

Public comments received after 5:00 pm August 5 through August 6, 2020 10:00 am.

- 54 comments arranged alphabetically.

Michael Draper

From: Paul Ashby <paul@dobiemeadows.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 10:26 PM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: comment for August 6 Board of Supervisors meeting on Tioga Inn proposal

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I find it difficult to accept that these revisions are the best that could be mustered, especially considering the thoughtful deliberation by (and unambiguous questions from) the Supervisors just five weeks ago.

The latest response, ostensibly addressing both original and subsequent community and Supervisors' concerns, didn't and doesn't adequately address flaws in the amendment, then or now. The latest proposed changes only inspire further questions.

- There's no adequate response to clearly stated concerns -- by Lee Vining emergency personnel, no less -- regarding fire safety and personnel capacity issues.
- There's no adequate response to pedestrian safety and connectivity. We are asked to accept studies at some vague later date.
- Visual impacts remain understated, and, in some cases, have been misrepresented by the proponent at each step in the process. At one point we were asked to accept studies of sightlines from the South Tufa parking lot — a disingenuous obfuscation that, reading between the lines, revealed the studies did not include sightlines from the South Tufa shoreline. This does not encourage credibility regarding other proffered changes.

It seems a shell game is being played with public safety (or lack thereof) in view of undeniable -- and, to a significant degree, admitted -- project impacts.

Is the proponent hoping to wear everyone down in the process? This isn't just moving motels around on a Monopoly board. Everyone who lives here, works here, and visits here would be paying for Tioga Inn, as presented, for decades. And not in just cash.

Respectfully,

Paul Ashby

Michael Draper

From: Dick Ashford <dicka@ashlandhome.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 6:39 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn comment

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Supervisors,
I am asking that you deny the revised “project”.

I place “project” in quotations, because it is not fully fleshed out, and many of the missing elements are those that you asked for when the matter was before you in June. It’s incomplete at best.

- The project concedes that impacts to views due to light and glare during the day and night will remain. It’s a beautiful place. Please help preserve that beauty.
- Additional significant adverse impacts still remain with the project; you heard them in June, and you asked for revisions. You didn’t get what you requested. IMHO, reason to vote “NO”.
- The changes to the plan have not produced a project that respects the local community, **NOR** does it respect visitors to the area. Visitors = tourists \$ = boost to the local economy.
- I first visited the area in 1967. We visited intermittently in the 70’s and 80’s and have visited almost ANNUALLY since the late 80’s. We love the Mono Basin. Please think long-term.

Thank you for your consideration,
Dick Ashford

Michael Draper

From: Richard Beebe <rbphoto@pacbell.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 7:18 PM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

It is my understanding that the "redo" on the project planning by the developer effectively was used to just make sure i's were dotted and t's crossed on the original document tossed back to them to "fix."

The impression the planning commission and board of supervisors are giving to those paying attention to this matter is the decision was closed back in 1993 when the original project - motel, restaurant, etc. - and nothing added on or clarified now means much. Too bad the people watching and paying attention, aside from the general public and those interested in the Eastern Sierra, Mono Basin, and Lake, are local Mono County residents the supervisors actually serve (and who can actually vote the planners and directors out of a job for ignoring their safety and other issues). They will be paying attention to how the supervisors support their expressed concerns.

The "new" amended proposal still ignores issues that are of serious concern.

* A safe travel route to/from Lee Vining from the site is still not included. (I guess someone has to get hit by an inattentive driver to make the point understandable, or someone on a bike getting a blown tire.)

* The views from points around Mono Lake, including the single biggest tourist visitor site in the County, South Tufa, that will be negatively impacted don't much matter.

How many spoken and written comments expressing concerns about (against) this project have been received?

How many comments in support of the project have been received?

Which way does the numbers of this math point?

Which side of the math will the final vote support?

I have had great pleasure in visiting, exploring, patronizing, sharing good stories about, and learning about your county going past the 42-year mark.

Thank you for your time. I hope your decision matters more than just some dollar value on a piece of paper. Maybe I should suggest getting out to Lee Vining, and see what the impacts of your actions this day will be.

Richard D. Beebe

...photographer-

.....N. California

...photography instructor-

.....Grand Theatre Center for the Arts,

.....Tracy, Calif.

Michael Draper

From: Sharon Boies <sbmuzicmts@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:16 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Fwd: Tioga Inn

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Mono County Board of Supervisors ,

I want to thank you for taking the time to read the original letter below that I sent to Mr. Draper almost one year ago.

So far I haven't seen anything that has changed my mind on the project.

Also, it may be difficult to predict the future of tourism and travel given the current pandemic.

I can't wait for the day I return to Lee Vining and I pray it will look the exact same way as it did the last time I saw it, unfortunately, it won't be this year. I have high hopes for next year.

In closing I want to express I'm having a hard time grasping how the future of a priceless landscape that took millions of years to create, that has been used by the native animal residents since the beginning of time could be permanently altered and scarred in such a devastating way, for generations to come, no matter how small the expansion is, can be decided by a small group of individuals for seemingly the gain of very few people against the will of their constituents who voted them in, the town and nearly everyone who has heard of the project.

I hope you will consider the weight and consequences of your decision today.

You have the absolute power to listen to the voices of your constituents and the animals who can't speak up and decide to put off any expansion at this time.

Thank you so much,

Very sincerely yours ,

Sharon Boies

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <smgsmb@verizon.net>

Date: Aug 5, 2020 8:50 PM

Subject:

To: <sbmuzicmts@gmail.com>

Cc:

Hello Mr. Draper,

My name is Sharon Boies , I live on the east coast in Columbia , Maryland.

When I heard about the potential project to expand the existing Mobil Gas station in Lee Vining, Ca, my heart sunk and I thank you very much for the opportunity to express my views and concerns in this letter.

My husband and I have been coming to Lee Vining for many, many years now , usually for several weeks to a month at a time.

We stay in Lee Vining as our base for backpacking trips in the park and day trips in the area.

Lee Vining to me is coming in from the North East, stopping at the overlook and taking in that huge view of the Mono Lake Basin.

We always make reservations at Murpheys Lodge, we get Mono Burgers for lunch. In the evening we stroll by the people on the porch and sitting out front in the lovely gardens of the Lah-Dee-Dah Cafe and hotel as we make our way to Nicelys looking forward to the nightly special.

We usually go to the Mono Market for dessert and any refills on backpacking supplies we need.

I have so many souvenirs from the gift shops including at the Mobil Gas station .

We have also re supplied at the hardware store in town.

We buy awesome sandwiches, chips and drinks from the Whoa Nellie Deli for our day trips , we refill our gas there at the Mobil too.

Walking back to Murpheys at night through town , looking up at the dark, non light polluted sky at all the stars is an incredible sight to see and one that is quickly disappearing from our night skies around this country at quite a clip. Dark night skies are so important to a lot of species.

Listening to the sprinklers water the beautiful street trees reminds me of the precious commodity water is out there. This is Lee Vining to me and I would venture to guess many others too.

The point I'm making is there are so many small businesses in town, I haven't named them all including other hotels and restaurants that have been there a long time and have endured alot to stay in business , the weather , the fire and the unpredictable , ever changing seasons.

I recognize the town does fill up, we make reservations before we come out. To those who arrive with no where to stay, I feel for them but there are so many existing year round hotels in June Lake and Mammoth and there's always camping.

If they've ever been to any town outside of a national park entrance before , seeing No Vacancy is to be expected . Then there is the drive into the park. I've had the opportunity to see alot of this country and the West but holy smokes, I kid you not, the Tioga Road from the second you turn onto it is drop dead, jaw dropping , one of a kind spectacular ! You're so lucky to live there.

When you are at the top of the canyon looking down from a couple of the overlooks, you can see down to the lake basin and out to the NV line including the Mono cones and craters and the volcano, it just builds and builds and it takes my breath away each time.

I can't imagine that view ever changing .

When we are losing protections for iconic landscapes more now than ever, every one we still have becomes that much more special and it's so important that it remain unmarred.

To think that future generations would not have the chance or privilege to get to see Lee Vining and the canyon area the way it is now is almost a crime to me.

A landscape marred is a landscape gone forever , it will never be the same or returned to its natural state, as it is now, ever again.

That's alot to consider.

I worry for all the existing businesses that are there now and have been as I know the winter months can be a struggle. Bodie Mikes closes down each winter, Murpheys doesn't have all their rooms open just to name a few because when you get down to it, Lee Vining is a seasonal town.

To make such huge permanent , potentially devastating changes to the scenic beauty, the quaint atmosphere of the town, the non light polluted night sky, the financial stability of existing businesses and their employees, the environment , the existing herds of animals that use that area for their migration routes and always have and for the unpredictable water source that will be required , not to mention the industrial pollution from the project and the permanent run off that would be created from the expanded footprint. Does it seem worth it?

I haven't even started on the impact of the public services around there , like the fire department for example.

One of the most fun things we've done in Lee Vining was to see a band at the Mobil Gas Station. It's nothing against the Mobil itself but I am against any plans for expansion .

Please , please keep Lee Vining sacred and special for all future generations to see it as we see it now.

You can always kick the can of development down the road.

We've lost alot and learned alot in the past 26 years but you can't take that can back once you've approved the project.

Please consider all the permanent consequences for a part time business. I hope you will at least give that can a big kick, way down the road.

Thank you so much for taking the time to read this and considering my thoughts and concerns.

Very most sincerely yours,

Sharon Boies

Michael Draper

From: Kathy Broesamle <kbroesamle@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 7:25 PM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Board of Supervisors

I wish to register my dismay at the proposed Tioga Inn development. For the past 70+ years, I have visited Yosemite either through the gateway community of Oakhurst or the gateway community of Lee Vining and believe that the Lee Vining entrance to the park is incomparably the more appealing. Why? Because it has managed to maintain its rustic nature.

We own a cabin in Wawona and are subjected to the urban sprawl of Oakhurst every time we go there. True, we can shop at the huge Vons or Raleys for groceries, but we would rather visit the little grocery store in Lee Vining and let the psychological process of returning to simpler, quieter times take hold as the rarified air begins to have its effect and we launch our trip up the Pass to Tuolumne Meadows. Oakhurst is currently building a gigantic hotel complex which frightens us as we envision the future congestion and pollution of what used to be, very long ago, a fairly charming community. Now we see the same things threatening Lee Vining.

For the past several years my extended family has spent two weeks each summer at Lake View Lodge in Lee Vining as a base for treks into the park and into the local Mono Lake area. It is apparent that this well-run, enjoyable, quiet lodge and others in Lee Vining are serving the needs of tourists like us quite adequately.

We have spent thousands of dollars on the cabins we've rented, the restaurant meals we've consumed, the groceries and sundry items we've purchased as well as gas along the main highway in Lee Vining. However, if the Tioga Inn development is approved as requested, we will feel compelled to take our patronage elsewhere to a destination where the magic still exists.

I am aware that the proposal is partly for what appear to be apartments. But it is easy to foresee how short-term rentals can be made of these apartments, and that there is no guarantee that, if needed, the units would be affordable. Instead, I suggest that affordable housing be specifically planned that does not interfere with views and that is guaranteed to meet the needs of the community.

Sincerely,

Michael Draper

From: Pat Brown <patbobbat@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 12:31 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Comments for August 6 Board Meeting on the Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have been following the issues in the Tioga Inn Project. When I first learned of the project, I thought that under public scrutiny it would not be allowed to proceed for many reasons. The primary reason was that it would change the visual and cultural character of the rural setting of Lee Vining and the view from Mono Lake and Highway 395 looking up towards Tioga Pass, the Gateway to Yosemite. Along with other residents, I thought that this should not happen just for private financial development and tax base increases. This week I visited the South Tufa area, and confirmed this opinion as I gazed west.

In light of the more practical shortcomings of the plan that have not yet been adequately addressed, I would like to comment now. I have lived in Paradise at the southern end of Mono County since 1994. Like Lee Vining, we have a small but dedicated volunteer fire department that was tested to its limits and beyond by the February 2015 wildfire. However, we were lucky to have Cal Fire in Round Valley and the Bishop Fire Department come to our rescue. Swall Meadows had its own community to protect. Paradise has two routes of escape on Lower Rock Creek Road. Swall Meadows has only one road that could easily be blocked by a wildfire. A new development like Tioga Inn needs a safe exit route onto Highway 395 included in the plan.

The development also needs to contribute much more to the Lee Vining Fire Department than currently included in the plan, both in terms of more equipment and paid fire fighters. Other than the Forest Service, there are no other close communities to assist in a wildfire emergency, which is bound to occur at some point. The more housing density, the more possibilities for human-caused fires.

The traffic pattern of vehicles entering and exiting the Tioga Gas Mart and Whoa Nellie Deli currently present a traffic hazard. Adding more residents, visitors and car traffic on the same side of the road for the Tioga Inn will just compound this issue. Much of the traffic on Route 120 in the spring through fall are tourists who are not familiar with the area.

The lack of safe pedestrian crossings and pathways into Lee Vining that do not require walking along busy highways has not been adequately addressed. If residents and visitors to the Tioga Mart are expected to drive into Lee Vining for supplies and other amenities, this will only increase the traffic problem.

In summary, I can think of many reasons why the Tioga Inn Project should not proceed with the current plan due to visual impacts, light pollution and safety considerations.

Sincerely,

Patricia Brown, Ph. D.
134 Eagle Vista
Bishop, CA 93514

760 920 3975

Michael Draper

From: Sue Burak <triplepointh2o@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:50 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Comment letter on Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Enclosed please find my comments on the water resources section of the Tioga Inn project.

Dear Mono County Supervisors,

I am a long-time resident of Mono County and am hydrologist and snow scientist by education. I have conducted research and reported on groundwater interactions between MCWD domestic water supply wells and Mammoth Creek. I currently conduct water quality investigations in the Big Springs area.

The project consultant's comments in response to my letter of June 29, 2020, did not address my concern that there is not enough information to determine if Well #1 and #2 can supply the Project during all phases of construction and buildout.

There are too many gaps in the data to safely proceed with Project approval. Estimates of Maximum daily demand are absent. In order to evaluate the capacity of the wells to meet the Project's need during construction phases and build out, information from a pumping test on Well #2 should be required. Pumping tests must simulate maximum water demand that will occur during July and August.

The question of whether the project will have long-term impacts on the aquifer has not been addressed. A long-term aquifer test has not been done. Long-term aquifer tests simulate the long-term stress to the groundwater system- test parameters must be based on realistic groundwater extraction rates. A multiple-well aquifer test of Well #1 and #2 with time-drawdown and distance-drawdown analyses are needed. The purpose of aquifer tests determines the transmissivity and storage coefficient of the aquifer. Test also determine well efficiency and optimum pumping rates. A well-designed aquifer test will determine boundary conditions and potential well interference.

The drawdown in short-term tests indicate drawn down water elevations were lower than the surface elevation of Mono Lake at the pumping rate of 150 gpm. The importance of establishing the pumping rate that maintains steady state conditions and eliminates the potential of reversing the hydraulic gradient between Mono Lake and the project wells cannot be overstated.

The existing water supply data are insufficient to evaluate the cumulative impacts as well as determining water supply estimate for each phase of the project. Maximum daily water demand numbers for each phase of the project are needed that include the volume of treated wastewater that is expected to reduce groundwater extraction.

Mono County should require max and daily/monthly demands that include construction water demand along with projections of water use that include the volumes of wastewater expected to augment groundwater extraction. This must be done for each phase of construction. It is not clear how much wastewater will be available during construction phases and peak build-out. The timing and expected volumes of wastewater are needed. to inform longer period pumping test parameters such as pumping rate and test duration.

WATER QUALITY

In order to properly characterize water quality so long term changes in geochemical constituents can be monitored, the following drinking water tests should be included. Down gradient monitoring, wells sited in the the direction of groundwater flow that has yet to be determined, are needed to monitor groundwater levels and water quality parameters.

General mineral, Inorganic chemistry including mercury, cadmium, trace metals including arsenic, uranium, copper and lead and Volatile organics including glyphosate used in Round Up.

Static water levels in well #1 and 2 are approximately 350 ft below ground surface. Soil infiltration rates and percolation rates are not known. Age dating groundwater will give the information needed to estimate precipitation recharge rates and to identify possible older sources of groundwater.

To summarize: the existing baseline data and impact analyses are not sufficient to support this project. Please require that additional tests described in this letter are completed. Without filling in the data gaps, the project water resources analyses are incomplete and do not justify approval of the project.

Regards,

Sue Burak

Michael Draper

From: Beth Costanza <costanzabeth@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 8:25 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please vote NO on this development project. The ever lasting harm to the beautiful environment cannot be undone once it is done. No development under any circumstances!

Angelo and Beth Costanza
626 7160040

Michael Draper

From: Crowfoot <hac4dac@bendbroadband.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 8:10 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have been visiting and supporting Mono Lake for 50 years. This proposal is an abomination. I know Mono County is a poor county, but to sell an unparalleled beauty for the short term is not the answer. People come from all over the world to see Mono Lake and its unspoiled beauty. They can go to a resort anywhere, but choose the Mono Lake area for a reason. Don't sell that reason for a short term gain. Please vote NO on the current proposal.

Sincerely, Hilma Crowfoot
Redmond Oregon

Michael Draper

From: Crowfoot <hac4dac@bendbroadband.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 7:35 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the current application for the a permit to develop the Inn. It is obvious the developer has no respect for the responsibility placed in you by the voters of Mono County. In apparently failing to even address several concerns, including those based on safety issues, I believe the developer has placed you in a position where you have no choice but to turn him down. I cannot imagine the project going away, developers do not give up, but they can be required to negotiate in some semblance of good faith. I do not think it excessive to say that this developer feels he "owns" the Board and the people of Mono County. As I have written you before, you hold the future standard of development around Mono Lake in your hands with this vote. Tioga Inn will, in all likelihood , be developed in some form at some point in time but it MUST be developed to meet appropriate standards in order to protect Mono Lake in all it's stunningly glorious beauty for both us and generations to come.

Again, please reject this proposal in its current form.

Respectfully,

David Amasa Crowfoot

August 5, 2020

Honorable Mono County Supervisors,

Five weeks ago, at the end of a two-day public hearing and after lengthy public testimony and board discussion, your board was not satisfied with the project as presented and the significant impacts still associated with it. As a board, you deferred your decision and directed staff and the proponent to continue to work on several problematic project issues because these components of the project and the resulting impacts were unacceptable to you.

The report in your packet today includes a progress report from staff on those specific items—the Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan housing alternative, project grading, the fire evacuation route, the propane tank, the trail and connectivity of the project to Lee Vining, and addressing the Lee Vining Fire Protection District safety concerns. With the exception of modest improvements to visual impacts as a result of the housing redesign, no significant improvements have been achieved in the other areas.

The same impacts exist today as they did five weeks ago.

The final project amendment as presented falls well short in incorporating the additional changes that the board was seeking at the June meeting to reduce impacts in the five key areas.

There are two project impacts that are especially concerning to me:

1. Despite connectivity concerns related to safe pedestrian movement between the project and the town of Lee Vining from the beginning of this process, it is disappointing that the best that could be achieved in four years of project development is that “the feasibility of such a connection will be explored.” There is no certainty and no commitment that a safe route for children, residents, and visitors will ever be constructed.
2. And perhaps more importantly is the fact that the Lee Vining Fire Protection District’s concerns remain unaddressed. The safety of our local fire department personnel and the safety of those they serve should be of utmost concern to Mono County elected officials. Safe egress and ingress to the project location during an emergency, financial support for additional equipment and supplies, and personnel response capacity have not been satisfactorily addressed in the Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan.

Furthermore, since five unavoidable, unmitigatable adverse environmental impacts remain, in order to consider approving this project you would need to find that these impacts are justified because of economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits to Mono County and the community. The benefits listed in this section of the document are faulty and weak at best when compared to the impacts they are attempting to justify and over-ride.

1. The project will provide needed housing. It is *still* unclear who this housing is for. The proponent states that it is for hotel and restaurant employees. But what if that

part of the project is never built? Lee Vining's current housing need is for approximately 15 affordable deed-restricted work-force housing units. This project does not satisfy that need.

2. The project will support economic development. The findings state that the project supports economic development because it provides much needed housing for Mono County. As stated above, it will not meet the *real* Lee Vining housing need but instead perhaps provide housing for people working in Mammoth Lakes. Mono County can do better in this regard and work toward meeting the County's housing need community by community—residents living in the communities where they work.
3. The project will support conservation. Design features incorporate solar panels and electrical vehicle charging stations. The findings state that open space will “nearly double” yet there is no mention of the no-build alternative and the benefit of maintaining undeveloped land.
4. The project will have social benefits. The benefits listed—response to public comment, the on-site day care facility, construction phasing and the fact that the deli exists—are meager at best and in no way compensate for the serious and permanent environmental impacts that will result from this project.

I urge the board to reject the preferred Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan for the Tioga Inn Project and deny project approval.

The project as presented to you for this final consideration remains flawed, inappropriate for the Mono Basin, and incompatible with Mono County's community-based, visionary and forward-thinking development approach.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Lisa Cutting
Lee Vining, CA

Michael Draper

From: martha davis <mlcmarthadavis@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 7:39 AM
To: CDD Comments; Bartshe Miller
Subject: Please note no on the Tioga Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you for directing the developer of Tioga Inn Project to work last month with the Lee Vining community to address and resolve the unacceptable impacts the Tioga proposed project will have on this small town.

The proposal before you reveals that much more could and should be done to reduce the Tioga Inn project impacts if the developer was willing to do more towards this goal. But the project that you are being asked to approve today does NOT do so.

The developer has had more than four years to put before you proposal that meets Mono County's commitment to protect the character of it's small towns and the health and safety of it's residents. The Tioga Inn Project fails on all counts, and the developer is placing on your shoulders the responsibility to declare impacts as unmitigable and when the truth is that these impacts could be mitigated if the developer was willing.

The Tioga Project is not worthy of your support as it is proposed today. Please vote no.

Sincerely,

Martha Davis

Michael Draper

From: Suzanne <snorkers@startmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:54 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: TIOGA INN PROJECT

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

DEAR BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,

THE DEVELOPERS OF THIS ILL-CONCEIVED PROJECT **DID NOT** ADDRESS THE ORIGINAL 5 ADVERSE IMPACTS OF THIS PLAN AS REQUIRED.

THIS FINAL REVISED PLAN IS INADEQUATE AND SEVERELY FLAWED.

THE DEVELOPERS ARE BEHAVING DISINGENUOUSLY IN TRYING TO FORCE YOUR HAND INTO APPROVING THE PROJECT **WITHOUT** EXECUTING THE NECESSARY CHANGES THAT WERE REQUIRED OF THEM.

DO NOT APPROVE THIS PROJECT AS IT STANDS.

My husband and I own a cabin in June Lake and have roamed the eastern Sierra since our youth. Please help to preserve this beautiful and exceptional place.

We support you!

Suzanne and Tom Davis
30 Silver Meadow Lane
June Lake

Michael Draper

From: Jan Derecho <jan_derecho@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:38 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Hybrid 7 Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Board Members,
Please reconsider this Hybrid 7 project proposal! My partner & I are homeowners in June Lake since 2003 and very much value the preservation of natural land and the special environment of the Eastern Sierra and Lee Vining area. Please be cautious and respectful of the natural habitat!

Sincerely,

Jan Derecho & Steve Whitelaw
189 Lakeview Drive
June Lake, CA 93529

Michael Draper

From: Sam Earnshaw <sambo@cruzio.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:03 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Reject Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Board of Supervisors:

Please reject Alternative # 7-Hybrid Plan, and send back for important design improvements. What you decide today will live forever for Mono County and the millions of people who come to the area.

The important improvements you asked for in June are not in Alternative # 7-Hybrid Plan. The original five significant impacts still remain.

The project as described would be a significant impact on the nature of the Lee Vining area. There is a need for worker housing, but it should not intrude on the nature of the area.

Thank you for standing up to the pressure of development.

Sam Earnshaw
602 Delta Way
Watsonville, CA. 95076

831 722-5556

Michael Draper

From: Joan Egrie <joanegrie@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 7:07 PM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Tioga Inn Housing Plans Should be Rejected or Further Revised

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Commissioners,

I have been coming to the Mono Lake Basin for 45 years, making multiple trips each year with the sole exception of this year, 2020, due to the pandemic. I have been carefully watching and reading about the Tioga Inn Development and Housing Plans and the Plan's revisions. Unfortunately, I do not think the current proposed revisions adequately address the issues identified in the Mono County Board of Supervisor's meeting on June 30, 2020.

In particular, issues relating to fire safety have not been resolved. The proposed development essentially will double the population of the town of Lee Vining putting strain on the volunteer Fire Department in the best of circumstances. There is currently only one road to serve as the entrance and exit for the proposed Development which will severely hamper efforts of the Fire Department to gain access to the Development while cars are evacuating during a fire. This will endanger the lives of the residents, tourists and firefighters and delay the efforts of the firefighters in doing their job. For the safety of everyone, this proposal should not be approved until the Lee Vining Fire Department are satisfied with the plans and any potential easements have been obtained.

In addition, there are no plans to provide safe pedestrian access from the development to the town of Lee Vining. Walking along the shoulder of a busy highway is too dangerous, especially for children walking to school or anyone walking when it is dark. It is ludicrous to think that a shuttle operating 3 trips a day at fixed times can accommodate the needs of the community.

Finally, while grading and eliminating second story structures will be helpful in mitigating the visible scars of the Development, the plans as presented are insufficient. Landscaping plans should be more detailed and include a qualified landscape architect's input to maximize the visual relief that can be gained by the landscape screening.

The Mono Lake Basin is one of the most beautiful areas in California. As the gateway to Yosemite National Park, it is incumbent upon the entire community to be sure that this Development neither scars not detracts from the natural beauty of the area; and, additionally, does not place undue burdens and safety issues on the town of Lee Vining.

Unfortunately, the proposed plans need further revisions or need to be rejected.

Thanks you for your consideration.

Best Regards,

Joan Egrie

June 5, 2020

Dear Honorable Mono County Supervisors,

I appreciate the staff's efforts to try to answer the board's questions and resolve unmitigable issues that were raised at the last meeting. After reviewing the report, though, I continue to have many major concerns regarding this development project. Here are a few:

1. You are being asked to approve a plan that is not complete. One quote, for example, from Exhibit A related to the trail that would connect the project to Lee Vining, states:

The feasibility analysis of the connectivity trail project shall commence within six months of the Board of Supervisors' approval of the Tioga Inn Specific Plan Amendment #3.

Safe connection between the project and Lee Vining as well as the safe crossing of the Tioga Road are critical components of this project—adverse impacts that cannot be disregarded or put off to a future time after the plan is approved. The feasibility analysis should have been completed by now and articulated in the project plan before you. As it stands, the adverse impacts on foot traffic between the project site and Lee Vining are considered significant and unavoidable. The vote before you is whether the “benefit” of housing is worth the safety threat to kids, community, and our visitors.

2. I take issue that one of the benefits listed of the Tioga Inn Project is: **THE PROJECT WILL PROVIDE NEEDED HOUSING** in Mono County. This project doesn't provide enough housing to cover all employees projected to work at the future hotel and restaurant. Also, the statement that this housing will reduce long commutes is not true. Winter jobs in Lee Vining are very few. Year-round renters will commute to Mammoth for work. And who the housing will actually be for still remains very unclear.

Board of Supervisors, you are the honorable caretakers of Mono County—the place, the people, and the distinctive communities. Please do not approve this piecemeal, half-hearted, poorly-planned, precedent-setting, inappropriate project. Please select **Option 2—Deny the Project and Do Not Certify the SEIR.**

Sincerely,

Margaret Eissler

Lee Vining

Michael Draper

From: Henry Feilen <henry.feilen@verizon.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:22 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Tioga Inn Proposed development Alt #7 hybrid plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Mono County Board of supervisors:

Dear Board - I have commented on this project before and still feel the need to provide comments in regards to this new Alternative #7 proposal. I am still opposed to this project.

It does not provide a practical and safe route for access to the town. Human nature tells me that no one will take a path that is over twice as long to get somewhere unless there are very strong physical barriers forcing people to take the longer route. Also the route needs to be approved before project approval, not debated at some later date when things may already be under construction.

Also in regards to the access path. Who is going to maintain it especially during the Winter months? The developer doesn't even seem to want to provide adequate monies for fire protection, etc. This access is required purely for the new development and they should pay the entire cost of its construction and maintenance in perpetuity.

There is still inadequate mitigation of the visual impacts.

I respectfully request that the Board not approve the proposed plan.

Thank you for your consideration

Henry M. Feilen
4145 Van Buren St.
Chino, CA 91710
909-325-2154

Michael Draper

From: smgsmb@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 8:32 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To, Board of Supervisors

Hello, My name is Steve Garmize, I live on the east coast in Maryland. My wife and I have been visiting Lee Vining and Yosemite for quite a while now. We learned of the Tioga inn project and are very concerned. This is just not something that will fit into this unique area. Lee Vining is a quiet and charming place, it is the Ma and Pa businesses that make it that way, Mono Mrkt, Murpheys Motel, Nicely's, and all the others. The environmental impact, the light pollution, the waste water and the additional traffic all will be the end of one of the jewels of the Eastern Sierra. Not to mention the Tioga road entrance to Yosemite is only open for 5 month max out of the year. I can not imagine coming down the 120 from Yosemite and seeing this eyesore interrupting the view of Mono Lake. With Topaz Lake to the north and June Lake and Mammoth to the south, all of which are already well developed, I can not see any logical reason for development like this in Lee Vining. Please make every effort to keep this project from moving forward. Sincerely, Steve Garmize

Michael Draper

From: peter@peterglassdesign.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 8:20 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: not a good fit

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for all of the time, effort, energy, you have spent on this.

My wife and I have a home in June Lake and have been enjoying this part of the Sierras for the last 50 years.

We have been following all of this.

This project doesn't fit. There will be others that do.

Thanks,

Peter and Donna Glass

Michael Draper

From: Terry Hastings <terrymh1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 5:32 PM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Misguided Tioga Inn project- safety at risk

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Commissioners,

Please do not let this project go forward as proposed!

Current and future generations in Mono County count on you to think about the impact of this project— not only on the environment, including its amazing vistas, but also the safety of those who will live or visit there. The proposed project is deficient in providing for safe routes to Lee Vining for pedestrians, bicycles, and vehicles. Lives are at stake—don't dismiss them! The future of just child, one tourist, one worker...that life will be on you.

Terry Hastings
Nevada City, CA

to allow the proposed Mono Inn project to go forward, even with the limited revisions made to address some of the worst visual impacts. Also, since this project is nominally to support workers in the Mono Basin area by providing affordable housing, the project must provide a safe way for these workers and their families to walk or bike into Lee Vining for school or shopping. The revision does not address this problem adequately. Finally, as I said in my earlier comments, this project should be sited in areas of Mono County that are already developed: Lee Vining itself or June Lake.

--

Terry Marie Hastings
Nevada City CA

Michael Draper

From: Elaine Holland <em.holland@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 10:28 PM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Tioga Inn project should not be approved

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Mono County Supervisors
From: Em Holland, Mono County resident

I concur with the Mono Lake Committee's assessment of the revised Tioga Inn proposal, that it must be rejected because

1. It does not adequately provide for safe exit route in case of wildfire. As I drove by Mono Lake today the fire scar and blackened trees were a tragic reminder of the danger of wildfire in our ever drier climate.
2. It does not provide a safe pedestrian route from the project to schools and shopping in Lee Vining. School children and other residents must not be forced to walk alongside Hwy 120 or 395, that's unthinkable.

Both of these are egregious shortcomings in the plan. For the safety of residents please reject the plan.

Michael Draper

From: James T. Hollibaugh <jaimelaplage@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 4:49 PM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Proposed Tioga Inn project.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Commissioners,

As a native Californian, I have visited scenic Mono County, Lee Vining and Mono Lake many times. Sometimes I stayed in Lee Vining at the Best Western, sometimes I drove up from Mammoth Lakes, and sometimes I camped locally or in Yosemite National Park. I visit Mono County because of the area's scenic beauty, especially the I 395 corridor, and for the outdoor recreational opportunities the County provides: fishing, horseback riding, hiking, climbing and so on. Mono County has done an exemplary job of protecting this scenic corridor from unsightly development like the proposed Tioga Inn project through the 70 plus years of my life. It would be a heinous crime to future generations, including my kids who spent many weeks in the County, during the summer, to allow the proposed Mono Inn project go forward, even with the limited revisions made to address some of the worst visual impacts. Also, since this project is nominally to support workers in the Mono Basin area by providing affordable housing, the project must provide a safe way for those workers and their families to walk or bike into Lee Vining for school or shopping. The revision does not address this problem adequately. Finally, as I said in my earlier comments, this project should be sited in areas of Mono County that are already developed: Lee Vining itself or June Lake.

Michael Draper

From: Ryan Hollibaugh <ryanhollibaugh@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 6:57 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn Comment

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Commissioners,

My family and I have visited scenic Mono Lake many times over the past thirty years, sometimes staying in Lee Vining at the Best Western, sometimes driving up from Mammoth Lakes. We believe it would be a mistake to allow the Tioga Inn project to go forward, even with the limited revisions made to address some of the worst visual impacts. Also, since this project is nominally to support workers in the Mono Basin area by providing affordable housing, the project must provide a safe way for these workers and their families to walk or bike into Lee Vining for school or shopping. The revision does not address this problem adequately. If it were to go forward, this project should be sited in areas of Mono County that are already developed: in Lee Vining itself or at June Lake.

Best,
--Ryan

Michael Draper

From: Ernest Isaacs <ernesti@pacbell.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 8:52 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Cc: lynn boulton
Subject: the tioga inn project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Supervisors -

I have been coming to the Eastern Sierras ever since the 60's to hike and backpack and enjoy Mono Lake. I remember when it was Mono Puddle. The attraction for me has been the wide open vistas of the sagebrush desert, the juniper forests, and the peaks of the Sierra.

On the one hand, this project will ruin the sweet small-town atmosphere of Lee Vining with the influx of so many new residents. But I don't live in Lee Vining, so my objection to the Tioga Inn is that it will contaminate the scenic and wild beauty of the Mono Lake area.?? It is what attracts me and I am sure is the attraction for so many others. It is why the motels in Lee Vining and the campgrounds in the canyons are full all summer.

Please don't approve this terrible project.

Ernest Isaacs
Berkeley, CA
(510) 526-0711

Michael Draper

From: terry kershaw <terrykershaw@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 4:48 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am writing this letter in opposition to the latest Alternative #7 Hybrid Plan proposed by the developer. The developer failed to address the five significant adverse impacts that you asked him/her to change. This plan is simply a "glossy" version of previous plans with no substantial changes to the previous plan.

In a nut shell it does not address the following significant issues:

1. No safe pedestrian route with a "study later" clause which is unacceptable
2. No visual screening from the south tufa area which is where the major screening needs to occur
3. Light impacts at night not even addressed
4. No fire safety route as requested by the Lee Vining Fire Dept.- this is totally non responsive by the developer and alone would cause the project to be terminated in my opinion
5. Impact on Lee Vining Fire Dept. not addressed- same response as number four.

In conclusion this Alternative Plan is totally unacceptable and I urge you to vote this project down now- no more gloss overs by the developers wasting your time and tax payers dollars.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Terry Kershaw
2006 S Newmark Ave
Sanger, CA 92657

Michael Draper

From: ek95014@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 8:22 PM
To: CDD Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Mono County Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to you as a Mono County property owner and year-round resident with a request that you vote NO on the Tioga Inn Project.

In June, the you directed the developer to address three significant issues: the visibility of the project from South Tufa and Navy Beach, the safety concerns of the Lee Vining Fire Department, and the lack of a safe connection for walking and bicycling between Lee Vining and the project site.

The project as presented to you today does not adequately address any of these issues.

You've heard from the community that it welcomes housing that meets Lee Vining's needs and fits within the community's existing footprint. This project neither enhances the community and its small-town character, nor safely addresses its need for housing.

Poorly planned from the start, it is not the kind of project that should be allowed to be built in Mono County. Please vote NO.

Thank you.

Ellen King
Mono City

Michael Draper

From: Kori Kody <kori.Kody@mindspring.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 12:23 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Please reject the Tioga Inn Project in Its Current Form

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Supervisors,

We are long-time visitors to Mono County who value the unique qualities of the landscape. The beauty of the environment is why we visit and spend our vacation dollars here. We think the Tioga Inn Project, in its current form, would cause permanent harm to the environment. Therefore, we urge you to reject the Tioga Inn Project. The ecosystem of Mono County is a treasure that needs to be cared for. Development should be undertaken only with extreme thoughtfulness. Our understanding is that the current plan, as submitted by the Developer, would negatively impact the unique grandeur of the area and cause adverse outcomes for the local and visitor communities.

Significant effort has been made by the local community to present an alternative vision of sustainable and beneficial development as represented by the Mono Basin Community Plan. The Mono Basin Community Plan creates opportunity for local affordable housing and diverse job opportunities while preserving the area's rich environment. This is in contrast to the Tioga Inn Project which, in its current form, only seems to serve the economic interests of the Developer while harming the local character of the community and the land.

Again, we urge you to act for the benefit of the community and reject the Tioga Inn Project.

Sincerely,
Steve Jackson
Kori Kody

Michael Draper

From: Patty Linder <patty4282@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 7:27 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn Project - Alternative #7 Hybrid Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

This hybrid plan falls short of what is needed and leaves some significant adverse impacts unaddressed, including a pedestrian walkway and fire safety, with no future means of amelioration. I don't believe this plan merits implementation.

Regards,

Patty Linder
839 Bend Avenue
San Jose CA 95136-1804

Michael Draper

From: Anne Lyon <mountan6@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 6:51 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Cc: Debbie Lurie
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I respectfully submit my objections to the proposed Tioga Inn Project. I have submitted comments as this process has rolled along, and I am still opposed to this project, despite so-called revisions to satisfy past concerns. The visual impact to the area remains substantial, especially when vistas untouched by development, are increasingly rare. The visual impact would affect both day and nighttime viewing of the area, it's unique geography and astronomical observation unhindered by light pollution. There are no proposed tree screenings from South Tufa. There is no third party detailed visual analysis, and the new proposal doesn't provide adequate information to support that. Safety doesn't appear to be of significant importance to the planners to protect citizens, either visitors or residents. Walking next to a major highway is simply not reasonable or acceptable. "Planning for it at a later date" is not specific, either in its financing or its location. Fire Department safety is not adequately addressed. No safety route has been identified in case of wildfire or other emergency, nor the route's eventual cost. We are dealing with a VOLUNTEER department, with no government or other funds supporting it. The growth of the citizenry they would be expected to handle, should the proposed Inn be built, is not addressed. How will these safety issues be handled? I value the Lee Vining and adjacent communities. I am aware of a good increase in revenues which might positively benefit the area. Nonetheless, I remain strongly opposed to the proposal and to the revised offerings.

Sincerely,
J. Anne Lyon
(Visitor and supporter of this area for 65 years)

Sent from my iPad

Michael Draper

From: Ilene <monogreens@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 5:06 PM
To: Shannon Kendall; CDD Comments
Subject: Comment for BOS Special Hearing, Tioga Inn, August 6, 2020

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Honorable Members of the Mono County Board of Supervisors,

I want to thank the Board for your patience during the last hearing and your direction to the proponent to address key issues and concerns that have been raised by the public by devising a revised Alternative for the Tioga Inn Project.

Unfortunately, the new "Hybrid Alternative #7" falls far short in addressing the shortcomings previously discussed. Unacceptable impacts to community connectivity, pedestrian, traffic and fire safety, schools, aesthetics and wildlife remain.

Furthermore, the revised diagrams do not contain sufficient information on the location, acreage and grading required for each proposed phase.

Given the continuing uncertainty that the hotel, restaurant and later housing phases will ever be realized, the proposal to complete all grading for all phases during the first phase, is unacceptable. The extent of natural landscape and habitat that would be unnecessarily denuded for an unspecified length of time could be considerable.

Furthermore, MC Public Works notes some components could be reasonably phased-

From attachment 6 of the staff report:

"The downsides of completing all grading in Phase I are as follows: 1) If the other phases are never built, asphalt that is installed but not driven on deteriorates and fails much faster than normal; however, that failure would not be an aesthetic impact as the asphalt would not be visible from US 395, South Tufa Beach or Navy Beach; and 2) Short-term visual impacts while the Revegetation Plan described in the FSEIR is implemented on graded areas left fallow. Mono County Public Works notes some components of the work may be reasonably phased. If phased grading is desired to minimize visual impacts and address the uncertainty that future phases will be built, the staff recommendation is to require the grading permit for each phase only provide for the minimum amount of grading needed for that phase and for infrastructure that must reasonably be installed, and be subject to the approval of the Public Works Director or County Engineer."

I continue to maintain that the project should be rejected for the numerous unmitigated impacts disclosed in the Final Subsequent EIR which continue to remain unresolved. I urge the Board to reject the Specific Plan Amendment 3, the Final Subsequent EIR and revised Alternative #7 for the Tioga Inn Project, which continue to be inadequate in analysis and inappropriate in vision, scale, design and location.

Thank you,

Ilene Mandelbaum
Lee Vining

Michael Draper

From: Barry McPherson <bdmcpherson@coho.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 9:21 PM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: B. McPherson opposition to the Tioga Inn development

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Honorable Supervisors,

I have been conveying my concerns and my opposition to Tioga Inn development verbally and in writing to the County since November 2016. I testified via the internet to the Planning Commission and then to the Board of Supervisors earlier this year, watched their deliberations, and I am still not convinced that this project should be approved as planned. You have been told over and over by me and others that this is a very large commercial development will create very large human safety, cultural, and environmental impacts on a small community that has tried valiantly to have their concerns adequately addressed by the developer and County without much success.

Some improvements have been made in the plan over the past few months, but not enough. I don't think it is even possible to make enough improvements in a project this big that is basically in the wrong location relative to the town and its schools, churches and other institutions, to alleviate the concerns of myself and other landowners, residents, long-term seasonal visitors. Once approved and built, the negative impacts will be impossible to alleviate.

The way I suggest things happen in the future to allow some reasonable expansion of housing, business and jobs in the Lee Vining area is to make Tioga Inn a considerably smaller project that is compatible with the community, and work toward a bit of expansion on the town-side of Lee Vining Creek. I hear over and over that it is impossible due to Los Angeles Dept of Water and Power (LADWP) ownership of the land. But there are already businesses in Lee Vining occupying LADWP land (and have for decades), and it is a weak and short-sighted argument to say "LADWP will never give in".

The County could surely help private interests deal with LADWP and, for instance, develop some workforce housing north and/or west of the high school that would allow safer and shorter routes of workforce children in this housing to reach schools. Housing development, and even hotel/motel, restaurant, and other business development could be done and be far less visible from Mono Lake and the rest of the Mono Basin than development on the hills above the Mobile gas station.

I'll state again that a Tioga Inn development with the currently planned amount of "workforce housing" is likely to create a "bedroom community" for Mammoth Lakes workers, resulting in unnecessary consumption of fuel, production of greenhouse gasses, and increase in vehicle accidents with associated injury and mortality. Workforce housing needs to be located close to where people work, and especially not on the other side of one of the highest passes in California (Deadman Summit) where winter storms create treacherous driving conditions.

I feel impelled to reiterate that I have deep roots in the Mono Basin, and deep concerns about development in the Basin. My grandmother and my father, who were icons of Mono Basin, repeatedly expressed opposition to "turning Mono Lake in to another overbuilt Lake Tahoe." I agree, and I'm concerned this large Tioga Inn development starts the Basin down that "overbuilt" trajectory. I was born in Bridgeport in 1947 and grew up in the home of my parents (Wallis R. and Virginia B. McPherson) situated below Mono Inn, the resort that my Grandmother Venita R. McPherson operated from the early 1920s until her death in 1961. After graduating from Lee Vining High School in 1965, obtaining a BS in

Zoology at UCSB in 1969, and working at the Sierra Nevada Aquatic Research Laboratory on Convict Creek, I moved to Oregon in 1970 to spend a career as a salmon biologist.

With my wife Denise McPherson, I inherited historical McPherson property below, above, and to south of Mono Inn in 1997 after both of my parents had died. My parents had sold the Mono Inn resort and some of the land around it in the late 1960s. Denise and I have managed the four rental houses on this historical property since 1997, including the house in which I grew up, two other houses from the 1930s, and one we had built 22 years ago. So it with these deep roots and current interest in the Mono Basin that I base my opposition to the Tioga Inn development as currently planned.

Thank you for your consideration,
Barry McPherson

Comments for Tioga Inn Hearing, Mono County Board of Supervisors Special Meeting, August 6, 2020

Regarding Agenda Item:

“Tioga Inn Specific Plan Amendment #3 and Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FSEIR)”

Connie Millar, 28 Silver Lake Way, Mono City, PO Box 201, Lee Vining, CA 93541
millarconnie@gmail.com; 510-292-6236

Thank you for considering my written comments prior to making a decision in regard to proposed activities for the Tioga Inn Project, Lee Vining, CA. I strongly oppose all developments in the plan at the site. I recognize that you are making a decision about narrowly prescribed actions currently proposed. Although I have address these specific items in public meetings over the past years, I continue to find that ignoring the main issue – the cumulative impact of increase in business, population, and infrastructure beyond the existing conditions – is like tending to a flaming bush while the forest burns. Thus, my plea once for opposing the project is to prevent the loss of a precious and rare condition, that is, the historic, rustic, Sierra Nevada community and culture of Lee Vining. If there were an Endangered Rural Communities Act, analogous to the Endangered Species Acts, Lee Vining would be designated endangered by the threat of development plans in the current proposals for growth at the Tioga Inn site. Please reach into your hearts and minds to protect this remaining community that we treasure, and vote against the developments at the Tioga Inn. Once developed, this landscape will not return to its wild nature in our lifetimes. The cumulative impact of development has to be seen in perspective to individual actions.

My opinion has not changed over time and as such below I repeat my comments to the April 14, 2020 Planning Commission and the June 29, 2020 Board of Supervisors meetings. At those times, I was shocked and dismayed by the manner in which the Commission and then the Board of Supervisors ignored the overwhelmingly opposing statements that were presented about the Tioga Inn developments, with only Supervisor Gardner recognizing the majority voice. I am confident that today you all, our elected representatives, will listen to our comments sincerely, and take them into consideration when you make your decision:

My comments to prior public meetings:

My name is Connie Millar. I have owned a home in Mono City since 1993 and, as a Forest Service research scientist, I have worked in Mono Country as part of my federal position since 1987. My comments are given as a private citizen. **I oppose Resolution 20-01.** While recognizing that the Specific Plan Amendment is under discussion today, I'll highlight the most important issue in my mind: that the 1993 EIR is invalid due to significant changes that have occurred over the past 27 years and that were not considered in the original assessment. These changes demand a new project EIR. Examples of changes include:

1) Climate change, including changes in wildfire and smoke, drought, heat events, and annual snowpack and water. Those have had cascading impacts on wildlife diversity, forest health,

visitor use, and recreation that relate directly to the Tioga Inn Project. The Mono Basin has endured significant climate change effects that were neither imagined nor evaluated in the 1993 EIR.

2) Sierra Nevada rural communities. Reports of the Congressionally mandated Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project, published after the 1993 EIR, redefined the role of rural communities in the Sierra Nevada, emphasizing their individual character, key values, and vulnerabilities. The reports described threats to communities from sprawl, influx of urban culture, loss of core areas, and erosion of local culture from developments that would overwhelm the historic community. The subsequent Mono Basin Community Plan built on the foundations of the pioneering SNEP descriptions for healthy communities. Full impacts to Lee Vining as a signature rural Sierran community were neither understood nor evaluated in the 1993 EIR.

These are only a few examples of changes since 1993 that affect environmental impacts. The piecemeal plans under consideration today ignore these changes. We must conduct a new EIR to address current environmental realities. **For these reasons I oppose Resolution 20-01 and further development at the Tioga Inn site.**

August 5, 2020

Dear Mono County Board of Supervisors,

I am a Lee Vining resident and an active volunteer in the community. In a normal year I volunteer at the schools as well as in the community garden with local youth. I am deeply concerned that the Tioga Inn project final proposal does not include safe connectivity between the proposed Tioga Inn site and the rest of the Lee Vining Community.

I walked Highway 395 near the turn off to 120 West on August 4 to try to get a sense of what folks living at the proposed Tioga Inn site may experience. It was nerve wracking and the situation felt treacherous. Large trucks, speeding cars and tourists with overflowing vehicles passed me within a few feet. Without a guaranteed safe walking and cycling route to connect the influx of residents at this site to the town of Lee Vining, this project is simply unsafe. Just one life is not worth it.

I willingly tried this route to gain a perspective of what the walking commute would be if this project is approved. I hope that no child or member of the community must walk this as a part of their daily routine.

Thank you,

Rose Nelson

Lee Vining Resident



Big rigs speed out of Lee Vining, gaining momentum to get up this hill. This individual did their best to try to give me room, but not every long-distance traveler is so attentive.



This is a common sight to see along HWY 395 and 120 W. A long trail of vehicles overloaded with camping gear racing to get to their destination.



Vehicles speed along the highway section where these project residents would be walking and often do not even slow down through town.



Highway 120 is also often busy and dangerous to walk along. The increase of traffic from more residents and guests increase that risk.



Michael Draper

From: robandjpat@verizon.net
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 7:41 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Mono Lake Meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We have camped at Big Bend Campground for 40 years with our family. Please retain the pristine beauty of Tioga Pass, Lee Vining and Mono Lake.

Robin and Jim Paterson, children and grandchildren

Sent from my iPhone

Michael Draper

From: Peggylmb <peggylmb@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 4:49 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Pass Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Heck NO!! Why would anyone consider taking a beautiful area (one of the few lovely places left) and threaten it's beautiful views and nature with another hotel!! Once its gone, we can't get that land and view back.....please vote NO..thank yo for your time and consideration.

Michael Draper

From: Joe Ratliff <joerat43@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 6:35 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org; carole reimer; Doug Reimer
Subject: Tioga Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have submitted numerous comments previously, but must once again voice my strong disapproval of this project. And it is with even more trepidation since the developers are failing to plan for a number of important long term impacts such as visual and walking safety.

Again, I must state that I have yet to see any discussion on the potential impacts to existing similar businesses in Lee Vining. And any detailed analyses of any logical justification of the project relative to the Covid 19 pandemic's current effects on local economies and employment, etc.

For these and many more reasons I say deny this project!

Joe M. Ratliff
Winnemucca, Nevada

Mono County Board of Supervisors
P.O. Box 347
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

August 6, 2020

RE: Tioga Inn Specific Plan SEIR

Dear Supervisors:

These are our comments on the Final Subsequent EIR (SEIR) prepared for the Tioga Inn Specific Plan Amendment Project (Project). We the undersigned have worked as environmental consultants focusing on the preparation of EIRs under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for over three decades. As Deputy Director of the Office of Planning and Research during the late 1990s, Antero Rivasplata helped draft three updates to the State CEQA Guidelines. Currently, in addition to working as a CEQA consultant, he presents classes on CEQA through UC Davis and UC Los Angeles Extensions. Melinda Rivasplata has been a CEQA practitioner for nearly 40 years, working in the areas of transportation, public projects, and cultural resources. This comment letter represents the personal opinions of the authors and does not represent the opinions of their respective employers.

Our interest in this project comes from our frequent visits to Lee Vining. We visit during the winter to ski in Yosemite. We visit during the summer to enjoy the Eastern Sierra and Mono Lake.

In general, the Final SEIR is inadequate in several aspects. These comments focus on the issues we raised in our prior letter on this SEIR and the responses in the SEIR. In addition, while reviewing the County's responses we found an additional shortcoming of the SEIR. Our comments are identified as comment letter #14 in the Final SEIR.

The response to comment 1 misses the point of our comment. We pointed out the confusing excess of non-pertinent information contained in the SEIR because it is our belief that it renders the SEIR “fundamentally and basically inadequate,” requiring recirculation pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. For instance, why include a discussion of the TSA when the Lee Vining airport not only lacks a TSA presence, but lacks any terminal? This isn't being inclusive of pertinent information, instead it distracts from the relevant issues. This approach conflicts with CEQA Guidelines Section 15006, in particular subsections (o), (p), and (s) regarding “[p]reparing analytic rather than encyclopedic” EIRs, “[m]entioning only briefly issues other than significant ones.” and “[e]mphasizing the portions of the EIR that are useful to decisionmakers and the public and reducing emphasis on background material,” respectively.

Our concerns over the fundamental lack of readability are compounded now by the SEIR's inclusion of Alternatives 6 and 7. The preparers of the EIR seem to mistake the requirements of NEPA, which emphasizes alternatives, for those of CEQA which require the identification of a project and consideration of a range of alternatives to that project. The text of the SEIR makes it clear that Alternative 6 is a revision of the project, not an alternative to the project, and the term “preferred alternative” is from NEPA, not CEQA. Alternative 7 is similarly a project revision. There is no

analysis of Alternative 7 in the SEIR itself, but rather it is buried over 100 pages deep in the staff report. Failure to properly identify the project in the SEIR impedes reviewers from commenting on the project. The SEIR's approach is similar to that disapproved by the California Court of Appeal in *Washoe Meadows Community v. Dept. of Parks and Recreation* (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 277 [EIR invalidated for failure of draft EIR to identify the project among alternatives; compliance with NEPA not a substitute for compliance with CEQA].

We stand by our comments 2 and 3 regarding the SEIR's failure to properly calculate the project's vehicle miles travelled (VMT). Topical Response #8 itself acknowledges that most employees housed in the project will likely work in Mammoth during the winter. The SEIR's analysis of VMT is fundamentally flawed because it does not reflect the reasonable assumption that work trips from the Tioga Inn site to Mammoth will be commonplace, particularly during the eight months of winter (October through June) when the Tioga Road is closed through Yosemite and much of Lee Vining closes down. Employment drops precipitously during the winter and residents of the proposed housing will have no other option but to work elsewhere. This obviates the SEIR assumptions that most workers will be employed on site.

We recognize that CalEEMod is the standard method for calculating VMT. However, the results from a CalEEMod run are only as good as the input on which it is based. Here, the input uses flawed assumptions about daily driving habits of the residents during most of the year. The severe undercount of VMT is important for two reasons: it results in a severe underestimate of the project's greenhouse gas emissions; and fails to properly disclose the project's energy consumption. As a result, neither the project's GHG emissions nor its energy efficiency is properly disclosed.

On the topic of energy conservation, we note that the SEIR fails to conform to Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines. The SEIR lacks a quantified accounting of project energy use by sector, nor does it disclose the estimated savings from on-site solar and other purported energy-saving features of the project. The discussion in Section 5.8 of the SEIR is conclusory; failing to fully analyze the reasonably foreseeable energy use of the project, particularly vehicle fuel use for commuting to and from Mammoth. The information presented in Section 5.8 is insufficient to determine whether the project will result in the "wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources" as required under the CEQA Guidelines and does not support a finding that the impact is less than significant, requiring no mitigation. This is a fatal flaw in the SEIR. (*California Clean Energy Comm. v. City of Woodland* (2014) 225 Cal.App.5th 173 [EIR invalidated in part for its energy analysis failing to follow CEQA Guidelines Appendix F and not disclosing total energy use]).

On our Comment 4, the response incorrectly asserts that improperly deferred mitigation measures are not important when the project will have significant unavoidable impacts. This, again, appears to be a mistaken reliance on NEPA's interpretation that mitigation is not a legal mandate. Under Public Resources Code Section 21002.1(b), CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4, and the California Supreme Court's decision in *City of San Diego v. Board of Trustees of the California State University* (2015) 61 Cal.4th 945), mitigation is required unless the EIR explains why mitigation is infeasible. An EIR must set forth effective mitigation measures even when the project's impact is significant and unavoidable or explain why no such measures are feasible. The SEIR does neither.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this CEQA document. As stated above, we believe that it is inadequate in various regards and should be revised and recirculated before it is finalized. Please take our concerns into consideration during project deliberations.

Sincerely,

Antero A. Rivasplata

Melinda M. Rivasplata

Michael Draper

From: brivenes@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 5:23 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Continued hearing on the Tioga Inn project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Supervisors,

My husband and I have been visitors to Mono Lake and Lee Vining for more than 40 years. We have ridden bicycles from LA to Mono Lake to raise funds to help protect the important Mono Lake levels and protect the environment and the birds for 10 of those years.

This is not a fully developed project in its most recent iteration. Perhaps the most important aspect of safety and community has not been satisfactorily resolved.

If this is to be truly needed new housing for Lee Vining then there has to be a safe connection for pedestrians and bicycles. It has to be carefully engineered and incorporated into the whole transportation planning for Lee Vining – not this cobbled together last ditch effort to satisfy you, as decision-makers. You would not be diligent in your duty to Mono County citizens if you accept a such a half-baked attempt.

Issues of aesthetics and siting must be other important considerations. You cannot allow such a large, less than well-designed project be plunked in an iconic special area like Mono Lake and the eastern Sierra. You'll never forgive yourselves – nor will millions of visitors.

We're not saying nothing will ever be worthy or satisfactory, but this project is not it!

You all worked really hard to help make the project better, but it's not – or even close. We urge you to reject the project and I think you will have all the findings you need to do just that. Please stand up for to the spectacular nature of the area you are charged to protect !

Sincerely,

Barbara and Donald Rivenes
Grass Valley, CA

Michael Draper

From: Elizabeth Rubens <elizabeth.rubens@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 7:45 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Board of Supervisors:

The dual challenges of both climate change and a pandemic have taught us many difficult lessons about the risks of promoting projects that are harmful to our environment. I strongly urge you to make sure that the five adverse impacts of the Tioga Inn Project are addressed BEFORE you approve any plan. We cannot afford to further damage our precious natural resources and continue to compromise our quality of life.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Rubens

Sent from my iPhone

Michael Draper

From: Nola Scalzi <nscalzi28@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 10:29 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

For the third time I will comment on this project. The developer made very little effort to modify this project. This type of project belongs in Mammoth. Please deny this project!

Nola Scalzi
PollockPines
El Dorado County

Michael Draper

From: Nola Scalzi <nscalzi28@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 9:52 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

For the third time I will comment on the Tioga Inn Project before the Mono County Board of Supervisors. I “discovered” Mono Lake as a young woman living in S Lake Tahoe in 1970. I was enraptured by it all. The lake, the town of LeeVining, and Tioga Pass road. I returned many, many times.

I was dismayed to read the full description of this project. I enjoy the Whoa Nellie Deli and the convenience of the gas station. But what is described boggles the mind!

I watched for 10 years as the south shore of Lake Tahoe developed itself into the tawdry mess you see today. In 1980 I moved to a much smaller town on the western slope, but I kept returning to LeeVining and Mono Lake; joining the Committee about 10 years ago. This project belongs in Mammoth!

The developer made very little effort to address the many concerns raised. Should this project be built as planned I will have to find another “favorite place” as seeing the completed project will break my heart. Please deny this project as planned.

Nola Scalzi
Pollock Pines
El Dorado County

Michael Draper

From: Jutta Schmidt-Gengenbach <jschmidtg@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:42 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Toga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Board of Supervisors:

Please, oh please vote no on the Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan for the Tioga Inn Project. This revised plan does not contain the improvements you asked for in the June meeting, and the major significant adverse impacts still remain.

The majority of the citizens that elected you oppose this project. Please represent their wishes and interests and vote "no".

Thank you.

Jutta Schmidt, Swall Meadows

Michael Draper

From: Bob Sitze <bob.sitze@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 7:04 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Mono County Supervisors:

Am I the only one who's wondering why you are considering this proposal at a time when the entire well-being of the County is growing more fragile because of an epidemic ?

A wider view of what you are facing right now—and even more in the future—would seem to show that any further consideration of this proposal is robbing all of you of the energy and wisdom you need to deal with the infinitely larger realities confronting all of us all over the country.

Please vote this proposal down so that you can take up the rest of your calling as leaders in this time of crisis.

Thank you,

Bob Sitze
Mono Lake property owner
Wheaton, Illinois

Sent from a phone smarter than I am

Wendy E. Stock, Ph.D.
1306 Bay View Place
Berkeley, CA 94708-1802
Phone: (510) 388-9154
WendyStock@aol.com

Aug 6, 2020

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to urge you to vote "No" on the Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan for the Tioga Inn Project. I visit Mono Lake and stay in Lee Vining yearly, for at least one week, in July or August. My most recent visit was July 16-25, 2020. I have serious concerns about how the Tioga Inn Project will affect the visual appearance, views, and safety in this gorgeous area. This is the third letter that I've written over the past year, as the Tioga Inn Project has continued to threaten the integrity of this special place.

Visual impact: As noted in the Mono Lake Committee summary of the #7 Hybrid Plan, the visual impacts remain in this revised proposal. The project concedes that impacts to views due to light and glare during the day and night will remain.

Safety concerns: Without a new safe route the project forces residents, including kids, to walk next to traffic on Highway 395 to get to Lee Vining for school, groceries, and community services. Providing safe and convenient pedestrian access is a core policy of the **Mono Basin Community Plan**, now adopted into the Mono County General Plan. This project has failed to generate a coherent plan to mitigate pedestrian risk.

Changes to the plan have not produced a project that respects the local community and the scenic Mono Basin. I urge the Board to vote no on the final proposal.

Wendy Stock Ph.D.

Michael Draper

From: Emilie Strauss <desertpeach@earthlink.net>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 9:13 PM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Please deny Tioga Inn project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County supervisors,

I am a former Mono Basin resident. The proposed Tioga Inn project is too large and the site is not appropriate.

I submitted comments in June and listened to much of the hearing via Zoom.

Given the well-thought out comments from the Lee Vining Fire Department regarding safety and staffing logistics, I am astonished to read that those needs are not met in the Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan.

The canyon is a critical deer migratory corridor. A project of this scale would cause unmitigatable impacts to the deer herd.

A proposal to build a cross-country trail increases the footprint of the project as well as impacts to migratory deer. The Lee Vining Creek stream corridor has been documented as having a very high diversity level of mammals and birds. No trail should be constructed near the stream corridor or bisecting the creek. (I am contacting the mammalogist who has sampled the diversity of this creek reach with the hopes s/he can contribute to the discussion) There is already a "new" lower trail directly adjacent to the creek running from 395 to USFS Visitor Center, which is also inappropriately placed within or directly adjacent to the riparian corridor. If yet another trail is to be built then the lower "new" trail should be removed and restored. The environmental documents are incomplete since it does not analyze impacts from the proposed trail.

The preferred alternative allows all grading to occur during Phase 1 rather than phasing it. This is not acceptable especially given the very uncertain current economic climate.

The Mono Basin is such a beautiful place. Please deny this project.

Thank you for consideration of my view.

Emilie Strauss

Michael Draper

From: Jeff Sullivan <myphotoguides@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 10:00 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Tioga Inn project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

The photography presented by the Board of Supervisors in their June 2020 meeting was presented in such an incorrect and dubious way, it made me immediately question the motives and credibility of the person or organization supplying it.

The one from South Tufa presented as "equivalent to 400mm" was nothing at all like a sharp 400mm image. Its graininess and heavy compression made detail very indistinct, as if intended to make the details on the hillside less visible. It was also claimed that "18mm is normal", as if to imply that 400mm was 20 times more detail than a person would see onsite. A 50mm lens is considered a normal perspective, but whether or not a person can make out a building on a hill has nothing to do with the scale that the photo is shot at, so the premise of tying harm to focal length seems disingenuous. Since a single LED can be seen at night from miles away, and similarly a glint of sunlight on glass or metal or the shape of a building can be seen clearly for miles, the litmus test is whether or not you can see any part of the object. At any magnification.

In my opinion as a professional photographer, these are misstatements of fact that are egregious. The source of the photography should have been clearly identified in the Board's presentation. Firstly, if the photography, and statements of significance about the photography in the Board's presentation are the claims of the applicant, if this process is not to be biased in favor of that one party, all other parties should have equal opportunity to present images and interpretations. Secondly, if the claims are demonstrably false, that situation could then cast doubt on the veracity of all of the other statements made by that party in this process.

I would propose that given the clear and overwhelming concern of the community about the visual impact of the development, it is critical to a thorough and proper assessment project that these misrepresentations be directly and assertively rebutted and corrected.

Image 9244 attached clearly shows the cell tower, residence, existing single-story employee housing as objects that any person with reasonable vision would clearly see. Image 0954 clearly shows the light from the cell tower, residence, at least four distinct point sources at the employee housing, light from the vista point (perhaps vehicles or LED landscape lighting), as well as lights installed down on 395, apparently signage for CalTrans. Based on the daylight shot (9244) of these same sources, the only grading that would hide the fully visible employee housing, and their lights, would appear to be a berm the full height of the buildings.

The proposal for bitterbrush to accomplish some of the screening does not account for bitterbrush not being particularly dense. It will not address light escaping from inside sources, potentially hundreds of lights in the full scope of the project. Bitterbrush grows particularly well in my neighborhood here at Topaz Lake, but it's mostly very spindly and porous above about 30-36" in height, and naturally the larger specimens tend to grow about 10' apart, since they

deplete the water in that radius around themselves. All in all, a poor plant to suggest as a visual screen or light-blocking hedge.

Currently from South Tufa we can clearly see the vista point, the existing employee housing, the house above, the cell tower, and lit signs down on 395. There are already objectionable intrusions on the day and night viewscape, pretty much everything from highway level through the project site and well above. Many of the objectionable developments are easy to locate via light at night, and can be easily correlated with objects including buildings, the cell tower, and lit signs visible in daytime shots.

Wasn't there mention during the last online meetings of current unpermitted employee housing at the project site? If this particular project has such a history, can future assurances and agreements be taken at face value, or should healthy skepticism be applied to all statements about mitigation of various points of potential damage? Is Mono County meeting its full obligations and duties for regulating the situation? Should some department of Mono County should be actively inventorying and challenging them, levying fines and/or bringing lawsuits if they are not removed or fully mitigated? Should further development even be discussed if there is evidence of a casual disregard for County planning and approval, and associated codes and regulations? Surely a project of this magnitude and impact should only be undertaken under the strictest possible oversight. Given the clear overwhelming concern of the community, this project needs to be monitored and regulated with the utmost scrutiny and enforcement. Can the applicant be trusted with other project commitments and assurances? The answer to that question is a serious matter when Lee Vining and the Mono Basin may be irreparably changed.

Reading Option 2 in the Board's pre-meeting notes from last week, the premise of the Board's approach seems to be that economic benefit is automatic grounds for County approval of development, if it can be done without significant damage. If the County is consistent in this logic and behavior, the exact same standard applied to damage already done should result in the County enthusiastically pursuing mitigation of all damage done to our collective economic prospects.

Mono County had the foresight to recognize the economic value of its night skies, such as in its lighting ordinances. The value of Mono County's dark night sky grows each year, as light pollution grows globally at a 3% annual rate, and particularly as other U.S. communities fail to rein in their development, and lighting. Once you lose your dark skies, it's far more difficult and costly to get them back. Yet in the case of one of the largest and potentially most impactful developments in Mono County in many decades, the bright, unshielded direct light sources have been growing in the vicinity of this proposed project site, below on 395, and above (cell tower) over the last few years. Where are the County's regulations, planning process, and code enforcement? Where is engagement with the parties and organizations involved, to mitigate in good faith any cumulative economic damage as the Mono Basin becomes degraded, whether or not specific codes or regulations are involved?

- Does the existing exterior lighting on the employee housing use lighting that meets all Mono County ordinances for compliance with dark skies? The several point sources seems to imply not. What County department should be addressing this? Can non-compliant sources be addressed immediately, and can fines be assessed while the lighting remains out of compliance? If the fixtures ARE compliant, that is actually the worst news for the proposed development, because then the sources would be internal ones, just like the ones that would shine for miles in all directions from up to 100 living rooms, 100 dining areas, 100 kitchens, plus 150 bedrooms.

- Does a two-light alternating yellow flashing traffic sign on 395 need to shine well out to the side (surely not) and for miles from 395, or could its light be far better directed down the highway itself? Has Mono County approached CalTrans and its lighting supplier to bring stray light under control and more in line with the intent of the

- Does a cell tower that may be of less height than many of the ponderosa pines in the Basin really need a light at all? Does it need to be so bright? Does such a light need to shine in all directions, including down? Does it need to shine

down at South Tufa specifically, or could the light be blocked from being seen down there? Did the tower, and its light, go through the full permitting and approval process?

Given the grounds for project approval as being for economic benefit, a thorough assessment of the project must include negative factors, such as impact on night sky tourism: stargazing, meteor shower watching, amateur astronomy, astrophotography, night photography, and night photography workshops. Given that such economic damage was brought up at the last meeting, doesn't the Board of Supervisors have some duty to assess the extent of the damage, in their consideration of the alleged economic benefit of the overall project?

For example, I've heard casually that the Bodie Foundation may arrange 30 or more special access events. Many, perhaps all, are night photography workshops for 10-20 photographers, but the Foundation also hosts 3-4 guided "Star Walks" for far more people at night, plus Bodie is open on those nights for the public to be in the Park, above and beyond the capacity of their guides. Many night photographers go to Bodie on these nights, and the total attendance of those 3-4 starry night events alone may be several hundred per night, easily 1000-2000+ per year in a normal year. Light pollution is degrading the quality of the night sky in the direction of the Mono Basin and Mammoth Lakes. Photos captured from Bodie on the night of August 15, 2015 during the Walker Fire show both an objectionable effect from increased light, and the particularly harmful direction of Lee Vining vicinity light as being directly in conflict with photography of the Milky Way over various Bodie subjects (exactly what so many photographers go there at night to do).

Similarly, there are at least a dozen or two photography workshop instructors who obtain permits to bring photographers to the Eastern Sierra, and probably all of them visit Mono Lake. Based on research I performed in discussion with Inyo National Forest last year, it appears that as many as 200% more photographers may also bring groups, but may not obtain permits. The number may double again if informal photography club trips, Instagram "Instameets" and Meetup .com trips are included. To what extent would a Mono Basin degraded for daytime views and emitting interfering light at South Tufa reduce tourism, including hotel stays, meals, gas sales, the sale of souvenirs and sporting goods, and so on?

This article excerpt below documents a massive influx of visitors to scenic locations such as National Parks, due to photo sharing sites such as Instagram. Photography, and the full current value of scenic views, was clearly not anticipated in the 1990s, when a restaurant was permitted essentially at the vista point. But we can clearly see that trend, and its economic significance, today. Is the Board of Supervisors willing to sacrifice the view, and its present and future economic value, to benefit a developer who has failed to use a 1993 permit? By today's standards and given the trends and knowledge we have today, that would clearly be an act of economic malfeasance by the Board.

Sincerely,

Jeff Sullivan

Michael Draper

From: MARY TUMBUSCH <linkdog20@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:24 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to ask you to NOT approve the Tioga Inn Project plan.

Again, I am writing to oppose the Tioga Inn project proposal, a large-scale development project that threatens to permanently alter the visual resources of the Mono Basin National Forest Scenic Area and the Mono Lake Tufa State Natural Reserve and erase the small-town, rural character of Lee Vining.

After reading the analysis of and mitigation for various impacts-including aesthetics, population and growth-inducing impacts, traffic and pedestrian safety, biological resources, wildfire hazards, Vehicle Miles Traveled, and greenhouse gas emissions- the Tioga Inn Specific Plan, Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan is a severely flawed project. Please respect the community and the Mono Basin and do not approve this project!

Sincerely,

Mary Tumbusch

A very concerned citizen and home owner in Mono Basin

Michael Draper

From: Warwick F. Vincent <Warwick.Vincent@bio.ulaval.ca>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:23 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Lake scientist comments on Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan for Tioga Inn Project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Board of Supervisors,

I wish to express international concern about the Alternative #7-Hybrid Plan for Tioga Inn Project, and I hereby submit my comments for your consideration.

I am a Professor of Biology at Laval University in Quebec City, Canada, where I hold the Canada Research Chair in Aquatic Ecosystem Studies. My experience in inland water ecosystem science includes my PhD in Ecology from University of California Davis, four decades of research and education on lakes in North and South America, Europe and Australasia, publication of several books on lakes and lake management, and more than 300 scientific articles on aquatic environments.

In your deliberations, I hope that you will take into account that Mono Lake is recognized internationally as a world lake treasure because of its many unique features, and the success story about its rescue from extinction that has been an inspiration to huge numbers of people. The book 'Storm over Mono' is read in classes around the world. For example, it was one such reading at the University of Kyoto that led my Japanese former student to switch his major to the aquatic sciences and do a PhD with me (he is now a lake scientist at UC Davis, working on Lake Tahoe). Mono Lake is described and celebrated in many books on lakes of the world, including my popular-science book, 'Lakes: A Very Short Introduction', Oxford University Press (2018 in English; 2019 in French; 2021 in Chinese and Japanese).

I am especially concerned that the Hybrid Plan does not fully address the visual impacts in this scenic corridor. There are no specifications for screening from South Tufa, which people visit from throughout the USA and the world each year, and there appears to have been no third-party detailed analysis of the visual impacts in the revised plan on this uniquely inspirational place.

The environmental consequences of the Toga Inn project will be scrutinized throughout the world, given the celebrated nature of the Mono Lake ecosystem and its remarkable success story. I implore you to make the fullest effort possible to ensure the continuity of this environmental success, now and for future generations.

Thank you very much for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

Warwick Vincent

Warwick F. Vincent, PhD,
Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada,
Professor & Canada Research Chair,
Biology Dept & Center for Northern Studies (CEN),
Laval University, Quebec City, QC G1V 0A6, Canada

Michael Draper

From: Carolyn Vondriska <cjvondriska@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 7:28 PM
To: CDD Comments

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to give input on the Tioga Inn development proposal pending before you. By way of background, I am the third of four generations of Eastern Sierra visitors. To this day, three generations of our family stay for two weeks in Lee Vining, at the Lake View Lodge. We have befriended the residents, we shop at the local shops, we dine in your restaurants and coffee houses, we support your visitor center and the Mono Lake Committee. Every year, year after year, our family spends thousands of dollars in the community of Lee Vining.

We did not always stay in Lee Vining. Rather, multiple generations of our family spent summers camping in Tuolumne Meadows. We shifted to Lee Vining several years ago in large part because of the ecological wonder that is Mono Lake. Lee Vining is not a mere gateway to Yosemite; rather, it is a natural wonder in its own right.

In reviewing the development proposal pending before you, I ask that you consider all negative impacts to this proposal. Some of those may not be readily apparent. For example, should you approve this project, our family no longer will stay in Lee Vining. Lee Vining will have lost that which draws us there. Instead, our family will join the many others coming from Southern California who simply make a hard left onto Highway 120. We will drive through the urban sprawl of this development and bypass Lee Vining altogether. We will simply go back to spending time in Yosemite and stay in Yosemite. There will be others who feel as we do. I ask that your review of this project consider the indirect – and *avoidable* – economic hits to your community.

Indeed, in the Mono County Economic Development and Visitor Impact Study posted on the county website, your consultant concluded that 84% of your visitors were satisfied with their experience due to the scenic beauty of Mono County. That is significant – your scenic beauty is your natural resource. Protect that resource as a way to maintain the economic viability of your community.

We live in the Ojai Valley, a community much like Mono County. Like yours, our economy relies heavily on tourism. People come here for many of the same reasons. As a community, we long have warded off threats of the magnitude currently pending before you. Indeed, in recent history our community stopped a development proposal in our watershed that would have doubled our valley's population. A short-sighted vision of our

community would have approved that project under the guise of “more must mean better.” The ensuing impacts on traffic, air quality, and our environment would have been crippling – the resulting impact on our economy a direct, and foreseeable, one. The development you are considering is in your viewshed and watershed. It stands to directly impact the "scenic beauty" your Economic Development study found crucial to your county. Our community has thrived as a result of its decision NOT to allow this massive development. Yours will too.

Thank you for considering my input.

Carolyn J. Vondriska

Michael Draper

From: Wilma Wheeler <wilma88bryce@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 8:37 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: Tioga Inn Specific Plan Amendment #3, Alternative #7 - Hybrid Plan

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mono County Supervisors,

Please accept my comments regarding this project.

Since the same five significant, unavoidable impacts remain in the statement of overriding concerns, I urge the Supervisors to reject this project as presented. Too much uncertainty on when, how, or if these impacts will be addressed remains in the proposal.

The attorney's letter on behalf of the Mono Lake Committee states the many problems with this project and they do not need to be restated here. On this basis, I believe the project should be rejected.

Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Wilma Wheeler
PO Box 3208
Mammoth Lakes

Michael Draper

From: Gretchen Whisenand <gmwhisen@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 7:42 PM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Comment in opposition to Tioga Inn

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Supervisors,

I am terribly disappointed that the developer has not made meaningful changes to this project in response to your concerns. Concerns shared, of course, by community members and lovers of Mono Lake worldwide like me.

The development would still be unavoidably and jarringly visible from South Tufa. The glare from lighting and reflections would still be visible all over the Mono basin. This is totally unacceptable.

As a Santa Rosa resident who went through the Tubbs and Kincade Fires, I am all too aware of the horrrific danger posed by wildfires. Unfortunately, the topography of the proposed development's location, just like the topography of the Napa to Santa Rosa corridor, causes a wind tunnel which results in repeated fires. Nothing can be done to change that. This is simply the wrong location for any buildings.

Finally, the danger to anyone attempting to walk along Hwy 120 should be obvious. If vehicles can't avoid something as large as a bear, how do you expect them to avoid pedestrians?

Please put a stop to this now.

Thank you,
Gretchen Whisenand

Michael Draper

From: Erin Wilson <wilson.erin00@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 9:52 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Tioga Inn revised proposal-please vote no on this project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I have previously commented on the Tioga Inn Project. I strongly urge the Board to vote no on this revised proposed project. In addition to the visual and dark skies impacts I previously noted in my comments, I am extremely concerned about the future cost/tax impact this project will have on the citizens of Lee Vining and Mono County. I attended the June hearings via Zoom and was appalled at the potential impacts of this project to the size of local schools and the volunteer fire department. It appears the developers of the Tioga Inn Project are trying to push project approval under the banner of affordable housing and trying to maximize the \$ per square foot return. However, the project as proposed will do very little to address the housing need in Lee Vining and will add housing demand. And, in my opinion, will leave the existing citizens with a large tax burden to supply services to deal with the added population. It boggles my mind that these infrastructure and services "cannot be considered or addressed" as part of the approvals. Please vote no until the developers address the severe flaws with this project. It is time to stand up to developers and Sacramento to get projects that will benefit the region and meet the desired outcome of addressing affordable housing and responsible development.

Finally, as a recreational photographer, if dark skies are eroded in the Mono Basin, I will likely take my tourist dollars elsewhere and remove Mono County from my travel list. Thank you for considering my comments.

Erin Wilson

Michael Draper

From: Janet Yamanaka <jyamanaka1@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 6, 2020 7:28 AM
To: CDD Comments; bartshe@monolake.org
Subject: Please Vote No on the Tioga Inn Proposal

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I sent a email awhile back, urging the board to reconsider this proposal.

I am asking again for the Board to vote “no” on this project. In addition to the immeasurable impact this will have on the scenic, relatively unspoiled beauty of the Mono Lake Basin, I am also concerned about the environmental impact this project will have based on the reports that are available to the public—dust, pollution, increased water usage for an already water challenged part of the state and safety for both humans and wildlife.

The infrastructure recommendations , particularly the 120/395 roundabout—sounds like a recipe for disaster— that is being tossed out, right, since the state isn’t funding it?

Am not convinced that the hydrology studies have fully taken into account the impact increased water usage will have during the project, and then, after it’s complete.

The Mono Lake Basin is a sacred treasure and a jewel that should be preserved, with as little human impact as possible.

Please look at the long term impact this proposal will have on all of us; surely there is a way to address the needs outlined in the proposal in a less impactful way.

Thanks for reading this.

Sincerely,

Janet Yamanaka