pit will now be staging for a multitude of uses and the Tank Farm, can you please confirm the size remains the same. The success of the Mammoth Motorcross is to a large part dependent on our ability to maintain and use this facility for parking as we currently do.	QUESTION
150	Summer	S		7	The ADA multi-use path is a great asset. Is it necessary to have a soft surface trail running parallel to it in sections? Seems this impact code be avoided in that section?	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
151	Winter	W		-	Please change the color of the existing Tamarack X-country ski trails to a different color than the blue. Similar to how you distinguished the Mammoth Mountain B ke Park. This is a fee area, and is confusing with your new proposed non-motorized Groomed Mixed-use trails. Especially where the existing and proposed systems are meeting up, I am also concerned with who is responsible for the maintenance and grooming of these new trails.	ERROR/OMISSION
152	Winter	W		-	Please confirm the Mammoth Creek trail section that is blue with white outline is a new overlay or designation? Not on the legend.	ERROR/OMISSION
153	Winter	W		-	Pink Cross marks are also not on the legend although I am assuming it is the designation for back/side country skiing and snowboarding.	ERROR/OMISSION
154	Winter and Summer	S, W		-	As noted in our previous comments, our endorsement of this project is not the endorsement of proposing uses on private property. Any and all trails or proposed uses drawn on the private such as Snowcreek, Terry Plum Properties we defer to the property owner and their rights.	OPINION
155		NONE		-	Thank you again for all of your hard work. Great Job and I will forward you our final comments	THANKS
156	Summer	S		-	Motor cycles with my family	OPINION
157	Winter	W		-	Snowmobile with my family	OPINION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
158		W		4	Greetings and thanks for your work: I've called Mammoth my home since 1972. My feedback for the SWG is: NO SNOWMOBILES IN THE SHERWINS!!! They have shown that they have no respect for wilderness boundaries as I've seen them "high mark" all over the Crest let alone in the Sherwins (please see picture taken on opening day to snowmobiles to the Lakes Basin, high mark TJ bowl). In other words they are law breakers and should not be rewarded for such behavior. They need to be policed better as they will not or cannot police themselves. There are reasons snowmobiles are banned in France. On big winters they can snowmobile to Nevada if they want. But leave us, (back country skiers, skimmers and gridders) a little piece of Mountain to enjoy, lawfully, without these senseless people and their dangerous machines endangering others. Thank You [signed] <i>[picture available in binder]</i>	POLICY
159	Winter	W	4	4	I would like to express my concern with the proposed closure of this area to motorized use. This area should be allowed use by all in a respectful manner. I have never witnessed conflict between motorized and non-motorized groups. This proposal is being pushed by a few vocal people whom do not represent the vast majority of people using this area. If there has been conflict between a few people, this conflict should be solved within a different avenue. This is a beautiful area which should be enjoyed by all.	POLICY
160		S, W		W4, S9	Please see attached form. Please do not close access to snowmobiles or summer OHVs.	POLICY
161	Winter	W		4	KEEP ALL ACCESS OPEN TO SNOWMOBILES. I reside in Utah but make several trips to the sierras in the winter for snowmobile recreation. The amount of OHV traffic this area receives is minimal at best and not causing any harm or conflicts. It should not be shut down to OHV in winter or in summer.	POLICY
162	Summer	S		9	KEEP ALL CURRENT OHV TRAILS OPEN TO OHV.	POLICY
163		NONE		-	Thanks for all your hard work. You've done a great job thinking of everyone. I have attached my comments.	THANKS
164	Summer	S	6, 7	6, 7	While I do see the benefit of these two trails, I believe they should be non-paved trails for maintainability as well as usage and visual aesthetics.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
165	Summer	S	6	6	I especially think this path should remain dirt and/or be routed around sierra meadows in a different manner – it should run adjacent to 1A, down one of the dirt roads that meet up with the bridge near Hayden cabin.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
166	Summer	S	All areas	-	Thank you all for all your hard work. You all have done a great job taking everyone's needs into account.	THANKS

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
167	Summer	S	Tamarack Street	2	Will the tamarack access area link back into the trail system that goes to snowcreek? It seems to me there are better places to make a parking area and if the b ke trail linked back to Snowcreek – that maybe that would be the better parking area.	QUESTION
168	Summer	S	All areas	W13	I am a big proponent of sharing trails since I enjoy a lot of different activities. One thing I have noticed this summer is that there is a need for trail etiquette. Many people don't seem to know that it is helpful if you ta k to the other users of the trails – especially the equestrians. I think the maps/signs need to identify ways that make trail usage enjoyable and safe for everyone.	OPINION
169		S, W		W5c, S2	Dear Sirs: my name is [deleted] and I reside at 306 Tamarack St. I have lived at this address for the past seventeen years. I would like to voice my strident objection of plans to install parking spaces at the end of tamarack street for access to the forest service meadow adjacent. I believe encouraging more traffic flow on an already substandard one lane residential street is a terrible idea. A poss ble better solution is to provide a shuttle stop on old mammoth road and have meadow users wa k the two hundred yards down Tamarack Street to access the meadow. Traffic on Tamarack street is already at a high level with many cars driving thru the neighborhood exceeding the speed limit, endangering residents. any encouragement of increasing cars that transit the area is a bad idea. respectfully [signed]	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
170	Winter	W	1	1	The concept of forced separation is odd to me, but I am told, necessary. I have snowmobiled that area quite a bit and rarely see boarders or skiers in the sherwins and when I do, I usually know them and they have used snowmobiles to get to the more extreme areas and to transport shovels and cameras in. I don't see any conflict, or need to keep snowmobiles out of an area that is usually only used by snowmobilers and extreme boarders and skiers on snowmobiles.	POLICY
171	Winter	W	1	1	I think there should be a western access point for snowmobilers who live in the bluffs and in old mammoth and in snowcreek, so there would be less vehicles at the access lots and less traffic on our roads.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
172	Winter	W	1	1	I think also, that there should be a penalty for non-motorized users who walk dogs and jog and snowshoe on the Motorized Use side that is the same as when a motorized user crosses onto the non-motorized side. That would be fair and safer. If it is safe for combined use on our side them it must be ok for us to use the non-motorized side as we choose also. We have to be safe and fair.	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
173	Winter	W	1	1	<p>I suggest that we take this season as a test to see how many non-motorized and motorized users really enjoy this area. We could document the use, mid-week and weekend, and interview actual users of the area, not just the people who are politically, economically, or morally motivated to change the use of this area. Many people who vote on and create use plans do not represent a statistically accurate study group of the actual users of an area. The evaluation would give us a real knowledge of how far south skiers are hiking and how much danger or conflict really exists between extreme backcountry users who could get to the higher elevations, and the snowmobilers who should also be allowed into this extreme riding area that is so needed in the mammoth snowmobile trail system.</p> <p>Again, in my experience snowmobilers, snowshoers, snowboarder, and skiers are all the same person. I do all the winter sports that I physically can, and I hate it when a government makes a line that I can not cross for no good reason.</p> <p>There should be similar punishment upon any breach of any line that is determined necessary. And I don't think the people involved in most planning issues are the people affected by the changes made. I know everyone says they are, but we really need more research on the actual use, before an educated decision can be made.</p>	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
174	Summer	S	7	7	Backbone trail should be paved to maximize potential users and to better tie into current paved trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
175	Summer	S	18	18	There should be more than one connector from the Meadow to the Mammoth Rock Trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
176	Summer	S	19	19	I would like to see trail development in Solitude Canyon. With trails, the impact on wildlife would be minimized because the trails will focus the use on a small area. In addition, if OSV's will be using the canyon during the winter, than hikers and bikers whose impact is a fraction of OSV's should be able to take advantage of it during the summer.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
177	Summer	S	26	26	I would like to see a multi-use trail to Sherwin Ridge that connects with Solitude Canyon and ultimately connects with the Coldwater/Lake Mary area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
178	Winter	W	4	4	I support a separation boundary. I will keep families who use the snow park and backcountry travelers safer	POLICY
179		NONE		-	Thanks! Sorry this is last minute!	THANKS
180		NONE		-	Thanks for all the work you put into this (attached is my form for feedback) I'm so stoked this is happening in Mammoth!	THANKS
181	Summer	S	7	7	Backbone trail should be paved to maximize potential users and to better tie into current paved trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
182	Summer	S	18	18	There should be more than one connector from the Meadow to the Mammoth Rock Trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
183	Summer	S	19	19	Encourage multi-use trail development in Solitude Canyon. Organize and focus users in a few trails to open up some great terrain and scenic areas. Keep folks on trails and off old, unused trails to minimize impact in undeveloped area and on wildlife. OSV's have access to this area in the winter and hikers and b kers should have access to this area in the summer – very little impact and brings some great additions to a limited trail system in this area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
184	Summer	S	26	26	How great would a multi-use trail to Sherwin Ridge that connects with Solitude Canyon and ultimately connects with the Coldwater/Lake Mary area. Whistler is seeing more business in the summertime from mountain b kers than in the winter time from skiers. Lets expand our recreation trails and attract visitors and offer locals more areas to enjoy.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
185	Winter	W	4	4	I support a separation boundary for motorized and non-motorized. Keeping the very different users more separated is safer and helps each type of user group retain their preferred experience.	POLICY
186		NONE		-	Thank you for providing this incred ble opportunity to help shape our community! Recreation is the main reason I live here and the main reason visitors come here!	THANKS
187		NONE		-	John and Kim- I have attached Snowcreek's feedback to the SWG proposal. You have done a great job and we appreciate the hard work. Thank you [signed]	THANKS
188	All	S, W		-	The Sherwin Working Group did a fantastic job on both the Summer and Winter Proposals for the Sherwin area. The proposals provide a solid foundation for planning recreation in Mammoth and the Sherwin's.	THANKS
189	Winter	W	15	2, 15	It is not necessary to have 2 snowplay areas in such close proximity to each other. Snowplay area #15 is much less desirable than #2. #15 is proposed to be located directly adjacent to the future Snowcreek VIII 4-5 star hotel which is not an appropriate adjacent use to a Mountain Hotel of that caliber. This use would destroy the view of the Sherwins from hotel rooms and hotel common areas. Additionally, the location at #15 is much more difficult to access for children and families than #2 as it is a long distance away from the Burrow pit staging area (#1) through difficult terrain. Snowplay area #2 is directly adjacent to the burrow pit staging area (#1), proposed parking, and also typically has better snow conditions and terrain for sledding.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
190	Summer/ All	S, W	7, 13, 3, 27, 6, 9, 10, 11, 18, 15, 17, 27	7, 13, 3, 27, 6, 9, 10, 11, 18, 15, 17, 27	Please consider using soft surface trails rather than paved MUP's and trails in all areas that are not located within or directly adjacent to roads or "high impact" development. It is important to maintain the "wilderness" feeling in the area and use as little pavement as possible to be environmentally conscious.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
191	Summer and winter	S, W	1	1	Please consider proposing to vegetate the surrounding undeveloped barren dirt areas directly adjacent to staging area #1 in the SWG proposal with plant types similar to the adjacent vegetation.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
192	Summer	S	9a	20	I feel it would be great to have an area for a bike park to facilitate the growing need of our community-bmx/fullsize mtn bike. The area can be shaped with the existing soil and water with a possibility of cement forms if the b ke community would want to take on the design and fundraising. Thank you.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
193	Winter	W	SWG Winter Proposal Map	4	I strongly oppose the OSV Restriction Area that is proposed in the SWG Winter Map. It closes very unique terrain only available in that area for OSV users. I ride my OSV out there frequently in the winter and have never seen or experienced any user group conflicts. Enough OSV land has already been taken away, this has to stop!!!! Do not add this OSV Restriction Area!!!!	POLICY
194	Winter	W	SWG Winter Proposal Map	4	I strongly oppose the OSV Restriction Area that is proposed in the SWG Winter Map. It closes very unique terrain only available in that area for OSV users. I ride my OSV out there frequently in the winter and have never seen or experienced any user group conflicts. Enough OSV land has already been taken away, this has to stop!!!! Do not add this OSV Restriction Area!!!!	POLICY
195		S, W		W4, S9	Please don't close these areas.	POLICY
196	Winter	W	SWG Winter Proposal Map	4	I strongly oppose the OSV Restriction Area that is proposed in the SWG Winter Map. I ride these areas each winter and also back country ski these areas. I have never had a conflict of use interests. Do not add this OSV Restriction Area!!!!	POLICY
197	Winter	W	4	4	Potential conflict is an assumption/discriminatory, this area should be open to all users including OSV's (AKA snowmobiles etc.). There has never been more snowmobiles and clubs than now especially from southern California where most of mammoths tourist dollars come from. We are a large family from southern California who choose mammoth rather than say Utah to snowmobile at and spend close to 10K dollars on the local economy because we love the sierras and the riding areas etc.. There are enough closed/wilderness areas already. Please listen and consider the opinions of the mammoth snowmobile club and locals as they know more than me of what is important and relevant. Equal access is fair to all. Thank You.	POLICY
198	Winter	W	4	4	I oppose the SWG Winter Recreation Proposal Map ID 4 because it designates a MOTORIZED/NON-MOTORIZED boundary which is extremely unfair to OSV users.	POLICY
199	Winter	W	4	4	I strongly oppose the idea of a Motorized/Non-motorized boundary as it exists in the SWG Winter Proposal Map. I feel this way because the Tele Bowls and Sherwin Range are also " a unique front-country OSV amenity", and likewise, the "Western portion of the Area offers excellent opportunities for MOTORIZED recreation as well because of its size and geography." Also, the unique terrain offers OSV users an experience not found elsewhere in the Mammoth area. Steep, long, open pitches.	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
200	Winter	W	4	4	I have never seen a conflict between MOTORIZED and NON-MOTORIZED users in the Area. In fact, many of the cross-country skiers I have spoke with say they enjoy using the tracks left from OSV's after a fresh snow. OSV users do not hang around Snowplay or Nordic Track areas, we go do our own thing and make every attempt to avoid conflict or hazardous situations with other user groups. We just want fair/equitable solutions so we can enjoy our recreational activity as well.	POLICY
201	Winter	W	4	4	Why not allow a MOTORIZED area south of the Stacked Loop Trail System? There is plenty of room for both MOTORIZED and NON-MOTORIZED uses in the Sherwin Meadow Area. You could easily designate a MOTORIZED trail or usage area south of the Stacked Trail System and away from the Snowplay Area. (i.e. a 100-200 yard buffer away from the Stacked Trail System/Snowplay Area).	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
202	Winter	W	4	4	The tradeoff of a fancy parking lot for MOTORIZED users in exchange for closing some of the most unique and challenging OSV terrain in the Mammoth Area is an unfair "compromise". OSV users have been using snowbanks and make-shift parking areas since the inception of OSV's, we don't mind shabby parking lots. We do mind when our riding areas continue to shrink at an alarming rate! The closure of the area is a much larger detriment to OSV users than our current parking situation.	POLICY
203	Winter	W	4	4	The Winter Proposal Map seems to benefit every winter recreation group that I can think of except for OSV users. Families get a designated Snowplay Area, Nordic users get a new track, dogs get a place to crap, etc. What do OSV users get? A big, fat closure of a popular riding area. Furthermore, many tourists are drawn to snowmobiling when they see them out in the Meadow, and their likelihood of renting an OSV from a Town business or booking a tour with MMSA or Mammoth Sled Adventures is more likely.	POLICY
204		W	4	4	This is a great opportunity to designate OSV/MOTORIZED use areas for future considerations, yet it is being viewed more as a way to further restrict MOTORIZED/OSV use. Imagine a trail system that connected the Sherwin riding area to the Shady Rest OSV Trail System. There could be possible fuel stations, or OSV services could be feasible future considerations at the Sherwin or Shady Rest sites, while current and future OSV recreationists could enjoy a legitimate OSV trail system around the Mammoth area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
205	Winter	W	4	4	In conclusion, I feel the SWG Winter Proposal is a poor compromise for MOTORIZED/NON-MOTORIZED users. It favors the NON-MOTORIZED recreation segment greatly and is essentially a slap in the face to OSV/MOTORIZED users.	POLICY
206	Both	S, W	Global	W13	Please recommend that any and all signage and wayfinding efforts in the Sherwins be consistent with the TOML Trail System Master Plan (2009 – Recommendation G3, page 114) and as further detailed in Chapter 5 of that plan, and that all signage and wayfinding be consistent across jurisdictions	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
207	Both	S, W	Global	-	Please recommend that naming conventions for any new trails and facilities be consistent with the TOML Trails System Master Plan (2009 - Recommendation G1, page 112 and table 4-1, p 113) including assignment of node and facility types.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
208	Both	S, W	Global	-	Please request of the two jurisdictions – TOML and USFS – guidance as to roles and responsibilities for implementation, maintenance and programming of SWG recommendations	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
209	Both	S, W	Global	-	Please consider recommending restoration of Hidden Lake and it potential as a destination	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
210	Both	S, W	Global	-	Please consider what role any of the draft recommendations may play in a “Mammoth Loop Trail” – the experience of a continuous trail experience around the entire community of Mammoth Lakes – and how recommendations in the SWG proposal can connect to other subregions in the Mammoth Area, ie the Lakes Basin, Shady Rest, etc.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
211	Both	S, W	Global	W9b, W10b, S22	Please ensure that recommendations for pets are consistent across the seasonal recommendations	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
212	Summer	S	Global	-	Please consider recommendations that will connect proposed trails to other sub regions in Mammoth Lakes region including Shady Rest and the Lakes Basin and the High Alpine regions to the south as well as the PCT.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
213	Summer	S	5A	5a	Please consider any opportunity to connect recommendation 5A to Le Verne Street and the Bluffs neighborhood.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
214	Summer	S	5C	5c	Please recommend that design and environmental analysis of 5C be prioritized so that its construction can be included as part of construction of the Lake Mary Bike Path, anticipated for the summer of 2010	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
215	Summer	S	11	11	Where does this recommendation terminate at its Eastern end? Map is unclear.	QUESTION
216	Summer	S	11	11	Please identify the Mammoth Creek crossing with a bridge symbol and identify if a new bridge will be required.	ERROR/OMISSION
217	Summer	S	12B	12b	Please recommend that design and environmental analysis of 12B be prioritized so that its construction can be included as part of construction of the Lake Mary Bike Path, anticipated for the summer of 2010	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
218	Summer	S	12B	12b	Rationale – Incorrectly identifies “... Old Mammoth Road ...” in first line of text, believe it should be “Lake Mary Road”	ERROR/OMISSION
219	Summer	S	16	16	Please identify opportunities for vistas and view points and ease of access from proposed Mill City Trailhead	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
220	Summer	S	17	17	Please recommend ultimate destination and opportunities for connectivity for this trail – please consider having this trail ultimately loop back to the Borrow Pit.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
221	Summer	S	19	19	Please consider more detailed recommendations for trails in Solitude Canyon.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
222	Summer	S	26	26	Please consider installation of a via ferrata on the south side of Mammoth Rock, and the potential of the summit of Mammoth Rock as a destination Please provide recommendations for the ultimate destinations and connectivity of this trail.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
223	Summer	S	27	27	Please consider routing this recommendation further to the south, leaving the Motocross Track to the East, and connecting further up the Sherwin Lakes Trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
224	Winter	W	Global	-	Please recommend and identify any opportunities for coordination of implementation with Turner Propane facilities and Sherwin Creek Road improvements.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
225	Winter	W	Global	-	Please chose a different color for graphic representations of existing trail systems, ie Tamarack Nordic System	ERROR/OMISSION
226	Winter	W	Global	-	Please choose a different color for graphic representations of egress routes across private property, ie Snowcreek VIII to Ranch Road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
227	Winter	W	Global	-	Please consider and recommend the potential for OSV connections to Shady Rest and OSV trail systems north of Town.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
228	Winter	W	Global	-	Please request jurisdictional representations of current legal status of OSV terrain to east of study area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
229	Winter	W	1	-	Please identify the parties who may be respons ble for winter maintenance to access the proposed trailhead and staging area	QUESTION
230	Winter	W	4	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please provide specific phasing recommendations for OSV restrictions and detailed rationale	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
231	Winter	W	4	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please recommend that should a hotel operator at Snowcreek VIII wish to provide OSV rentals and/or staging, that a corridor be provided to connect to proposed OSV staging area at Borrow Pit	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
232	Winter	W	4	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please recommend that should an HOA or property owner grant a public facility for OSV staging, provisions for a corridor be provided to connect to OSV winter staging area at Borrow Pit.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
233	Winter	W	5B	5b	Please revisit concept to indicate that the recommendation is to connect to the point where the egress alignment across Snowcreek VIII golf course connects to USFS land, and not to the Ranch Road Easement. Recommendations should be on public land that is within the scope of the SWG effort, and not to private property that may be outside of the proposal's (and USFS) scope.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
234	Winter	W	7	7	Please consider that this recommendation may not be necessary nor practicable given winter conditions and the lack of concurrent summer facilities.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
235	Winter	W	4	4	Regarding the idea of restricting OSV use to the east of the borrow pit: the only reason to do this that makes any sense is because there will be an alternative amenity in the area that's not compatible with snowmobile use. Certainly it makes sense to have snowplay or dog-walk areas restricted, and slow zones in busy areas, but without the presence of a regularly-groomed XC trail system, there's no good reason to boot snowmobiles from the area. The only rationale cited is the prevention of "potential conflicts." Since the meadow area is currently used by OSV's w/ no conflicts, why will there be potential conflicts in any other scenario that one that includes a groomed system? Re: the "quiet area" rationale: nobody made people buy those homes and condos adjacent to OSV area, and there were snowmobiles there before there were any houses. Since the main beneficiary from such a restriction would be the neighboring HOA's and Chadmar, if they want it, they should shoulder the load of grooming etc, perhaps include public access to trails on the golf course. A true amenity would have to be added to make the OSV restriction pencil out in light of historic use and the already heavily restricted local OSV access. Furthermore, the line of OSV exclusion, as represented on the SWG map, excludes the Tele Bowl Area with no clear topographic boundary to deter people from riding in that inviting area directly adjacent to the motocross track. Again, are there conflicts? Is there any rationale for this?	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
236	Summer	S	All	-	<p>It's crucial that the group recommend that mountain bike preferred trail be built in the study area as part of this proposal. Please, consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mammoth is (and markets itself as) a mountain bike destination. Yet it has the worst (and tiniest) public trail system of any comparable resort. There is not one purpose-built mtb trail around Mammoth. Most mountain resorts have networks with hundreds of miles of public trails built primarily for mountain biking. This is an economic need, and a glaring lack in our recreational facilities. Unless you're a downhiller that wants to pay the ski area, there is effectively no decent riding here, compared to similar towns. By comparison, the town of Whistler spends \$50-100,000/year on building public MTB trails around town. We desperately need a better riding experience, and this is a chance to change it. 2. We have hundreds of miles of bike-free trails, bike-free Wilderness, but no bike trail system--not even one decent trail by mountain biking standards, just disconnected snippets of opened hiking trails that aren't properly built or designed for bikers. 3. The Town can't build trails, and the Forest Service never has. This is the first and only chance we've ever had to ask for more MTB trails. 4. Many non-bikers don't like mountain bikes on the same trails--if we build new trails that are fun for mountain bikes, the bikers will ride those instead of hiking trails. 5. There is enough room in the study area to build many miles of high-quality mtb-preferred trail. There should be a loop branching off the Rock Trail, an MTB-preferred loop around the Hidden Lake Meadow, an extension to the Rock Trail that loops out to the east of town and then connects to Shady Rest, and more trail in the Panorama Dome area. MTB trails don't have to go anywhere, or run through the same locales as hiking-preferred trails. Voila--at least one day's worth of fun riding in Mammoth. 6. Modern trail design and construction can ensure safety for all users. 7. Compared to all the infrastructure in this proposal, building trails is cheap and is guaranteed to attract private donations and volunteers. We could easily raise enough money to build miles of trail with no help from the Forest Service--businesses like Footloose make a lot of money from mountain bikers. 	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
237	Summer/ Winter	S	2	2	Regarding the Tamarack access point--since there is only one horse property that will use this entrance, perhaps they should pay for any horse specific improvements in that location--public funds should not be spent to improve an access point for just one user.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
238	Summer	S	4	-	The idea of closing upper Old Mammoth Rd. and converting it to a MUP has great merit, and would be considerably simpler than many of the connectivity proposals for that area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
239	Summer	S	1	1	<p>Would like to see better defined "footprint" of proposed improvements @ staging area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2" water line should be enough to operation proposed restrooms (this is size of line for USFS stables) - would recommend Trails End Park restroom prototype for borrow pit staging area this is durable and year round. - propose paving Sherwin Creek Road @ 32' width from OMR to borrow pit (width would accommodate desired winter parallel parking and summer bike lanes. Some type of pedestrian access link to the Sherwin Creek Campground would be good. Either bike lanes if paved or parallel MUP 	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
240	Summer	S	2	2	TOML would recommend no less than 3 / no more than 6 parking spaces (TOML can make requirement during negotiations w/land owner)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
241	Summer	S	4	4	Note location of grave sites/archeological sites in this area - recommend 20-25 parking spaces - TOML easement ends before this identified location; easement would need to be extended - Check motorcycle accessibility across mining road – is this ok? - Recommend paved MUP from staging area to vista (accessibility)	ADDITIONAL INFO, SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
242	Summer	S	5	5	Note trolley stop integrated into OMR/LMRBP access point (USFS \$\$\$ to put in this stop) - a natural access to LMRBP connector exists (TOML staff has identified spot) - would recommend staging area south and east on LMR - opportunity for bridge access @ Twin Lakes for LMRBP - potential for tunnel as access from entrance to Tamarack under LMR for connection to LMRBP	ADDITIONAL INFO, SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
243	Summer	S	7 & 8	7, 8	The meadow area provides a unique opportunity due to the relatively flat grades to provide fully accessible routes as a paved or boardwalk routes for families of young kids with training wheels, elderly, adults in wheel chairs or walkers, etc. This section would be only the loop from Snowcreek VIII to Tamarack Street and one linear path to Hidden Lake area. A hard surface would be compatible with the spring and early summer boggy soils and provide access points to the other soft surface paths.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
244	Summer	S		-	Sherwin area above meadow has a significant and growing area of dead trees that should be addressed to eliminate or reduce the disease spread.	ADDITIONAL INFO
245	Winter	W	OMR/Minaret area	-	There could be an opportunity for some public along the street parking for winter use with a minimal amount of widening as an interim option.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
246	Winter	W	Snowmobile closure area	4	The avalanche chutes provides some extreme snowmobiling not found in many areas. A corridor to that area would serve that type of snowmobiling and access from owners that live along the route. What are the implications and impacts to the spring snowmobiling that occurs in the lakes basin after April 15??	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT, QUESTION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
247	Summer	S		-	Horses should be prohibited from using any of the paved or boardwalk trails/paths.	POLICY
248	Both	S, W		W13	The area will provide numerous areas for interpretive signage for history, natural resources, and ecology of the area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
249	Summer	S		-	The meadow has significant damage due to erosion in many areas and there is also an opportunity to create a mitigation-banking fund to help restore much of the eroded areas.	ADDITIONAL INFO
250	Summer	S	7 & 6	7, 6	Item 7 is specifically identified with a wheel chair symbol but item 6 is not. This may be misleading since all MUP's are designed to be fully accessible and are usually required to be accessible by the funding agency.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
251	Summer	S	3 & 7	3, 7	A hard surface MUP should connect the Snowcreek paths to item 7. This reinforces the concept of nested loops for the MUP system.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
252	Summer	S	5C	5c	This path should be a hard surface MUP. It connects a paved MUP with a paved roadway.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
253	Summer	S	New	-	The Lake Mary Road Bike Path is not complete (MUP) along the section of Twin Lakes Loop that passes through Tamarack. A Class 1 bike path is still needed where the path shares the roadway in front of Tamarack. Right of Way issues must still be negotiated with Tamarack.	ADDITIONAL INFO
254	Summer	S	8	8	Separate trails should be provided for equestrian and pedestrian use. Horses are too hard on a pedestrian trail and they do not mix well with bikes. Parallel trail could be provided with a separation of 50 to 100 feet.	POLICY
255	Summer	S	12A & 12B	12a, 12b	The Lake Mary Road Bike path should be extended across Mammoth Creek on a bridge just east of the vehicle bridge and the MUP extended 400 feet further east to Twin Lakes Loop. This will replace on-road bike lanes in the current design.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
256	Summer	S	12A & 12B	12a, 12b	Install an under-crossing to safely carry bike and pedestrian travelers under Lake Mary Road at Twin Lakes Loop. The at-grade bike path crossing of Lake Mary Road should be replaced with a safer crossing.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
257	Winter	W		8	Grooming Old Mammoth Road may inhibit emergency access to the Lakes Basin in the event that Lake Mary Road is closed (avalanche, tunnel issues/maintenance)	ADDITIONAL INFO
258	Winter	W		4	Provide a "snowmobile corridor" for access to the Sherwin range	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
259	Both	S, W		-	The Town has a drainage easement at the end of LaVerne Street. There may be an opportunity to make a public connection at this location. It could be suitable for a soft path in summer and winter egress.	ADDITIONAL INFO
260	Summer	S	19	19	I would support Solitude Canyon area being developed into more mountain bike trails.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
261	Summer	S	Panorama Dome	-	I support mtn bike trail development . Development of existing trails.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
262	Summer	S	19	19	Would love to see multiple types of trails - mostly bike only DH trails, freeride, XC loop.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
263	Summer	S	5A	5a	Would love to see horse-only access trail // no bikes(+) horse on same trail.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
264	Summer	S	19	19	I would like to see more mountain bike trails in this area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
265	Summer	S	19	19	Developing mountain bike trails that connect to Mammoth Rock Trail would greatly improve Mammoth's mountain bike trail network.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
266	Winter	W	4	4	The no OSV zone needs to be further back from the motocross track to allow snowmobiles access to lower bowls near the back of the motocross track.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
267	Winter	W	1, 2, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6, 7, 8, 9A, 10A, 10B, 12, 13, 16, & 17	1, 2, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6, 7, 8, 9A, 10A, 10B, 12, 13, 16, & 17	Full support, good idea.	OPINION
268	Winter	W	3	3	Keep motorized staging and parking in one area for ease of maintenance, control and use.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
269	Winter	W	4	4	The use of this area by snowmobiles has never been restricted, why now? What are the "conflicts" that have occurred that cause the restriction to be proposed? The only issue that comes to mind is noise and that some people object to it. There are countless acres available to those who desire a quiet experience. This area is a "playground" for all to use and restricting a user from a large area does not appear to be fair or warranted. The existing Forest Order should not be revised to limit motorized use. The existing Forest Order and the proposed non-motorized trails would be consistent as to motorized crossings and impact avoidance.	POLICY
270	Winter	W	9B	9b	Off leash dogs should be limited to one area and to allow off leash dogs within a trail network is very hard to manage and police voice compliance. Some people would prefer that dogs be on leashes to limit dog/people conflicts and help keep the dogs close to the owners when the blue bags are needed. Otherwise it may be difficult for the owner to retrieve the deposits.	POLICY
271	Winter	W	15	15	This area may be too close to the residents of Snowcreek V and the "run-out" area at the bottom may be very small. There are existing fences that would need to be considered also. The #2 area may better serve the snowplay needs.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
272	Summer	S	17 & 5B	17, 5b	Most of #17 currently exists; connect #17 to the Lake Mary Bike Path via "utility access road".	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
273	Summer	S	17	17	#17 should be non-equestrian due to fine soils and damage potential by horses. (See attached photos). <i>[Photos are available in binder.]</i> Keep horses on existing for fee "pony ride" trails.	POLICY
274	Summer	S	5B	5b	Create & Establish as an Equestrian Preferred trail. It may be best to have separate but equal trails for horses and mountain bikes. Separation should be about 50' to 100' min.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
275	Summer	S	1, 2, 3, 4, 5C, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, & 28	1, 2, 3, 4, 5C, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, & 28	Great ideas, full support.	THANKS
276	Summer	S	5A	5a	Separate horses and hikers due to impact from horses on soft surface trails. Or armor the tread to minimize damage.	po
277	Summer	S	6	6	The surface should be asphalt paving to match Snowcreek VIII MUP so a consistent loop is formed.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
278	Summer	S	8	8	Is this proposed to be open for bikes? Horses?	QUESTION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
279	Summer	S	12A & 12B	12a, 12b	Move further up Lake Mary Road to the existing "flat spot" adjacent to the Vista Trail & Panorama Dome Trail. Run a trail back down to the bridge & bike path.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
280	Summer	S	17	17	This route should be left as is and no improvements made due to the condition of the rock and the rough existing nature of the experience.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
281	Summer	S	19	19	There is enough to do in the areas closer to town w/o adding this item.	OPINION
282	Summer	S	20-23	20, 21, 22, 23	No comment.	THANKS
283		NONE		-	<i>Many photos attached.</i>	ADDITIONAL INFO
284	Both	S, W		S7	Please keep Kerry Meadow dirt road/trail access open. Long time favorite in town trail.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
285	Both	S, W		-	Please keep Snowcreek Project propane gas tanks on private property. Keep the public lands open for recreation.	NOT IN SCOPE
286	Both	S, W	4	4	Not closing motorized vehicals access because its really good for snowmobiling.	POLICY
287	Both	S, W	5C	5c	I have friends that live on Tamarack and it's a great place for us to go out from.	OPINION
288	Both	S, W	4, 5C	4, 5c	Not closing the area to motorized vehicles because the area is amazing for snowmobileing!	POLICY
289	Both	S, W	9A	9a	Same as above. [Not closing the area to motorized vehicles because the area is amazing for snowmobileing!]	POLICY
290	Winter	W	1	1	I don't see much need for greater separation of areas. - There is a need for a staging area due to heavy use and limited parking. - The benefit to this staging area with the proposed boundary #4 is mainly for the non-motorized users. The area to the east has limit terrain and no access to other zones such as Shady Rest or the east of 395. The terrain available is for advanced riders. - The major issue along witht the conjection of parking is the dog waste. - Any effects caused by motorized vehicles (OSV) are insignificant compared to the dog waster. - The staging area needs to address this issue. - A beacon basin is a great addition to heighten public awareness. - Signage is important to optimize use and provide the best experience for all parties. - This section of road needs to be accessible to green sticker vehicles.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
291	Summer	S	19	19	Potential for Mtn. Bike Trail in Solitude Canyon would be a great addition to our limited off MMSA trail system.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
292	Winter	W	4	4	The area to the west has always been multiuse with no apparent conflicts. Motorized users typically stay on the slope of the Sherwins with non-motorized users staying in the meadows. - Restricting this area to motorized users leaves mainly expert terrain which is not safe to have all levels of riders forced to use. - This area to the east has no access to other zones such as Shady Rest or the East side of 395. - This boundary cuts off the most direct route to access the base of the telebowls and Solitude Canyon. This causes more use of fuel and late season limitations for those who use snowmobiles for skiing and snowboarding access. - It is important to consider that motorized users may be using their vehicle to access areas for their non-motirized activities. By limiting one use may limit both uses. - Are there private property owners who are pushing for this boundary in their backyard? Because this area is all of our backyard and private ownership should not influence these boundaries.	POLICY
293	Winter	W	2	2	This area has been multiuse with no apparent conflicts. - It is available now for non-motorized snowplay. - This moraine is typically used by OSV users to access backcountry skiing + snowboarding terrain. This is an open area with great visibility for all users to be able to extend courtesy to each other. - There is already a proposed snowplay area adjacent to SCVIII (#15) which does not affect this corridore.	POLICY
294	Summer	S	20	20	A BMX Park would be a great addition to our community for locals + guests. The shelter of the forest would be a better location. Well maintained jumps and burms would be a great training ground for future competitors and recreationalists.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
295	Winter	W	4	4	The mountain already ahs Tamarack closed for most of the winter. The Sherwins is a big and open & gets good amount of snow for snowmobiles.	POLICY
296	Winter	W	5C	5c	I live on Tamarack Ln. It is very nice to drive a couple of seconds to be able to snowmobile.	OPINION
297	Both	S, W	4	4	Not closing to motorized vehicle in winter, I like riding sled with my kids out there.	POLICY
298	Winter	W	5C	5c	Its close to my house and very convenient.	OPINION
299	Winter	W	4, 5C	4, 5c	Please don't close for motorized vehicles in winter.	POLICY
300	Winter	W	4, 5C	4, 5c		-
301	Summer & Winter	S, W	N/A	4	The Sherwin area should not be closed. It has been a popular recreation area for years. There is no valid reason for closure or restrictions.	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
302	S	S	1A, 10, 1, 13, 27, 21, 11, 9, 6	1A, 10, 1, 13, 27, 21, 11, 9, 6	Easy trails close to town leading to other large areas for off road recreating.	OPINION
303	W	W	21, 27, 13, 16, 9, 27	21, 27, 13, 16, 9, 27	Easy way to hit the slopes for those wanting to avoid the resort and crowds.	OPINION
304	Winter	W	4	4	Each year more and more OHV & OSV area's are closed. This is an unfair trend which occurs! The land should stay open to public use, such as snowmobiling & skiing/snowboarding. People should be more realistic and realize that "shared use", and being fair to both interest's motorized/non-motorized use's. Is the fair thing to do.	POLICY
305	Winter	W	4	4	I strongly dis-approve of closing these area's - Mammoth Lakes is a Recreation dependent town - this will hurt the people who spend money here!! KEEP IT OPEN!!	POLICY
306	Both	S, W	4	4	Not closing to motorized vehcile it a great place to ride sleds.	POLICY
307	Winter	W	5C	5c	I lke loading and unloading my sled there its very convient	OPINION
308	Winter	W	4, 9A, 9C	4, 9a, 9c	Please don't close to motorized/winter.	POLICY
309	Both	S, W	4	4	Not closing to motorized vehicel caues its fun out there	POLICY
310	Winter	W	5C	5c	Loading and unloading from tamarack is awesome	OPINION
311	Winter	W		4	The Sherwins is one of my favorite places to ride snowmobiles with my friends and family and it is is a great place to shuttle skiers and snowboarders to powder runs	OPINION
312	Summer	S		-	I ride my dirt b ke by the Sherwins all summer long because it is the best place to start from where I live	OPINION
313	Summer & WInter	S, W		W4	Please don't close down the Sherwins it is a great place to ride. I have always helped friends + family shuttle up and around that area. I ride my snowmobile + dirtb ke there so please don't close it.	POLICY
314	Winter	W	4, 5C	4, 5c	Not closing area to motorized vehical in winter.	POLICY
315	Both!	S, W	4, 5C	4, 5c	The Sherwin Mtn range is a very beautiful and Recreational area for Mammoth locals. Closingthe area would be a very disappointing action. Growing up here for 20 years I have spent all my time exploring and being very active in that area. Please do not close this area down!	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
316	Winter	W	5C	5c	Please don't re route this trail. Please let us keep our land to use as we like. Thank you.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
317	Winter	W	5B	5b	Keep this trail. There is enough room for everyone. We pay our taxes. Thank you.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
318	Both	S, W	4	4	not closing area to motorized vehicle	POLICY
319	Winter	W	5C	5c	not closing area to motorized vehicle	POLICY
320	Both	S, W	4, 5C	4, 5c	not closing area to motorized vehicle	POLICY
321	Winter	W	4, 5C	4, 5c	don't shut down area to motorized vehicles because the area is amazing for snowmobileing	POLICY
322	Summer & Winter	S, W		W4	We are already losing places to ride + enjoy our National playgrounds. If we continue to close areas to locals + paying visitors that are spending good money in our town to enjoy those areas we will lose what our ancestors set aside for us and our children to enjoy like we have for decades. Also what proof do you have that is substantial to say power sports, and human powered sports are destroying these areas! All Seasons.	POLICY
323	Winter/ Snowmobile Access Summer/ dirt bike/ moto	S, W		W4	We use the Sherwins area as a starting point for shuttle at the telebowls and to access Pyramids. Everyone I ride with is always considerate of hikers, dogs, x-country skiers, etc. and there is no reason we shouldn't be allowed in that area. Banning motor vehicles in that [illegible] place will eventually lead to us being banned from many areas around Mammoth, which would be detrimental to the town. Snowmobiling and Dirt Biking bring many tourists into town that spend money on lodging, food, gas, etc.	POLICY
324	Summer & Winter	S, W	All	-	Keep all access open, to all public use!!	POLICY
325	Summer Winter Fall Spring Any Season	S, W		W4	I believe everyone should have the ability to enjoy public land in all ways, equally. Every sport has its opportunities and it encourages every person to try & more importantly: TO EXERCISE. Any time is an amazing time to hike, bike, moto, run, anything.// How is one sport different from another & why should that freedom be taken away skiing, snowmobiling, snowshoing, dog walking are all forms of love for nature. Why destroy that for anybody? There is not a season, an outdoor activity, or a sport that should be banned anywhere, so long as the people of any and all parties are respectful & enjoying.	POLICY
326	Summer	S	3, 7, 13	3, 7, 13	I ride my dirt bike out of Snowcreek 5 where I live & I do not have a trailer to leave from anywhere else.	NOT IN SCOPE
327		W		4	open for snowmobiles.	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
328	Winter	W		4	I enjoy snowmobile access to the Sherwin area for skiing and would like snowmobile access to remain open.	POLICY
329	Winter	W		4	I would like for the Sherwins to continue staying open for snowmobilers to enjoy!	POLICY
330	Winter	W		4	Please leave snowmo access to the sherwin area. My self and many others do not have Mammoth Mtn passes and rely on snowmo accessto go skiing with out hiking so much.	POLICY
331		W		4	Don't close access for winter.	POLICY
332		W		4	Don't close access for winter.	POLICY
333	Winter	W		4	open for snowmobiles	POLICY
334	Winter	W		4	Please allow people to use the land we all own.	POLICY
335	Winter	W		4	Open for snowmobiling	POLICY
336	Winter	W	All	4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY
337	Open	W		4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY
338	Winter	W		4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY
339	Winter	W	All	4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY
340	Winter	W		4	open snowmobiling	POLICY
341	Winter	W		4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY
342	Winter	W	5B	5b	Traffic across a golf course, even in winter can cause damage. Why not use 5C instead.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
343	Winter	W	Summer Map #11	13	Add snowshoe/xcountry signage aling N. side of Mammoth Creek to avoid snowmobile traffic along Mammoth Creek Rd.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
344	Winter & Sunner	S, W		-	Thanks for the thourough communication -	THANKS
345	Winter	W	9B yes	9b	All staging areas should be leash required. Sierra Meadows should be leash-free BUT we should work with Steve Searles, MLPD, USFS/DFG, about penalties regarding unprovoked dog attacks.	POLICY
346	Winter	W	12 yes	12	As we construct these facilities, one of the best ways to reduce traffic congestion PLUS increase access is to have our transportation system providing rides to our new rec areas.	OPINION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
347	Winter	W	13 yes	13	We should have fundraiser events particularly for this proposal. Also, Friends of the Inyo would be a great group to utilize for creation + placement of signs. :)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
348	Winter	W	16 yep	16	There is plenty of space to create and allow for new parking space to alleviate overcrowding along Lake Mary road and other resorts + turnouts.	OPINION
349	Winter	W	2, 15 yes	2, 15	Anytime we can create easily accessible and family rec areas near downtown + lodging that also have restroom amenities we increase commerce.	OPINION
350	Summer	S	17	17	Would appreciate more concise mapping...BUT both of these closely related accesses should be connected for year round use. How about possible weekday hours for snowmobiles for SnoBoard drop offs??	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
351	Summer	S	18	18	Could be expanded to an even higher elevation and utilized in winter for possible snowmobile access for SnoBoard drop-offs during winter weekdays.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
352	Summer	S	21	21	YES. Absotively/Posilutely and schedule MORE motor/bi-cycling events, along with snoMobile races in winter. BiAthalon + SnoShoe races also. :)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
353	Summer	S	13, 27	13, 27	Can also be utilized during winter once put in. Will also decrease cross-training/spider-webbing.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
354	Summer	S	9	9	Open to bikes and all non-motorized use during summer. Additionally, I think should be added to MUP groomed snowmobile access during winter season along with the whole #10 + #11 routes.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
355	Summer/ Winter	S, W	Winter #16 12A & B	S12a, S12b	Same as winter #16 = yep, yep, yep!! AS we develop and expand these trails systems, the more that we can keep from impacting existing parking, and especially alleviating roadside parking the safer and better off we'll be.	OPINION
356	Summer	S	5A, B & C	5a, 5b, 5c	Creation of this corridor will provide numerous recreational options. I still see clarifying needed in the \$5 B&C area, along with summer/winter #17 trails to avoid cross-training + spider-webbing...obvious + consistent trails area MUST!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
357	Summer	S	14, 15, 16	14, 15, 16	YES YES YES. We need a SAFE parallel bike & pedestrian route along that stretch of OLD Mammoth. Durin ghte summer x-country training clubs it becomes SCARY to drive. I DO NOT want to run over anybody!!!	OPINION
358	Summer	S	17	17	As mentioned in winter #17, clarification of routes is hereby requested, but #17 should be utilized both winter and summer with maybe occasional use during weekdays for recreational motorized vehicle use.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
359	Summer	S	18	18	SAA and refer to earlier #18 recomms.	OPINION
360	Summer	S	19	19	Concur with assessment + think that this area should seriously be considered for any future skilifts or Gondola proposals. Also a snowmobile for skiing + boarding drop-offs.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
361	Summer	S	20	20	Expand Shady Rest skate/bike uphill for multi-use.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
362	Summer & Winter	S, W	21	21	EXPAND & SCHEDULE & RACE Dammit!! Also snomobiles...we could be on ESPN at least every other month!! We should be utilizing moto for multi-uses year round...	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
363	Summer/Winter	S, W	22/9B	22, 9b	Leashes required in ALL staging areas, exception being Sierra Meadows. BUT we should develop quick response situations with MLPD, Steve Searles, Animal Control, DFG/USFS/BLM for ANY dog attacks, unrovoked or not...	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
364	Summer/Winter	S, W	24/13	24, 13	Yep. Coordinate with Friends of the Inyo for these projects.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
365	Summer	S	25	25	Concur with assessment and proposal	THANKS
366	Summer	S	26	26	OH YEAH!! And expand East + West for ski/board access.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
367	Summer/Winter?	S, W	27/?	27	Development of already existing MAIN trail(s) will result in less cross-training/spider-webbing, plus could result in an excellent snowmobile route. Another "Fr of Inyo" weekend project!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
368	Summer/Winter	S, W	28	28	Yeppers!! As we develop these trails, playgrounds, and access areas we should implement transportation spots. Maybe some \$ day passes or round trip fees from say uphill drop-offs to down-hill pick-ups!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
369	Summer	S	1A 10 11 ?E	1	Just returned from our 3rd annual visit to Mammoth Lakes/Sherwin Creek area – PLEASE DO NOT pave the Sherwin Creek Rd. from 395 to Old Mammoth Rd.– some already is, probably for the motocross development – but stop at that – The impact on trash and traffic will be even greater and the area of "wilderness/remoteness" in the midst of "the city" will be further lost [signed]	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
300	Winter	W	4, 5C	4, 5c		-
9	Winter	W	?	-	There is no written document or agreement that the lakes basin is closed prior to April 15th. There was a written agreement approximately 1989 that allowed osv access prior to Thanksgiving and after April 1st to utilize the Lake Mary Road to the Lakes Basin. This issue seemed to evolve into dates which did not allow public input, an EA or any type of discussion.	ADDITIONAL INFO
10	Winter	W	?	4, 10b	The open area off of the Sherwin Creek Road has a blue diamond cross country ski trail through it. This is flat terrain for the most part with gentle hills and popular at times in the past for OSV's.	ADDITIONAL INFO
11	Winter	W	?	4	The huge OSV closure at the base of the Sherwins's between the golf course and the sherwins was proposed by Jim Ognisty, deceased (right-hand man for Tom Dempsey) to allow OSV access to a proposed conference center. This route coincided with the TMT (Trans Mammoth Trail) in the 90's.	ADDITIONAL INFO
12	Winter	W	?	8	Within the TMT, a trail paralleling the Sherwin's was proposed by the mountain ski area to connect to the Old Mammoth road to the lakes basin. I believe the ski area made this proposal with the intention of renting snowmobiles from Tamarack Lodge to parallel the Sherwins and open areas south of Sierra Meadows. Instead, they bought a snowmobile rental company and moved it to the Inn without an EA or any type of public notice. But they were still pushing for this trail.	ADDITIONAL INFO
16	Winter	W	?	9a, 10a	The area is so windblown, the cost of maintaining any trail system in this area will be substantial.	ADDITIONAL INFO
49		W		-	I am in receipt of and have reviewed the Sherwins Working Group Winter Narrative and related map dated September 11, 2009.	ADDITIONAL INFO
84	Winter	W	8	8	this is a corridor for So. Cal Edison + H2O district cat machines - they are regularly going up + down road w/out tillers - ripping up snow - it does not make sense to groom this when it will be cut up - also need to consider existing Tamarack operations + feeding people into this operation + the consequences: more signage, trail pass issues, accessories, etc.	ADDITIONAL INFO
257	Winter	W		8	Grooming Old Mammoth Road may inhibit emergency access to the Lakes Basin in the event that Lake Mary Road is closed (avalanche, tunnel issues/maintenance)	ADDITIONAL INFO
18	Winter	W	?	-	Why is Old Mammoth Rd missing from the map?	ERROR/OMISSION
19	Winter	W	?	-	Why dosen't the map show the multi-use trail paralleling Mammoth Creek? The bridge crossing the creek was built specifically to allow use of OSV crossings.	ERROR/OMISSION
97	Winter	W	5B	5b	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Purple line extending from Snowcreek Golf Course area does not have a designation. 2) Parking is not allowed in the area so there is no reason for a public easement 3) There is no public transportation once outside gates so narrative for "direct" is unclear. 4) Roads are privately maintained and there is no specification as to who will contribute to maintenance if it is used for public purposes. 5) Snowcreek VIII master plan shuttle stops, etc. are not designated on proposal. 	ERROR/OMISSION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
101	Winter	W	5B	5b	1) Purple line extending from Snowcreek Golf Course area does not have a designation. 2) Parking is not allowed in the area so there is no reason for a public easement 3) There is no public transportation once outside gates so narrative for "direct" is unclear. 4) Roads are privately maintained and there is no specification as to who will contribute to maintenance if it is used for public purposes. 5) Snowcreek VIII master plan shuttle stops, etc. are not designated on proposal.	ERROR/OMISSION
151	Winter	W		-	Please change the color of the existing Tamarack X-country ski trails to a different color than the blue. Similar to how you distinguished the Mammoth Mountain B ke Park. This is a fee area, and is confusing with your new proposed non-motorized Groomed Mixed-use trails. Especially where the existing and proposed systems are meeting up, I am also concerned with who is responsible for the maintenance and grooming of these new trails.	ERROR/OMISSION
152	Winter	W		-	Please confirm the Mammoth Creek trail section that is blue with white outline is a new overlay or designation? Not on the legend.	ERROR/OMISSION
153	Winter	W		-	Pink Cross marks are also not on the legend although I am assuming it is the designation for back/side country skiing and snowboarding.	ERROR/OMISSION
225	Winter	W	Global	-	Please chose a different color for graphic representations of existing trail systems, ie Tamarack Nordic System	ERROR/OMISSION
6	Winter	W	?	-	Currently there are few lodging facilities that promote the 21,000 owners of osv's in the state within the town limits. This issue has not been addressed.	NOT IN SCOPE
77		W		-	Winter Biathlon area?	NOT IN SCOPE
13	Winter	W	?	-	I do not agree with the SWG Proposal for winter recreation on this map. You will stifle and concentrate diversified recreation which is in total conflict with the USFS Land Management Plan which states that diversified recreation must be "dispersed."	OPINION
17	Winter	W	?	1, 3	The parking area appears insufficient on the Sherwin Creek Rd. Know that many events have taken place in this area over the years and could again in the future if planned well.	OPINION
25	Winter	W	4	4	It a great place to see the Town of Mammoth it away from cross coutry skier	OPINION
36		W		4	Like the tele bowl access and the winter snow access on Sherwin Creek Rd and out to the base of the Sherwins.	OPINION
45	Winter	W		-	I question the results of opening more places that are now closed for winter. Our guests often have limited knowledge of winter exposure here in the Eastern Sierra. Unexpected snowstorms, avalanches etc. threaten the lives of those in the back country - Do we need more deaths? Even the ski area (well patrolled) can attest to that. Expensive to maintain and dangerous.	OPINION
69	Winter	W	1	1	Once parking access is developed @ borrow pit I suspect there will be a big increase in use + potential for conflict btwn motorized + non-motorized use. In this light, providing separate + well defined user areas (as is currently proposed) will help to alleviate this potential conflict.	OPINION
113	Winter	W	1	1	Combined OK	OPINION
114	Winter	W	3	3	Fine	OPINION
116	Winter	W	5A	5a	Not needed	OPINION
117	Winter	W	5B	5b	Not needed	OPINION
118	Winter	W	6	6	Not needed	OPINION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
141	Winter	W	All	-	It seems odd creating more use of the forest when the political trend today is more restrictions, less use. What development , ski slope, housing, shopping, commercial enterprise are you doing to raw land and offsetting the area with more managed recreational use?	OPINION
142	Winter	W	All	9a	The snow is thin in this area so do not groom.	OPINION
157	Winter	W		-	Snowmobile with my family	OPINION
267	Winter	W	1, 2, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6, 7, 8, 9A, 10A, 10B, 12, 13, 16, & 17	1, 2, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6, 7, 8, 9A, 10A, 10B, 12, 13, 16, & 17	Full support, good idea.	OPINION
296	Winter	W	5C	5c	I live on Tamarack Ln. It is very nice to drive a couple of seconds to be able to snowmobile.	OPINION
298	Winter	W	5C	5c	Its close to my house and very convenient.	OPINION
303	W	W	21, 27, 13, 16, 9, 27	21, 27, 13, 16, 9, 27	Easy way to hit the slopes for those wanting to avoid the resort and crowds.	OPINION
307	Winter	W	5C	5c	I like loading and unloading my sled there its very convient	OPINION
310	Winter	W	5C	5c	Loading and unloading from tamarack is awesome	OPINION
311	Winter	W		4	The Sherwins is one of my favorite places to ride snowmobiles with my friends and family and it is is a great place to shuttle skiers and snowboarders to powder runs	OPINION
346	Winter	W	12 yes	12	As we construct these facilities, one of the best ways to reduce traffic congestion PLUS increase access is to have our transportation system providing rides to our new rec areas.	OPINION
348	Winter	W	16 yep	16	There is plenty of space to create and allow for new parking space to alleviate overcrowding along Lake Mary road and other resorts + turnouts.	OPINION
349	Winter	W	2, 15 yes	2, 15	Anytime we can create easily accessible and family rec areas near downtown + lodging that also have restroom amenities we increase commerce.	OPINION
5	Winter	W	?	4	SWG Winter Proposal Map This map proposes huge closures for winter osv access near the town of Mammoth that are currently shown on the Winter Recreation Map as "open use".	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
44	Winter	W	4, mostly but all	4	There are plenty of non motorized areas around and plenty of snowplay areas. Snowmobiles leave no impact on the environment and drive no one away from sledding and playing in the snow Closing off this much area should put OHV fees down from \$45 a year to \$10 because there is nowhere to ride our \$12000 machines that is alot of tax revenue for the state	POLICY
50		W		4	As an overview observation, it appears that the working group has calculated that there is no place for OSVs in the Mammoth Lakes Area near Snowcreek Properties. Not only does the plan push all OSV use areas significantly away from the Snowcreek sphere of influence (as defined in its master plan), it provides ZERO oversnow pathways for ingress and/or egress from currently OSV accessible lands to those distant areas which have been designated for this purpose. The plan also adds a burden to any staging area as there is little opportunity for OSV users to arrive at the proposed trail head by means other then by truck and trailer.	POLICY
51		W		4	While the Map indicates there would be "restrictions" on the northeast side of line 4, the Narrative indicates a zero OSV use policy. "Restrictions" would be more appropriate. Creating a "no-fly zone" for OSVs is inconsistent with the goal of a diversified use of public lands. The stated purpose for the no-fly-zone is to eliminate the "POTENTIAL" for conflicts of use. Wiping out one side of the potential conflict is certainly the easiest and least creative way to avoid that potential conflict. Yet neither a rationale nor actual historical data has been provided to support the need for such a large swath of public land to be set-aside for a zero-tolerance (of OSVs) policy. The group has provided no support, nor presented a narrative, to indicate that OSV use in this area has been historically abusive or a public nuisance. Nor has the group communicated that OSVs have presented an actual danger to other participants on public lands sufficient for the wholesale elimination, not regulation, of their use.	POLICY
52		W		4	It is clearly reasonable to designate certain areas and pathways to be restricted to non-motorized use. And it would be understandable had the working group determined a need to restrict OSV speed and/or noise levels based on other permitted uses near an area, the hour of day, etc. Or to place restricted use in certain densely used areas to OSV pathways. But, I believe the current plan demonstrates a clear negative bias against this form of recreational use of public lands.	POLICY
53		W		2, 15	Specifically, while areas 2 and 15 are designated "snowplay" areas (presumably 15 is for the Snowcreek VIII hotel guests) and paths 5A and 9A are designated non-OSV pathways, there is little reason that public lands next to these zones exclude all OSV use. Rather, a more reasoned approach would be to restrict speeds and/or noise levels near these pathways/play areas.	POLICY
54		W		4	I specifically request the working group eliminate the line 4 "no-fly-zone" and provide, instead, for reasonable speed and noise restrictions in this area. I request OSVs be provided regulated access on, or immediately next to, path 5A and all areas surrounding path 9A (thus establishing a regulated public ingress/egress/touring area near developed projects).	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
55		W		4	Again, it is easy to eliminate "potential conflicts" when you completely omit one side in such a large area. But, I have enjoyed touring many seniors, children and non-athletes, on the back of the snowmobiles, through the various areas of the Sherwins and sharing with them the beauty of nature and the various scenic views. Because of there less physical capabilities, they would not have seen this otherwise. They are not purist cross-country skiers or back country snow-shoers. While those non-motorized purist may feel the views and beauty are reserved for them; they are not. They also belong to those whose only access is via OSVs. The public land is to be shared with all who respectfully approach it. I challenge the group to find a two-sided solution providing access to all major areas of the Sherwins.	POLICY
61	Winter	W	9A 4 9A 8	9A 4 9A 8	Skiers and backcountry people have trails & ski areas everywhere, why shut down snowmobilers best thing going.	POLICY
62	Winter	W	4	4	With the loss of the White Mt's now this it seems one sided what do us OSV users get SCS	POLICY
73	Winter	W		4	<u>Sherwin Meadows</u> I love the snowmobile tracks as a path for XC skiing and exiting the Sherwins.	POLICY
105	Winter	W	4	4	The rational you present: 1) Separation of use via a clearly marked boundary will reduce potential conflict between motorized and non-motorized use in the Sherwins area. Through my experience, I have never encountered any conflict with other snowmobiles, skiers, or hikers while using this area on my snowmobile. If anything, I have positive encounters with other, regardless of the method of entertainment chosen. Although I am sure a conflict can/has occurred, this is not the norm. To close an area to 'reduce potential conflict' is a bit extreme. A more appropriate approach would be to devise a code of conduct for people to follow. Using the rational to close the area to 'reduce potential conflict' could be used to close Lake Mary off to kids in the summer because their noise while playing could result in 'potential conflict' with the fishermen. Although the example presented above is a bit extreme, what is occurring is you are choosing one group over another, and thus potentially creating conflict. I think the SWG should really consider the rational presented and apply this to everyday situations in life, and how they would be applied, and if that application would be appropriate.	POLICY
106	Winter	W	4	4	2) <i>Additionally, the Sherwins Range is a unique front-country ski and snowboard amenity.</i> This sentence is 100% true, but you have excluded some important parts. The sentence should read: <i>Additionally, the Sherwins Range is a unique front-country ski, snowboard, snowmobile, snowshoe, cross-country, winter hiking, amenity and generally enjoyed by any winter out-door enthusiast.</i> As in #1 above, again, one group is being selected over another, without providing any reasoning why.	POLICY
107	Winter	W	4	4	3) <i>Plentiful motorized opportunity is on offer to the east and south of the Sherwins area, and the inclusion of Solitude Canyon in the OSV zone enables users to also access Pyramid Peak and other destinations.</i> Likewise, this sentence is correct, but the reality is in the Eastern Sierra, snowmobilers are already restricted from a number of areas that are currently available to non-motorized forms of recreation. This sentence could just as easily read: <i>Plentiful ski & snowboard opportunity are offer to the east and south of the Sherwins area, and the inclusion of Solitude Canyon, enables users to also access Pyramid Peak and other destinations.</i>	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
108	Winter	W	4	4	In summary, the rational presented is favoring one group over another, without providing justification why. The rational presented is more of a matter of opinion, rather than based on facts. It is my opinion that if the SWG wants to exclude motorized vehicles from the area define, more defined reasons should be presented, and no group should get preferential treatment in the final recommendation, as is currently the case.	POLICY
112		W		4	Also I want to emphasize that I think item #4 is a fantastic idea and should be implemented immediately. OSV play in the meadow and the front side of the Sherwins is damaging, dangerous, and a nuisance to residents.	POLICY
115	Winter	W	4	4	OSV's do not conflict!	POLICY
119	Winter	W	General	4	Keep access open to snowmobiles to Sherwin's.	POLICY
120	Winter	W	4	4	I have ridden this area for the last 30 years. And would like to continue to do so.	POLICY
122	Winter	W	4	4	Too much stuff is closed to snowmobiling already. This would be a terrible loss to the snowmobiling community of the Eastern Sierra's. Keep the Sherwins open!	POLICY
123	Winter	W	4	4	This area should definitely stay open to snowmobiling! We hardly have any good terrain I ke the Sherwin Range to ride in this area as it is, without having to drive to Sonora Pass. That area doesn't get enough snow every year. So it's a nice treat to enjoy when it's got enough snow. "Snowmobiling is already limited", the Forest Service & the Town should promote this sport more in our area. It makes another reason for people to come visit our area and benefits our economy! Snow machines make no impact on the terrain!	POLICY
124	Winter	W	4	4	Spring use of Lakes Basin needs motorized access from here by April 15 the borrow pit routes will be burned off.	POLICY
126	Winter	W	1	1	Borrow pit access is a great idea but should not [illegible] #4 + loss of higher altitude motorized access.	POLICY
127	Winter	W	4	4	I like to ride out of the Sherwin area and also the lakes basin. To close these off for motorized recreation takes away from all who enjoy these areas - all need to share not just one group.	POLICY
131	Winter	W		4	Please don't close off any more areas to ORV access, there is no reason there can't be shared use. Sherwin is the only terrain of its kind available to ORV there are countless areas of similar terrain available to non-ORV usage only. If anything impose [illegible] but don't restrict already limited available terrain.	POLICY
136	Winter	W	All	4	I am opposed to any restrictions to winter motorized travel / recreation on public land	POLICY
138	Winter	W	All	4	It seems better not to go to Mammoth and ride in other areas like near June Lake, Tahoe. Why ... so many (emotionally created) restrictions and a confrontational attitude between snowmobiles and non motorized recreation. For example people who run their dogs without a leash on the trail and riders must stop. The trail is blocked by skiers (instead of getting to one side and share they turn their skies perpendicular to the trail and stand in the middle of the trail) and dogs bark and bite at the snowmobile, rider and passenger.	POLICY
143	Winter	W	4	4	Please do not close this area. For every area that is closed to snowmobiles, a new one never gets opened up. Backcountry skiers have millions of acres available to them where sleds are not permitted, so why keep limiting the access to other users? I thought MLPTA stands for public access! I'm a responsible sled owner, who abides by the rules, and keeps my sled running cleanly and quietly. The majority of snowmobile users in the tele bowls area, are responsible locals, and not the obnoxious and rude tourists that populate the trail system outside shady rest.	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
146	Winter	W		4	Snowmobiling in the foothills of the Sherwins has been a long standing tradition for many families for many years and adding the load of enforcement to this area that has been open for riding is another added burden to the already lack of enforcement. Also concentration all the use of snowmobilers into the Shady and Inyo Craters area is an ongoing concern as well. The areas of Sherwin Creek road and South is a minimal impact to the neighboring residents and it gives a port to our town in good winter years. Closing any of these areas to future snowmobiling would be a bad judgment. A large number of our winter visits are snowmobiles and with responsible use and good education this area is well suited for a multiple of users. The Forest Service has much of that area open to multi-use and it should remain with that designation.(including motorized)	POLICY
158		W		4	Greetings and thanks for your work: I've called Mammoth my home since 1972. My feedback for the SWG is: NO SNOWMOBILES IN THE SHERWINS!!! They have shown that they have no respect for wilderness boundaries as I've seen them "high mark" all over the Crest let alone in the Sherwins (please see picture taken on opening day to snowmobiles to the Lakes Basin, high mark TJ bowl). In other words they are law breakers and should not be rewarded for such behavior. They need to be policed better as they will not or cannot police themselves. There are reasons snowmobiles are banned in France. On big winters they can snowmobile to Nevada if they want. But leave us, (back country skiers, skimmers and gridders) a little piece of Mountain to enjoy, lawfully, without these senseless people and their dangerous machines endangering others. Thank You [signed] [picture available in binder]	POLICY
159	Winter	W	4	4	I would like to express my concern with the proposed closure of this area to motorized use. This area should be allowed use by all in a respectful manner. I have never witnessed conflict between motorized and non-motorized groups. This proposal is being pushed by a few vocal people whom do not represent the vast majority of people using this area. If there has been conflict between a few people, this conflict should be solved within a different avenue. This is a beautiful area which should be enjoyed by all.	POLICY
161	Winter	W		4	KEEP ALL ACCESS OPEN TO SNOWMOBILES. I reside in Utah but make several trips to the sierras in the winter for snowmobile recreation. The amount of OHV traffic this area receives is minimal at best and not causing any harm or conflicts. It should not be shut down to OHV in winter or in summer.	POLICY
170	Winter	W	1	1	The concept of forced separation is odd to me, but I am told, necessary. I have snowmobiled that area quite a bit and rarely see boarders or skiers in the sherwins and when I do, I usually know them and they have used snowmobiles to get to the more extreme areas and to transport shovels and cameras in. I don't see any conflict, or need to keep snowmobiles out of an area that is usually only used by snowmobilers and extreme boarders and skiers on snowmobiles.	POLICY
172	Winter	W	1	1	I think also, that there should be a penalty for non-motorized users who walk dogs and jog and snowshoe on the Motorized Use side that is the same as when a motorized user crosses onto the non-motorized side. That would be fair and safer. If it is safe for combined use on our side then it must be ok for us to use the non-motorized side as we choose also. We have to be safe and fair.	POLICY
178	Winter	W	4	4	I support a separation boundary. I will keep families who use the snow park and backcountry travelers safer	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
185	Winter	W	4	4	I support a separation boundary for motorized and non-motorized. Keeping the very different users more separated is safer and helps each type of user group retain their preferred experience.	POLICY
193	Winter	W	SWG Winter Proposal Map	4	I strongly oppose the OSV Restriction Area that is proposed in the SWG Winter Map. It closes very unique terrain only available in that area for OSV users. I ride my OSV out there frequently in the winter and have never seen or experienced any user group conflicts. Enough OSV land has already been taken away, this has to stop!!!! Do not add this OSV Restriction Area!!!!	POLICY
194	Winter	W	SWG Winter Proposal Map	4	I strongly oppose the OSV Restriction Area that is proposed in the SWG Winter Map. It closes very unique terrain only available in that area for OSV users. I ride my OSV out there frequently in the winter and have never seen or experienced any user group conflicts. Enough OSV land has already been taken away, this has to stop!!!! Do not add this OSV Restriction Area!!!!	POLICY
196	Winter	W	SWG Winter Proposal Map	4	I strongly oppose the OSV Restriction Area that is proposed in the SWG Winter Map. I ride these areas each winter and also back country ski these areas. I have never had a conflict of use interests. Do not add this OSV Restriction Area!!!!	POLICY
197	Winter	W	4	4	Potential conflict is an assumption/discriminatory, this area should be open to all users including OSV's (AKA snowmobiles etc.). There has never been more snowmobiles and clubs than now especially from southern California where most of mammoths tourist dollars come from. We are a large family from southern California who choose mammoth rather than say Utah to snowmobile at and spend close to 10K dollars on the local economy because we love the sierras and the riding areas etc.. There are enough closed/wilderness areas already. Please listen and consider the opinions of the mammoth snowmobile club and locals as they know more than me of what is important and relevant. Equal access is fair to all. Thank You.	POLICY
198	Winter	W	4	4	I oppose the SWG Winter Recreation Proposal Map ID 4 because it designates a MOTORIZED/NON-MOTORIZED boundary which is extremely unfair to OSV users.	POLICY
199	Winter	W	4	4	I strongly oppose the idea of a Motorized/Non-motorized boundary as it exists in the SWG Winter Proposal Map. I feel this way because the Tele Bowls and Sherwin Range are also " a unique front-country OSV amenity", and likewise, the "Western portion of the Area offers excellent opportunities for MOTORIZED recreation as well because of its size and geography." Also, the unique terrain offers OSV users an experience not found elsewhere in the Mammoth area. Steep, long, open pitches.	POLICY
200	Winter	W	4	4	I have never seen a conflict between MOTORIZED and NON-MOTORIZED users in the Area. In fact, many of the cross-country skiers I have spoke with say they enjoy using the tracks left from OSV's after a fresh snow. OSV users do not hang around Snowplay or Nordic Track areas, we go do our own thing and make every attempt to avoid conflict or hazardous situations with other user groups. We just want fair/equitable solutions so we can enjoy our recreational activity as well.	POLICY
202	Winter	W	4	4	The tradeoff of a fancy parking lot for MOTORIZED users in exchange for closing some of the most unique and challenging OSV terrain in the Mammoth Area is an unfair "compromise". OSV users have been using snowbanks and make-shift parking areas since the inception of OSV's, we don't mind shabby parking lots. We do mind when our riding areas continue to shrink at an alarming rate! The closure of the area is a much larger detriment to OSV users than our current parking situation.	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
203	Winter	W	4	4	The Winter Proposal Map seems to benefit every winter recreation group that I can think of except for OSV users. Families get a designated Snowplay Area, Nordic users get a new track, dogs get a place to crap, etc. What do OSV users get? A big, fat closure of a popular riding area. Furthermore, many tourists are drawn to snowmobiling when they see them out in the Meadow, and their likelihood of renting an OSV from a Town business or booking a tour with MMSA or Mammoth Sled Adventures is more likely.	POLICY
205	Winter	W	4	4	In conclusion, I feel the SWG Winter Proposal is a poor compromise for MOTORIZED/NON-MOTORIZED users. It favors the NON-MOTORIZED recreation segment greatly and is essentially a slap in the face to OSV/MOTORIZED users.	POLICY
235	Winter	W	4	4	Regarding the idea of restricting OSV use to the east of the borrow pit: the only reason to do this that makes any sense is because there will be an alternative amenity in the area that's not compatible with snowmobile use. Certainly it makes sense to have snowplay or dog-walk areas restricted, and slow zones in busy areas, but without the presence of a regularly-groomed XC trail system, there's no good reason to boot snowmobiles from the area. The only rationale cited is the prevention of "potential conflicts." Since the meadow area is currently used by OSV's w/ no conflicts, why will there be potential conflicts in any other scenario that one that includes a groomed system? Re: the "quiet area" rationale: nobody made people buy those homes and condos adjacent to OSV area, and there were snowmobiles there before there were any houses. Since the main beneficiary from such a restriction would be the neighboring HOA's and Chadmar, if they want it, they should shoulder the load of grooming etc, perhaps include public access to trails on the golf course. A true amenity would have to be added to make the OSV restriction pencil out in light of historic use and the already heavily restricted local OSV access. Furthermore, the line of OSV exclusion, as represented on the SWG map, excludes the Tele Bowl Area with no clear topographic boundary to deter people from riding in that inviting area directly adjacent to the motocross track. Again, are there conflicts? Is there any rationale for this?	POLICY
269	Winter	W	4	4	The use of this area by snowmobiles has never been restricted, why now? What are the "conflicts" that have occurred that cause the restriction to be proposed? The only issue that comes to mind is noise and that some people object to it. There are countless acres available to those who desire a quiet experience. This area is a "playground" for all to use and restricting a user from a large area does not appear to be fair or warranted. The existing Forest Order should not be revised to limit motorized use. The existing Forest Order and the proposed non-motorized trails would be consistent as to motorized crossings and impact avoidance.	POLICY
270	Winter	W	9B	9b	Off leash dogs should be limited to one area and to allow off leash dogs within a trail network is very hard to manage and police voice compliance. Some people would prefer that dogs be on leashes to limit dog/people conflicts and help keep the dogs close to the owners when the blue bags are needed. Otherwise it may be difficult for the owner to retrieve the deposits.	POLICY
292	Winter	W	4	4	The area to the west has always been multiuse with no apparent conflicts. Motorized users typically stay on the slope of the Sherwins with non-motorized users staying in the meadows. - Restricting this area to motorized users leaves mainly expert terrain which is not safe to have all levels of riders forced to use. - This area to the east has no access to other zones such as Shady Rest or the East side of 395. - This boundary cuts off the most direct route to access the base of the telebowls and Solitude Canyon. This causes more use of fuel and late season limitations for those who use snowmobiles for skiing and snowboarding access.	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
					It is important to consider that motorized users may be using their vehicle to access areas for their non-motirized activities. by limiting one use may limit both uses. - are There private property owners who are pushing for This boundary in their backyard? Because This area is All of our backyard and private ownership should not influence these boundaries.	
293	Winter	W	2	2	This area has been multiuse with no apparent conflicts. - It is available now for non-motorized snowplay. - This moraine is typically used by OSV users to access backcountry skiing + snowboarding terrain. This is an open area with great visibility for all users to be able to extend courtesy to each other. - There is already a proposed snowplay area adjacent to SCVIII (#15) which does not affect this corridore.	POLICY
295	Winter	W	4	4	The mountain already ahs Tamarack closed for most of the winter. The Sherwins is a big and open & gets good amount of snow for snowmobiles.	POLICY
299	Winter	W	4, 5C	4, 5c	Please don't close for motorized vehicles in winter.	POLICY
304	Winter	W	4	4	Each year more and more OHV & OSV area's are closed. This is an unfair trend which occurs! The land should stay open to public use, such as snowmobiling & skiing/snowboarding. People should be more realistic and realize that "shared use" , and being fair to both interest's motorized/non-motorized use's. Is the fair thing to do.	POLICY
305	Winter	W	4	4	I strongly dis-approve of closing these area's - Mammoth Lakes is a Recreation dependent town - this will hurt the people who spend money here!! KEEP IT OPEN!!	POLICY
308	Winter	W	4, 9A, 9C	4, 9a, 9c	Please don't close to motorized/winter.	POLICY
314	Winter	W	4, 5C	4, 5c	Not closing area to motorized vehical in winter.	POLICY
319	Winter	W	5C	5c	not closing area to motorized vehicle	POLICY
321	Winter	W	4, 5C	4, 5c	don't shut down area to motorized vehicles because the area is amazing for snowmobileing	POLICY
327		W		4	open for snowmobiles.	POLICY
328	Winter	W		4	I enjoy snowmobile access to the Sherwin area for skiing and would like snowmobile access to remain open.	POLICY
329	Winter	W		4	I would like for the Sherwins to continue staying open for snowmobilers to enjoy!	POLICY
330	Winter	W		4	Please leave snowmo access to the sherwin area. My self and many others do not have Mammoth Mtn passes and rely on snowmo accessto go skiing with out hiking so much.	POLICY
331		W		4	Don't close access for winter.	POLICY
332		W		4	Don't close access for winter.	POLICY
333	Winter	W		4	open for snowmobiles	POLICY
334	Winter	W		4	Please allow people to use the land we all own.	POLICY
335	Winter	W		4	Open for snowmobiling	POLICY
336	Winter	W	All	4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY
337	Open	W		4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY
338	Winter	W		4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY
339	Winter	W	All	4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY
340	Winter	W		4	open snowmobiling	POLICY
341	Winter	W		4	open for snowmobiling	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
345	Winter	W	9B yes	9b	All staging areas should be leash required. Sierra Meadows should be leash-free BUT we should work with Steve Searles, MLPD, USFS/DFG, about penalties regarding unprovoked dog attacks.	POLICY
7	Winter	W	?	4	Is the line of demarcation for restricted OSV use and unrestricted osv use "signs" or "terrain"?	QUESTION
8	Winter	W	?	4	How do you propose to enforce the unrestricted areas which are currently used by snowboarders to access the Sherwins?	QUESTION
14	Winter	W	?	-	What is diversified recreation? Snowmobiling, dog sledding, snowplay, cross country skiing, kite skiing, or anything other than downhill skiing.	QUESTION
15	Winter	W	?	1, 3	On the positive side, the parking area for multi-use near Sherwin Creek Rd is good with separate trails. But how do you plan to keep them separate with OSV use unrestricted in the same area?	QUESTION
59	Winter	W		4	On the Winter Proposal, I am concerned with the OSV Unrestricted area including the most easterly blue diamond cross country ski trail and the sloping hills on the east side of Sherwin Creek Road down to 395. Could specific trails and areas be identified for motorized vehicles which would still allow for close-by but separate ungroomed cross country skiing? These slopes are a favorite of many touring skiers.	QUESTION
60	Winter	W		-	Finally, for the Lakes Basin closure, it might be better to say through the Special Use Permit for Tamarack Lodge rather than state a specific date. It is my understanding that the opening date for OSV's changes each year based on that permit. Has the USFS approved this date? [signed]	QUESTION
67	Winter	W	10E	10b	Parking for off-leash dog area?	QUESTION
75		W		10b	I have kids and a dog. Parking area for dogs same as snowmobile? Groomed loop in meadow split use walk/dogs + ski.	QUESTION
85	Winter	W	10b	10b	where is the parking for the pets-off-leash area	QUESTION
93	Winter	W	5B	5b, 12	1. Why aren't any of the public transportation shuttle stops shown on this map? 2. Shouldn't those shown in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan also be included?	QUESTION
95	Winter	W	Various	5a, 5b, 5c	Who provides liability insurance coverage to protect the interests of private property owners where the public is ingressing or egressing over their land e.g. Snowcreek VIII, the Tamarack 5C area, Ranch Road public easement?	QUESTION
130	Winter	W		10b	I like the proposed dogs off-leash area but I didn't find it in the summer map?	QUESTION
137	Winter	W	All	4	The narrative does not detail what was open and is now closed. I cannot determine what is now allowed and what is restricted after this proposal.	QUESTION
139	Winter	W	All	4	How do you access the other trail system? Not having connectivity will create the risk for skier / snowmobiler to access the trail to the trails north of the 203 thru already restricted space	QUESTION
229	Winter	W	1	-	Please identify the parties who may be responsible for winter maintenance to access the proposed trailhead and staging area	QUESTION
92	Winter	W	5B	5b	Regarding the dark blue (purple?) line going from 5B into the Snowcreek Golf Course area: 1. What is the purpose of this egress terminating at the Ranch Road public easement if there is no parking available I ke at 5C and 9A? There is no legal public parking allowed along Ranch Road to Old Mammoth Road or at the St Joseph's parking lot. 2. The narrative describes this as "a direct an easy-to-use route" "back to town for skiers and snowboarders exiting the Sherwins" but the rationale doesn't explain how that is facilitated once they get outside the gate area. 3. This line also has no description in the map's legend.	QUESTION, ERROR/OMISSION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
70	Winter	W	9A	9a	Why not plan to groom the entire 9A loop? Sherwin skier/boarders may cause damage to the grooming but I think the impact would ultimately be ltd, and may help to focus down hill traffic on their way out. TO have a loop to x-country/walk etc. makes for a much more use friendly/enjoyable experience etc.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
74		W		2, 10b	Snow play and dogs go together.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
91		W		4, 13	Designation and implementation of motorized/non-motorized boundaries. This obviously needs to include some kind of educational opportunities –see item 1	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
132	Winter	W	12	12	It would be nice if public transit stop(s) could be added at Snowcreek 5 also.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
133	Winter	W	5A	5a	It would also be nice if parking could be provided at 5A for the snow play area #15. It would greatly increase use of the play area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
171	Winter	W	1	1	I think there should be a western access point for snowmobilers who live in the bluffs and in old mammoth and in snowcreek, so there would be less vehicles at the access lots and less traffic on our roads.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
173	Winter	W	1	1	I suggest that we take this season as a test to see how many non-motorized and motorized users really enjoy this area. We could document the use, mid-week and weekend, and interview actual users of the area, not just the people who are politically, economically, or morally motivated to change the use of this area. Many people who vote on and create use plans do not represent a statistically accurate study group of the actual users of an area. The evaluation would give us a real knowledge of how far south skiers are hiking and how much danger or conflict really exists between extreme backcountry users who could get to the higher elevations, and the snowmobilers who should also be allowed into this extreme riding area that is so needed in the mammoth snowmobile trail system. Again, in my experience snowmobilers, snowshoers, snowboarder, and skiers are all the same person. I do all the winter sports that I physically can, and I hate it when a government makes a line that I can not cross for no good reason. There should be similar punishment upon any breach of any line that is determined necessary. And I don't think the people involved in most planning issues are the people affected by the changes made. I know everyone says they are, but we really need more research on the actual use, before an educated decision can be made.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
189	Winter	W	15	2, 15	It is not necessary to have 2 snowplay areas in such close proximity to each other. Snowplay area #15 is much less desirable than #2. #15 is proposed to be located directly adjacent to the future Snowcreek VIII 4-5 star hotel which is not an appropriate adjacent use to a Mountain Hotel of that caliber. This use would destroy the view of the Sherwins from hotel rooms and hotel common areas. Additionally, the location at #15 is much more difficult to access for children and families than #2 as it is a long distance away from the Burrow pit staging area (#1) through difficult terrain. Snowplay area #2 is directly adjacent to the burrow pit staging area (#1), proposed parking, and also typically has better snow conditions and terrain for sledding.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
201	Winter	W	4	4	Why not allow a MOTORIZED area south of the Stacked Loop Trail System? There is plenty of room for both MOTORIZED and NON-MOTORIZED uses in the Sherwin Meadow Area. You could easily designate a MOTORIZED trail or usage area south of the Stacked Trail System and away from the Snowplay Area. (i.e. a 100-200 yard buffer away from the Stacked Trail System/Snowplay Area).	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
204		W	4	4	This is a great opportunity to designate OSV/MOTORIZED use areas for future considerations, yet it is being viewed more as a way to further restrict MOTORIZED/OSV use. Imagine a trail system that connected the Sherwin riding area to the Shady Rest OSV Trail System. There could be possible fuel stations, or OSV services could be feasible future considerations at the Sherwin or Shady Rest sites, while current and future OSV recreationists could enjoy a legitimate OSV trail system around the Mammoth area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
224	Winter	W	Global	-	Please recommend and identify any opportunities for coordination of implementation with Turner Propane facilities and Sherwin Creek Road improvements.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
226	Winter	W	Global	-	Please choose a different color for graphic representations of egress routes across private property, ie Snowcreek VIII to Ranch Road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
227	Winter	W	Global	-	Please consider and recommend the potential for OSV connections to Shady Rest and OSV trail systems north of Town.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
228	Winter	W	Global	-	Please request jurisdictional representations of current legal status of OSV terrain to east of study area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
230	Winter	W	4	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please provide specific phasing recommendations for OSV restrictions and detailed rationale	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
231	Winter	W	4	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please recommend that should a hotel operator at Snowcreek VIII wish to provide OSV rentals and/or staging, that a corridor be provided to connect to proposed OSV staging area at Borrow Pit	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
232	Winter	W	4	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please recommend that should an HOA or property owner grant a public facility for OSV staging, provisions for a corridor be provided to connect to OSV winter staging area at Borrow Pit.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
233	Winter	W	5B	5b	Please revisit concept to indicate that the recommendation is to connect to the point where the egress alignment across Snowcreek VIII golf course connects to USFS land, and not to the Ranch Road Easement. Recommendations should be on public land that is within the scope of the SWG effort, and not to private property that may be outside of the proposal's (and USFS) scope.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
234	Winter	W	7	7	Please consider that this recommendation may not be necessary nor practicable given winter conditions and the lack of concurrent summer facilities.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
245	Winter	W	OMR/Minaret area	-	There could be an opportunity for some public along the street parking for winter use with a minimal amount of widening as an interim option.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
258	Winter	W		4	Provide a "snowmobile corridor" for access to the Sherwin range	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
266	Winter	W	4	4	The no OSV zone needs to be further back from the motocross track to allow snowmobiles access to lower bowls near the back of the motocross track.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
268	Winter	W	3	3	Keep motorized staging and parking in one area for ease of maintenance, control and use.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
271	Winter	W	15	15	This area may be close to the residents of Snowcreek V and the "run-out" area at the bottom may be very small. There are existing fences that would need to be considered also. The #2 area may better serve the snowplay needs.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
290	Winter	W	1	1	I don't see much need for greater separation of areas. - There is a need for a staging area due to heavy use and limited parking. - The benefit to this staging area with the proposed boundary #4 is mainly for the non-motorized users. The area to the east has limit terrain and no access to other zones such as Shady Rest or the east of 395. The terrain available is for advanced riders. the major issue along with the conjection of parking is the dog waste. Any effects caused by motorized vehicles (OSV) are insignificant compared to the dog waster. - the staging area needs to address This issue. a beacon basin is a great addition to heighten public awareness. Signage is important to optimize use and provide the best experience for All parties. This section of road needs to be access ble to green sticker vehicles.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
316	Winter	W	5C	5c	Please don't re route this trail. Please let us keep our land to use as we l ke. Thank you.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
317	Winter	W	5B	5b	Keep this trail. There is enough room for everyone. We pay our taxes. Thank you.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
342	Winter	W	5B	5b	Traffic across a golf course, even in winter can cause damage. Why not use 5C instead.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
343	Winter	W	Summer Map #11	13	Add snowshoe/xcountry signage aling N. side of Mammoth Creek to avoid snowmobile traffic along Mammoth Creek Rd.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
347	Winter	W	13 yes	13	We should have fundraiser events particularly for this proposal. Also, Friends of the Inyo would be a great group to utilize for creation + placement of signs. :)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
246	Winter	W	Snowmobile closure area	4	The avalanche chutes provides some extreme snowmobiling not found in many areas. A corridor to that area would serve that type of snowmobiling and access from owners that live along the route. What are the implications and impacts to the spring snowmobiling that occurs in the lakes basin after April 15??	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT, QUESTION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
244	Summer	S		-	Sherwin area above meadow has a significant and growing area of dead trees that should be address to eliminate or reduce the disease spread.	ADDITIONAL INFO
249	Summer	S		-	The meadow has significant damage due to erosion in many areas and there is also an opportunity to create a mitigation-banking fund to help restore much of the eroded areas.	ADDITIONAL INFO
253	Summer	S	New	-	The Lake Mary Road Bike Path is not complete (MUP) along the section of Twin Lakes Loop that passes through Tamarack. A Class 1 bike path is still needed where the path shares the roadway in front of Tamarack. Right of Way issues must still be negotiated with Tamarack.	ADDITIONAL INFO
241	Summer	S	4	4	Note location of grave sites/archeological sites in this area - recommend 20-25 parking spaces - TOML easement ends before this identified location; easement would need to be extended - Check motorcycle access bility across mining road – is this ok? - Recommend paved MUP from staging area to vista (accessibility)	ADDITIONAL INFO, SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
242	Summer	S	5	5	Note trolley stop integrated into OMR/LMRBP access point (USFS \$\$\$ to put in this stop) - a natural access to LMRBP connector exists (TOML staff has identified spot) - would recommend staging area south and east on LMR - opportunity for bridge access @ Twin Lakes for LMRBP - potential for tunnel as access from entrance to Tamarack under LMR for connection to LMRBP	ADDITIONAL INFO, SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
1	-	S		-	Kerry Meadow Trail - a popular in town trail is not listed.	ERROR/OMISSION
63	Summer	S	7 and 6	7, 6	Item 7 is specifically identified with a wheel chair symbol but item 6 is not. This may be misleading since all MUP's are designed to be fully accessible and are usually required to be access ble by the funding agency.	ERROR/OMISSION
216	Summer	S	11	11	Please identify the Mammoth Creek crossing with a bridge symbol and identify if a new bridge will be required.	ERROR/OMISSION
218	Summer	S	12B	12b	Rationale – Incorrectly identifies "... Old Mammoth Road ..." in first line of text, believe it should be "Lake Mary Road"	ERROR/OMISSION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
326	Summer	S	3, 7, 13	3, 7, 13	I ride my dirt bike out of Snowcreek 5 where I live & I do not have a trailer to leave from anywhere else.	NOT IN SCOPE
46	Summer	S	Map won't open	-	I like mountain biking and would love to go up there to vacation and ride ONLY IF there are lots of trails open to mountain bikers.	OPINION
47	Summer	S		19	open the Solitude Canyon area (item #19 in the Draft Summer Narrative) for the development of new mountain bike trails	OPINION
86	Summer	S		5a, 5b, 5c, 13, 14, 16	More trails, nodes + cnxts. in Old Mammoth Mill City, Rock Trail, etc. in summer might alleviate traffic on Old Mammoth Rd. more	OPINION
134	Summer	S	1-27	1-27	It's all great! Hope it happens.	OPINION
156	Summer	S		-	Motor cycles with my family	OPINION
168	Summer	S	All areas	W13	I am a big proponent of sharing trails since I enjoy a lot of different activities. One thing I have noticed this summer is that there is a need for trail etiquette. Many people don't seem to know that it is helpful if you talk to the other users of the trails – especially the equestrians. I think the maps/signs need to identify ways that make trail usage enjoyable and safe for everyone.	OPINION
281	Summer	S	19	19	There is enough to do in the areas closer to town w/o adding this item.	OPINION
302	S	S	1A, 10, 1, 13, 27, 21, 11, 9, 6	1A, 10, 1, 13, 27, 21, 11, 9, 6	Easy trails close to town leading to other large areas for off road recreating.	OPINION
312	Summer	S		-	I ride my dirt bike by the Sherwins all summer long because it is the best place to start from where I live	OPINION
357	Summer	S	14, 15, 16	14, 15, 16	YES YES YES. We need a SAFE parallel bike & pedestrian route along that stretch of OLD Mammoth. During the summer x-country training clubs it becomes SCARY to drive. I DO NOT want to run over anybody!!!	OPINION
359	Summer	S	18	18	SAA and refer to earlier #18 recomms.	OPINION
276	Summer	S	5A	5a	Separate horses and hikers due to impact from horses on soft surface trails. Or armor the tread to minimize damage.	po

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
26	Summer	S	21	21	Keep it open to MX + allow multiple use	POLICY
27	Summer	S	All	9	Continue to allow multiple use including motorcycles	POLICY
28	Summer	S	21	21	Please give us our MX track back!! The deer will go around, there are plenty of mule deer to get accustom to the change. Any question, please get in touch with me. Thanks.	POLICY
43	Summer	S	1, 2, 6, 7	1, 2, 6, 7	It would be nice to have motorized multi use, perhaps with strict street regulations. This would allow access to surrounding motorized use trails.	POLICY
57	Summer	S		-	Also, the Trails System Master Plan Draft is suggesting separation of these same groups on the Mammoth Rock trail. Again, I can't find how this is accommodated in the proposal.	POLICY
125	Summer	S	9	9	Low motorized usage is still usage + should be allowed on historical motorized routes.	POLICY
147	Summer	S		9	The area of the Sherwin Creek campground and the gravel pit on Sherwin Creek road needs to remain open to multi-use (including motorized). In the summer months large numbers of people use these areas to get access to the system of some 3000 miles of legal established roads and trails. Any change in this area would be devastating to the access for many many of our users. The designation in this area needs to remain approved for motorized to accommodate the need.	POLICY
247	Summer	S		-	Horses should be prohibited from using any of the paved or boardwalk trails/paths.	POLICY
254	Summer	S	8	8	Separate trails should be provided for equestrian and pedestrian use. Horses are too hard on a pedestrian trail and they do not mix well with bikes. Parallel trail could be provided with a separation of 50 to 100 feet.	POLICY
273	Summer	S	17	17	#17 should be non-equestrian due to fine soils and damage potential by horses. (See attached photos). <i>[Photos are available in binder.]</i> Keep horses on existing for fee "pony ride" trails.	POLICY
29	Summer	S		9	I come up frequently to ride the Mammoth Lakes area. When I come I spend quite a bit of money. Trail Closures or restricted access will negatively impact my desire to spend time in the area. Don't close or restrict any more trails!	POLICY
31	Summer	S		9	Please do not close any trails or roads in this area otherwise my family and I will be forced to go elsewhere. We like to recreate with our motorcycles here in the summer. [Added signature] Keep our trail free to ride!	POLICY
32	Summer	S	21	21	I've been riding offroad motorcycle in this area for 22 years - our club puts on a dual sport ride here ever Oct. we bring 150 riders to Mammoth - close the trails & our reason for coming here will disappear & so will we - please don't close any more trails - we don't want any new trails - we just want the trails we have - closing public land is not land management but a failure to manage public land! [signed]	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
34	Summer	S	19	19	I think it's wonderful to use the Motocross track area for multi-use. Including biathalons, mountain biking, hiking, picnicks, etc. However, it would also be nice to use it for it's intended purpose, which is Motocross!! If we keep closing off-road venues and staging areas, laws will continue to be broken. Us off-roaders bring in a revenue to both the city and state. Let's get our money's worth out of our registration fees! This land is your land, this land is my land!!	POLICY
162	Summer	S		9	KEEP ALL CURRENT OHV TRAILS OPEN TO OHV.	POLICY
56	Summer	S		18	On the Summer Proposal, I am in full agreement that soft surface trail loops of various lengths are appropriate to this area. However, I cannot find a discussion anywhere in the document regarding separation of bikers, hikers and equestrians. Just as an example, #18 shows several tight turns while ascending to the top of the Sherwin Ridge. I think we can all agree that a switchback for a hiker and a hairpin turn for a mountain biker are completely different designs. How will all groups be accommodated?	QUESTION
149	Summer	S		1	Since the gravel pit will now be staging for a multitude of uses and the Tank Farm, can you please confirm the size remains the same. The success of the Mammoth Motocross is to a large part dependent on our ability to maintain and use this facility for parking as we currently do.	QUESTION
167	Summer	S	Tamarack Street	2	Will the tamarack access area link back into the trail system that goes to snowcreek? It seems to me there are better places to make a parking area and if the bike trail linked back to Snowcreek – that maybe that would be the better parking area.	QUESTION
215	Summer	S	11	11	Where does this recommendation terminate at its Eastern end? Map is unclear.	QUESTION
278	Summer	S	8	8	Is this proposed to be open for bikes? Horses?	QUESTION
2	Summer	S	11, 25	11, 25	A ped./bike bridge over Mammoth Creek to provide easy direct access to Hayden Cabin from bike/walk loop and Mammoth Creek park—make it part an integral of the loop.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
20	Summer	S	3 & 7	3, 7	A hard surface connector path between 3 and 7 would be beneficial.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
21	Summer	S	11	11	Consideration should be given to a connection between the Main Path vista point (south east of the college) and #11, the path along Mammoth Creek Road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
22	Summer	S	5c	5c	This segment of path connects a paved path (Lake Mary Road Bike Path) and a paved roadway (Lake Mary Road) and should therefore be paved and fully accessible.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
23	Summer	S	12b	12b	Consideration should be given to extending the Lake Mary Road Bike Path across a bridge over Mammoth Creek (parallel to the existing road bridge). Then extend the paved path southerly along the east edge of Lake Mary Road approximately 350 feet (to just above Twin Lakes Loop) where an undercrossing could be constructed to provide a safe crossing of Lake Mary Road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
24	Summer	S	New item	-	Consider an option for a paved path paralleling Twin Lakes Loop past the Tamarack resort area that would separate bikes and pedestrians from vehicle traffic on Twin Lakes Loop. The current LMR bike path alignment for this area calls for a "share the road" bike route along the shorefront road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
58	Summer	S		5a, 8, 16	Finally, please explain why there would not be a proposal to put a MUP into the Hidden Lake area. I can understand beginning with soft surface for cost reasons, but also realize that a hard surface extends the "easy" walk or bike ride into this area and would presumably be less likely to erode like the existing user trails. A MUP is also more distinct and visible, which could reduce the formation of additional user trails.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
68	Summer	S	15	15	Close upper Old Mammoth Rd. to vehicle traffic, turn it into M.U.P., improve interpretive trails, signage, etc. at Mill City to Lake Mary Rd.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
71	Summer	S	Mill City	6, 24	Close the road year round @ closure gate. Make it a bike trail/walking path. Stop the [traffic] @ Mill City and utilize the space you have now and better the experience by eliminating traffic. Also build an interprtative path through the Mill City + Old Mammoth City to increase knowledge of Mammoth Gold Mining History.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
76	Summer	S		17, 26	Connect Trails 17 + 26	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
78	Summer	S	Mill City	4, 6	Modify the plan & use Old Mammoth Rd for the trails. Close the road - and use it now for the trail system.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
79	Summer	S	14/15	14, 15	Keep the water wheel rustic - it's a great place for kids today - don't make it a main thorough-fare. You can still find old iron nails, "garbage" from the 1800s & 1920a. Keep it that way	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
80	Summer	S	Mill City	4, 5a, 5b, 5c	Include pavement area for road bikes.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
81	Summer	S	5	5a, 5b, 5c	Make huge trail head/node @ Mill City, close off upper Old Mammoth Rd. to cars, use this as obvious bike trail, MUP, save \$\$ designing trails + connections when you have the obvious!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
82	Summer	S	19	19	Open Solitude Canyon to mtn. biking - create 1 or 2 long trails - OSV allowed here, allow bikes.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
83	Summer	S	24	24	Separate Mill City historic trail from bike paths - keep this quiet, ped. oriented. Make this an interpretive area - Mmth does not have interpretive area/experience. This is an excellent oppt. to develop + create something like this - connecting historical Mammoth to present day Mammoth.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
87	Summer	S		4, 5a, 5b, 5c	Convert Upper Old Mammoth Rd. to wide b ke path - close it off entirely to vehicles - use it for emergency vehicles only	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
90		S		1, 2, 7, 16	Connecting ADA trails (preferably paved) so folks can begin to use and appreciate the area in a way which is linked to the existing town trail system in progress	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
150	Summer	S		7	The ADA multi-use path is a great asset. Is it necessary to have a soft surface trail running parallel to it in sections? Seems this impact code be avoided in that section?	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
164	Summer	S	6, 7	6, 7	While I do see the benefit of these two trails, I believe they should be non-paved trails for maintainability as well as usage and visual aesthetics.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
165	Summer	S	6	6	I especially think this path should remain dirt and/or be routed around sierra meadows in a different manner – it should run adjacent to 1A, down one of the dirt roads that meet up with the bridge near Hayden cabin.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
174	Summer	S	7	7	Backbone trail should be paved to maximize potential users and to better tie into current paved trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
175	Summer	S	18	18	There should be more than one connector from the Meadow to the Mammoth Rock Trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
176	Summer	S	19	19	I would like to see trail development in Solitude Canyon. With trails, the impact on wildlife would be minimized because the trails will focus the use on a small area. In addition, if OSV's will be using the canyon during the winter, than hikers and b kers whose impact is a fraction of OSV's should be able to take advantage of it during the summer.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
177	Summer	S	26	26	I would like to see a multi-use trail to Sherwin Ridge that connects with Solitude Canyon and ultimately connects with the Coldwater/Lake Mary area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
181	Summer	S	7	7	Backbone trail should be paved to maximize potential users and to better tie into current paved trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
182	Summer	S	18	18	There should be more than one connector from the Meadow to the Mammoth Rock Trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
183	Summer	S	19	19	Encourage multi-use trail development in Solitude Canyon. Organize and focus users in a few trails to open up some great terrain and scenic areas. Keep folks on trails and off old, unused trails to minimize impact in undeveloped area and on wildlife. OSV's have access to this area in the winter and hikers and bikers should have access to this area in the summer – very little impact and brings some great additions to a limited trail system in this area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Sherwins Working Group
Community Feedback Process
Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

SUMMER

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
184	Summer	S	26	26	How great would a multi-use trail to Sherwin Ridge that connects with Solitude Canyon and ultimately connects with the Coldwater/Lake Mary area. Whistler is seeing more business in the summertime from mountain bikers than in the winter time from skiers. Lets expand our recreation trails and attract visitors and offer locals more areas to enjoy.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
192	Summer	S	9a	20	I feel it would be great to have an area for a bike park to facilitate the growing need of our community-bmx/fullsize mtn b ke. The area can be shaped with the existing soil and water with a possibility of cement forms if the b ke community would want to take on the design and fundraising. Thank you.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
212	Summer	S	Global	-	Please consider recommendations that will connect proposed trails to other sub regions in Mammoth Lakes region including Shady Rest and the Lakes Basin and the High Alpine regions to the south as well as the PCT.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
213	Summer	S	5A	5a	Please consider any opportunity to connect recommendation 5A to Le Verne Street and the Bluffs neighborhood.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
214	Summer	S	5C	5c	Please recommend that design and environmental analysis of 5C be prioritized so that its construction can be included as part of construction of the Lake Mary Bike Path, anticipated for the summer of 2010	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
217	Summer	S	12B	12b	Please recommend that design and environmental analysis of 12B be prioritized so that its construction can be included as part of construction of the Lake Mary Bike Path, anticipated for the summer of 2010	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
219	Summer	S	16	16	Please identify opportunities for vistas and view points and ease of access from proposed Mill City Trailhead	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
220	Summer	S	17	17	Please recommend ultimate destination and opportunities for connectivity for this trail – please consider having this trail ultimately loop back to the Borrow Pit.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
221	Summer	S	19	19	Please consider more detailed recommendations for trails in Solitude Canyon.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
222	Summer	S	26	26	Please consider installation of a via ferrata on the south side of Mammoth Rock, and the potential of the summit of Mammoth Rock as a destination Please provide recommendations for the ultimate destinations and connectivity of this trail.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
223	Summer	S	27	27	Please consider routing this recommendation further to the south, leaving the Motocross Track to the East, and connecting further up the Sherwin Lakes Trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
236	Summer	S	All	-	<p>It's crucial that the group recommend that mountain bike preferred trail be built in the study area as part of this proposal. Please, consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mammoth is (and markets itself as) a mountain bike destination. Yet it has the worst (and tiniest) public trail system of any comparable resort. There is not one purpose-built mtb trail around Mammoth. Most mountain resorts have networks with hundreds of miles of public trails built primarily for mountain biking. This is an economic need, and a glaring lack in our recreational facilities. Unless you're a downhiller that wants to pay the ski area, there is effectively no decent riding here, compared to similar towns. By comparison, the town of Whistler spends \$50-100,000/year on building public MTB trails around town. We desperately need a better riding experience, and this is a chance to change it. 2. We have hundreds of miles of bike-free trails, bike-free Wilderness, but no bike trail system--not even one decent trail by mountain biking standards, just disconnected snippets of opened hiking trails that aren't properly built or designed for bikes. 3. The Town can't build trails, and the Forest Service never has. This is the first and only chance we've ever had to ask for more MTB trails. 4. Many non-bikers don't like mountain bikes on the same trails--if we build new trails that are fun for mountain bikes, the bikers will ride those instead of hiking trails. 5. There is enough room in the study area to build many miles of high-quality mtb-preferred trail. There should be a loop branching off the Rock Trail, an MTB-preferred loop around the Hidden Lake Meadow, an extension to the Rock Trail that loops out to the east of town and then connects to Shady Rest, and more trail in the Panorama Dome area. MTB trails don't have to go anywhere, or run through the same locales as hiking-preferred trails. Voila--at least one day's worth. 6. Modern trail design and construction can ensure safety for all users. 7. Compared to all the infrastructure in this proposal, building trails is cheap and is guaranteed to attract private donations and volunteers. We could easily raise enough money to build miles of trail with no help from the Forest Service--businesses like Footloose make a lot of money from mountain bikers. 	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
238	Summer	S	4	-	The idea of closing upper Old Mammoth Rd. and converting it to a MUP has great merit, and would be considerably simpler than many of the connectivity proposals for that area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
239	Summer	S	1	1	<p>Would like to see better defined "footprint" of proposed improvements @ staging area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2" water line should be enough to operation proposed restrooms (this is size of line for USFS stables) - would recommend Trails End Park restroom prototype for borrow pit staging area this is durable and year round. - propose paving Sherwin Creek Road @ 32' width from OMR to borrow pit (width would accommodate desired winter parallel parking and summer bike lanes. Some type of pedestrian access link to the Sherwin Creek Campground would be good. Either bike lanes if paved or parallel MUP 	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
240	Summer	S	2	2	TOML would recommend no less than 3 / no more than 6 parking spaces (TOML can make requirement during negotiations w/land owner)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
243	Summer	S	7 & 8	7, 8	The meadow area provides a unique opportunity due to the relatively flat grades to provide fully accessible routes as a paved or boardwalk routes for families of young kids with training wheels, elderly, adults in wheel chairs or walkers, etc. This section would be only the loop from Snowcreek VIII to Tamarack Street and one linear path to Hidden Lake area. A hard surface would be compatible with the spring and early summer boggy soils and provide access points to the other soft surface paths.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
250	Summer	S	7 & 6	7, 6	Item 7 is specifically identified with a wheel chair symbol but item 6 is not. This may be misleading since all MUP's are designed to be fully accessible and are usually required to be accessible by the funding agency.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
251	Summer	S	3 & 7	3, 7	A hard surface MUP should connect the Snowcreek paths to item 7. This reinforces the concept of nested loops for the MUP system.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
252	Summer	S	5C	5c	This path should be a hard surface MUP. It connects a paved MUP with a paved roadway.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
255	Summer	S	12A & 12B	12a, 12b	The Lake Mary Road Bike path should be extended across Mammoth Creek on a bridge just east of the vehicle bridge and the MUP extended 400 feet further east to Twin Lakes Loop. This will replace on-road bike lanes in the current design.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
256	Summer	S	12A & 12B	12a, 12b	Install an under-crossing to safely carry bike and pedestrian travelers under Lake Mary Road at Twin Lakes Loop. The at-grade bike path crossing of Lake Mary Road should be replaced with a safer crossing.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
260	Summer	S	19	19	I would support Solitude Canyon area being developed into more mountain bike trails.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
261	Summer	S	Panorama Dome	-	I support mtn bike trail development. Development of existing trails.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
262	Summer	S	19	19	Would love to see multiple types of trails - mostly bike only DH trails, freeride, XC loop.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
263	Summer	S	5A	5a	Would love to see horse-only access trail // no bikes(+) horse on same trail.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
264	Summer	S	19	19	I would like to see more mountain bike trails in this area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
265	Summer	S	19	19	Developing mountain bike trails that connect to Mammoth Rock Trail would greatly improve Mammoth's mountain bike trail network.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
272	Summer	S	17 & 5B	17, 5b	Most of #17 currently exists; connect #17 to the Lake Mary Bike Path via "utility access road".	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
274	Summer	S	5B	5b	Create & Establish as an Equestrian Preferred trail. It may be best to have separate but equal trails for horses and mountain bikes. Separation should be about 50' to 100' min.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
277	Summer	S	6	6	The surface should be asphalt paving to match Snowcreek VIII MUP so a consistent loop is formed.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
279	Summer	S	12A & 12B	12a, 12b	Move further up Lake Mary Road to the existing "flat spot" adjacent to the Vista Trail & Panorama Dome Trail. Run a trail back down to the bridge & bike path.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
280	Summer	S	17	17	This route should be left as is and no improvements made due to the condition of the rock and the rough existing nature of the experience.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
291	Summer	S	19	19	Potential for Mtn. Bike Trail in Solitude Canyon would be a great addition to our limited off MMSA trail system.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
294	Summer	S	20	20	A BMX Park would be a great addition to our community for locals + guests. The shelter of the forest would be a better location. Well maintained jumps and berms would be a great training ground for future competitors and recreationalists.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
350	Summer	S	17	17	Would appreciate more concise mapping...BUT both of these closely related accesses should be connected for year round use. How about possible weekday hours for snowmobiles for SnoBoard drop offs??	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
351	Summer	S	18	18	Could be expanded to an even higher elevation and utilized in winter for possible snowmobile access for SnoBoard drop-offs during winter weekdays.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
352	Summer	S	21	21	YES. Absolutely/Positively and schedule MORE motor/bi-cycling events, along with snowmobile races in winter. BiAthalon + SnoShoe races also. :)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
353	Summer	S	13, 27	13, 27	Can also be utilized during winter once put in. Will also decrease cross-training/spider-webbing.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
354	Summer	S	9	9	Open to bikes and all non-motorized use during summer. Additionally, I think should be added to MUP groomed snowmobile access during winter season along with the whole #10 + #11 routes.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
356	Summer	S	5A, B & C	5a, 5b, 5c	Creation of this corridor will provide numerous recreational options. I still see clarifying needed in the \$5 B&C area, along with summer/winter #17 trails to avoid cross-training + spider-webbing...obvious + consistent trails area MUST!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
358	Summer	S	17	17	As mentioned in winter #17, clarification of routes is hereby requested, but #17 should be utilized both winter and summer with maybe occasional use during weekdays for recreational motorized vehicle use.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
360	Summer	S	19	19	Concur with assessment + think that this area should seriously be considered for any future skilifts or Gondola proposals. Also a snowmobile for skiing + boarding drop-offs.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
361	Summer	S	20	20	Expand Shady Rest skate/bike uphill for multi-use.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
366	Summer	S	26	26	OH YEAH!! And expand East + West for ski/board access.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Sherwins Working Group
 Community Feedback Process
 Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

SUMMER

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
369	Summer	S	1A 10 11 ?E	1	Just returned from our 3rd annual visit to Mammoth Lakes/Sherwin Creek area – PLEASE DO NOT pave the Sherwin Creek Rd. from 395 to Old Mammoth Rd.– some already is, probably for the motocross development – but stop at that – The impact on trash and traffic will be even greater and the area of "wilderness/remoteness" in the midst of "the city" will be further lost [signed]	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
166	Summer	S	All areas	-	Thank you all for all your hard work. You all have done a great job taking everyone's needs into account.	THANKS
275	Summer	S	1, 2, 3, 4, 5C, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, & 28	1, 2, 3, 4, 5C, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, & 28	Great ideas, full support.	THANKS
282	Summer	S	20-23	20, 21, 22, 23	No comment.	THANKS
365	Summer	S	25	25	Concur with assessment and proposal	THANKS

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
244	Summer	S		-	Sherwin area above meadow has a significant and growing area of dead trees that should be address to eliminate or reduce the disease spread.	ADDITIONAL INFO
249	Summer	S		-	The meadow has significant damage due to erosion in many areas and there is also an opportunity to create a mitigation-banking fund to help restore much of the eroded areas.	ADDITIONAL INFO
253	Summer	S	New	-	The Lake Mary Road Bike Path is not complete (MUP) along the section of Twin Lakes Loop that passes through Tamarack. A Class 1 bike path is still needed where the path shares the roadway in front of Tamarack. Right of Way issues must still be negotiated with Tamarack.	ADDITIONAL INFO
241	Summer	S	4	4	Note location of grave sites/archeological sites in this area - recommend 20-25 parking spaces - TOML easement ends before this identified location; easement would need to be extended - Check motorcycle access bility across mining road – is this ok? - Recommend paved MUP from staging area to vista (accessibility)	ADDITIONAL INFO, SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
242	Summer	S	5	5	Note trolley stop integrated into OMR/LMRBP access point (USFS \$\$\$ to put in this stop) - a natural access to LMRBP connector exists (TOML staff has identified spot) - would recommend staging area south and east on LMR - opportunity for bridge access @ Twin Lakes for LMRBP - potential for tunnel as access from entrance to Tamarack under LMR for connection to LMRBP	ADDITIONAL INFO, SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
1	-	S		-	Kerry Meadow Trail - a popular in town trail is not listed.	ERROR/OMISSION
63	Summer	S	7 and 6	7, 6	Item 7 is specifically identified with a wheel chair symbol but item 6 is not. This may be misleading since all MUP's are designed to be fully accessible and are usually required to be access ble by the funding agency.	ERROR/OMISSION
216	Summer	S	11	11	Please identify the Mammoth Creek crossing with a bridge symbol and identify if a new bridge will be required.	ERROR/OMISSION
218	Summer	S	12B	12b	Rationale – Incorrectly identifies "... Old Mammoth Road ..." in first line of text, believe it should be "Lake Mary Road"	ERROR/OMISSION

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
326	Summer	S	3, 7, 13	3, 7, 13	I ride my dirt bike out of Snowcreek 5 where I live & I do not have a trailer to leave from anywhere else.	NOT IN SCOPE
46	Summer	S	Map won't open	-	I like mountain biking and would love to go up there to vacation and ride ONLY IF there are lots of trails open to mountain bikers.	OPINION
47	Summer	S		19	open the Solitude Canyon area (item #19 in the Draft Summer Narrative) for the development of new mountain bike trails	OPINION
86	Summer	S		5a, 5b, 5c, 13, 14, 16	More trails, nodes + cnxts. in Old Mammoth Mill City, Rock Trail, etc. in summer might alleviate traffic on Old Mammoth Rd. more	OPINION
134	Summer	S	1-27	1-27	It's all great! Hope it happens.	OPINION
156	Summer	S		-	Motor cycles with my family	OPINION
168	Summer	S	All areas	W13	I am a big proponent of sharing trails since I enjoy a lot of different activities. One thing I have noticed this summer is that there is a need for trail etiquette. Many people don't seem to know that it is helpful if you talk to the other users of the trails – especially the equestrians. I think the maps/signs need to identify ways that make trail usage enjoyable and safe for everyone.	OPINION
281	Summer	S	19	19	There is enough to do in the areas closer to town w/o adding this item.	OPINION
302	S	S	1A, 10, 1, 13, 27, 21, 11, 9, 6	1A, 10, 1, 13, 27, 21, 11, 9, 6	Easy trails close to town leading to other large areas for off road recreating.	OPINION
312	Summer	S		-	I ride my dirt bike by the Sherwins all summer long because it is the best place to start from where I live	OPINION
357	Summer	S	14, 15, 16	14, 15, 16	YES YES YES. We need a SAFE parallel bike & pedestrian route along that stretch of OLD Mammoth. During the summer x-country training clubs it becomes SCARY to drive. I DO NOT want to run over anybody!!!	OPINION
359	Summer	S	18	18	SAA and refer to earlier #18 recomms.	OPINION
276	Summer	S	5A	5a	Separate horses and hikers due to impact from horses on soft surface trails. Or armor the tread to minimize damage.	po

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
26	Summer	S	21	21	Keep it open to MX + allow multiple use	POLICY
27	Summer	S	All	9	Continue to allow multiple use including motorcycles	POLICY
28	Summer	S	21	21	Please give us our MX track back!! The deer will go around, there are plenty of mule deer to get accustom to the change. Any question, please get in touch with me. Thanks.	POLICY
43	Summer	S	1, 2, 6, 7	1, 2, 6, 7	It would be nice to have motorized multi use, perhaps with strict street regulations. This would allow access to surrounding motorized use trails.	POLICY
57	Summer	S		-	Also, the Trails System Master Plan Draft is suggesting separation of these same groups on the Mammoth Rock trail. Again, I can't find how this is accommodated in the proposal.	POLICY
125	Summer	S	9	9	Low motorized usage is still usage + should be allowed on historical motorized routes.	POLICY
147	Summer	S		9	The area of the Sherwin Creek campground and the gravel pit on Sherwin Creek road needs to remain open to multi-use (including motorized). In the summer months large numbers of people use these areas to get access to the system of some 3000 miles of legal established roads and trails. Any change in this area would be devastating to the access for many many of our users. The designation in this area needs to remain approved for motorized to accommodate the need.	POLICY
247	Summer	S		-	Horses should be prohibited from using any of the paved or boardwalk trails/paths.	POLICY
254	Summer	S	8	8	Separate trails should be provided for equestrian and pedestrian use. Horses are too hard on a pedestrian trail and they do not mix well with bikes. Parallel trail could be provided with a separation of 50 to 100 feet.	POLICY
273	Summer	S	17	17	#17 should be non-equestrian due to fine soils and damage potential by horses. (See attached photos). <i>[Photos are available in binder.]</i> Keep horses on existing for fee "pony ride" trails.	POLICY
29	Summer	S		9	I come up frequently to ride the Mammoth Lakes area. When I come I spend quite a bit of money. Trail Closures or restricted access will negatively impact my desire to spend time in the area. Don't close or restrict any more trails!	POLICY
31	Summer	S		9	Please do not close any trails or roads in this area otherwise my family and I will be forced to go elsewhere. We like to recreate with our motorcycles here in the summer. [Added signature] Keep our trail free to ride!	POLICY
32	Summer	S	21	21	I've been riding offroad motorcycle in this area for 22 years - our club puts on a dual sport ride here ever Oct. we bring 150 riders to Mammoth - close the trails & our reason for coming here will disappear & so will we - please don't close any more trails - we don't want any new trails - we just want the trails we have - closing public land is not land management but a failure to manage public land! [signed]	POLICY

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
34	Summer	S	19	19	I think it's wonderful to use the Motocross track area for multi-use. Including biathalons, mountain biking, hiking, picnicks, etc. However, it would also be nice to use it for it's intended purpose, which is Motocross!! If we keep closing off-road venues and staging areas, laws will continue to be broken. Us off-roaders bring in a revenue to both the city and state. Let's get our money's worth out of our registration fees! This land is your land, this land is my land!!	POLICY
162	Summer	S		9	KEEP ALL CURRENT OHV TRAILS OPEN TO OHV.	POLICY
56	Summer	S		18	On the Summer Proposal, I am in full agreement that soft surface trail loops of various lengths are appropriate to this area. However, I cannot find a discussion anywhere in the document regarding separation of bikers, hikers and equestrians. Just as an example, #18 shows several tight turns while ascending to the top of the Sherwin Ridge. I think we can all agree that a switchback for a hiker and a hairpin turn for a mountain biker are completely different designs. How will all groups be accommodated?	QUESTION
149	Summer	S		1	Since the gravel pit will now be staging for a multitude of uses and the Tank Farm, can you please confirm the size remains the same. The success of the Mammoth Motocross is to a large part dependent on our ability to maintain and use this facility for parking as we currently do.	QUESTION
167	Summer	S	Tamarack Street	2	Will the tamarack access area link back into the trail system that goes to snowcreek? It seems to me there are better places to make a parking area and if the bike trail linked back to Snowcreek – that maybe that would be the better parking area.	QUESTION
215	Summer	S	11	11	Where does this recommendation terminate at its Eastern end? Map is unclear.	QUESTION
278	Summer	S	8	8	Is this proposed to be open for bikes? Horses?	QUESTION
2	Summer	S	11, 25	11, 25	A ped./bike bridge over Mammoth Creek to provide easy direct access to Hayden Cabin from bike/walk loop and Mammoth Creek park—make it part an integral of the loop.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
20	Summer	S	3 & 7	3, 7	A hard surface connector path between 3 and 7 would be beneficial.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
21	Summer	S	11	11	Consideration should be given to a connection between the Main Path vista point (south east of the college) and #11, the path along Mammoth Creek Road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
22	Summer	S	5c	5c	This segment of path connects a paved path (Lake Mary Road Bike Path) and a paved roadway (Lake Mary Road) and should therefore be paved and fully accessible.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
23	Summer	S	12b	12b	Consideration should be given to extending the Lake Mary Road Bike Path across a bridge over Mammoth Creek (parallel to the existing road bridge). Then extend the paved path southerly along the east edge of Lake Mary Road approximately 350 feet (to just above Twin Lakes Loop) where an undercrossing could be constructed to provide a safe crossing of Lake Mary Road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
24	Summer	S	New item	-	Consider an option for a paved path paralleling Twin Lakes Loop past the Tamarack resort area that would separate bikes and pedestrians from vehicle traffic on Twin Lakes Loop. The current LMR bike path alignment for this area calls for a "share the road" bike route along the shorefront road.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
58	Summer	S		5a, 8, 16	Finally, please explain why there would not be a proposal to put a MUP into the Hidden Lake area. I can understand beginning with soft surface for cost reasons, but also realize that a hard surface extends the "easy" walk or bike ride into this area and would presumably be less likely to erode like the existing user trails. A MUP is also more distinct and visible, which could reduce the formation of additional user trails.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
68	Summer	S	15	15	Close upper Old Mammoth Rd. to vehicle traffic, turn it into M.U.P., improve interpretive trails, signage, etc. at Mill City to Lake Mary Rd.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
71	Summer	S	Mill City	6, 24	Close the road year round @ closure gate. Make it a bike trail/walking path. Stop the [traffic] @ Mill City and utilize the space you have now and better the experience by eliminating traffic. Also build an interprtative path through the Mill City + Old Mammoth City to increase knowledge of Mammoth Gold Mining History.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
76	Summer	S		17, 26	Connect Trails 17 + 26	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
78	Summer	S	Mill City	4, 6	Modify the plan & use Old Mammoth Rd for the trails. Close the road - and use it now for the trail system.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
79	Summer	S	14/15	14, 15	Keep the water wheel rustic - it's a great place for kids today - don't make it a main thorough-fare. You can still find old iron nails, "garbage" from the 1800s & 1920a. Keep it that way	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
80	Summer	S	Mill City	4, 5a, 5b, 5c	Include pavement area for road bikes.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
81	Summer	S	5	5a, 5b, 5c	Make huge trail head/node @ Mill City, close off upper Old Mammoth Rd. to cars, use this as obvious bike trail, MUP, save \$\$ designing trails + connections when you have the obvious!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
82	Summer	S	19	19	Open Solitude Canyon to mtn. biking - create 1 or 2 long trails - OSV allowed here, allow bikes.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
83	Summer	S	24	24	Separate Mill City historic trail from bike paths - keep this quiet, ped. oriented. Make this an interpretive area - Mmth does not have interpretive area/experience. This is an excellent oppt. to develop + create something like this - connecting historical Mammoth to present day Mammoth.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
87	Summer	S		4, 5a, 5b, 5c	Convert Upper Old Mammoth Rd. to wide b ke path - close it off entirely to vehicles - use it for emergency vehicles only	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
90		S		1, 2, 7, 16	Connecting ADA trails (preferably paved) so folks can begin to use and appreciate the area in a way which is linked to the existing town trail system in progress	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
150	Summer	S		7	The ADA multi-use path is a great asset. Is it necessary to have a soft surface trail running parallel to it in sections? Seems this impact code be avoided in that section?	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
164	Summer	S	6, 7	6, 7	While I do see the benefit of these two trails, I believe they should be non-paved trails for maintainability as well as usage and visual aesthetics.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
165	Summer	S	6	6	I especially think this path should remain dirt and/or be routed around sierra meadows in a different manner – it should run adjacent to 1A, down one of the dirt roads that meet up with the bridge near Hayden cabin.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
174	Summer	S	7	7	Backbone trail should be paved to maximize potential users and to better tie into current paved trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
175	Summer	S	18	18	There should be more than one connector from the Meadow to the Mammoth Rock Trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
176	Summer	S	19	19	I would like to see trail development in Solitude Canyon. With trails, the impact on wildlife would be minimized because the trails will focus the use on a small area. In addition, if OSV's will be using the canyon during the winter, than hikers and b kers whose impact is a fraction of OSV's should be able to take advantage of it during the summer.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
177	Summer	S	26	26	I would like to see a multi-use trail to Sherwin Ridge that connects with Solitude Canyon and ultimately connects with the Coldwater/Lake Mary area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
181	Summer	S	7	7	Backbone trail should be paved to maximize potential users and to better tie into current paved trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
182	Summer	S	18	18	There should be more than one connector from the Meadow to the Mammoth Rock Trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
183	Summer	S	19	19	Encourage multi-use trail development in Solitude Canyon. Organize and focus users in a few trails to open up some great terrain and scenic areas. Keep folks on trails and off old, unused trails to minimize impact in undeveloped area and on wildlife. OSV's have access to this area in the winter and hikers and bikers should have access to this area in the summer – very little impact and brings some great additions to a limited trail system in this area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
184	Summer	S	26	26	How great would a multi-use trail to Sherwin Ridge that connects with Solitude Canyon and ultimately connects with the Coldwater/Lake Mary area. Whistler is seeing more business in the summertime from mountain bikers than in the winter time from skiers. Lets expand our recreation trails and attract visitors and offer locals more areas to enjoy.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
192	Summer	S	9a	20	I feel it would be great to have an area for a bike park to facilitate the growing need of our community-bmx/fullsize mtn b ke. The area can be shaped with the existing soil and water with a possibility of cement forms if the b ke community would want to take on the design and fundraising. Thank you.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
212	Summer	S	Global	-	Please consider recommendations that will connect proposed trails to other sub regions in Mammoth Lakes region including Shady Rest and the Lakes Basin and the High Alpine regions to the south as well as the PCT.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
213	Summer	S	5A	5a	Please consider any opportunity to connect recommendation 5A to Le Verne Street and the Bluffs neighborhood.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
214	Summer	S	5C	5c	Please recommend that design and environmental analysis of 5C be prioritized so that its construction can be included as part of construction of the Lake Mary Bike Path, anticipated for the summer of 2010	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
217	Summer	S	12B	12b	Please recommend that design and environmental analysis of 12B be prioritized so that its construction can be included as part of construction of the Lake Mary Bike Path, anticipated for the summer of 2010	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
219	Summer	S	16	16	Please identify opportunities for vistas and view points and ease of access from proposed Mill City Trailhead	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
220	Summer	S	17	17	Please recommend ultimate destination and opportunities for connectivity for this trail – please consider having this trail ultimately loop back to the Borrow Pit.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
221	Summer	S	19	19	Please consider more detailed recommendations for trails in Solitude Canyon.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
222	Summer	S	26	26	Please consider installation of a via ferrata on the south side of Mammoth Rock, and the potential of the summit of Mammoth Rock as a destination Please provide recommendations for the ultimate destinations and connectivity of this trail.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
223	Summer	S	27	27	Please consider routing this recommendation further to the south, leaving the Motocross Track to the East, and connecting further up the Sherwin Lakes Trail	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
236	Summer	S	All	-	<p>It's crucial that the group recommend that mountain bike preferred trail be built in the study area as part of this proposal. Please, consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mammoth is (and markets itself as) a mountain bike destination. Yet it has the worst (and tiniest) public trail system of any comparable resort. There is not one purpose-built mtb trail around Mammoth. Most mountain resorts have networks with hundreds of miles of public trails built primarily for mountain biking. This is an economic need, and a glaring lack in our recreational facilities. Unless you're a downhiller that wants to pay the ski area, there is effectively no decent riding here, compared to similar towns. By comparison, the town of Whistler spends \$50-100,000/year on building public MTB trails around town. We desperately need a better riding experience, and this is a chance to change it. 2. We have hundreds of miles of bike-free trails, bike-free Wilderness, but no bike trail system--not even one decent trail by mountain biking standards, just disconnected snippets of opened hiking trails that aren't properly built or designed for bikes. 3. The Town can't build trails, and the Forest Service never has. This is the first and only chance we've ever had to ask for more MTB trails. 4. Many non-bikers don't like mountain bikes on the same trails--if we build new trails that are fun for mountain bikes, the bikers will ride those instead of hiking trails. 5. There is enough room in the study area to build many miles of high-quality mtb-preferred trail. There should be a loop branching off the Rock Trail, an MTB-preferred loop around the Hidden Lake Meadow, an extension to the Rock Trail that loops out to the east of town and then connects to Shady Rest, and more trail in the Panorama Dome area. MTB trails don't have to go anywhere, or run through the same locales as hiking-preferred trails. Voila--at least one day's worth. 6. Modern trail design and construction can ensure safety for all users. 7. Compared to all the infrastructure in this proposal, building trails is cheap and is guaranteed to attract private donations and volunteers. We could easily raise enough money to build miles of trail with no help from the Forest Service--businesses like Footloose make a lot of money from mountain bikers. 	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
238	Summer	S	4	-	The idea of closing upper Old Mammoth Rd. and converting it to a MUP has great merit, and would be considerably simpler than many of the connectivity proposals for that area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
239	Summer	S	1	1	<p>Would like to see better defined "footprint" of proposed improvements @ staging area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2" water line should be enough to operation proposed restrooms (this is size of line for USFS stables) - would recommend Trails End Park restroom prototype for borrow pit staging area this is durable and year round. - propose paving Sherwin Creek Road @ 32' width from OMR to borrow pit (width would accommodate desired winter parallel parking and summer bike lanes. Some type of pedestrian access link to the Sherwin Creek Campground would be good. Either bike lanes if paved or parallel MUP 	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
240	Summer	S	2	2	TOML would recommend no less than 3 / no more than 6 parking spaces (TOML can make requirement during negotiations w/land owner)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
243	Summer	S	7 & 8	7, 8	The meadow area provides a unique opportunity due to the relatively flat grades to provide fully accessible routes as a paved or boardwalk routes for families of young kids with training wheels, elderly, adults in wheel chairs or walkers, etc. This section would be only the loop from Snowcreek VIII to Tamarack Street and one linear path to Hidden Lake area. A hard surface would be compatible with the spring and early summer boggy soils and provide access points to the other soft surface paths.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
250	Summer	S	7 & 6	7, 6	Item 7 is specifically identified with a wheel chair symbol but item 6 is not. This may be misleading since all MUP's are designed to be fully accessible and are usually required to be accessible by the funding agency.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
251	Summer	S	3 & 7	3, 7	A hard surface MUP should connect the Snowcreek paths to item 7. This reinforces the concept of nested loops for the MUP system.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
252	Summer	S	5C	5c	This path should be a hard surface MUP. It connects a paved MUP with a paved roadway.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
255	Summer	S	12A & 12B	12a, 12b	The Lake Mary Road Bike path should be extended across Mammoth Creek on a bridge just east of the vehicle bridge and the MUP extended 400 feet further east to Twin Lakes Loop. This will replace on-road bike lanes in the current design.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
256	Summer	S	12A & 12B	12a, 12b	Install an under-crossing to safely carry bike and pedestrian travelers under Lake Mary Road at Twin Lakes Loop. The at-grade bike path crossing of Lake Mary Road should be replaced with a safer crossing.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
260	Summer	S	19	19	I would support Solitude Canyon area being developed into more mountain bike trails.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
261	Summer	S	Panorama Dome	-	I support mtn bike trail development. Development of existing trails.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
262	Summer	S	19	19	Would love to see multiple types of trails - mostly bike only DH trails, freeride, XC loop.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
263	Summer	S	5A	5a	Would love to see horse-only access trail // no bikes(+) horse on same trail.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
264	Summer	S	19	19	I would like to see more mountain bike trails in this area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
265	Summer	S	19	19	Developing mountain bike trails that connect to Mammoth Rock Trail would greatly improve Mammoth's mountain bike trail network.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
272	Summer	S	17 & 5B	17, 5b	Most of #17 currently exists; connect #17 to the Lake Mary Bike Path via "utility access road".	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
274	Summer	S	5B	5b	Create & Establish as an Equestrian Preferred trail. It may be best to have separate but equal trails for horses and mountain bikes. Separation should be about 50' to 100' min.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
277	Summer	S	6	6	The surface should be asphalt paving to match Snowcreek VIII MUP so a consistent loop is formed.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
279	Summer	S	12A & 12B	12a, 12b	Move further up Lake Mary Road to the existing "flat spot" adjacent to the Vista Trail & Panorama Dome Trail. Run a trail back down to the bridge & bike path.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
280	Summer	S	17	17	This route should be left as is and no improvements made due to the condition of the rock and the rough existing nature of the experience.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
291	Summer	S	19	19	Potential for Mtn. Bike Trail in Solitude Canyon would be a great addition to our limited off MMSA trail system.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
294	Summer	S	20	20	A BMX Park would be a great addition to our community for locals + guests. The shelter of the forest would be a better location. Well maintained jumps and berms would be a great training ground for future competitors and recreationalists.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
350	Summer	S	17	17	Would appreciate more concise mapping...BUT both of these closely related accesses should be connected for year round use. How about possible weekday hours for snowmobiles for SnoBoard drop offs??	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
351	Summer	S	18	18	Could be expanded to an even higher elevation and utilized in winter for possible snowmobile access for SnoBoard drop-offs during winter weekdays.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
352	Summer	S	21	21	YES. Absolutely/Positively and schedule MORE motor/bi-cycling events, along with snowmobile races in winter. BiAthalon + SnoShoe races also. :)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
353	Summer	S	13, 27	13, 27	Can also be utilized during winter once put in. Will also decrease cross-training/spider-webbing.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
354	Summer	S	9	9	Open to bikes and all non-motorized use during summer. Additionally, I think should be added to MUP groomed snowmobile access during winter season along with the whole #10 + #11 routes.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
356	Summer	S	5A, B & C	5a, 5b, 5c	Creation of this corridor will provide numerous recreational options. I still see clarifying needed in the \$5 B&C area, along with summer/winter #17 trails to avoid cross-training + spider-webbing...obvious + consistent trails area MUST!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
358	Summer	S	17	17	As mentioned in winter #17, clarification of routes is hereby requested, but #17 should be utilized both winter and summer with maybe occasional use during weekdays for recreational motorized vehicle use.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
360	Summer	S	19	19	Concur with assessment + think that this area should seriously be considered for any future ski lifts or Gondola proposals. Also a snowmobile for skiing + boarding drop-offs.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
361	Summer	S	20	20	Expand Shady Rest skate/bike uphill for multi-use.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
366	Summer	S	26	26	OH YEAH!! And expand East + West for ski/board access.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Sherwins Working Group
 Community Feedback Process
 Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

SUMMER

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
369	Summer	S	1A 10 11 ?E	1	Just returned from our 3rd annual visit to Mammoth Lakes/Sherwin Creek area – PLEASE DO NOT pave the Sherwin Creek Rd. from 395 to Old Mammoth Rd.– some already is, probably for the motocross development – but stop at that – The impact on trash and traffic will be even greater and the area of "wilderness/remoteness" in the midst of "the city" will be further lost [signed]	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
166	Summer	S	All areas	-	Thank you all for all your hard work. You all have done a great job taking everyone's needs into account.	THANKS
275	Summer	S	1, 2, 3, 4, 5C, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, & 28	1, 2, 3, 4, 5C, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27, & 28	Great ideas, full support.	THANKS
282	Summer	S	20-23	20, 21, 22, 23	No comment.	THANKS
365	Summer	S	25	25	Concur with assessment and proposal	THANKS

Sherwins Working Group
 Community Feedback Process
 Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
98	Winter & Summer	S, W	5C, 2	5c, 2	There is no winter street parking and there is no adequate parking lot for parking and disabled vehicles designated in the narratives.	ADDITIONAL INFO
102	Winter & Summer	S, W	5C, 2	5c, 2	There is no winter street parking and there is no adequate parking lot for parking and disabled vehicles designated in the narratives.	ADDITIONAL INFO
110	Both	S, W	2 summer, 5c winter	W5c, S2	<p>The idea of Tamarack Street as a staging area/ trailhead is great, and the provision of ADA-accessible parking is also very sound. However, any additional parking in this neighborhood will meet with STRONG opposition from the many full time residents on Tamarack Street. Tamarack Street is a sub-standard 20' right of way (min town standards are 40') that cannot accommodate additional automobile traffic – especially in winter when it remains icy most of the season and snowbanks reduce the usable road surface even further. Additional parking even if just a few spaces will cause a huge increase in car travel on this street. In winter there will be a rush of cars trying to drop a shuttle ride there (with two cars needed to drop a shuttle). All year, once the few spaces are filled the rest of the cars will be rushing back to go elsewhere creating a major hazard for children, horses and pedestrians which use this street year round.</p> <p>A transit stop (or even parallel parking on OMK) at the Old Mammoth Rd end of Tamarack Street adds only ¼ mile of foot travel to the meadow and maintains the current character of this street which is primarily pedestrian and non- motorized. It is a misleading description to say this is a “heavily used access/egress point” (per summer narrative item #2) as the majority of use is currently not via automobile. Perhaps with increased use, a better “improvement” than parking would be a bathroom facility so that the human waste issue which affected the Ranch Road access debate is resolved up front.</p> <p>***This was also presented as a signed petition with 9 other names, "Tamarack St Residents" ***</p>	ADDITIONAL INFO

Sherwins Working Group
 Community Feedback Process
 Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
259	Both	S, W		-	The Town has a drainage easement at the end of LaVerne Street. There may be an opportunity to make a public connection at this location. It could be suitable for a soft path in summer and winter egress.	ADDITIONAL INFO
48A	Summer Winter	S, W	Summer: 2, 7, 8 Winter: 5c, 9a	S2, S7, S8, W5c, W9a	As excerpted and summarized from the approved Sherwins Working Group (SWG) meeting notes of May 21, 2009 relating to Terry Plum's tentative offer to provide pedestrian access across his family's properties between existing Tamarack Street and the Sherwin Meadows area to the south:	ADDITIONAL INFO
48B	Summer	S, W	Summer: 2, 7, 8 Winter: 5c, 9a	S2, S7, S8, W5c, W9a	<p>[Excerpt] Mr. Plum said the access easement he is proposing would be a 4' wide pedestrian only trail. He also plans on granting shared vehicle access easements (which would overlap the pedestrian trail) to only the Town of Mammoth Lakes (ToML) and its Fire Protection District (MLF), the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and Mammoth Community Water District for emergency and/or maintenance purposes only. He further stated no motorized vehicles (other than those of the agencies already noted) would be permitted to cross his family's properties. Upon inquiry, Mr. Plum added a willingness to consider permitting bicycles and horses within the access easement if the USFS allows those uses in the immediately adjacent Sherwin Meadows area, the Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA) publicly supports his proposed Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) which permits building 6 single family homes (1 on Leverage Street in the Bluffs subdivision and 5 between existing Tamarack Street and the USFS lands) on his family's 5.6 acres of properties, and the ToML approves</p> <p>Mr. Plum stated he has offered to construct the infrastructure improvements (such as an additional fire hydrant and 3 emergency vehicle turnouts on the existing sub-standard Tamarack Street as requested by MLF, extending Tamarack Street into his family's property as a standard 24' wide public street, trailhead public parking (only if required by the ToML), and the 4' wide pedestrian only trail within his family's private driveways) at his family's cost, and also give the northerly .25 acres of his family's property to the ToML (for snow storage and maintenance).</p>	ADDITIONAL INFO

Sherwins Working Group
Community Feedback Process
Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
48C	Summer	S, W	Summer: 2, 7, 8 Winter: 5c, 9a	S2, S7, S8, W5c, W9a	Note: The SWG, MLTPA, ToML & USFS already have an email of the SWG May 21, 2009 meeting notes (including attached maps). The SWG draft Summer and Winter Proposal maps show a Multiple Use Path across the Plum family properties. Further, the SWG draft Summer and Winter Proposal narratives note "respecting the private-property owner". Accordingly, please revise the draft SWG Summer and Winter Proposals so those submitted to the USFS are in accordance with my above tentative offers and requirements. Finally, I am very willing and eager to meet with SWG, MLTPA, ToML and/or USFS personnel upon my return to Mammoth Lakes on October 2 to answer any questions and/or discuss any concerns regarding the above. Thank you for your serious consideration to my feedback. Working together, we'll develop a great private/public partnership which ensures pedestrian access between Tamarack Street and the Sherwin Meadows area for generations to come. Sincerely, [signed]	ADDITIONAL INFO
96	Winter & Summer	S, W	5A, 5C, 2	5a, 5c, 2	The Snowcreek influence area, shown as yellow or light tan, does not include the Fairway HOA area. It would be preferable to show both Fairway Ranch and The Ranch at Snowcreek HOAs in a distinct color, defining them a private property. The tan areas of the maps are also not defined.	ERROR/OMISSION
100	Winter & Summer	S, W	5A, 5C, 2	5a, 5c, 2	There is not an adequate designation as to the Snowcreek Influence Areas, including but not limited to the Fairway HOA Area, Fairway Ranch, and The Ranch at Snowcreek. The tan areas of the map are not designated.	ERROR/OMISSION
104	Winter & Summer	S, W	5A, 5C, 2	5a, 5c, 2	There is not an adequate designation as to the Snowcreek Influence Areas, including but not limited to the Fairway HOA Area, Fairway Ranch, and The Ranch at Snowcreek. The tan areas of the map are not designated.	ERROR/OMISSION
285	Both	S, W		-	Please keep Snowcreek Project propane gas tanks on private property. Keep the public lands open for recreation.	NOT IN SCOPE
42		S, W		-	A favorite area that the community has walked, biked, hiked, horsebackriding, dogwalking, viewing, stargazing, birding to Kerry Meadow and up to a beautiful viewpoint, also Tele Bowl, and the extremely popular snowplay on Sherwin Creek Rd winter closure area that's easy to access from town.	OPINION
64	Both	S, W		-	Both maps seem to be very inclusive of everything I would like to see.	OPINION

Sherwins Working Group
Community Feedback Process
Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
66	Both	S, W	N/A	-	The O.H.V.Registration program has been in California for over 30 years. Every Legal Dirt Bike, ATV, Snowmobile, ect - must be registered with the state. The fees have recently <u>doubled</u> . We pay a lot to the state for the right to use our trails. Exactly how much do rock climbers, hikers, runners, cross-country skiers pay to use the same trails? If you don't think O.H.V. funds benefit us all, think again! Thank you.	OPINION
72	Both	S, W		W9b, W10b, S22	Great to have an off leash trail for dogs please!	OPINION
109		S, W		W5c, S2	To whom it concerns: Please carefully consider the impact of parking at the end of Tamarack St. If it becomes inevitable, a traffic study must be done and traffic calming measures will be imperative for public safety. Please see comments on the SWG feedback form attached. Thanks. [signed]	OPINION
121		S, W		-	Don't Change Anything	OPINION
154	Winter and Summer	S, W		-	As noted in our previous comments, our endorsement of this project is not the endorsement of proposing uses on private property. Any and all trails or proposed uses drawn on the private such as Snowcreek, Terry Plum Properties we defer to the property owner and their rights.	OPINION
287	Both	S, W	5C	5c	I have friends that live on Tamarack and it's a great place for us to go out from.	OPINION
355	Summer/ Winter	S, W	Winter #16 12A & B	S12a, S12b	Same as winter #16 = yep, yep, yep!! AS we develop and expand these trails systems, the more that we can keep from impacting existing parking, and especially alleviating roadside parking the safer and better off we'll be.	OPINION
30	Both	S, W		W4, S9	Keep areas open for public use. Been off-roading for 40+ years. Family grew up riding there isn't a better sport around for families. Keep areas open	POLICY
33	Both	S, W		W4, S9	Need more access to off-road trails	POLICY
65	Both	S, W	22 summer & 9B winter	S22, W9b	I think that this is the most important rule that needs to be. (Dogs under voice command) There is nowhere like that in the town.	POLICY

Sherwins Working Group
Community Feedback Process
Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
88	Winter/ Summer	S, W	Solitude Canyon	W4	Un fit for motorized use. No mention of likely trespass into designated Wilderness. Little to no mention of major deer migration corridor and possible impacts. No mention of historic bc ski use and possible conflicts.No mention of how ironic it would be (is) to have a place named Solitude Canyon over run by snowmobiles. I fully applaud all the hard work and effort that has gone into this, but Solitude is an unacceptable compromise.	POLICY
128	Both	S, W	4	4	We see no change in usage necessary for this area. Leaving existing usage allows for all to use these resources. [signed]	POLICY
135		S, W	on 2007 maps at MMSA	W4, S9	East access to Sherwins important, via over the snow at the winter closure on Sherwin Creek Rd to Tele Bowl + out to Kerry Meadows on the dirt road by the old FS pack station on Sherwin Creek Rd or gravel pit access to Kerry Meadow, a very popular in town trail, both summer + winter. The community should not have to lose that.	POLICY
144	Both	S, W			I oppose the closing of public lands for use only by select groups. Our lands should be for multiple use. The land grabs the wrong way to manage our lands.	POLICY
160		S, W		W4, S9	Please see attached form. Please do not close access to snowmobiles or summer OHVs.	POLICY
195		S, W		W4, S9	Please don't close these areas.	POLICY
286	Both	S, W	4	4	Not closing motorized vehicals access because its really good for snowmobiling.	POLICY
288	Both	S, W	4, 5C	4, 5c	Not closing the area to motorized vehicles because the area is amazing for snowmobileing!	POLICY
289	Both	S, W	9A	9a	Same as above. [Not closing the area to motorized vehicles because the area is amazing for snowmobileing!]	POLICY
297	Both	S, W	4	4	Not closing to motorized vehicle in winter, I like riding sled with my kids out there.	POLICY
301	Summer & Winter	S, W	N/A	4	The Sherwin area should not be closed. It has been a popular recreation area for years. There is no valid reason for closure or restrictions.	POLICY

Sherwins Working Group
Community Feedback Process
Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
306	Both	S, W	4	4	Not closing to motorized vehicile it a great place to ride sleds.	POLICY
309	Both	S, W	4	4	Not closing to motorized vehicel caues its fun out there	POLICY
313	Summer & WInter	S, W		W4	Please don't close down the Sherwins it is a great place to ride. I have always helped friends + family shuttle up and around that area. I ride my snowmobile + dirtbike there so please don't close it.	POLICY
315	Both!	S, W	4, 5C	4, 5c	The Sherwin Mtn range is a very beautiful and Recreational area for Mammoth locals. Closingthe area would be a very disappointing action. Growing up here for 20 years I have spent all my time exploring and being very active in that area. Please do not close this area down!	POLICY
318	Both	S, W	4	4	not closing area to motorized vehicle	POLICY
320	Both	S, W	4, 5C	4, 5c	not closing area to motorized vehicle	POLICY
322	Summer & Winter	S, W		W4	We are already losing palces to ride + enjoy our National playgrounds. If we continue to close areas to locals + paying visitors that are spending good money in our town to enjoy those areas we will lose what our ancestors se aside for us and our children to enjoy lik ewe have for decades. Also what proof do you have that is substantial to say power sports, and human powered sports are destroying these areas! All Seasons.	POLICY
323	Winter/ Snowmobile Access Summer/ dirt bike/ moto	S, W		W4	We use the Sherwins area as a starting point for shuttle at the telebowls and to access Pyramids. Everyone I ride with is always considerate of hikers, dogs, x-country skiers, etc. and there is no reason we shouldn't be allowed in that area. Banning motor vehicles in that [illegible] place will eventually lead to us being banned from many areas around Mammoth, which would be detrimental to the town. Snowmobiling and Dirt Biking bring many tourists into town that spend money on lodging, food, gas, etc.	POLICY
324	Summer & Winter	S, W	All	-	Keep all access open, to all public use!!	POLICY

Sherwins Working Group
Community Feedback Process
Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
325	Summer Winter Fall Spring Any Season	S, W		W4	I believe everyone should have the ability to enjoy public land in all ways, equally. Every sport has its opportunities and it encourages every person to try & more importantly: TO EXERCISE. Any time is an amazing time to hike, bike, moto, run, anything.// How is one sport different from another & why should that freedom be taken away skiing, snowmobiling, snowshoing, dog walking are all forms of love for nature. Why destroy that for anybody? There is not a season, an outdoor activity, or a sport that should be banned anywhere, so long as the people of any and all parties are respectful & enjoying.	POLICY
38		S, W		W1, W3, S1	My only comment on the summer and winter narratives is the parking will be too crowded at the tank farm/borrow pit site. Snowmobile enthusiasts with their trucks and trailers need a lot more space for parking than Subarus with x-country skis. Could parking not be extended further down the Sherwin Creek Road?	QUESTION
41		S, W		-	Why is the community losing the EAST access of the Sherwins too?	QUESTION
94	Winter & Summer	S, W	5C, 2	5c, 2	The placement of the Parking & Disabled symbols need to be repositioned and clarified in the narrative so that they don't imply access to/from Ranch Road. Since there is not winter street parking allowed, where is the space being provided to build an adequately sized parking lot?	QUESTION
99	Winter & Summer	S, W	Various	W5a, W5b, W5c, S2, S3	There is a question as to who will provide the liability insurance for these easements.	QUESTION
103	Winter & Summer	S, W	Various	W5a, W5b, W5c, S2, S3	There is a question as to who will provide the liability insurance for these easements.	QUESTION
3	Both	S, W	5c, 6, 9b	5c, 6, 9b	Provide not only doggie bag stations but also Mammoth Disposal-serviced bearproof trash bins at each staging area for dog waste (and other trash) disposal. Most dog owners seem unwilling to bag waste (even with bags provided) for the extra step of having to drive it to the dump (or let it fester on the floor of the car).	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
89		S, W		W1, W5C, W6, W13, S1, S2, S4	Staging areas with information kiosk including a map and some outline of proposed plan	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
129	Both	S, W		W13	I'd like to see a signage in more details not just at the beginning of any trail, included the distances of individual trail and maybe also in the middle showing us how far we still have to go (and if we're going the right direction.)	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Sherwins Working Group
Community Feedback Process
Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
140	Winter/Summer	S, W	All	W10b, S22	Make an enclosed dog park so they have a dedicated place for animals to run without a leash.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
169		S, W		W5c, S2	Dear Sirs: my name is [deleted] and I reside at 306 Tamarack St. I have lived at this address for the past seventeen years. I would like to voice my strident objection of plans to install parking spaces at the end of tamarack street for access to the forest service meadow adjacent. I believe encouraging more traffic flow on an already substandard one lane residential street is a terrible idea. A possible better solution is to provide a shuttle stop on old mammoth road and have meadow users walk the two hundred yards down Tamarack Street to access the meadow. Traffic on Tamarack street is already at a high level with many cars driving thru the neighborhood exceeding the speed limit, endangering residents. any encouragement of increasing cars that transit the area is a bad idea. respectfully [signed]	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
190	Summer/All	S, W	7, 13, 3, 27, 6, 9, 10, 11, 18, 15, 17, 27	7, 13, 3, 27, 6, 9, 10, 11, 18, 15, 17, 27	Please consider using soft surface trails rather than paved MUP's and trails in all areas that are not located within or directly adjacent to roads or "high impact" development. It is important to maintain the "wilderness" feeling in the area and use as little pavement as possible to be environmentally conscious.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
191	Summer and winter	S, W	1	1	Please consider proposing to vegetate the surrounding undeveloped barren dirt areas directly adjacent to staging area #1 in the SWG proposal with plant types similar to the adjacent vegetation.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
206	Both	S, W	Global	W13	Please recommend that any and all signage and wayfinding efforts in the Sherwins be consistent with the TOML Trail System Master Plan (2009 – Recommendation G3, page 114) and as further detailed in Chapter 5 of that plan, and that all signage and wayfinding be consistent across jurisdictions	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
207	Both	S, W	Global	-	Please recommend that naming conventions for any new trails and facilities be consistent with the TOML Trails System Master Plan (2009 - Recommendation G1, page 112 and table 4-1, p 113) including assignment of node and facility types.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
208	Both	S, W	Global	-	Please request of the two jurisdictions – TOML and USFS – guidance as to roles and responsibilities for implementation, maintenance and programming of SWG recommendations	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
209	Both	S, W	Global	-	Please consider recommending restoration of Hidden Lake and it potential as a destination	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT

Sherwins Working Group
Community Feedback Process
Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
210	Both	S, W	Global	-	Please consider what role any of the draft recommendations may play in a "Mammoth Loop Trail" – the experience of a continuous trail experience around the entire community of Mammoth Lakes – and how recommendations in the SWG proposal can connect to other subregions in the Mammoth Area, ie the Lakes Basin, Shady Rest,	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
211	Both	S, W	Global	W9b, W10b, S22	Please ensure that recommendations for pets are consistent across the seasonal recommendations	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
237	Summer/ Winter	S	2	2	Regarding the Tamarack access point--since there is only one horse property that will use this entrance, perhaps they should pay for any horse specific improvements in that location--public funds should not be spent to improve an access point for just one user.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
248	Both	S, W		W13	The area will provide numerous areas for interpretive signage for history, natural resources, and ecology of the area.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
284	Both	S, W		S7	Please keep Kerry Meadow dirt road/trail access open. Long time favorite in town trail.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
362	Summer & Winter	S, W	21	21	EXPAND & SCHEDULE & RACE Dammit!! Also snomobiles...we could be on ESPN at least every other month!! We should be utilizing moto for multi-uses year round...	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
363	Summer/ Winter	S, W	22/9B	22, 9b	Leashes required in ALL staging areas, exception being Sierra Meadows. BUT we should develop quick response situations with MLPD, Steve Searles, Animal Control, DFG/USFS/BLM for ANY dog attacks, unprovoked or not...	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
364	Summer/ Winter	S, W	24/13	24, 13	Yep. Coordinate with Friends of the Inyo for these projects.	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
367	Summer/ Winter?	S, W	27/?	27	Development of already existing MAIN trail(s) will result in less cross-training/spider-webbing, plus could result in an excellent snowmobile route. Another "Fr of Inyo" weekend project!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
368	Summer/ Winter	S, W	28	28	Yeppers!! As we develop these trails, playgrounds, and access areas we should implement transportation spots. Maybe some \$ day passes or round trip fees from say uphill drop-offs to down-hill pick-ups!!	SUGGESTION/NEW CONCEPT
4	Both	S, W	5c, 6, 9b	5c, 6, 9b	awesome work all around!! Thank you!!	THANKS
111	Both	S, W	1, 3-28	1, 3-28	All your other work has produced a fantastic plan for improved resources throughout the Sherwins. Thank you for all your efforts!! ***This was also presented as a signed petition with 9 other names., "Tamarack St Residents"****	THANKS

Sherwins Working Group
 Community Feedback Process
 Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

YEAR-ROUND

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
188	All	S, W		-	The Sherwin Working Group did a fantastic job on both the Summer and Winter Proposals for the Sherwin area. The proposals provide a solid foundation for planning recreation in Mammoth and the Sherwin's.	THANKS
344	Winter & Sunner	S, W		-	Thanks for the thourough communication -	THANKS

Sherwins Working Group
 Community Feedback Process
 Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

NON-SEASONAL

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
283		NONE		-	<i>Many photos attached.</i>	ADDITIONAL INFO
35		NONE		-	Does the Sherwin Working Group focus on the eastside of the Sherwins?	QUESTION
39		NONE		-	Who are the maps from?	QUESTION
40		NONE		-	Very nice display and comment gathering, to who?	QUESTION
37		NONE		-	Excellent work, guys!!	THANKS
145		NONE		-	Just a few comments for the area of Sherwin Creek Road. We are working on many other comments for the actual motocross area. Stay tuned!	THANKS
148		NONE		-	Hi John, I have reviewed the Sherwins Working Group proposal and commend you, Austin, and the USFS for a job well done! I know there were diverse interests throughout the process. I will get final comments from both Roy and Mike and just have a couple clarifying questions right now so as not to bog down the official comment process. Please feel free to comment or answer so I can make sure my final comments are appropriate and helpful to you and the USFS.	THANKS
155		NONE		-	Thank you again for all of your hard work. Great Job and I will forward you our final comments	THANKS
163		NONE		-	Thanks for all your hard work. You've done a great job thinking of everyone. I have attached my comments.	THANKS
179		NONE		-	Thanks! Sorry this is last minute!	THANKS

Sherwins Working Group
 Community Feedback Process
 Final Compilation (through 10/01/09)

SORT DATE: 10/06/09

NON-SEASONAL

Comment Number	Winter or Summer	STAFF SEASON ASSIGNMENT	Map ID#	STAFF MAP ID ASSIGNMENT	Comment	STAFF CATEGORY ASSIGNMENT
180		NONE		-	Thanks for all the work you put into this (attached is my form for feedback) I'm so stoked this is happening in Mammoth!	THANKS
186		NONE		-	Thank you for providing this incredible opportunity to help shape our community! Recreation is the main reason I live here and the main reason visitors come here!	THANKS
187		NONE		-	John and Kim- I have attached Snowcreek's feedback to the SWG proposal. You have done a great job and we appreciate the hard work. Thank you [signed]	THANKS



Summer Concerns

Equestrian Concerns

Summer Concern 1: Provide an Equestrian Specific Trail at #5b			
274	Summer	5b	Create & Establish as an Equestrian Preferred trail. It may be best to have separate but equal trails for horses and mountain bikes. Separation should be about 50' to 100' min.
276	Summer	5b	Separate horses and hikers due to impact from horses on soft surface trails. Or armor the tread to minimize damage.

Lake Mary Bike Path Concerns

Summer Concern 2: Extend LMRBP across Mammoth Creek to Connect to Old Mammoth Road			
23	Summer	12b	Consideration should be given to extending the Lake Mary Road Bike Path across a bridge over Mammoth Creek (parallel to the existing road bridge). Then extend the paved path southerly along the east edge of Lake Mary Road approximately 350 feet (to just above Twin Lakes Loop) where an undercrossing could be constructed to provide a safe crossing of Lake Mary Road.
Summer Concern 3: Connect #17 to LMRBP Via the Existing Utility Road			
272	Summer	17, 5b	Most of #17 currently exists; connect #17 to the Lake Mary Bike Path via "utility access road".

Mill City/OMR Concerns

Summer Concern 4: Convert Old Mammoth Road to Pedestrian Only at Mill City			
81	Summer	5a, 5b, 5c	Make huge trail head/node @ Mill City, close off upper Old Mammoth Rd. to cars, use this as obvious bike trail, MUP, save \$\$ designing trails + connections when you have the obvious!!
Summer Concern 5: Move Old Mill City Trailhead Higher up Old Mammoth Road			
351	Summer	18	Could be expanded to an even higher elevation and utilized in winter for possible snowmobile access for SnoBoard drop-offs during winter weekdays.
279	Summer	12a, 12b	Move further up Lake Mary Road to the existing "flat spot" adjacent to the Vista Trail & Panorama Dome Trail. Run a trail back down to the bridge & bike path.

Mountain Bike, Bike and BMX Concerns

Summer Concern 6: Provide a BMX Park at #20.			
294	Summer	21	A BMX Park would be a great addition to our community for locals + guests. The shelter of the forest would be a better location. Well maintained jumps and burms would be a great training ground for future competitors and recreationalists.
192	Summer	21	I feel it would be great to have an area for a bike park to facilitate the growing need of our community-bmx/fullsize mtn bike. The area can be shaped with the existing soil and water with a possibility of cement forms if the bike community would want to take on the design and fundraising. Thank you.
Summer Concern 7: Allow Bikes and Non-Motorized on #9 During the Summer			
354	Summer	9	Open to bikes and all non-motorized use during summer.
Summer Concern 8: Provide Loop MTB Trails from the Rock Trail, around Hidden Lake Meadow, and Connecting to Shady Rest			
236	Summer	-	There should be a loop branching off the Rock Trail, an MTB-preferred loop around the Hidden Lake Meadow, an extension to the Rock Trail that loops out to the east of town and then connects to Shady Rest, and more trail in the Panorama Dome area.



Summer Concern 9: Provide More MTB Trails in the Panorama Dome Area			
236	Summer	-	There should be more trail(s) in the Panorama Dome area.
Summer Concern 10: Provide a Mountain Bike/ Multiple Use Trail in Solitude Canyon			
291	Summer	19	Potential for Mtn. Bike Trail in Solitude Canyon would be a great addition to our limited off MMSA trail system.
183	Summer	19	Encourage multi-use trail development in Solitude Canyon. Organize and focus users in a few trails to open up some great terrain and scenic areas. Keep folks on trails and off old, unused trails to minimize impact in undeveloped area and on wildlife. OSV's have access to this area in the winter and hikers and bikers should have access to this area in the summer – very little impact and brings some great additions to a limited trail system in this area.
221	Summer	19	Please consider more detailed recommendations for trails in Solitude Canyon.
Summer Concern 11: Separate Bike Path from Mill City Interpretive Trails			
83	Summer	24	Separate Mill City historic trail from bike paths - keep this quiet, ped. oriented. Make this an interpretive area - Mmth does not have interpretive area/experience. This is an excellent oppt. to develop + create something like this - connecting historical Mammoth to present day Mammoth.



MUP Concerns

Summer Concern 12: Provide More MUPS to Create Accessible Nested Loops at #3, from #4 to the Vista, on #5c at #7 and to Hidden Lake			
241	Summer	4	- Recommend paved MUP from staging area to vista (accessibility)
58	Summer	5a, 8, 16	Put a MUP into the Hidden Lake area. I can understand beginning with soft surface for cost reasons, but also realize that a hard surface extends the "easy" walk or bike ride into this area and would presumably be less likely to erode like the existing user trails. A MUP is also more distinct and visible, which could reduce the formation of additional user trails.
22	Summer	5c	This segment of path connects a paved path (Lake Mary Road Bike Path) and a paved roadway (Lake Mary Road) and should therefore be paved and fully accessible.
277	Summer	6	The surface should be asphalt paving to match Snowcreek VIII MUP so a consistent loop is formed.
243	Summer	7, 8	This section would be only the loop from Snowcreek VIII to Tamarack Street and one linear path to Hidden Lake area. A hard surface would be compatible with the spring and early summer boggy soils and provide access points to the other soft surface paths.
20	Summer	3, 7	A hard surface connector path between 3 and 7 would be beneficial.
251	Summer	3, 7	A hard surface MUP should connect the Snowcreek paths to item 7. This reinforces the concept of nested loops for the MUP system.
90		1, 2, 7, 16	Connecting ADA trails (preferably paved) so folks can begin to use and appreciate the area in a way which is linked to the existing town trail system in progress
Summer Concern 13: Consider Widening Sherwin Creek Road to Allow for Summer Bike Lanes			
239	Summer	1	- propose paving Sherwin Creek Road @ 32' width from OMR to borrow pit (width would accommodate desired winter parallel parking and summer bike lanes. Some type of pedestrian access link to the Sherwin Creek Campground would be good Either bike lanes if paved or parallel MUP



Parking Concerns

Summer Concern 14: Provide a clear statement of purpose and size for the Tamarack Street Trailhead			
110	Summer	W5c, S2	The idea of Tamarack Street as a staging area/ trailhead is great, and the provision of ADA-accessible parking is also very sound. However, any additional parking in this neighborhood will meet with STRONG opposition from the many full time residents on Tamarack Street. Tamarack Street is a sub-standard 20' right of way (min town standards are 40') that cannot accommodate additional automobile traffic – especially in winter when it remains icy most of the season and snowbanks reduce the usable road surface even further. Additional parking even if just a few spaces will cause a huge increase in car travel on this street. In winter there will be a rush of cars trying to drop a shuttle ride there (with two cars needed to drop a shuttle). All year, once the few spaces are filled the rest of the cars will be rushing back to go elsewhere creating a major hazard for children, horses and pedestrians which use this street year round.
169	Summer	W5c, S2	Dear Sirs: My name is [deleted] and I reside at 306 Tamarack St. I have lived at this address for the past seventeen years. I would like to voice my strident objection of plans to install parking spaces at the end of tamarack street for access to the forest service meadow adjacent. I believe encouraging more traffic flow on an already substandard one lane residential street is a terrible idea. A possible better solution is to provide a shuttle stop on old mammoth road and have meadow users walk the two hundred yards down Tamarack Street to access the meadow. Traffic on Tamarack street is already at a high level with many cars driving thru the neighborhood exceeding the speed limit, endangering residents. Any encouragement of increasing cars that transit the area is a bad idea.
Summer Concern 15: Widen Sherwin Creek Road to Allow for Winter Roadside Parking			
239	Summer	1	- propose paving Sherwin Creek Road @ 32' width from OMR to borrow pit (width would accommodate desired winter parallel parking and summer bike lanes. Some type of pedestrian access link to the Sherwin Creek Campground would be good Either bike lanes if paved or parallel MUP

Transit Concerns

Summer Concern 16: Consider Providing Recommendations for Transit Stops at Trailheads			
132	Both	12	It would be nice if public transit stop(s) could be added at Snowcreek 5 also.



Concerns Organized by

#5 Concerns

Summer Concern 17: Consider Connecting 5A to Le Verne Street			
213	Summer	5a	Please consider any opportunity to connect recommendation 5A to Le Verne Street and the Bluffs neighborhood.
259	Summer	5a	The Town has a drainage easement at the end of LaVerne Street. There may be an opportunity to make a public connection at this location. It could be suitable for a soft path in summer and winter egress.

#S7 Concerns

Summer Concern 18: Keep Kerry Meadow Road Access Open at #S7			
284	Both	S7	Please keep Kerry Meadow dirt road/trail access open. Long time favorite in town trail.

#16 Concerns

Summer Concern 19: Provide a Constructed Vista/Overlook in the Vicinity of #5a and #16			
223	Summer	27	Please consider routing this recommendation further to the south, leaving the Motocross Track to the East, and connecting further up the Sherwin Lakes Trail



17 Concerns

Summer Concern 20: Make no Improvements to #17			
280	Summer	17	This route should be left as is and no improvements made due to the condition of the rock and the rough existing nature of the experience.
Summer Concern 21: Provide Loop Opportunities and Connectivity Between #17, #26 and the Borrow Pit			
76	Summer	17, 26	Connect Trails 17 + 26
220	Summer	17	Please recommend ultimate destination and opportunities for connectivity for this trail – please consider having this trail ultimately loop back to the Borrow Pit.

#26 Concerns

Summer Concern 22: Provide a Via Ferrata on the South Side of Mammoth Rock at #26			
222	Summer	26	Please consider installation of a via ferrata on the south side of Mammoth Rock, and the potential of the summit of Mammoth Rock as a destination Please provide recommendations for the ultimate destinations and connectivity of this trail.

#27 Concerns

Summer Concern 23: Route #27 Further to the South			
223	Summer	27	Please consider routing this recommendation further to the south, leaving the Motocross Track to the East, and connecting further up the Sherwin Lakes Trail





Winter Concerns

OSV Concerns

Winter Concern 1: Realign boundaries for OSV Restrictions to Follow Topographic or Other Definable Boundary			
7	Winter	4	Is the line of demarcation for restricted OSV use and unrestricted osv use “signs” or “terrain”?
266	Winter	4	The no OSV zone needs to be further back from the motocross track to allow snowmobiles access to lower bowls near the back of the motocross track.
59	Winter	4	On the Winter Proposal, I am concerned with the OSV Unrestricted area including the most easterly blue diamond cross country ski trail and the sloping hills on the east side of Sherwin Creek Road down to 395. Could specific trails and areas be identified for motorized vehicles which would still allow for close-by but separate ungroomed cross country skiing? These slopes are a favorite of many touring skiers.
235	Winter	4	Furthermore, the line of OSV exclusion, as represented on the SWG map, excludes the Tele Bowl Area with no clear topographic boundary to deter people from riding in that inviting area directly adjacent to the motocross track. Again, are there conflicts? Is there any rationale for this?
Winter Concern: 2 Provide Corridors for OSV Access			
171	Winter	1	I think there should be a western access point for snowmobilers who live in the bluffs and in old mammoth and in snowcreek, so there would be less vehicles at the access lots and less traffic on our roads.
293	Winter	2	This area has been multiuse with no apparent conflicts. - It is available now for non-motorized snowplay. - This moraine is typically used by OSV users to access backcountry skiing + snowboarding terrain. This is an open area with great visibility for all users to be able to extend courtesy to each other. - There is already a proposed snowplay area adjacent to SCVIII (#15) which does not affect this corridor.

Winter Concern: 2 Provide Corridors for OSV Access (cont'd)

204		4	This is a great opportunity to designate OSV/MOTORIZED use areas for future considerations, yet it is being viewed more as a way to further restrict MOTORIZED/OSV use. Imagine a trail system that connected the Sherwin riding area to the Shady Rest OSV Trail System. There could be possible fuel stations, or OSV services could be feasible future considerations at the Sherwin or Shady Rest sites, while current and future OSV recreationists could enjoy a legitimate OSV trail system around the Mammoth area.
231	Winter	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please recommend that should a hotel operator at Snowcreek VIII wish to provide OSV rentals and/or staging, that a corridor be provided to connect to proposed OSV staging area at Borrow Pit
232	Winter	4	Should the recommendation go forward, please recommend that should an HOA or property owner grant a public facility for OSV staging, provisions for a corridor be provided to connect to OSV winter staging area at Borrow Pit.
54		4	I specifically request the working group eliminate the line 4 "no-fly-zone" and provide, instead, for reasonable speed and noise restrictions in this area. I request OSVs be provided regulated access on, or immediately next to, path 5A and all areas surrounding path 9A (thus establishing a regulated public ingress/egress/touring area near developed projects).
296	Winter	5c	I live on Tamarack Ln. It is very nice to drive a couple of seconds to be able to snowmobile.
350	Summer	17	How about possible weekday hours for snowmobiles for SnoBoard drop offs??



Winter Concern 3: Provide a Clear Rationale for Changing Historic OSV Use Through Closures and Restrictions

51		4	<p>While the Map indicates there would be "restrictions" on the northeast side of line 4, the Narrative indicates a zero OSV use policy. "Restrictions" would be more appropriate. Creating a "no-fly zone" for OSVs is inconsistent with the goal of a diversified use of public lands. The stated purpose for the no-fly-zone is to eliminate the "POTENTIAL" for conflicts of use. Wiping out one side of the potential conflict is certainly the easiest and least creative way to avoid that potential conflict. Yet neither a rationale nor actual historical data has been provided to support the need for such a large swath of public land to be set-aside for a zero-tolerance (of OSVs) policy. The group has provided no support, nor presented a narrative, to indicate that OSV use in this area has been historically abusive or a public nuisance. Nor has the group communicated that OSVs have presented an actual danger to other participants on public lands sufficient for the wholesale elimination, not regulation, of their use.</p>
235		4	<p>Regarding the idea of restricting OSV use to the east of the borrow pit: the only reason to do this that makes any sense is because there will be an alternative amenity in the area that's not compatible with snowmobile use. Certainly it makes sense to have snowplay or dog-walk areas restricted, and slow zones in busy areas, but without the presence of a regularly-groomed XC trail system, there's no good reason to boot snowmobiles from the area. The only rationale cited is the prevention of "potential conflicts." Since the meadow area is currently used by OSV's w/ no conflicts, why will there be potential conflicts in any other scenario that one that includes a groomed system?</p> <p>Re: the "quiet area" rationale: nobody made people buy those homes and condos adjacent to OSV area, and there were snowmobiles there before there were any houses. Since the main beneficiary from such a restriction would be the neighboring HOA's and Chadmar, if they want it, they should shoulder the load of grooming etc, perhaps include public access to trails on the golf course.</p> <p>A true amenity would have to be added to make the OSV restriction pencil out in light of historic use and the already heavily restricted local OSV access. Furthermore, the line of OSV exclusion, as represented on the SWG map, excludes the Tele Bowl Area with no clear topographic boundary to deter people from riding in that inviting</p>



Winter Trail Concerns by

Winter Concern 4: Reconsider the Viability of the Proposed Snowplay Area at #15			
133	Winter	15	It would also be nice if parking could be provided at 5A for the snow play area #15. It would greatly increase use of the play area.
189	Winter	2, 15	It is not necessary to have 2 snowplay areas in such close proximity to each other. Snowplay area #15 is much less desirable than #2. #15 is proposed to be located directly adjacent to the future Snowcreek VIII 4-5 star hotel which is not an appropriate adjacent use to a Mountain Hotel of that caliber. This use would destroy the view of the Sherwins from hotel rooms and hotel common areas. Additionally, the location at #15 is much more difficult to access for children and families than #2 as it is a long distance away from the Burrow pit staging area (#1) through difficult terrain. Snowplay area #2 is directly adjacent to the burrow pit staging area (#1), proposed parking, and also typically has better snow conditions and terrain for sledding.
271	Winter	15	This are may be to close to the residents of Snowcreek V and the "run-out" area at the bottom may be very small. There are existing fences that would need to be considered also. The #2 area may better serve the snowplay needs.
Winter Concern 5: Re-evaluate Feasibility of Grooming Proposal for #9 and #10			
16	Winter	9a , 10a	The area is so windblown, the cost of maintaining any trail system in this area will be substantial.
Winter Concern 6: Expand Grooming on the #9a			
70	Winter	9a	Why not plan to groom the entire 9A loop? Sherwin skier/boarders may cause damage to the grooming but I think the impact would ultimately be ltd, and may help to focus down hill traffic on their way out. TO have a loop to x-country/walk etc. makes for a much more use friendly/enjoyable experience etc.
Winter Concern 7: Consider Phased Implementation of Old Mammoth Road Winter Closure Trailhead Parking			
245	Winter	OMR/Minaret area	There could be an opportunity for some public along the street parking for winter use with a minimal amount of widening as an interim option.





Dog Concerns

Include a Dedicated, Year-Round, Enclosed Dog Park			
140	Winter/ Summer	W10b, S22	Make an enclosed dog park so they have a dedicated place for animals to run without a leash.
Provide a Clear Recommendation for a Year-Round Dog Leash Policy			
270	Winter	9b	Off leash dogs should be limited to one area and to allow off leash dogs within a trail network is very hard to manage and police voice compliance. Some people would prefer that dogs be on leashes to limit dog/people conflicts and help keep the dogs close to the owners when the blue bags are needed.
345	Winter	9b	All staging areas should be leash required. Sierra Meadows should be leash-free ...
74		2, 10b	Snow play and dogs go together.
211	Both	S, W	Please ensure that recommendations for pets are consistent across the seasonal recommendations



**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
 Community Feedback Review Team Meeting Sign-In Sheet (10/08/09)**

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	<i>Malcolm Clark</i>
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	ARRIVED LATE (KS)
Stacey	Crockett	High Sierra Equestrian Club	<i>Stacey Crockett</i>
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	ARRIVED LATE (KS)
Hans	Ludwig		<i>Hans Ludwig</i>
Ron	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	<i>Ron Malm</i>
Chuck	Megivern		<i>Chuck Megivern</i>
Clayton	Mendel		<i>Clayton Mendel</i>
Jennifer	Noerdlinger		<i>Jennifer Noerdlinger</i>
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	
Terry	Plum	Tamarack Street homeowner/area property owner	<i>Terry Plum</i>
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	<i>Stephanie A. Wolff</i>
PARTNERS			
Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	✓
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	✓
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	<i>Kimberly Stravers</i>

STREUBER SPRENGEL JMWL

SWG Full-Group Meeting #7

October 13, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting agenda
2. USFS Feedback Primer
3. SWG FAQ
4. Sign-in sheet
5. Photos

Sherwins Working Group

Meeting #7 (October 13, 2009, 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.)

Sierra Meadows Ranch (Old Sherwin's Restaurant)



Meeting Agenda 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

- 4:00–4:05** **Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping**
- Review of overall process status and progress, including acknowledgement of work done on preamble statement
 - Clarification of role of non-SWG participants at this point (if necessary)
- 4:05–4:10** **Meeting #6 Summary Discussion and FAQ Update**
- Meeting summary review and adoption
 - FAQ update from Forest Service
- 4:10–4:15** **Non-SWG Public Comments**
- 4:15–4:30** **Feedback Process Status/Review Process**
- Overview of results from feedback process
 - Report from October 8 sub-group meeting
 - Recommended process for addressing feedback received
- 4:30–5:30** **Small Group Work to Address Feedback**
- 3 groups to work separately to discuss/brainstorm how to revise proposal based on feedback received
 - 1 group to address winter OSV and dog issues
 - 2 groups to address summer issues
- 5:30–5:40** **Stretch Break**
- 5:40–6:40** **Small Group Report-Out**
- Each group to present recommendations for addressing key concerns from public feedback process
 - Goal is to reach consensus from SWG as to how to best address feedback



6:40–6:50

Activities Prior to Meeting #8 (date TBD)

- Who is willing and able to help with work reconciling decisions made this evening with proposal and maps?
- Scheduling of next sub-group meeting and steps to complete work (who/what/where/when)—ideally, 10/14–10/23
- Set date for next full SWG meeting (ideally, early November)
- Determine necessary steps to refine preamble statement

6:50–6:55

Non-SWG Public Comments

6:55–7:00

Meeting Wrap-Up

- Review of what has been decided
- Next steps/meeting schedule





Feedback: What to do about it? What to do with it? A quick primer

Prepared by Mike Schlafmann, USFS

You're about to leap into the process of reading through and sorting community feedback on your proposal. At this stage in your process it's easy to get upset, or take things personally, or even feel overwhelmed. After all, you've spent a lot of time over the last several months in discussion, on field trips, and on your own, thinking through your draft proposal and the supporting rationales, and now people are asking you to consider more or telling you they think you got it wrong.

Before we jump into a little background on processes we might use for sorting comments, it is important to take a step back and remember why you solicited feedback in the first place.

The fundamental reason to solicit feedback, from my perspective, is always to gain input that will improve the quality of your proposal. It is a chance to have a set of fresh eyes look over your work and help you improve it. It is an opportunity for you to check your facts, review your rationales, and make sure they lead to a quality decision. Soliciting feedback also:

- **Helps people feel heard.**
- **Helps build the credibility of your proposal.**
- **Helps you identify errors or omissions.**

It's important to stay focused on these positive outcomes from soliciting public feedback and to resist the temptation to make it personal and debate the validity of the feedback people are providing, or of the people who are providing it. Review of public feedback requires the Zen-like skill of mindfulness without attachment. You've got to read all the comments and consider them carefully, and you also have to stay focused and move on to using the input wisely.

So what do you do with all this input? Under most circumstances there are five options.

Comments can be used to:

- 1) Modify your proposal or make other small changes.**
- 2) Develop and consider new ideas not previously given serious consideration.**
- 3) Supplement, improve, or modify your rationales.**
- 4) Make factual corrections.**
- 5) Or you can explain why you are not responding to a given concern.**

Remember: A key purpose of feedback is to improve the quality of your decision. You are not going to respond to every comment. By respond, I mean act on the substance of the comment in one of the five ways described above.

To determine which comments warrant a detailed response, you will use some basic criteria. Oftentimes it's easier to figure out which comments do not warrant a detailed response.

Generally, the quality of your decision will not be improved by responding to comments that meet the following criteria. I offer paraphrased examples from real comments:

1) Statements of opinion, general comments, or position statements: Many people offer comments indicating either their support or dislike of a component of your proposal or the whole thing.

“I’ve enjoyed hiking in this area for several years.”

“Your proposal is right on track.”

“Keep areas open for snowmobiles.”

“I think cross-country skiing is more important than other winter activities.”

Unfortunately, they also often forget to tell you the all-important why—the rationale that would allow you to consider their input in the context of how you might modify or change your proposal.

2) Outside the scope of the decision: Sometimes people don’t have a clear understanding of the scope of the proposal, or they choose to comment on items that are clearly not part of the proposal.

“The Shady Rest Trailhead needs to be improved.”

“An OSV connection should be provided from Shady Rest to the Sherwin Area.”

“Implement fees for uphill rides for snowboarders.”

“A motorized corridor should be provided in case Snowcreek 8 decides to rent snowmobiles in the future.”

Comments are outside the scope when they address a different geographic area than the study area, propose changes to the proposal that may already be decided by law or regulations, or propose changes in response to a speculative future condition.

3) Already addressed by law, regulation, or policy: People may suggest changes to your proposal that are outside your ability to recommend, much less implement. This criteria may not apply all that often to your proposal and is similar to the idea of outside-the-scope comments.

“More motorized events should be held at the motocross racetrack.”

“Require dog owners to pick up after their pets.”

Both the number of motorized events at the motocross racetrack and a requirement for disposal of dog waste are decisions that have already been made and are addressed by existing law, regulations, or policy.

4) Raise an issue better addressed through another decision process: Sometime people bring up concerns that are better addressed at a different scale or in a different process.

“Provide a site-specific design plan for the gravel pit trailhead.”

“You should seriously consider the area for future gondolas or ski lifts.”

Since the SWG did not address site-specific design, it would likely not be appropriate to decide to do so at this point. Regardless, it is clear that site-specific design will be considered during the next phase.



It is important to note that these criteria are not mutually exclusive. The objective of this kind of process is not to figure out which criteria are the best; a comment may meet several. The objective is to separate those comments that do warrant a detailed response from those that do not warrant a detailed response.

Remember, the objective is to identify those comments that will help improve the quality of the decision!

Here is an easier way to get your head around these criteria, and maybe an easier way to sort the comments. When your reading comments, ask the questions: Can we do something about it? Did we do something about it? Should we do something about it? For right now just focus on the first two; the last question helps get at the process we'll engage in on October 13.

Can we do something to address the concern?

Is it within scope?

Is it within our authority?

Is this the right process within which to consider it?

Did we do something to address the concern?

Did we consider it and address it in our rationale?

Should we do something to address the concern?

Would it improve the decision?

Does it better address the issues we were resolving?

Does it identify a new opportunity or constraint?

Here are some examples:

“You should seriously consider the area for future gondolas or ski lifts.”

Is this something SWG can do? Probably not; it's outside the scope, it exceeds SWG's charter for looking at trails, and this may not be the right process for considering ski lifts.

“Provide access corridors for snowmobiles with restrictions on speed.”

Can SWG consider this idea? Probably yes; it's within the scope of the work SWG is doing and it's the right process for considering this kind of idea.

Did SWG consider this idea already? I remember SWG looked at corridors and talked about noise and speed restrictions and concluded we were more concerned about an inability to enforce these kinds of regulations.

“Consider restrictions on time and days of use for snowmobiles to allow continued OSV use while minimizing impacts.”



Can SWG consider this idea? Probably yes; it's within the scope of the work SWG is doing and it's the right process for considering this kind of idea.

Did SWG consider this idea already? I remember SWG looked at corridors and talked about noise and speed restrictions, but I don't recall SWG discussing restrictions on days of use as a means for reducing impacts.

Should SWG consider this idea? Well, we had concerns about enforcement; restrictions on days of use might be more enforceable. Even if we decide not to propose restrictions on days of use for snowmobiles, it is worth considering and will improve the quality of whatever decision we make.

Task for October 8, 2009

Your task for Thursday is to review the public feedback and sort it into those comments that warrant a detailed response, the ones that will be carried forward to the full SWG on October 13.

There are many comments that ask questions, request clarification, or point out an error or omission. In general we will not be spending a lot of time on these comments. Don't worry, they won't be lost, but for right now we need to focus on those comments that could result in a change to the SWG proposal.

Before the meeting, please:

- 1. Read or at least skim through all the comments in the table provided by MLTPA. Please do not judge or try to sort comments the first time you read them. Do start to think about how you might organize them.**
- 2. Take a look at the example I am providing of how I sorted comments related to snowmobiles. Our end result on Thursday will look something like this, but for the full range of topics.**
- 3. Once you have read through the comments and taken a look at the example I am providing, take another look at the table provided by MLTPA and jot down what you think the eight or nine key issues are that the SWG will need to respond to on the 13th.**





Frequently Asked Questions About the Sherwins Working Group (SWG) Proposal

How did the SWG consider all the different uses and interests in the Sherwins area?

- The SWG took time to consider existing and historic uses of the Sherwins area as well as opportunities for new uses. In some cases the SWG identified opportunities or proposed future uses that differed from past practice to address resource and social concerns.
- The SWG recognizes that there is limited quantifiable data reflecting recreational uses in the Sherwins area and focused its review and proposal development on anticipated future needs.
- The SWG process and meetings were all open to the public and a diversity of interests and groups were reflected at each meeting.
- When specific interests were not represented directly at a given meeting, care, time, and consideration were taken to attempt to address all potential interests and needs within the scope of the Sherwins area.

Why didn't the SWG address motorcycle use of the motocross track?



- Some issues were outside the scope of the SWG effort. For example, the Forest Service made it clear that use of the Mammoth Motocross Track for motocross events is governed by the Environmental Analysis and Decision Notice authorizing the current summer events. Therefore, the SWG only considered uses of the Mammoth Motocross Track other than for motocross races.

Why didn't the SWG address the cost and design details of their proposal?


- Cost, maintenance requirements, and site-specific trail design details were not addressed by the SWG. This was intentional and aimed at ensuring that the proposal was based on needs and opportunities rather than a pre-determined budget or pre-determined outcome. Cost and design will be addressed as part of the process of prioritizing the proposal for implementation.



**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #7 Sign-In Sheet (10/13/09)**

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Brent	Allen	Eastern Sierra 4WD Club	
John	Armstrong	Eastside Velo (President)	present (KS)
Jim	Barnes		
Pete	Beck		
Phyllis	Benham	Mammoth Nordic	Phyllis Benham
Brigitte	Berman	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Secretary)	
Ryan	Berry		
Rachel	Bowman	Mammoth Base Camp at Sierra Meadows Ranch (owner)	
Lesley	Bruns		present (KS)
Jon	Carlton		
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	
Sharon	Clark		
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	
Stacey	Crockett	High Sierra Equestrian Club	
Forrest	Cross	ESAC	
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area Mountain Bike Organization (MAMBO)	
Alex	Fabbro	395 Fat Tire Council	
Ali	Feinberg		
Karen	Ferrell-Ingram	Eastern Sierra Land Trust	
Dave	Geirman	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Nate	Greenberg		
Jennifer	Heintzelman		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #7 Sign-In Sheet (10/13/09)**

Thom	Heller	Mammoth Lakes Fire Protection District	Thom Heller
Mark	Hendrickson	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Zach	Hickman		
April	Holly		
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	
Doug	Jung	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Andrew	Kastor	High Sierra Striders (president)	
Martin	Kleinbard		
Kraig	Kupiec		
Chad	Lande	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jesse	Langley	Cardinal Investments (The Sherwin)	
Dave	Laverty	Triad/Holmes Associates	
Julien	Lecorps		
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	arrived late (KS)
Hans	Ludwig		present (KS)
Ron	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	
Mike	McKenna	Hot Creek Hatchery Foundation (Board member)	
Chuck	Megivern		
Clayton	Mendel		
Marshall	Minobe	Mobility Commission	
Andrew	Murphy		
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	
Tammy	Nguyen	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	present (KS)
Jennifer	Noerdlinger		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #7 Sign-In Sheet (10/13/09)**

Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	<i>m palchak</i>
Marge	Papp	Turner Propane	
Rebecca	Paranick- Poiset	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
J.	Parsons		
Terry	Plum	Tamarack Street homeowner/area property owner	<i>Terry Plum</i>
Monica	Prelle		
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Cory	Rice	Wave Rave Snowboard Shop	
Jennifer	Roeser	McGee Creek Pack Station	
Brandon	Russell		
Bill	Sauser	Mammoth Snowmobile Association/TOML Tourism & Recreation Commission	
Patty	Schwartzkopf	Tamarack Street homeowner	<i>present (18)</i>
Steve	Schwind		
Elaine	Smith	High Sierra Striders	
Jim	Smith	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
Joel	St. Marie		
Barbara	Stefanides		
Dave	Stefanides		
Autumn	Talsky	Mammoth Mountaineering Supply/Alpine Approach	
Bill	Taylor		
John	Teller		
Tim	Villanueva	Bardini Foundation	

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #7 Sign-In Sheet (10/13/09)**

John	Walter	Advocates for Mammoth	
Chris	Walters		
Jon	Watson	Far West Ski Association	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	<i>Will</i>
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	
Gene	Zeiner		

PARTNERS

Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	<i>present (ES)</i>
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	<i>present (ES)</i>
Jon	Kazmierski	USFS: GIS Specialist	<i>present (ES)</i>
Austin	McInerney	Center for Collaborative Planning	<i>present (ES)</i>
Danna	Stroud	TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director	<i>present (ES)</i>
Steve	Speidel	TOML: Principal Planner	<i>present (ES)</i>
Mark	Wardlaw	TOML: Community Development Department Director	
Jen	Daugherty	TOML: Assistant Planner	
Jim	Miller	Turner Propane	
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	<i>present (ES)</i>
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	<i>Kimberly A. Stravers</i>

Heather deBethizy Mono County Planning hdebethizy@mono.ca.gov



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_101.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_008.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_117.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_120.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_133.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_139.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_157.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_189.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_279.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_293.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_403.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_457.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_467.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_515.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_548.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_580.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_684.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved




SWG_2009_10_13_mtng07_701.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved

Narrative Reconciliation Sub-Group Meetings #1, #2, and #3
October 21, 2009
October 22, 2009
October 27, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. SWG Summer Narrative with map (Group Revised Draft, October 28, 2009)
2. SWG Winter Narrative with map (Group Revised Draft, October 28, 2009)
3. Draft SWG Preamble
4. Sign-in sheet, October 21¹
5. Sign-in sheet, October 27

¹ A sign-in sheet for the October 22, 2009, meeting does not exist.



SUMMER NARRATIVE

Group Revised Draft
October 28, 2009



Map ID #

Description

1

CONCEPT: Major multi-use staging area at the borrow pit

This will be the primary staging area for the Sherwins area and therefore the most developed. Facilities will include parking, bathrooms, an education/interpretive area, and signage. Additionally, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Maintenance Level on Sherwin Creek Road would need to be changed to allow off-highway vehicles (OHV) to travel eastbound along the entire length of Sherwin Creek Road to Highway 395 (across both USFS and Department of Water and Power [DWP] land) to access appropriate OHV routes. This staging area will be open year-round (see Winter Map ID #1) to all users and will be served by public transit (see Summer Map ID #28).

RATIONALE: This area has traditionally been, and continues to be, a popular staging area for recreationists. The tank-farm facility to be built by Turner Propane at the borrow pit offers several opportunities to create a major staging area in this location: Sherwin Creek Road will require conversion to a hardened surface from its intersection with Old Mammoth Road to the borrow pit, which will provide for improved vehicular travel; construction of the tank farm will allow the staging area to be situated in an already-disturbed location; and future water infrastructure for the tank farm may be usable for bathrooms at the staging area. An education/interpretive area would be an excellent addition to this staging area due to the expected high volume of users.

OHV use is currently prohibited in open areas and on some routes within the Sherwins area, including much of Sherwin Creek Road. Changing the USFS Maintenance Level on Sherwin Creek Road will allow OHV users to ride directly from the borrow pit staging area and then along Sherwin Creek Road to routes open to them in the east without needing to stage farther down the road.

NOTE: Maintenance Levels are defined by the USDA Forest Service Handbook as the level of service and maintenance for a specific road. When roads are maintained, Maintenance Levels must be consistent with road-management objectives and maintenance criteria.



Map ID #	Description
2	<p>CONCEPT: Non-motorized trailhead at Tamarack Street Develop an ADA-accessible non-motorized trailhead at the end of Tamarack Street. Facilities will be limited to signage and the creation of three to six parking spaces, at least one of which will be an ADA-only spot. This trailhead will be open year-round to non-motorized use only (see Winter Map ID #5c) and is intended to serve as a secondary, neighborhood-centric access/egress point</p> <p>RATIONALE: Tamarack Street is an access/egress point popular with neighborhood residents and others. Improving the site with parking and signage will increase ease of use and accessibility while respecting the private-property owner. Formalizing it as a trailhead creates an important link within the stacked-looped trail system in the meadow (see Summer Map ID #7). This trailhead will provide an alternate access/egress point for non-motorized users, including equestrians, wishing total separation from OHV staging at the borrow pit staging area and will primarily serve neighborhood residents. This trailhead is intended to support a relatively low volume of users as compared to formal staging areas such as the borrow pit, Mill City, and the Lake Mary Road winter closure, which will help to keep traffic levels low in the neighborhood and alleviate safety concerns of residents regarding increased traffic on this narrow street.</p> <p>NOTE: The private-property owner's future development plans will influence the exact location of this trailhead as well as potential usage, signage, and parking, but also may provide opportunity for site improvement concurrent with private construction.</p>
3	<p>CONCEPT: Formal non-motorized access/egress point at Snowcreek VIII Formalize the access/egress point at Snowcreek VIII as identified in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan. Facilities will be limited to signage and the area will be served by public transit (see Summer Map ID #28). This point will be open year-round to non-motorized users only (see Winter Map ID #5a).</p> <p>RATIONALE: Formalization of this access/egress point will allow residents of, and visitors to, the Snowcreek VIII development access to the borrow pit staging area, the stacked-loop trail system (Summer Map ID #7), and other amenities and destinations nearby, such as Cerro Coso Community College and the Mammoth Lakes Library, while also allowing users to travel through Snowcreek VIII to visit the planned hotel and retail amenities.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Summer Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #

Description

CONCEPT: Multi-use staging area at Mill City

Develop a multi-use staging area at Mill City, located at the Old Mammoth Road winter closure. Facilities will include signage, expanded parking, and bathrooms. This staging area will be open year-round to non-motorized use (see Winter Map ID #6) and will be served by public transit (see Summer Map ID #28).

4

RATIONALE: This facility will provide an alternative to the borrow pit staging area, which will relieve pressure on the main parking/staging areas at the eastern end of the Sherwins and provide an alternate access/egress point to the Sherwins area for non-motorized users wishing total separation from OHV staging. It also will provide additional staging opportunities for the Lakes Basin, Mammoth Rock Trail's western endpoint, and Panorama Vista Trail/Panorama Dome Trail's eastern endpoints. An adequate turnaround for public transit will need to be constructed at this location, but transit availability will reduce overcrowding at parking areas and supports the Town of Mammoth Lakes' General Plan vision of public-transit mobility.



Map ID #

Description

CONCEPT: Soft-surface non-mechanized connector from the Hidden Lake meadow to the Mill City staging area (Summer Map ID #4 and Summer Map ID #16), Panorama Dome, and the Lakes Basin.

Articulate a soft-surface non-motorized connector between the Mill City staging area and the stacked-loop system present within the Hidden Lake meadow on the west end of the Sherwins area (see Summer Map ID #8). The connector will be signed to indicate the level of difficulty and will also connect to La Verne Street, possibly via an existing drainage easement. The trail will be articulated beneath the winter trail where possible (see below and Winter Map ID #7) and will be open to non-mechanized use year-round.

The trail will follow this rough alignment: Beginning in the Hidden Lake meadow, the trail will head up the south side of The Bluffs through the manzanita, gain the ridge along the firebreak, present a spur to the proposed Mill City staging area, and continue to the west end of the Mammoth Rock Trail.

5a

RATIONALE: This connector satisfies an existing need to provide efficient, marked travel between the popular Lakes Basin amenities and the frequently used meadow at the west end of the Sherwins that avoids conflict with mountain bikes for hikers and equestrians. This feature will provide an important link directly into the stacked-loop trail system (see Summer Map ID #8) and also will allow equestrians and hikers a bike-free alternative to using the Mammoth Rock Trail to access the Lakes Basin. Signage and trail construction (a series of tight switchbacks) will be designed to deter “poaching” by downhill mountain bikers.

The specific routing of this trail offers the following benefits: avoidance of the steep existing drainage; spectacular views; good sun exposure, which will allow more rapid snowmelt and therefore early access in the spring; reduction of visual impact via placement in manzanita; and connection to the safe crossing at Old Mammoth Road (see Summer Map ID #15), the Mill City staging area (see Summer Map ID #4), the Tamarack Street trailhead (see Summer Map ID #2), and the Mammoth Rock Trail. Additionally, the trail’s aspect allows the ridge to be gained using only three or four switchbacks, which will make construction easier and result in a gentler, more user-friendly grade.



Map ID #

Description

5b

CONCEPT: Parallel soft-surface non-motorized connections—one on the north side of Old Mammoth Road, one on the south side—from the Old Mammoth Road safe crossing (Summer Map ID #15) to the intersection of Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road

Develop a set of parallel soft-surface non-motorized trail connections between the Old Mammoth Road safe crossing and the road’s intersection with Lake Mary Road. Facilities will be limited to signage. One connection will be open to all non-motorized use, and its complement will be open to non-mechanized use only.

RATIONALE: Routing these connections along Old Mammoth Road will offer the following benefits: quick snowmelt due to aspect, and therefore early spring accessibility; reduction of visual impact via placement in manzanita; existing topography and vegetation require less-intensive development; good views; avoidance of boggy/wet areas and dense stands of lodgepole pine and aspen; historical/interpretive opportunities as the trails pass through the Mammoth City site; and increased user safety via the off-road location. Additionally, creation of parallel trails will mitigate potential user conflict between equestrians, hikers, and mountain bikers as well as trail deterioration from heavy multiple use.

The trail on the north side of Old Mammoth Road will connect users to the Lake Mary Road Bike Path, crossing Lake Mary Road and encouraging use of that path and the Mammoth Lakes Trail System as a continuous system. The connection to the trail at Summer Map ID #26 encourages and makes accessible recreation and vista opportunities at and near Mammoth Rock. Facilities will be limited to signage, and the Lake Mary Road Bike Path connector will be closed to equestrians.

NOTE: Further study is needed to determine an optimal road-crossing for equestrians.



Map ID #	Description
5c	<p>CONCEPT: Soft-surface pedestrian and bike connections from the intersection of Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road to the Lake Mary Road Bike Path Develop surface-appropriate, safe connections for hikers and mountain bikers who wish to access the new Lake Mary Road Bike Path from the Sherwins area.</p> <p>RATIONALE: Currently there are no formal, safe points of connection between the new, paved multi-use Lake Mary Road Bike Path and the intersection of Lake Mary Road and Old Mammoth Road. Providing these connections will increase safety by avoiding user presence on Lake Mary Road and will encourage use of the new bike path, which connects into the larger, paved Mammoth Lakes Trail System.</p>
6	<p>CONCEPT: Hard-surface or paved non-motorized connector from the borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Creek Park East at the bridge Develop a hard-surface or paved ADA-compliant multi-use path (MUP) from the borrow pit staging area to the bridge at Mammoth Creek Park East. Specific routing will take users from the borrow pit staging area, east of the USFS stables, and deliver them to a connection with the existing MUP at Mammoth Creek Park East. This connector can route beneath the winter alignment (see Winter Map ID #10) and will be open to non-motorized use only. The exact surface is to be determined.</p> <p>RATIONALE: This trail will encourage and facilitate use of Mammoth Creek Park East as an alternate staging area and provide connectivity between the park, the borrow pit staging area, the stacked-loop trail system, and formal access/egress points along the meadow's northern boundary. Routing of the trail as described above will increase user safety by keeping users separated from Sherwin Creek Road and Old Mammoth Road traffic, enhance the user experience by presenting less noise and visual impact (vehicular traffic), mitigate potential conflict with the two stock operations in the area (primarily Sierra Meadows Equestrian Center), and provide a direct connection to an existing portion of the Mammoth Lakes Trail System that leads to the Mammoth Lakes Library, Cerro Coso Community College, and other destinations. The park-side endpoint of this connection also will facilitate easier access to the Hayden Cabin (Summer Map ID #25), which presents historical opportunities and can increase visitor traffic to this amenity.</p> <p>NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #25.</p>



Map ID #

Description

CONCEPT: Non-motorized “backbone” trail connections from the borrow pit staging area to the Tamarack Street trailhead

Articulate two separate non-motorized routes that connect the borrow pit staging area to the Tamarack Street trailhead and also connect into the summertime stacked-loop trail system (see Summer Map ID #8). The hard-surface or paved trail will be ADA-accessible and will be aligned over the existing USFS 4S100 road, which will require closure to motorized use. Construction should accommodate service- and maintenance-vehicle access to Kerry Meadow for special events such as weddings. The complementary trail will be soft surface and aligned over the existing trail to the south, near the base of the Sherwins. Accommodation of equestrian use will be included in the design process, which may include an equestrian-only bridle path. Environmentally appropriate trail design is critical. These trails will be open to non-motorized use only, with specific use dependent on trail surface.

7

RATIONALE: Accommodating multiple uses is important to the diverse Mammoth Lakes community, and providing one hard-surface trail and one soft-surface trail that link the borrow pit staging area to the Tamarack Street trailhead and the greater stacked-loop trail system allows users a choice of experience. The hard-surface or paved trail will enable disabled users and those desiring a compacted surface to enjoy the Sherwins area. It also will provide direct connections to other points on the Mammoth Lakes Trail System by way of the Tamarack Street trailhead, the Snowcreek VIII access/egress point, and the borrow pit staging area. The soft-surface trail allows equestrians who have property on Tamarack Street to cross the meadow and access the borrow pit staging area and beyond, or to head up to the Lakes Basin if coming from the east. It also furthers connectivity for mountain bikers and hikers and discourages use-trail proliferation by providing an easy, clear route. The meadow area is flat and open, which provides excellent visibility for equestrians, hikers, and mountain bikers sharing the soft-surface trail and can help curb user conflict and increase user safety. Proper trail engineering will allow for restoration of the wet meadows by closing other, less-sustainable use trails. Ensuring continued, though modified, access to Kerry Meadow will sustain special-event business there and also offer interpretive opportunities.

NOTE: The exact alignment of the backbone trails has not yet been determined, but will be positioned to avoid possible conflict with golf balls hit from the nearby fairway.



Map ID #

Description

8

CONCEPT: Non-motorized stacked-loop trail system in the meadow

Articulate a stacked-loop trail system from the borrow pit staging area, along the base of the Sherwins to the Tamarack Street trailhead, and back to the borrow pit staging area. Facilities will include signage. The southern half of the perimeter trail of this system will be soft surface; the northern half will be hard surface or paved (see Summer Map ID #7). The entire system will be open to non-motorized use only. An equestrian crossing across Bodle Ditch will be necessary.

RATIONALE: To improve the existing non-motorized opportunities in the meadow, a “stacked-loop” or “nested” trail system will be created to offer multiple route and surface options to a variety of summer users. The primary section of trail, out from which the smaller, nested loops will branch, will connect to the access points identified in Summer Map ID #2 and #3 via the hard-surface or paved northern half of the loop, providing consistent and easy access/egress across the area to the loop system, the borrow pit staging area, and points of connection farther north and east. Creating a soft-surface southern half will provide an option for equestrians unable to use a hard-surface or paved trail as well as those seeking a more “wild” or “natural” experience.

NOTE: The possibility of adding a hiking-only trail around the meadow should be considered.

NOTE: Mammoth Community Water District needs for access to Hidden Lake will be considered and coordinated with the design process.

Sherwins Working Group: Summer Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #

Description

9a

CONCEPT: Convert existing USFS roads 4S104 and 4S110 to non-motorized use

Convert existing USFS roads 4S104 and 4S110, at the eastern end of the study area, to non-motorized use only. The routes run roughly from Sherwin Creek Road north to just short of Mammoth Creek.

RATIONALE: The existing roads are currently open to motorized use but lack connectivity to other motorized opportunities and experience minimal use. The conversion would help to protect the existing mule deer habitat in the area, which is a tourism amenity (to see deer on the trail is a unique experience). Additionally, this road is part of the existing Sierra Meadows Ranch lease-area trail inventory.

NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #10 and #11.

QUESTION: Should the area through which these existing roads run be open or closed to mountain bikes?

Sherwins Working Group: Summer Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #

Description

9b

CONCEPT: Non-motorized stacked-loop trail system located in the eastern portion of the Sherwins study area

Develop a trail system based on existing trails in the area that will address the needs of visitors who go on day rides, equestrians who board both long- and short-term at Sierra Meadows Equestrian Center, as well as those who use the trails for hiking, running, biking, and dog walking. Trails will be designed and maintained as equestrian-preferred, but will remain open to all non-motorized users.

RATIONALE: This trail system has traditionally been and continues to be used by both locals and out-of-town visitors who enjoy this area. The trails represent a stacked-loop system that offers the opportunity for users to walk their dogs, hike, run, mountain bike, and horseback ride. The stacked loops provide for great variety in length of experience and can be used in different directions and configurations, such as figure eights, to enhance enjoyment of the area. The trail system provides essential connectivity between Sierra Meadows Equestrian Center and other system trails, including the Mammoth Rock and Sherwin Lakes trails.

Additionally, designing the trails as equestrian-preferred provides an opportunity for a safe equestrian experience for novice riders and children. For the most part, the trails are on relatively gentle terrain over soils that are soft and sandy and provide excellent line of sight, minimizing the potential for conflict with other users.

Sherwins Working Group: Summer Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #

Description

10

CONCEPT: Soft-surface non-motorized connector from the borrow pit staging area across Mammoth Creek to Shady Rest Park

Develop a soft-surface non-motorized trail connector from the borrow pit staging area across Mammoth Creek and on to Shady Rest Park. The trail would run adjacent to Sherwin Creek Road to Sherwin Creek Campground, then head east to the footbridge and northwest toward Mammoth Community Water District and the existing MUP system leading to Shady Rest Park. Facilities will include signage and doggie-bag stations along the main trail. Improvements to the existing footbridge or a new creek crossing will need to be built. This trail would be open to non-motorized use only; once clear of the borrow pit staging area, dogs may be off-leash if under voice control.

RATIONALE: This trail achieves connectivity between two heavily used recreation areas without forcing users onto Old Mammoth Road, which improves user safety and the user experience by avoiding traffic hazards, visual impact, and noise. This trail allows dog owners to walk their pets leash-free and provides clear sightlines between equestrian users in the area and mountain bikers on the trail, reducing potential safety hazards and user conflict. The creek crossing will be simple and minimal, such as a flat log crossing, to reduce cost, and signage indicating a “slow zone” will further assist with user-conflict mitigation and safety concerns.

NOTE: Both the crossing at Highway 203 and the side of Sherwin Creek Road on which the trail will be aligned have yet to be determined.

NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #9.



Map ID #

Description

11

CONCEPT: Soft-surface non-motorized trails along Mammoth Creek

Consolidate the multiple use-trails along Mammoth Creek into two parallel system trails: the north-bank trail will be open to all non-motorized use, while the south-bank trail will be designated as non-mechanized. Each trail will begin from Mammoth Creek Park East and head east toward Sierra Meadows Equestrian Center.

RATIONALE: Consolidation of the many existing use-trails into two clearly signed routes on either side of the creek will allow for rehabilitation of the creek's banks and will prevent further proliferation of social trails. Creating one trail that permits bikes and one that prohibits them allows users a choice of experience and to avoid potential conflict with other trail users. Situating the trails on opposite sides of the creek will assist with enforcement of use restrictions; further, the trail on the north side of the creek can link directly into the connector trail to Shady Rest Park (Summer Map ID #10). Additionally, the north-side trail provides connectivity for bicycles from the park to Hayden Cabin, a point of historical interest (Summer Map ID #25).

NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #9, #10, and #25.

12a

CONCEPT: Non-motorized staging area at the Lake Mary Road winter closure

Develop a formal non-motorized staging area at the Lake Mary Road winter closure, east of Lake Mary Road and above the bridge. Facilities will include signage and parking. The staging area will be open to non-motorized use year-round (see Winter Map ID #16). The Panorama Vista Trail would be rerouted to start from this staging area (see Summer Map ID #12b), and a safe crossing at the staging area itself would need to be constructed. This staging area will be served by public transit (see Summer Map ID #28).

RATIONALE: This staging area will relieve existing pressure on the current Lake Mary Road parking used to access the Sherwins, Panorama Dome, and other Lakes Basin recreation amenities, as well as on the Mill City staging area. It also will help to eliminate pullout parking that is currently happening along Lake Mary Road (a high-traffic, high-speed road). The safe crossing could include use of a four-way stop at the intersection, speed bumps, and diagonal parking along the staging area, which could also slow traffic.

NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #5b, #5c, #12b, #14, #15, and #17.



Map ID #

Description

CONCEPT: Soft-surface non-motorized trail connecting the Lake Mary Road staging area to the Panorama Vista Trail, Panorama Dome Trail, and the Lake Mary Road Bike Path

Develop a soft-surface non-motorized trail that connects from the end of the Lake Mary Road Bike Path at the bridge and continues on the east side of the road to connect to Panorama Dome Trail. Realign the northern end of Panorama Vista Trail to parallel the road, with a connection to the Lake Mary Road winter closure staging area and the south end of the trail. Build a bridge that connects the Lake Mary Road Bike Path to the soft-surface trail described here. This would be constructed on the east side of the existing bridge where the Lake Mary Road Bike Path currently ends.

12b

RATIONALE: User safety will be increased by keeping users off of Old Mammoth Road. Panorama Vista Trail realignment will eliminate use of the dangerous southern end of the trail at its intersection with Lake Mary Road. The bridge will allow bike-path users to utilize the safe crossing to the Lake Mary Road winter closure staging area (see Summer Map ID #12a). The trail connection will connect users in the lower Sherwins area and Panorama Dome with the Lake Mary Road Bike Path as well as provide safe and accessible connectivity between the Lakes Basin, Mammoth Mountain Ski Area (MMSA) Bike Park, and Panorama Dome.

NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #5b, #5c, #12a, #14, #15, and #17.

CONCEPT: Soft-surface non-motorized connector from the borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Rock Trail

Develop a soft-surface non-motorized connector trail from the Mammoth Rock Trail to the south side of the borrow pit staging area. Design concerns may necessitate rehabilitation of the two existing use-trails into one system trail that connects to the existing road on the south side of the borrow pit.

13

RATIONALE: This connection will enable users, particularly mountain bikers, to exit the Mammoth Rock Trail and make a direct connection to the Mammoth Creek Park East connector trail (see Summer Map ID #6) and the larger Mammoth Lakes Trail System, or to one of the two “backbone” trails connecting the borrow pit staging area to the Tamarack Street trailhead (see Summer Map ID #7). Consolidation of the two existing use-trails will reduce visual impact. This connection will deliver users from Mammoth Rock Trail directly into the borrow pit staging area, which is a major node featuring an array of facilities.



Map ID #	Description
14	<p>CONCEPT: Soft-surface non-motorized connector from the Mill City staging area to the end of the Panorama Vista Trail Improve and formalize the existing use-trail or build a new soft-surface non-motorized trail to connect the system trail at Mill City to the end of the Panorama Vista Trail at the Mill City staging area. This trail will be open to non-motorized use only.</p> <p>RATIONALE: This trail connects the MMSA Bike Park, Lake Mary Road Bike Path, and Panorama Dome Trail back to town without needing to take Mammoth Rock Trail or create downhill traffic on the Lake Mary Road Bike Path, which will improve user safety and relieve some pressure on Mammoth Rock Trail. It creates the opportunity for a firebreak on Panorama Dome, creates an option for trail users to stay off of Old Mammoth Road, and eliminates some road crossings, also contributing to increased user safety. This trail provides connectivity to the larger Mammoth Lakes Trail System and public transit via the Mill City staging area, and also connects to and presents interpretive opportunities at the Mill City historical site.</p>
15	<p>CONCEPT: Old Mammoth Road soft-surface non-motorized safe crossing Develop a soft-surface non-motorized safe crossing of Old Mammoth Road. A trail would be built roughly from the western entrance of Mammoth Rock Trail and stay on the uphill (south) side of Old Mammoth Road, utilizing a portion of the existing use trail/mine road, then turn parallel to the road and continue to the uppermost hairpin turn of Old Mammoth Road. Here the trail would cross just uphill (west) of the turn. The crossing will be open to non-motorized use only.</p> <p>RATIONALE: This crossing provides continuity of the soft-surface system described in Summer Map ID #14 and elsewhere in this proposal. It avoids having bikers cross Old Mammoth Road in a blind hairpin, as is the current configuration, thereby dramatically increasing public safety both for trail users and drivers. This is a safe crossing point because uphill traffic has a 180-degree turn to negotiate; therefore, traffic is slow and downhill traffic has a long straightaway on which to see oncoming cars or pedestrians. Cars are naturally slowing here in anticipation of the hairpin turn. Additionally, this crossing will minimize use of unsafe and over-utilized vehicular turnouts along Old Mammoth Road.</p> <p>NOTE: The exact alignment of the safe crossing is yet to be determined but could include a below-grade crossing.</p>

Map ID #

Description

16

CONCEPT: Soft-surface non-motorized connector from the Mill City staging area to the trail connecting it to the western end of the meadow (see Summer Map ID #5a) and Mammoth Rock Trail, with additional connectivity to La Verne Street

Develop a soft-surface non-motorized connector trail that will link into Mammoth Rock Trail and the meadow via the trail connection described in Summer Map ID #5a. This spur, which will be ADA-accessible, should be aligned with the identified existing use-trails/roads if possible and will include an ADA-accessible constructed overlook/scenic vista area. ADA access may terminate at the vista point.

A spur to La Verne Street should be developed as well. A trail to La Verne Street will provide neighborhood residents easy access to the larger trail system in the meadow as well as to the Lakes Basin. A La Verne Street spur alignment will require further study and will take into account private-property opportunities and constraints.

RATIONALE: This trail provides an essential, though short, link between the Mill City staging area and the trail that connects it to the meadow. As an ADA-accessible trail with a constructed scenic-overlook point, it will offer vista opportunities from The Bluffs to disabled users. This connection provides access to potential public transportation and to Mill City, which is a historic point of interest that has further connections to other area trails. Additionally, this alignment will take pedestrian and bicycle traffic off of Old Mammoth Road and help to minimize the use of unsafe roadside turnouts along Old Mammoth Road. There is good visibility in this area, which will help to prevent or mitigate conflict between users.



Map ID #	Description
17	<p>CONCEPT: Sherwin Ridge access from Mill City, Mammoth Rock Trail, and the meadow Construct a soft-surface non-motorized trail from Mammoth Rock Trail heading west, wrapping around the base of the Sherwins before connecting with the trail identified in Winter Map ID #17 to access the Sherwin Ridge.</p> <p>RATIONALE: This connection creates safe access to the existing Sherwin Ridge use trail during the summer by eliminating the need for parking on unsafe turnouts along Lake Mary Road. Users will be able to access the Sherwins from a variety of proposed facilities, including the historic Mill City site (which also presents interpretive opportunities), the Mammoth Rock Trail, the meadow, and the borrow pit staging area.</p> <p>The option to explore further connectivity from this trail back to the borrow pit staging area, Solitude Canyon, and other destinations will be addressed by a Solitude Canyon Study Group (see Summer Map ID #19).</p> <p>NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #19.</p>
18	<p>CONCEPT: Improved soft-surface non-motorized connector from Mammoth Rock Trail to proposed meadow loop trail (see Summer Map ID #8) Improve the existing trail connection that links the eastern section of Mammoth Rock Trail to the loop trail around the meadow (see Summer Map ID #8). The connector will be clearly delineated and marked as two-way (uphill and downhill), utilize the existing use-trail, which is currently in good shape except for the top portion, and will be open to non-motorized use only. Equestrian use will be accommodated per appropriate and sustainable design needs of the topography and terrain, which could include a second trail.</p> <p>RATIONALE: This connector will allow mountain bikers to exit the Mammoth Rock Trail before reaching the sandy eastern end (an undesirable soil type for mountain bikers) and can connect them via the backbone trails to the Tamarack Street trailhead (see Summer Map ID #7). This link will open up loop opportunities both within the Sherwins area and on Mammoth Lakes Trail System facilities accessible from the Tamarack Street trailhead and the borrow pit staging area. Making the trail two-way helps to prevent and mitigate user conflict between riders coming downhill at higher speeds and users traveling more slowly upslope.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Summer Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #	Description
19	<p>CONCEPT: Recommendation for further study/assessment of Solitude Canyon and Panorama Dome areas</p> <p>While no specific trail or facility recommendations are offered, further study of the Solitude Canyon and Panorama Dome areas should be undertaken to analyze opportunities for future trail access, connectivity, and development. Site-specific, community-based working groups should be formed to conduct these studies within the next 12 months.</p> <p>RATIONALE: Possibilities exist for connectivity from the Solitude Canyon area to Mammoth Rock Trail, the Lakes Basin, the motocross track area, and Sherwin Ridge. The motocross track area could be considered for a mountain bike–race staging area, which would offer an alternative to races at the MMSA Bike Park. Possibilities for connectivity also exist on Panorama Dome.</p> <p>NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #13 and #27.</p>
20	<p>OMITTED</p>
21	<p>CONCEPT: Summer biathlon course</p> <p>Develop a summer biathlon course in the motocross track area.</p> <p>RATIONALE: The motocross track is far enough away from the borrow pit staging area to avoid heavy use conflict. Potential conflict with mountain-bike races or the annual motocross event can be resolved with advance notice and scheduling.</p>
22	<p>CONCEPT: Dog-leash policy</p> <p>Dogs may be off-leash on soft-surface trails in the Sherwins area if under voice command. Dogs must be on-leash on hard-surface trails and at all trailheads and staging areas.</p> <p>RATIONALE: With leash policies at areas such as Horseshoe Lake and Shady Rest Park being increasingly enforced, dog owners should be offered an option to walk or exercise their pets without a leash. Requiring dogs to be under voice control will help to prevent conflict and safety hazards between users, as will an on-leash policy at trailheads and staging areas and on hard-surface trails, where use may be more concentrated.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Summer Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #	Description
23	OMITTED
24	<p>CONCEPT: Preservation of Old Mill site Develop a walking/interpretive trail at the Old Mill site. This trail will be limited to pedestrians and will be separated from the nearby bike path.</p> <p>RATIONALE: The Old Mill site offers many interpretive opportunities to explore the area's history. Limiting the path to foot traffic will allow visitors to enjoy and experience those opportunities without conflict with those on bikes or horses.</p>
25	<p>CONCEPT: Promote local historic elements at the Hayden Cabin Though no specific recommendations are being put forth at this time, it was agreed that interpretive opportunities at Hayden Cabin should be explored and expanded. Utility of the proposed connector from the borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Creek Park East at the bridge (Summer Map ID #6) should be considered in this assessment.</p> <p>RATIONALE: The Hayden Cabin is a unique historical point of interest in Mammoth Lakes and should be better promoted to visitors and residents. The current entrance, despite existing signage, is not intuitive, as several routes are present.</p> <p>NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #6, #9, #10, and #11.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Summer Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #	Description
26	<p>CONCEPT: Soft-surface non-motorized trail to Mammoth Rock Develop a soft-surface non-motorized trail to Mammoth Rock from the western end of Mammoth Rock Trail. Alignment should follow and/or improve the existing use-trails.</p> <p>RATIONALE: This area provides excellent views and incorporates one of the iconic features of the area and of the town; Mammoth Rock should be highlighted as a recreation destination and remain open to new recreation opportunities. Formalization of a trail will create a sustainable alignment where several use trails currently exist. This trail can also form a connection up and over the Sherwin Ridge to the improved Sherwins access trail that intersects with Lake Mary Road on the south side of the crest (see Summer Map ID #17), or over to Solitude Canyon.</p> <p>NOTE: Wildlife and view-shed preservation are concerns; this concept requires further study.</p> <p>NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #17 and #19.</p>
27	<p>OMITTED</p>
28	<p>CONCEPT: Public-transit stops near staging areas and trailheads Public-transit stops should be located within reasonable walking distance of the following staging areas and trailheads: the Mill City staging area; the borrow pit staging area; the Lake Mary Road winter closure staging area; and the Snowcreek VIII access/egress point (see also Winter Map ID #12).</p> <p>RATIONALE: Public-transit stops close to staging areas and trailheads will make it easy for those who do not have a vehicle available to them (or a driver's license) to access the Sherwins zone via formal access/egress points with facilities of some kind. Expanded routes support the Town of Mammoth Lakes' vision for public-transportation mobility and can help alleviate potential traffic congestion both on the roads and at the parking areas. Adding stops near these points also supports the area's internal connectivity (i.e., the stacked-loop system described in Summer Map ID #8) by enabling users to enter or exit from the location that is most desirable or convenient.</p> <p>NOTE: The turnaround for public transit at the Mill City staging area could be built at the same time that the parking area is expanded.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Summer Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #	Description
29	<p>CONCEPT: Soft-surface non-motorized connector from the borrow pit staging area to the Sherwin Lakes area</p> <p>Develop a soft-surface non-motorized connector from the borrow pit staging area east to the Sherwin Lakes area (non-preferred equestrian) that routes south of the motocross track.</p> <p>RATIONALE: This connection would provide a direct route to link into alternative non-motorized recreation experiences at and near the popular Sherwin Lakes area, as well as to Mammoth Rock Trail and Solitude Canyon, without incorporating the Sherwin Lakes trailhead as its endpoint.</p> <p>NOTE: The dashed line indicating Summer Map ID #29 on the map is not a specific proposal, but is a general concept to promote dialogue about this opportunity. The preferred route alignment is yet to be determined and requires further study.</p> <p>NOTE: Signage and trail engineering are important to executing this recommendation.</p> <p>NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #13 and #19,</p> <p>NOTE: Develop further study of Solitude Canyon using Summer Map ID #29 as primarily a bike- and hike-only trail continuing on and up to Solitude Canyon. Convene a Solitude Canyon Study Group to further explore opportunities in Solitude Canyon (see Map ID #17).</p> <p>NOTE: Maintain separate hiking/biking and equestrian facilities, including a hiker-only trail connecting to the existing Sherwin Lakes trail.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Summer Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #

Description


30

CONCEPT: Signage and wayfinding system

A comprehensive signage and wayfinding system should be installed throughout the study area, including educational and interpretive opportunities.

RATIONALE: A uniform and comprehensive signage and wayfinding system will enhance the user experience by providing specific information (trail length, degree of difficulty, etc.), more general information (overview of stacked-loop system, public-transit schedules, etc.), interpretive opportunities (anatomy of a meadow, mining-town history, etc.), and education that will assist with enforcement of policies (on- and off-leash areas, motorized/non-motorized use, etc.).

NOTE: See also Winter Map ID #13.



Proposals Without Map Representation: 20 22 28 30

SWG Summer Proposals

- 1 Summer Proposal ID's
- Bridge
- Change Road Maintenance to Allow OHV's
- Proposed Trails**
- Multiple Use Path
- Soft Surface Trail
- Proposed Staging**
- Multi-Use Staging Area
- Non-Motorized Staging Area
- Non-Motorized Trailhead

Disclaimer: Alignment and placement of data may not be exact.

EXISTING & NEAR TERM CONDITIONS LEGEND

Bridges	Adopted Multiple Use Paths	MMSA Bike Park Trails	Roads	Moto-x	Valentine Reserve	Snowcreek District Area	Town Urban Growth Boundary	Drainage Features
Existing Tunnels	Existing Multiple Use Paths	INF System Trails	Fences	INF Stable	Parcels	Parks/Open Spaces	Town Municipal Boundary	Streams
	Gates/Barriers/Closures	Tank Farm	Sierra Mdws Ranch	East OSCC NDP			Water Bodies	Cultural Historical Area

SHERWINS
WORKING
GROUP 2009

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

UAS Mammoth Lakes MLIPA R

WINTER NARRATIVE

Group Revised Draft
October 28, 2009



Map ID #

Description

1

CONCEPT: Major multi-use staging area at the borrow pit

This will be the primary staging area for the Sherwins area and therefore the most developed. Facilities, which will be shared between both parking areas (non-motorized at the southern end, motorized turnaround and/or parallel roadside parking at the northern end; see also Winter Map ID #3), will include bathrooms, a beacon basin/interpretive area, and signage. This staging area will be open year-round (see Summer Map ID #1) to all uses and will be served by public transit (see Winter Map ID #12).

RATIONALE: The tank-farm facility to be built by Turner Propane at the borrow pit offers several opportunities to create a major staging area in this location: Sherwin Creek Road will require conversion to a hardened surface from its intersection with Old Mammoth Road to the borrow pit, which must be plowed in the winter and therefore will provide for improved vehicular travel; construction of the tank farm will allow the staging area to be situated in an already-disturbed location; and future water infrastructure for the tank farm may be usable for bathrooms at the staging area. This area has traditionally been, and continues to be, a popular staging area for recreationists, as evidenced by existing winter conditions (crowded vehicle parking along Sherwin Creek Road). A beacon basin/interpretive area would be an excellent addition to this staging area due to the expected high volume of users.

Creating a separate parking area with over-snow vehicle (OSV)–specific design allows for separation of motorized and non-motorized staging, which mitigates noise and air pollution, reduces potential safety hazards and/or conflicts between snowmobiles and children, dogs, or others, and provides an easy loading/unloading area for those with trailers. Locating the non-motorized parking area farther south allows for better access to the proposed snowplay area for families with children too small to walk a long distance (see Winter Map ID #2) as well as for proximity to non-motorized recreation opportunities to the west.

Sherwins Working Group: Winter Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #	Description
2	<p>CONCEPT: Non-motorized snowplay area adjacent to the borrow pit staging area Situating a non-motorized snowplay area on the moraine that is nearest the borrow pit staging area to provide sledding and other complementary wintertime recreation opportunities. This area will be open to non-motorized snowplay only.</p> <p>RATIONALE: This area is ideal for snowplay due to its moderate slope, gentle terrain, and aspect (north-facing, which best retains snow). Its proximity to the borrow pit staging area makes it highly visible and therefore attractive to potential users, enables them to access the snowplay area via a very short walk, and offers bathrooms and other facilities nearby, which is important for families with small children.</p>
3	<p>CONCEPT: Additional off-loading area for OSV users near the borrow pit staging area Extend a spur from the borrow pit staging area along Sherwin Creek Road that ends in a turnaround that can accommodate a pickup truck with a trailer, but is not limited to or reserved strictly for OSV users. Facilities will be limited to signage; users will access additional facilities at the main borrow pit staging area (see Winter Map ID #1).</p> <p>RATIONALE: Providing an additional off-loading area with a turnaround will help to relieve potential congestion at the formal borrow pit staging area, enabling drivers to drop off or pick up both motorized and non-motorized users more efficiently and with ease. The proposed site's distance from the main staging area will naturally contribute to separation of use.</p>
4	OMITTED

Sherwins Working Group: Winter Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #	Description
5a	<p>CONCEPT: Formal non-motorized access/egress point at Snowcreek VIII Formalize the access/egress point at Snowcreek VIII as identified in the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan. Facilities will include signage and the area will be served by public transit (see Winter Map ID #12). This point will be open year-round to non-motorized use only (see Summer Map ID #3).</p> <p>RATIONALE: Formalization of this access/egress point will allow residents of, and visitors to, the Snowcreek VIII development access to the borrow pit staging area as well as to other amenities recommended in this proposal, such as the groomed portion of the stacked-loop trail system (Winter Map ID #9a), while also allowing users to travel through Snowcreek VIII to visit the planned hotel and retail amenities.</p>
5b	<p>CONCEPT: Formal non-motorized access/egress point at the Snowcreek golf course Formalize the access/egress point at the Snowcreek golf course as consistent with the Snowcreek VIII Master Plan. Facilities will be limited to signage. This point will be open to non-motorized winter use only.</p> <p>RATIONALE: Formalization of this point will facilitate clear egress across the Snowcreek golf course and back to town for skiers and snowboarders exiting the Sherwins, a very popular front-country ski and snowboard amenity, avoiding conflict with private-property owners while providing a direct and easy-to-use route. This point will also connect to Snowcreek VIII–area transit stops.</p> <p>NOTE: The exact location of this point will be determined by construction phasing of the Snowcreek VIII project.</p>

Map ID #

Description

5c

CONCEPT: Non-motorized trailhead at Tamarack Street

Develop an ADA-accessible non-motorized trailhead at the end of Tamarack Street. Facilities will be limited to signage and the creation of three to six parking spaces, at least one of which will be an ADA-only spot. The trailhead will remain ungrooved. This trailhead will be open year-round to non-motorized use only (see Summer Map ID #2) and is intended to serve as a secondary, neighborhood-centric access/egress point.

RATIONALE: Tamarack Street is an access/egress point popular with neighborhood residents and others. Improving the site with parking and signage will increase ease of use and accessibility while respecting the private-property owner. Formalizing it as a trailhead creates an important link within the stacked-looped trail system in the meadow (see Winter Map ID #9a). This trailhead will provide an alternative access/egress point to the Sherwins area for non-motorized users wishing total separation from OSV staging at the borrow pit staging area and will primarily serve neighborhood residents. This trailhead is intended to support a relatively low volume of users as compared to formal staging areas such as the borrow pit, Mill City, and the Lake Mary Road winter closure, which will help to keep traffic levels low in the neighborhood and alleviate safety concerns of residents regarding increased traffic on this narrow street.

NOTE: Signage regarding avalanche danger should be considered at this spot.

NOTE: The private-property owner's future development plans will influence the exact location of this trailhead as well as potential usage, signage, and parking, but also may provide opportunity for site improvement concurrent with private construction.



Map ID #

Description

6

CONCEPT: Multi-use staging area at Mill City

Develop a multi-use staging area at Mill City, located at the Old Mammoth Road winter closure. Facilities will include signage, expanded parking, and bathrooms. This staging area will be open year-round to non-motorized use (see Summer Map ID #4) and open to OSV use after April 17, when snowmobiles are permitted in the Lakes Basin. This staging area will be served by public transit (see Winter Map ID #12).

RATIONALE: This facility will provide an alternative to the borrow pit staging area, which will relieve pressure on the main parking/staging areas at the eastern end of the Sherwins and provide an alternative access/egress point to the Sherwins area for non-motorized users wishing total separation from OSV staging prior to April 17. It also will relieve pressure on the existing Lake Mary Road winter closure staging area. Parking along Old Mammoth Road will continue to be permitted per Town of Mammoth Lakes policy until the parking area is completed.

7

CONCEPT: Non-motorized connector from the Mill City staging area (Winter Map ID #6) to Hidden Lake meadow

Articulate a non-motorized connector between the Mill City staging area and the stacked-loop system present within the Hidden Lake meadow on the west end of the Sherwins area (see Winter Map ID #9a). The connector will be ungroomed and receive no maintenance, but will be signed to indicate the level of difficulty. The trail will be articulated over a summer trail and will be open to non-mechanized use year-round (see Summer Map ID #5a).

RATIONALE: This connector satisfies an existing need to provide efficient, marked travel for cross-country skiers and snowshoers from popular Lakes Basin amenities such as Tamarack Cross-Country Ski Center and the frequently used meadow at the west end of the Sherwins. This feature will provide an important link directly into the stacked-loop trail system (see Winter Map ID #9a). Lack of grooming will make the trail less visible, keeping use to a minimum, and the steeper slope angle and cautionary signage will deter less-skilled skiers and snowshoers.

Sherwins Working Group: Winter Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #

Description

8

CONCEPT: Grooming on Old Mammoth Road from the Mill City staging area (Winter Map ID #6) to the Lakes Basin

Groom over the existing Old Mammoth Road alignment from the Mill City staging area to the intersection of Old Mammoth Road and Lake Mary Road. This will be corduroy only (no Nordic track) that will be open to non-motorized use only until April 17.

RATIONALE: Grooming this portion of Old Mammoth Road will facilitate connectivity to the Lakes Basin for non-motorized users, as it will provide an easier surface on which to cross-country ski, snowshoe, or skin. Following the existing road alignment will allow grooming to occur with a low snow threshold, keeping this access/egress corridor open longer than would be possible if it were groomed over vegetation.

Map ID

Description

9a

CONCEPT: Non-motorized stacked-loop trail system in the meadow

Articulate a stacked-loop trail system from the borrow pit staging area, along the base of the Sherwins to the Tamarack Street trailhead, and back to the borrow pit staging area. Facilities will include signage and some maintenance; a specific grooming program will be developed to provide a quality experience for multiple uses, which may include separate trails or delineation as appropriate. The westernmost loop is intended to be left ungroomed, while the section connecting the borrow pit staging area and the Tamarack Street trailhead is intended to be groomed. This system will be aligned, if possible, over the summertime system (see Summer Map ID #8) and will be open to non-motorized use only. This system will be contained within the developed recreation area described in Winter Map ID #18 and will provide connectivity to the Lakes Basin via Winter Map ID #7.

RATIONALE: To improve the existing non-motorized opportunities in the meadow (the legacy blue-diamond signage system, as one example), a “stacked-loop” or “nested” trail system with partial grooming will be created to offer multiple route options to a variety of winter users, including a quality groomed cross-country skiing experience. The primary section of trail (aligned over the MUP identified in Summer Map ID #7), out from which the smaller nested loops will branch, will connect to the access points identified in Winter Map ID #5a, #5b, and #5c, providing consistent and easy access/egress across the area to the loop system, the borrow pit staging area, and points of connection farther north and east. Grooming will provide a packed surface for dog-walkers, snowshoers, pedestrians, cross-country skiers, and others and will allow these users a lengthy maintained-route option. Leaving the western loop ungroomed (but signed) will provide an option for those seeking a more “wild” or “natural” experience.

Sherwins Working Group: Winter Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #	Description
9b	<p>CONCEPT: Dog policy for stacked-loop trail system in the meadow Dog owners are free to have their pets off-leash on ungroomed non-motorized trails and in open areas, but dogs must be under voice control. Dogs must be leashed on groomed non-motorized trails, at the snowplay area (see Winter Map ID #2), and at all trailheads and staging areas. Facilities will include signage and “doggie bag” stations along the main trail.</p> <p>RATIONALE: As on-leash policies are increasingly enforced at other areas, such as Shady Rest Park, an alternative should be provided to those who would like to take their pets for a walk leash-free. Clear signage outlining this policy and providing trail-etiquette education is essential. The “doggie bag” facilities installed along the trail at regular intervals will help to ensure cleanup compliance, which will not only keep the area tidy, but also will reduce potential conflict between dog-walkers and other users.</p>
10a	<p>CONCEPT: Non-motorized connector from the borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Creek Park East at the bridge Develop a groomed connector (corduroy, but no Nordic track) between the borrow pit staging area and Mammoth Creek Park East at the bridge near Hayden Cabin. This connector will be open to non-motorized use only and will be consistent with the alignment of Summer Map ID #6.</p> <p>RATIONALE: This trail will encourage and facilitate use of Mammoth Creek Park East as an alternate staging area and will provide connectivity between the park, the borrow pit staging area, the stacked-loop trail system, the Mammoth Lakes Trail System, and formal access/egress points along the meadow’s northern boundary.</p>



Map ID #	Description
10b	<p>CONCEPT: Off-leash dog area north of Sherwin Creek Road Designate a zone that is north of Sherwin Creek Road and east of the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) stables where dogs may be off-leash and are not required to respond to voice command. Facilities will include signage and doggie-bag stations, and the area will not be groomed or fenced. Dogs must be leashed, however, at all trailheads and staging areas.</p> <p>RATIONALE: As on-leash policies are increasingly enforced at other pet-play areas, such as Shady Rest Park, an alternative should be provided to those who would like to walk, play with, or exercise their pets leash-free. This specific area is a logical choice due to its proximity to the borrow pit staging area parking (easy and quick to access), its lack of groomed trails (reduces potential conflict with other users), and the tendency for this area to become packed down relatively quickly due to foot traffic and OSV use.</p>
11	OMITTED
12	<p>CONCEPT: Public-transit stops near staging areas and trailheads Public-transit stops should be located within reasonable walking distance of the following staging areas and trailheads: the Mill City staging area; the borrow pit staging area; the Lake Mary Road winter closure staging area; and the Snowcreek VIII access/egress point (see also Summer Map ID #28).</p> <p>RATIONALE: Public-transit stops close to staging areas and trailheads will make it easy for those who do not have a vehicle available to them (or a driver's license) to access the Sherwins zone via formal access/egress points with facilities of some kind. Expanded routes support the Town of Mammoth Lakes' vision for public-transportation mobility and can help alleviate potential traffic congestion both on the roads and at the parking areas. Adding stops near these points also supports the area's internal connectivity (i.e., the stacked-loop system described in Winter Map ID #9a) by enabling users to enter or exit from the location that is most desirable or convenient.</p> <p>NOTE: The turnaround for public transit at the Mill City staging area could be built at the same time that the parking area is expanded.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Winter Map ID Descriptions




Map ID #	Description
13	<p>CONCEPT: Signage and wayfinding system A comprehensive signage and wayfinding system should be installed throughout the study area, including educational and interpretive opportunities.</p> <p>RATIONALE: A uniform and comprehensive signage and wayfinding system will enhance the user experience by providing specific information (trail length, degree of difficulty, etc.), more general information (overview of stacked-loop system, public-transit schedules, etc.), interpretive opportunities (anatomy of a meadow, mining-town history, etc.), and education that will assist with enforcement of policies (on- and off-leash areas, motorized/non-motorized use, etc.).</p> <p>NOTE: See also Summer Map ID #30.</p>
14	OMITTED
15	OMITTED
16	<p>CONCEPT: Multi-use staging area at the Lake Mary Road winter closure Develop a formal multi-use staging area east of Lake Mary Road, above the bridge. Facilities will include signage and parking. The staging area will be open to non-motorized use year-round (see Summer Map ID #12a) and to OSV use only after April 17, when snowmobiles are permitted in the Lakes Basin. This staging area will be served by public transit (see Winter Map ID #12).</p> <p>RATIONALE: This staging area will relieve existing pressure on the current Lake Mary Road parking used to access the Sherwins, Panorama Dome, Tamarack Cross-Country Ski Center, and other Lakes Basin recreation amenities.</p>

Sherwins Working Group: Winter Map ID Descriptions



Map ID #	Description
17	<p>CONCEPT: Improved trail to the Sherwins from Lake Mary Road Create a more visible, guided connection between Lake Mary Road and the Sherwins by installing a set of simple signage. This route will not be groomed and will be open to non-motorized use only.</p> <p>RATIONALE: The trail currently used to access the Sherwin Ridge from Lake Mary Road, though heavily used, is not formally recognized by the USFS. Making it “legal” will allow the trail to be aligned to address erosion and other environmental concerns and will enable a simple, small set of signage to be installed at the trailhead (and other spots where necessary) to guide users up the most sustainable route.</p>
18	<p>CONCEPT: Developed, partially groomed non-motorized recreation zone extending from the borrow pit staging area to Old Mammoth Road, including Winter Map ID #2, #5a, #5b, #5c, #6, #7, and #9a Define and articulate a developed, partially groomed non-motorized recreation zone as shown on the SWG Winter Map extending roughly from the borrow pit staging area south to Mammoth Rock Trail and west to Old Mammoth Road. The Town of Mammoth Lakes Urban Growth Boundary will form the northern boundary.</p> <p>RATIONALE: Defining and articulating a developed, partially groomed non-motorized recreation area will offer a “quiet recreation” experience for those who wish to snowshoe, walk, cross-country ski, or enjoy snowplay by providing a sight and sound buffer from OSV use. The establishment of a grooming plan as described in Winter Map ID #9a will preclude motorized use of this area; however, OSV use will continue to be permitted in this area until the grooming plan is established. The location of this zone will allow for direct OSV access to Solitude Canyon via the Tele Bowls.</p>



Disclaimer: Alignment and placement of data may not be exact.

SWG WINTER PROPOSALS

- 1 Winter Proposal ID's
- Proposed Trails**
 - Groomed Multi-Use
 - Non-Motorized Groomed Mixed-Use
 - Non-Motorized Ungroomed Mixed-Use
- Proposed Winter Areas**
 - Winter Developed Recreation
 - Non-Motorized Staging
 - Motorized Staging
 - OSV Restrictions
 - Dogs Off-leash
 - Snowplay

EXISTING & NEAR TERM CONDITIONS LEGEND

[] Existing Tunnels	X Gates/Barriers/Dead Ends	— Snowshoe Trails	— Snow Covered MUP	— Fences	— Parks/Open Spaces	— Proposed Tank Farm	— East OSCC NDP	— Winter Access - SnowCrk Master Plan
— Bridges - Existing & Near-Term	+ MCWD Sherwin Area Wells	— Existing Groomed Fee Trails	— Streets	— Cultural Historic Areas	— Valentine Reserve	— Moto-x	— Ranch Rd Easement	— Snowcreek District Area
◆ Blue Diamond Marker	— Backcountry Area	— Groomed MUP	— Planned Multi-Use Paths	— Backcountry Ski/Snowboard	— INF Stable	— Town Municipal Boundary	— Parcels	— Streams
	— OSV Restriction Area	— Snow Removed MUP			— Borrow Pit	— Town Urban Growth Boundary		— Water Bodies



Sherwins Working Group
Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (2009)
PREAMBLE

The Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (SHARP) is the work product of a diverse coalition of volunteer citizens known as the Sherwins Working Group (SWG). Facilitated by the Center for Collaborative Policy, convened by the Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA), and with technical support from the Town of Mammoth Lakes (TOML) and the Inyo National Forest, the SWG met over a six-month period to develop and recommend summer and winter recreation development and management plans for the Sherwins and Mammoth Meadows areas.

The Sherwins is the landscape immediately to the south of the TOML's Urban Growth Boundary and is a uniquely diverse natural environment offering equally diverse recreation opportunities. Dog walkers, backcountry skiers and snowboarders, equestrians, mountain bikers, Nordic skiers, motorized recreationists, world-class athletes in training, hikers, climbers, individuals in pursuit of quiet and reflective natural experiences, and visiting families, among others, coexist with wildlife, wetlands, native forests, and Eastern Sierra granite.

Participants in the SWG represented varied recreation interests, generations, activities, and perspectives, including private property and commercial interests, and all shared a common acknowledgement of the increasing and future usage of the Sherwins area and an abiding concern for the landscape's health and well-being. The SWG was completely open to the public, and SWG members ensured an open invitation to participate in any of its many meetings was extended to any interested individuals and/or groups. It was the overriding intent of the SWG to speak for and represent all interests whether those interests were present in spirit or in person.

The values of the SWG were informed by local knowledge and experience and were built around a common respect for the natural environment and the following goals:

- Achieve appropriate land use and avoidance of potential user conflicts.
- Use what is already present and improve it or make it more defined.
- Have a low overall impact on the region while providing for a coherent and satisfying trail and use network that includes appropriate signage and wayfinding.
- Ensure that trails and facilities are stealth and undercover—never clear-cut, bold, or pretentious in their visual impact.
- Apply preference for discrete trails and facilities that blend with the landscape and each other.
- Identify increased opportunities for connectivity.
- Identify opportunities to enhance public safety.
- Further wildlife and resource protection, sustainability, and stewardship.
- Achieve sustainable, practical solutions that make sense.
- Maintain opportunities for wildlife observation and interaction.

The decision-making process of the SWG was built on the following:

- Respect for one another and the activities and interests each participant represents
- One person speaking at a time and people listening to understand
- A very strong effort to understand everyone else at the table
- A consensus decision-making process used at every step of the way. When the group is comfortable with a direction, its participants mutually agree to move forward.
- An uncommon degree of productivity
- All members of the group may not always completely agree, but everyone stands behind a decision once it is made
- A commitment to getting the proposal done and hanging in there until it is complete and ready for hand-off
- Focus on concepts and philosophies of land use and avoidance of the trap of jumping into operational levels of detail
- Recognition of the role and importance of professional designers and planners in deciding on the final levels of detail and design
- Embracing of activities from low-key to extreme, local to international, and novice to elite

The SWG did not come to 100 percent agreement on all recreational uses and management solutions, but there was long discussion, general goodwill, and consensus in arriving at compromise recommendations. Participants in the process believe that the SWG process should serve as a model for collaborative and cooperative efforts on behalf of public lands in the region, wide varieties of recreation interests, and the Eastern Sierra's residents and visitors.

The Sherwins Area Recreation Plan that follows represents the general and sometimes specific recommendations from the SWG to the Inyo National Forest for the recreational uses and natural habitat/resources protection of Mammoth Meadows and the Sherwins Range.

10/21 - Revision Group

Name

Matt Peterson

Jen Girard

Ron Malm

Maggie Pelcher

Stacy Corless





Chuck Mesisen

STENR SPIDBL

Hans Ludwig

JUAN WIMTUBWTA

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Community Feedback Review Team Meeting Sign-In Sheet (10/27/09)**

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	
Stacey	Crockett	High Sierra Equestrian Club	
Hans	Ludwig		
Ron	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	
Chuck	Megivern		
Jennifer	Noerdlinger		
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	
Terry	Plum	Tamarack Street homeowner/area property owner	
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	
PARTNERS			
Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	
Jon	Kazmierski	USFS: GIS	
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	

SWG Full-Group Meeting #8

November 3, 2009

CONTENTS:

1. Meeting agenda
2. Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (SHARP) document outline
3. Meeting summary
4. Sign-in sheet
5. Technical Review Committee sign-up sheet
6. Photos

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



Meeting Agenda
4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

- 4:00–4:05** **Welcome, Agenda Overview, Introductions, Housekeeping**
- Clarification of role of non-SWG participants at this point (only if necessary)
 - Acknowledgement of hard work completed
- 4:05–4:10** **Non-SWG Public Comments**
- 4:10–4:45** **Review and Completion of Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (SHARP) Document**
- Overview of SHARP outline [**Attachment 1**]
 - Discussion and finalization of preamble [**Attachment 2**]
 - Process for completing document
 - Instructions for submitting additional participant concerns for inclusion in SHARP document
- 4:45–5:00** **Process Evaluation/Feedback**
- Distribution of and instructions for completing evaluation form regarding how to improve collaborative process [**Handout**]
- 5:00–6:00** **Presentation of Summer and Winter Narratives/Maps [Attachment 3]**
- Report from SWG Reconciliation Sub-Group meetings
 - Final clarification on any element of narratives and/or maps
 - Presentation of key elements of proposal
- 6:00–7:00** **Next Steps, Prioritization Exercise, and Celebration**
- Review of what happens next with SHARP
 - Prioritization exercise
 - Group photo
 - Group celebration!



Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (SHARP)
Document Outline

- A.** Cover page
- B.** TOC
- C.** Preamble (*drafted by staff; final approval by SWG*)
 - 1.** Include SWG team photo
 - 2.** No longer than two pages
- D.** Introduction (*derived from SWG docs; MLTPA to draft*)
 - 1.** Explanation of why SWG was formed
 - 2.** Description of Sherwins area landscape and uses (*describe the wide variety of social and environmental ingredients in the Sherwins study area*)
 - a.** Outdoor recreation activities
 - i.** Birding
 - ii.** Bouldering and climbing
 - iii.** Cross-country skiing/snowshoeing
 - iv.** Dog walking
 - v.** Equestrian area
 - vi.** Fishing
 - vii.** Golf course
 - viii.** Mountain biking
 - ix.** OHV/OSV use
 - x.** Sherwin Bowl ski/snowboard area
 - xi.** Snowplay
 - xii.** Vistas/fall-color viewing
 - xiii.** Walking/running area
 - b.** Avalanche area
 - c.** Immediately adjacent to incorporated town of 7,500 people
 - d.** Mining claims
 - e.** Private development
 - f.** Town parks
 - g.** Unique: more recreation-based area and representative of regional recreation uses
 - h.** Utility company access/use

- i. Wide variety of environmental and ecological diversity, including wetlands and native forests
 - j. Wildlife protection
- E. Overview of SWG process (*derived from SWG docs; MLTPA to draft; photos will be incorporated where appropriate*)
 - 1. Participants
 - a. Charter and signatories (refer to Charter appendix)
 - 2. Staff
 - a. Participants by partner organization
 - b. Roles and responsibilities
 - 3. Meetings (*statistical breakdown*)
 - a. Number of meetings (including field trips)
 - b. Dates
 - c. Hours of effort (refer to attendance-record appendix)
 - 4. Public feedback effort synopsis (refer to feedback appendices)
- F. Summer Narrative and Map (*final SWG documents*)
- G. Winter Narrative and Map (*final SWG documents*)
- H. SWG understanding of what next steps will be and what USFS and TOML will do with recommendations (*derived from SWG docs and results of November 3 meeting; MLTPA to draft*)
- I. Results of prioritization exercise that will be conducted at November 3 meeting (*derived from results of November 3 meeting; MLTPA to draft*)
- J. SHARP signatory page (*see final page of outline*)
- K. Appendices
 - 1. SWG Charter with signatures
 - 2. SWG attendance record
 - 3. Complete meeting records (agendas, minutes, materials, etc.) (*downloaded from Web page*)
 - 4. SWG Public Feedback Process
 - i. Compiled comments
 - ii. Description of outreach (locations, methods, etc.)
 - 5. Additional participant comments and concerns

SHARP SIGNATURE PAGE

With my signature below, I attest to having participated in the Sherwins Working Group and to my support for the “Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (2009)” as developed by the Sherwins Working Group.

Signature Print Date

Signature Print Date

Signature Print Date

Signature Print Date

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.



**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #8 Sign-In Sheet (11/03/09)**

First Name	Last Name	Club or Organization	Signature
COMMUNITY MEMBERS			
Brent	Allen	Eastern Sierra 4WD Club	
John	Armstrong	Eastside Velo (President)	arrived late (H)
Jim	Barnes		Jim Barnes
Pete	Beck		
Phyllis	Benham	MMA Nordic	Phyllis Benham
Brigitte	Berman	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Secretary)	
Ryan	Berry		
Rachel	Bowman	Mammoth Base Camp at Sierra Meadows Ranch (owner)	Rachel Bowman
Lesley	Bruns		Lesley Bruns
Jon	Carlton		
Malcolm	Clark	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (President)	Malcolm Clark
Sharon	Clark		
Stacy	Corless	Friends of the Inyo (communications director)	
Stacey	Crockett	High Sierra Equestrian Club	Stacey Crockett
Forrest	Cross	ESAC	
Mark	Davis	Mammoth Area Mountain Bike Organization (MAMBO)	
Alex	Fabbro	395 Fat Tire Council	Alex Fabbro
Ali	Feinberg		
Karen	Ferrell-Ingram	Eastern Sierra Land Trust	
Dave	Geirman	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Nate	Greenberg		
Jennifer	Heintzelman		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #8 Sign-In Sheet (11/03/09)**

Thom	Heller	Mammoth Lakes Fire Protection District	
Mark	Hendrickson	Mammoth Mountain Bike Park	
Zach	Hickman		
April	Holly		
Henning	Jensen	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter (Ex Com member)	
Doug	Jung	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	
Andrew	Kastor	High Sierra Striders (president)	
Martin	Kleinbard		
Kraig	Kupiec		
Chad	Lande	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jesse	Langley	Cardinal Investments (The Sherwin)	
Dave	Laverty	Triad/Holmes Associates	
Julien	Lecorps		
Alana	Levin	High Sierra Triathlon Club	
Hans	Ludwig		
Ron	Malm	Mammoth Powersports	
Mike	McKenna	Hot Creek Hatchery Foundation (Board member)	
Chuck	Megivern		
Clayton	Mendel		
Marshall	Minobe	Mobility Commission	
Andrew	Murphy		
Dave	Neal	Reel Mammoth Adventures	
Tammy	Nguyen	Chadmar Group (Snowcreek VIII)	
Jennifer	Noerdlinger		

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #8 Sign-In Sheet (11/03/09)**

Greg	Norby	Mammoth Community Water District	<i>Greg Norby</i>
Maggie	Palchak	Disabled Sports Eastern Sierra	<i>M Palchak</i>
Marge	Papp	Turner Propane	
Rebecca	Paranick- Poiset	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	<i>arrived late @</i>
J.	Parsons		
Terry	Plum	Tamarack Street homeowner/area property owner	
Monica	Prelle		
Mary K.	Prentice	Sierra Club, Range of Light Chapter	<i>Mary K Prentice</i>
Cory	Rice	Wave Rave Snowboard Shop	
Jennifer	Roeser	McGee Creek Pack Station	
Brandon	Russell		
Bill	Sausser	Mammoth Snowmobile Association/TOML Tourism & Recreation Commission	
Patty	Schwartzkopf	Tamarack Street homeowner	<i>Patty Schwartzkopf</i>
Steve	Schwind		
Elaine	Smith	High Sierra Striders	
Jim	Smith	Mammoth Mountain Ski Area	
Joel	St. Marie		
Barbara	Stefanides		
Dave	Stefanides		
Autumn	Talsky	Mammoth Mountaineering Supply/Alpine Approach	
Bill	Taylor		<i>Bill Taylor</i>
John	Teller		
Tim	Villanueva	Bardini Foundation	

**Sherwins Working Group (SWG) 2009:
Meeting #8 Sign-In Sheet (11/03/09)**

John	Walter	Advocates for Mammoth	
Chris	Walters		
Jon	Watson	Far West Ski Association	
Douglas	Will	High Sierra Equestrian Club (President)	<i>Will</i>
Stephanie	Wolff	Mammoth Pet Shop	<i>Stephanie A Wolff</i>
Gene	Zeiner		

PARTNERS

Mike	Schlafmann	USFS: Deputy District Ranger - Mammoth and Mono Basin	
Matt	Peterson	USFS: Recreation Planner	
Jon	Kazmierski	USFS: GIS Specialist	
Austin	McInerney	Center for Collaborative Planning	
Danna	Stroud	TOML: Tourism & Recreation Department Director	
Steve	Speidel	TOML: Principal Planner	<i>Speidel</i>
Mark	Wardlaw	TOML: Community Development Department Director	
Jen	Daugherty	TOML: Assistant Planner	
Jim	Miller	Turner Propane	
John	Wentworth	MLTPA: CEO/Board President	
Kim	Stravers	MLTPA: Development & Community Relations Director	<i>Kimberly A Stravers</i>

SWG TECHNICAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

<u>NAME</u>	<u>Email</u>
Hans Ludwig	hansludwig@gmail.com
Stephanie Wolff	Stephanie@mammothpetshop.com
Chad Lande	ChadLande@shadmar.com
Malcolm Clark	WMALCOLM.CLARK@GMAIL.COM (mainly out of town until January)
Stacey Rockett	Stacey yokara14@yahoo.com
MABBE PALCHAK	mpalchak@disabledsportscoasternsierra.org
Jen Girard	jen @jennardlinger@earthlink.net
Ron Malm	ron@mammothpowersports.com
Bill Taylor	wbtaylor@gmail.com
Mary K Prentiss	MKP@NPCCABLE.COM
THOM NEUER	THOM@MAMMOTHLAKESFD.COM
Doug Will	dougw@ATT.NET
JOHN ARMSTRONG	jalaagte.net
Greg Norby	GNORBY@MCWD.DST.CA.US
LESLEY BRUNS	LESTRAVEL@HOTMAIL.COM
CLAYTON MENDEL	CWMENDEL@GMAIL.COM
CHUCK MEGIVERN	CMEGIVERN@GMAIL.COM



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_023.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_014.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_033.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_275.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_398.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_020.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_120.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_144.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_156.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_194.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_272.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_281.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_321.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_323.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_426.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_703.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_742.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved



SWG_2009_11_03_mtng08_802.jpg
MLTPA - All Rights Reserved