

**Sierra Nevada Conservancy-Progress Report**

**Sierra Nevada Conservancy Grant Program  
Safe Drinking Water, Water Quality and Supply, Flood Control  
River and Coastal Protection Act of 2008 (Proposition 84)**

**Grantee Name:** Town of Mammoth Lakes

**Project title:** Mammoth Lakes Basin Interagency Collaborative Planning

**SNC Reference Number:** SNC 070305      **Submittal Date:** 3-1-12

**Report Preparer:** Jessica Morriss      **Phone #:** 760-934-8989 ext. 225

**Check one:**

**6-Month Progress Report**

**Final Report**

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>6-Month Progress Reports</b> should reflect the previous six months. <b>Final Reports</b> should reflect the entire grant period.</p> |
|---|

**A. Progress Report Summary:** (Please provide a general description of work completed during this reporting period.)

**This progress report covers the project period of April 2009 to February 2012.**

This progress report covers the entire grant period for the Mammoth Lakes Basin Interagency Collaborative Planning Project, which is also known as the Lakes Basin Special Study (LABSS).

The grant for the LABSS project was awarded to the Town of Mammoth Lakes (Town) in the summer of 2008 by the Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) to complete a collaborative transportation and recreation planning process for the Mammoth Lakes Basin in partnership with the United States Forest Service (USFS) Inyo National Forest and the non-profit organization, Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access (MLTPA).

As one of Mammoth's most popular amenities, the Mammoth Lakes Basin (Lakes Basin) sees thousands of visitors every summer who come to experience a wide diversity of recreation experiences. The Lakes Basin is also a critical watershed, providing water resources to Mammoth Lakes and other downstream communities. The LABSS process has provided an invaluable opportunity to ensure the proper planning and management of the Lakes Basin. The process involved comprehensive data collection in an around the basin, the identification of issues, opportunities and constraints, broad public participation, and the development of management concepts and recommendations.

**Deliverables or Outcomes completed during this Reporting Period or Milestones Achieved:** (Include specific information, such as public meetings held, agency participation, partnerships developed, or acres mapped, treated or restored.)

#### Data Collection and Existing Conditions

The LABSS process was initiated based on the recognized need to have a better understanding of the issues facing the Lakes Basin and the jurisdictions responsible for the area's management: the Town and the Inyo National Forest (INF). The first steps of the process involved meeting with the planning partners to develop a framework of goals and objectives for the project and to begin to identify project deliverables. Early in the process, the need for comprehensive data, including transportation and recreation use and patterns, was determined to be necessary in order to establish baseline existing conditions and identify issues.

The planning partners developed a detailed plan to collect data both within and outside of the Lakes Basin and began data collection in the summer of 2009, which continued in the summer of 2010. The following data was collected and was used during the planning process:

- Vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle volume and turning movement data at key nodes in the basin;
- Parking capacity and utilization at key parking locations in the Basin;
- Vehicle speed data;
- Transit ridership and priority transit stops;
- Recreation patterns at key nodes within and around the basin, including the Sherwin area, which is a popular recreation area adjacent to the Lakes Basin;
- GIS inventory of existing facilities, including marinas, boat launches, restrooms, dumpsters, trash receptacles, monofilament collectors, illegal and legal parking areas, illegal and legal trails, etc.

All collected data was input into a GIS database in order to more easily analyze it and develop materials for presentation to the public, including the Existing Conditions Report, which is provided on the enclosed disc.

#### Public Engagement and Feedback

A series of three public meetings were held in the fall of 2010, prior to which, a comprehensive public outreach initiative was conducted. Public outreach included newspaper and radio advertisements, distribution of flyers throughout town and in the Lakes Basin, deployment of a "Lakes Basin Special Study" online blog (<http://labss.wordpress.com>) and Facebook group, announcements at the local Town Council, Planning Commission, Recreation Commission and Mobility Commission meetings, and press-releases from the INF and the Town.

The three public meetings were broken into the following separate, but related topics:

- “State of the Lakes Basin” September 30, 2010 – this meeting focused on presenting the existing basic conditions of the basin, including an inventory of front-country facilities (restrooms, parking spaces, marinas, stores, trash receptacles, etc.). Meeting participants also engaged in discussion of existing conditions and issues.
- “Lakes Basin Recreation Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow” October 14, 2010 – this meeting focused on the existing range of recreational activities and when and how they occur in the Lakes Basin. Meeting participants discussed existing recreational use patterns and issues.
- “Lakes Basin Mobility and Transportation” October 28, 2010 – this meeting focused primarily on transportation to/from and within the Lakes Basin, presenting existing multimodal transportation data (vehicle, transit, parking, pedestrian, and bicycle) and patterns. Meeting participants discussed existing transportation issues and needs.

Each public meeting was held at the Westin Monache Resort (services and meeting space were donated) in Mammoth Lakes, CA as well as online through a “Go to Meeting” webinar. Each public meeting consisted of an introductory PowerPoint presentation followed by question-answer sessions and in the case of the last two meetings, group work sessions. Notes, photos, and audio and text recordings of the webinars were taken at each public meeting and are included on the enclosed disc.

#### Preliminary Management Concepts Analysis

Following the public meetings, the planning team compiled the public input and feedback, which was then used to begin preparation of the draft “Preliminary Management Concepts” (PMC) document. The document outlines four management alternatives that were developed based on public input, collected data, and jurisdictional knowledge of the issues, opportunities, and constraints. The document describes potential management scenarios that may be selected individually or used to create a new concept for potential future implementation in the Lakes Basin. The goal of the scenarios was to present the public with a range of recreation opportunities while sustaining the natural environment.

The public review period for the draft PMC was held between June 1, 2011 and August 15, 2011. Feedback from the public on the document was gathered through an online questionnaire and one public meeting, which was held on June 21, 2011. The PMC and the public comments received are provided on the enclosed disc.

#### Lake Mary Road Loop

Following the input and feedback received from the public and based on data collected in the basin, the planning team decided that a more focused analysis of the Lake Mary Loop Road and surrounding area was necessary. The area is of particular concern due to its high levels of activity and lack of appropriate transportation infrastructure. With remaining grant funds, the planning team was able to complete a topographical survey of

the Lake Mary Loop Road, which is approximately 1.5 miles long, and assess a number of preliminary multimodal transportation improvement concepts for the roadway, including options to convert it to one-way vehicle travel, provide a separated multiuse path, and provide on-street vehicle parking. The preliminary study is provided as an attachment.

### Executive Summary

In order to tie all of the deliverables together, the planning team prepared an “executive summary” intended to briefly describe the LABSS process and findings. The summary provides a series of recommendations for mostly short-term management and/or infrastructure improvements. The executive summary is attached.

**B. Challenges or Opportunities Encountered:** (Please describe what has worked and what hasn't; include any solutions you initiated to resolve problems. If your project is not on schedule, please explain why here.)

The planning team did not encounter any major negative challenges during the project period. Given the broad range of experience of the planning team, which included planners, transportation planners, engineers, resource specialists, community engagement and marketing specialists, and GIS technicians, the project process was an extremely productive multi-jurisdictional effort. The team worked collaboratively and effectively during the process and was able to complete more work than what was originally anticipated within the grant's scope, budget, and timeline.

**C. Unanticipated Successes Achieved:** (Please describe any additional successes beyond completing scheduled tasks or meeting scheduled milestones.)

The planning team experienced a number of successes during the process. In our opinion, we accomplished much more than we originally anticipated within the schedule and budget. This was possible because of the strong relationship among the partners and the ability to share resources in an efficient and productive way.

We were able to exceed the original goals of the grant and scope of work, which ultimately led to a more comprehensive planning process that will provide the ability to implement recommendations in the near-term, as well as provide additional valuable information for the United States Forest Service INF to utilize in their General Management Plan.

In particular, the planning team was able to use remaining grant funds to prepare the Preliminary Management Concepts document, implement an on-line survey, and hold one additional public engagement meeting to gather public input on the document. Additionally, the more detailed analysis of Lake Mary Road Loop multimodal concept alternatives was able to be completed with remaining grant funds.

**D. Compare Actual Costs to Budgeted Costs:** (Please refer to your grant agreement to list your deliverables/budget categories and budgeted costs compared to actual costs incurred during this reporting period in the table below.)

| <b>PROJECT BUDGET CATEGORIES</b>   | <b>Budgeted SNC Dollars</b> | <b>Actual Dollars</b> |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Grant Administration (includes administration and project management for all collaborative partners)                               | \$45,723                    | \$45,723              |
| Transportation (includes data collection, analysis, collaborative meetings, preparation of recommendations, and written reporting) | \$80,160                    | \$80,160              |
| Recreation (includes data collection, analysis, collaborative meetings, preparation of recommendations, and written reporting)     | \$80,160                    | \$80,160              |
|  |                             |                       |
| <b>GRAND TOTAL</b>   | <b>\$196,000</b>            | <b>\$196,000</b>      |

**Explanation:** The project was successfully completed on time and within budget.

**E. Do you have information to report on the project-specific Performance Measures for your project?** (If so, please list the Performance Measures below and describe your progress.)

Reporting on performance measures is provided below, as a component of the Final Report.

**F. Were there any other relevant materials produced under the terms of this Agreement that are not a part of the budgeted deliverables? If so, please attach copies.** (Include digital photos, maps, media coverage of project, or other work products.)

All project deliverables are provided on the enclosed disc, this includes deliverables that were originally budgeted and deliverables that were able to be completed in excess of the budgeted deliverables (please refer to Section C, **Unanticipated Successes Achieved**).

**G. Next Steps:** (Work anticipated in the next 6 months, including location and timing of any scheduled events related to the project.)

It is anticipated that both the INF and Town, with support from other local organizations, including MLTPA, will work to implement a number of short-term recommendations that resulted from the LABSS process. Given the current economic situation, it is likely that near-term improvements will be focused on those that will achieve the most benefit for the lowest cost. These types of improvements may include improved maintenance of existing facilities, the addition of comprehensive signage and wayfinding, providing additional trash and monofilament receptacles, and the possible addition of multimodal infrastructure as funding becomes available.

In January 2012, the Town and the INF were notified that they had received two Federal Transit Administration grants through the Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in Parks program (formerly known as the Alternative Transportation in Parks and Public Lands program). These grants were received in large part due to the SNC-funded LABSS project, because the planning partners were able to demonstrate the long-standing commitment and unique partnership between the Town and the INF to improve transportation and recreation in and around the Mammoth Lakes community. One grant award is dedicated to completing capital improvements and the other grant is dedicated to continued planning for the Lake Mary Loop Road area of the basin.

The capital project grant award of approximately \$1.25 million will be used to construct a 1600-foot separated multiuse path called the Lake George Connector, which will tie into the recently completed Lakes Basin Path and will connect to Lake George Road. The capital grant funding will also be used to construct additional transit stops and shelters, purchase an additional trolley and several bike trailers.

The planning grant award of approximately \$153,000 will provide funding for further analysis of Lake Mary Loop Road. While some preliminary analysis of potential multimodal transportation options was conducted as part of the LABSS process, more detailed evaluation is needed, as well as public engagement to collect input regarding potential changes.

**Project Deliverables (provided on the enclosed disc):**

Attachment 1: Existing Conditions Report

Attachment 2: Recreation Survey

Attachment 3: Public Meeting PowerPoints and Meeting Notes

Attachment 4: Preliminary Management Concepts Report

Attachment 5: Preliminary Management Concepts Survey Results

Attachment 6: Lake Mary Loop Road Multimodal Transportation Concept Alternatives  
Evaluation

Attachment 7: Executive Summary of Recommendations

Attachment 8: Promotional and Advertising Materials

## FINAL SNC REPORT SUMMARY

### **Capacity-Building Results and Collaboration and Cooperation with Stakeholders:**

(What partnerships did you initiate or strengthen as a result of this project? How did they affect the project outcome? If applicable, how did this grant increase your organization's capacity? What is your plan to sustain this increase?)

As described above, the project was completed by a joint partnership between the Town of Mammoth Lakes (Town), the United States Forest Service Inyo National Forest (INF), and the non-profit organization, Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access (MLTPA). There is a long history of these organizations working together collaboratively on recreation and transportation issues in the community and region. This project provided another opportunity to strengthen these partnerships and truly define a vision for the future of the Mammoth Lakes Basin, an extremely important environmental, economic, and social resource for Mammoth Lakes, the surrounding region, and the State.

The partners worked closely together throughout the process, developing data collection plans, organizing and holding public engagement meetings, developing management alternatives, and reporting outcomes. The grant provided critical support for all of the organizations in terms of financial resources to maintain (not increase) staffing capacity and avoid the possible layoff of existing staff.

As described in Section G above (**Next Steps**), the Town and INF have received two grants from the Federal Transit Administration, one to complete additional planning work for the Lakes Basin and one to complete several transportation related capital improvements. These funds will again be used to maintain existing staff resources at the Town and the INF.

### **Description of Project Accomplishments:**

#### **1. Most Significant Accomplishment**

Describe in one concise, well-written paragraph, the most significant accomplishment that resulted from this grant.

The most significant accomplishment of the project was the successful completion of comprehensive data collection and a thorough and broad-based public engagement process where community members were able to discuss exiting issues, potential solutions, and help to develop a long-term vision for the Mammoth Lakes Basin.

These accomplishments allowed the LABSS planning partners to develop a strong baseline of information and a series of recommendations geared toward the preservation and protection of the important natural resources of the Basin, while maximizing the visitor experience.

## **2. WOW Factor**

If applicable, please describe anything that happened as a result of the project or during the project that is particularly impressive.

The planning team felt that there were a number of “wow” moments throughout the project, however, two things stand out above the rest: 1. The number of people that participated in the public workshops was more than expected and the input received was invaluable; and 2: the amount and quality of work that was completed under the grant program was greater than originally anticipated (please refer to Section C, **Unanticipated Successes Achieved**).

## **3. Design and Implementation**

When considering the design and implementation of this project, what lessons did you learn that might help other grantees implement similar work?

Successful design and implementation of any project, particularly one that involves multiple agencies/organizations, hinges on communication and organization among the project team members. All partners must be fully engaged and dedicate time and energy to the project to keep it on time and within budget. Thankfully, all the partners in this project (TOML, INF, and MLTPA) were thoroughly engaged and responsibly carried out assignments on time and budget.

To accomplish this, the planning team had regular meetings and frequent email communications. Meetings were typically held twice/month, but sometimes more often during phases that required more coordination, such as during the public engagement phase when multiple public workshops were being held. Another key component of our success had to do with instituting a strict timeline for the planning partners to provide review and comments to each other on project deliverables.

## **4. Indirect Impact**

Please describe any indirect benefits of the project such as information that has been developed as a result of the project is being used by several other organizations to improve decision-making, or a conservation easement funded by this grant that encouraged other landowners in the area to have conservation easements on their property.

An indirect benefit of this project is that the information that was collected will be used in the USFS Inyo National Forest’s future general management plan update, as well as the development and scoping for other projects (capital and planning) related directly and indirectly to the LABSS project. Additionally, the planning team believes that the two federal Paul S. Sarbanes grant awards were received in part due to the success of the LABSS project, which demonstrated the strong commitment of the partners to work together.

## **5. Collaboration and Conflict Resolution**

If you worked in collaboration or cooperation with other organizations or institutions, describe those arrangements and their importance to the project. Also, describe if you encountered conflict in the project and how you dealt with it, or if there was conflict avoided as a result of the project.

Please refer to Section B, **Challenges or Opportunities Encountered**. The project involved significant collaboration between the Town, the INF, and the non-profit organization, MLTPA. The Town acted as the grant administrator, executing contract agreements with the other entities, reviewing and processing invoices, submitting progress reports to the SNC, and coordinating project deliverables among the planning partners.

In general there were no major conflicts or issues during the process. In fact, the project provided the opportunity for the organizations to coordinate more effectively and communicate more efficiently about the Lakes Basin, an area of great importance to the community and the planning partners.

## **6. Capacity-Building**

SNC is interested in both the capacity of your organization, as well as local and regional capacity. Please describe the overall health of your organization including areas in need of assistance. SNC is interested in the strength and involvement of your board, significant changes to your staff, size and involvement of membership. In addition, describe how your project improved capabilities of partners, or the larger community.

The funding provided by SNC for this project provided critical support for the planning partners, and in particular the Town of Mammoth Lakes. The Town has faced a number of budgetary challenges that have resulted in reductions in total resources and staff, with a significant reduction in the total number of staff in the Town organization in the past 5 years. These reductions have required Town staff to do “more with less” – in other words, find more efficient ways of doing business, focus on certain priorities (at the expense of other priorities), and seek outside resources (such as grant-funding and partnerships) to leverage resources internally available. The SNC grant was critical in filling a funding gap that enabled the completion of the LABSS project and helped to maintain existing staff resources of the Town and the other partner organizations as well.

The Town’s various Commissions, and its Town Council have remained committed to outdoor recreation and trails as a focus of Town activities, and have continued to dedicate funding, primarily in the form of funding for Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access, to advance recreation activities (particularly trails). Two voter approved tax measures (Measure R, a sales tax measure, and Measure U, a Utility Users Tax) were passed in recent years that have secured funding for recreation and trails, among other community amenities. Effective planning, through projects such as LABSS, helps to build the basis of community knowledge, and more effectively guide allocation of funding and resources for specific projects and priorities.

## **7. Challenges**

Did the project face internal or external challenges? How were they addressed? Describe each challenge and any actions that you took to address it. Was there something that SNC did or could have done to assist you? Did you have to change any of your key objectives in response to conditions “on the ground”?

Please refer to Section B, **Challenges or Opportunities Encountered**.

## **8. Photographs**

Grantees are strongly encouraged to submit photos, slides or digital images whenever possible. These images will be used for SNC publications such as annual reports or on the website. Please make sure you clearly identify location, activity, and your project with each submitted image. Images will be credited to the submitting organization, unless specified otherwise.

Digital photos have been provided on the disc included with this report.

## **9. Post Grant Plans**

What are the post-grant plans for the project if it does not conclude with the grant? Include a description of the following (if applicable): (1) Changes in operations or scope; (2) Replication or use of findings; (3) Names of other organizations you expect to involve; (4) Plans to support the project financially, and; (5) Communication plans?

Please refer to Section G above, **Next Steps**.

## **10. Post Grant Contact**

Who can be contacted a few years from now to follow up on the project? Please provide name and contact information.

### Town of Mammoth Lakes

Ray Jarvis, Public Works Director, 760-934-8989 ext. 267, [rjarvis@ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us](mailto:rjarvis@ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us)

Jessica Morriss, Associate Transportation Planner, 760-934-8989 ext. 225, [jmorriss@ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us](mailto:jmorriss@ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us)

### Inyo National Forest

Jon Kazmierski, Recreation Officer, 760-924-5503, [jkazmierski@fs.fed.us](mailto:jkazmierski@fs.fed.us)

### Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access

John Wentworth, CEO and Board President, 760-934-3154, [johnwentworth@mltpa.org](mailto:johnwentworth@mltpa.org)

**SNC-approved Performance Measures:** (Please list each Performance Measure for your Project, as identified in your Grant Agreement, and the results/outcomes.)

### **1. Resources leveraged in the Sierra Nevada**

The vast majority of the project was fully funded by the SNC grant funds provided. There was minimal in-kind support received in the form of donated meeting space and volunteer hours. The donated meeting space for three public workshops, provided by the Westin Monache, was valued at \$4,000. No other major matching funds, in-kind services, or other in-kind contributions were made.

However, although not directly attributable to the project, it can be assumed though that the SNC grant funded work played a substantial role in the receipt of additional grant funds from the Federal Transit Administration's Paul S. Sarbanes grant program totaling more than \$1.4 million. These grant funds will provide additional organizational capacity to the planning partners and will fund future construction, contributing to local jobs in the community and region.

### **2. Number and diversity of people reached**

As described in Section A above, a series of three public meetings were held in the fall of 2010, prior to which, a comprehensive public outreach initiative was conducted. Public outreach included newspaper and radio advertisements, distribution of flyers throughout town and in the Lakes Basin, deployment of a "Lakes Basin Special Study" online blog (<http://labss.wordpress.com>) and Facebook group, announcements at the local Town Council, Planning Commission, Recreation Commission and Mobility Commission meetings, and press-releases from the INF and the Town. A detailed table of the number and types of people reached is provided below.

| <b>Lakes Basin Special Study: Performance Measure: Number and Diversity of People Reached</b> |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Method of Outreach or Engagement</b>   | <b>Number</b>   | <b>Type</b>   |
| Announcements made at government, agency, and service organization meetings                   | 27 government officials, at least 11 government staff members, varying numbers of public and/or group members in attendance; multiple meetings for each         | Mobility Commission, Planning Commission, Mammoth Lakes Town Council, Recreation Commission, Mono County Board of Supervisors, Mammoth Lakes Water District, Mammoth Lakes Tourism, Lions Club, Mammoth Lakes Noon Rotary Mammoth Lakes Chamber of Commerce, Mammoth Trails |
| Blog  | 894 total views   | Static page with regular posts (residents, second homeowners, and visitors; varying ages, professions, and affiliations)  |
| E-mail blasts   | 1,123 (average over 13 blasts)  | Members of MLTPA Foundation e-newsletter database (residents, second homeowners, and visitors; varying ages, professions, and affiliations)   |
| Facebook page   | 204 users   | Static page with regular posts and 3 specific even invitations tied to LABSS public meetings (residents, second homeowners, and visitors; varying ages, professions, and affiliations)  |
| Field-based recreation survey respondents   | 353   | Anonymous Lakes Basin recreationists (residents, second homeowners, and visitors; varying ages, professions, and affiliations)  |
| MLTPA Foundation-generated press releases   | 32 media contacts, 4 unique press releases  | Sent to MLTPA Foundation's media contact list; varying ages, professions, and affiliations dependent on each media outlet's unique audience and demographics  |
| Postcards/flyers  | 730 cards distributed over 3 sessions to more than 75 Mammoth Lakes businesses, public buildings, public campgrounds and concessions, and public message boards | Residents, second homeowners, and visitors; varying ages, professions, and affiliations   |
| Print advertising   | 16,500  | Approximately 5,500 readers per issue of local newspaper <i>The Sheet</i> ; 3 separate ads (residents, second homeowners, and visitors; varying ages, professions, and affiliations)  |
| Public LABSS meeting webinars   | 29  | Residents and second homeowners; varying ages, professions, and affiliations  |
| Public LABSS meetings (in-person)   | 92  | Residents and second homeowners; varying ages, professions, and affiliations  |
| Radio advertising   | Approximately 17,500 daily listeners for at least 15 days   | Residents, second homeowners, and visitors; varying ages, professions, and affiliation. Based on the tri-county area.   |
| TV news crawl   | Unknown   | Local Channel 72 viewers (residents, second homeowners, and visitors; varying ages, professions, and affiliations)  |
| USFS Inyo National Forest email to recreation residence owners and campground concessionaires | Unknown   | Permittees of "recreation residences" within the LABSS study area, campground concessionaires   |
| USFS Inyo National Forest press   | Unknown   | Residents, second homeowners, and visitors; varying ages, professions, and affiliation  |

### 3. Number and type of jobs created

No *new* full-time equivalent jobs were created as a result of this project. However, approximately 1.375 full-time equivalent positions were maintained (not laid off), broken down as follows:

| Occupational Group   | Number of People Employed | Length of Employment (weeks) | Average Number of Hours Worked per Week | Total FTEs | Employment season |
|--|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|------------|-------------------|
| Government position (Town of Mammoth Lakes)                          | 2                         | 104                          | 3.53                                    | 0.353      | All year          |
| Government position (USFS Inyo National Forest)                      | 2                         | 104                          | 0.68                                    | 0.068      | All year          |
| Non-profit position – Professional Services                          | 5                         | 104                          | 3.25                                    | 0.813      | All year          |
| Contractor position – Professional Services (surveying and drafting) | 3                         | 4                            | 24.4                                    | 0.141      | Summer            |

Although not directly attributed to the project, as described above under #1, Resources **Leveraged in the Sierra Nevada**, it could be assumed that the SNC grant funded work played a substantial role in the receipt of additional grant funds from the Federal Transit Administration’s Paul S. Sarbanes grant program totaling more than \$1.4 million, which will be used for future planning and construction. These funds will provide funding for staffing related to planning, design, environmental review, permitting, and construction.

### 4. Number and value of new, improved or preserved economic activities

The LABSS project was primarily a due-diligence/planning project and therefore did not directly result in the creation, improvement, or preservation of economic activities.

However, indirectly, the project facilitates the preservation and improvement of tourism-based recreation in a locally and regionally significant recreation area, which is integral to the economy of the Town and the Inyo National Forest. It is not possible to precisely quantify the value of that economic activity, but may amount to millions of dollars in increased tourism-based revenues for local businesses and tax revenues for the Town. Construction-related economic will also be associated with implementation of the project, providing local employment and sustaining the local economy.

## 5. Percent of pre-project and planning efforts resulting in implementation

The LABSS project was primarily a due-diligence/planning project and therefore no actions have been implemented at this time. However, as described in Section G, **Next Steps**, some implementation actions will take place in the next 1 to 3 years with the award of two federal FTA grants to fund capital and planning projects in the Lakes Basin that are directly related to the LABSS project recommendations/outcomes.

## 6. Number of collaboratively developed plans and assessments

A number of written documents were produced for the project that meet the following criteria:

- They are written documents
- They are developed by at least two organizations that represent different constituencies
- They are provided to stakeholders or the public for review and comment
- They relate to one or more of SNC's seven program goals

All documents were developed by the planning partners (TOML, MLTPA, and the INF), each of which represent varying constituencies. Each document below was released to the public for review and comment and each document relates to at least one of the seven SNC goals.

These documents are summarized as follows:

| Document                        | Developed By                          | Public Review                          | Relates to SNC goals 1 - 7 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| Existing Conditions Report      | TOML, INF, MLTPA, Friends of the Inyo | 9-20-10 to 10-28-10                    | 1, 2, 5, 7                 |
| Preliminary Management Concepts | TOML, INF, MLTPA                      | 6-1-11 to 8-15-11                      | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7        |
| Executive Summary               | TOML, INF, MLTPA                      | Will be released March 2012 – no close | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7        |

Additional materials that were produced, such as data collection sheets and meeting notes from public meetings have also been published on the LABSS project website at [http://www.mltpa.org/projects/current/SOS\\_2010/LABSS/](http://www.mltpa.org/projects/current/SOS_2010/LABSS/)

## 7. Number of participants and organizations represented in the transportation and recreation analysis and development process.

See #2 above. The organizations/agencies represented during the project include the Town of Mammoth Lakes, the United States Forest Service Inyo National Forest, and the

Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access Foundation. Other organizations/agencies that were involved include the Friends of the Inyo (a non-profit) and the Mammoth Community Water District.

#### **8. Resources identified and funds secured to implement the recreation and transportation plans.**

Please refer to Section G, **Next Steps**. Implementation of the management concepts and recommendations resulting from the LABSS project will occur as funding opportunities arise and as staff resources are available. The information and data will also be used by the INF for their update to the forest general management plan.

The Town and its planning partners continually research, evaluate and apply for grants in a number of areas, including transportation, recreation, economic development, etc. As described previously, the Town and INF recently were awarded to federal grants to complete additional planning work and construct transportation capital improvements in the Lakes Basin, which are action items resulting from LABSS.

#### **9. Forecasted change in the number of vehicle miles traveled following the transportation plan implementation.**

In general, the management concepts and recommendations developed during the LABSS project with input from the community and the planning partners aim to reduce overall vehicle use and vehicle miles traveled. A number of the concepts, when/if implemented, have the potential to reduce vehicle miles traveled; however, it is not possible to quantify the reduction at this time. The reduction of vehicle miles traveled is dependent on the type and number of implementation actions that are taken, if they are implemented individually or in combination, and when implementation takes place. Some examples of concepts or recommendations that would reduce vehicle miles traveled if implemented include the following:

- Improvements to multimodal transportation, including adding or improving transit service, construction of additional multiuse paths, improvements or changes to soft-surface trails, signage and wayfinding improvements, etc.;
- Improvements to pedestrian and bicyclist safety that would encourage people to use alternative transportation;
- Possible changes to enforcement and management of parking throughout the Basin that may encourage people to use alternative transportation; and

#### **10. Forecasted change in the resources protected following the recreation plan implementation.**

It is anticipated that implementation of LABSS management concepts and recommendations will significantly improve resource protection related to water quality

and air quality. For example, water quality protection may be improved with implementation of measures such as reducing/prohibiting roadside parking or prohibiting the use of lead fishing tackle. Additionally, both water quality and air quality can be improved if vehicle travel is reduced as described in #9; however, for the reasons described above, it is not possible to quantify a reduction at this time.

**END OF REPORT**