

MONO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

PO Box 347
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
760.924.1800, fax 924.1801
commdev@mono.ca.gov

PO Box 8
Bridgeport, CA 93517
760.932.5420, fax 932.5431
www.monocounty.ca.gov

DRAFT SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

April 16, 2020

As authorized by Gov. Newsom's Executive Orders, N-25-20 and N-29-20, the meeting will be accessible remotely by livecast with Commissioners attending from separate remote locations. There is no physical meeting location. This altered format is in observance of recent recommendations by local officials that certain precautions be taken, including social distancing, to address the threat of COVID-19.

The meeting may be joined by video at: <https://monocounty.zoom.us/j/634770837> and by telephone at: 669-900-6833 (Meeting ID# is 634 770 837) where members of the public shall have the right to observe and offer public comment. Public comments may also be submitted to cddcomments@mono.ca.gov and will be read into the record if received before the end of the agenda item.

An alternate method to access the video meeting is <https://zoom.us/join> and enter Meeting ID: 634 770 837.

COMMISSIONERS: Scott Bush, Roberta Lagomarsini, Chris I. Lizza, Dan Roberts & Patricia Robertson

STAFF: Wendy Sugimura, director; Gerry Le Francois, principal planner; Michael Draper & April Sall, planning analysts; Christy Milovich, deputy county counsel; CD Ritter, PC clerk

**Agenda sequence (see note following agenda).*

- 1. CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Chair Scott Bush called the meeting to order via Zoom at 9:02 a.m., and attendees recited pledge of allegiance from remote locations.
- 2. REVIEW OF MEETING MANAGEMENT & PROTOCOLS:** Wendy Sugimura asked staff to turn videos on, public turn videos off. Public comment? Three ways: observe not participate, log into Zoom or by phone to participate, and email. Time limit to be decided. Limit to something reasonable so all can speak. Note agreement with prior speakers. Chat room has "raise hand" option, on phone *91. Moderator will unmute for comment. Summary of >250 words. Respectful with comments. People can be removed for disruptive behavior, just as in physical meeting.
- 3. PUBLIC COMMENT:** Bentley Regehr noted none.
- 4. MEETING MINUTES**

MOTION: Carry minutes of Jan. 16, 2020 to the May 21 meeting. Lizza asked for his vote on the Lampson project to be checked.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. TIOGA INN SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT AND FINAL SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

REPORT to amend the 1993 Tioga Inn Specific Plan located at 22, 133, and 254 Vista Point Road and consisting of four parcels (APN 021-080-014, -025, -026 & -027). The entitlements approved in 1993 remain intact and approved regardless of the outcome of the currently proposed project. The current Specific Plan Amendment proposes: 1) up to 150 new workforce housing bedrooms in up to 100 new units; 2) a third gas-pump island and overhead canopy; 3) additional parking to accommodate on-site guest vehicles as well as a general-use park-and-ride facility and bus parking for Yosemite transit vehicles; 4) a new package wastewater treatment system tied to a new subsurface drip irrigation system; 5) replacement of the existing water storage tank with a new tank of the same size in the same area; 6) a new 30,000-gallon on-site propane tank (eventually replacing the existing five on-site tanks); and 7) modification to the boundaries and acreage of designated open space and modification of parcel boundaries. A Subsequent Environmental Impact Report is proposed for the project. Project materials are available for public review online at <https://monocounty.ca.gov/planning/page/tioga-inn-specific-plan-seir> and hard copies are available for the cost of reproduction by calling 760-924-1800. *Staff: Michael Draper*

DISTRICT #1
COMMISSIONER
Patricia Robertson

DISTRICT #2
COMMISSIONER
Roberta Lagomarsini

DISTRICT #3
COMMISSIONER
Daniel Roberts

DISTRICT #4
COMMISSIONER
Scott Bush

DISTRICT #5
COMMISSIONER
Chris I. Lizza

Commissioner Lizza will not participate in discussion or vote, so only four commissioners. Let proponent know needs three positive votes to pass. Any other contact by commissioners? Lagomarsini: After site visit with Geoff McQuilkin and Lisa Cutting, got packet of letters that only glanced at, into notebook, sent to Planning Division office, included in materials. Cutting is personal friend, asked more contact, McQuilkin also. Roberts: At jury duty with proponent, no discussion. Robertson or Bush: None. Milovich: Commissioner must recuse if has prejudged or is biased in any way. Decision to make. No issue legally except for Lizza.

Request to postpone meeting evolved, BOS discussed this week. Part of PowerPoint presentation. Mono Basin RPAC April 8 considered letter asking postponement due to Covid-19. Letter in packet. BOS April 14 discussed, Mono needs to treat applicants fairly. What applications qualify, when to hear. BOS debated back and forth. No BOS direction to PC, may delay BOS on Tioga Inn. Reasons not to delay in staff report. Remote hearing authorized, technology to do so, stay home exemption includes housing project. Still PC discretion.

Milovich: Public comment not required at this point. Within PC discretion. Bush: Not if just Covid-19. With 127 participants, larger than any or all meetings. Not attendance issue. Lagomarsini: Technology allows more to comment than in person. Bush: Any opposition? None, so move ahead.

Sugimura: Tag-team presentation, identify self. Thanked everyone for participation, comments taken seriously, changed project. Covid-19 challenge for all, doing best to do well, make meetings meaningful and available. Ensure opportunity to address PC directly.

Sugimura: Commenters have asked to delay meeting during Covid-19, but remote meetings authorized by Gov. Newsom allow housing comments and Board declined to direct delay. Three ways to join meeting. Concern about Zoom-bombing. Limit comment time, not repeat earlier comments. Staff will read comments <250 words, summarize those greater. Project documents released late last night. Will post final PowerPoint after meeting.

Gerry Le Francois reviewed project revisions, history of project. Two-story structures now in mix. First formal amendment in 1995. Relocated 300,000-gal water tank. Phasing allowed convenience store prior to hotel. Amend 2 in 1997: Restaurant parcel. No access from 395, clarified financing components. Backcountry hiker shower and laundry proposed, not accepted. Master sign had modified night lighting. Amend 3: Housing up to 150 bedrooms in units, daycare facility. Six unpermitted employee cabins demolished. New 30,000-gal propane tank. Expanded open space. Parking for oversized rigs.

Sandra Bauer, CEQA consultant. Scope of analysis shaped by 15162 on subsequent EIRs. 904 comment letters from agencies, tribes and individuals: 697 in format generated by MLC (Mono Lake Committee). Formal responses to 19 comment letters.

For Alternative 6, pad elevations lowered by added grading, roof elevations on all six most visible structures reduced 15 to 11 in square format (instead of long rows) with shortest walls facing east. Six rows in original plan reduced to two housing, two parking. Paint color shaker gray, roof dark muted colors. Detailed outdoor lighting plan to reduce impact. Berms between parking areas. Daycare facility relocated. Landscape berms 3' high. Visual effects: Prepared by Triad/Holmes Engineering from Navy Beach (visibility of 2nd story of upper row buildings), south Tufa parking lot (not visible), lower structures northbound one-foot of roofline is visible from 395 for three seconds. Gas station lighting visible at night.

Many changes to project. Workforce housing became community housing to be more broadly inclusive (some not employed). Alt 6 is proposed project. Daycare center staffed, open to Mono Basin residents. Two EV charging stations. Greater square footage for increased livability.

Pedestrian connectivity to LV: Caltrans discussions. On-site trail a future Caltrans option. Caltrans has no plans at junction, not concur with pedestrian safety. High speeds and poor sight distance are issues. Public uses vs utility. ADA sidewalk based on prospect of future safety features.

Caltrans identified six fatality hot spots for wildlife collisions, but none are in project area. Cumulative impacts significant.

Access: Secondary access on Edison easement.

Phasing: 1 = 30 units initially for construction workers, 2 = 40 for hotel/restaurant employees along with Phase 1, 3 = then final 30 units if Phase 2 reaches 80% occupancy.

Draft EIR recirculate? When new info available with new impacts, increased severity of impacts, draft precludes meaningful public comment. None found. Project revised but no need to recirculate.

Grant funding no longer part of mitigation goals.

Tribe noted potential for cultural resources but no evidence, wanted paid monitoring during grading, applicant suggested training construction crew. Consultation resulted in agreement to use 50 hr compensated time.

Lee Vining Community Plan and character: FPD identified concerns, CDD offered assistance. 194-300 new residents on site, fluctuate as elsewhere. Lee Vining retain identity as small community.

150 new jobs added to 37 existing jobs on site. Many will hold second jobs.

Traffic: Home to work, home to shopping, home to other. Intersection mitigations in DEIR: Traffic signal, roundabout. Caltrans indicated applicant would fund improvements. For FSEIR, Mono, applicant, Caltrans met: July traffic counts overestimated traffic in peak season conditions. October volumes little over half, more representative; revise to reflect that data? County opted for July data. Significant impact from July 4 to Labor Day. No feasible mitigation as roundabout unfunded, not reasonably foreseeable. Not satisfy signal, not recommend. Caltrans does not agree with significance finding.

Significant impacts on biology, hydrology. Three new mitigation measures based on comments. Sierra Nevada red fox: extremely rare, state-threatened species. New: Post do not feed wildlife signage on each housing unit, parking lots, entry to complex. Amended: Badger now badger and fox. 500' buffer in all directions until den occupation has ended. If active den found, groundwork halted pending consult with CDFW.

Phasing plan: Incorporate phasing into new mitigation measure. Revise final SEIR. Change 40 units to hotel permit application deemed complete.

Aesthetic resources: Commenter wanted all two-story structures removed. Maybe no units in line of sight with adjustments to number of stories. Eliminate phase 3 units in line of sight. Incorporate into Reso 1. If no change recommended, alt 6 remain.

Other issues: DSEIR incorporated by reference, published in same webpage. Redline changes documented. Definition of AH: Retitled to "community housing."

No wood stoves or fireplaces; only propane. Project improved due to public comments.

Lagomarsini: Eliminating two-story structures? *Bush: In upper row. Eliminate second story on upper row is alternative for consideration.*

Lagomarsini: Where would housing units go? *Bush: PC could recommend change to eliminate second story but keep units. Would reduce from 100 to 70.*

Bauer: No time for engineering input on proposed changes. Upper row of 2nd story would eliminate three structures. Not just build lower floor but upper row minus 2nd story.

Bush: Eliminate height problem if only single story? *Bauer: Still have 11 including six one story, five on upper row...*

Bush: 30 units 40 units. If built, make phase 3 go away? How change? *Bauer: Modify footprints, size but change layout of remaining units, or just reduce to 70 w/o 2nd story. Has to be drawn out by engineer.*

Bush: Realistic for height restrictions not phase 3.

Roberts: If reduce height get sprawling complex? *Bauer: If keep 100, requires footprint modification of upper-row units.*

Roberts: Existing two-story buildings, how much visible: peaks of roofs or entire? *Bauer: One foot of upper roof line of lower row visible from US 395. Not part of alts presented to eliminate visibility from Navy Beach. Applies to three of upper row but may include all five to retain unit count.*

Robertson: Explain employee generation of project vs job generation? Current Mono residents take job at project. How many new might live in Mono? *Bauer: Did not estimate % of outside vs Lee Vining.*

Bush: Name changed to community housing not employee housing. Applicant said employees only, show employment. Have to be employees, long-term rentals, sellable like condo? *Bauer: None for sale, just long-term housing. Goal is employees.*

Bush: Affordability guidelines? *Bauer: Housing Mitigation Ordinance would apply to units in project but applicant seeks funding via sustainable communities grant. Only if project committed to state guidelines.*

Bush: Ask Milovich. Any info on how to limit who lives there? Everybody or employees?

Milovich: Within applicant's discretion who to rent to. Mono requires some units as affordable. Adhere to state law on housing. Mono can't enforce.

Bush: Hotel/restaurant permitted since 1993, any way if proceed to have drop-dead date or void out or keeping alive forever and ever? Not want another 27 years. *Sugimura: Not know legal specifics. Mono has not put time frames on planning docs but other jurisdictions have. Practical reality is construction so based on economic realities nobody has control over, usually applicant asks deadline extension. Another layer of process for accountability.*

Bush: Likes projects already studied affordability. Project keeps morphing. Project hung over everyone's head forever. Look at what can afford, what's planned, move ahead.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT: 10:58 a.m. Sugimura: Instructions on how get in queue to speak. Applicant statement first, then to Bentley to call individuals. About dozen want to speak. Limit to two minutes. Emails to be read by April Sall (47 now).

Dennis Domaille (applicant): Feasibility study in 1996, economic turndown. 2006 hotel determined feasible, after propane explosion 103 days in coma, then recession. Before Covid-19 virus, housing crisis exponentially worse. Didn't want hotel without creating more housing. Coronavirus time for shovel-ready projects, trillions of dollars available.

Just what Governor wants -- more housing. Virtually all units could be low-income housing. If get to move forward, sees no reason to see economy get back on its feet. Will respond to comments. *Bush: Chance to rebut at end as well.*
Ellen King: Mono 13 years, last eight in Mono City. Morphed from hotel into community housing. Project defined for workforce on site. Not adequate if fully built out. Could add to, not solve housing. Directly in line with wildfires, highway intersection, community with limited services, spot exemplifies Mono's Wild by Nature motto. Ask PC to vote no.

Connie Millar: Mono City since 1993, USFS. 1993 EIR invalid due to significant changes over past 27 years not considered. Climate change effects. Redefinition of threats to communities of sprawl, erosion of local culture. Mono Basin Community Plan: Significant changes since 1993 with environmental and social impacts. Oppose.

Margaret Schwarz: Regular visitor for > 20 years, photographer. Deep concern on scenic beauty of Mono. Visibility from shoreline. Vote no.

Grace Henderson: Landowner in Mono Basin since 1988, litter pickup for 10 years. Significant impacts to Lee Vining. Original permit for hotel not OK today. Phasing is illusory, based on occupancy. Allows complete project grading at outset. Scarred landscape. What if hotel not feasible? Mono study to meet housing needs. Dark skies. Disallow any grading except specific phase, Mono housing needs assessment. Land trade partnerships. Vote no.

Tony Taylor: Lived in Mammoth Lakes >20 years. Very active, especially in Mono Basin. Unavoidable significant impacts in revised state. Three concerns: 1) migrating deer herd exposure on two highways; 2) non-safe route to Lee Vining could result in accidents and fatalities; and 3) emergency evacuation congestion. Route goes up-canyon, up-wind in fast-moving wildfire. Liability ultimately falls on Mono County. Responsibility and liability -- we all in Mono County bear responsibility for this project.

Secretary interrupted by phone call. Granicus video available online for any information potentially missing.

Sheryl Taylor: Sink buildings into hillside, keep out of viewshed. Unclear if all phases will be completed. Native vegetation removal will be scar. Dark skies valuable. Vote no.

Ernest Isaacs: Berkeley, 80 years old, visit since 1960s for backpacking. Open vistas. Buildings will be scar on landscape. Disingenuous photograph. Visible from canoeing on lake. Destroy greatest virtue. Vote no on unwelcome project.

Deanna Dulen: Preserving Mono's sense of place in honor of Andrea Lawrence. New development fit harmoniously. Accelerate urbanization and visual blight, loss of charming rustic character. Here three decades. We all lose what is woven into landscape we value. Community would lose. Justify by tax revenues for Mono budgets. Recall trapeze blight on scenic highway, circus edge. Reticence to have truly valued standards to preserve viewshed. Protect integrity of natural and cultural landscapes. Supports reference to impacts. Deed restrictions should be in place. Preserve sense of place in Lee Vining, reject proposal.

Janet Carle: Retired state park ranger. Easiest is to rubber-stamp, send to BOS. Project large, growth-inducing, in iconic location. Major CEQA issues. Market-rate income housing project; who housing is for keeps changing. Not OK for applicant to say. Timeline for project to happen. Destroying large, pristine area. Recall Conway Ranch that grading got done. Not OK to ignore greenhouse gas. Worthy of iconic location?

Rose Nelson: Lee Vining resident most concerned about significance to scenic, dark skies. People visit for inspiration, beauty, learn from natural history. Led tours at lake. Look out at unobstructed view of Mono Lake. Seen from places along shore takes away awe-inspiring view. Maybe encourage other projects. Protect unmatched scenic resources.

Margaret Eisler: Mono City, lifelong connection to Yosemite. Major concerns that housing proposal with 100 units contributes to housing shortage. Two-thirds of hotel employees. Rest find housing elsewhere. Attempts to legitimize projects. Entirely inappropriate in Mono Basin. Encourage not to support.

Elin Ljung: Full-time Mono City 15 years. Affordable housing exists in Mammoth Lakes. Project would exacerbate housing shortage. Vote no.

Lisa Cutting: Urge vote no. Follow-up on Mono Basin Community Plan, finalized in 2012 after two years of consensus-based approach. Serves as Mono Basin Area Plan. Problems: Lee Vining small-town character. Contort intent of community plan. If Mono Basin Plan cannot guide, what purpose does it serve? Role to guide development in community and county.

Geoff McQuilkin: Executive director MLC, 30-year resident. Visitation to Mono Lake is cornerstone. Most development projects do not harm Mono Lake, but impacts continue to be too large and too significant to remain silent. People truly care about this special place. Multiple permanent unacceptable impacts. Fire safety, schools ignored. Spectacular, distinctive. 16,000 members ask to reject.

Philip Schafnaker: Impacts forever change area. Vote no.

Duncan King: Retiree from State Parks. Direct conflicts with Community Plan, effort to guide future land use. Small, compact communities, healthy natural environment, dark night skies. Rehabilitate existing development. Retain small-town character. Vote no.

Nora Livingston: Firefighter in area. Agree with earlier comments opposing. Disproportionately large development for Lee Vining. Increase in vehicular cross traffic at intersection, accidents severe. Disappointed could not find solutions to dangerous impacts. Save lives. Vote no.

Aaron Stanton: Shute attorney. Reviewed FSEIR. Project description confusing, unclear. Who will housing serve? No means...

Secretary interrupted by phone call. Granicus video available online for any information potentially missing.

Shuttle should work out details. Improperly compares Specific Plan to General Plan rather than existing conditions. Small-town <10,000 residents not apply to several hundred residents. Cannot approve in current form.

Winter King: Partner at Shute, representing MLC. Several comment letters submitted. Despite changes proposed now, continue to believe EIR inadequate under CEQA. Essential to have red-line in proposal. Phasing plan not resolve uncertainty of who will occupy housing units. Impacts not only actual environmental but also Mono Lake, findings required. Not require hotel be built or occupied for phases 2 or 3. Applicant intends to make affordable, but PC can't rely on that. Not recommend.

Caelen McQuilkin: Lived in Mono Basin entire life, graduated high school this year. Impact on local schools. LVHS increase 50% w/o funding. 75 students unevenly distributed, class size could be 30, no room to accommodate books, laptops. Final document does not resolve. No way to mitigate when quadruple small town's population.

Bartshe Miller: 27-year resident, MLC member. Overwhelming volume of comments. Night-sky resources significant and adversely impacted. Create new concentrated, ambient light source, no precedent. Not evaluate scenic impacts. New mitigations not substantively resolve impacts. Findings put project in conflict with one fundamental goal: Maintain spectacular values of Mono Basin. Lake is number 1. Vote no.

Paul McFarland: Thanks to all. Project representatives really missed opportunity. Built on faulty foundation. New housing (needed) development approved nearly 30 years ago. Town, tourism, county have changed. Yosemite increase of 25%, nearly million more visitors/year. Reconsider hotel along with new housing. Analyzed at different time. Nobody can say for certain project solves or addresses housing in Mono County. Don't know what getting, moving target. Unsafe travel. Can do better, believe we can.

Maureen Mc Glinchy: Mono City resident added to school comments. On school site council. Schools not adequately portrayed. At Lee Vining six grades combined. Budget not allow more teachers. No increased operating budget. 35%-50% increase for six teachers for nine grades. Planning demands further inquiry into alternatives. Comments as parent, PTO member. Vote no.

**Sugimura has copy of school district letter from 4:38 pm yesterday,
Will summarize into record when all speakers done.**

Claire Landowsky: June Lake resident, loves Mono Basin. Development actually exacerbates housing. So few long-term rentals in area. At full build-out still 50 looking for long-term affordable housing in Lee Vining and Bridgeport. No safe walkable route, so drive to Lee Vining or Mammoth Lakes. No real assurance housing will be available. Likely market rate, completely out of reach. Where is benefit for Lee Vining? Big problems with no offsetting benefits. Please reject, work to build housing. Wonderful small town in gorgeous landscape. Revise proposal to agree with Community Plan. Vote no.

Tim Banta: Lifetime resident of Lee Vining, speaking on behalf of family. Fifth generation. Agree can do better with this for Lee Vining and Mono Basin. Must fit into character and image of Mono Basin and Lee Vining. Too much, too big. No visible connection to Lee Vining. Talk about shuttle, but visitors to Lee Vining see two defined communities. Leap-frogging. If PC moves forward with this, someone needs adequate trail system consistent with visitation to Basin. Major traffic problem at intersection. Thanked attendees.

Kevin Bown: Resident Lee Vining. Significant unavoidable: pedestrian and cyclists exposed to unsafe travel conditions. Reasons immaterial. Project puts people at risk if travel to Lee Vining. "Unsafe at any speed." Urge no vote, echoed others. We can do better.

Ilene Mandelbaum: Lee Vining resident 36 years, member Mono Basin RPAC. Community Plan for low-income community with very little control over surrounding lands. Many impacts not mitigatable. Housing goal for yet unbuilt, out-of-scale a phantom. Unlikely to break ground. Never successfully marketed to developers. Not even keep deli open year-round. Create company town. Smaller alternative dismissed as not support nonexistent hotel complex. Reduced alternative: Smaller footprint, campground for seasonal workers who not want to pay rent, expand deli. Other solutions for housing. Reject resolution.

Arya Harp: Resident. Makes community housing issues worse. Wants community to thrive. Accept tradeoffs on housing. How pencil out for housing? Vote no.

Nathan Taylor: Lifelong Eastern Sierra resident, architect in area. Agree with concerns...

Secretary interrupted by phone call. Granicus video available online for any information potentially missing.

Bare-bones proposal for large project. Need better documentation and visual guidance. Show some degree of good design. Collaborate more with community. Need well-thought-out project, clear, well-designed.

Mary Young: Mono City six months every year. Applicant asking to make dangerous situation worse by traffic, congestion for two highways. Applicant not suffer but rest would. Grew up in big county, biked area. Big development occurred, still no safe passage. Re-zone decision made by people elsewhere. Cumulative, dangerous impacts. Vote no.

John Young: Family visited for decades. EIR is stale, on shelf 27 years, attempts to refresh failed. Comments from law firm conclude fatally flawed, fails to comply with CEQA. Urge vote no.

David Strelneck: Born Bridgeport, legal resident Lee Vining, attended local schools, MMSA race department. Not have anyone speak up in favor of project. Three concerns: Schools issue shows lack of understanding, fire safety from FPD not others, and cold, dictionary definition of "small town." Run over who actually are. Hard for everybody, not want chapter in book about something great that used to exist, especially with confusion on housing.

Will Hamann: Grown to love area. Agree with all concerns. Biggest is what comes next? Widen 395? Urban sprawl? Wrong precedent. Vote no.

Daniel Bittel: Area past four years, ecological work in Tuolumne. Conflicts with environmental and cultural values. Fragile ecosystem, visual impact unavoidable. Traffic problems. Forever change Lee Vining, Tuolumne, Eastern Sierra. Vote no.

Lynn Boulton: Lee Vining resident, chair of Range of Light Group. Sierra Club concerned with climate change -- propane heat instead of electric. All-electric homes preferred. Why move water tank higher where visible from many places? Project should focus on net zero energy, fight climate change.

Barbara Harriman: Annual visits 25 years. Accepting reports from 27 years ago? Consider changing environment, especially water. Lee Vining has had fires. Where get water for facility? Two wells on site. Comprehensive water report. Wells taking water from water table? Firefighting. Fires go uphill, additional propane and fuel tanks, where water come from when fire occurs? Disaster waiting to happen. Vote no.

Barry Mc Pherson: Born Bridgeport, inherited Mono Inn property 20 years ago. Provides three little houses below plus rental. Donated upside-down house. Agree with commenters too big, too undefined, too poorly planned. After 27 years, start over for safer, better for wildlife, fewer impacts on scenic views. Unreasonable and poorly done. Adding to tide of opposition.

Name Unknown: Project too big, traffic, intersection, dark skies, alter beauty and attraction to visitors. Covid-19 crisis lets hydro-head move ahead. Agree with all other comments, urge vote no, come back with better and smaller. Enjoys gas station and deli, but no place for huge project.

Andrew Youssef: Mono Basin five years. Agree with issues of nebulous project. Mitigations still inadequate. Led tours at lake, where see nearly no human development. Now massive project approved near Mono Basin Scenic Area. Mono can do better, need more mitigation for impacts.

Jeff Wyneken: Resident 25 years. Double population. Will have to live with results. Ongoing involvement of all stakeholders. Historic gateway, portal community. Irreversible impacts. Without ongoing community involvement, without collective consent. Lee Vining listed as model gateway. Mono Basin already said no in Community Plan. Suspend project. Vote no.

David Passmore: Lifelong CA resident, Fresno County. Natural beauty main thing that draws to area. Project significantly detracts from natural beauty. Ill-conceived project for all reasons noted by many speakers, especially degradation of viewscape. Recommend back to drawing board. Not against all development but project seems ill-conceived. Reject as proposed, consider more appropriate alternatives.

Dan McConnell: Didn't want to but listened to everybody, glad he did. Some comments made Dennis sound like bad guy. Photos in staff report showing visibility of project taken with a high-quality, high-powered lens. Highway much more disturbing with lights. Night photography points up at sky. Not going to walk out onto highway. Easily solved problems.

Don Jackson: Lives 325 mi away but been here 35 years for nature, wildlife photography. Not everything done at South Tufa and Navy Beach. Been in many other areas on lake in canoe where visual impacts would be significant. Friend killed by 395 driver.

Santiago Escruceria: Chair Lee Vining FPD. Document inadequate to ensure safest, most balanced project. Threats to public safety for firefighters. Small department with volunteers. Cannot back project as written.

--- Break: 12:55-1:10 pm ---

Malcolm Clark: Executive on behalf of Range of Light's 400 members. Project has hung over area, not accounted for substantial changes in area. Start over, have deadline. Impacts locally on scenic area, gateway to Yosemite. Water concerns: groundwater sustainability. Tripling of population could overwhelm local services and schools. Major projects should contribute on-site solar power or non-fossil-based alternative. Reduce use of fossil fuels. Increase number of EV charging stations. Two not meet need but better than nothing. Urge not to support.

April Sall read written comments received after 3 pm deadline yesterday

Carol Reimer: Not recommend poorly planned community housing development. Retain integrity of Lee Vining and rural scenic gateway community, cumulative impact. Not want eyesore to go forward.

Darrel Quiring: Frequently backpacked here. Irreversible impacts to scenic area. Not help housing shortage in region.

Raymond F. Sciarga: Dark sky from anywhere near lake compromised by lighting as designed. Building above ridgeline an obtrusion. Busy roads in summer will be jammed.

Phyllis Benham: Longtime Mammoth Lakes resident, volunteer at Mono County Park. Poorly designed. Vote no.

Janet Keller: Grandma early settler, coming here 62 years. Rugged beauty takes breath away. Mono Lake wild and serene, remained relatively undeveloped. Development will ruin place forever.

Virginia Hilker: As faithful visitor and supporter of the Mono Lake Committee and Mono Basin, strongly support the Mono Lake Committee positions on this subject.

George Mellon: Too many units in wrong area. Find somewhere less impacting to the overall topography and closer to needed services.

Pamela Tumbusch: Enjoying area since 1960s. Other areas with overcrowded roads and recreation. Rural scenic paradise with multitude of natural wonders. Stay as is for future.

Robert J Hutchens: Actually provide affordable housing or just sell to buyers? Spend more to support than make.

Karen Loro: Longtime supporter of Mono County beauty and recreation opportunities. No signs of imminent action to build the hotel or restaurant. County should take necessary time to revise its environmental analysis and do it right.

Winter King: County cannot lawfully approve in current form. Fails to inform of impacts, reduce impacts. 27 years have passed, no signs of imminent action. Take time to revise environmental analysis.

Dan Hackston: Access for hiking, skiing. Environment fragile, preserve this region. Significant impacts. Preserve aesthetic sense of Mono Basin. Vote no.

John (last name unknown): Mono Basin since 1978. Dark skies valuable resource.

Kirk Dixon: Visitor from Gardnerville since 1981. Wrong project for this location. Night sky a concern.

Rafe Miller: Mono Basin lover >50 years. Project will cause significant, irreversible, negative impacts on scenic beauty of unique landscape. Implore vote no.

Sandra Bowman: Always recommend for majestic night sky. Elevated location even more extensive. Citizens everywhere more concerned with quality of environment. Vote against.

Janet R. Barth: Stand at shore totally devoid of human incursions. Other than the kiosk and parking lot at South Tufa, there are no other buildings, no visible roadways, no power lines. Purity of viewscape rare at heavily visited destination. Service project in Death Valley: view from Telescope Peak 45 out of 50. View from South Shore would easily rate same. Please keep purity of the Mono Lake viewshed in mind.

Rebecca Waters: Mono Lake and tufas subject of many photos. Negative impact on landscape and wildlife. So many areas for growth of consumer needs.

Robin Hartman: Visitor to area 30 years. Mono Lake, Lee Vining sacred places entwined. Project increase traffic with no provision for pedestrians or cyclists. Wildlife impacts. Urge vote no.

Gary Nelson: Mono City. Hotel project shopped around for 27 years with no takers. Lee Vining not operative half of year. Only theoretical housing. Phase 4 supply vs demand makes unaffordable. Limit grading to phase 1. How much infrastructure?

Rob Hirsch: Professional photographer, leads workshops. Unavoidable visual impact. As natural biologist, concern for impact to deer. Charming, rural character of Lee Vining. Develop gateways to minimize environmental impacts. Urge vote no.

Daniel Bittel: Unique and iconic piece to protect, respect, and preserve. Development needs to line up with Lee Vining and Mono Lake. Ask vote no.

Ruth Garland: Out of character with natural. Not want big hotel on hill lighting up dark sky. Not allow.

Whitney Larson: Northern California resident. Visual impacts to shores of lake and tufa reserve. Insufficient mitigation. Vote no.

Brock Graves: Not agree with development, should not go through.

Jessica Bittel: Protect. Please vote no.

Christian Wyatt: Deep discomfort to affect Lee Vining with hotel. Protect ecosystem.

Caitlyn Bittel: Shocked and saddened to think this could happen. So many reasons why bad idea. Small community with unique culture and way of life. Family in Kansas vacationed to enjoy peaceful pristine nature there. Beg stop development. Entire area negative effect forever.

Cambo Ferrante: Inevitable impact on environmental, scenic and visual resources within Mono Basin, migration path of mule deer. Eyesore detracts from rustic small-town charm Lee Vining is known for.

Mark Liljegren: Environmental impacts far outweigh positive benefits.

Renee Jones: Significant impacts still remain. Frequent changes tried to slip through for 27 years. Not enough housing for employees. Significant visual and wildlife impact. Contrary to goals.

Helen Vajk: Better expressed by others, but this can't be a runaway train. No improvement in affordable housing; serious impact on Lee Vining size and character and on natural beauty and ecology. If you degrade this, you cannot get it back. Stop now.

Martha Mosman: Outsized impact on ridgeline above Mono Lake. Come to be part of whole ancient landscape, preserve incredible beauty of Mono Lake. Vote no.

Don Condon: California goal is to reduce fossil fuel use. Not heat with propane. Residentials now net zero. Should consider solar panels and electric heat pumps.

Colleen Balch: Former resident. Assaults on viewshed, character of iconic small town.

Janet R. Barth: Affordable housing important but development fails to provide this need. Vote no.

Jordan Solitto: June Lake cabin owner. Not want to be redundant. For love of God, don't do it!

Allison Smyth: Concern of impact on Lee Vining. Seasonal employee. Agree with countless comments on connectivity, safety. Public outcry proves goes against Community Plan. Could create domino effect. Properties built without approvals impact. Vote no.

Joseph Migliore: Lifelong California resident, member MLC, visiting all of life. Truly has special place in heart. Visiting Yosemite till crowd diminished. Same could happen here. Cascade of more development.

Robin Hartmann (repeat): Regular visitor 30 years for activities. Lee Vining and lake entwined. Severe negative impact day and night. No provisions for pedestrians and cyclists. Ill-conceived real estate deal. Urge no.

Ivan Olsen: Bedroom-style employee housing like USFS offers workforce every year.

Michael Draper summarized comment letters >250 words

Henry Haviland: 40-year Mammoth Lakes resident. Should have sunsetted long ago, threatens to overpower Lee Vining, inadequate services.

Malcolm Mozier: Lundy Lake area. Mecca for photographers. Threaten vistas and dark skies. Environment, traffic, safety, school, fire, sheriffs, CHP impacts. Should not be increased. Adhere to 1993 approval.

Heidi Torix: Eastern Sierra Unified School District. Concern for schools, development fees cover classrooms but not teachers to maintain class sizes.

Martha Davis: Former executive director MLC. Significant unmitigated adverse impacts. Not adequately address concerns. Visual impacts from vista points, night skies, population.

Paul Ashby: Photographer and visitor. Traffic safety issues, lack of connectivity to Lee Vining. Reexamine project, lease to outside operator. Triple population of Lee Vining.

Carmen Borg: Urban planner with Shute law firm. No safe way to travel into Lee Vining, no safe route to school, typical of "sprawl" development California planners have sought to avoid for the last 20 years.

Caroline Vondriska: Three generations of family stay in Lee Vining every summer. Still significant negative impacts. You risk converting your community from residential tourism to Yosemite-bound "gas and go" traffic.

Will Rowe: Chico resident. County will lose significant visitor-derived income from those of us who purposefully travel to Mono Basin to enjoy the very assets this development will destroy.

George Todd: Artist. Out of character with area. Only benefits owners. Housing only for workers. Too much traffic, demand on services.

Deanna Dulen (repeat): Accidents, roadkill. Services impacted. Need deed restrictions. Not for Mammoth or June ski area employees. Accelerates urban blight. Preserve sense of place.

Cecile Audenried: Manager Murphey's motel. Not meet employee housing so increase demand on community. FPD stress, schools, traffic accidents, fatalities, intersection. Not enough parking in Lee Vining.

Range of Light Group: Phasing not sufficient. Overbuilding. Housing not for employees, hotel not be built. Housing where hotel planned. Too much grading in plan. Visual concerns, dark sky disturbance. Lack of pedestrian connectivity.

Lily Pastell: Six-year resident. Safety risk for pedestrians, strain on FPD.

Sam Bittel: Strong opposition. Visitor from Kansas. This area represents a special and unique ecological treasure to not only California but the United States and our planet. Lee Vining, as a community, is a special place that retains its beautiful setting and old Northern California feel by avoiding over-development.

Will Rowe: Destroy visual assets of Mono Basin, approval creates negative precedent in Mono Basin.

Sarah Taylor: Project not provide affordable housing, not benefit schools.

Alex Bittel: Private individual encroaching on what belongs to everybody, impacts benefits, damages ecosystems, increases housing costs.

Jeff Wyneken (repeat): Detrimental to health of Lee Vining. Retain character.

Robert Di Paolo: Six-year resident of Mono Basin. Night sky issues, increases traffic, no definition of workforce housing, still more housing needed for employees.

Melinda Rivasplata: Recommends recirculation of DEIR as inadequate. Revise vehicle miles, deferred mitigation lacks performance standards.

Dave Marquart: Mono Basin several decades. Impact to night skies, negative population increase.

Julie Brown, Mono resident 40 years, June Mtn employees 150 people, project would make more attractive. Provide summer job opportunities, housing biggest barrier to hiring.

Mary Bittel: Obvious man-made distractions, night sky affected. Mule deer migration path. Biking, walking more dangerous. Reason to visit is magnificent views. Development detracts from town economy. Plan in constant flux, unpredictable. Humans are stewards of earth, protect treasures. Do not thrust haphazard plan on town, tripling size. Vote no.

Liam Caulfield: Not address needs of community. Analyze limits and constraints on community. Transform true soul of area. Degrade foundation of community itself. Lee Vining staple within great Sierra range. Reject, save Mono Basin.

Carmen Borg: Certified urban planner at Shute for 20 years. Not in keeping with current planning practices. No safe way to Lee Vining, half-mile. Choose driving or walking with safety hazard. Design conflicts with smart land use policies, safe routes to school.

Robbie Di Paolo: Three concerns: night skies unique and valuable resources; increased traffic; define workforce. Impact on scenic views, impact on night skies. Affordability ill-defined, housing only 2/3 of staff. Ask vote no.

Manuel Santillan: Nobody doing anything to keep jobs for locals. People outside town deciding how new generations should live. Need job and place to stay.

###

Domaille rebuttal: Providing about 70 of onsite housing for employees. Maybe already living in area. Beauty of project is 22 years at Tioga Gas Mart, hard to keep employees. Mono Market same problem. Work all summer, not have to move, become stable residents. Patronize local businesses in town year-round, not find restaurant, bar, market closed. Stable workforce lives there, kids in local school. Were 300 kids at LVHS. Eight gas stations, several markets. Not healthy place. Property cause financial impact? Elementary would run out of room. Plenty of room at LVHS. Impact fees will cover that. Prop taxes haven't gone up on existing properties. Enormous amount of money from project. Not enough for solar panels (fog in winter). Gas heat is lowest cost. Every intention to seek grant money. Virtually all will be affordable but can't guarantee. If can't build financially, won't get built. \$300/sf big problem. Government needs to provide housing. Dan McConnell to site with scaffolding red and yellow. Couldn't even see it without binoculars. Whole argument about visual impacts not significant. Just a speck, not where people focusing cameras. Minimal visibility. Not lobbied commissioners. People sleeping in cars and woods by dozens. People need housing. Right to view lake more important than place to live? Review record, see what's in it. Make right decision.

###

Sugimura: More comment, correction, staff comment.

Sall: Range of Light letter by Malcolm Clark not Lynn Boulton.

David Strelneck (repeat): ESUSD refutes evidence. Be sure accurate input used rather than previous staff person.

Sarah Taylor (repeat): Lee Vining more than 20 years. Lee Vining need more affordable housing? Yes. Beautiful and friendly small town? Yes. Would project provide affordable housing? No. Increase beauty of landscape? No. Please ask development to make project work to benefit all.

###

Sugimura: Eastern Sierra Unified School District submitted letter that changed previous input. Mono followed proper contacting procedures for initial input. Housing study has been conducted, see Housing Element adopted last year. Showed housing opportunity sites, Tioga Inn site in adopted plan. Also showed Draft EIR project description, which has not changed from Draft to Final EIR. Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative have changed in response to public comments, which is what should happen in a good public process and if project is being responsive to the community.

Trail to town: No new feasible mitigation measures suggested by public comment except eminent domain, which Mono historically has not used.

Not subject to SB 375, State ARB would not certify Mono's Resource Efficiency Plan as SCS.

No legal requirement for projects to comply with safe routes to schools. Routes into town not subject to Mono or developer control.

This project is a housing project and does not determine whether hotel and restaurant get built. 187 employees already exist due to approved hotel/restaurant project and so are reasonably foreseeable. Project proposal provides up to 150 bedrooms toward the 187. Understand idea that project exacerbates housing problem but that is not accurate picture.

Bush: 187 now or later? *37 current, 150 more.*

Sugimura: If hotel not built, phase 2 not happen and 30 units max will be built. Housing Needs Assessment indicates 120-170 units needed across entire county. Most comments addressed in analysis, many inaccuracies stated but no time to address point by point.

Bauer: Public trust doctrine not apply to this project. Buffer for fox would be 500'.

Bush: Heard EIR in 1993 could become stale? Law address that? Bauer: Original document valid unless changes proposed (changes were, assessed in new document). Anything unchanged remains protected, even in 100 years.

Milovich: Initial public comment letter brought up law that EIR does not go stale.

Bush: Any law supporting that PC would want to redo or stepping out of bounds? Two projects. Hotel not built, so no real need for housing. One dependent upon other.

Milovich: Within staff discretion to open up entitlements from 1993, decided not to do so which is legally valid. PC could ask to revisit project.

Bush: Cost involved? *Milovich: Completely new effort, more cost, resources. Can't reopen EIR, but PC could revise Specific Plan to eliminate hotel.*

Bush: Without hotel would not have housing. **CLOSE PUBLIC COMMENT.**

DISCUSSION: Robertson: Clarify confusion. Voting on housing project. If vote no, will hotel and restaurant still move forward? *Yes.* Grade phases individually? Add childcare into phase 1.

Domaille: Daycare part of first phase, also laundry facility.

Bauer: Allow all grading before phase 1. Cannot proceed with construction without fill material.

Domaille: To lower buildings would require dirt removal, hotel would give place to put dirt. Grading has to be done when people not coming and going.

Bauer: Portion of grading to enable phases 1 and 2, postpone phase 3? *Domaille: Major grading project with people there -- logistical nightmare.*

--- Pause for tech issue: 2:58-3:13 pm ---

Robertson: Need 120-170 housing units for Mono. Large percent living with family in Mono Basin. Can't require additional affordable outside what's required in Housing Mitigation Ordinance. Project provides much-needed housing. One piece of puzzle. Not often find project proposing employee housing on site in recent years, almost unprecedented. Takes burden off current, aging housing stock existing. Incorporates changes requested. Safe access, childcare. Sense Specific Plan not going to triple population of Lee Vining, people already in overcrowded housing.

Roberts: Intimidating to speak after all negative comments. Lived in area over 50 years, understand concern about change in community. Not like when something new gets built, all share that. Disapproving this housing project does not eliminate any development on that property that provides great share of impact. Need for housing is great. Makes little sense to seek housing elsewhere for employees of that development. Live elsewhere, travel to site for employment, transportation impact than living on site. Network effect of massive PR campaign by organizations using social media mailing lists to garner opposition to project. Many who spoke thought denial would kill entire project; not true. In original 900+ comments were just a template provided. Today same talking points. Fewer than 10 people had original thought on matter. Property owner should have some rights.

Bush: If open hotel, not having housing for employees.

Lagomarsini: Share comments. Change is difficult but took extra step to read Mono Basin and Caltrans documents. Unfortunate geographical separation from town. Empty storefronts in downtown Lee Vining. Can't make that happen. If done thoughtfully, could work. Concern about dark sky issues, torn about second story buildings. Lights in town, highway, visitor center. Town could benefit from few more people, more jobs, more housing.

Bush: Public comment astronomically against but is it really that wonderful what exists? Nice if jobs available in area, housing too. Turning down housing does not negate hotel, not going away. Make housing protect ambience. If need 187 but cut down, exacerbating housing problem.

Robertson: Many comments wanted to house all employees but no visual impact. If remove second story, does that meet intent of public comments?

Bush: If goes ahead, haven't discussed lighting. Colors of buildings can make stuff go away. Lights directed down, why so overwhelming? Talk about fox, shuttle, phasing plan?

Sugimura: Not yet built in, be part of PC recommendation.

Roberts: Signage to not feed wildlife could be too many signs.

Robertson: Include childcare in phase 1 in motion? *Bush: Add that.*

Lagomarsini: See language on fox, shuttle, phasing?

Bush: Lighting shielded, downward, color choices. So much public outcry about lighting.

Lagomarsini: Ambient lighting always exists. Lighting addressed.

Robertson: Grading logistics best to do at once but occurs that phase 3 may not be built ever or later. Reasonable to do grading same as phase 1 when occupancy right away.

Bush: If phase 3 not built, would reclaim/revegetate so blends in.

Lagomarsini: If phase 3 not started within certain time...

Bauer: New mitigation requirement. Landscaping plan recognizes exposed soils. Revegetation plan outlines issues.

Bush: Already incorporate if phase 3 never happens, will revegetate to natural state.

Final public comments via email to be summarized/read into record:

Ruth Garland: People sleep in cars because like to camp there. Not buy into this argument.

Shelley Hutchinson: Family visited since was teen Special place in hearts. Never be same if built. Not right place for new housing. Changing sound pollution. Find more suitable project.

Alicia Vennos: 2018 survey of 80 businesses in unincorporated, plus Mammoth Lakes and June Lake. Almost half report difficulty recruiting. Challenges keeping year-round employees. Availability and affordability. Housing scarcity for year-round employees. Challenging, but tourism will rebound, maybe exceed prior to pandemic.

Eva Brown: Hotel/restaurant going forward. What if project decides not to build hotel?

MOTION: Adopt Resolution R20-01 making the following findings and recommending 1) adoption of Tioga Inn Specific Plan Amendment #3 and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program with the modifications read by staff and identified in Section One of R20-01, and 2) certification of the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report:

- A. Having reviewed and considered all information and evidence presented to it including public testimony, written comments, the Final SEIR (Attachment 1), staff reports and presentations, the Planning Commission finds, as set forth in Section Two of Resolution R20-01 (Attachment 2), that:
 1. The proposed changes to the Tioga Inn Specific Plan are consistent with the text and maps of the General Plan,
 2. The proposed changes to the Tioga Inn Specific Plan are consistent with the goals and policies contained within any applicable area plan,
 3. The site of proposed change in the specific plan is suitable for any of the land uses permitted within the proposed specific plan,
 4. The proposed changes to the Tioga Inn Specific Plan are reasonable and beneficial at this time, and
 5. The proposed changes to the Tioga Inn Specific Plan will not have a substantial adverse effect on surrounding properties.
- B. The Planning Commission finds that the Tioga Community Housing Project Final Subsequent EIR (FSEIR; Attachment 1) has been prepared for the Tioga Inn Specific Plan Amendment #3 in compliance with CEQA and that the FSEIR reflects the County's independent judgment and analysis. The Planning Commission further finds that the FSEIR has been presented to, and reviewed by, the Planning Commission and is adequate and complete for consideration by the Board of Supervisors in making a decision on the merits of Tioga Inn Specific Plan Amendment #3, and for making the findings substantially in the form set forth in Exhibit A of Resolution R20-01 (Attachment 2).
- C. The Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors: 1) make the findings and statement required by 14 CCR §§ 15091 and §15093, substantially in the form set forth in Resolution R20-01; 2) certify the Final SEIR; 3) adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as modified; and 4) approve Tioga Inn Specific Plan Amendment #3 as modified.

(Bush/Roberts. Roll-call vote: Bush-aye. Lizza-recused. Roberts-aye. Lagomarsini-aye. Robertson-aye.)

--- Break: 4:13-4:18 pm ---

- B. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 19-010/Subia.** Proposal to operate an overnight kennel facility for cats and dogs on a 5-acre Rural Residential (RR) parcel at 206 Inca Place in Benton (APN 025-030-048). The facility will be housed in a 25' x 30' metal building and will board a maximum of 17 dogs and 8 cats. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, a Notice of Exemption will be filed. Project materials are available for public review online at <https://monocounty.ca.gov/planning-commission/page/planning-commission-special-meeting-7> and hard copies are available for the cost of reproduction by calling 760-924-1800. *Staff: Kelly Karl*

Kelly Karl presented an overview of the proposed project. Last kennel project was 10 years ago. Must maintain annual kennel license and comply with noise ordinance. One negative comment. Karl suggested listing parameters of noise ordinance.

How close to neighbors? *120 feet to south.*

Comment letter from neighbor? *Not specified.*

Owner have dogs now? *Yes.*

Building exist now? *No yet. Not far from neighbor.*

Supervised all time? *Applicant lives short distance away, always staff person.*

Why 17 dogs? *13 kennels plus four additional dogs.*

Lizza: Let animal control set timing of inspection. *County Code requires two inspections. Animal Control reviewed, had no edits.*

Lizza: Thorough, complete report and business plan?

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT: Applicant Holly Subia does not know commenter Pat. Immediate neighbors OK with it. If barking occurs, closest is her bedroom. Opaque panels on lower part so dogs not see each other, want to interact. No way to eliminate barking when outside playing.

Think will have 17 dogs? *Rare occasions like holidays. Could adjust kennels to accommodate.*

Ongoing availability in area now? *Not in Benton or Mammoth. Round Valley at capacity. Small at Mill Pond, dogs outside. Bishop Vet, dogs inside, cats in kennels. No cat condo with multilevel space. Looking for options for pet parents. Small area survey. Someone drove four to five dogs to AZ to board, not happy with options here. Benton out of way but has more space. No kennels inside Bishop city limits. Metal building can be hot. **CLOSE***

PUBLIC COMMENT.

DISCUSSION: Lagomarsini: Add noise-ordinance-specific language: All requirements of Mono County General Plan and Code 10.16.08 and project conditions.

Bush: Dog barking is rhythmic and not go away, not even have to be loud.

6. WORKSHOP: None

7. REPORTS

A. DIRECTOR: Next month: Short-term rental use permit application, SP amend Highlands Specific Plan for STRs on certain parcels, Tract Map amendment.

B. COMMISSIONERS: **Bush:** Perfect setup for Zoom. **Lagomarsini:** Zoom went well. **Lizza:** Wendy could wordsmith document on screen.

8. INFORMATIONAL: None

9. ADJOURN at 4:54 pm to regular meeting May 21, 2020.