

APPENDIX A: SWG Process Narrative

Introduction

PROJECT BACKGROUND: Building on the success of work completed as part of the Town of Mammoth Lakes Trail System Master Plan Update (TOML TSMP) in February 2009 and the Sherwin Area Trails Special Study (SATSS), also completed in February 2009, the United States Forest Service/Inyo National Forest (USFS), the Town of Mammoth Lakes (TOML), and the Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA) provided an opportunity for private citizens and interested parties to choose to form an independent working group to collaboratively develop preferred winter and summer alternatives for trails, public access, and recreation facilities for implementation in the region known as the Sherwins, the land area immediately adjoining the southern Urban Growth Boundary of the TOML. The group comprised 71 total participants from its first field trip in March 2009 to its final meeting in November 2009, with a core of 25 to 30 participants attending sessions consistently. A broad spectrum of recreation, commercial, private property, and agency interests was represented and varied in age, philosophy, and recreation affiliation. MLTPA, a local nonprofit organization with a strategic commitment to facilitate stewardship of trails and their recreation opportunities through collaborative partnerships, convened a total of 26 group meetings, field trips, and study sessions, with the USFS and TOML providing technical support. Through existing agreements already in place between the U.S. Institute for Environmental Policy Resolution and the USFS, the Center for Collaborative Policy in Sacramento, Calif., provided an outside, neutral facilitator for the duration of the process. The facilitator led full-group meetings and communicated with SWG partners and participants in person, by phone, and via e-mail throughout the project period. The Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (SHARP) is the final deliverable of the SWG process; it is intended for inclusion in the TOML TSMP and to serve as a resource document for the USFS, the TOML, private property and real estate development interests, and any other effort with an interest in trails and recreation infrastructure development in the Sherwins region.

PROJECT SCOPE AND EXISTING CONDITIONS¹: The Sherwins area is defined as the general area south of the TOML's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) between the Hayden Cabin site and Sherwin Creek Road on the east and Old Mammoth Road on the west, up to Lake Mary Road. Though the bulk of the landscape included in the study area is contained within the TOML Town Boundary, the vast majority is federal public land administered by the USFS, including businesses operating under special-use permit. Private property interests, such as the Old Mammoth neighborhood, and real estate development projects, such as Snowcreek V and Snowcreek VIII, are contained within the TOML UGB and lie beyond the scope of the specific recommendations made by the SWG as reflected in SHARP.

The Sherwins is a diverse high-desert landscape that contains such iconic features as Mammoth Rock, the Sherwin Range, Hidden Lake, Panorama Dome, Solitude Canyon, and Mammoth Meadows and offers opportunities to explore native forests, wetlands, bodies of water, and wildlife. Topography varies from flat meadowlands to glacial moraines to the chutes and cirque of the Sherwin Range, dotted with evergreens, sage, aspens, and other native plants rooted primarily in till and talus. The area receives variable winter snowfall and is often subject to high winds. Recreation

¹ For additional technical details, please see "Appendix G: SATSS Complete Report."

use in the Sherwins has traditionally been high and complex; the area is currently enjoyed year-round by individuals in pursuit of quiet and reflective natural experiences, backcountry skiers and snowboarders, world-class athletes in training, those seeking motorized play, and others via a loose, primarily unsigned, organically developed system of USFS-recognized trails (such as Mammoth Rock Trail), USFS and TOML roads (such as 4S100 and Sherwin Creek Road), a portion of the legacy Blue Diamond Trail System, and unofficial social trails. No formal trailheads or facilities exist at this time and the area receives no maintenance; nonetheless, the Sherwins remains popular with residents and guests alike.

The SWG did not separately propose or consider trails depicted as USFS system trails on the Summer map while drafting their Summer and Winter proposals, having assumed that, as official trails recognized as part of the Inyo National Forest inventory, they would not be restored to a natural state or lose system status if not specifically identified in the proposals. It is the intent and assumption of the group that these trails will remain or become official USFS system trails and will be included as part of their Summer and Winter proposals, regardless of their seasonal use and accessibility. Examples of these trails include, but are not limited to, Mammoth Rock Trail, Panorama Dome Trail, and the Sherwin Lakes Trail.

Recreation activities identified in the study area include:

- Backcountry skiing and snowboarding
- Birding
- Dog walking/pet play
- Equestrian use
- Fishing
- Hiking/walking
- Mountain biking
- Nordic skiing
- Off-highway vehicle (OHV) use
- Over-snow vehicle (OSV) use
- Snowplay
- Snowshoeing
- Trail running
- Vista/fall-color viewing

Other factors and considerations identified in the study area include:

- Avalanche terrain
- Cultural/historic sites, such as Hayden Cabin and Mill City
- Existing and future commercial and residential private development
- Existing fee-based equestrian center
- Existing fee-based golf course
- Existing private youth camp
- Immediate accessibility to incorporated town of 7,500 year-round residents
- Interface with the Lakes Basin
- Interface with Mammoth Mountain Ski Area
- Mining claims
- Proximity to existing and future municipal parks, trail systems, and recreation facilities
- Special-event business, such as at Kerry Meadow
- Utility company access, use, and facility development
- Wetlands restoration
- Wide variety of environmental and ecological diversity
- Wildlife protection

PROJECT FUNDING: Facilitation services from the Center for Collaborative Policy at California State University in Sacramento, Calif., were provided through existing agreements with the United States Forest Service and the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. The convening services of MLTPA were partially funded by the TOML through a grant from the Sierra Nevada Conservancy (“Mammoth Lakes Basin Interagency Collaborative Planning – 2007”) and through a standing contract for services executed between the TOML and MLTPA in June 2009 (“MLTPA – Measure R Spring 2009 Award”) funded by Measure R, which contract scope includes “Data Management and Development” and “Outreach and Facilitation.” Additional funding for convening services was provided by MLTPA through a grant awarded to MLTPA by the Sierra Nevada Conservancy (“Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Concept and Master Planning – 2007”).

FURTHER INFORMATION: For more information on the Sherwins Working Group process, please review Appendices B through F. The SHARP and SWG Web pages and complete document archive may be accessed at www.mltpa.org.

Overview of SWG Process

PARTICIPANTS: A total of 71 individuals attended at least one meeting, field trip, or study session of the SWG between the process start date of March 21, 2009, and its end date of November 3, 2009². At the conclusion of the second full-group meeting, on June 16, 2009, 21 people signed the Sherwins Working Group Charter, an agreement on the scope of work, membership roles and responsibilities, decision-making process, ground rules, goals, and expectations, which was prepared by process facilitator Austin McInerny and revised by the group.³ More than 100 individuals were added to the SWG group e-mail list used by MLTPA to communicate with the SWG regarding meetings, developments, and other information; at least 150 people were individually contacted by MLTPA to participate in the SWG over the course of the process. Of the 71 individuals who attended at least one meeting of the SWG, which saw an average meeting attendance of 21, 25 individuals signed the following statement: “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.”⁴

PARTNER TEAM: Partners involved in the convening, facilitating, and technical support aspects of the SWG are identified here by organization:

United States Forest Service/Inyo National Forest (USFS): The role of the USFS was to provide technical support to the SWG, including mapping/GIS services, provision of additional USFS-specific information, and reference documents. Facilitation services from the Center for Collaborative Policy at California State University in Sacramento, Calif., were provided through existing agreements between the United States Forest Service and the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution. Process facilitator Austin McInerny led seven of the eight full-group SWG meetings. Staff participants were:

² See “Appendix C: SWG Attendance Record” for a detailed breakdown of participation and “Appendix D: Complete SWG Meeting Records” for more information.

³ See “Appendix B: SWG Charter with Signatures” for the original language and signatures.

⁴ See the pages at the end of this Appendix for copies of the original signatures.

Mike Schlafmann, Deputy District Ranger, Mammoth and Mono Basin
Matt Peterson, Acting Recreation, Lands, and Wilderness Staff Officer
Jon Kazmierski, Mono Basin Scenic Area Visitor Center Director
Jonathan Cook-Fisher, Winter Sports Specialist

Town of Mammoth Lakes (TOML): The role of the Town of Mammoth Lakes was to provide technical support to the SWG by providing additional TOML-specific information, resources, and reference documents. Town Staff also led or attended field trips, participated in some breakout-group meetings, and attended each of the full SWG meetings. Staff participants were:

Danna Stroud, Tourism & Recreation Department Director
Steve Speidel, Principal Planner

Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation (MLTPA): The role of MLTPA was to convene the SWG and act as the main point of contact and communication between SWG members and the partner team. MLTPA directed public outreach for the SWG's formation and continuing work, maintained the master SWG contact list and sent out all group communication regarding upcoming and past meetings and deadlines, secured meeting venues, coordinated the SWG Community Feedback Process, helped to develop displays, recorded attendance at all meetings, recorded minutes at all meetings and circulated them for approval, provided photographic documentation of all meetings, posted all SWG materials to and maintained the SWG Web page on www.mltpa.org, led or provided staff to attend field trips, provided staff to attend all full SWG meetings and breakout-group meetings, and drafted the Summer and Winter proposals and SHARP on behalf of the SWG. Staff participants were:

John Wentworth, CEO/Board President
Kim Stravers, Development and Community Relations Director
Lara Kirkner, Operations Director
Kristy Williams, Special Projects Coordinator

Partners worked together throughout the process to answer participant questions or address their concerns and to provide whatever support was required by the SWG to accomplish their objectives.

MEETINGS: The SWG held 26 different meetings on 22 different days over a seven-month period. Though technically no meetings were mandatory, it was expected that SWG members participate in the eight scheduled full-group meetings. Of the 71 total participants, 27 attended at least four of the eight full-group meetings; these 27 people formed the nucleus of the group. Average attendance for the full-group meetings was 21, with a high of 27 and a low of 17. The SWG dedicated a total of approximately **6,968 volunteer work hours over seven months** to the collaborative process.

Full-group meetings: It was at these gatherings—complete with agendas, previous meeting summaries, and other supplemental materials—that the bulk of the collaborative work was completed. All SWG consensus decisions were made at the full-group meetings. Full-group meetings lasted approximately three hours each.

Meeting dates: May 9, June 16, July 14, August 11, September 3, September 22, October 13, November 3

Total attendance: 172

Hours of effort invested: 4,128 (8 full-group meetings at 3 hours each with 172 total attendants)

Field trips and site visits: These trips were arranged to provide on-the-ground insight and generate discussion about specific proposal concepts, existing conditions, and near-term improvements. Field-trip participants reported their findings back to the full SWG at the regular monthly meetings. Field trips lasted approximately two hours each.

Meeting dates: March 21, April 4, July 22, July 24, August 16, August 25, August 30

Total attendance: 76

Hours of effort invested: 1,520 (10 field trips/site visits at 2 hours each with 76 total attendants)

Breakout groups/study sessions: These volunteer-based work gatherings were convened to further or complete tasks initiated in the full-group meetings. Participants met between regularly scheduled full-group meetings, often more than once to achieve the set goals, and reported their findings and recommendations to the full group at the next monthly SWG meeting. Breakout-group meetings/study sessions lasted approximately three hours each.

Meeting dates: July 21, July 22, July 28, July 29, October 8, October 21, October 22, October 27

Total attendance: 55

Hours of effort invested: 1,320 (8 breakout groups/study sessions at 3 hours each with 55 total attendants)

Noticing and other communication regarding meetings, field trips, and breakout groups was accomplished via group e-mails from MLTPA and through the SWG Blog (<http://mltpa.wordpress.com/>), which was created and administered by MLTPA. Additionally, MLTPA created and maintained an SWG-specific page on their Web site, www.mltpa.org, to which was posted complete information about all meetings—including dates, times, and locations, agendas, minutes, supporting documents, photos, and draft and final versions of SWG-created documents—organized chronologically. Other tools posted to the SWG Web page included resource documents from the TOML, USFS, and other entities, such as the Sherwin Area Trails Special Study (SATSS), USFS special-use permits, private-development master plans, and excerpts from USFS resource-management plans. This Web page was accessible to the public at large and was promoted continually on the MLTPA homepage. Please visit www.mltpa.org to view the archived SWG Web page.

SWG COMMUNITY FEEDBACK PROCESS⁵: In order to best serve the broader community and to ensure that the full range of interests and activities related to the study area were considered, SWG members agreed to seek public opinion on the first complete drafts of the Summer and

⁵ See “Appendix E: SWG Community Feedback Process” for detailed information about the SWG’s effort to obtain input from the general public on the group’s draft Summer and Winter narratives and maps.

Winter proposals. The process was coordinated and overseen by MLTPA. Feedback received through this process was considered by the SWG as they crafted their final Summer and Winter proposals.

Timeline: Physical displays and the SWG Community Feedback Process Web pages were set up on September 11, 2009; feedback was accepted through close of business (physical displays) or 11:59 p.m. (electronic feedback) on October 1, 2009.

Methodology: MLTPA and the partner team developed and produced Community Feedback Forms that collected basic identifying information about the commenter and provided space in which he or she could provide comments tied to specific proposal features of either or both narratives and maps. Forms were provided on the SWG Community Feedback Process Web page and at eight different physical locations throughout the town of Mammoth Lakes, where they could be filled out by hand and dropped into a collection box. Comments were tallied throughout the feedback process; a unique ID number was assigned to each form received and to each comment received, and all comments were transcribed by MLTPA onto a master feedback list. The master list was eventually sorted by season and comment type by MLTPA for ease of use by the SWG.

Online opportunities: Feedback forms, the Summer and Winter narratives and maps, the FAQ document, and the official press release were available on the SWG Community Feedback Process Web page hosted online through www.mltpa.org. Completed electronic forms were e-mailed to swgfeedback@mltpa.org.

Physical displays: Eight different sites were set up with information/feedback displays including the feedback forms and drop box, Summer and Winter narratives and maps, FAQ document, and press release. Sites were checked twice per week, at which time comments were collected and materials were replenished if necessary. Hours of availability were determined by each hosting location:

- Footloose Sports
- Mammoth Community Water District offices
- Mammoth Lakes Library
- Mammoth Pet Shop
- Mammoth Powersports
- MLTPA offices
- Snowcreek Athletic Club
- Town of Mammoth Lakes Tourism and Recreation Department offices

Additional support: The partner team made itself readily available to the public to provide additional information or an explanation of any of the materials, as well as to conduct field trips in the study area if desired. Field Guide kits were made available to people who wanted to take information to the site for review. Kits included:

- Winter map and corresponding narrative
- Summer map and corresponding narrative
- FAQ document
- Press release
- Comment forms

Community Feedback Process results:

Total number of individuals who provided feedback: 129

Total number of comments: 369

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK RECONCILIATION AND FINAL PROPOSALS: At its sixth full meeting, on September 22, 2009, the SWG agreed to form a volunteer SWG Community Feedback Review Committee that could provide the larger group with recommendations at their October 13 meeting on how to proceed with the results of the SWG Community Feedback Process. This committee was formed in acknowledgement of the potential for a large volume of comments to be received by the close of the process, and that having the full group assess each one individually on October 13 would be burdensome and time-consuming. The group also recognized that the time allotted for the partner team to process the final compilation and distribute it to the full group with time for thorough review before the October 13 meeting was extremely short, and they wanted to ensure that the materials put before the full SWG would be digestible within a short time frame.

The SWG Community Feedback Review Committee reviewed the final compilation of public feedback, which omitted identifying comment-source information and was sorted by season, comment type (informational, errors and omissions, etc.), and comment ID number. The group was tasked with assessing the compilation to identify the key issues of each season's proposal and then generating recommendations for the larger group on how to incorporate these issues and their proposed actions into the final drafts of the proposals. The committee succeeded in identifying three sets of key issues—summer concerns, winter concerns, and dog concerns—which were distributed to the full group via e-mail in advance of the October 13 meeting.

At its seventh meeting, on October 13, 2009, the full group met to make decisions on how to refine the draft Summer and Winter proposals given the community feedback sorted by the SWG Community Feedback Review Committee. The full group was given an overview of the committee's work and then split into three different small groups to make determinations on each of the three key issue sets (summer, being longer, was tackled by two small groups, while winter and dog concerns were examined together by the remaining group). Members of the committee were distributed throughout the small groups and helped to lead discussion, explaining how committee members identified each issue, what they recommended, and how the committee arrived at their final recommendations. Consensus was reached within the small groups on action to be taken for each key issue they considered. The full group then reconvened to discuss all key issues. Though some recommendations were modified during this review, the group came to consensus on actions for every key issue and agreed to move forward with composition of the Summer and Winter proposals' final drafts. The group agreed to form a Narrative Reconciliation Sub-Group to translate and reconcile the consensus actions of the full group into the draft Summer and Winter narratives and maps for presentation back to the full group at their final meeting, scheduled for November 3.

The Narrative Reconciliation Sub-Group met for two consecutive sessions, October 21–22, 2009, to determine how best to revise the draft Summer and Winter proposals to incorporate the consensus actions agreed to at the previous full-group meeting. They met a third time on October 27, 2009, to complete their work. The group worked off of updated versions of each narrative that had been marked up by the partner team to show the new language and/or direction agreed to on October 13. A new Summer Map ID # (9b) was created to propose equestrian-preferred trails in the eastern

portion of the study area, previously assumed to have already been part of the proposal. A new Winter Map ID # (18) was created to propose a developed-recreation area in the meadow.

On November 3, 2009, the full SWG convened for their eighth and final meeting, where they reviewed the Sherwins Area Recreation Plan (SHARP) outline and preamble and provided sign-off on the final versions of the Winter and Summer proposals. Process facilitator Austin McNerny took the group through the major changes to the proposals (Summer Map ID #9b and Winter Map ID #18) and allowed members of the Narrative Reconciliation Sub-Group to explain how they had arrived at their recommendations and final revisions. A significant portion of time was spent discussing these changes, but at the meeting's conclusion the full SWG confirmed 100% consensus support for the final narratives and maps. Having achieved consensus on the documents with some minor text corrections, the group also agreed that the final SHARP package, to be put together by the partner team, was ready for submittal to the Inyo National Forest.

Next Steps

A proposal with broad-based public support is a significant step toward implementing trails projects on the ground. It's not the last step, though. A well-thought-out proposal provides the framework for moving toward implementation. It identifies the why—the all-important community-based rationale for even considering taking action—but there are several steps between completing the vision, the why, and getting to the how of implementation.

The SWG has accomplished a lot over the last several months. The SWG produced two thoughtful trails proposals, one for winter and one for summer, and vetted those proposals with the broader public. A significant outcome of successful collaboration, though, is sometimes more intangible. SWG members have helped build community-based social capacity by:

- Developing new working relationships, new attitudes, and new perspectives toward people with different interests and values
- Sharing a wealth of personal knowledge and experience with each other
- Choosing to become empowered citizens, community leaders, and experts on trails in the Sherwins area

As a testament to the commitment of group members to staying with the group throughout the process, the SWG has:

- Reinforced democratic values
- Enhanced an ethic of shared land and resource stewardship and collective responsibility
- Improved opportunities for leveraging funding and enhancing institutional capacity
- Increased the ability of local government and agencies to meet their missions and goals
- Broadened the base of local political support for better trails in the Sherwins area by demonstrating the ability of members of the community to work together and find solutions

The SWG process is transitioning from the working group working with agency support to the Forest Service working with SWG support. This is a significant change but should not be viewed as a formal trigger for NEPA. In a sense, the Forest Service intends to accept the SWG proposal for

review and now needs to work to refine the proposal to make it “NEPA-ready” in anticipation of initiating a NEPA review early in 2010.

The SWG proposal includes many different components for both summer and winter; some are more detailed proposals than others, and this is okay. The Forest Service proposes to work with the group or a subset of the group to help prioritize components for implementation. Considerations such as cost, potential funding sources and partnership opportunities, relative need, and timeliness of implementation (i.e., the gravel-pit trailhead may be very timely; the gravel-pit snowplay area may be less timely) will all factor into a prioritization of components for implementation.

Where the SWG was unable to provide sufficient detail, or lacked the technical knowledge to provide more detail, the Forest Service and its jurisdictional partners will work to refine elements of the proposal.

The Forest Service does not intend to take the entire plan through NEPA all at once for two important reasons: the SWG proposal will likely take several years to implement, and conditions change. A high initial investment in site-specific environmental analysis may be misspent if environmental review needs to be completed again at a later date to account for changing conditions.

Conversely, conditions do change; the results of the initial stage of implementation may lead the Forest Service and the SWG to reconsider different elements of the SWG proposal and assess opportunities.

The SWG proposal will continue to provide the framework. However, the Forest Service, with the SWG’s continued participation, will work to ensure that the proposal stays a living, adaptable document as we move forward. Accordingly, the Forest Service will keep the environmental review process as streamlined and effective as possible. The likely result is a handful of different projects ready for implementation in summer 2010 and funded for implementation.

October/December 2009

Technical Review/Proposal Refinement

1. Detailed identification of proposal environmental constraints/considerations.
 - a. Constraints field trips (ongoing from October w/ SWG and FS specialists)
2. Develop draft detailed cost projections.
 - a. Cost Projection workshop (FS)
3. Develop prioritization from project implementation and rationale.
 - a. Prioritization workshop – open house (FS)
4. Identify potential funding sources.
 - a. Funding workshop (FS, SWG, and other potential partners)
5. Develop NEPA-ready proposal (FS).
6. Develop strategy for NEPA Scoping/Public Involvement (FS w/ SWG Technical Group).

Analysis Needs

Trails	Trails design and spec. (w/Recreation)
Watershed	RCO Analysis
Wildlife	BE/BA, MIS for Mule Deer
Cultural	Survey/Screened Undertaking
Botany	BE/BA, Noxious Weed Risk Assessment
Recreation	Cost Assessment/Prioritization. Analysis of Rec. outcomes
GIS/ GPS	Site surveys
Landscape Architect/ Engineer	Site Design/ Design Review

FS Staffing Needs

Trails	5 to 10 days. Trails design and plan.
Watershed	3 days (including analysis) – piggyback on Mammoth Meadows/Turner/Sherwin to
Wildlife	5 days (including analysis) – piggyback on Mammoth Meadows/Turner/ Sherwin top.
Cultural	5 days (including analysis) – limit to just current year delineated trails.
Botany	3 days (including analysis) – piggyback on Mammoth Meadows/Turner/Sherwin to *Utilize data from Sherwin to Scenic Loop and other Analyses.
GIS/ GPS	5 days
Landscape Architect/ Engineer	10 days
*Utilize data from Sherwin to Scenic Loop and other Analyses including Snow Creek Ski Area EIS.	

January/March 2010 (January to May if EA)

NEPA Analysis/Decision (consider modifying timing as needed to meet grant application deadlines)

1. Public Scoping
 - a. Begin formal scoping with notice in Jan. 2010.
 - b. Workshop/public meeting on NEPA process/proposal in Feb. 2010
 - i. Consider winter field trip.
2. Publish Decision Document
 - a. Assuming signed acceptance of SWG proposal as concept plan, Decision is DM for CE pathway rather than EA. If EA, extend timeframe to May 2010 for decision.
 - b. Decision includes reference to concept plan and prioritization for implementation developed in the fall of 2009.

March/June 2010 (May-July if EA)

Finalize funding/implementation plan

1. Final On-Site Design Review for Phase 1 Winter by end of April.
2. Final On-Site Design Review for Phase 1 Summer by end of May .
3. Finalize funding plan.
4. Finalize implementation plan including work by volunteers and partners.
5. Complete proposed schedule of work.

July/September 2010

Implementation

1. Implement 1st phase for summer and winter.
2. Celebrate...evaluate success and start planning for Phase II.

Priorities

At their final full-group meeting on November 3, 2009, the SWG completed a prioritization exercise to take a first pass at identifying the top five summer and winter project concepts (by Summer/Winter Narrative Map ID #) from SHARP for implementation beginning in the summer of 2010. These prioritized project concepts are intended to be used by the SWG Technical Review Committee in conjunction with the TOML and the Inyo National Forest. The lists and tables that follow illustrate the results of this exercise as bar graphs, sorted data, and unsorted data. Map ID #s may be cross-referenced with the appropriate narrative and map.⁴

Prioritized List of Top Five Summer Projects

- **Summer Map ID #19:** Recommendation for further study/assessment of Solitude Canyon and Panorama Dome areas
- **Summer Map ID #9b:** Non-motorized stacked-loop trail system located in the eastern portion of the study area
- **Summer Map ID #5a:** Soft-surface non-mechanized connector from the Hidden Lake meadow to the Mill City staging area, Panorama Dome, and the Lakes Basin
- **Summer Map ID #1:** Major multi-use staging area at the borrow pit
- **Summer Map ID #7:** Non-motorized “backbone” trail connections from the borrow pit staging area to the Tamarack Street trailhead

Prioritized List of Top Five Winter Projects

- **Winter Map ID #9a:** Non-motorized stacked-loop trail system in the meadow
- **Winter Map ID #1:** Major multi-use staging area at the borrow pit
- **Winter Map ID #18:** Developed, partially groomed non-motorized recreation zone extending from the borrow pit staging area to Old Mammoth Road, including the non-motorized snowplay area, the formal non-motorized access/egress point at Snowcreek VIII, the formal non-motorized access/egress point at the Snowcreek golf course, the non-motorized trailhead at Tamarack Street, the multi-use staging area at Mill City, the non-motorized connector from the Mill City staging area to Hidden Lake meadow, and the non-motorized stacked-loop trail system in the meadow
- **Winter Map ID #16:** Multi-use staging area at the Lake Mary Road winter closure
- **(tie) Winter Map ID #10a:** Non-motorized connector from the borrow pit staging area to Mammoth Creek Park East at the bridge
- **(tie) Winter Map ID #2:** Non-motorized snowplay area adjacent to the borrow pit staging area

⁴ See “Section 7: Summer Proposal” and “Section 8: Winter Proposal.”