



OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

PLEASE MARK ONE: <input type="checkbox"/> CONSENT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR	AGENDA REQUEST FOR THE MEETING OF:	<u>October 10, 2006</u>
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------

DEPARTMENT: Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT: Receive report and recommendation from staff and the June Lake Coalition regarding future development in June Lake including the Rodeo Grounds.

REGULAR ITEMS ONLY Time Required: 2-3 hours	REGULAR ITEMS ONLY Person Appearing Before the Board:	David Wilbrecht, CAO
--	--	----------------------

Department Review (if applicable)	ACTION ITEMS and LEGAL DOCUMENTS:	Review Date
	Fiscal Impact—Reviewed by Auditor-Controller and CAO Risk Exposure and Insurance—Reviewed by Risk Manager Legal Issues and Form—Reviewed by County Counsel (check one): Marshall Rudolph ___ Mark Magit ___ Stacey Simon ___ Allen Berrey ___ Policy Establishment or Change—Reviewed by CAO Impact to Other Dept(s): _____ — Reviewed by: _____ Personnel—Reviewed by Human Resources	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

NAMES, TITLE, ADDRESS OF PERSONS TO RECEIVE COPIES

<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy/ies requested (number of copies) ___ to: <input type="checkbox"/> Send ORIGINALS to: <input type="checkbox"/> URGENT ITEM- OVERNIGHT DELIVERY REQUESTED TO: <input type="checkbox"/> Request continued from the meeting of _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Questions? Contact _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Special Instructions for the Clerk:	
--	--

SUBMIT THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT WITH ATTACHMENTS TO THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD PRIOR TO 5:00 P.M. ON THE FRIDAY 11 DAYS PRECEDING THE TUESDAY BOARD MEETING. PLEASE STATE THE RECOMMENDED ACTION IN DETAIL IN SPACES BELOW AND ATTACH STAFF REPORT AS REQUIRED.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Receive report and recommendation from staff and the June Lake Coalition regarding future development in June Lake including the Rodeo Grounds. Consider and potentially direct staff regarding potential next steps and desired outcomes based on Board discussion, priorities and objectives, including but not limited to the following: seek grants for and start work on a specific plan for the Rodeo grounds that reflects the community's values and recommendations and preserves the economic vitality of the community and June Mountain; investigate adoption of land-use regulations establishing minimum density requirements and how they might work to help enforce the options and values chosen by a majority of the Coalition members; work with developers to complete and

Approved by CAO
Initials
Date

Agenda Item _____



OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

process specific plan applications; and provide periodic updates to the Board and the community.

Approved by CAO
Initials _____
Date _____

Agenda Item _____



COUNTY OF MONO – County Administrative Office

P.O. BOX 696, BRIDGEPORT, CALIFORNIA 93517

(760) 932-5410

□5411

David Wilbrecht
County Administrative Officer

TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: David Wilbrecht, CAO 

DATE: October 1, 2006

SUBJECT: Receive report and recommendation from staff and the June Lake Coalition regarding future development in June Lake including the Rodeo Grounds

Recommendation:

Receive report and recommendation from staff and the June Lake Coalition regarding future development in June Lake including the Rodeo Grounds. Consider and potentially direct staff regarding potential next steps and desired outcomes based on Board discussion, priorities and objectives, including but not limited to the following: seek grants for and start work on a specific plan for the Rodeo grounds that reflects the community's values and recommendations and preserves the economic vitality of the community and June Mountain; investigate adoption of land-use regulations establishing minimum density requirements and how they might work to help enforce the options and values chosen by a majority of the Coalition members; work with developers to complete and process specific plan applications; and provide periodic updates to the Board and the community.

Background:

As you recall, on March 1, 2006 Rusty Gregory from Mammoth Mountain Ski Area (MMSA) announced a closure of June Mountain from seven to four days per week beginning the 2006-2007 season. In response the Board of Supervisors at the April 18, 2006 adjourned meeting in June Lake authorized Supervisor Bauer to utilize County resources including staff time, facilities and funding to conduct a series of meetings to consider the potential impacts of a partial and full closure of June Mountain Ski Area and determine the potential development options for the Rodeo Grounds. Based on this direction and commitment by the Board and community to accomplish this work, Rusty Gregory from Mammoth Mountain Ski Area (MMSA) deferred the partial closure of the ski at this time.

Supervisor Bauer established a group of citizens, community leaders, representatives from several public entities and business members to serve as the June Lake Coalition (JLC). Beginning May 24, 2006, the JLC has met on the average of two times a month to study and review many topics including water availability, population, public safety, emergency and fire services, June Mountain economics including partial and full closure of the operations, resort and development economics, toured undeveloped properties including the Rodeo Grounds, reviewed the Master Environmental Assessment, reviewed the 2010 June Lake Area Plan, the June Mountain Special Use Permit, reports from all the various groups and several other consultants.

JLC Preferences:

The high participation level and quick pace combined to create both a better understanding of the

facts and community values. Based on this information the JLC developed a list of community values as the basis for future decisions for future development and six potential options for the development of the Rodeo Grounds and other commercial properties. With the community values and the options in hand, each member of the JLC voted their preferred option and the top three values that supported their choice. There was no one who had a preference for single family homes (SFR) to dominate or even occupy the site. But there were several who preferred an all-resort-only development. The main reason cited was how dramatically less water that resort units use relative to SFR's and how little SFR's add to the economic vitality of June Lake.

The majority of votes, 70 percent, of the JLC preferred Option 5 which proposed 900 units built on the Rodeo Grounds with mixed use and a maximum height of the tree canopy/65 feet, and 350 units built on other June Lake undeveloped properties. The main values addressed in this preference were Community Character – six votes, Environmental – five votes, Economic Vitality – four votes, County Services and Affordable Housing - tied with 2 votes and Water, Safety and Owner Rights tied for 1 vote each. In the overall tally, the highest community value was Community Character with eight votes. Economic Vitality and Environmental Protection received six votes each, Water received three votes, County Services and Affordable Housing received two votes each and Building Height and Owner Rights received one vote each. Overall, it can be concluded that Community Character, Economic Vitality and Environmental Protection are the highest community values which the majority of the JLC believe can be maintained or enhanced by Option 5. The remaining votes went to Options two and three. There were no votes cast for Option One – no development or Option six – 1,287 units on the Rodeo Grounds. Additional information is provided in the detailed voter information is attached at the end of this staff report.

Impacts of Closure of June Mountain:

It was generally agreed that partial closure of June Mountain would have a significant negative impact on the economy of June Lake. The June Lake Economic Corporation estimates that the proposed reduction of days from seven to four as presented by Rusty Gregory would have a minimum \$600,000 loss of revenue annually to the local economy and full closure of June Mountain would present a possibility of total collapse of most of the businesses in June Lake.

June Lake is tourism only based economy with visitors coming to the area for skiing, fishing, camping and other outdoor interests. Many visitors stay in local hotels, condos and other transitory housing and utilize local restaurants and businesses. Many others utilize Forest Service camp grounds or may come to June Lake for a day visit. The June Lake Economic Development Corporation reported to the JLC that most business could not stay operating with only summer business. Business that started up in June Lake after the ski area was originally developed included the business activity in their year-round economic forecast model to develop business plans, enter into long-term debt and to project cash flow. To sustain business in June Lake therefore requires year-round business activity. Consequently even partial closure would cause significant negative financial impact to local business. The full closure of June Mountain would have an even more significant financial impact. The exception to this would be the businesses that serve summer-only visitors and second homeowners. Currently there are 50 plus businesses in June Lake. Of these, less than 10 are summer-only businesses. Closure of June Mountain would potentially impact all of the local business.

Alternative Concepts:

There is one member of the JLC that does not support the analysis of the negative impact of the June Mountain closure on the business community. During the JLC process there was some discussion regarding a back up plan to take over June Mountain operations by another private or public entity. This was called the "Plan B" concept. Plan B is not a traditional free-market model whereas business invests financial resources for future return on investments. Non-free market strategies include the County or some other public or non-profit entity formed to purchase the investment from MMSA and become the new operator. After several requests and attempts to flush out this plan, a realistic plan was never brought forth.

This concept is very problematic in the staff's view relative to Mono County. Early estimates indicate June Mountain may be closed for two or more years during this type of process. (The June Lake Economic Corporation indicates that a one year closure would be very negative to local business.) Staff reviewed the County's current property tax revenue, potential for funding new projects and has indicated to the JLC that Mono County is not in a position to consider purchasing and assuming the operations of June Mountain. The Board of Supervisors may desire to clarify this position since it is very much in the realm of public policy and long-term financial commitment. Staff would recommend a much more thorough and detailed operational analysis, economic study and public process before the Board considered adopting this policy direction. At this time no other public interests, have come forward to discuss purchasing and operating June Mountain.

The two final Plan B concepts include an individual or entity willing to form a not-for-profit corporation or as an act as a charity with enough financial resources to purchase and operate June Mountain at no cost to the tax payer. The JLC did not pursue any of these concepts. I believe due to two reasons. First is the basic question of who would be willing to take on the enormous and uncertain job of creating or securing funding of up to \$25 to \$30 million to purchase June Mountain with no guarantees of success and with the same constraints as MMSA in making on-site improvements? Without increased revenue, needed improvements such as connecting sewer to the utility district system are impossible. Increased revenue comes from increased ticket prices and more ticket sales. On-mountain capacity is constrained by Chair One capacity and therefore ticket sales are constrained. The reciprocal is true as well. If ticket prices were reduced and a larger number of tickets were sold, ticket holders would still not be able to access the ski area because the slowness of Chair One. The domino effects are that Chair One improvements lead to sewer and restroom improvements that lead to facility improvements. These are estimated to cost upward of \$15 million. The funding for purchase and improvements is in the range of \$40 to \$45 million. It is a very large number and a very large and uncertain task that the JLC tried but was not able to pursue.

Second and most important is there are committed business entities willing to operate June Mountain and are willing and able bring private financing to June Lake for improvements and development purposes. I believe this is reflected in the vote by the JLC. It appears that the process shows that the majority of the members of the JLC have confidence in the preferred option and are committed to the values of the community and the existing June Lake area plan.

They have confidence that by keeping the values as community as a very high priority and by working with the county for enforcement of development regulations and codes and by keeping the community informed about the future of June Lake that both preservation and growth can occur in the June Lake Community.

Fiscal Impact:

Staff has not studied this impact to the County from a property, sales and transient occupancy tax (TOT) perspective but logic and common sense dictates that that less business mean less tax revenue which could effect service levels. The public entities supported by property, sales and TOT include the County (safety and paramedic services), June Lake Fire District, June Lake Water Sewer District and Mono County Office of Education. Further analysis and reporting can be accomplished in this area if the Board desires.

Alternatives:

1. Receive report and recommendation from staff and the June Lake Coalition regarding future development in June Lake including the Rodeo Grounds.
2. Consider and potentially direct staff to seek grants for and start work on a specific plan for the Rodeo grounds that reflects the community's values and recommendations and preserves the economic vitality of the community and June Mountain.
3. Consider and potentially direct staff to investigate adoption of land-use regulations establishing minimum density requirements and how they might work to help enforce the options and values chosen by a majority of the Coalition members.
4. Consider and potentially direct staff to work with developers to complete and process specific plan applications.
5. Consider and potentially direct staff to provide periodic updates to the Board and the community.

June Lake Coalition Options and Votes

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
Rodeo Grounds	do nothing	200	350	499	900	1287
Type of Development (SFR, resort, other)	do nothing	mixed use	resort	mixed use	mixed use	mixed use
Other J.L. properties	do nothing	260	350	200-350	350	500
Building height	do nothing	35	60	60	60-65 Tree canopy	90
Unbuilt Lots		over 500				
JLC Members						
Molly Brown	did not vote					
Dan Lyster	non-Voting Member					
Dave Wilbrecht	non-Voting Member					
Vikki Bauer	non-Voting Member					
Peter Dennison					1	
Carl Williams					1	
Mindy Pohlman			1			
Mike Bauer					1	
Connie Black					1	
John Logue					1	
Danny Roberts					1	
Al Heinrichs		1				
Ron Gilson			1			
Paul Gallager					1	
Total Votes		1	2	0	7	0

June Lake Coalition Options and Votes

Values	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
Transient Bed Base (0)						
Timing (0)						
Population (0)						
Jobs/Labor Force (0)						
County Services (2)					County Services (2)	
Affordable Housing (2)					Affordable Housing (2)	
Schools (0)						
Volunteers (0)						
Economic Vitality (6)			Economic Vitality (2)		Economic Vitality (4)	
Water (3)		Water (1)	Water (1)		Water (1)	
Traffic / Safety (1)					Safety (1)	
Noise & Light (0)						
Environmental Protection (6)		Environmental (1)			Environmental (5)	
Community Character (8)			Community Character (2)		Community Character (6)	
Building Height (1)		Building Height (1)				
Owners Rights (1)					Owners Rights (1)	

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name:

On this page feel free to comment on the options you did not vote for.

Option 1 Comment: YOU CANNOT SIT AROUND AND DO NOTHING. CALIFORNIA IS THE BIGGEST STATE WITH A HUGE POPULATION. WE CANNOT EXPECT ~~NOT~~ TO HAVE HAVE ANY GROWTH IN THE FUTURE. *SHOULD TO GO*

Option 2 Comment: WITH 200 UNITS OPTION 2 DOES NOT FIT FOR THE PROPERTY. OPTION 2 WOULD LEAD TO SOME VERY LARGE PARCELS, PROBABLY LEADING TO TROPHY HOMES. THIS WOULD NOT HELP REJUVINATE THE ECONOMY IN JUNE LAKE

Option 3 Comment: OPTION 3 IS NOT MUCH OF AN IMPROVEMENT FROM OPTION 2. WE NEED A DEVELOPMENT THAT WILL HELP SUSTAIN NOT ONLY JUNE MOUNTAIN, BUT THE WHOLE JUNE LAKE LOOP AND MONO COUNTY.

Option 4 Comment: THIS IS OUR NEXT BEST CHOICE. THERE WAS DISCUSSION OF OPTION 4 AMONG PLENTY OF CHAMBER MEMBERS. MANY MEMBERS FELT THAT SOMEWHERE BETWEEN 499 & UNITS WOULD BE A GOOD FIGURE.

Option 5 Comment: OPTION 5 WAS TOO BIG, TOO TALL. 1287 UNITS WAS FELT TO BE WAY TO CROWDE

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: MINDY POHLMAN

On this page feel free to comment on the options you did not vote for.

Option 1 Comment: Not an option. Property owner has a right to develop their property.
 1

Option 2 Comment: Create sprawl. Too restrictive. Option makes too many assumptions.
 2

Option 4 Comment: Mixed use concerns me—could end up with more SFRs and less resort units.
SFRs puts more stress on all resources (natural and man made)
 4

Option 5 Comment: All values would be lost. Adverse effects on natural resources, infrastructures (roads,
water, wastewater) safety, county services. Could ruin community character.
 5

Option 6 Comment: Same as option 5.
 6

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: Al Heinrich

Cast your vote by writing the number of the option you prefer in the space provided. Please state the three values that represent your preference for the option you voted for.

Use the comment space provided to comment on why you preferred the option you voted for.

Preferred Option Number

2

Value 1 Water Value 2 Building heights/Density Value 3 Environment/Community Character

Comment: I represent the June Lake Advocates (JLA), currently comprised of 570 residents, some business owners, property owners and visitors who support moderate development. Our Option choice is # 2, for 200 units of mixed use with building heights limited to 35 feet, providing that our concerns about adequate water supply, traffic, ridge line building, density, water, air and noise pollution, parking, utilities, power plant requirements, etc. are mitigated to retain the mountain character of the June Lake Loop. Building heights above 35 feet will be obstructive of the natural scenic beauty of the community and set precedent for future June Lake development that may be more intrusive to our environment and diminish the unique appeal of the June Lake experience.

Since June Lake is only at approximately 20% of buildout, natural growth on unbuilt lots and commercial areas will generate significant skier base to help support June Mountain operations while minimizing the adverse impact on the environment and community character. We are extremely concerned that major development in the Rodeo Grounds area and other areas will far exceed the carrying capacity of the June Lake Loop.

It is our recommendation, that the developer of the Rodeo Grounds area meets with community members, second home owners and visitors to address their concerns.

At this time, it is extremely difficult for the JLA or anyone else to recommend a specific development scope option considering that fact that so much information and facts related to adequate water supply, ground water, economic feasibility analysis and the tentatively planned increased IW project to approximately 900 is not available. The entire coalition premise and partial water study was based on 499 units. This data may no longer be relevant since we understand that Intrawest may significantly increase the quantity of units and heights.

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: Al Heinrich

On this page feel free to comment on the options you did not vote for.

Option Comment:

1

Although viable and will result in moderate growth, we felt that the business and workforce community warrant growth to maintain a healthy economic environment.

Option Comment:

3

Mixed use would be more applicable to the terrain while the 60 foot building heights would be obstructive to the natural scenic beauty of the community and set precedent for future June Lake development that may be more intrusive to our environment.

Option Comment:

4

499 units will adversely affect the community's infrastructure, traffic, etc. and place too much strain on our natural resources including water. 60 foot building heights will be obstructive to the natural scenic beauty of the community and set precedent for future June Lake development that may be more intrusive to our environment and diminish the unique appeal of the June Lake experience.

Option Comment:

5

900 units will irreversibly ruin the character of the June Lake Loop resulting in possible loss of tourist revenue, devastation of the water system and fisheries which are the primary basis of the economy. Additionally, Steve Perkins, Intergraded Design Studio, stated that IW is going to increase heights to 4 stories over underground parking structures which will probably increase heights to 75 or 85 feet.

Option Comment:

6

1287 units will totally ruin the entire area, use up all natural resources, force moratoriums on everything and represents nothing more than frank greed.

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: Paul Gallagher

Cast your vote by writing the number of the option you prefer in the space provided. Please state the three values that represent your preference for the option you voted for.

Use the comment space provided to comment on why you preferred the option you voted for.

Preferred Option Number

5

Value 1 Environment Value 2 Community Interest Value 3 Economic Viability

Comment:

I was part of a team that proceeded with option 44 from the project program, but now understanding the needs of the community we would suggest option 5.
The Community and Mountain would need to work with Intergovernment to provide additional infrastructure for the 700 units, they include:
1) Improve water and waste water facilities
2) Improve Roads Paths and trails. This could include a Cultural Road about
3) Improving Infrastructure could require partnering and coordination with Forest Service, handling the NEPA process. This process would require support from Community and County.

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: Paul Gallagher, Interwood

On this page feel free to comment on the options you did not vote for.

Option Comment:

1

doing Nothing is
Always Wrong!
The Community must allow
positive growth to remain
economic growth.

Option Comment:

2

Not feasible for a
Resort development. May
work, for private ownership

Option Comment:

3

Option #3 does not meet
specific Plan Goals or
provides the much needed
M+ use. Project should
Not be all Resort

Option Comment:

4

Viable but not the
Best Project for the
community

Option Comment:

6

Too much for June
Lake Community and
is just not needed to
support Community

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Bar Williams _____

Cast your vote by writing the number of the option you prefer in the space provided. Please state the three values that represent your preference for the option you voted for.

Use the comment space provided to comment on why you preferred the option you voted for.

Preferred Option Number

Value 1 Economic Viability Value 2 Environment Value 3 Community Character

Comment: June Mountain is the primary economic driver in June Lake during the winter season. In order to continue operations at June, and make the necessary improvements to the mountain infrastructure, we need to develop a transient occupancy bed base in June Lake that can support and compliment the mountain operations. The Rodeo Grounds represents really the only opportunity in June Lake to create a sufficient number of warm beds to accomplish this goal. The June Lake Area Plan has recognized and supported this concept since its creation in the early 80's.
While the "loop" needs to grow and develop in order to become sustainable, and reverse the decline of the community, we need to be conscious of the limits of our resources, and recognize that the natural environment in June Lake is our greatest attraction. We need to balance the economic and social needs of the community within the limitations of the natural ecology.

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: _____

On this page feel free to comment on the options you did not vote for.

Option Comment:

6

While option 6 provides an opportunity for more transient occupancy beds on the Rodeo Grounds, I believe a project of that size is too dense for the site.

Option Comment:

1

The "no action alternative" does not mean maintaining the status quo. Rather, continued erosion of the economy and character of the area.

Option Comment:

2,3,4

Does not provide sufficient number of transient occupancy beds to support existing ski area operations, or necessary on mountain improvements. Underutilizes the only large undeveloped piece of private land within the June Lake loop.

Option Comment:

Option Comment:

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: Jon Bilson

Cast your vote by writing the number of the option you prefer in the space provided. Please state the three values that represent your preference for the option you voted for.

Use the comment space provided to comment on why you preferred the option you voted for.

Preferred Option Number

Value 1 community character Value 2 economic viability Value 3 traffic safety

Comment: In fact, the three values significantly overlap. The community's economic viability depends on its community character. Our summer business depends on protecting our views, our lakes and the sens rural environment that is encompassed by protecting view corridors, open space and ridge lines. Thus, the grounds development has to walk the fine line between improving our winter season by keeping June Mount viable and not intruding on the characteristics of June Lake that sustain our summer season. My preference unit resort development that is clustered on the protected portion of the Rodeo Grounds, that does not exten line above Gull Lake, and that is not visible other than from places where the June Mountain parking lot is al seems to me to best accomplish this. One further thought concerns the economic viability of June Mountain We cannot assess the accuracy of the numbers we have been presented. Making an adjustment for the ab overhead allocation without also being able to take into account the value to Mammoth of a two site resort fo of developing a destination resort -- which is the only strategy the Mountain offered for filling mid week beds In the end, we need to offer what is viable for the community. From then on, it is a bargaining game, which t has to be willing to play to avoid getting run over. A final thought -- to the extent that the Coalition's conclusi considerations of economic viability and the need for investment in June Mountain, it is imperative that we g commitment from the Mountain to make the investment as part of the development agreement associated w it receives for the Rodeo Grounds. Otherwise, we are inviting the Mountain to come back year after asking l concessions to warrant their investment. We need to do this only once.

Name: _____ **June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot**

Dan Roberts

Cast your vote by writing the number of the option you prefer in the space provided. Please state the three values that represent your preference for the option you voted for.

Use the comment space provided to comment on why you preferred the option you voted for.

Preferred Option Number

5

Value 1 Environmental Value 2 Community Character Value 3 County Services

Comment:

Preserving our environmental values within the framework of development is of utmost importance for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that recreation in our unspoiled environment is the primary offering to our guests in a tourist-based economy. Thus the ensuing CEQA process will be important, and could ultimately result in modification of our goals. The targets set within "option 5" seem to be within limits which will allow us to continue to responsibly maintain our valuable natural resources.

I view "community character" as a broad value which incorporates most of the others we talked about in the coalition proceedings. In my view, June Lake's community character represents a balance among a number of diverse (and sometimes conflicting) issues: for example, the need for a permanent population and affordable/workforce housing to provide a local economy, must be balanced with the need for second homes and transient bed base. June Lake is a unique community and for nearly a century has represented the balance between enterprise and recreation. In the earlier times, the local population was composed of workers who built the Rush Creek hydroelectric project, and later, the Mono Basin aqueduct. Resort development in the mid-1920's established several guest lodges and camps for a variety of visitors. The ski industry was introduced in 1940 when the June Lake Winter Sports Association (a group of local business Owners) built and operated a 2200-foot rope tow near Fern Creek, to help provide economic balance between summer and winter seasons. What results is a community that can be enjoyed by a wide variety of individuals, for a number of diverse reasons. While it is impossible to be all things to all people, the "mixed" nature of our community is what appeals to many of us, as well as to our visitors.

I also feel that as a successful, mixed-use community, June Lake will provide substantial support to the county government. Sales and transient occupancy as a source of revenue highlight the need for further economic development including a bed base and commercial activities.

As a representative of the June Lake Citizen's Advisory Committee, option 5 also most closely mirrors the goals and objectives set forth in the June Lake Area Plan. The planning documents for June Lake were drafted and adopted using a community-based process over the course of the last fifteen years: this groundwork represents the efforts of many concerned and involved citizens. There seems to be continuing popular support for the June Lake Area Plan and its supporting documents: upon periodic reviews by community members, very few changes or revisions have been proposed since adoption.

There are many concerns and issues to be addressed during the ensuing specific plan process for the Rodeo Grounds development. This coalition has been very valuable in identifying and beginning to address many of them. A number of careful compromises will need to be reached, and it is important to keep the community involved in these decisions.

Name: _____ **June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot**

On this page feel free to comment on the options you did not vote for.

Option: Comment: _____

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: Connie A. Black, June Lake Resident and President of the June Lake Economic Development Corporation

Cast your vote by writing the number of the option you prefer in the space provided. Please state the three values that represent your preference for the option you voted for.

Use the comment space provided to comment on why you preferred the option you voted for.

Preferred Option Number

Option # 5

Value 1 Economic Viability Value 2 Affordable Housing Value 3 Community Character

Comment: There is no doubt in my mind that June Lake's economic sustainability is intricately tied to the development of the Rodeo Grounds. This development will provide the bed base needed to support June Mountain expansion and make their operations profitable. June Lake's winter economy is very dependent on the Mountain being open seven days a week. One of the June Lake Area Plan's specific objectives is to "create a year-round tourist economy" and this can only be achieved if our #1 winter attraction, June Mountain remains open. Over the past ten years June Lake has slowly but surely slipped into serious population decline; loss of businesses and loss of families. The only way to reverse this pattern is to attract and support appropriate development and viable businesses.

It is apparent that the number of units built on the Rodeo Grounds must be sufficient in number to create the bed base necessary to sustain the Mountain's operations. The project also has to be financially feasible for the developer. The addition of retail and commercial space also offers the opportunity for other businesses to develop in our community.

The issue of "affordable housing" is a huge priority in this community. The development of the Rodeo Grounds offers us the greatest opportunity to require a substantial number of work-force housing units to be included with the project. The existing housing situation negatively impacts our ability as business owners to attract, hire and retain new employees. We are working with other developers to encourage them to add additional affordable housing units in their developments.

I speak for myself and the members of the June Lake Economic Development Corporation - We are committed to being stewards of our beautiful natural environment. The "Community Character" Value is very important to us. We seek to work with developers, Mono County Planning and other community groups to achieve the appropriate checks and balances in design, site planning, traffic flow, water planning, waste disposal, etc. through the Specific Plan and EIR processes.

Connie Black

On this page feel free to comment on the options you did not vote for.

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: _____

Option: 1,2,3,4 Comment: Voting for anything under 900 units is not going to reverse June Lake's economic decline. Fewer numbers of units will not provide a sufficient bed base to generate the revenues necessary to support June Mountain operations. Keeping the Mountain open and financially viable is essential to June Lake's economic recovery.

Option: 1,3 Comment: Voting for the "resort only" option versus the "mixed use" option does not allow for the building of any single family homes or condos. This mix is needed to support community development, attract families and new business owners. The mixed use is more appropriate for our small community than just a transient resort/hotel development.

Connie Shook

Option: Comment: _____

Option: Comment: _____

Option: Comment: _____

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: Mitay

Cast your vote by writing the number of the option you prefer in the space provided. Please state the three values that represent your preference for the option you voted for.

Use the comment space provided to comment on why you preferred the option you voted for.

Perferred Option Number

Value 1 Safety Value 2 Workforce Housing Value 3 Owners Rights

Comment: Saftey- If the resort buildings are in the 60-65 foot range they fall under the high rise designation and are bui with stricter fire requirementsand fire caches on each floor to aid the firefighters in their work.

Workforce Housing- Development is the only likley source of affordable housing. Workforce housing is being to second homes and nightly rentals depleating the people available as volunteers for service clubs and the

Owners Rights- When the Rodeo Grounds went into private ownership the area plan designated that propety 10 units per acre. Now a group of mostly outsiders want to change that to the detriment of the viability of the

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: Peter Dennison

Cast your vote by writing the number of the option you prefer in the space provided. Please state the three values that represent your preference for the option you voted for.

Use the comment space provided to comment on why you preferred the option you voted for.

Preferred Option Number Five

Value 1 Environmental Value 2 Community Value 3 Viability

Comment: Encouraging each of us to pick our three most important values out of a list of 20 to 30 values that we all agree are very important to the community helped us filter out a great deal of noise to focus on what's really important and, at least for me, made the decision on a preferred option much easier. The environmental value to me is the importance of operating within the comfortable carrying capacity of the June Lake Loop. This means that any development must be limited based on the capacity of the physical infrastructure as may be expanded and the capacity of the natural resources. The community value to me is to maintain the current community character and recreational opportunities. The viability value is to create the sustainable economic viability of the June Lake Loop by at least ensuring the completion of the phase one June Mountain improvements that require the suitable development of the rodeo grounds to create an adequate number of transient beds to support these on mountain improvements. Of all the options, only option five satisfies all these values.

As part of the approval process, we need to ensure that other values established through this June Lake Coalition are satisfied. Accordingly, we must:

- (1) protect major view corridors and prominent ridgelines
- (2) ensure that the Gull and June Lake water levels are maintained
- (3) commit future decision makers to the approved plan
- (4) solve community-wide circulation issues - roads, trails, bikeways, etc. - prioritizing feet first (walk, jog, ski or bike), transit second and automobile last.

June Lake Coalition Development Options Ballot

Name: Peter Denniston

On this page feel free to comment on the options you did not vote for.

Option Comment:

One

The do nothing option does not result in the status quo. It will result in continued economic and community deterioration

Option Comment:

Two

Will not support the June Mountain improvements

Option Comment:

Three

Will not support the June Mountain improvements

Option Comment:

Four

Will not support the June Mountain improvements

Option Comment:

Six

While this option does support the June Mountain improvements, it does not honor the community character and, perhaps, environmental values. It also violates my commitment to Ron and Al that all the transient beds required do not have to be built on the Rodeo Grounds

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

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

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

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

VALUE: TRANSIENT BED BASE

- *Viability of June Mountain; Mammoth Mountain is carrying financially; need for \$2 million on Mountain improvements (first phase); additional skier visits needed 117,000; \$20m; 1284 hotel equivalents/ additional beds*
- *There are alternative thoughts regarding strategies to reduce # of transient beds required*
- *Differences in definition of "profitability", e.g. JM not currently covering administrative costs or debt service vs. "5 years profitable"*
- *Capital investments go to highest revenue opportunities*
- *On a stand alone basis June Mountain is not profitable*

VALUE: TIMING

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

VALUE: POPULATION

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

VALUE: JOBS/ LABOR FORCE

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

VALUE: COUNTY SERVICES

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

VALUE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

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

VALUE: SCHOOLS

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

VALUE: VOLUNTEERS

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

VALUE: ECONOMIC VIABILITY

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

VALUE: WATER

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

VALUE: TRAFFIC / SAFETY

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

VALUE: NOISE & LIGHT

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

VALUE: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

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

VALUE: COMMUNITY CHARACTER

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

COMMUNITY CHARACTER CONTINUED..

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

FINAL CONCERN/ THOUGHT

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