

JUNE LAKE

Citizen Advisory Committee

PO Box 347
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546
760-924-1800 phone, 924-1801 fax
commdev@mono.ca.gov

PO Box 8
Bridgeport, CA 93517
760-932-5420 phone, 932-5431 fax
www.monocounty.ca.gov

Draft Minutes

Wednesday February 4, 2026 – 6:00 p.m.
June Lake Community Center 90 W. Granite Ave in June Lake, CA

1. **6:01 Call to order by chair, pledge of allegiance, introductions**

CAC members present: Julie Brown, Claire Landowski, David Rosky, Janet Hunt, Kelsey Mooney, Gary Johansen

2. **Public comment** (*for items not on agenda—please limit comments to 3 minutes*) – none

3. **Action Items**

a. All-remote attendance options

New Brown Act regulations would allow us to meet entirely remotely –

David Rosky – clarification question, having the authorization does not require we always meet remotely, correct? Just would be able to meet during storms etc

Janet Hunt – so if I'm out of town I would be able to remotely join and be part of quorum

--yes

David – would we be able to always run hybrid meetings?

--Wendy Sugimura – we're working out technology that would enable us to offer hybrid meetings every time

Julie – how far in advance of the meeting would we have to decide?

--with at least 72 hours notice, though legally you can do it up until the meeting is held; ideally we would make the decision before the first posting of the agenda.

Janet – do we have remote attendants today?

--yes but it's been done tonight by special request

Kelsey – could we all still meet here if we wanted to?

--we'd want to know that it's being run as a hybrid meeting so that we can everything set up in advance

Claire -- what is the mechanism for deciding when we meet in in person or remote?

--you'd decide in consultation with the chair ahead of time

Dave: move to make a motion to request a remote meeting option, Janet seconds. Motion passes 7-0

b. Election of CAC officers

Julie nominates Claire for secretary, Kevin seconds, motion passes 7-0

Dave nominates John DeCoster to be vice chair, Janet seconds, motion passes 7-0

Claire nominates Julie to be chair, Janet seconds, motion passes 7-0

4. **Informational/Discussion Items**

a. Clark and Peterson roads (Emily Fox of County Counsel, Kalen Dodd of Public Works)

Supervisor McFarland: roads are one of the issues I hear from people about most often, I have walked all the roads in Clark and Peterson. Public works is here to provide context and history about how we arrived here at the private roads issue and what our future might look like. But the future really depends on a neighborhood's ability to cooperate, identify how work can be done, and move forward

Sean: I'm a surveyor so I look at everything through the lens of maps and property lines. First map was Silver Lake Pines I in 1925, then another map in 1927 – combined number of parcels was 2,185, but only several hundred were able to be developed into homes. These parcels were drawn without any regard for what was actually on the ground. The roads did not develop within the rights of way that were designated—some examples from Steelhead and Texas, where a house was built in the middle of the right of way. Some of the rights of way were designated as 25', that's great, but in many places just 8', like Hillside Road. We have many challenges from a surveying perspective.

Q: in the cases where the roads do follow the right of way, who owns the right of way?

--County Counsel Emily Fox will handle that in a moment

Paul R: Mono County does have standards in place for how roads should be developed. In general if roads are to be public roads, they need 60' rights of way. In some places we knew that would be a problem and side-stepped that—for example in the village, the standard right of way is 25'. So, I would be in favor of—if everyone were interested in giving right of way, rallying together—of designating 25' as the standard for other tracts. But fire access is critical. 25' is not quite up to CalFire standards. We are applying for an earmark to improve the roads in the Peterson tract, but one requirement is that the RoW is 25' and has a second egress.

Ann Tozier: why would the county allow people to build in the right of way?

Paul R: Emily can speak to that more later, but in short, if the county doesn't allow people to build on their property, that becomes a take. Also remember that in 1925, the paths were wide enough for a horse and that seemed wide enough at the time. Personally I don't prefer zones of benefit – I think they aren't fair – so I believe it's better if the roads can be brought into the county system.

A few numbers: Peterson tract has \$137,000 in its pocket now; that number has fluctuated some over the years. The projection for next year is that it will be a little higher. But \$100k only gets you about 100 feet of road. \$40,500 per year is generated from the zone of benefit in Peterson.

Jerry Hallum: our zone of benefit was established 36 years ago.... We are essentially being taxed without representation ... I came here tonight with the hope of dissolving our zone of benefit so that we can improve the roads.

Paul R: one answer is to reassess property lines based on where the roads are – this was done in the Bluffs in Mammoth Lakes, for example.

Jerry: additionally, the Peterson roads are designated class 3, so we end up being plowed last and paying for the county's overtime.

Paul R: I'd like to see the subdivision get the best price possible, whether that's private plowing or county.

Jerry: And that's just plowing, not considering cost of road maintenance

Paul R: Yep, again my preference would be to bring the roads into the County roads system

Supervisor McF: for reference, how much did it cost in the Bluffs to do the reassessment and realignment?

Paul R: \$2.1 million in 1998 for 80 parcels. It took a full year before construction and then another year of construction

Alan: in the Clark tract, \$3,399 per parcel real assessment versus initial estimate of \$665 per parcel. The real cost is probably more like \$5,000 per parcel, and that's unaffordable for many folks in the tract. The tract voted on the roads being brought to the county several times and it was voted down each time.

Emily Fox: private vs public roads – California is riddled with private roads in private subdivisions. Every owner of property technically owns the road, in part. This comes from a private landowner parceling it out and then the roads stay private as it's developed. County has to make road standards in order to receive funding from state and federal sources – for example CalFire. The county cannot accept a road unless it meets the base standards – 12' for a one-way, 25' for a two-way. State code 845 requires that everyone chip in for the roads in a private subdivision.

Ann: but this can be so hard because it's based on use

Emily: yes, but what usually happens is that this ends up going to superior court and a special master is assigned – usually an engineer of some kind – that figures out who owes what based on the parcels, ownership and use. To go back to what Paul was saying about giving up the zone of benefit and submitting the roads to the county – just about everyone would have to give up some of their lot, but you get the benefit of a county maintained road and fire access.

Jerry: what about in the case where the lots are reduced beyond development standards of the county

Emily: county can't really say no to building a house as long as the lot is reasonable, but if you have a house that is within the right of way, there really aren't any good options. Yeah I've basically stood up here for ten minutes and said it's very ugly and complicated and bad.

Also the legislation for zones of benefit was enacted in 1992, and at the time they didn't require a board be formed. So this is why Peterson doesn't have a board, but they should consider enacting one. I will look into figuring out how the Peterson tract could form a board

Paul R: I feel obligated to mention the cost of road maintenance – it's quite expensive for the county to do this work, so it would be more cost-effective for the tract to get together and do the work yourselves.

Jerry: what will be the process if our single egress in Peterson tract fails?

Emily: in the worst case scenario, I think there would be state and federal money to respond to that emergency

Paul R: We also have applications in for a couple of earmarks in the range of \$1M that would help repair that if we can bring the roads up the standard

Sup McF: I brought two folks from from public works out to look and they agree that the Reversed Creek crossing will be the first project when it warms up. It's into the community's hands

- b. Mammoth200 race course modification through Clark & Peterson tracts (Tim Tollefson, Mammoth200)

My wife Lindsay and I are professional runners and have started a small business to host races here in mammoth. We're getting a lot of local engagement and excited to give back in the form of USFS VSA, partnership with mammoth lakes rec, etc. This presentation is just informational –

Last year we launched a new event called the mammoth 200. It's a 214 mile foot race that takes 5 days, 250 participants. Last year people came through the June lake loop; we are looking to be a good neighbor. We would like to move people off Highway 158 and onto the roads of the Clark and Peterson tract – there would be no vehicles, crew, spectator access, leave no trace. 2026 event will be Oct. 2. We're looking to involve the community as much as possible – that adds value to the runners and the community both. You can reach me at info@mammothtrailfest.com and I look forward to hearing from you.

Jen VanDragt: concern about the section of trail between Peterson tract and June Mountain – will this be publicized on Strava, is there a way to prevent that?

Tim: as an event we could refrain from publishing the route in full, but the runners' tracks will be uploaded eventually. I'm very sensitive to that as well, but that section has been populated into CalTopo as a USFS trail, which is how I made the route, as well as on Strava.

Phil Sutphin: I live at the end of the Peterson trail, and it's a small trail – having 250 people move through there would really affect the trail

Tim: we are in consultation with the USFS who designates the use level of trails – we're really sensitive to that concern

5. **7:43 pm Monthly reports**

a. Supervisor's Report (*Paul McFarland*)

We'll be able to bring the small business administration to mono county to help businesses who were affected by the power outages to be able to apply for low-interest loans to cover losses

Matt paruolo from SCE will be here next month to discuss the Christmas outage and the work ahead for the spring and summer. SCE is pushing off most of the planned outages for the winter until spring

b. CAC Chair

June Mountain is open, and the skiing is great

c. Member reports/comments

Dave – Clark tract has voluntary road maintenance fund. We fully depleted the fund last year so Wendy and I started a new fundraiser, we have about \$17k now. In spring we will evaluate what needs work and reach out to the community.

Claire – Sierra STEM is continuing Friday Night Science Club, the next one is Feb 13, theme is Darwin Day. March 13 will be Pi Day celebration, and April will be the last one before we break for the summer, April 17 is an Earth Day theme. Summer camps registration opens March 15 in person and March 16 online. See sierrastem.org/camps for more info

d. 7:55 pm Planning Update (*Erin Bauer*)

5 STR applications that are in process (for context, there were 7 STRs approved in all of 2025 and 13 housing units in the county in 2025)

Other current development projects: One is a 4-apt rental on Granite Ave. The Poe project is back, it seems they're configuring it as a lodge. Victory Lodge is on the path toward applying for use as a commercial space. Bear Paw RV proposal, developers are engaged but no formal movement yet.

Commercial land use designation changes coming to the board of supervisors later the spring.

6. **Community Updates**

a. Women's Club

Kelsey – I joined the Women's Club! I am very excited to be officially a part of it, it's been a long time coming.

Women's club donated a total of \$41,643 to various local organizations including Sierra STEM, Lee Vining ASB, Mono Lake Committee Experience Ambientalia, June Lake Arts, June Lake Triathlon. Also gave \$12,00 in scholarships; thrift store brought in \$16k

b. Chamber of Commerce

Kevin – Frosty Walkabout this Saturday, tour through participating businesses for snacks and raffle tickets

7. **Future agenda items**

- a. Southern California Edison (Matt Paruolo, March)
- b. Golden State Connect high speed internet (Shayne Pope and Kyle Zimbelman of GSC, May)
- c. Community Garden
- d. Gull Lake Park Electrical Enhancement
- e. National Forest Foundation Fuel Reduction on June Mountain, Summer 2026.

8. CAC meeting: March 4, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

9. **7:58 pm Adjourn**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, anyone who needs special assistance to attend this meeting can contact the RPAC coordinator at 760-924-1805 within 48 hours prior to the meeting in order to ensure accessibility (see 42 USCS 12132, 28CFR 35.130). Agenda items may not be taken in order, agenda item times are estimated.

CAC MEMBERS

Julie Brown, John DeCoster, Janet Hunt, Claire Landowski, Kevin Larsen,
David Rosky, Gary Johanson, Kelsy Glastetter