

MONO COUNTY
JUNE LAKE COALITION
MEETING NOTES
from September 6, 2006

PROCESS DECISIONS, CLARIFICATIONS, QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED BY 9/20 MEETING

- *Voting Process: do not need to color code ballots*
- *JLC Options: number under "rodeo grounds" refers to number of residential and resort units*
- *JLC Options: under "type of development", what does "resort" indicate? No single family residences"? Detached units?*
- *JLC Options: under "type of development", what is the definition of "mixed use"*
- *JLC Options: Under Option 5 - "building height", what does "tree canopy" mean? I think at the walk through Tree canopy was between 70 and 75 feet.*
- *JLC Options: Group did not look at un-built residential lots; since un-built lots are a resource, should be included in list of Questions*
- *What is the status of the Water study.*
- *Questions (which will accompany Recommendations): want to make sure that the water issue is included*

Note: "Value Notes" are the flip chart notes the facilitator made during the meeting discussion; they are a listing of what was said.

VALUE: TRANSIENT BED BASE

- *Viability of June Mountain; Mammoth Mountain is carrying financially; need for \$20 million on Mountain improvements (first phase); additional skier visits needed 117,000; \$20m; 1284 hotel equivalents/ additional beds*
- *There are alternative thoughts regarding strategies to reduce # of transient beds required*
- *Differences in definition of "profitability", e.g. JM not currently covering administrative costs or debt service vs. "5 years profitable"*
- *Capital investments go to highest revenue opportunities*
- *On a stand alone basis June Mountain is not profitable*

VALUE: TIMING

- *Moderate development - phased*
- *MM has made no commitment past 06-07 ski season*
- *Will speed of development meet revenue needs? ASAP*
- *In 120 day ski season, 40 days are profitable*
- *Initially developers identify key bed opportunities*
- *Having the ski area continue to operate is of key importance to the community*

VALUE: POPULATION

- *Work within a comfortable carrying capacity*
- *Declining population*
- *There is a dispute re population #'s*

VALUE: JOBS/ LABOR FORCE

- *Small labor force - relates to housing (in general, not just affordable housing)*
- *Year round (both seasons) jobs important to community*

VALUE: COUNTY SERVICES

- *"poor" county*
- *Concern that existing county services will be lost, e.g. paramedics*
- *Possible opportunities for revenue procurement - county*
- *County will need additional \$ support - taxes in property tax, TOT*
- *Improvements don't happen unless some growth*
- *If Mountain doesn't stay open; property taxes decrease, TOT decrease*

VALUE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

- *Housing (general, not just affordable) is at issue; some housing being lost to second home owners, i.e. second home owners don't tend to rent to someone in town/labor force, loss of volunteer base// full time residents selling homes to second home owners Note: not a value statement re second homeowners*

VALUE: SCHOOLS

- *Difficult to attract families*
- *Perception of #'s by people moving here, e.g. moving from a place where there are a lot of students*
- *Transfers to Mammoth from Lee Vining*
- *Parents working in Mammoth transferring children to Mammoth - latch key children age*
- *Schools tie to housing, jobs..*
- *Charter schools*

VALUE: VOLUNTEERS

- *Housing issue*
- *Job issue*
- *Lost 3 firefighters to Mammoth and Bishop; lost 2 who are returning to school; of 4 "badged" firefighters - 3 work in Mammoth*
- *(medical services)*

VALUE: ECONOMIC VIABILITY

- *Important to have June Mountain open*
- *Increase profitable days from 40; address how to increase profit on off days*
- *Will this project keep community viable 360 days a year ... May - October already viable .. looking at winter viability*
- *With more rooms, owners will have more motivation to keep beds filled in off season*
- *Poised as a gateway for people traveling to/from Yosemite, Death Valley*
- *Balance - don't want to hurt summer business*
- *(Snow removal - more than half the roads in town are private; Cal Trans plows Main Street)*

VALUE: WATER

- *Ensure Gull & June Lake levels maintained at acceptable level*
- *PUD - If restrict Rodeo Grounds on amounts of water, have to restrict all others developing property; PUD = public - job is to supply the public with water; concerns about equal treatment, existing commitments, law suits*
- *Whatever decisions are made about water, they will effect all of June Lake*
- *Snowcreek surface water - have rights .. increasing treatment facility needed for peak usage)*
- *Special restrictions - conservation*
- *Single family residents use more water than multi use*
- *Meter program = effective*
- *Different projections in discussions of water by different hydrologists*

VALUE: TRAFFIC / SAFETY

- *Concern with increased traffic - no sidewalks/ trails for pedestrians to get around town (paid for by development)*
- *Parking*
- *Ski area - ample parking but not for increased visitors*
- *Resort across the street would help reduce traffic/ parking issues from increased visitors*

VALUE: NOISE & LIGHT

- *Complaints - single family homes*
- *Preservation of night sky*

VALUE: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

- *What will be the impact on the June Lake Loop ?? -> CEQA should address*

VALUE: COMMUNITY CHARACTER

- *Village in a park*
- *As natural as possible*
- *Revitalize family friendly aspect*
- *Recreation hub*
- *Four seasons*
- *One of the oldest resort communities around with a rich history and culture*
- *The antithesis of LA*
- *Visual impact is part of community character*
 - *Everyone has impacted the view*
 - *What is the threshold ?*
- *There is no "one set theme" - it is a mix .. so should the Rodeo Grounds have a "mix look" ?*
- *Scale is important, as well as, how much is visible/ seen*
- *Height vs. sprawl*

COMMUNITY CHARACTER CONTINUED..

- *No (minimal) ridgeline building; what is considered a ridgeline? Something can appear to be a ridgeline from different perspectives*
- *What ordinances, laws codes, etc. can keep sprawl from happening? Site coverage? Zoning? Deed restriction? Land easement?*
- *Concern about/can't trust future decision makers. Does a specific plan address this?*

FINAL CONCERN/ THOUGHT

- *Fire safety - building regulations: under 35' - wood structures, over 35' - fire resistance materials, over 55' - (new ordinance will require better materials/ fire fighting prepared sites*