

Design Workshop, Inc.  
Landscape Architecture  
Land Planning  
Urban Design  
Strategic Services

## Meeting Record

To: Bob Snoddy and Becky Napier  
From: Stephanie Grigsby  
Date: April 29, 2009  
Project Name: Eastern Central California Blueprint  
and Eastern Sierra Corridor  
Enhancement Program  
Project #: 4424  
Subject: Mono County Collaborative Planning  
Team Meeting Notes  
Meeting Date: April 23, 2009  
Start/End: 9:00am - 10:45 am  
Location: Mono County / Town of Mammoth  
Conference Room  
Copy To: Scott Burns

Meeting  Telephone  Conference Call

---

Following are the minutes of the above referenced meeting. The following people were present:

BILL REID, MONO COUNTY BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS

ISAAC VAUGHAN, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

SANDY HOGAN, MOBILITY COMMISSION

MARY CANADA, SIERRA BUSINESS COUNCIL

VICKIE TATON, SIERRA BUSINESS COUNCIL

SARAH MCCAILL, MONO COUNTY

GREG NEWBRY, MONO COUNTY

JIM UPCHURCH, USFS

DAN LYSTER, MONO COUNTY

JOHN HELM, EASTERN SIERRA TRANSIT  
AUTHORITY

DAVE WILBRECHT, MONO COUNTY

MARY BOOHER, MONO COUNTY

JOHN WENTWORTH, MLTPA

MIYA EDMONSON, CALTRANS

CD RITTER, MONO COUNTY

BRAD METTAM, CALTRANS

SCOTT BURNS, MONO COUNTY

LARRY PRIMOSCH, BUREAU OF LAND  
MANAGEMENT

STEVE NOLL, DESIGN WORKSHOP

STEPHANIE GRIGSBY, DESIGN WORKSHOP

1. Scott Burns (SB) introduced the two projects to the attendees by giving a brief overview of their purpose. He then turned the time over to Steve Noll (SN).
2. Steve welcomed the group and touched on what would be presented at the meeting. The intent was to provide an overview of the projects and the presentation and group exercises to

## DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Austin • Denver • Phoenix • Salt Lake City • Tahoe  
128 Market Street, Suite 3E, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559  
[www.designworkshop.com](http://www.designworkshop.com)

be conducted at the Walker and Lee Vining Public Workshops later that day. Brad Mettam (BM) gave an overview of the Eastern Central California Blueprint project and SN presented the Corridor Enhancement Program.

3. Discussion items centered on several of the questions included on the Blueprint comment form and the added questions requested by Mono County. Comments and discussion items included the following:
  - a. Recognize working landscapes and agricultural lands.
  - b. Has there been thought about tying promotional CD to mile markers to connect it to the actual location of resources?
  - c. Hope the planning for the National Scenic Byway Designation can coordinate with this process. There are overlaps.
  - d. Who do we coordinate providing data through to incorporate it into the process? There is other access information available. (It was determined that information should be provided through the County representative back to the project team. Provide to Scott Burns.)
  - e. The “access points” project by John Helm also fits into transit and creating connections. It is important that natural resource pieces are shown by using the most accurate GIS information available.
  - f. There are four million visitors every year to Mammoth and that needs to be recognized in the planning process. It should be integrated in a BIG way. Recognize how visitors are moving around. Transit is a key component that should be evaluated.
  - g. We are a “Destination Forest”. The 7<sup>th</sup> most visited forest in the nation.
  - h. Visitors like scenic beauty according to the visitor profile plan. In regards to travel patterns, one-third of the visitors did not stay overnight. For those who did stay, their number one destination was Mono County.
  - i. The new wilderness designation has opportunities.
  - j. The Interagency Visitor Center in Lee Vining helped spur their destination status and increase tourism for Lee Vining.
  - k. The Corridor goes “wall-to-wall”. It doesn’t end at the edge of the right-of-way.
  - l. Bishop, Mammoth, and Lee Vining are attracting young workers. This generation wants to live and work where they recreate. It is more important than just work opportunities. It also reinforces the need to look at access points.
  - m. Values:
    - Space
    - Beauty
    - Small town where everyone knows everyone
    - Ability to get involved
    - Remoteness: We get to know each other and work with each other. This allows us to learn to respect where the other person is coming from at meetings and so forth.
  - n. Issues:
    - There is a communication issue. We do not have sufficient cell phone and wide broadband coverage. We will miss out on tourism opportunities if it is not addressed.

## DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Austin • Denver • Phoenix • Salt Lake City • Tahoe  
128 Market Street, Suite 3E, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559  
[www.designworkshop.com](http://www.designworkshop.com)

There needs to be a real good communication plan that covers data sources all along the corridor.

- Transit.
    - In regards to transit we need to have links from Mammoth to San Francisco, to Los Angeles, and to Las Vegas. We need to move from being the missing link to being the bridge between these areas. That will enhance the value of what we can do here.
  - A year-round economy is critical. It is a 5 ½ month economy right now.
  - Education: People can choose where they want to live not solely based on work due to the ability to work from home. Having an excellent education system will be necessary to attract families.
  - Access: There is so much public land, people can stop and take off wherever they want. There needs to be identified access points.
  - Kids graduating and moving away because of lack of opportunities or they can't afford to move back.
  - Second home owners can devastate the local community feeling. The numbers available for volunteerism and involvement are all decreased by 60% (the percent of second home owners).
- o. Additional Lands:
- Communities with more lands are doing better.
  - Smaller communities can't get the momentum for development and growth opportunities started because of being restricted by available land.
  - The need for additional lands for development is important.
  - Each community is different in their opinion of having additional lands.
  - The City of Los Angeles land ownership is a major impact to the corridor. They control the future of Owen's Valley and they have to be at the table or nothing is really viable. They need to be included as they are a big part of what we are talking about.
  - Additional land issues seem to be a bigger issue for Inyo County, but it needs to be recognized as an issue for Mono County as well.
- p. Would making it easier to live hear change the experience and quality of the community that we enjoy?

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

---

**DESIGNWORKSHOP**

Asheville • Aspen • Austin • Denver • Phoenix • Salt Lake City • Tahoe  
128 Market Street, Suite 3E, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559  
[www.designworkshop.com](http://www.designworkshop.com)