

**Attachment 6:
Responses to Comments Requested by the Board**

1. Response to 4 August 2020 comment letter from Matt Banta (the original comment letter is attached)
2. Response to letter from Angela Williams Eddy, Mono Lake Kutzadida'a Tribal Vice Chairwoman
3. Email exchange with Charlotte Lange, Mono Lake Kutzadika'a Tribe Chairwoman and original emails

Response to 4 August 2020 Comment Letter from Matt Banta

Response to Hydrology Concerns Raised in Public Comment Letter

The Mono County Board of Supervisors received correspondence on 4 August 2020 from Matt Banta (Attachment 1) that raised questions concerning potential impacts of project water demands on the Mono Groundwater Basin. In response, the Project Hydrologist (Roger Smith of SGSI) has provided information as presented in the discussion below.

Comments provided in the 4 August letter indicate that the author has not fully reviewed information provided in the environmental record for the proposed Community Housing Project. The author makes reference to a 4-hour pump test at 150 gallons per minute (gpm), as a comparison to the water level elevation of Mono Lake. The referenced pump test (by Kleinfelder) was performed more than 25 years ago, and was used in the current hydrologic assessments only for backup data. A new pump test was performed for the current project EIR (i.e., the 2017 24-hour "long term" aquifer test). Results of the 2017 pump test (which were not mentioned in the August 2020 comment letter) refute the claim made by the commenter that boundary conditions were found. The project wells are located over a mile from Mono Lake, and drawdown from the wells remains over 50 feet above the elevation of Mono Lake. Based on the foregoing, it is not reasonable to postulate that the project wells will cause saltwater intrusion into the aquifer. The springs along the lake shore indicate that there is a hydraulic pressure gradient of fresh water pushing against the salt water of the lake from the west, and the 2017 pump test showed that there was no impact on the Winston well. With construction of a second well on the Tioga site, it will be possible to compile additional data on how far the cone of groundwater level depression extends while the wells are being pumped.

The two Tioga Inn wells and the Andrews well are the only active wells in the study area south of the Lee Vining Study area of Team's Mono Basin Report (Figure 3 Subwatershed Map, Lee Vining). As noted in response to the comment letter submitted during June 2020, the Andrews well is in the same watershed, but not in the same aquifer, as the Tioga wells. Thus, the only potential impacts to the aquifer from pumping the Tioga wells would be a decrease in water flow from "nearby" springs. Because the wells are more than a mile from these springs, and the recharge to the basin is high, and the pumping rate is so low, any impacts of the Tioga wells on the spring flow would be negligible and unmeasurable. Additional discussion of these issues is provided in Sections 3.0, 3.8., and 3.11 of the Team Engineering Report (Surface Water and Groundwater and Basin Assessment, Lee Vining^a). It is also noted that the Tioga Inn project has been pumping from Well #1 for more than 25 years with no known detriment to the nearest springs.

The comment letter asks if water use during construction would require more water than the daily use when the project is complete and fully operational. For several reasons, it is anticipated that construction will use less water than future water demands. Key factors include the fact that construction will occur primarily during daylight hours, and for a relatively short period of time, with maximum water consumption limited by the wells' production capability of up to 125 gpm each. Additionally, Well #1 was used as the sole source of construction water during Caltrans' expansion of US 395 from 2-lanes to 4-lanes. The well operated a full capacity for the duration of that construction effort, which continued over an 8 month period around 2004. Well #1 was later used as the sole water source for the reconstruction of Lee Vining Airport. There was no sustained decline in water levels during either project.

As discussed in DSEIR/FSEIR §5.2 (Hydrology), and in response to DSEIR review comments submitted by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB), monitoring wells will be provided on the project site along with other mitigation requirements that have been developed to protect area water quality and area water supply in the

^a See Attachment 4 to the 6 August 2020 staff report for the Board of Supervisors meeting, available at https://monocounty.ca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/board_of_supervisors/meeting/30949/08_aug_06_2020_special_agenda.pdf.

Tioga Inn SP3 - Attachment 5: Responses to Comments Requested by Board

event the proposed Community Housing Project is approved. Requirements include (a) Mitigation HYDRO 5.2(b-1) detailing decommissioning of the existing septic system and limits on future use of the existing leachfield, (b) Amended Mitigation HYDRO 5.2(b-2) specifying percolation rates and minimum distance from high groundwater for the new leachfield, (c) Mitigation HYDRO 5.2 (b-3) specifying treatment standards and performance goals for the new package system, (d) Mitigation HYDRO 5.2(b-4) requiring Title 22 compliance, or a written letter from the SWRCB Division of Drinking Water stating that the project does not need to satisfy Title 22 criteria, (e) New Mitigation HYDRO 5.2(b-5) requiring that the project provide at least 3 monitoring wells (1 upgradient and 2 downgradient of the package treatment system), in locations and at depths to be determined by LRWQCB during permitting, (f) New Mitigation HYDRO 5.2(b-6) requiring that the package treatment system be modified to include nitrogen removal systems if the monitoring wells show a sustained increase in groundwater salinity levels.

The WWTP monitoring wells will be separated from the water supply wells by approximately 1500 feet. The monitoring wells will provide information about groundwater flow and gradient for the treatment system, and may determine whether the waste system and the water supply wells are located in separate aquifers, as hypothesized on the basis of current information. Groundwater flow in this area is most likely towards the lake, due to elevation differences and recharge from upslope. However, there may be fault or boundary conditions that shift groundwater flow in a slightly different direction, as discussed in Section 3.4 of the Team Engineering Report. Issues pertaining to the Andrews well were addressed in depth in FSEIR Topical Response #11.

The commenter requests that the project applicant undertake studies to characterize the entire Mono Basin. The proposed project has a de minimis impact on overall Mono Basin hydrogeology. Far more important to basin hydrology are the operations of LADWP and SCE, as well as many other smaller operations. A fairly detailed characterization of the Mono Basin hydrogeology is provided in the Mono Basin watershed studies prepared for Mono County by Team Engineering.

The first Tioga well has been in operation for more than 25 years, and producing water supply at a rate that is sufficient to meet all foreseeable future demands of the project including existing and proposed elements. SGSI recommendations for Well #1 are to periodically clean it and remove sediment build up from the sump to maintain well capacity and efficiency. Well #2 was not installed to meet water demands, but rather was installed as a back-up well, to meet the well reliability requirements of the State of California. The project applicant does not plan, or foresee a need, to construct a third well. Normal completion times to construct a well of this size and depth would be 2-3 weeks, irrespective of the 6-month timeframe used by Maranatha to construct Well #2. Please note that neither Well #1 nor Well #2 is part of the proposed Community Housing Project.

Attachment 1: Comment letter from Matt Banta dated 4 August 2020

August 4, 2020

14175 Saddlebow Dr.
Reno NV, 89511
775-843-1908
mbantah2o@yahoo.com

Mono County Board of Supervisors
P.O. Box 715
Bridgeport, CA 93517

Regarding: Tioga Inn Project - Water Resource Development Plan (General Comments)

Dear Mono County Board of Supervisors,

Greetings, my name is Matt Banta. I am of over five generations to have been born and raised in the Eastern Sierra and of four generations whom have called Lee Vining and the Mono Basin home. I am a graduate of Mammoth High School, a community volunteer, and an advocate of preserving the intrinsic values of wild unspoiled places, such as the Mono Basin. I am proponent of sustainable development and industry. I am also a professional hydrogeologist with many years of experience in various development markets.

For over two decades, the Tioga Inn Project (Project) has been in a process of on-going planning and feasibility level studies. From a water resources perspective, the data presented from previous groundwater and surface water resource evaluations is insufficient to defensibly establish baseline data required to evaluate cumulative impacts. Specifically, impacts resulting from the long-term stress to the underlying alluvial groundwater system has not been characterized in accordance with acceptable engineering practices. Impacts to surface water resources, i.e. Lee Vining Creek, and regional seeps and springs have not been assessed. A hydrologic study area (HSA) has not been established, nor has the hydrology within the HSA been characterized to define basic hydrological parameters. At minimum, these baseline parameters should include characterizing the groundwater flow direction, gradient, transmissivity, and storage coefficients of the underlying aquifer(s). The current hydrological evaluation supporting the Project is insufficient in characterizing these parameters and does not address feasibility level impacts since it lacks site specific data.

The following provides a summary of data gaps which must be addressed to defensibly evaluate cumulative impacts and provide feasibility level design specifications for the Project:

1. The Project does not provide a detailed water balance and the yearly duty of groundwater extraction has not been completely defined. For example, there is no accounting for construction water demand through each phase of development. It is unclear if the existing

water supply well has sufficient capacity to support construction and dust suppression activities during summer months. Has Mono County accounted for all components of the Project's water demand and can the existing well support those demands through the life of the Project? Please provide a detailed water balance accounting for each development phase to ensure the existing well can support the entire Project. Please also provide a statement indicating no water will be required from the Lee Vining community water system to supplement the existing supply well(s) during construction activities.

2. As indicated above, baseline water resource parameters have not been characterized. It is not clear what the gradient or direction of groundwater flow beneath the Project is. Without this basic information, future downgradient groundwater monitoring wells cannot be located to establish baseline conditions or monitor for potential impacts resulting from the proposed wastewater management system. At minimum, three piezometers must be installed in the vicinity of the proposed system to define the gradient and groundwater flow direction. The elevation of groundwater measured from the piezometers will be required to properly establish a defensible downgradient monitoring location, which is currently lacking from the plan.

3. There has been no long-term aquifer test to assess boundary conditions or establish aquifer parameters such as Transmissivity or Storativity (T&S) outside the vicinity of the existing wellbore. These parameters are required to simulate a long-term stress to the underlying groundwater system and should be based on realistic Projects extraction rates. The data generated from the short-term well test indicated drawdown occurred to an approximate elevation of 6,252 feet above mean sea level (feet amsl) at an extraction rate of 150 gallons per minute (GPM) over 4-hours. The approximate surface elevation of Mono Lake located 1-mile east of the well is 6,400 feet amsl. The short-term test indicates drawdown will occur below the elevation of Mono Lake at a pumping rate of 150 GPM. A longer-term test conducted at a pumping rate which realistically simulates the operational demand of the Project will be required to determine if long-term drawdown also persist at a lower rate or, if near steady state conditions can be achieved in the aquifer.

4. The head dynamics between Lee Vining Creek, Mono Lake, and the seeps and spring in the vicinity of Mono Lake, vs. the long-term groundwater demand (still to-be-defined) have not been examined. Since there is no analyses of constant head or constant flux boundaries, it is unknown if the Project's pumping wells will reverse the hydraulic gradient in a direction away from Mono Lake back towards the extraction wells. In this case, the fresh water alluvial aquifer system which the Project wells are located may be contaminated with saline lake water. This dynamic must be defined to eliminate potential to degrade waters of the State and not violate regulations protecting fresh-water aquifers. Additionally, seeps and springs in the vicinity of

Mono Lake may cease to flow through prolonged extraction from the alluvial groundwater system. Please provide evidence that the long-term net extraction of groundwater, including the demand for construction water will not impact other water resources in terms of direct impacts to water quality and discharge rates.

5. Since storage parameters and boundary conditions have not been defined, there is no defensible evidence indicating the Project's long-term use of groundwater will not impact the neighboring domestic well located on the Andrews' property, approximately 0.75 miles south of the Project. Please provide evidence indicating the Andrews Well will not be impacted by the Project, or provide a monitoring, mitigation and maintenance plan to address potential impacts to the nearby domestic well.

In terms of feasibility, the capital expenditures to construct and maintain new wells which are designed to be in compliance with California well standards, the storage tanks, wastewater treatment system, and all other water conveyance systems requires further examination to define the magnitude of respective impacts. For example, drilling of additional wells or piezometers will likely be required to meet future permit conditions or operational demands. This work will be completed at the expense of the Project proponent. The most recent Project well was spud in October 2019 and completed in early summer 2020 (over half a year to complete one well). The well was poorly designed and will likely have a well-life similar to the Proponent's original water supply well. Has Mono County considered the visual impacts associated with a single well drilling program which was drug out over the course of half a year? Please consider supporting a timeframe for completion of any new wells to avoid prolonging undue degradation of visual resources within the Mono Basin.

In closing, please be aware this comment letter was not solicited from any single organization. From a technical water resource perspective, the existing baseline data and impact analyses is not sufficient to support the Project, nor is it defensible. From a personal perspective, the people who live and recreate in the Mono Basin are distinctively tied to the waters. These waters are sacred and have been protected for thousands of years with the lives of countless individuals dedicated to its preservation. We would be abandoning our duties as scientist and remiss as stewards of this remarkably unique environment if we ignore our responsibility to complete the full due analysis based on the best available science. Anything less would desecrate the work and the path set forth by those individuals who fought tirelessly to protect these extraordinary resources from exploitation.

With urgency, please consider filling the data gaps which are required to defensibly evaluate cumulative impacts and provide realistic feasibility level water resource design specifications for the Project.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Matt D. Banta", with a horizontal line underneath.

Matt Banta

Mono County response in blue, dated Sept. 22, 2020.

To Whom It May Concern:

September 1, 2020

I, Angela Williams Eddy a Mono Lake Kutzadika'a Tribal member/Tribal Council Vice Chairwoman writing this letter with concerns, facts and reasons that no building or disturbance of our sacred lands in the Tioga Inn project. I am opposed to this project.

Thank you for your letter and the information you have provided. The Mono County Community Development Department (Department) recognizes that the entire landscape is considered traditional lands of the Kutzadika'a Tribe and respects the Tribe's cultural heritage. At the same time, the Department must honor current legal land use laws and private property owner rights.

Our concerns are that Native artifacts have been found on this land and in the area.

In the original archaeological survey for the project, conducted in 1984, portions of the Lee Vining Ditch and associated 20th-century artifacts were recorded, as well as an obsidian flake and a small pumice block. Because that survey was over 30 years old, the project area was resurveyed in 2016 for the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR). Eleven isolated artifacts were documented during that survey; four of these were obsidian flakes, the others include cans and can fragments that date to the mid- to late 20th century, a whiteware bowl dating to between 1958 and 1980, a saw-cut stump, and asphalt fragments. The Lee Vining Ditch was determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources in 1996 as part of the Highway 395 widening project. Even with the additional biface found by a tribal member in 2020, none of the isolates meet the criteria for the California Register of Historical Resources, either individually or taken together.

Its also known as a walking path of the Mono Lake Kutzadika'a tribe to and from town, to the known areas of our people that lived out by Williams Bluff, Cane Ranch, Rush Creek , Tioga pass, and Yosemite. The fact that multiple cry dances took place in this area in which it makes it sacred land. A fact that I have knowledge of and took part in 1988 when my Great Grandmother (Hutsi) Vina Williams took her journey. This area is important to our heritage, culture, people and the future of our people.

The County recognizes that not all Tribal Cultural Resources will be found during archaeological survey and, following the provisions of AB 52, consultation was held with the Kutzadika'a Tribe. In meetings with the county staff, Tribal representatives identified several concerns, including public safety, traffic, noise, and competition with existing Lee Vining motels. Many of these concerns are shared by members of the public, and the EIR has addressed them and identified mitigation measures where appropriate.

The Kutzadika'a Tribe and the Bridgeport Indian Colony also stated concerns about the potential for human burials to be encountered during ground disturbance: as we understand it, burials were often not marked, and if they were located away from villages, there would be few artifacts accompanying them. To address this concern, the applicant voluntarily agreed to adopt a mitigation measure to provide some funding for monitoring by qualified tribal members and/or training for the construction crew. The mitigation measure was accepted in an email dated 13 January 2020 from Michael Godbe, the attorney from California Indian Legal Services representing the Tribe.

The Department recognizes the importance of cry dances. To the owner's knowledge, no cry dances have taken place on the property for the past approximately 37 years since he has been the owner. We realize that cry dances and other traditions and ceremonies have likely occurred in the vicinity, given the Kutzadika'a's long history in the area, and that the landscape in its entirety is sacred to indigenous people. It is beyond the scope of the current analysis to address the management of sacred lands in general, but we hope that with continued communication and collaboration, the County and the Tribe will be able to work together to better acknowledge and honor the Kutzadika'a's heritage. With that in mind, the County would be happy to facilitate a conversation between the Tribe and public land managers such as the Bureau of Land Management and/or Inyo National Forest to find and establish an appropriate cry dance site should the Tribe be interested. Given the current level of existing and approved development on the Tioga Inn Specific Plan site, the location is likely not ideal for a cry dance site regardless of the currently proposed project.

There are important concerns and questions we have about the contract that was approved in 1993. Was the tribe offered consultation or involved? Were there tribal monitors there when surveyed and when ground breaking began for the building of the gas station? Who? Were they certified? Why now?

In 1993, the California Environmental Quality Act did not readily or directly include California Native American tribes' knowledge and concerns. Although an archaeological survey was conducted at that time, Tribes were treated as regular members of the public, and were not afforded specific government-to-government consultation. The California state legislature tried to remedy this situation with Senate Bill (SB) 18, passed in 2005, and Assembly Bill (AB) 52, passed in 2014. The provisions of AB 52 have been incorporated into CEQA, Division 13 of the Public Resources Code. The County has followed the provisions of SB 18 and AB 52 for the currently proposed Specific Plan Amendment, but the 1993 approvals are not reconsidered as part of the current project.

Instead of building lets help local community businesses (motels) by using them as seasonal housing for the workers. Already a safety hazard with the gas station in that area, vehicles parked all over the side of road, people running and walking on HWY120 to get to and from those vehicles, a distraction from HWY395 for traffic

passing by. Also was having live entertainment part of the contract? Do they have permits? Do they have security and safety in place for the public? What about drinking and noise ordinances? I believe we should come together and renegotiate this contract do to the findings of Native Artifacts and the tribal sacred land.

Local motels and hotels are generally fully booked during the summer season when employee housing is at peak demand. However, these properties are welcome to utilize rooms at any time of the year for longer term rental housing; it is a private business choice that does not involve the County. As for the parking and pedestrian safety situation, both will be substantially reorganized and cleaned up in the current proposal. The project has coordinated with Caltrans on parking along State Route 120 and the entry roadway will be slightly reconfigured to improve traffic circulation. The live entertainment is considered an allowable ancillary use to the deli and is being formally acknowledged under the current proposed project, alcoholic beverage consumption is regulated by the California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC), and all uses on the site are required to comply with the noise ordinance as set forth in Mono County Code.

So in closing can we please compromise, work together to come up with another solution? You have the Gas station that is making a great deal of money, while serving the community and tourist. More building just destroys mother earth and brings more people into a very content small community. Than it soon becomes a crowded over populated city and you lose the tourist. Another fact is that it is a Native sacred site being artifacts have been found on the land and that cry dances took place in that area. Our people are asking please leave our sacred land undisturbed? Our heritage, culture, traditions, land and people are very important to us.

Unfortunately, the County is not currently revisiting the development approvals issued in 1993 under the current project proposal. During review of the current project proposal, several concerns were identified by the Tribe and addressed through a voluntary agreement by the property owner to fund cultural monitoring by qualified tribal members and/or training for the construction crew in identification of cultural resources. Other compromises and project revisions by the property owner include: the provision of housing to alleviate the housing need in the county, reduction in scale of the original project (which proposed a third story on the hotel and a larger restaurant), a secondary emergency access road, solar panels, a recycled water system, lighting restrictions exceeding the County's regulations for dark sky protection, and several others that will be listed in the 13 October 2020 staff report for the upcoming Board of Supervisors meeting. Please let us know if you have any specific additional mitigations to propose for the current project, which is the only proposed development under consideration at this time.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Thank you again for your letter, and for your prior participation in the Kutzadika'a's consultation with the county. We recognize your continuing cultural ties to the land and the importance of your traditional heritage, and appreciate the Tribe's efforts to help us meet our responsibilities under CEQA. In addition to the offer to help identify a cry dance site, the County is happy to support the Tribe's effort for federal recognition which has been introduced by Congressman Cook. Please let us know if the Tribe has any interest in pursuing either of these two issues.

Angela (Williams) Eddy
Mono Lake Kutzadika'a Tribal Member/Vice Chairwoman

From: [charlotte Lange](#)
To: [Wendy Sugimura](#)
Cc: [Bob Gardner](#)
Subject: Re: Kutzadika" Tribe comments on Tioga Inn
Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020 12:52:29 AM

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

Thanks for the info.
Charlotte

On Tue, Sep 22, 2020, 9:22 PM Wendy Sugimura <wsugimura@mono.ca.gov> wrote:

Dear Chairwoman Lange:

Supervisor Gardner asked me to follow up further and provide the details about the Andrews well that is referenced in my email.

The staff report for the 6 August 2020 Board of Supervisors meeting states, "The Team Engineering study shows that the Tioga Inn well is not in the Lee Vining Creek watershed, or any of the Lee Vining Creek sub-watersheds, and also shows that the Tioga well is in the same watershed as the Andrews well, but not in the same aquifer as the Andrews well. Additional information concerning the Andrews well is provided in FSEIR Topical Response #11, Water Quality and Water Supply."

The Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (FSEIR) states the following: "The project hydrologist has reviewed and analyzed concerns raised by the Mono Lake Kutzadika'a Tribe regarding project impacts on the neighboring Andrews family Indian allotment wells. By way of background, the Andrews family in 1980 installed a well on their property at a depth of 250 feet; the well did not reach groundwater. In 1992, the family hired Maranatha to drill through the bottom of the original hole to a new depth of 370 feet. With the second effort, Maranatha did reach groundwater, and the new well produced groundwater at an estimated rate of 30 gallons per minute (gpm). The static water level of the new well stabilized at 230 feet.

The Andrews well was drilled in a comparatively small groundwater basin located about 1 mile south of the Tioga wells. The groundwater basin tapped by the Andrews well is geologically separated from the Tioga well by the Sierra Range Front Fault System. Based on this review, the hydrologist concludes that the failure of the initial Andrews well resulted from insufficient well depth, and that the low groundwater production rate of the second Andrews well is due to the small diameter of the well and the completed depth of the well (i.e., not deep enough). The reason this well cannot be deepened is that it is already cased with 4 inch diameter casing (i.e., the 4-inch diameter casing cannot support a larger pump

than what is in it now; to drill deeper would require a 3 inch diameter casing and a much smaller pump, further reducing production from this well).

The pump stress test conducted for the proposed Community Housing Project showed no interference with the Winston well, which is located northwest of and in the same groundwater basin as the Tioga well, and is nearly the same distance away as the Andrews well. Even if no recharge to the basin occurred in a given year, the project hydrologist indicates that it is highly unlikely there would be a noticeable drop in the groundwater levels of surrounding wells solely due to annual production from the Tioga well. Based on these considerations, the project hydrologist has a 95% confidence level that there will be no interaction between the Tioga and Andrews' wells resulting from groundwater production in these two wells.”

I have attached the 6 August 2020 staff report, the Team Engineering study, and FSEIR Topical Response #11 for your convenience.

Thank you,

Wendy Sugimura

Community Development Director

760.924.1814

From: Wendy Sugimura
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2020 5:07 PM
To: Charlotte Lange <char54lange@gmail.com>
Cc: Bob Gardner <bgardner@mono.ca.gov>
Subject: Kutzadika'a Tribe comments on Tioga Inn

Dear Chairwoman Lange:

The Mono County Community Development Department is in receipt of your email dated August 9 commenting on the Tioga Inn Specific Plan Amendment, as well as emails from Vicki Glazier, Jocelyn Sheltraw, and Angela Williams Eddy. Mono County welcomes these comment letters from the Tribe and tribal members.

The concerns raised in the recent emails, including water usage, potential depletion of the Andrews well, law enforcement, medical services, and impacts to community character have been addressed in the published materials on the project and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis. Concerns about pollution and land fill are also addressed in the CEQA analysis; please let me know if there are specific aspects of those issues that were not considered.

Lastly, although not mentioned in any of the emails, testimony from the Tribe at the August public hearing indicated an arrowhead was found on the site. The Community Development Department recognizes that the project area is within the traditional territory of the Kutzadika'a and that the evidence of your ancestors' use of the land may well be found in the project area. The archaeological survey conducted for the project documented a few other isolated artifacts, although no archaeological sites or historic properties potentially eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources were discovered. During our previous consultations, we identified a mitigation measure that is being voluntarily provided by the applicant for the discovery of cultural resources during the project implementation. We understand that the mitigation measure resolved that issue, as indicated in an email dated January 13, 2020, from Michael Godbe, the attorney from California Indian Legal Services representing the Tribe.

Thank you again for the Tribe's input. Mono County values input from the Tribe and recognizes the need to be respectful of traditional lands and values while also adhering to our responsibilities to private landowners.

Thank you,

Wendy Sugimura

Community Development Director

PO Box 347

1290 Tavern Road, Suite #138

Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

760.924.1814



Michael Draper

From: Wendy Sugimura
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 9:34 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: FW: Tioga Inn

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Wendy Sugimura
Community Development Director
760.924.1814

-----Original Message-----

From: Bob Gardner <bgardner@mono.ca.gov>
Sent: Saturday, August 8, 2020 9:12 PM
To: Wendy Sugimura <wsugimura@mono.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: Tioga Inn

FYI

-----Original Message-----

From: Vicki Glazier <vickimnolk@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 8, 2020 8:27 PM
To: Bob Gardner <bgardner@mono.ca.gov>
Subject: Tioga Inn

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

Mr. Gardner,

I strongly oppose the work force housing project being proposed in Lee Vining. As a restaurant and hotel have already been approved, that in itself will hurt the established businesses in Lee Vining. I grew up in Lee Vining and always appreciated the sense of community. Tioga Inn will undoubtedly become a community of itself. Seasonal workers will be moving in and out, with no plans of permanent residency. What about law enforcement and medical services? Those services are limited as it now. The Paiute people lived and traveled all throughout that area and to see the destruction of more our homeland is devastating.

Sincerely,

Vicki Glazier
Mono Lake Kutzadika Tribal Member

Sent from my iPad

Michael Draper

From: Wendy Sugimura
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 11:32 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: FW: Tioga Inn Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Wendy Sugimura

Community Development Director
760.924.1814

From: Bob Gardner <bgardner@mono.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2020 10:52 AM
To: Wendy Sugimura <wsugimura@mono.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: Tioga Inn Project

FYI

From: charlotte Lange <char54lange@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 9, 2020 10:19 PM
To: Bob Gardner <bgardner@mono.ca.gov>
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

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

Supervisor Bob Gardner,
I am sending this email expressing my opposition to the Tioga Inn Project.
The community of Lee Vining needs to be kept serene, safe and the traditional lands not disturbed as best we can.
The amount of more pollution, land fill, water usage and the well depletion for the Andrew's family are more concerns.
Thank you for your time in considering our request.
Charlotte Lange,
Mono Lake Kutzadika Chairperson

Michael Draper

From: Wendy Sugimura
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 8:44 AM
To: CDD Comments
Subject: FW: Tioga Inn Project

Wendy Sugimura

Community Development Director
760.924.1814

From: Bob Gardner <bgardner@mono.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 8:41 AM
To: Wendy Sugimura <wsugimura@mono.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: Tioga Inn Project

FYI

From: Bob Gardner
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 8:40 AM
To: Jocelyn Sheltraw <jocelynscheltraw@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Tioga Inn Project

Dear Jocelyn,

Thank you for your comments. I will make sure it gets included in the public comments for the Tioga Inn project.

Bob Gardner
Mono County Supervisor

From: Jocelyn Sheltraw <jocelynscheltraw@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 11:11 PM
To: Bob Gardner <bgardner@mono.ca.gov>
Subject: Tioga Inn Project

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

Hello Supervisor Bob Gardner,

I am emailing you today to express my opposition to the Tioga Inn Project.

I believe that the community of Lee Vining should be kept serene and safe, ultimately ensuring that the traditional lands are the least disturbed as possible. I have concerns over increases in pollution, landfill, and water usage. The well depletion for the Andrew's family is concerning as well.

Thank you for your time in considering our request.

Be well,
Jocelyn Sheltraw
Mono Lake Kutzadika Preservation Chairperson