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I. Purpose:

The purpose of the Midpines Area Plan exercise is to implement the General Plan Land Use Element policies. The planning process designed for this purpose is intended to invite the community to have a conversation about: 1) the community that exists; and 2) possibilities that will contribute to the viability and sustainability of the Midpines community as a distinct place among the constellation of Mariposa County places identified in the General Plan.

II. Hierarchy of Plans

The General Plan is the County’s most important policy document, containing overarching goals and implementation measures addressing the health, safety and general welfare of the County as a whole. The Mariposa County General Plan provides the framework for the Midpines Community Plan.

The General Plan contains many goals, policies, standards, prescriptions, and guidelines that affect local community planning. For example, the General Plan describes:

- The overall County setting relative to the natural and built environment, County residents and their government (Chapter 1);
- Issues of importance to all County citizens and guiding principles for the entire County (Chapters 2 and 3);
- Mandatory and optional “elements” containing policies and standards for Circulation, Housing, Agriculture, etc..(Chapters 5-16); and
- An interesting set of “Future Considerations”, applicable to each of the elements, is found in Appendix “C”. (Exhibit 1 - General Plan Table of Contents)

All Elements of the General Plan are equally important. State Law mandates that the General Plan be “internally consistent”; therefore, all of the General Plan Elements must work together in harmony. This necessitates that the General Plan enable subordinate plans, and that these plans are also consistent with the General Plan. Another important feature of the General Plan is its ability to mitigate the environmental effects it creates, or to be “self-mitigating”. So for example while development is envisioned in certain areas, the effect of development on open space is mitigated by measures designed to protect and conserve lands, waters, and related habitats from related adverse effects. Area Plans, creatures of the General Plan, may also be “self-mitigating” in nature, and some aspects of these plans may be mitigated by broader policies.

The most frequently referenced General Plan document is the General Plan Land Use Map, contained in Chapter 5, Land Use Element (Exhibit 2). In addition to overall land use, The General Plan Land Use Map identifies distinct geographic areas for preparation of “Town”, “Community”, and “Special” plans. 17 such areas have been designated throughout the County (Exhibit 3 – General Plan Planning Areas Map). Some of these plans have already been prepared, and, as they are adopted, they assume the authority of the General Plan for the designated area (Exhibit 4 – General Plan table 5-1 Area Planning status).
The General Plan Land Use Element (Exhibit 5 - Chapter 5 Land Use) establishes a hierarchy among the designated Area Plans and establishes assumptions for intensity of land use and development accordingly:

- **Town Planning Areas** are expected to accommodate the most intense development described by the General Plan as “rural-scale urban development”. Acceptable land use and development includes the full range of residential, commercial, quasi-public and public land use and development at densities and intensities compatible with the character of these areas.

- **Community Planning Areas** emphasize single family residential, rural commercial, resort, small businesses, and public land use and development.

- **Special Planning Areas** are designated areas within the County established to address a specific issue or subject of local importance. A Town Plan or Community Plan may also develop a Special Planning area within its boundaries to focus on an issue of key concern to that particular area; e.g. areas of unique recreational, historical, ecological, or social significance or hazard to the County or the area might be designated a Special Planning Area. Midpines is a Community Planning Area and may also possess such unique characteristics, such as fire hazard, historical, recreational or visitor oriented attributes that compel focused action or unique implementation measures.

Midpines is a designated Community Planning Area.

### III. Content of Plans: Mandatory Considerations

Upon adoption, all Area Plans are consistent with General Plan policies and cannot be less restrictive than policies and standards contained in the General Plan. The General Plan encourages Midpines community residents to add layers of detail that illuminate the local condition within the planning area. Midpines Community Planning Area will represent the unique character of the area and the aspirations of residents and businesses.

The General Plan enables the development of Area Plans for the express purpose of maintaining rural character, preserving public lands and protecting agriculture.

All Area Plans are also expected to fulfill County-wide objectives:

- Adhere to minimum County policies and standards;
- Express and evoke the unique character of communities;
- Address key issues of concern to the Area and the County as a whole (the General Plan references key concerns for Midpines as: 1) pressure for additional park employee and seasonal housing; 2) water supply; and 3) fire protection.)
- Enable expansion of rural home industries to appropriately planned and zoned land within the same area; and,
- Incorporate the use of buffer areas and greenbelts to preclude rural sprawl
The General Plan anticipates that the Midpines Community Plan will balance County-wide objectives with the desire to preserve and protect the character of the area.

IV. Midpines Planning Area Classification

General Plan - The current classification for the Midpines Community Plan is Community Planning Area, consistent with the current character of this area, which the General Plan Background Report describes as “Forested, Modest Rural Subdivision, Small scale commercial oriented to tourists”.

Community preferences have historically sought to retain a strong rural character for the area. These community preferences were transferred to the 2006 General Plan; therefore, an Interim Community Center designation, representing any potential or anticipated new residential, limited, supporting commercial development and tourism services, has not been applied to the Midpines area (Figure ____ Midpines Interim Land Use Diagram).

Zoning Ordinance - The Zoning Ordinance implements the Land Use Element of the General Plan. State Law requires consistency between the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan. Current Mariposa County Zoning Ordinance standards for the following Midpines area zoning districts will continue to apply and are therefore considered consistent with the General Plan, regardless of existing land uses that may not conform with principle land uses in these districts.

- Resort Commercial (CR)
- Mountain Home (MH)
- Mountain General (MG)
- Mountain Preserve (MP)
- Public Domain (PD)
- Open Watershed Conservation (OWC)
- Scenic Highway Overlay (SHO)
V. Community Planning Program for Midpines:

The adopted planning program for the Midpines Community Plan is outlined as follows:

A. Planning Process Culture: invitation, ownership, dissent, gifts, commitment, powerful questions, no wrong answers.

1) Invite the community
   a. Notices
   b. Flyers
   c. Personal
   d. Message Boards (electronic and physical)

2) Acknowledge the participants
   a. External
   b. Specific Stakeholders
   c. Partners
   d. Decision Makers

3) Enable personal community interaction as a priority

4) Small groups, informal, adhoc interaction inside and outside meetings
   a. Workshops
   b. Scoping Meetings

B. Planning Process: Roles

1) Community Role
   a. Share the story of our community
   b. Express personal hopes, desires, fears and reservations
   c. Acknowledge issues
   d. Set forth possibilities
   e. Assume responsibility for, and commitment to, change and sustainability

2) Committee Role
   a. Invite the community
   b. Conduct informal outreach
   c. Facilitate gifts of knowledge, perspective, information, and commitment to action
   d. Evaluate information
   e. Deliberate and decide together

3) Staff Role
   a. Partner with Committee
   b. Partner with agency staff
   c. Provide planning context and framework
   d. Describe alternative scenarios and strategies
   e. Inform and educate
f. Conduct research and analysis  
g. Bring agency partners  
h. Assist with facilitation, formal outreach  

C. Planning Process: Inform  
1. Area History (from available literature, participant discussion)  
2. Physical Characteristics (use existing and supplement if needed)  
   a. Ecological (over time)  
   b. Built environment (over time)  
   c. Social expression (arts and letters)  
3. Non-physical attributes with physical implications  
   1) Social interaction  
   2) Ambience  
   3) Cultural influences e.g. local vs. non-local  
4. Illustrate plan boundaries and revise and refine  

D. Planning Process: Tools  
1. Physical and electronic message boards  
2. Adhoc study groups, workshops, scoping meetings  
3. Dot maps (likes, dislikes, issues, opportunities, key areas)  
4. Focused-area maps relative to key areas issues (services, access, geographic, features)  
5. Networking tables  
6. Thematic seating  
7. Writings (issues, options and possibilities, alternatives, policies, standards)  
   1. Participants  
   2. Committee  
   3. Staff  

The MPAC took the following into consideration in programming the community engagement strategy:  
A. Philosophy for conduct of the planning process  
B. Identification of key issues that are anticipated to drive the plan  
C. Guiding Principles for the development of policies and standards for the area  
D. Boundaries of plan area  

**Appendix A** contains diagrams that illustrate the various phases of the planning process that have been adopted by the MPAC.
VI. Plan Area vs. Study Area; Amendments to Classification and Boundaries

The 2006 General Plan provides that the Planning Area classification for an area may be changed and boundaries of planning areas reconfigured. Preparation of a Community Plan often requires consideration of influential factors located outside the Planning Area Boundary. In such cases, a Study Area that is larger than the eventual planning area is selected for this purpose. Selection of a Community Plan Area will occur along with evaluation of Study Area relationships examined in the Background and Issues Identification Report. Completion and adoption of the Midpines Community Plan is the process for amending the Midpines Community Planning Area boundary.

VII. Community Engagement

MPAC has utilized a variety of ad hoc committees to research and conduct activities deemed necessary to inform the planning process and the plan, including a Blog page on the County’s website, Community Forums, and Stakeholder engagement. These activities, together, comprise the Midpines community engagement program: Community Conversations to obtain public input about important topics to be included in the plan.

A. Midpines Community Conversations

MPAC developed a comprehensive public engagement program, entitled “Community Conversations” spanning several months. Community engagement activities including:

- A Community Conversations Blog through the County’s website and a Facebook page
- Community Forums
- Stakeholder surveys

MPAC first approved a series of five key topics and a corresponding set of questions identifying issues to be presented to the community via the County’s website.

1. Fire: wildland, modification, ecology, regulations
2. Regulation: appearance, structures, habitats, scenic quality, safety
3. Development: type, priority, quality, purpose
4. Culture and History: places, features, structures
5. Open Space: management, hazards, interface

The following series of questions, developed by the MPAC for use on the Community Conversations Blog, were designed to elicit community opinion on a range of topics considered key topics by the MPAC. The questions have been used to guide during a more extensive engagement process.
1. Fire Hazard
   
a. Are current fire safety regulations adequate? What regulations would you add or change?
   b. What should be done to improve fire safety for: a) the community; and b) individual properties?
   c. Should current fire safety construction and fuel modification standards be required? If so, when after adoption of the Community Plan should this requirement take effect?
   d. Can fire safety be achieved and the ecological value of forest habitats also protected?

2. Land Use Regulation
   
a. Should the design, placement and color of new structures in Midpines be regulated? If so, to what end?
   b. Should the design of residential subdivisions be regulated? If so, what factors should be used to the subdivision of properties?
   c. Should Midpines have design and appearance standards for private properties? If so, what should these standards accomplish?
   d. Should the Midpines Community Plan identify any special habitats, vegetation of geologic features for protection? What measures should be used to protect these features?
   e. In addition to areas covered by the current Scenic Highway Overlay (SHO) zoning designation, are there any other visual resources within the Midpines area that should be protected? If so, how should these resources be protected?
   f. Should existing and abandoned mines be regulated? If so, how should they be regulated?
   g. Restrictions and Incentives are two regulatory tools that are often used to achieve the best outcome in such areas as appearance, safety, density, preservation or conservation. Are there either incentives or restrictions, or both, that you believe would help to achieve any positive community preservation, conservation or development goals?
   h. Overlay zoning and performance – based zoning are two types approaches to land use regulation. In addition to Watershed and Scenic Overlay Districts, under what other circumstances and how should these approaches be used in Midpines?
   i. What regulations and permits are appropriate for rural industries? Home based businesses? How should the Midpines plan provide for and support the expansion of home based businesses to rural industries.

3. Economic Development, Housing and Community Character
   
a. What is the rural character of the Midpines community, how is it defined, and how should that character be preserved, protected and enhanced?
   b. Should there be new commercial development in Midpines? If so: a) what sort of commercial development is needed in Midpines; b) where should this development be located?
   c. Should the Midpines Community Plan establish a priority for different types of commercial development in Midpines; for example, community-serving or visitor-serving uses?
   d. Is additional housing needed in Midpines? If so, what types of housing is desired and
needed (employee housing, second units, apartments, single family residences, small lot or clustered mixed use development etc.)?

e. Should Midpines have a community center? If so, how should this center be developed, what should it contain, and how should it be designed to serve the community?

4. Cultural History and Community Character

a. What are the important historical aspects of Midpines and how should they be protected?
b. What places and either man-made or natural features are worthy of preservation? How should these areas be preserved?
c. Midpines Community Plan will include an inventory of historically and culturally significant places and structures. What types of, or specific, places or things should be included in this inventory?
d. How should the cultural history and historical community character of Midpines influence future development and improvements within the community?

5. Open Space Management

a. Should the undeveloped open space lands and areas within Midpines community be actively managed to achieve specific objectives?
b. What are the most important purposes to be achieved in managing open space within the Midpines community?
c. What are some ideas for achieving a better relationship, or interface, between open space and developed areas of Midpines?
d. In order to reduce fire or other hazards that threaten the community’s vital economic and cultural assets, should management of unimproved areas of property and open space land be: 1) encouraged through education and incentives? Or 2) required and mandated?
e. Are there other questions, ideas or comments that you would like to make regarding the management of open spaces in Midpines?
f. How should the County support specific outdoor recreation uses and activities that regularly occur in Midpines?
g. How should the plan foster integrated open space planning among agencies?

6. Services

a. Should the 2 lane rural road concept for Midpines be maintained throughout the Planning Area?
b. Can a private party supply community water to off-site uses?
c. What basic infrastructure should be required to be provided prior to, along with, or following development?
d. How should the concept of “carrying capacity” be defined and utilized in the plan?
e. Should additional water storage facilities be provided in Midpines
B. Community Forums and Stakeholder Engagement

The “Community Conversations” public participation program included two Community Forums and a separate Stakeholder Engagement effort. These activities produced the most useful and significant public input regarding key topics of community concern and potential solutions to issues. Key topics identified during these activities were later used to organize MPAC Focus Groups, which developed a set of issues specifically related to these topics.

1. Community Forums - Panel and “Open Space Technology”

MPAC approved a scenario for each of two community forums including: method, central theme, panelists, general and specific topics, and MPAC member roles. Topics for the two forums were: Fire Safety and Open Space Management and 2) Economic Development, Housing, Culture and History.

Each forum was divided into two parts: 1) a panel discussion; and 2) a facilitated “open agenda” discussion of key topics centered around a common theme.

Each panel consisted of subject-matter experts recommended by MPAC. Presentations were designed to both inform and stimulate subsequent conversation.

Following the panel presentations, MPAC conducted an “open agenda” process for public participation involving a simple, self-guided, annotated exchange of concerns and solutions centered around themes and key topics identified by those in attendance that day.

The theme for Fire Safety and Open Space Management Forum: “Create a plan that: 1) results in a safe and healthy community within the urban/wild land interface; 2) acknowledges that a healthy forest ecosystem is fire-dependent; and 3) establishes an action plan for the protection, conservation and use of natural resources.”

The theme for the Economic Development, Housing, Culture and History Forum: “The matrix of social, cultural and economic relationships that formed the community must be identified, recognized and acknowledged as a foundation from which the present day Midpines community has evolved. Present day and foreseeable economic, institutional, and personal relationships are, nonetheless, much more influential in charting a path toward a desirable future community.”

Community members, MPAC members, and panelists participated in break-out group discussions. Important topics raised during Community Forums included:

- Watershed
- Water Supply
- Fire
- Open Space
Prescriptions for the Community Plan developed during the Community Forums are as follows:

- Community development:
  - Define carrying capacity limits
  - Retain rural character
  - Cluster development
  - Conserve viewshed

- Business Development:
  - Leverage only existing local recreation and environmental attributes and assets

- Health and Safety:
  - Water supply quality protection
  - Access for emergency vehicles
  - Private property maintenance
  - Up to date communications network

- Open Space
  - Management - oriented open space management
  - Recreation - integrated access planning

2. Stakeholder Engagement

After reviewing data from the two public forums, MPAC determined that additional effort was necessary to:

a) Identify and engage a broader spectrum of stakeholders;
b) Understand the demographics of Midpines residents;
c) Understand Midpines specific issues and concerns; and
d) More fully describe a range of planning alternatives.

An MPAC adhoc committee developed surveys for Midpines residents, businesses, and landowners; although effectively, only resident survey efforts resulted in meaningful
information. Seventy-four residents completed the survey in March and April, 2014, with questions and the results of a content analysis (key words and themes) contained in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Midpines Stakeholder Preferences Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do I like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural Foothills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coexistence of divergent interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results were then displayed graphically for review by the MPAC using charts and graphs prepared by the Stakeholder Adhoc Committee. *(Appendix B)*

VIII. MPAC Focus Groups

MPAC established Focus Groups to provide recommendations to MPAC regarding topics to be addressed in the Background and Issues Identification Report, based on selected key topics and issues raised during Community Conversations. Members of the MPAC and interested community partners comprise Focus Groups. MPAC directed that: 1) the activities of Focus Groups be solution – driven; and 2) Focus Groups will continue to be “topic experts”, and groups will provide important feedback to MPAC regarding policies and implementation measures as the draft Community Plan moves toward adoption. Four Focus Groups were established by the MPAC:
The four Focus Groups established by the MPAC and key concerns addressed by each group are as follows:

The following is a summary of the key topics identified by each Focus Group which the MPAC has directed to be addressed in this report in greater detail in the related chapters of this report and, subsequently, within the Community Plan:

A. Fire Focus Group

The focus group discussed contents of the Background and Issues Identification Report and how fire related information and issues should be framed and incorporated into the plan. The overall theme that emerged from focus group discussion is of fire as an overarching ecological context for Midpines to be used as a key factor in determining policies and standards of the Community Plan. The group recommended that information assembled to assist in framing issues should include current conditions, policies, regulations, services and resources, and hazard severity by area. The group recommended the following approach.

The Midpines CCWPP and Local Hazard Mitigation Plan should be used as a foundation for the report. Policies, programs and regulations that are based on uniformly applied criteria for ranking degree of fire hazard by area: e.g. terrain, aspect, vegetative cover (fuel load), water resources, access considerations, ownership, proximity and accessibility by fire services, should be considered in incorporated into the report and plan.

The Fire Focus Group recognized the potential for a wide range of policies and regulations from designation of areas for special treatment in the plan, standards for development of individual sites, policies enabling the County to enact hazard mitigation financing programs, and economic development opportunities based on fire hazard and mitigation as a local resource in addition to a constraint.

B. Historic Resources Focus Group

The focus group described and mapped historic sites, areas and routes characteristic of the Midpines area and for which policies and programs can be considered.

C. Economic Development, Housing and Community Character Focus Group

Historical and existing business development should be used to provide the context and guide the location of future economic development. The focus group identified and characterized existing
businesses, primarily along Highway 140, in order to develop policies and programs that support and retain businesses important to the maintenance of the most desirable aspects of rural economic character. The Focus Group identified three areas with distinctive commercial characteristics based on the character of existing businesses. In addition, the focus group conducted an in-depth assessment of attributes that constitute the Midpines rural character.

D. Open Space Focus Group

The focus group identified open Space uses for conservation, recreation, and managed production using on site resources. Enhancement of existing open space uses in all of these categories were explored. The focus group explored ways that use of public open space areas can be enhanced for recreational access and use and that private lands can be preserved in open space such as through slope/density standards and clustered residential uses.

IX. Vision Statement

The public engagement phase of the Community Plan program (“Midpines Conversations” blog, forums, stakeholder outreach, and focus group discussions) enabled the Planning Advisory Committee to prepare a vision statement synthesizing this information. The MPAC adopted the draft statement on July 9, 2014.

- Midpines will continue to be a rural community of diverse neighborhoods and environments. Personal, community and governmental actions will achieve a strong sense of community that honors our natural resources and our historical and cultural heritage. The Midpines community will work to achieve the following:
  - The social, natural, historical and cultural resources of Midpines, including water resources, will be proactively protected for the enjoyment of visitors and residents.
  - Midpines rural character will be maintained and reinforced through the preservation of scenic open spaces, forested areas, and the quiet, natural beauty of the area.
  - Outdoor recreational opportunities will be encouraged, developed, and promoted as important social and economic elements of the community for residents and visitors.
  - Existing and new home-grown and small businesses that are compatible with the historical and environmental context will be supported and encouraged.
  - Housing will be developed in a way that preserves open space, rural character, natural resources, and the history of Midpines.
  - Community safety and resilience, and a balance between the protection of private property rights and the needs of the community, will be achieved through strong community action and shared responsibility for hazardous fuel removal, resulting in a fire safe, forested community.
Community well-being will be maintained by managing growth in accordance with the carrying capacity of community infrastructure and by encouraging a diverse economy and population.

New development will provide public services as development occurs without compromising levels of service or burdening existing residents with the cost of these services.

X. Issues Summary

The MPAC has appointed an adhoc committee to confirm issues and related options for use in preparing a draft Community Plan. The adhoc committee, relying on the results of the Community Conversations program, focus groups and the community visioning process identified issues for which a range of options will be identified. Appendix C contains summaries of issues developed by the Issues and Options Ad-hoc committee.

A. Safety

1. Fire safety management
   a. Road Access
   b. Traffic capacity
   c. Fuel Reduction
   d. PG&E slash removal
   e. Responsibilities of absentee ownership

2. Pollution
   a. Light, noise (e.g., music & dogs)
   b. Hazardous waste
   c. Private & Public Property
   d. Hazardous mines
   e. Historical
   f. Abandoned

B. Housing

1. Design standards
2. Water availability
3. Apartments
4. Locations
5. Cluster Housing
6. Standards
7. Availability
8. Employee Housing
9. Zoning setbacks
C. Open Space

1. Trees & Habitat conservation
2. Watershed Management (Oak Rd., 312 acres)
3. Recreation & Trails
4. Hiking & Biking,
5. Equestrian
6. ATV, etc.
7. Clustered Housing

D. Commercial Business Development

1. New buildings
2. Existing buildings
3. Business incentives (DSL, cell, etc.)
4. Community Serving
5. Visitor Serving
6. Open space vs development
7. Management of unimproved property
8. Location & size
9. Mixed use
10. Zoning overlay

E. Historical and Cultural Preservation

1. Existing & abandoned mines
2. Historical housing incentives
3. Midpines Public Parks Plan (within 20 yrs)

F. Types of Zoning Overlays

1. Scenic overlay
2. Heritage & Trees
3. Habitats
XI. Community Profile and Setting

A. Introduction

Midpines is a geographically undefined, mountainous community located at the foot of the Sierra Nevada Mountains at an elevation of 2585 ft., 6 to 10 miles East of the Town of Mariposa, the County Seat. California Highway 140, located within Community Plan Study Area provides principal access to the community. (Figure 1: Location Map)

The community is comprised of scattered, rural density home sites, small-scale resort and other commercial development, larger undeveloped parcels, working landscapes (ranching, timber and mining), and some Rural Home Industry land uses. Development along Highway 140 consists of residences and limited commercial development serving visitors and the local community.

The Midpines Planning Advisory Committee (MPAC) has delineated a “Study Area” to frame preparation of the Midpines Community Plan. This Study Area, is used to organize the information contained in this report. The following natural, man-made, and jurisdictional/political attributes were used to determine the boundary of the Midpines Community Plan Study Area depicted in Figure 2:

Natural Features:
- Buckingham Mountain
- Feliciana Mountain
- Merced River
- Bear Creek
- Watersheds

Manmade features:
- 140 Corridor
- Local existing and historical landmarks
- Community development
- Private development

Jurisdictional and Political boundaries:
- Supervisor Districts
- Federal Lands (Forest Service and BLM)
- State Lands
- Local Govt.
- Special Districts

Information contained in the Background and Issues Identification Report references the Study Area within which the Community Plan Area will be established. The MPAC has not yet determined a Midpines Community Plan Area.
Figure 1: Location of Midpines

Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.
Figure 2: Midpines Study area

DATE: November 16, 2015
DATA SOURCE: Mariposa County Planning GIS; Parcel Update October 2015
CREDIT: E.E. Meriam - emeriam@mariposacounty.org
Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.
Much of the area surrounding the private lands to the east and north is owned by the Bureau of Land Management and US National Forest. These open space lands perpetuate and enhance the Community’s rural character and forested ambience. Elevations range from 1000 feet to the north along the Merced Wild and Scenic River to ridgelines and peaks that exceed 4000 feet, framing scenic vistas that define the community for residents. The majority of development ranges from 2000’ to 3000’ feet elevation. Accessibility, scenic vistas, the Merced River corridor and year–round access to open space and Yosemite National Park attract many people looking for a rural lifestyle in a mountain forest environment. Table 2. lists the distribution of land under various ownerships depicted in Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% Total Acres</th>
<th>Number of Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>15,620</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>15,379</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra National Forest</td>
<td>8,640</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa County</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced Community College</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Priest Indian Allotment</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California College of Arts</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa Public Utility District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG&amp;E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40,511</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: Midpines Land Ownership
Midpines is within the wildland side of the urban-wildland interface and is well known as a fire
adapted landscape.

B. Demographics (reference to 2010 Census; American Community Survey)

The total population of Midpines was 1,204. Population estimates for 2010-14 show a steady,
annual population decline of 19% below the 2010 estimate. 51% of the population is 45 years of
age or older. There are a total of 511 households, 61% of which are family households. 23% of
households have children under the age of 18. The median household size is 2.36 persons. A
significant number of householders, 31%, live alone. 32% of households include an individual 65
years of age or older.

Of the 571 Midpines residents 16 years of age or older, 48.7% are not in the labor force or are
unemployed. 47% are employed. Most, 63% are employed in non–industrial or non-service
occupations such as business or management, with the remainder in the arts, recreation, public
administration, and social services. 32% are employed in sales and service occupations. There are
no employees in agriculture, forestry or mining occupations.

The median family income is $37,100.

Of the 243 employed Midpines workers, 87% drive alone, and 8% carpool. 1.5% of people work at
home. The mean travel time to work is around 40 minutes. No one walks to work or utilizes any
form of public transportation.

There are a total of 627 housing units in Midpines. 28 of these units are rented. The 2010 census
indicates that there were 49 seasonal or recreational units. The County Auditor has recorded 31
Transient Rental Units in Midpines. The homeowner vacancy rate is 1.5%, and the rental vacancy
rate is 10.4%.

The following Figures 4 – 7 illustrate the populations for Midpines Census Blocks, the Census
Designated Place Population, Housing Units within the CDP and the Median Household Income,
respectively.
Figure 4: Midpines 2010 U.S. Census - Block Population
Figure 5: Midpines 2010 Census Designated Place (CDP) - Population
Figure 6: Midpines 2010 Census Designated Place (CDP) - Housing Units
Figure 7: Midpines 2010 U.S. Census Block Group - Median Household Income

CAL. PRC. CODE § 75005:
California Code - Section 75005
(g) “Disadvantaged community” means a community with a Median Household Income (MHI) less than 80% of the statewide average. “Severely disadvantaged community” means a community with a median household income less than 60% of the statewide average.

2010 California MHI: $60,883

- Disadvantaged Community (DAC): (80%) MHI $48,706
- Severely Disadvantaged Community (XDAC): (60%) MHI $36,530

DATE: October 21, 2015
DATA SOURCE: Mariposa County Planning GIS; Parcel Map March 2015; 2010 US Census American Factfinder; http://www.water.ca.gov/irwm/grants/resourceslinks.cfm
CREDIT: E.E. Meriam - emeriam@mariposacounty.org
Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.
A. General Plan

The 2006 Mariposa County General Plan identifies an interim Midpines Community Planning Study Area and related policies pending adoption of a Community Plan. Land uses consistent with this Planning Area are single-family residential, rural commercial, recreation/resort-oriented, small business and public facilities. Multi-family residential of more than two attached dwelling units are not consistent. Nonetheless, the Midpines Planning Advisory Committee has contemplated a more expansive boundary that encompasses both developed and undeveloped areas such that the character of the area can be recognized, protected and enhanced.

The Midpines Planning Advisory Committee identified a Community Plan Study Area within which an expanded Community Plan boundary will be established. This Study area is bounded by the Merced River to the north; Sweetwater Creek and Snow Creek to the east; Snow Creek to the south; and Fremont Peak to the west. The boundaries of a planning area will be amended through preparation of the Community Plan. (Figure 2 - Community Plan Study Area)

The Mariposa County General Plan classifies lands for the Midpines Study Area as Residential, Rural Economic, Agriculture/Working Landscape, and Natural Resources. These designations are described as follows:

**Agriculture/Working Landscape** land use classification defines lands for the production, extraction, or harvesting of food, timber, and minerals on large parcels of 160 acres or greater in size. These lands and their historically and economically important activities are a major contributing factor to the county’s character. This classification incorporates both the County’s traditional ranch lands and timberlands at the mid-elevations of the County west of Yosemite National Park. This land use classification identifies lands where the primary use is the production of agriculture, timber, or mining for economic benefit, which incidentally have scenic value and appear as open space areas (5.3.04.A).

**Residential** land use classification identifies lands for single family dwellings in a rural setting outside the Planning Area land use classification (5.3.02.A).

**Rural Economic** land use classification identifies land for limited business and commerce to 1) primarily support the needs of local residents, and 2) secondarily support tourism and County visitors. Rural Economic lands are intended to create a local economic unit with the ability to grow and develop in concert with its local service area residential population, reducing local area dependency on vehicle trips to regional commercial centers. Rural Economic land uses provide opportunities for local jobs and a salary base outside of planning areas without creating strips of commercial development (5.3.03.A). There are three sub-classifications of the Rural Economic land use classification: a) Commercial; b) Recreation; and c) Resort.
Natural Resource land use classification defines lands for open space, recreation, ecosystem conservation, watershed protection, environmental protection, conservation of natural resources, and protection of public health and safety (5.3.05.A).

Lands added into the planning area land use classification will be designated “planning area” with a reference to the adopted area plan. (Mariposa County General Plan 5.3.01.G).

Parcels of 40 acres or larger in size may be designated on the Land Use Diagram with more than one General Plan land use classification. Classification boundaries are intended to coincide with zoning boundaries wherever possible.

Parcels less than 40 acres shall be designated on the Land Use Diagram with one General Plan land use classification with the greatest area. (Mariposa County General Plan 5.3)

Where sewer connections are not available to serve any land use, parcels must have approved areas for onsite or community system sewage disposal.

Rural Economic/Commercial - Lands so designated must not exceed 20 acres, including proposed and any existing land uses. Parcels must be contiguous, and not create Residential or other land use islands.

A minimum separation between a planning area or another Rural Economic/Commercial land use classification must be three miles, and the service population within the radius of separation must be at least one thousand persons.

Development sites in Rural Economic land use classifications with slopes over 15% slope must incorporate landform grading engineered for stability and be designed to match the natural contours and topography blending in the natural environment. (Mariposa County General Plan 5.3.03.E(4)

Safe access is required for development of lands in Rural Economic land use classifications. Development will be required to front on a road meeting County road standards. Direct access to State Highways or county arterials should be limited, as appropriate to reduce multiple driveway encroachments, through the use of shared driveways or frontage roads. (Mariposa County General Plan 5..3.03.E(2))

Lands proposed for inclusion in the Rural Economic/Resort subclassification must have a minimum of thirty acres of property developed with resort facilities and amenities. A reclassification to Rural Economic/Resort is required to approve a resort or visitor-oriented ranch as the primary use (Mariposa County General Plan 5.3.04.B)

Land proposed for Rural Economic/Recreation subclassification, must be at least five acres and will not exceed 35% of the total land area within the land use classification. (Mariposa County General Plan 5.3.03.F(2))
Conserving rural character, and avoiding an “over-developed” appearance countywide is an issue of critical concern in hillside areas designated for the Residential land use. The County’s terrain and topography has no regularity, making a uniform solution impossible. Subdivision roads and building sites will be designed to minimize cuts and fills. All cuts and fills will be revegetated within one growing season of construction. The Planning Commission will review subdivisions with slopes on parcels in excess of 15% intending to consider the following:

- The Commission may permit lot size flexibility within density limits (e.g. clustering) to best achieve safe and reasonable building sites
- The Commission will review proposed building sites and native vegetation with the intent of requiring or maintaining a screen of access roads, driveways, and structures consistent with fire safety regulations
- The Commission may require building sites to be set back from ridgelines
- Visual impact of the subdivision and its building sites may result in the Planning Commission modifying parcel sizes and potentially reducing the number of proposed lots
- Proof of slope stability will be required as a condition of a final or parcel map submittal (Mariposa County General Plan 5.3.02.E(2)

The primary uses in Agriculture/Working Landscape land use classification include single-family dwellings on large parcels, agritourism uses in conjunction with the primary agriculture production use of the property, agriculture, timber, and mining activities requiring large acreages for production activities, and processing. The County permits through a discretionary review (conditional use permit) churches, and organizational camps; in addition, the creation of resort or visitor uses which are secondary to the primary uses of agriculture, timber, and mining production.

Table 3 lists the amount of land within various General Plan Land Use designations in the both the existing Community Plan area and the Community Plan Study Area depicted in Figure 8.

B. Zoning

Current zoning classifications are established in Mariposa County Code Title 17, containing the standards, permitted and other uses, and density for zones designated on the Mariposa County Land Use Map.

Mountain Home zone are lands best suited for moderate residential densities based upon suitability of terrain, location adjacent to population centers and services areas. This land use classification is provided to accommodate the major portion of the rural home site growth of the County (17.20.010).

Mountain Transition zone are lands with limited development potential (17.24.010).

Mountain General zone are lands characterized by terrain that is less suitable for moderate or high residential densities or intense use, or is remote from established service centers (17.28.010).
**General Forest** zone are lands under private ownership primarily located within the boundaries of national forest lands that are best suited for low density residential, timber management, agriculture and mining (17.32.010).

**Mountain Preserve** zone are lands that are suitable for extremely low density residential development due to terrain and lack of accessibility. These lands are under private ownership within or adjacent to publicly owned lands, with brush and grass cover, and some timber (17.36.010).

**Agriculture Exclusive** zone are lands considered to be most valuable for agriculture use. The purpose is to preserve the agricultural industry of Mariposa County as a viable economic activity (17.40.010). The density is two single family residences per 160 acres (17.40.010.A.3).

**Timber Exclusive** zone are lands for growing and harvesting timber and those uses which are an integral part of timber management operations. Land use under a TEZ is restricted, for a minimum of ten years, to growing and harvesting timber, and to compatible uses approved by the county (17.44.010). The density is two single family residences per forty acres (17.44.010.A.3).

**Public Domain** zone are lands under public ownership, primarily by the US Forest Service or Bureau of Land Management outside the boundaries of the federal preserve known as Yosemite National Park (17.52.010).

**Public Sites** zone are lands under Federal, state, or other government agency ownership, but not under the control and administration of the US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, or part of the Yosemite National Park Federal Preserve, used primarily for a public purpose (17.56.010).

**Resort Commercial** zone provide locations for highway-related and tourist services. Standards will require that traffic will not unnecessarily be impeded by such locations and a broad range of services will be available (17.96.010).

**Open Watershed Overlay** is a district utilized, or proposed, as watershed providing public surface water supply for a specific project or area, as defined by engineering studies. The specific standards, and regulations of the principal zone with which the OWO is combined are modified in accordance with this chapter (17.60.010). The density is as required by the principal zone or one single family residence per twenty acres, whichever is more restrictive (17.60.010.A.3).

**Scenic Highway Overlay** is an overlay district, combined with any other district, to protect the scenic qualities of public highways or roadways designated a scenic highway by the State of California and/or the Board of Supervisors. The purpose of this district is to maintain the recreational, social and economic values of the County by protecting and enhancing the designated highway, for the benefit of residents and visitors. This zone will function to promote the overall
economic vitality of a district, enhance tourism, and stabilize and increase property values (17.65.010).

Table 4 lists the Zoning Classifications depicted in Figure 9 and the amount of land within the various Zoning Districts within the Study Area. Table 5 lists General Plan Land Use designations within the Study Area and the Zoning Districts that implement these General Plan designations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Midpines General Plan Land Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Community Plan Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag/Working Landscape</td>
<td>445.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2,218.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Economic</td>
<td>13.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,676.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag/Working Landscape</td>
<td>8,678.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource</td>
<td>10,934.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>12,046.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Economic</td>
<td>59.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,719.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4  Midpines Zoning District Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent of Acres</th>
<th>Minimum Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Exclusive</td>
<td>703.17</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Forest</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain General</td>
<td>1,331.08</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>9,937.55</td>
<td>31.33%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Preserve</td>
<td>2,646.00</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Transition</td>
<td>1,438.72</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Domain</td>
<td>15,311.44</td>
<td>48.27%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sites</td>
<td>207.42</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Commercial</td>
<td>121.86</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>2.5 ac: well and septic 1 ac: well or septic 9000 sq.ft.: community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,719.26</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5  Midpines General Plan Land Use Designations – Zoning Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Land Use Designations</th>
<th>Midpines Zoning District Consistent with General Plan Land Use Designations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag Working Landscape</td>
<td>Natural Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Forest</td>
<td>General Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Preserve</td>
<td>Mountain General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Domain</td>
<td>Public Domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sites</td>
<td>Public Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8: Midpines Study Area - General Plan Land Use
Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.

Figure 9: Midpines Study Area - Zoning
XIII. Existing Development

Existing land uses in the Midpines Study Area are predominantly single family residential, with a mix of commercial and public facility land uses clustered in three locations in close proximity to Highway 140.

A. Residential Land Uses

Existing residential land uses in Midpines consist of single family residences, and mobile home parks. There are 31 transient rental occupancies, also considered a residential land use. Of the 837 parcels 73 (9%) are public lands and 448 (53%) parcels have structures with greater than $25,000 in improvement value, indicating development with a residence. Of these, 234 (52%, ) of owners have filed Homeowner Exemptions with the Mariposa County Tax collector, indicating that they consider Midpines their place of residence. 14 Assessor Parcels with Homeowner Exemptions are combined with others under the same ownership.

A variety of alternative uses of land are considered residential land uses including:

- Home Enterprises
- Rural Home Industry
- Mobile Home Parks
- Planned or cluster residential development
- Secondary Residences
- Small Residential Care Facilities
- Day Care Facilities
- Bed and Breakfast and Vacation Rentals

The above uses are subject to zoning ordinance performance standards, and therefore, do not require an entitlement for use permit or other entitlement. Bed and Breakfast and Vacation Rentals are required to register with the County Tax Collector and pay a transient occupancy tax. Figures 10 – 14 depict the following relative to residential land uses in the study area:

10 The location of undeveloped parcels
11 Parcel fragmentation by parcel size
12 Parcels aggregated under one owner
13 An illustration of absentee ownership (Homeowner Tax Exemption)
14 The location of structures and vacation rentals
Tables 6 and 7 provide information corresponding to information illustrated on these figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Parcel Ownership By Size of Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Ownership &lt; 10 acres</td>
<td>2217.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Ownership 10.01 - 40.00 acres</td>
<td>5045.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Ownership 40.01-80.00 acres</td>
<td>2305.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Ownership 80.01 - 160.00 acres</td>
<td>2667.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Ownership 160.01 - 320.00 acres</td>
<td>1564.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Ownership &gt; 320.00 acres</td>
<td>2016.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected/Public Lands</td>
<td>24698.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40513.732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Divisibility of Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/Working Landscape &gt; 320 acres</td>
<td>640.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &gt; 80 acres</td>
<td>988.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Dividable</td>
<td>1888.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Land &gt; $15,000 in Improvements</td>
<td>6339.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected/Public Land</td>
<td>24698.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 0-9.99 acres</td>
<td>517.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential 10-24.99 acres</td>
<td>1379.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential &gt; 25 acres</td>
<td>4061.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40513.732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Commercial Land Use

Midpines is home to 68 businesses, many of which are home-based businesses. Figure 15 depicts existing commercial land uses. The existence of commercial land uses in the Study Area, compared to the overall residential zoning classification within the area, creates a number of non-conforming land uses listed in Table 8. The improvement and intensification of these land uses is restricted due to this designation.
Figure 10: Midpines Undeveloped Land
Private land < $15,000 in improvements and Land Use with Agriculture/Working Landscape, Natural Resources, and Residential

DATE: December 16, 2015
DATA SOURCE: Mariposa County Planning GIS; Parcel Update November 2015
CREDIT: E.E. Meriam - emeriam@mariposacounty.org
Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.
Figure 11: Midpines Assessor's Parcel Fragmentation
Figure 12: Midpines Private Ownership Parcels Aggregate (One Owner)
Figure 13: Midpines Homeowner Exemptions
Midpines Parcels with $7,000 Homeowner Exemption (Primary Residence) and Parcels with Assessed Improvement Values > $15,000

DATE: March 1, 2016
DATA SOURCE: Mariposa County Planning GIS; Parcel Update November 2015
CREDIT: E.E. Meriam - emeriam@mariposacounty.org
Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.
Figure 14: Midpines Study Area - Transient Rental and Parcels > 40 Acres
Figure 15: Midpines Commercial Sites
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Key #</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Landuse</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cal. Trans Maint. Station</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOA Campground &amp; RV Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muir Lodge</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>On Split Parcel of MG/MH; On MG portion</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>N- Expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpines Store</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Bug Rustic Mountain Resort</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>On Split Parcel of RC/MG; On RC portion</td>
<td>Rural Economic</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek Cabins</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Resort Commercial</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Old&quot; Octagon Cafe</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mountain Preserve</td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outward Bound</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Resort Commercial</td>
<td>Rural Economic</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Inn (historical)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>N- Expired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chappell Winery &amp; Vineyard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Automotive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Oaks, Inc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sierra Manufacturing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes/Apartments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briceburg Visitor Center</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mountain Preserve</td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop Inn/Employee Housing (Fisher)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mountain Preserve</td>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa Pines (Residential Care Facility)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mountain Home</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIV. Public Services and Facilities

A. Public Services:

Midpines is served by the following service districts:

- Countywide County Service Area No. 1 — Roadway maintenance.
- Countywide Service Area No. 3 — Fire Protection Services
- Countywide Districts:
  - John C. Fremont Hospital District, provides general hospital services;
  - Mariposa County Water Agency, conserves, develops, and controls use of water for areas not served by the Mariposa Public Utility District;
  - Resource Conservation District develops and administers programs for soil, water, and other natural resource conservation;
  - County Service Area No. 1 provides maintenance for County paved and unpaved roadways, and also contains Zones of Benefit (ZOB) for private road maintenance for two roadways, Leichtlin Lane, and Silva Ridge Road.

1. Fire and Pre-Fire Services

Fire Protection, Suppression and Prevention in Mariposa County is multi-level, interagency and multi – faceted. Beginning in 2000 Federal, State and Local governments began preparing a comprehensive plan known as the "National Fire Plan". The national plan outlined a comprehensive five point strategy:

- Firefighting
- Rehabilitation and Restoration
- Hazardous Fuel Reduction
- Community Assistance
- Accountability

This comprehensive strategy committed funding for a continued level of "Hazardous Fuel Reduction" and new funding for a "Community Assistance/Community Protection Initiative." The intent of the Community Assistance initiative is to provide communities interfacing with federal lands, such as Mariposa County, an opportunity to get technical assistance and funding to reduce the threat of wildfires.

A fundamental step in implementing this strategy is identification of communities that are at high risk of damage from wildfire. These “Communities At Risk” within the wildland-urban interface, the area where homes and wildlands intermix, were published in the
Federal Register in 2001. At the request of Congress, the Federal Register listed those communities neighboring federal lands.

The Plan directed federal agencies to "work directly with communities to ensure adequate protection from wildfires, and to develop a collaborative effort to attain the desired future condition of the land."

The key wildland fire management agencies in California have chosen to accomplish this effort through the California Fire Alliance (CFA). Participating members of the Alliance include the US Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, CalFire, and the California Fire Safe Council.

The CFA has agreed to focus alliance efforts on four strategies:

- Collaborate to develop, modify and maintain a comprehensive list of “Communities At Risk” from wildfires
- Work with communities to develop community based planning leadership and facilitate the development of community fire loss mitigation plans;
- Assist communities in the development of fire loss mitigation planning, education and projects that will reduce the threat of wildfire losses on public and private lands; and
- Develop a universal information and education outreach plan to increase awareness of wildland fire protection program opportunities.

The California Fire Safe Council (CFSC) is particularly instrumental in channeling information and financial resources to local Councils and similar groups to address the needs of Communities at Risk. Initiated as a committee within CalFire, the CFSC became a separate non-profit entity in 2002 to facilitate information and financial assistance to local governments, districts and community groups from Federal Agencies (BLM, USFS, NPS, USFW) for pre and post fire mitigation.

Midpines is among the 1,329 California communities identified by the California Fire Alliance as a “Community at Risk”. Using funding provided by the Sierra Nevada Conservancy via the CFSC, in 2012 the Mariposa County Fire Safe Council completed the Midpines Community Conservation and Wildland Fire Protection Plan. The plan contains in depth description of the fire – adapted ecology of the area, analysis and important conservation prescriptions based on this information.

Within the Study Area, 24,167 acres are Federal Responsibility Areas and 16,132 acres are State Responsibility Areas.
Individual CAL FIRE Unit Fire Management Plans document assessments of the fire situation within each of CalFire’s 21 distinct Units and six contract counties.

The Midpines Community Plan Study Area is encompassed by the Madera-Mariposa-Merced Unit. This unit has three operational divisions whose boundaries are established by the three county lines. The Unit protects a total area of 3,570,000 acres, and a total population of 284,000 residents. The three divisions include the Mt. Bullion Conservation Camp and eleven (11) Battalions. The key operational preparedness program is the Unit wide "Structure Defense / Evacuation Plan". The Unit collaborates with Mariposa County Fire Safe Council, Mariposa Resource Conservation District and South West Interface to encourage communities to adopt fire safe practices and provide educational resources. The Study Area is included within the service area of Battalion 2.

Battalion 2 stretches through the Eastern portion of Mariposa County’s State Responsibility Area (SRA) with State Highway 49 and 140 intersecting in the town of Mariposa. The communities of Mariposa, Bootjack, Lushmeadows, Ponderosa Basin, Midpines, Mount Bullion and Mormon Bar are within this Battalion. The most populated areas are the communities located on the Highway 49 corridor. Battalion 2 areas, including Midpines, have grown in recent years with new residential construction. This rate of development created numerous areas in Battalion 2 that have a high potential for rapid fire spread and loss of structures. Most of the Unit’s large, damaging fires have originated within these areas, influenced by high fuel loads, including diseased dead trees, steep slopes, and housing density.

Two Figures 16 depict State and Federal Responsibility Areas (SRA/FRA) within and surrounding the Study Area and the related Battalion boundary serving the community.

Public Resources Code, section 4291 requires that properties within State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) maintain a well cleared area of 30 feet a 100’ fuel reduction zone around residences and structures. Inspections throughout Battalion 2 are conducted annually using a Form LE-100. LE-100 inspections to ensure a 100’ clearance is maintained. The Battalion averages 2,700 inspections, yielding an average of 4,700 structures. LE-100 inspections are carried out under Mutual Aid Agreement with Mariposa County Fire Dept and the Mariposa Public Utility District. The Unit Plan Appendix “E” contains a summary of the results of these inspections, along with other fire-related data. (Source: Madera Mariposa Merced Unit Plan.)
CAL FIRE has a legal responsibility to provide fire protection on all State Responsibility Area (SRA) lands, which are defined based on land ownership, population density and land use. The SRA dataset shown here provides areas of legal responsibility for fire protection, including State Responsibility Areas (SRA) and Federal Responsibility Areas (FRA).

The Direct Protection Area (DPA) delineates the dividing lines between land that will be provided wildland fire protection by the State, Federal, and Local agencies. The Cooperative Fire Management Agreement (CFMA) between the federal agencies and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is the primary mechanism that provides the framework for wildland fire protection responsibilities statewide.
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Figure 16a: DPA, FRA, SRA and Mariposa County Community Response Areas
16B Battalion Map
b. County Service Area No. 3 Fire Protection serves Midpines, along with all other areas of the County not served by MPUD. Mariposa County Fire Department, Fire Company 21, is located in the heart of Midpines at the Midpines County Park, 6364 Highway 140. The Company provides primary coverage to Midpines and secondary coverage to El Portal, Mariposa, Mt Bullion/Airport and Bootjack companies. A fire engine, water tender, and patrol with “jaws of life” are assigned to the company. A Zone of Benefit enabled acquisition of fire equipment prior to the establishment of CSA 3. This ZOB has expired.

c. Fire Ready Committee: MCRCD (see below)

Established as a formal committee by the MCRCD Board of Directors, the objective of the Committee is to motivate private landowners to join together at the neighborhood level to reduce hazardous vegetative fuel loads on their property both in and beyond the defensible space required by Public Resource Code 4291. The Committee hosts educational workshops and events and publishes material designed to raise awareness of the need, benefits, methods, and resources available for achieving defensible space.

2. Mariposa County Resource Conservation District (MCRCD)

Resource conservation districts (RCDs), are "special districts" of the state of California established under Division 9 of the California Public Resources Code to be locally governed agencies with their own locally appointed, independent boards of directors.

The mission of the Mariposa County Resource Conservation District is to encourage and facilitate cooperative solutions to local resources conservation issues and problems. The organization is funded. We provide technical, financial and educational resources, whatever their source, to meet the needs of the local land-users.

Together with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the two organizations are local partners providing assistance to our community.

These goals are designed to bring about a wider awareness that conservation is necessary for the protection of our resource base, the beauty of our environment, and the prosperity of Mariposa County. Inherent in these goals is an ecosystem approach to conservation issues related, but not limited to, soil, water, air, wildlife, fish, plant, timber, mineral, geological, scenic, historical, recreational, and economic resources on private lands of Mariposa County.

A principal project of MCRCD is the Yosemite-Mariposa Integrated Regional Water Management Plan Y-M IRWMP. The region, whose boundaries coincide with the Mariposa
County line, has been involved in the work of integrated regional water management since 2008. The region’s pristine Sierra Nevada headwaters flow to the San Joaquin Valley. The Y-M Regional Water Advisory Council (RWAC) includes water purveyors, special districts, a land conservancy and environmental groups. The group was pleased to be awarded a CA Dept of Water Resources (DWR) planning grant of $823,019 to complete a regional IRWM Plan, which was approved by DWR in September 2014.

A project of MCRCD and IRWMP, the Upper Merced River Watershed Council (UMRWC) was established in 2001 through a watershed coordinator grant awarded to the Mariposa County Resource Conservation District. The Council identified Watershed needs, and formulated a work plan for the watershed. In 2008, it gained 501(c)3 status as a nonprofit organization. The mission of the Upper Merced River Watershed Council is to work with stakeholders, individuals and organizations to protect and enhance the natural, economic, and cultural resources of the Watershed through education, community-based projects, responsible planning, and stewardship. Midpines is located within the IRWMP and Upper Merced Watershed Council planning and study areas.

B. Public Facilities

1. Roadways

Midpines is served by a variety of paved and unpaved Federal, State, and Local Roadways depicted in Figure 17. State Route 140 provides principal access to properties and lands within the study area along an approximately 10 mile stretch beginning east of Grosjean Rd. and ending at Briceburg.

a. State Route 140

Caltrans has adopted a Concept Plan for SR 140, described as a year - round route that runs west to east from I-5 to SR 99 to Yosemite National Park (YNP) through Merced and Mariposa Counties, serving the Cities of Gustine and Merced, and the communities of Planada, Catheys Valley, Mariposa Midpines, Briceburg, and El Portal.

The SR-140 corridor travels through three distinct environmental contexts—the reclaimed Tulare Lake bed and the San Joaquin River Valley, the Sierra Nevada foothills, and the Merced River Canyon. Along this corridor are recreational areas such as San Luis National Wildlife Refuge, Kesterson National Wildlife Refuge, the Sierra National Forest, and Yosemite National Park. Along Segments 5 and 6, from Midpines to the YNP boundary, SR 140 encounters prehistoric and historic cultural resources; endangered, threatened or sensitive biological species; wetlands, along with aesthetic resources, and encroaching upon a Wild and Scenic River.
As one of the four highway entrances to the Park, SR 140 offers the shortest access to Yosemite Valley from nearby local lodging, compared to SR 120 (north and east entrances) and SR 41 (south entrance).

Of the six segments in Mariposa County, depicted in Figure 17 all are two lane, most having posted speed limits of 55 MPH in rolling terrain. The portion of SR 140 through Midpines is designated as Segment 5, extending from Triangle Road to Foresta Road near the town of El Portal.

East of the town of Mariposa throughout the Study Area, SR 140 is a designated State scenic highway. Commute volumes tend to diminish and the traffic becomes predominantly recreational past Midpines. Throughout its extent, SR 140 is bicycle and pedestrian accessible. Currently SR 140 is considered an unsigned Class III bicycle route. Given the planning emphasis on bicycle use and the efforts to reduce motorized vehicle travel in YNP, the Concept Report recommends a bicycle route be provided with a lane separate facility connecting City of Merced’s transit center to YNP.

East of Triangle Road through Midpines, SR 140 is a California Advisory Legal Truck Route with a king to rear axle restriction of 32 feet with an additional temporary restriction of no buses or trucks greater than 45 feet in length permitted east of the Ferguson Slide.

Yosemite Area Transit Service (YARTS) serves SR 140 between the City of Merced and YNP and is considered to provide primarily a recreation and tourist service to YNP. YNP has planned to reduce automobile congestion through transit solutions. YARTS was specifically conceived to address this need.

Given the rolling to mountainous terrain throughout Mariposa County, there exists some need for passing lanes. Several of these are proposed in the current RTP and affect Segment 5. The Mariposa County RTP does not include any capacity increasing projects for SR 140 by 2040. The RTP does address long range operational projects (Tier II), realigning a portion of the segment of SR 140 between Midpines and Briceberg.

A key issue affecting the Midpines Segment 5 is the recommendation that SR 140 include a separated bicycling corridor parallels SR 140.

Key intersections with Hwy 140 within the Study Area include:

- Allred Rd.
- Triangle Rd.
- Whitlock Rd.
- Colorado Rd., and
- Briceburg Rd. providing recreational access to the Merced River corridor.
Caltrans operates a Maintenance Facility to service Hwy 140 operations located on Hwy 140 in Midpines (see discussion Public Facilities).

b. County and Private Roadways

There are approximately 61 miles of paved and unpaved County and privately maintained roadways in the Study Area. Principal access to the Study Area is from E. Whitlock Rd. and Colorado Rd., via intersections with Hwy 140. Together with Sherlock Rd., these principal County-maintained roads form the primary looped system enabling access to Study Area lands and parcels via local public and private roads. West Whitlock Rd., a paved, County maintained road forms a portion of the westerly boundary of the Study Area providing secondary connection between Hwy 140, Study Area roadways and Hwy 49 North.

1) County Maintained Roads - There are approximately 18 miles of paved and 6 miles of unpaved County maintained Roads in the Study Area. The following are the only County maintained road segments that are paved along their entire length:

- Triangle Rd.
- Colorado Rd. from Hwy 140 to Sherlock Rd.
- Yosemite Oak Rd.
- West Whitlock Rd.
- East Whitlock Rd. from Hwy 140 to West Whitlock/Sherlock Rd. Intersection and
- Ponderosa Wy. Feliciana Mtn. Rd.

Other County - maintained road segments are a combination of paved and unpaved sections including:

- Sherlock Rd.
- Colorado Rd.
- Oak Rd
- Allred Rd.

2) Private Roads. There are approximately 36 miles of paved and 1 mile of paved private roadways in the Study Area, more than double the number of County maintained roadways. Many of these private roadways are named, including those accessed from principal roadways as follows:

- Hwy 140: Chamberlain Rd.; Leichtlin Rd
• East Whitlock: Paddy Hill Rd.; Cory Pines Rd.; Placer Ln.; Black Oak Ridge Rd.; Red Cedar Court; Foran Rd.; Alta Vista Rd.; Penny Royal Ln.; Crystal Aire Dr. (portions); Vineyard Ln.

• Yosemite Oaks Rd/Oak Rd.: Windsong Ln

• Sherlock Rd.: Salamander Rd.; Spencers Mill Ln

• Colorado Rd.: Lakeside Rd.; Lakeside Dr.; Wilderness View Dr.; Pine Canyon Rd.; Deer Meadow Wy; Davis Rd.; Cedar Gulch Ln.; Rumley Mine Rd.; Rancheria Creek Rd.; Quail Ln.;

• Ponderosa Wy: Deer Park Dr.;

• Triangle Rd.: Plumbar Creek Rd via Buckingham Mountain Rd.

• West Whitlock: Gold Mine Pl.

3) Several unpaved and unnamed private roads exist within the study area: extending from Rancheria Creek Rd toward the Merced River; extending from Hwy 140 and serving the Sarah Priest Allotment; and extending from Sherlock Rd. parallel to Long Canyon Creek; and extending from Sherlock Rd to a private inholding on Telegraph Hill across BLM lands.

   Despite the prevalence of privately maintained roadways, only two (2) County Zones of Benefit for road maintenance exist, for Silva Ridge Rd. and Leichtlin Ln.

4) BLM and USFS Roadways: In addition to County maintained and private roads, there are approximately 53.49 miles of unpaved and 6.9 miles of unpaved roadways that are located and maintained with USFS and BLM (noted as “other public) lands. These remote and difficult to traverse roadways may be accessed by the public.

5) Principal Intersections in the Study Area are as follows:

• Hwy 140/East Whitlock Rd.
• Hwy 140/Yosemite Oaks/Oak Rd.
• Hwy 140/Triangle Rd.
• Hwy 140/Colorado Rd.
• Hwy 140/Briceburg Rd.
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CREDIT: E.E. Meriam - emeriam@mariposacounty.org

Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.

Figure 17: Midpines Area County Maintained Roads (Sierra Tel)
2. Public Facility Sites

Public Facility Sites depicted in Figure 18 include the following:

- Midpines County Park and Community Hall,
- Midpines Fire Station (Mariposa County Fire);
- Briceburg Visitor’s Center,
- CalTrans Facility;
- U.S. Post Office;
- MPUD potable water storage facility off Colorado Road
- Saxon Creek MPUD pumping station;
- Cemeteries on Colorado Rd and Oak Rd;
- PG&E poles, lines & equipment (high tension line to YNP);
- Sierra Telephone lines & equipment; and
- Northland Cable lines & equipment, cell towers
Figure 18: Midpines Public Facilities
a. **MPUD**

MPUD delivers water to the Town of Mariposa via the Saxon Creek pipeline located within the Saxon Creek Watershed, which is pumped to a 1 million gallon water storage tank located near Colorado Rd. These facilities were approved for construction in 1991 and completed in 1997.

b. **Recreation**

The Study Area contains a wide variety of public recreation resources, including those oriented to use of the Merced River environment, and the Midpines Park. Recreation on BLM managed lands includes McCabe Flat campgrounds family and group camping, swimming holes, river rafting, fishing, placer mining, touring, and hiking. (Figures 19a and b)

Midpines Community Park is a four (4) acre parcel granted to the County of Mariposa in 1983. In 2013, an adjoining, undeveloped 7.75 acres with providing access to seasonal Bear Creek was added to the park. The Park is currently used by the community by reservation. Park facilities include open space with playground, picnic tables, BBQ, restrooms a community hall outdoor patio and restrooms. (Figure 20)

The site contains the County Fire Station Fire Station which houses fire protection equipment serving the Midpines Community. The fire station is also a designated public refuge gathering point.

The site also serves as a park and ride facility for YARTS with approx. 24 commuter parking spaces.
FIGURE 19 B MERCED RIVER REC AREA

Figure 20: Mariposa County Park - Midpines
c. Caltrans Yard

The Caltrans Midpines Maintenance Station is located at 6610 Highway 140 bounded on the northwest by Ponderosa Way, to the southwest by Hwy 140, and to the northeast and southeast by sparse rural residential development. The site was developed as a Caltrans maintenance station in 1928 including the foreman’s office, gas house, truck shed, superintendents office, a 3,800-liter (1,000-gallon) gasoline underground storage tank (UST) and a 2,090-liter (550-gallon) diesel UST, a domestic water well and a septic tank and leach field. A covered asphalt emulsion aboveground storage tank (AST), loading dock, a water tank, a second domestic well, blacksmith shop, paint house, and garage were constructed at the Site prior to 1950.

In 1994, the site was demolished and re-developed on two levels including an office and equipment building, a domestic water well, two water storage tanks, warehouse/gas house, sand storage building, detention basin and material storage bins. The site contains several above ground storage tanks for diesel, gasoline, liquefied petroleum gas, hazard materials storage, sand storage and a detention basin.

Road Grader, Loader, 2 - 1 ton trucks, 1 equipment trailer, 4 to 5 dump trucks w/ sander and plows, trailer mounted arrow board.

d. Briceburg

The eastern most landmark in the Study is the Visitor Center at Briceburg, located 15 miles north of Mariposa (Fi. A suspension bridge crosses the Merced River, giving access to the former Yosemite Valley Railroad right of way, which runs along the river’s north bank. A well maintained BLM gravel road runs down stream four and a half miles, passing three campgrounds and many beaches and turnouts on the way. There are three BLM campgrounds along the Merced River between Briceburg and Bagby. They are the McCabe Flat Campground, Willow Placer Campground and the Railroad Flat Campground. The campgrounds are accessible only by crossing the bridge at Briceburg and heading down river on the road (old Figure 20 Yosemite Valley Railroad grade)

XV. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

NOTE: The following narrative is a compilation developed and written for the Midpines Community Plan by Mariposa County Historian, Ron Loya. Other excerpts are from the Community Features Section of the 2012 Midpines Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) attached as Appendix C. Figure 21 depicts sites and resources referenced in the following narrative.
A. Historical Overview

Pre-History
For eons before the arrival of white settlers, the Bear Creek waterway and the land around it was nothing more or less than a source of food and shelter for sparse populations of Native American Indians. Life for them was dictated by the seasons, as differing selections of flora and fauna foods, and associated products such as pelts and plant fiber, became available. Traveling from one point to another was accomplished on foot, and mostly by using game trails. (Kroeber, Indians of Yosemite; 1921)

The Midpines area has, for generations, contained a substantial population of American Indians. The Yokut, Paiute, Miwok, Kesson and Chukchansi Peoples survived on the natural bounty that was provided by the Central California foothills’ soil. The contemporary members of these tribes have banded together, forming the Southern Sierra Miwok Nation. This cultural group currently strives to maintain language, identity, custom, and heritage along with forming an element essential in dealing with the various government agencies brought to the fore when California became a state in the United States of America.

The Southern Sierra Miwok have extensive spiritual, cultural and traditional ties to the land in Midpines. From the abundant local plant life, tribal members would gather not only food staples, but also plants and herbs used for medicinal purposes as well as the raw materials required for basketry. While useful plants are manifold, too numerous to mention here, the following represent some of the more prevalent and important of the flora gathered by the local tribes.

Currently the Southern Sierra Miwok have been designated several Bureau of Indian Affairs administered allotments in the Midpines area. These allotments provide federally protected land for specific families of the Southern Sierra Miwok nation and, in the case of the Hearn allotment, contain post-European contact cemeteries for burial of family members. Along with these federal allotments, the tribe maintains a 137-acre contiguous mining claim which is reserved for mixed usage including mining, and traditional ceremony.

Midpines is very archaeologically diverse, with some nineteen Indian village sites within its modern boundaries. These can be found along Saxon Creek, including Feliciana, Timber and Carstens Road as well as a documented village site just below the location of the old Acorn Inn located at the convergence of Triangle Road and Highway 140. Another village site can be found in the area directly behind the Midpines Store.

Midpines is also home to a number of traditional burial locations for the member tribes of the Southern Sierra Miwok Nation. The Saxon Creek and Jones Creek areas were popular locations to bury the dead. The tribes would traverse the lands between village sites and gathering areas using an extensive network of trails, with one of the most important running perpendicular to the Merced River and crossing near Briceburg.
Due to the sensitive nature and archaeological value of these areas, their direct locations of burial, village and trail sites cannot be revealed in this report. While any major work will require permitting that will be viewed by the Mariposa Indian Council, it would be to great advantage to check with the Council before any extensive work is considered.

First European/American Exploration
It wasn’t until Spanish, English and American explorers began to penetrate inland California in the late 1700’s and early 1800’s that the indigenous populations began to see the first white men and some strange new animals called horses. The “Fur Rush” of the 1780’s to the 1830’s brought the first white men who sought not so much to explore, than to make a profit from the abundance of fur bearing animals in this region, and so the Native Americans came to the stunning realization that they were not alone in their world.

(Moraga: Diary of Ensign Gabriel Moraga’s Expedition of Discovery in the Sacramento Valley; 1806, 1808)
(Bancroft: History of California; 1886)
(Carter: Mountain Men & Fur Traders of The Far West; 1982)
(Gutierrez/Orsi: Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush; 1998)

Gold Rush
The sole reason that non-natives chose to be here was to mine, and mine they did. In fact, this very area was known to be one of the richest gold deposits in the southern Mother Lode region.

Within a year of the discovery of California gold in 1848, the first of the Argonauts that were in search of the yellow metal, began arrive here. The portion of the highway that we now know as State Route 140, from Mariposa to the Merced River, became a well-worn footpath for the miners to follow along Bear Creek. Indeed, it may have been a boulder strewn, winding trail with precipitous drops and steep climbs, punctuated with oak, pine and brush but it served the needs of the new transient population none the less. By the 1850’s, Bear Creek and all of its tributaries began to be inundated with miners from all over the world in search of fast and vast riches. Ramshackle dwellings of all sorts, from makeshift mercantile tents to reed huts to log cabins began to line the creek.

As is the case with most initial gold discoveries, the miners were in search of placer gold, the kind that was laying on the bottoms of creeks and streams. Occasionally, these waterways were diverted to better exploit the placers, and sometimes very rich pockets of gold were unearthed. As the success of this type of placer mining became known, groups of miners formed “companies”, and Bear Creek began to undergo significant changes as tailing piles (which can still be seen to this day) began to accumulate adjacent to the creek. The settlement of Bear Creek became a destination from the mining camps and later towns of Mariposa and Agua Fria to the south and from the north, via the Inland waterways out of San Francisco and Sacramento that ended at what is now, Stockton.
One early miner was a man by the last name of Sherlock, who gave up an elected position in Agua Fria to pursue the yellow metal:

**SHERLOCK’S DIGGINGS:** This, Mr. Editor, is unquestionably the place for 'big chunks,' but let me instruct you concerning these diggings. They were discovered two or three months since by a man named Sherlock, who, with a company of seventy Mexicans worked these deposits on shares. The work varies with us, as well as elsewhere. In eight days, three men took out 57 pounds of pure gold. And last week two men took out in two days 29 pounds from a spot near my camp. Sherlock has gone into the mountains, no one knows where, and we have elected a new Alcalde, who, the day of his installation into office, issued an order for all Mexicans to decamp, which they did forthwith. We all intend to winter here, as we can easily make comfortable quarters. This place is distant 11 miles from Fremont's discovery, and is much the richest of the two deposits. Many large pieces have been found here averaging from one to eight pounds pure gold. The finest pieces usually are worth about fifty cents, so you perceive this is the region of "big lumps". (Alta California: News from the Mines 1849)

Other miners were Lafayette Bunnell who later joined James Savage's Mariposa Battalion and entered the Miwok valley that he would name “Yosemite”, and the eccentric Captain John Diltz, who stashed large chunks of gold in grain sacks, and believed that one day more ships would be in the air than on the ocean.

One exception to the rule that Bear Creek was a place dominated by miners was David Clark, who came here in 1851 to become one of the county's first sawyers. Besides supplying the local mines, his mill was one of two that cut the timbers that it took to build the Mariposa County Court House.

**Early Tourism**

With the growth of automobile tourism in the early 1900’s, the foothills and mountain ranges of Central California, and most importantly the newly designated Yosemite National Park, became a popular destination. To accommodate these new “motor-argonauts” a new road which could provide year-round access to Yosemite was needed, and so in the mid 1920’s the dirt trails that were barely adequate enough to qualify as a horse drawn wagon route, began to be transformed into bona fide highways.

Even before the grading machines arrived, entrepreneurs began making plans to take advantage of the increased traffic, and bought land adjacent to the coming highway. They knew that overnight accommodations, eateries, rest stops and gas stations would be a profitable venture and places like Log Cabin City, and Camp Midpines (the future namesake for the community of Midpines) suddenly appeared, making for an ideal overnight stay before the last leg of a tourist’s trek to Yosemite. The highway changed Bear Creek from an outpost that was a half day horseback ride from Mariposa, to an hour or two jaunt in an automobile. Even with the fancy new pavement, the road was not without its own “built in” dangers. Much of the road paving material came from the Mariposa Mine located just to the south of the town of Mariposa, and it was that material that came be a hazard in and of itself, as it contained many
pieces of jagged iron, spikes, nails and shards of glass. Many of the thin banded rubber automobile tires of the time did not fare well on this portion of the journey to Bear Creek and beyond. Curves and inclines were still for the most part untamed, and for motorists not used to mountain driving, auto accidents were also common.

This unfortunate side - effect of progress was not lost on the lodge owners and so auto repair shops were added to their facilities. Now Bear Creek could provide any tourist who experienced an unfortunate driving experience with the respite of a bit of socializing, a good meal, and a comfortable night’s sleep while their driving machine was put back into good repair.

Many years later in 1926, when the All Weather Highway from Merced to Mariposa was officially opened, Bear Creek began to come to life with people who had no interest in mining, but who came to explore as an activity of leisure, they were the among the very first motor tourists in the foothills of Mariposa County.

Entrepreneurs were quick to capitalize on the increased traffic, with resort lodges, restaurants and lunch counters springing up to take advantage of the relative deluge of outsiders. The simple fact was that gold mining was on the wane and tourism on the rise, and things were indeed changing fast for the residents of Bear Creek.

One entrepreneur by the name of Newell Chamberlain paid the tidy sum of $800.00 to buy a 160 acre homestead and one time mining claim for a lodge which he named Camp Midpines. Once a post office was opened at that location (with Mr. Chamberlain becoming its first Postmaster, of course), Midpines was an officially designated location on the way to Yosemite National Park. The following are illustrative of the businesses that flourished as Highway 140 opened:

**Acorn Inn**
Located at the junction of Highway 140 and Triangle Road. This tourist resort would begin as the brainchild of Fred Clark Sr. who broke ground just before the building of the all year SH140, or State Highway 140, in 1926.5 Though it has not functioned as a tourism venue for many years, the original main hall still stands.

**The Midpines Resort**
Established in the early 1920’s when Newell Chamberlain built camp Midpines on a 171 acre parcel he had recently purchased. This camp quickly became a tourist resort when California established all year highway 140 to Yosemite in 1926. Soon a Post Office was placed there and Midpines became the official name of the township, with Newell serving as its first postmaster.

**The Summit Inn**
Located on SH140 at the Midpines Summit. Another of the tourism operations related to the 1926 opening of all year SH140. Opened by the Millburn family, the remains of this operation were torn down because of the Midpines Summit Highway widening project.
The Midpines Store
The Carstens family opened this store, located at the intersection of Carstens Road and Hwy 140 to serve visitors. The store, still in operation is a community landmark.

With all of the changes that mining, tourisms and their resulting development imparted on the landscape of Bear Creek, this tiny hamlet managed to retain its natural beauty, and visitors came back, many times not to return to Yosemite, but to enjoy Bear Creek itself.

The Highway 140 corridor has historically been the focus of this commercial activity supporting the community and visitors. **Table 9** lists early tourism sites and uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISTORIC NAME</th>
<th>HISTORIC USE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briceburg Settlement</td>
<td>residence, school, post Office, grocery store, rail stop</td>
<td>North side Merced River @ Hwy 140, BLM Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briceburg Inn</td>
<td>restaurant, gas station, auto repair, motel, saloon</td>
<td>South side Merced River @ Hwy 140, BLM Visitor Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenes Station/Octagon</td>
<td>restaurant, snack stand, gas station</td>
<td>Briceburg Grade, Hwy 140, private residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Solomons</td>
<td>café, saloon, gas station</td>
<td>Briceburg Grade, Hwy 140, vacant land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whispering Pines</td>
<td>campground, restaurant, pub. pool, lodge, phone co.</td>
<td>Top of Briceburg Grade, Hwy 140 rental housing, Bug Hostel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyatts</td>
<td>homestead, lodge, mining claim</td>
<td>Muir Lodge site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek Lodge</td>
<td>lodge, public swimming, cabins, camping, gas station</td>
<td>Now Midpines Post Office and parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>boutique, chapel, grocery store, café</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek Annex</td>
<td>lodge, camping, cabins, café, restaurant, gas station</td>
<td>Now Outward Bound School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson’s Trail/Timber Lodge</td>
<td>lodge, saloon, dance hall, cabins, camping, museum</td>
<td>Now Yosemite Trailer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>ice cream parlor, restaurant, butcher shop, gas station</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Resort</td>
<td>cabins, grocery store, gas station, post office, saloon</td>
<td>Now Mt. View Grocery Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuglers Rustic Inn</td>
<td>restaurant, plumbing repair, fox farm</td>
<td>Next to Midpines Fire Station, private residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Midpines</td>
<td>lodge, restaurant, snack stand, butcher shop, library</td>
<td>Now the KOA campground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>auto repair &amp; gas, post office, mini golf, pool, factory</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark’s Mill</td>
<td>homestead, saw mill</td>
<td>Triangle &amp; Hwy. 140, west side, abandoned building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Oaks, Acorn Inn</td>
<td>cabins, tennis courts, saloon, community kitchen</td>
<td>Triangle &amp; Hwy. 140, east side, vacant land abandoned building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Inn</td>
<td>cabins, grocery store, gas station, feed shop</td>
<td>Hwy 140 &amp; Whitlock Road, vacant land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modern Day
With few exceptions, World War II proved to be the death of the mines, and tourism was put on hold until the soldiers came home. After the war, there was a formal effort to designate Midpines as a vacation destination in and of itself, and fishing, tours of the mines and recreational gold panning began to be a popular draw.

To those who pass through, it must seem like nothing but a wide spot in the road as it whizzes by in a blur and with little more than a campground, a gas pump and general store, one might wonder why it’s there at all.

Having once been a peaceful Native Indian habitat, this area experienced the invasion of the 49er gold miners, later was plunged into the modern age of vacation seekers, and finally is slowly settling back into a place known more for its natural beauty than for its gold mines and roadside eateries. The giant lodges have been replaced with quaint Bed and Breakfast facilities, an attribute that many visitors seek out as an alternative to big city type hotels and motels. The local residents live in mostly secluded mountain homes, with regular school bus routes for children and a peaceful lifestyle of the type that they came here to enjoy.

But looks are deceiving and if one were to take a look around, and invest some time to hear the stories and see the sights of this place, they would find that it is rich in its own beauty and steeped in history.

B. Historical Resource Areas

The history of Midpines is can be organized according to the following historical districts:

- Feliciana
- Sherlock
- Colorado
- Whitlock
- Merced River Canyon

1. Feliciana Mountain District

**Pre-history:** Native occupation here can be documented by the many grinding, or “mortar” stones that can be found in bedrock along the many creeks of the area. Some mortar holes are as deep as 12 inches and are found in large numbers within a small area, indicating prolonged use by large numbers of people.

**Early European And American Exploration:** Although there is no written record of early occupation of this area, Spanish explorer Gabriel Moraga’s expedition likely saw this mountain as they ventured east along the Merced River. The mountain may have been dubbed “Feliciana”, after Maria Feliciana Arballo, whom he knew as a child while a member...
of the Anza Expedition into California, and who died months before he came here in 1808 (two years after he named the Merced River).

Gold Rush: When the “first” miners arrived on Feliciana Mountain at the beginning of the Gold Rush, they found significant earthworks which indicated that they were not the first miners at all, and that mining had taken place here for some time. Some of the first mines that were named by the 49ers, such as “Old Diggins, and “Mexican Diggins”, attested to this fact. As mining continued into the late 1800’s and early 1900’s, the area became a part of the Jerseydale Mining District. Along with mining claims, homesteads were sparsely distributed throughout the area. Logging became a lucrative business as large stands of timbers could be felled and cut at the many saw mills that were erected to supply the mines.

Feliciana Mountain was not significantly affected by early tourism considering the fact that it was quite a bit more difficult to navigate, and certainly off limits for any motor traffic. The area did become dotted with small cabins used by seasonal game hunters.

Modern Day: Feliciana Mountain has changed very little since the Gold Rush, other than a sparse network of significantly improved roads. Limited logging is still practiced here to this day, and some of the early homesteads are still occupied along with a few newer remote mountain homes. Game hunting and recreational off highway vehicle use accounts for a majority of nonresident visitors.

2. Sherlock, Whitlock, And Colorado Districts

Pre History: Evidence of Native American occupation can be found throughout this district in the form of mortar stone sights along the creeks. The mortars are identified as round depressions in bedrock that were a result of countless sessions of grinding acorns into meal with a rounded water worn stone. Many of these sights contain multiples of these mortars, which indicate regular gatherings of people. Documented finds of arrowheads, beads and burial grounds all attest to a sustained Native American culture in the area. One can only speculate that at the time before any outsiders were here, that this place must have been a tranquil paradise, with the sound of running water, quaking leaves and birds being the predominante background noise.

(Barret/Gifford: Indian Life of the Yosemite Region;1933)
(Greene: Yosemite Historic Resource Study;1987)

European And American Exploration: Although there is documented evidence of Spanish exploration of the region, and accounts of American, French, English and Russian Trappers as they passed through what is now the Mariposa County foothills, there is no specific record of non-natives having permanent settlements here prior to 1849.

(Moraga: Diary of Ensign Gabrial Moraga’s Expedition of Discovery in the Sacramento Valley; 1806, 1808)
Gold Rush: Beginning in 1849, placer mining (gold panning) spread throughout the smaller creeks and streams of this area as gold seekers began to arrive in California from all over the world. Prospectors learned to locate the source of the gold that was in the waterways in order to find the “big chunks” that could sometimes be found. In cases where the actual gold bearing “lode” quartz formation was found, hard rock mining would then be employed in order to free the gold from the quartz that was still buried in the ground. A single man could do this by simply removing some of the quartz with a pick and then crush the material with a hammer or other implement. Larger operations dedicated exclusively to hard rock mining used large, expensive and heavy stamp mills to crush the quartz in larger quantities to achieve the same result.

With the beginning of the stamp mill operations, peace and quiet came to an end, as the percussion of the mills resonated throughout the deep ravines, and the many miners created a commotion never experienced in these woods. Add to that the sound of stream engines, as they replaced water power to the mills, and explosions of blasting powder and later, dynamite which was employed to wrench loose the quartz from the earth’s subterranean grip.

Two creeks in particular were named after the men who discovered the first lode deposits, Sherlock, and Whitlock. Another district, the Colorado, known to locals as “Colorow”, was named by Mexican miners as a description of the iron rich red soils found there. These districts all centered around the towns and roads of the same name that sprang up as a result of the mines. Schools post offices, saloons bakeries, stage stops, even Mason and Oddfellow halls, all served the local citizenry and the economy of each of these rural outposts.

Each town had its own voting district as well. Well over 60 individual mines were worked in this area alone. Families from each town would visit each other as well as Bear Creek, and the local Mariposa newspaper even would advertise social activities and reveal local gossip, much to the enjoyment and sometimes chagrin of the residents.

Many miners became rich here, many lost all their gold and money from theft and bad investments, and many died here. Some lost their lives in mine accidents, some from illness and other from disputes among themselves. That being said, many married and began families here and their children lived a fascinating period of history that can never be replicated.

(Crampton: Opening of the Mariposa Mining Region 1849 to 1859; 1935
Gilpin: The Central Gold Region; 1860)
Early Tourism: As Mining began to decline, a slow exodus of miners and their families drained the area of what little commerce that the population could generate. Even as the small towns disappeared, a widely dispersed population stayed on. The only access routes into this area was from the Merced River via dangerously rough trails, or by Whitlock Road an old wagon route that was prone to being washed out during the rainy season. As soon as the All Weather Highway began to see the flow of tourists into the area, the residents of what was left of the Whitlock, Sherlock and Colorado area began to lobby for a safer and more direct road into Bear Creek, and so the Colorado Road was built. This would open their area to development, and of course the commerce that tourism could generate for them. By 1930, the lodges of Bear Valley began to offer excursions into the mining districts to experience a few hours of being a “real 49er”. Mine tours and gold panning comprised most of these activities, but many residents took advantage of the traffic by setting up roadside stands to sell whatever fruit and vegetable crops that they had.

Modern Day: Today, a very small amount of commercial mining exists, some families that own the properties where the mines are, mine as a hobby, but the days of the big mining operations are long gone. There is no more of the thunderous roar of stamp mills, but occasionally one will hear blasts of dynamite from the few mines still being worked. For the most part, all that is left is the legacy of what once took place here, and the atmosphere has reverted closer to what it was like before the miners came.

3. Merced River Canyon District

Pre History: Archeological excavations have dated Native occupation in the region to about 12,000 years ago. When the Merced River was a nameless watershed that drained away the melting snows of the Sierras, many Natives called its banks their home. Salmon, trout and many other animals could be harvested from its flow and mammals that were lured in for a drink, made for easy hunting.

Early European & American Exploration: The first white men to come into the Merced River area were Spanish explorers led by Gabriel Moraga in 1806 and again in 1808. In fact, it was
Moraga who gave the Merced its name. In his diaries, he describes the first contact made with Native Americans living along the river here, and their initial reluctance to have anything to do with his party of men. Twenty years later, the first American fur trappers began to appear. Jedediah Smith, Kit Carsen and Joseph Walker, all trappers and frontiersmen, were known to be frequent visitors to the Central California foothills and although there is no specific mention of the Merced River, it would make sense that they would have come through this area in their multiple travels north and south.

(Moraga: Diary of Ensign Gabriel Moraga’s Expedition of Discovery in the Sacramento Valley; 1806, 1808)
(Bancroft: History of California; 1886)
(Carter: Mountain Men & Fur Traders of The Far West; 1982)
(Gutierrez/Orsi: Contested Eden: California Before the Gold Rush; 1998)

**Gold Rush:** As soon as the first of the 49ers came into the area, placer mining camps began to be established. Initially, group camps were set up for the convenience of communal cooking and the security of numbers of people to fend off Native Americans who had been inquisitive early on, but who quickly grew to resent the interlopers. Later, large companies of men would be formed to work cooperatively in major efforts to excavate the riverbed down to bedrock. As Quartz veins were exposed, hard rock mining began to take place and as was the case many mother Lode locations, stamp mills began to be constructed. Even with flat land being at a premium, some homestead homes were built and now it was the families of miners that made their home here. One major problem early on was just how one could negotiate crossing the river, which could be a life threatening task, especially at times of high water. As early as 1850, a toll crossing called Ridley’s ferry operated, but it only lasted 2 years. Other crossings were erected in many locations, with some being a single cable with a gondola, and some being a swinging footbridge. Travel to and from towns to the south could be done by navigating trails into Bear Creek or the creeks of Whitlock and Sherlock and beyond, but any major equipment or building materials going to or from the river were best hauled to Ridley’s Ferry (which was later renamed Benton Mills, and is now Bagby, at current Hwy. 49 and the Merced). From there, a well-worn wagon road would facilitate an easy trek to Bear Valley and Mariposa. Travel up and down the river was rarely done at water level, as the rocky terrain made for slow progress. It was more efficient to travel along the rim-line of the valley and descend sometimes steep ravines.

(Crampton: Opening of the Mariposa Mining Region 1849 to 1859; 1935
(Gilpin: The Central Gold Region; 1860)
(Chamberlain: The Call of Gold; 1936)
(Mariposa Museum and History Center Archives)
(Mariposa County newspaper column accounts)

**Early Tourism:** Tourists made their first appearance in this area as early as 1855, on their way to Yosemite Valley, but because of the long, dusty, dangerous and expensive trip from San Francisco, they numbered less than 80 per year. With the completion of a system of
stage roads in the 1870’s, the number of tourists increased, as they came into Mariposa County from Coulterville. By that time, Ridley’s Ferry had been transformed into the bustling mining town and developing resort of Benton Mills, and it would have been here that they got their first glimpse of the Merced River. Beginning in 1900, plans were made for a railroad to transport tour groups to Yosemite in comfort and style, and in 1909 the Yosemite Valley Railroad made its first run. Beginning at a rail hub in city of Merced, the train hugged the north shore of the Merced River until it reached the village of El Portal. The rail line’s benefits were multifold, as freight could more easily be transported to the mines in the area, and lumber and other mineral commodities could be hauled from the foothills to the San Joaquin valley and points beyond. Mines along the river, were now able to conduct their business in a more efficient manner, growing to a point that they could support a small town population, complete with boarding houses, hotels, saloons, stores and schools. The Yosemite Valley Railroad Company ceased operation in 1945, and the era of commerce on the Merced River quickly came to a close.

(Mariposa Gazette Centennial Edition 1954)
(Johnston The Yosemite Rant 1864-1906; 2008)
(Mariposa Gazette Newspaper columns 1926 to 1960)
(Mariposa Museum and History Center Archives)

Modern Day: Today, the Merced River has been designated as a Wild and Scenic waterway, and no mining other than recreational gold panning is allowed. Many of the signs of commercial development have been removed, and hiking, fishing, rafting and camping are the predominant activities. The abandoned rail bed now serves as an automobile road to access campgrounds and other recreational resources. There are still some vestiges of the past that can be discerned, such as building foundations, gravesites, eyebolts driven into bedrock which secured cable crossings, but much of the area has been returned to the condition that it was when the Native Americans made it their home.
**Figure 21: Midpines Historic Resources**

- **GIS data.**
- **DATE:** November 30, 2015
- **SOURCE:** Mariposa County Planning GIS; Minor Update October, 2015; Ron Lopez Historic Resources Mapping 2014
- **CREDIT:** E.E. Meriam - emeriam@mariposacounty.org

Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.
XVI. COMMUNITY DESIGN

The information contained in this section was taken directly from the work of the MPAC Economic Development Focus Group during March and April of 2015. Photos and text are credited to MPAC member Les Marsden from March 24 – April 2, 2015.

COMMERCIAL
CelltowernearMidpinesSummit,on140:

Though it’s not fooling anyone into thinking this is a sequoiadendron giganteum, this is far better integration into the natural environment than an “undisguised” cell tower. This is the way to go in case of possible future cell towers in Midpines anywhere within scenic view areas.

Fencing - two similar samples are evident in this photo; natural wood tone fits into its environment. Fencing height not too obtrusive – inner height appears to be less than six feet. Serves to possibly mask/hide equipment or other extranea. Signage is obtrusive and mars the somewhat clean look of the fences.
While we may or may not be limited in terms of expecting a state agency to comply with local design guidelines, there is much that’s good here, as well as not-so-good.

**Good:** textured cement construction gives a rustic, faux hand-hewn look. Attractive roof pitch as well as no-nonsense fireproof metal roof are highly desirable for potential snow OR fire conditions. Ventilation gable-ends suggest period shutters – and there’s actually much this structure has in common with the Briceburg Visitors Center, albeit in a much more contemporary manner – pillars, overhang, cement/concrete construction, etc.

**Not-So-Good:** while we weren’t going to get into negatives at this juncture, it serves to point out the incongruent roof color which jars the eye rather than helping the structure to blend into its environment, as it mostly does. The radio/cell tower, while located behind the building, does call attention to itself and is out-of-character with the otherwise rustic nature of Midpines. Likewise the parking lot/driveway light fixtures and the highly unattractive chain-link security fence which – especially with its barbed-wire outwards-repel course at top, give more than a suggestion of a prison. While the general semi-terraced siting of the facility (seen below on next page) helps it to conform into its surrounding grade, overall the appearance of this state government maintenance facility right on the 140 corridor approach to Yosemite, and within the Midpines community may not be the look that we want to promote even for industrial/commercial construction.
Forbidding, elevated large-mass construction with only slight landscape screening to alleviate a fairly jarring turquoise color that’s visually out of character with the sort of environmentally-consistent subdued colors which might be a little more compatible with nature. It is an important consideration especially for large non-residential structures of relatively undistinguished architectural style.

COMMERCIAL/COMMUNITY USE
FireStation/CommunityCenteron140,MidpinesPark:

This is a good example of paint color integrating an otherwise somewhat-incongruent structure into its environment. Natural-compatible roofing colors as well help the fire station and community center to fit in rather than to stick out. Gravel, highly permeable parking surface is excellent for an area in which we can all remember rains of the past(!) It might be nice to have more landscape screening between these structures and the 140 view shed, but in general they feel sufficiently removed from the landscape to not impact the traveler on 140 to a high degree.
COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL SIGN SAMPLES

Briceburg Visitors Center: Excellent pseudo-NRA fonts, highly-desirable color coordination with the natural environment; effective in communicating the structure’s function while not being visually jarring.

West-bound 140 approach to Midpines. Excellent example of desired qualities of signage: natural material, color completely compatible with a natural environment, an historic-appearing font which plays upon Midpines’ important historic image.
While at the other end of the 140 approach (east-bound) we have this example. In its own way, it’s also an example of natural construction materials but has a little less of a “deliberately casual” look than the west-bound sign. Its color may be even a little TOO natural: the sign nearly seems to blend in to become invisible at times of day, and due to its placement on the opposite side of the traffic lanes. Both are fine, though the first sign example, is preferred for its edge when it comes to understated casual elegance.

“Competing” signs on 140. Begins to verge on urban visual blight; while the Bear Creek Cabins sign attempts to salute nature and does have a very simple message, its color causes it to stick out. The Bug sign is lower profile, but is a little busy – perhaps far too much information which (due also to greenery obstruction) is unreadable from a 55-mph passing vehicle.
While a bit busy, this sign is perfectly in keeping with Midpines’ individualist, funky, quirky and inviting nature. While there are no less than four separate fonts and at least two competing styles, that sort of eclecticism is perfectly in place. The upper portion is inescapably hand-made and even a bit historic in appearance – while the lower (newer) addition has a great sense of elegance. Do we need to establish a standard re: mixed signs such as this for a single business? It is divided on that. Purely for esthetic reasons perhaps a single, integrated sign with a greater sense of combined institutionalized casual elegance and unexpected, impromptu funky surprise? Its location (private approach to the Bug, in a 15-mph zone) certainly allows for easy readability.

Eclectic hand-made funkiness of a different sort. In an off-the- main-drag location, this sort of sign has just enough effort and workmanship to make it fit its environment although the lettering color might be a tad bright. Directionally, it might confuse one into thinking that Bear Creek Cabins are actually below the bridge, IN Bear Creek...
Outward Bound, 6617 Highway 140 east right at the intersection of Ponderosa Way, directly opposite the Post Office. Excellent integration of Outward Bound’s institutionalized colors and logo “localized” by use of natural, unfinished log standards and made slightly whimsical with the addition of wildlife statuary. When an existing color scheme/font/appearance may not necessarily represent a desired or even recommended design standard, this is a great way to mitigate the discrepancy.

Midpines Country Store on 140 at Carstens. Similar natural-log standards. Sign fits into its environment well, color—though similar to that used by Bear Creek Cabins, is a little more subtle.
Rustic Midpines small-scale industry/business signage at its best: 6247 Highway 140. Rustic charm in the standards, hardware and actual sign – all natural materials; the font/painting has refined primitivism to it. Understated from the road yet fully effective in marking the business.
Professionally constructed and set within beautiful, well-kept landscaping but (pardon me) this huge sign is not terribly compatible with the natural, environmentally-peaceful atmosphere which many would like to see in Midpines – not only the size, but the color scheme as well – which is the official KOA logo. There should be some way in which the logo can be mitigated in the manner in which the (decidedly more subtle) Outward Bound logo has been used in its location. Or if the KOA logo was utilized less obtrusively – perhaps smaller, perhaps as an inset within a much more appropriate overall sign consistent with the natural surroundings/natural tones.

And things are made worse by the fact that there’s not one but two large, double-sided yellow KOA logo signs along the 140 frontage:
4988/4992 Carstens Road: yes, I know we’re only supposed to be identifying desirable features, but there is a desire that signage as this (unless temporary emergency) be made inappropriate! The green 4992 is of course appropriate, but the hand-painted apparently off-site residential signage is an eyesore, even though it might be argued that the materials are natural and the paint color is in keeping with the natural setting.
IDENTIFYING the “QUAINT” RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER OF MIDPINES:

Identifying residential features which create or define the unique, even quirky character of Midpines.

6363 Highway 140 — opposite Midpines Community Park. To me, this is Midpines residential creativity. Garden area with “found art.” In speaking with the owner of the property (who gave me permission to shoot on her land) and she related how she had had 6 truckloads of scrap metal removed from the acreage when she first purchased, but then learned to weld and began turning some scrap into pieces which interested her.

This handsome shed is visible from 140 and hints at the creative, resourceful sort of person living in Midpines.
6363 Highway 140 continued – though a modest pre-fabricated structure, the visible portions of the home have had an attractive fascia applied. Natural stone retaining wall, artistically-created stairs/steps which might have a somewhat more- substantial railing, but – while appearing to be flimsy, was very sturdy.

Dark green water tank barely visible behind home, good color to blend into the environment.

Is this a palace? No. But it’s an honest, well-cared for and thoughtfully-integrated home, which is perfectly natural within the Midpines community. The home and its grounds and outbuildings (even including a former trucking/shipping vehicle) are nicely adapted into its setting.

6322 Highway 140: note gable end detailing. Quaint, adds a small amount of style to what might otherwise be a non-too- distinctive home. Note also freestanding port- cochere with angled braces mirroring the roof pitch of the house. Natural unpainted wooden fence screens entry of home from public view of highway; fence is partially masked by landscaping.
6330 Highway 140: the former Kugler Chicken Restaurant. Please: let’s encourage retention of such wonderful historic reminders of Midpines’ past. This sign – unmarked, with no explanation to the casual traveler heading to Yosemite: is a literal icon of Midpines. Whether the traveler knows the reason or not, it’s irrelevant. This IS Midpines.

Same address as above – the main structure. The color may be a little bold for the environment, but it’s fine. The natural-hued trim and fascia (as well as the wooden fence) help to blend the home’s bold color into its environment. Historic structure of course. Roof pitch appears to be 12/12, which helps in suggesting the overall historic “mountain cabin” or “mountain lodge” visual/architectural concepts which were so important to early Midpines.
The historic David Clark Homestead located at 140 and Triangle Road. Beautiful (though in profound disrepair) example of farm/ranch style home. Admirable historic details which should be considered part of the Midpines character: though somewhat incongruous with its surrounding environment’s muted colors, the New England white clapboards (diffused a bit by the much later-added green metal roof) establishes clean lines. 12/12 (or so) pitched roof, picket fence (matching white,) and residence-surrounding porch are all welcoming elements. The post supports for the porch roof help convey farmhouse” style. Below: more of the same residence.
Midpines Summit: 5845 Highway 140 at “Ricks Drive.” Excellent colors; muted scheme with complimentary trim. Composition roofing at 12/12 pitch, divided lights in windows and door hint at history in a contemporary home. Weathered wooden fencing is an appropriate look for the area.

Residence on “Ricks Drive” directly east of the above residence; chalet-style home with 12/12 pitch roof is appropriate to the “mountain” character of the area. Home is screened from general views by mostly-native growth – and such choices of landscaping should be encouraged.
6440 Highway 140: Though possessing some similar qualities to those noted in the David Clark Homestead, this is a more recent example of a Cape Cod-meets-farmhouse-derived structure with a native rock chimney. Detached garage nicely set back from the house. NPS Arrowhead signage on garage adds a quaint touch.

5012 Oak Road: A low profile ranch beautifully integrated into its environment. The home’s color palette is subtle and effective; the rockwork foundation (and matching retaining wall in the next picture) compliment the home’s surroundings. The house is screened from both the road and 140 by excellent mostly-native landscaping.
5012 Oak Road (cont.) – as noted in previous photo, here’s a retaining wall from the same property; it beautifully fits into its environment as well as matching the home’s foundation. Stylistically, it is somewhat reminiscent of the rock walls which were created by Chinese and other 19th-century workers in Hornitos and other portions of western/northern Mariposa County – a fitting comparison in terms of respecting our area’s history.

Another example of fencing (Oak Road at Highway 140) though in this case, it’s strictly utilitarian: apparently an attempt to keep deer out of an orchard/garden. Stylistically undistinguished but at least it allows the eye to pass through the fencing with only minor obstruction to the view beyond.
Ponderosa Way/Feliciana Mountain: and now for something completely different. As far as I could see from the road, this home is in a Spanish/Moorish architectural style complete with red mission tile roof – excellent choice for a wildfire-prone environment. And as well, the style pays homage to California’s pre-statehood/mission history, if not of specific, absolute relevance to the Midpines area.

Another view of the home shown above to give the feeling of its placement within its property – and its feeling of privacy.
4900 block of Ponderosa Way: very typical T1-11 siding over possible 4” x 6” construction. Composite roof with relatively modest slope.

4954 Ponderosa Way: Beautiful “mountain cabin” styling with 12/12 pitched roof. Subtle color scheme, well-integrated into its environment. Rustic rock fireplace chimney. This should be one of several model design styles for Midpines due to its emphasis on Midpines’ historic lodge emphasis.

4959 Ponderosa Way: Modular/prefabricated home with little to nothing done to disguise its origins or style. I would suggest some sort of environment-embracing approach to recommended colors for such housing options at the very least.
FENCING: EXISTING STYLES FOUND IN MIDPINES:
In addition to fencing examples already identified in photos from preceding categories:

Yosemite Oaks (Triangle at 140.) Antiquated whitewashed wood in a state of disrepair.


Muir Lodge: low road boundary/traffic control/marking fencing. Low profile boundary fencing can be effective without impacting the view too heavily. That noted, and besides its decrepit state, the bridge railing is more than a little out of place due to its red shade.
COMMERCIAL/RESIDENTIAL LANDSCAPING:

KOA on 140:

Despite previously-stated concerns about the signage itself, the landscaping in general at the KOA is very attractive and well cared-for.

KOA Driveway/entrance again. Island functions well to divert/separate traffic. Paving material is also attractive: color fits in with the earth tones of the area.

KOA approach, Highway 140. Not to beat a dead horse, but the overall attractiveness of this inviting location is marred by the excessive signage. The YARTS shelter is nicely integrated into its environment, however.

Bear Creek Cabins complex. A slightly more elaborate design than that shown in the previous photo (from the Midpines Mobile Home Park and Apartments) with the major difference being side rails.
COMMERCIAL PROPERTY STRUCTURES – GENERAL DESIGN, ACCESS, LANDSCAPING, SIGNAGE not previously noted:

**Midpines Post Office, 6629 Highway 140.** No-nonsense T1-11 sided structure with composition roof; its color and detailing do lend it a bit of distinction – the protruding rafter ends, trim design elements (horizontal AND vertical elements which extend to the ground) are all good touches to help this building disguise its relatively simple structure. Landscaping is sparse but effective; a good all-around benign structure which neither adds to or (more importantly) detracts from the overall image of Midpines.

![Midpines Post Office](image1)

**(Former) Acorn Inn, Highway 140 at Triangle Road.** With the given fact that the building is in disrepair stated right up front, there’s much good to be gleaned from this structure relevant to the historic look of Midpines. Shallow (metal) roof pitch, low, nearly sprawling ranch/farmhouse styled construction. Inviting covered porch on two sides – with more detailing notes to follow in the next three photos.

![Acorn Inn](image2)
Beautiful (native?) rock fireplace though the choice of paint on its upper portion assumedly to match the roof color is not a good idea. Log pillars with matching rails and supports further give it an historic feel. Log elements are left unfinished or clear-varnished.

Barn structure in the rear of the Acorn Inn property. Classic barn architecture, classic red – and note fencing. Midpines has also had a stock history – and we need to remember that when determining design standards.
Acorn Inn (continued.) Photo shows another view from the same aspect; weathering of exposed log rails and painted rafter ends as well as rot-susceptible (but charming) step unit. Also note lower fascia board elements coming into direct contact with ground. The planking of the porch floor running perpendicular to the structure walls is a nice historic touch.

Final detailing shot showing the front (140-facing) section of the porch. Note roof/ceiling pitch and also perpendicular floor planking from this view. The structure’s parking area is a well-known contemporaneously-utilized and wholly informal “park & ride” location for local commuters. This structure could be a very charming setting for a restaurant or other commercial use today.
Midpines Country Store/Mt. View Grocery. Historic structure(s) dating from the very late 30s to early 1940s. Many “historic” details including the scalloped fascia. Dormers add another period touch. Clapboards are utilized on the front of the structure and rounded “logs” are used on the building’s sides.

Closer view showing eclectic elements from many many years of additions, improvements – though not all of them (perhaps) well-considered. The stone-fronted porch tries to tie the building to its surroundings. The cedar shake roof appears to be aging – and not well. It’s also worth considering more fire-resistant roofing materials in this area. Kinda-cabin, kinda-chalet transformation from its original construction, which was an old western-style false-fronted building without porch or (front) roof overhang. Native and non-native landscaping. Signage could be better-integrated into the structure. False-Tudor windows and divided light door attempt a different sort of age/period.
Midpines Country Store/Mt. View Grocery (cont.) Quaint sign with nice natural wood standards; however, the overall appearance of the complex’s approach is cluttered – including the historic marker, propane tank, gas price sign, etc. Historic structure dating from 1939 is visible in this shot (see more below.) as well as a slight bit of one of the historic inn cabin structures in the upper right portion of the photograph.

One of the most charming aspects of the property: the original 1939 cabin built just north of the present-day store by James Dodge for habitation while the store (and attached housing) itself were being constructed. Though more esthetically suggestive of history than actually distinguished itself, the small building was in operation as “Mike’s Bar” during the property’s historic operation as Pine View Lodge. Though ramshackle, the structure has great historic character and could serve in some limited use today as an appurtenant structure for the main store.
Briceburg Visitor Center (built circa 1926 as the River View Tavern.) Built from Merced County granite. Another very distinctive though eclectic architectural style. Note the (former) gas-station porte-cochere with pillar detail work. As noted previously, excellent signage.

Detailing of the same: note slate-mimicking composition roof, beautiful stonework detailing (particularly in the cornerstones and arches over windows and doors.) Period (original?) double-hung windows. The stonework helps this structure blend into its environment, despite the fact that it’s a very distinctive structure.
Briceburg Visitor Center (cont.) Note the structure’s adaptation to the slope of the property, its wrap-around porch and beautiful rockwork foundation and matching retaining wall on the opposite side of the drive. Low profile, transitional landscaping from the structure to the area environment.

Porch detailing showing fascia/beam decoration.
Bear Creek Cabins, Highway 140. Beautiful log/northwoods style. This is/should be a standard model of esthetic residential and/or commercial design in the Midpines area – perfectly in keeping with the mountain feel and lodge background of Midpines.
Outward Bound 6617 Highway 140, Midpines. Another conversion of an historic (circa 1920s) structure, the former “Tekoya Lodge” and later Bear Creek Lodge Annex, and later still McCain’s Trailer Court’s “Jennie’s Juice Joint” – and much later Bear Creek Café/beer garden. The structure has been updated and unified somewhat but its history can still be seen in the waterwheel and fireplace.

Architecturally benign for the most part, its color and trim options work well on this low building complex to help integrate it into/below road grade. Old ornamental waterwheel and rockwork, southern corner of building. Many eclectic design elements (including Tudor “divided light” of door) tied together/unified strictly by the building’s paint color.

Closer look at that waterwheel, rockwork pool areas and a look at the much more modern chimney which makes an excellent attempt to fit in with the nearby rockwork from some half-century earlier in the building’s past.
The Yosemite Bug. Wonderful integration into a problematic hillside grade, the modern version/expansion of what might be termed an historic locale has been done with taste, stylistic conformity as various elements are slowly made unified.

Below: detailing showing incorporation of existing grade of walkways, stairs, etc as well as “hidden,” subtle lighting.

The Yosemite Bug (cont.) One aspect of stylistic standards to be addressed (and not merely building code) will be the utilization of steep hillsides in this manner. Note: the building itself "floats" entirely above the ground: only piers contact the ground at all points; the structure itself doesn't rest on the ground at any point, creating (in a sense) a treehouse.
XVII. NATURAL RESOURCES

A. Watersheds

The principal waterway in Midpines is the Merced River, a designated “Wild and Scenic” river that defines the northern boundary of this planning area. Bear Creek, Stockton Creek (water supply for town), Saxon Creek, Sherlock Creek, Mosher Creek, Rancheria Creek, Long Canyon, Trabucco Creek, Mariposa Creek, Stockton Creek, Long Canyon Creek, Lyons Gulch, and Mono Gulch lie within this planning area. Seven springs are mapped in the planning area. Table 10 lists the Watersheds, sub watersheds depicted in Figure 22 located within the Study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Acres Within Midpines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek-Merced River</td>
<td>59,647</td>
<td>21,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duck Slough</td>
<td>106,798</td>
<td>2,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell Creek-Merced River</td>
<td>102,490</td>
<td>8,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Chowchilla River</td>
<td>118,123</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>387,058</td>
<td>31,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub Watershed</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Acres within Midpines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek</td>
<td>14,453</td>
<td>14,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Gulch-Merced River</td>
<td>19,388</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxon Creek-Merced River</td>
<td>25,805</td>
<td>7,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherlock Creek</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>7,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Gulch-Merced River</td>
<td>27,725</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Creek-Mariposa Creek*</td>
<td>21,778</td>
<td>2,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Fork Chowchilla River</td>
<td>35,994</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157,283</td>
<td>31,918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Land within the Stockton Creek subwatershed is designated as Open Watershed Overlay 20 acre minimum parcel size, designated as an Erosion Hazard Area and percolation tests are required for all development.
Figure 22: Midpines Watersheds
B. Plants and Animals

Midpines is positioned within the medium elevations of the Sierra Nevada from 2,000 to 3,500 feet. The location of habitats within this area is determined by slope, slope aspect, soils, aspect, and watershed characteristics. The Californian Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) BIOS program classifies Midpines as within the Feliciana Mountain Quadrant. Vegetation types are depicted in Figure 23. BIOS lists the Federal, State, and CA Rare Plant Rank of 21 animal and plant species. The following sensitive species are known to exist or have the potential to exist within this planning unit. This list is not all-inclusive:

Plants:

Mariposa clarkia Beaked clarkia
Parry’s horkelia
Shaggyhair Lupine
Slender stemmed monkeyflower
Mariposa pussypaw

Animals:

Limestone Salamander
Boharts blue butterfly
Foothill yellow-legged frog
Pallid Bat
Western Pond Turtle
Spotted Bat
Great Grey Owl

The following are principal habitats, all of which comprise ecologically fire adapted landscapes:

C. Habitat Types

1. Sierran Mixed Conifer

The higher elevations in Midpines are within the lower elevation of Sierran mixed conifer habitat. This habitat is an assemblage of conifer and hardwood species that forms a multilayered forest. Historically, burning and logging have caused wide variability in stand structure, resulting in both even-aged and unevenaged stands (Rundel et al. 1977).

Ponderosa pine dominates at lower elevations and on south slopes. Blue Oak - Foothill Pine (BOP) and Mixed Chaparral (MCH) may adjoin this type at drier, and lower, elevations.
Deerbrush, manzanita, chinquapin, tan oak, bitter cherry, squawcarpet, mountain whitethorn, gooseberry, rose, and mountain misery are common shrub species in the mixed conifer understory (Kosco and Bartolome 1983). Grasses and forbs associated with this type include mountain brome, Carex, bull thistle, iris, Juncus, and needlegrass. In all, over 100 species of grasses, forbs and shrubs contribute to the flora of the mixed conifer habitat (Tappeiner 1980).

The mixed conifer forest supports some 355 species of animals (Verner and Boss 1980). Sensitive species inhabiting mixed conifer include spotted owl, fisher and pine marten. Endangered species include bald eagle and peregrine falcon (Verner and Boss 1980). (Barbara Allen: CWHR Staff, April 2005)

2. Ponderosa Pine

Habitat-In Northern California, ponderosa pine stands occur above coastal oak woodland, valley oak woodland, blue oak woodland, blue oak-foothill pine and below mixed conifer. The ponderosa pine habitat includes pure stands of ponderosa pine as well as stands of mixed species in which at least 50% of the canopy area is ponderosa pine. Associated species vary according to location and site conditions. Typical tree associates include white fir, incense-cedar, Coulter pine, Jeffrey pine, sugar pine, Douglas-fir, bigcone Douglas-fir, canyon live oak, California black oak, Oregon white oak, Pacific madrone and tanoak.

Coastal scrub, chamise-redshank, mixed chaparral, or woodland oaks are typical at the lower boundary of the ponderosa pine habitat. Associated shrubs include manzanita, ceanothus, mountain-misery, Pacific dogwood, hairy yerba-santa, yellow leaf silk tassel, bitter cherry, California buckthorn, poison-oak, Sierra gooseberry. Grasses and forbs include slim leaf brome, Orcutt brome, carex, small flower melic grass, bluegrass, bottlebrush squirrel tail, bedstraw, bracken fern, bush morning-glory, rhomboid clarkia, Child’s blue-eyed mary, shrubby eriastrum, splendid gilia, Sierra iris, whisker-brush, Inyo bush lupine, summer lupine, purple nightshade, streptanthus, gooseroot violet, and wild iris.

On sites or areas that are dry or of low quality, significant pine regeneration may depend on concurrent disturbance of chaparral and a good pine seed crop with favorable weather. Thus, it may require 50-100 years for significant pine regeneration in the absence of intervention. Sites disturbed by fire or logging sometimes are converted to dense montane chaparral or mixed chaparral.

Ponderosa pine is found on all aspects, depending on soils and location within the local elevational range. Less than one-third of the precipitation is snowfall (Barbour 1986).

Ponderosa pine sometimes is a transitional or migratory habitat for deer and can be extremely important to deer nutrition in migration holding areas. A mixture of early and late successional stages closely interspersed probably will provide good general wildlife habitat but riparian zones, deer migratory routes and holding areas require special consideration during management planning. The Sierra Nevada red fox, are found in the habitat.

3. Blue Oak – Foothill Pine
In the foothills of the Sierra Nevada, tree species typically associated with this habitat are interior live oak and California buckeye. At upper elevations, BOP habitats merge with extensive stands of Mixed Chaparral in most localities, although in some places the Ponderosa Pine type grows at an elevation low enough to form a mixed ecotone with Mixed Chaparral and BOP. At lower elevations, where blue oaks make up most of the canopy, the understory tends to be primarily annual grasses and forbs. At higher elevations where foothill pines and even interior live oaks sometimes comprise the canopy, the understory usually includes patches of shrubs in addition to the annual grasses and forbs. Shrub species include Ceanothus spp., Mariposa manzanita, whiteleaf manzanita, Parry manzanita redberry, California coffeeberry, poison-oak, silver lupine, blue elder, California yerba-santa, rock gooseberry, and California redbud.

BOP woodlands provide breeding habitats for a large variety of wildlife species, although no species is totally dependent on them for breeding, feeding, or cover. In the western Sierra Nevada, for example, 29 species of amphibians and reptiles, 79 species of birds, and 22 species of mammals find mature stages of this type suitable or optimum for breeding, assuming that other special habitat requirements are met (Verner and Boss 1980).

4. Ponderosa Pine Riparian

Dominant overstory vegetation observed within this habitat typed includes willow (Salix sp.), interior live oak, incense cedar. Dominant understory vegetation includes Himalayan blackberry (Rubus discolor), dock (Rumex crispus), and greater periwinkle (Vinca major).

5. Mixed Chaparral

Mixed Chaparral generally occurs below 1520 m (5000 ft) on mountain ranges throughout California.

Mixed Chaparral is a floristically rich type that supports approximately 240 species of woody plants (Oruduff 1974). Dominant species in cismontane Mixed Chaparral include scrub oak, chaparral oak, and several species of ceanothus and manzanita. Individual sites may support pure stands of these shrubs or diverse mixtures of several species. Commonly associated shrubs include chamise, California buckeye, poison-oak, California buckthorn, hollyleaf cherry, and California fremontia. Some of these species may be locally dominant.

Mixed Chaparral begins with a cover of subshrubs, annuals, and perennial herbs. However, shrubs that will be dominant in mature chaparral are present as seedlings and root-crown sprouts. As shrub cover and height increase with age, herbaceous cover declines.

In the Midpines Study Area, Mixed Chaparral merges with Annual Grassland (AGS) and Blue Oak-Foothill Pine (BOP) at lower elevations. Chaparral shrubs form the understory of many Blue Oak-Foothill Pine stands. At upper elevations, Mixed Chaparral grades into Coastal Oak Woodland (COW), Ponderosa Pine (PPN) or mixed conifer types and frequently forms the understory of these habitats.
Figure 23: Midpines Vegetation
D. Soils and Slope

1. Soils

A variety of soils exist in the Study Area. The principal categories are listed in Table 11 and are illustrated in Figure 24. Soils in the Boomer and Josephine series comprise 50% of the soils mapped within private held areas. Most areas that have been developed or served by public roadways within the Study area possess these soils.

The Boomer series consists of well drained, moderately permeable soils on uplands with elevations ranging from 2500 to 3500 feet and slopes as high as 75%. Soils are underlain by basic and igneous rocks at a depth of 40 to 60 inches. Vegetation is mainly pine and oak woodland and chamise. These soils are used for range and woodland, with many smaller areas used as family orchards and vineyards, home sites, commercial development. In the Study Area, Boomer series soils are exist primarily along E Whitlock Rd., Colorado Rd.

The Josephine Series consists of well drained soils of good to moderate permeability, on uplands, with elevations ranging from 2,500 to 3000 feet and slopes of up to 75%. Soils are underlain by at a depth of 24 – more than 60 inches by metasedimentary rock. Vegetation is mainly conifers, oaks and brush. Soils in this series are used for woodland, watershed, wildlife habitat, grazing and small orchards. Josephine soils are found in the Study Area along Oak Road, Yosemite Oaks Road, Carstens Rd., Chamberlain Rd., Deer Meadow Wy, and Sherlock Rd.. It should be noted that soils in the Josephine series located along Oak Rd., Carstens Rd. and Chamberlain Rd. are in the Midpines Study Area that has the highest number of wildfires in the Study Area. Significantly, these soils also predominate a portion of the Study Area, Yosemite Oaks Rd., Crystal Aire Dr. that has never had wildfire or prescribed burn.

Boomer and Josephine soils in the lower slopes are classified as Woodland Suitability Group 1 and 2 and are most amenable to forest management practices involving reforestation, are relatively less susceptible to erosion, and can more readily accommodate development due to the relative ease of site preparation and road construction within this series.

Both the Boomer and the Josephine Series comprise an area that has been determined to be typically acceptable for on – site sewage disposal.

Other soil series represented in the Study Area have more limited distribution, typically higher slopes in the Study Area, and are mainly used for watershed and wildlife habitat, with some areas used for grazing due to the relatively higher incidence of chamise vegetation. Small areas of Trabuco may be used for dry land grain farming, and small areas of the Auburn series may be used as pasture.
Figure 24: Midpines Soil Summary

DATE: Nov 1, 2016
DATA SOURCE: Mariposa County Planning GIS; Parcel Update March, 2015
CREDIT: J.White
Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.
### Table 11: Soils Series in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soils Series</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boomer</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maymen</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabuco</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blasingame</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULTIC</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mariposa County has documented areas within the Study Area that are relatively suitable for on-site sewage disposal, based on these soil characteristics. **Figure 25** illustrates these areas.
Figure 25: Midpines Soils for Septic Tanks

Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.
Figure 26: Midpines Slope
2. **Slope** - The topography of Midpines is varied consisting of slopes ranging from less than 15% to greater than 30%. Much of this planning area has a south or southwest aspect. Figure 26 depicts areas of less than 15% slope, 15-30% slope and 30% and greater slopes.

**Table 12** based on this figure, includes information about privately held parcels *that have at least 50% of the land* within three slope categories: 0-15%, 15-30% and over 30%.

- 79% of parcels have slopes of 0-30%. 42% of parcels have slopes between 0-15%, and 37% of parcels have slopes between 15-30%.

- Private parcels comprise 10,841 acres. 24% of the total acres of these parcels have 0-15% slopes; 29% of the total acres of these parcels have slopes of 15-30%, and 44% of the total acres of over 30%. Roughly half the acreage of parcels is 30% slope or less and roughly half are 30% slope or greater

- 27% of slopes are between 0-15%. 29% of slopes are 15-30%. 44% of slopes are over 30%. 56% of slopes are between 0-30%. The remainder, 44% are over 30% slope.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12</th>
<th>Parcels* and Slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># Parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Parcels Between 0-15% Slope</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Parcels Between 15-30% Slope</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Parcels Over 30% slope</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Private Parcels</strong></td>
<td><strong>654</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Given the wide variation in the amount of land on each parcel covered by slopes, the table only includes parcels having at least 50% of parcel acreage within the three referenced categories.

3. **Slope and Soils**

Figure 27 combines information about soil characteristics with topographic information to illustrate, and predict, where these characteristics are more likely to support development. Generally, the majority of soils classified as capable of supporting development (percolation for on site sewage systems) also coincide with lower slopes, resulting in well-defined areas of existing and potential new development along established access routes.
Figure 27: Midpines Slope & Soils
Table 13 was prepared based on the Slope/Soils Figure 27. The table provides the following information:

- There are 275 undeveloped parcels (single parcels and those aggregated under one ownership) that: 1) have at least one-half acre of 0% - 30% slope; and 2) are also rated ideal or moderate for percolation.

- Of these parcels (above): 128 have at least one-half acre of slopes of 0-15% and also ideal or moderate soils likely to accommodate septic systems, and 152 parcels have at least one-half acre of slopes of 15-30% and ideal or moderate soils.

- 0-15% slopes with ideal soils constitute 20% of the total acreage of parcels with slopes and soils in this category.

- 0-15% slopes with ideal soils and 15-30% slopes with ideal soils constitute 43% of parcels with slopes and soils in these two categories.

- 0-15% slopes with moderate soils constitute 3% of the total acreage of parcels with slopes and soils in this category.

- 15-30% slopes with ideal soils constitute 23% of the total acreage of parcels with slopes and soils in this category.

- 15-30% slopes with moderate soils constitute 13% of the total acreage parcels with slopes and soils in this category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 13</th>
<th>Percent Slope And Soil Percolation Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-15% Ideal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parcels *</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of parcels*</td>
<td>4888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Acros of parcels in slope/soil categories | 986 | 60 | 1310 | 250 | 1526 | 258 | 1954 |
| | % of acres in slope/soil categories | 20% | 3% | 23% | 13% | 29% | 14% | 43% |
| | Acres in Watershed Overlay | 441 | 3 | 311 | 10 | 218 | 7 | 33 |
| | Acres in Scenic Overlay | 285 | 5 | 398 | 6 | 438 | 19 | 386 |
| | Acres outside of overlays | 338 | 52 | 672 | 236 | 920 | 240 | 1543 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 14</th>
<th>0-15% Ideal</th>
<th>0-15% Moderate</th>
<th>15-30% Ideal</th>
<th>15-30% Moderate</th>
<th>&gt;30% Soils Ideal</th>
<th>&gt;30 % Moderate</th>
<th>Slope &gt;30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel size acres*</td>
<td>Number of Parcels With More Than .5 acres of slope/soil categories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels with roadway access Private or Public</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:
Parcels listed include only:
1. Separate parcels
2. Adjacent parcels aggregated under one ownership
3. Parcels with less than $15,000 of assessed improvement value and without STI service.
E. Fire Ecology

“Fire always has been and always will be an ecological force in the Sierra Nevada. Decades of fire suppression have changed this role, allowing stands to thicken and fuels to accumulate, especially in the foothills and lower montane zone, where developments are increasing. We either manage fire and live with fire on our terms or let fire dictate the terms. The choice is ours.” Jan W. van Wagendonk, Wildfire (2006)

The predominant fire adapted habitat types in Midpines are Chaparral, Foothill woodlands, and Ponderosa Pine. Riparian habitats along the Saxon Creek and Bear Creek drainages are located within these habitat areas. (Note: Excerpts from Midpines Community Wildfire Protection Plan: refer to plan for footnote references).

1. Mixed Chaparral

Chaparral is described as a fire-adapted ecosystem, requiring fire for its regeneration and to reduce competition. In foothill chaparral, the absence of fire can result in dense, tall stands of shrubs that have a low diversity of both shrub and herbaceous species. This situation is a high fire hazard and has less ecological value than a high diversity of younger shrubs.

Regardless of whether chaparral occurs in the foothill or montane regions, tall, old, mature chaparral generally produces high-intensity fires. Wildfires in chaparral communities often are stand-replacing events; fires burn sufficiently hot to consume all of the aboveground plant material.

In the past, frequent fire in chaparral communities led to fragmentation, thereby reducing the continuity of the vegetation. Generally, where plant cover is discontinuous in chaparral landscapes, fires were characterized as medium-sized, burning at varied intensities. Infrequent fire has led to dense and continuous stands of chaparral which burn in a unique pattern, and those fires that escape can lead to enormous high-intensity conflagrations. Fires in chaparral today generally are larger, less scattered, and more uniform than those in pre-settlement times.

Chaparral fires generally occur in summer and fall, depending on the dryness of the year and site. The time between episodes of fire—the fire return interval—in chaparral is highly variable, ranging from ten to more than one hundred years. Chaparral plant communities have developed important adaptations for fire survival and regrowth. Sprouting from the underground rootstock and the stimulation of seed germination are examples of such adaptations. Some shrub species that usually reproduce by seeds are able to resprout from rootstock after fire; these plants are called facultative sprouters. Other shrub species either only regrow from seeds (obligate seeders) or from rootstock (obligate sprouters).

Herbaceous plants in chaparral, which are often "fire followers," usually only become conspicuous during initial post-fire years. The seeds of many herbaceous plants remain dormant in the soil until germination is triggered directly or indirectly by fire. Examples of fire-related stimuli include heating of seeds for a particular amount of time or to a certain temperature in
order to scar the seed coat to allow germination and sunlight. Smoke can cause seed germination in some species, whereas it is lethal to other species.

2. Foothill Woodlands (Bishop Pine – Blue Oak, Mixed Conifer)

Periodic fire in foothill woodlands can reduce the competition for water and nutrients by killing shrubs and small trees found in the pine and oak understory. Periodic fire creates openings in dense stands to allow the sprouting and growth of new oaks and other tree species (e.g. gray pine). Historically, fires in these woodlands were frequent, usually low to moderate with occasional high-intensity areas. Woodland understory strongly influences the intensity of the burn. Those dominated by grass and herbaceous plants tend to burn less intensely than those dominated by shrubs. Historically, perennial plants dominated the herbaceous understory. Today shorter-lived annuals dominate, primarily introduced grasses. Annual grasses may promote an earlier onset to burning season because they dry and cure earlier than perennials.

Only a few studies have examined the time between foothill woodland fires. Prior to European settlement, fire return intervals ranged from 8 to 49 years. The shorter fire-return intervals were noted where site conditions were drier and warmer.

Tree response to fire in the foothill woodland is varied. Bark thickness, tree structure, and sprouting response each affect the ability of a given species to resist or recover from fire. Canyon live oak and interior live oak have thin bark, and their tops are more sensitive to heat damage from fire. These live oaks, however, can vigorously re-sprout from their stumps following fire. Blue oak and black oak have thicker bark and hence are better able to resist the damaging effects of fire. These species also vigorously re-sprout from rootstock following fire. Seed stored in the soil is another source for regrowth for all oaks. Shrubs and grasses in the understory have similar adaptations as those discussed in the chaparral and grassland sections above.

3. Ponderosa Pine

Fire in this forest type is particularly important for maintaining species composition. Pine species are generally shade-intolerant. Therefore, fire that creates gaps or openings in the vegetation can support their germination and growth. With early logging practices that removed the large, fire-resistant tree species (e.g. pine), and the general exclusion of fire from Sierra Nevada forests in the last 75 to 100 years, shade-tolerant tree species (e.g. white fir) have become far more abundant, reducing pine’s historic role in this ecosystem. This has often resulted in overly dense stands of trees. Conifer species like Ponderosa pine also germinate best when there are low amounts of litter and duff; periodic fire keeps these levels low enough to support germination. Fire kills understory trees and top-kills shrubs, simplifying the structure to consist of a tree over story with a herbaceous understory.

These forest types are often characterized by a historic regime of frequent fires that were low to moderate intensity. Exceptions to this have been noted where topographic position, vegetation, and other site factors led to more severe fires. A great deal of variation in fire intensity and effect has been noted among similar sites, even within a single fire. Historically, few fires exceeded ten
thousand acres in size, whereas such large fires are now more common in the Sierra Nevada.

Fire return intervals for these types range from two to forty years, with median values ranging from five to twenty years. Variability in fire return intervals is linked to the species composition of the stand and landscape location (i.e., types dominated by pine, as well as hotter and drier sites, often have shorter fire return intervals).

Ponderosa pine is especially well adapted to periodic fire. Adaptations for seedlings include the rapid development of thick insulating bark, deep taproots, and high moisture content of living needles. Similarly, mature trees have thick bark, deep roots, and crown structures that are less vulnerable to flames. This pine is also more tolerant of crown scorch than other conifer species such as incense cedar, white fir, and Douglas fir. Ponderosa pine also has an effective wound response in which resin is produced to seal off any wounds that are made in the bark.

Other conifers resist fire to varying degrees depending on the thickness of their bark. The bark of mature sugar pine, Jeffrey pine, Douglas fir, and incense cedar is thick and fire-resistant. In contrast, the bark of white fir is considerably thinner and poorly protects the growing portions of the tree that are just under the bark.

Figures 28 – 32 illustrate that Midpines habitats comprise an entire fire adapted landscape. Figure 28 illustrates the fire fuel ranking for the Study area based on pre-fire engineers assessment of fuel, slope, brush density, and crown cover. Figure 29 depicts fire threat based on fuel ranking (figure 28) and fire frequency. This information is used to create Fire Severity Zones depicted in Figure 30. These rankings and ecological characteristics have resulted in historic fire returns and an adaptive response in the form of prescribed burns. Figure 31 illustrates the location of historic fire perimeters for both wild fires and prescribed burns, separately. This information is comprehensively represented in Figure 32, which depicts the substantial influence of fire in the Study area.
California Department of Forestry pre-fire engineers verify these rankings and use this fuel rank assessment in conjunction with three additional Fire Plan assessments (weather, assets at risk and level of service). This map indicated moderate, high, and very high fuel rankings based on inputs, such as fuel, slope, brush density (ladder), and tree density (crown cover).

Figure 28: Midpines, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) - Fuel Rank
CAL FIRE-FRAP has developed a rating of wildland fire threat based on the combination of potential fire behavior (Fuel Rank) and expected fire frequency (Fire Rotation) to create a 4-class index for risk assessment. Areas that do not support wildland fuels (e.g., open water, agricultural lands, etc.) are omitted from the calculation. Most large urbanized areas receive a moderate fire threat classification to account for fires carried by ornamental vegetation and flammable structures.
Figure 30: Fire Hazard Severity Zones in SRA
Figure 31: CAL FIRE Historic Fire Perimeters
Figure 32: Midpines Fires

Midpines Fires

- 1 Prescribed Burn
- 2 Prescribed Burns
- 1 Wildfire
- 2 Wildfires
- 3 Wildfires
- 4 Wildfires
- No Wildfires
- No Fires

DATE: August 18, 2016
DATA SOURCE: Mariposa County Planning GIS; Cal-Fire FRAP Data 1911 - 2016
CREDIT: J.White
Mariposa County makes no warranty regarding the accuracy of the GIS or the analysis and the conclusions resulting from using our GIS data.
The following tables interpret the above fire-related figures. Table 15 illustrates the acreage and relative percentage of land within the Study Area classified as either moderate, high or very high fire hazard. Table 16 lists the known fires that have occurred in the Study Area by name, year and location.

### Table 15  
**Fire Hazard Severity Zones (SRA Lands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1,933 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3,562 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>10,637 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,132 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16  
**Location of Fires by Year (with total acres)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fires Along County Maintained Roads</th>
<th>Year/Fire Name (If Identified)/Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allred Rd.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carstens Rd.</td>
<td>1918 - 328.90 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1921 - 408.39 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1924 - 43312.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1934 - 13.8 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962 - 195.70 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter Rd.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Rd.</td>
<td>1924 - 43312.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1953 - Cassacia #2 Fire, 551.924 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004 - Colorado Fire, 15.42 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Aire Dr.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Whitlock Rd.</td>
<td>1953 - Cassacia #2 Fire, 551.924 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008 - Telegraph Fire, 34083.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosher Rd.</td>
<td>2008 - Telegraph Fire, 34083.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Rd.</td>
<td>1911 - 878.56 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1921 - 408.39 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1924 - 43312.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1952 - 199.66 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponderosa (Midpines) Wy.</td>
<td>1921 - 408.39 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1952 - 199.66 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherlock Rd.</td>
<td>2008 - Telegraph Fire, 34083.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Rd.</td>
<td>2008 - Telegraph Fire, 34083.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangle Rd.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Whitlock Rd.</td>
<td>2008 - Telegraph Fire, 34083.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Oaks Rd.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 explains the information depicted in Figure 31 and lists the number and relative acreage of acres for wildfire and prescribed burns and also unburned areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 17</th>
<th>Fire Frequency by Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midpines Wildfires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Burns</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prescribed Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Burns</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unburned Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 illustrates Figures 31 and 32 by listing the number of acres within the study area that have been subjected to wildfire, prescribed burns and a combination of the two. Because fire history within the Study Area is a composite consisting of wildfire incidents, prescribed burns and fire return (rotation), the table describes these conditions. Of the areas that have experienced either or both types of fire:

- 3,554 acres have been subject to 1 prescribed burn and no wildfires.
- 1,066 acres have been subject to 2 prescribed burns and no wildfires.
- 10,680 acres have been subject to 1 wildfire and no prescribed burns
- 162 acres have been subject to 1 wildfire and 2 prescribed burns
• 2,177 acres have been subject to 2 wildfires and no prescribed burns
• 53 acres have been subject to 2 wildfires and one prescribed burn
• 22 acres have been subject to 2 prescribed burns
• 483 acres have been subject to 3 wildfires and no prescribed burns
• 127 acres have been subject to 4 wildfires and no prescribed burns

The area is generally considered to have a high hazard rating with the relative risk illustrated by the percentage of area subject to return fires.

• 15% of the area burned has experienced no wildfires;
• 75% of the area burned has experienced one wildfire, and
• 10% of the area burned has experienced between 2 and 4 wildfires.
• 53% of the area burned has had a prescribed burn; and
• 4% of the area burned has had more than one prescribed burn.

One well-defined 500 acre area in the vicinity of Highway 140 and Carstens Road and Oak Rd. has been subjected to 3 or 4 return fires, and no prescribed burns have occurred within this same area.

In contrast, there exists a swath of land of approximately 2,800 acres along Colorado Road, in the vicinity of Wilderness View Drive, and East Whitlock Rd. in the vicinity of Crystal Aire Drive, Yosemite Oaks with no history of either wildfire or prescribed burns. This area is generally comprised of south and southwest facing slopes that divide the portions of the Study Area surrounding Colorado Rd. and those portions surrounding East Whitlock Rd.. The area is bounded on the west by areas that have been subject to 2 prescribed burns and on the east by one or more wildfires that have occurred nearer Highway 140. A significant portion of this area is along owned by the Bureau of Land Management. The unpaved section of Colorado Rd. bisects BLM land in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18. Continued</th>
<th>Midpines Wildfires</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Burns</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribed Burns</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Burns</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acre of Unburned Areas</td>
<td>2,883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Planning Process Diagrams
Community Plan Diagram with Focus Group Concept Diagram

Plan Initiation & Programming
- MPAC
  - Community Engagement
    - Blog
    - Community Forums
    - Outreach and Surveys
    - Facebook Page
    - Meet and Greet
  - March 2013

Community Engagement
- Community Engagement Ad Hoc Committee
  - Outreach and Surveys
  - Facebook Page Meet and Greet
  - December 2013 – April 2014

Visioning
- Visioning
  - MPAC
  - April - June 2014

Background Report
- Background Report
  - Fire
  - Historic Resources
  - Econ. Dev.
  - Housing
  - Community Character
  - Open Space
  - Focus Groups
  - Staff Research and Mapping

Issues and Options
- Issues and Options
  - Draft Plan
  - March 2013

Draft Plan
- Draft Plan
  - Fire FG
  - Historic Resources FG
  - Other FG TBD
  - Other FG TBD
  - Fire FG
  - Historic Resources FG
  - Other FG TBD
  - Other FG TBD
  - Fire FG
  - Historic Resources FG
  - Other FG TBD
  - Other FG TBD

Other FG
- Other FG
  - Fire and HR FG hiatus
  - Focus Groups Reconvene as necessary

TBD
- TBD
- TBD
- TBD
- TBD
- TBD
- TBD
- TBD
- TBD
# Midpines Community Plan Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Participation</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPAC Work Program</strong></td>
<td>MPAC Formulate Goals: Public Engagement (Forums, Blog) Define Important Principles (Progress Report to PC &amp; BOS)</td>
<td><strong>California Environmental Quality Act</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Chapter 5 policies Program Outline (February 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Collect and Analyze Information Examine Current Conditions &amp; Trends Complete Background Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPAC</strong></td>
<td><strong>MPAC</strong></td>
<td><strong>CEQA Document Preparation Begins</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review data &amp; Public Participation Develop Issues and Options (Progress Report to PC &amp; BOS)</td>
<td>Develop Alternative Plan Scenarios (Progress Report to PC and BOS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPAC</strong> Recommend Preferred Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Community Engagement Program Summary
Community Engagement Adhoc Committee

*Recommended Topics for Community Forums*
And

*Recommended Public Engagement Questions for Community Voice*

*June 4, 2013*

I. Community Forums (in order)

The Committee recommends that three forums be held in the following order:

- Fire Safety
- Community Character, Cultural History and Community and Economic Development
- Open Space Plans and Management

The Ad Hoc Committee will continue to meet to determine the content of the forums. Additional feedback and input from the MPAC will be helpful in this regard.

II. Community Voice Questions (in order)

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends the following questions for Community Voice. Review and confirmation from the MPAC is needed.

**Community Character, Economic Development and Housing**

1. What is it about Midpines (activity, character, surroundings) that you most enjoy?

2. Should there be new commercial development in Midpines? If so: a) what sort of commercial development is needed in Midpines; b) where should this development be located?

3. Should the Midpines Community Plan establish a priority for different types of commercial development in Midpines; for example, community-serving or visitor-serving uses?

4. Is additional housing needed in Midpines? If so, what types of housing do you think are most desired and needed (second units, apartments, single family residences, small lot or clustered mixed use development etc.)?

5. What sort of development would you like to see more of in Midpines? Is there any development that should be prohibited, avoided, or discouraged in Midpines?

6. Should Midpines have a community center? What important elements do you think such a center should include?
Cultural History Community Character

1. What are your favorite places in Midpines?

2. What do you think are important historical aspects of Midpines?

3. What places and either man-made or natural features are worthy of preservation?

4. Should Midpines Community Plan develop an inventory of historically and culturally significant places and structures? If so, what types, or specific, places or things should be included in the inventory?

5. How should the cultural history and historical community character of Midpines be made “real”, or influence, future development and improvements within the community?

Land Use Regulations

1. Should the design and placement of new structures in Midpines be regulated? If so, to what end?

2. Should Midpines have appearance standards for private properties? If so, what should these standards accomplish?

3. Should the Midpines Community Plan identify any special habitats and Heritage Trees for protection? What measures should be used to protect these features?

4. Are there any visual resources within the Midpines area that should be protected? If so, how should these resources be protected?

5. Should existing and abandoned mines be regulated? If so, how should they be regulated?

6. Are you more comfortable with incentives to achieve important land use goals, or would you prefer that regulations be used to achieve these goals?

7. When should land use standards be flexible and adapted to a situation, and when should standards be firm and fixed?

Fire Hazard

1. Do you ever worry about wildland fires? If so, what should be done to address your concern?

2. Are current fire safety regulations adequate? What regulations would you add or change?

1. What is the greatest hindrance to achieve fire safety for: a) the community; and b) your property?
3. Should current fire safety construction and fuel modification standards be required for homes upon re-sale?

4. Can fire safety be achieved and also the ecological value of forest habitats protected?

**Open Space Management Plans**

1. Should the undeveloped open space lands and areas within Midpines community be actively managed to achieve specific objectives?

2. What are the most important purposes to be achieved in managing open space within the Midpines community?

3. What are some ideas for achieving a better relationship, or interface, between open space and developed areas or Midpines

4. In order to reduce fire or other hazards that may threaten the community’s economic and cultural viability, should management of open space lands and areas be: a) encouraged through education and incentives? Or b) Required and mandated?
An eight-item survey was developed for Midpines residents which included four open-ended survey items and four demographic items. Seventy-four residents completed the survey in March and April, 2014.

The demographic items were examined for statistically significant differences between the groups (i.e., Home Owners vs. Renters, Men Vs. Women, Married vs. Single, and, Number of Children) regarding their opinions in open-ended questions.

A “Content Analysis” was used to evaluate three of the open-ended questions in the Midpines Residential Survey: 1. Name ONE thing you really like about Midpines; 2. Name One thing that needs to be improved in Midpines; 3. Name ONE thing you really don’t want to happen in Midpines. The fourth open-ended question was a “catch-all” item, and did not have enough responses for analysis. Briefly, a Content Analysis identifies key words, then analyzes these key words in context in order to develop themes.

Key Word Identification:

1. Each open-ended question was treated separately, i.e., three Content Analyses were conducted.
2. Initially, in each analysis, all of the words were evaluated for exclusion. Common words and words providing grammatical structure, such as “a”, “the”, “and”, “there”, etc., were excluded. Typically, about 70% of the words are excluded in this kind of analysis.
3. The pool of remaining words were considered potential key words.
4. At this point key word “thresholds” were determined, that is, how often each of these words needed to appear. In each analysis if a word appeared three or more times it was left in the key word pool. Words appearing fewer than three times were excluded.
5. The resulting pool of words comprised a key word list.

Analyzing Key Words in Context:

1. Each response was examined by sentence, by paragraph, and by respondent using the key word list.
2. If more than one key word was found in a response, the words were examined for proximity (how close they were to each other) by counting the number of words separating them. For example, Trees, Quiet, and Community were often found together, but separated by varying numbers of words and sentences and responses; in contrast, Fast and Food, when present, were always found together with no separation.
3. This information is then analyzed statistically for proximity, and grouping of key words into themes.
4. The results were then displayed graphically using dendograms and balloon charts. The dendograms illustrated key words by theme (color-coded), how close each key word was to another, and how key words combined into a theme. The balloon charts provided a spatial illustration of the relationships among the key words and themes, as well as the importance of each key word, indicated by the size of the balloon.

The key words and emergent themes were as follows (key words are in parentheses):

**What I like about Midpines**

1. Natural Foothills Environment (*rural, beautiful, mountains, forest, river, peaceful, etc.*);
3. Quiet (*natural, quietness*).

**What Needs to be improved in Midpines**

1. Personal responsibility regarding fire suppression (*fire, property, fuel, reduction, water*);
2. Community responsibility regarding communications and road access (*cell, phone, road*);
3. Community recreational opportunities and convenience (*community, people, trails, bike, hwy, park, coffee, store, businesses*);
4. Roads (roads).

**What I don’t want in Midpines**

1. Franchises (*fast, food, chain, stores, restaurants*);
2. Large scale tourism attractions and accommodations (*big, scale, hotel, casino*);
3. Cancerous growth and development (*development, business, commercial, buildings, lots, growth, town*);
4. Low-cost housing (*low-cost, housing*).

Examination of the key words and themes with the demographic items did not provide any meaningful differences across the groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Form neighborhood groups</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community Cultural Center include Native American Community</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More hiking, biking, equestrian access</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Allow cluster housing with open space</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Automobile disposal to avoid toxins in ground water</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thin timber to release more water and reduce hazardous vegetation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Persue broad band for Community Center</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>List potential historical sites</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Small property owners start a cooperative to clear hazardous vegetation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trail restoration &amp; maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DSL within 2 months</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Capture grey water</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grazing to reduce hazardous vegetation</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Open US Forest Svc to commercial harvest</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Develop Bear Creek Trail, connect to other trail systems</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rails to trails - historical railroad through Merced River Canyon</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tax incentive for small landowners to thin vegetation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Encourage prescribed burns</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Chipping and mastication</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Limit development based on water availability</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sewer System</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>County needs to take control of land via jurisdiction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Open roads in forest for public use, fire access</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wifi at Community Center</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Support conservation easements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What I Like about Midpines
What I Like About Midpines
What Needs to be Improved in Midpines
What I Don't Want in Midpines
What I Don't Want in Midpines
Midpines Planning Advisory Committee Resident Survey

The Midpines Community is developing a community plan that will compliment the Mariposa County General Plan. The purpose of this survey is to get public input for this plan. Your opinions are very important in order to develop a plan that meets our needs in Midpines.

1. Tell us one thing you really like about Midpines:

2. Tell us one thing that really needs to be improved in Midpines:

3. Tell us one thing that you really don’t want in Midpines:

4. Other comments:

ARE YOU:  (circle your answer)

5. Male        Female

6. Single       Married    # Children living with you __________

7. Do you own or rent your home?        Own    Rent

If you would like to be put on the Midpines Advisory Planning Committee mailing list, please provide your email address:

The Midpines Planning Advisory Committee meets every 2nd Wed at 6 p.m. at the Community Center. All are invited.
Midpines Planning Advisory Committee Business Survey

The Midpines Community is developing a community plan that will compliment the Mariposa County General Plan. The purpose of this survey is to get business input for this plan. Your opinions are very important in order to develop a plan that meets needs of businesses in Midpines.

1. Tell us one thing you really like about Midpines that is important to your business:

2. Tell us one thing that really needs to be improved in Midpines in order to help your business:

3. Tell us one thing that you really don’t want in Midpines because it will hurt your business:

4. Other comments:

(circle your answer)

5. How many employees (include yourself) do you have? _____

6. Do you have plans for business improvement/development? Yes No

7. If you would be interested in attending a Midpines business mixer or "meet 'n greet", please provide your email address:

If you would like to be put on the Midpines Advisory Planning Committee mailing list, please provide your email address:

The Midpines Planning Advisory Committee meets every 2nd Wed at 6 p.m. at the Community Center. All are invited.
Midpines Planning Advisory Committee Land Owner Survey

The Midpines Community is developing a community plan that will compliment the Mariposa County General Plan. The purpose of this survey is to get public input for this plan. Your opinions are very important in order to develop a plan that meets our needs in Midpines.

1. Tell us one thing you really like about Midpines:

2. Tell us one thing that really needs to be improved in Midpines:

3. Tell us one thing that you really don't want in Midpines:

4. Other comments:

The Midpines Planning Advisory Committee meets every 2nd Wed at 6 p.m. at the Community Center. All are invited.
APPENDIX C

Issues and Options Summaries
Issues and Options
Midpines Community Planning

Major Issue: HOUSING

Minor Issue (Problem): Undefined pressure exists to increase housing options, especially for employees of Yosemite National Park, which is the economic engine of Mariposa County. Midpines is the nearest community that offers the security of land ownership and reliable public transportation. Not only minimum wage earners need housing; moderate income households and high end buyers cannot find places to live, making hiring a challenge throughout Mariposa County. However, due to rugged terrain there is very little space to expand housing in Midpines, despite the large geographic area. Furthermore, Midpines offers magnificent view sheds that need protection if rural community character is to be maintained.

General Plan Citations w/ brief description: The General Plan has a component or chapter called the Housing Element. This is a comprehensive study of housing availability in Mariposa County according to a broad variety of individual and family needs, and a breakdown of housing stock according to costs and infrastructure options. The Affordable Housing portion is currently being rewritten.

Other appropriate citations w/ brief citations: The Cluster Subdivision: A Cost Effective Approach by Welford Sanders, which was distributed to the Midpines Committee and is available at the Planning Department for anyone who has not received his or her copy.

Definitions (when required): Cluster development allows housing on smaller lots than the five acre lots currently specified by our zoning requirements, provided the land saved is reserved for permanent common use, such as open space for outdoor recreation, habitat preservation, or simply preserving a view of the hills.

Current state of the problem: Midpines has large undeveloped areas. Most is zoned Five Acre Mountain Home. Two houses require a five acre lot, near enough to see the neighbors but separated by enough space that construction costs cannot be shared. This scatter approach results in here a house, there a house, everywhere another house.

Ideal state of the problem: This cluster option would result in smaller, tighter neighborhoods surrounded by open hills, where scenery and wildlife habitat would be preserved, and infrastructure costs could be more easily shared. This would be an option, not a requirement for new construction.

Submitted by Candy O'Donel-Browne
June 12, 2016
MPAC ISSUES AND OPTIONS TEMPLATE by Gary Francisco 6/5/16

Major Issue: Noise Pollution

Minor Issue (Problem):

There are no County mandated restrictions on type, frequency, intensity or time of day that can be noise can be created on public or private property, other than regarding the operation of aircraft. Operation of motorized equipment or vehicles with loud exhaust, constantly barking dogs, high volume sound systems (radio/stereo/TV) produced by some property residents interferes with the comfort and enjoyment of a peaceful rural environment.

General Plan Citations:

General Plan Implementation Goals –

Goal 11-1: Conserve the natural and scenic resources, and open space lands to protect and enhance the County’s quality of life and character ensuring a viable economy.

General Plan Volume 1-15 addresses noise as an issue, identifying four chief sources of concern:

- Mariposa Yosemite Airport; motor vehicle noise; off road vehicles and recreational uses; and special events.

General Plan Implementation Goals are outlined in Chapter 15-2, however the timing for implementation is listed as either “intermediate-term” or “ongoing review standard.”

County Codes – Title 19 – Airport, Chapter/Section 19.02.140 – Noise:

“No person shall operate any aircraft in flight or on the ground in such a manner as to cause unnecessary noise as determined by applicable federal or state or local laws and regulations. (Ord 925 Sec1, 1997; Ord. 510 Sec.1 (part).”

Current state of problem:

Indiscriminate use of engine brakes on diesel engine trucks through populated areas, recreational use of off road motorcycles and ATV’s on property near neighboring residences, chain saws, mowers and other motorized equipment operated late night or early morning hours, operating loud radios and sound systems and allowing the constant barking of dogs late night or early morning are existing sources of noise pollution that presently exist without remedy for those affected by it, due to the lack of County noise standards and ordinances.

Ideal state of problem:

Develop noise standards and ordinances to implement the policies established in General Plan 15.2.
MPAC ISSUES REGARDING FUEL REDUCTION by Gary Francisco 9/20/16

1. Property Line Setbacks versus Defensible Space
   Mariposa County minimum setback requirements for structures from property lines are less than the Cal Fire SRA 100 foot defensible space requirements, allowing structures to be located closer than 100 feet to adjoining property with heavy vegetation.

2. Roadway Edge Fuel Clearance
   Cal Fire SRA Fire Safe Regulations require roads with two way traffic to have 10 feet of fuel modification clearance from each edge of the road. Given the number of dirt/gravel roads with minimum width standards, the 10 foot fuel modification requirement is not adequate to provide safe ingress/egress during a wild fire event.

3. Dead Tree Removal in the Defensible Space
   Neither Cal Fire SRA Fire Safe Regulations nor Mariposa County codes explicitly address the need to remove dead trees within the defensible space/100 feet from habitable dwellings. And, 100 feet would not be adequate distance for dead trees of the same height or more.
Major issue: Tree and Habitat Conservation

Context: Plan vision statement supports governmental actions to honor natural resources, proactively protect natural resources, including water, for residents and visitors. It refers to the importance of maintaining and reinforcing Midpines' rural character through the preservation of scenic open spaces, forested areas and the quiet, natural beauty. There are specific references to encouraging outdoor activities and developing housing in ways to preserve open space, rural character, natural resources and the history of Midpines.

Minor issues (as taken from community comments): Sustainability (water, nature, rural character), need for open space and recreation, climate change, watershed protection, need for appropriate management approach especially in light of tree mortality.

Current state of the problem: Little accessible open space, areas for recreation limited and area for exercise primarily associated with roads; watershed characteristics—how contaminants travel or how water is captured—is complex; extremely high rate of tree mortality in the last three years creates a high degree of uncertainty in terms of watershed, safety and overall community character.

General Plan citations: The General Plan Volume 1, Chapter 11 deals with conservation and open space. Goals focus on scenery, water, minerals, wildlife and plants, forests and soils and lays out policies for the conservation of each.
Implementation includes:
- Development of guidelines: location of structures, landscaping, development that consider issues of scenery, habitat, watersheds, waste discharge planning, low density/cluster development,
- Development standards: scenery and viewsheds, water conservation (waster water reuse, system repairs), setbacks, water for nature, landscaping (avoid invasive, working landscapes).
- Cooperation with federal and private landowners—conservation planning, invasive plants.
- Efforts to promote: air quality--solar energy and energy efficiency, transport (schools, improve roads, traffic), reduction of invasives (ag and federal land cooperation),
- Code revisions: mining exploration and reclamation, update Grading Ordinance.
- Analysis: watersheds, standards to protect threatened and endangered species and habitat, need for comprehensive mapping and site surveys of resources and invasives

Strong linkages with Chapter 5: Land Use—Rural Character, delegates responsibility for policies to Advisory Committees; Agricultural lands are an unrecognized subset of open space; Collaborative planning—55% of land in Mariposa is public with DOI/NPS or BLM, USFS, irrigation districts, state forestry office and fish and game; 5.1.09-Five Acre Density and Rural Character; Goal 5-12—Protect significant timberland and provide for sustainable management and harvesting—Timber Preservation Zoning.

Also links to Chapter 12: Local Recreation, especially Goal 12-2, which deals with a regional recreational strategic plan.
Other citations: IRWM Final Plan Documents from 2015: Goals 1, 4, 5, 7 and 9. Williamson Act—Mariposa focus is on the agricultural land, but this also deal with open space; Sierra Forest Plan: Draft Revised Land Management Plan for the Sierra National Forest Fresno, Madera, and Mariposa Counties, California; BLM—WSRP, but not focused on forestry; Mariposa has voluntary guidelines for woodlands through Mariposa RCD and UCCE. There are 299,000 acres of woodland in Mariposa County.

Information gaps: Need more information on location and state of resources—maps and site surveys, eg, where are the heritage trees?. Should and how should any conservation efforts be coordinated with the public land owners (USFS, BLM)? What is the current state of and future plans for projects such as the Bear Creek trail? What are the BMPs for current and future management of forests and watersheds given the high tree mortality?

Advantages/opportunities: Midpines’ residents favor: rural character; open space; outdoor recreation; and desire to keep population density low. There are large areas of public land within and adjacent to Midpines (USFS, BLM and community college).

Suggested Actions (from communities comments): Increased access to USFS, BLM college lands; new and restored biking, hiking and riding trails; rails to trails; timber thinning and hazard reduction; private land conservation easements.

Ideal State of the problem: Support the development of standards and guidelines for development that protect identified resources. Of particular interest, given tree mortality, might be to look at landscaping and forest management options to reduce erosion, encourage native landscaping and avoid introduction of invasives. In terms of local recreational opportunities, could revisit trail and walking options, such as the Bear Creek trail, and look at options for public land areas as was encouraged by the public.
The effects of slash from downed trees in Midpines:

Removal and disposal of Tree Slash is one of the most difficult aspects of the hazard tree removal process as resources are very limited. Many trees have been downed with slash still remaining on the ground and on some occasions still on the tree.

Road nuisance: Vehicles obstructing traffic & blocking roadways, causing delays and potentially accidents.

Influx of work crews: the crews can disrupt the local community thru’ extra road traffic. Their presence can also be felt by them driving rents upwards or even driving the cost of affordable housing upwards as they vie w/ locals for accommodation.

Visual: The sight of so many downed trees along public roadways is not a pleasant one. It is a visual blight and unpleasant for both locals and visitors alike, as well as a distraction for drivers.

Fire danger: If left on the ground it becomes a fire danger adding lots of fuel for potential wildfires. This is happening throughout the county but particularly evident along Triangle Road and parts of Highway 140.

Loss of Habitat for wildlife: The slash, or more accurately the tree limbs when the were alive, is where many birds, insects and other wildlife once lived. Without this habitat they either abandon the area, or die off.

Environmental Effect:

(1) An infected forest is essentially a dead one, full of dead standing trees. The resultant air quality is not as fresh, it loses that typical fresh pine scent. It instead smells simply warm and dusty. It also loses its ability to cool the adjacent air via transpiration, resulting in warmer temperatures in the immediate area, and most likely warmer temperatures in general throughout the entire forest.

(2) Increased danger from erosion and runoff.

(3) Pollution from equipment. Chainsaws are typically gross polluters (degraded air quality) and in addition there is oil spray from the chain itself (ground pollution) Both these forms of pollution would be present in large quantities, making their way eventually into the air and water ways. In addition there will be increased pollution from crew work vehicles plus other heavy equipment.
1273.01. Road Width
All roads shall be constructed to provide a minimum of two ten (10) foot traffic lanes, not including shoulder and striping. These traffic lanes shall provide for two-way traffic flow to support emergency vehicle and civilian egress, unless other standards are provided in this article, or additional requirements are mandated by local jurisdictions or local subdivision requirements.

1273.10. Driveways
(a) All driveways shall be constructed to provide a minimum of one (1) ten (10) foot traffic lane and fourteen (14) feet unobstructed horizontal clearance and unobstructed vertical clearance of fifteen (15) feet.
APPENDIX D

Midpines Conservation and Wildfire Protection Plan
LINK:
http://www.mariposacounty.org/DocumentCenter/View/33783
APPENDIX E

Employment Information - Midpines
Employment Profile of Midpines Residents

Information from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey
Five-year average covering 2007 to 2011

Profile of employed Midpines residents
Five-year average for 2007 to 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASS OF WORKER</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian employed population 16 years and over</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private wage and salary workers</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government workers</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed in own not incorporated business workers</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALES 16 YEARS AND OVER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME (IN 2010 INFLATION-ADJUSTED DOLLARS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median earnings for workers</td>
<td>$31,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median earnings for male full-time, year-round workers</td>
<td>$44,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median earnings for female full-time, year-round workers</td>
<td>$31,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN EARNINGS BY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over with earnings</td>
<td>$31,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency)</td>
<td>$24,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or associate's degree</td>
<td>$17,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>$114,539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Data is from surveys of a small population, resulting in large margins of error.
## Industries employing Midpines residents

**Five-year average for 2007 to 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Median Earnings</th>
<th>Male Median</th>
<th>Female Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civilian employed population 16+ years</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$33,092</td>
<td>$24,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$22,086</td>
<td>$24,297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, &amp; technical</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative &amp; support &amp; waste mgmt,</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>$8,642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$22,263</td>
<td>$22,263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public admin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$112,061</td>
<td>$112,061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table S2403: Industry by Sex and Median Earnings for the Past 12 Months (in 2011 inflation-adjusted dollars) for the Civilian Employed Population 16 Years and Over

Note: Data is from surveys of a small population, resulting in large margins of error.

## Occupations of Midpines residents

**Five-year average for 2007 to 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Median Earnings</th>
<th>Male Median</th>
<th>Female Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civilian employed population 16+ years and over</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$33,092</td>
<td>$24,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management occupations</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$17,152</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and social services occupations</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$5,576</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, design, entertainment, sports, &amp; media occup.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement workers including supervisors</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$112,061</td>
<td>$112,061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal care and service occupations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and related occupations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$32,985</td>
<td>$24,297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and administrative support occupations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$20,938</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation occupations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2007-2011 American Community Survey, Table S2401: Occupation by Sex and Median Earnings for the Past 12 Months (in 2011 inflation-adjusted dollars) for the Civilian Employed Population 15 Years and Over

Note: Data is from surveys of a small population, resulting in large margins of error.
### Employers in ZIP Code 95345

Annual payroll in 2011: $1,494,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Total Establishments</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing, heating, and air-conditioning contractors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood kitchen cabinet and countertop manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline stations with convenience stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic and sightseeing transportation, land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust, fiduciary, and custody activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessors of residential buildings and dwellings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other professional, scientific, and technical services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other miscellaneous schools and instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels (except casino hotels) and motels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV (recreational vehicle) parks and campgrounds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses not classified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for all sectors</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011 County Business Patterns, establishment data for ZIP Code 95345.