



Van Sickle CA/NV Bi-State Park

APPENDIX II MASTER PLAN SUMMARY REPORT JUNE 2005

DESIGN WORKSHOP
PARSONS
JWA
CONSORTIUM WEST
KLEINFELDER
SUSAN LINDSTROM
WESTERN BOTANICAL
SERVICES
LSC TRANSPORTATION
TURNER AND ASSOCIATES

Appendix II - Master Plan Summary Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Public Workshop 1 Participants and Minutes
2. Public Workshop 2 Participants and Minutes
3. Public Workshop 3 Participants and Minutes
4. Steering Committee Meeting 1 Participants and Minutes
5. Steering Committee Meeting 2 Participants and Minutes
6. Steering Committee Meeting 3 Participants and Minutes
7. Steering Committee Meeting 4 Participants and Minutes
8. Steering Committee Meeting 5 Participants and Minutes
9. Advisory Committee Meeting 2 Participants and Minutes
10. Advisory Committee Meeting 3 Participants and Minutes



Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Memorandum

To: Participants Public Workshop #1
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Date: July 31, 2003
Project Name: Van Sickle CA/NV Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Attendance List & comment sheets
Copy To:

Steve Weaver
David Hamilton
Kristine Roberts
Jennifer Hannum
Pat Deadder
Rori Cosma
Steve Anteaga
Jay Howard
Garry Bowen
Deanna Weber
Judy Clot
Scarlett Skelton
Craig Robinson
Susan Wood
Rene Hoogendijh
Randy Moore
Bill Kolstad
Russ Thaw
Russell Wey
Yale Spina
Tom Wendell
Brian Jonas

Comments (6 comment sheets were returned):

How did you find out about the public workshop?

- Most respondents found out about the workshop through the newspaper (Tahoe Daily Tribune). One heard KLOL announcements. One saw a poster.

Are there any specific issues you feel we should address?

- Through traffic from CA to NV (hike or bike) – Keller Road level to lower Kingsbury Grade
- Special interest facilities designed by that special interest group, for example, disc golf

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Aspen • Denver • Jackson Hole • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Vail • Santa Cruz • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

- Forest Stewardship Day should be incorporated into the planning process (September 20)
- Limit parking by providing for alternative access

What are your thoughts regarding tonight's presentation?

Generally, respondents indicated the presentation was good.

- There was a request made for maps showing the location of existing roads and trails in surrounding areas were requested

Additional comments?

- Have an off leash dog trail, preferably accessible or connecting to all 3 trail heads (upper California, lower California and Nevada)
- Have an easy interpretive trail near the CA entrance
- Thanks for including the public for input and ideas
- Tahoe needs a leash free dog park, agility courses
- Design team and agencies need to be involved with Forest Stewardship Day.

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record

To: Meeting Attendees
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Steve Noll
Date: July 25, 2003
Project Name: Henry Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Public Workshop #1
Meeting Date: 7/10/03
Start/End: 6:00 – 8:00
Location: Augustus Room, Caesars, Tahoe
Attendees: see attached list

The following is a summary of the discussions held at the above referenced meeting.

Introductions:

A welcome and introductions were given by Steve Noll from Design Workshop Inc.

Powerpoint Presentation:

A powerpoint presentation was given by Steve Weaver and Steve Noll to locate the site, and to outline the history and process the establishment of the park has followed to date. Some existing site conditions were discussed, followed by an explanation of the design process.

Images were shown to generate thought regarding potential recreation uses for the park, with the point being made that State Park use is distinct from regional and local park functions.

The function of the workshop was identified as soliciting information from the public regarding potential recreation uses for the park. The exercise to be used for this purpose was explained – the dot exercise. Participants were asked to add uses to the list already prepared and then stick colored dots next to the uses, indicating their preferences.

Questions:

Questions were taken before the exercise and are listed with responses below:

1. Clarification was requested regarding the stated “inadequacy” of access potential from the Nevada side of the park
 - Existing access to the South Tahoe Public Utility Site is too steep and narrow to be used as a primary access to the park. It could be used as secondary access.
2. What will happen to gain access at the corner points of the 2 major parcels?

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Aspen • Denver • Jackson Hole • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Vail • Santa Cruz • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

- This is under consideration but will probably be achieved through an access easement and could potentially be accommodated through land swapping with the USFS.
3. Will there be access from residential streets in Nevada, particularly Easy Street?
 - This is not suitable for a main entrance with frequent access.
 4. Where are the fire trails located?
 - All trails need to be mapped more comprehensively with GPS. Connections to Easy Street on the Nevada side and Californian streets should be included.
 5. Can we e-mail the co-ordinates of the park?
 - If specifically requested, yes.
 6. The new road loop at Highway 50 was discussed. ‘New Alternative C’ was shown as one of 3 options being developed by TRPA and CalTrans. The main entrance to the park (off Park Avenue) was identified.
 7. How realistic is it to say a RV campground would be located in the park?
 - Demand for this use is high state-wide.
 - The topography will limit any RV camping. It will not be possible to have 100’s of RV’s. It may be possible to have 3x25 space loops with widely spaced camp areas.
 8. How is demand tested for this kind of facility?
 - From recreation surveys conducted by the TRPA, Nevada State Parks and California State Parks.

Steve Weaver from Nevada State Parks reiterated that the park is in the beginning stages of planning. The process will involve application of rules and regulations required by each agency in addition to environmental planning. These will influence the final recreation uses provided for in the park.

The Dot Exercise:

Participants were asked to add to the list of recreation uses (indicated in italics) and indicate their preferred uses with 4 green dots and 1 red dot per person by placing next to the listed activity. The red dots counted for 4 green dots. A summary of the results of the dot exercise is included below.

Activity	Green Dot	Red Dot
Amphitheatre	4	0
Camping - Hike-in	6	1
Camping – Tent	4	1
Camping - Group Tent	1	0
Camping – Vehicle	1	2
Camping - RV (hookup)	1	1
Camping - RV Group	0	0
Cabin Rental	0	0
Cross-Country Ski Trails	3	1
Equestrian Trails	3	0
Group Use Area	1	0
Hiking	4	0
Hiking –Accessible	1	0

Interpretive Center	3	0
Interpretive Trails	6	1
Mountain Bike Trails	3	5
Multi-Use Trails	5	1
Museum	3	0
Picnic Area	3	0
Snowshoe Trail	0	0
Snow Play Area	2	0
Trailheads w/Parking	1	1
Wildlife Viewing Area	2	0
<i>Disc Golf</i>	7	3
<i>Dog Park</i>	6	3
<i>Archery Range</i>	1	0
<i>User Specific Trail</i>	7	0
<i>Par Course (exercise)</i>	2	0
<i>Horseshoe Pits</i>	3	0
<i>Hike/Bike/Cross Country Cabin Network</i>	4	0
<i>Mountaineering Course</i>	3	0
<i>Ropes</i>	4	1
<i>Climbing/Bouldering Areas</i>	0	2

Discussion:

The results of the dot exercise were discussed. Comments and questions are outlined below:

- Bike-in campsites are a good addition to the list.
- A dog park is not consistent with CA State Park policy – how would this be dealt with if a dog park was a component of the program for the site?
 - The design team has to review and understand the parameters of each agency to develop partnership strategies and policy direction.
- What is the time-frame for building these recreation facilities?
 - The Master Plan will be complete by September/October 2003.
 - First phase construction work is projected for 2005/2006 and will contain the entrance/access road.
 - The park will not be complete by the time the CTC bike trail is installed.
- There was much discussion about facilities for dogs, focused on the range of facilities that could be provided for dogs and what would be appropriate for a State Park. Specific comments/suggestions included:
 - If a dog park is provided, facilities should be installed for large and small dogs.
 - Is this site particularly suitable for a dog park or is the demand because of a lack of facilities in the community? Is it an appropriate use for a State Park?
 - There are issues with dogs and wildlife. This could be mitigated by on-leash and off-leash trails/areas.
 - A dog park should have amenities such as pooper-scooper bags and a donation box for maintenance.
 - Dogs should be leashed.
 - A dog park is associated with urban areas. Is it appropriate for Van Sickle Bi-State Park?

- There is a lot of area on USFS property in the Tahoe Basin to walk dogs (visitors may not know the location of these areas or the access points to them).
- There could be a couple of designated trails for dogs within the trail network.
- A dog park would be beneficial for visitors to the Tahoe Basin. Van Sickle Bi-State Park offers a good location away from residential areas.
- There could be an off-leash area and an on-leash trail.

- The existing Par Course at Bijou is not used very much. These need to be designed to maximize the benefit of the workout. There could be the opportunity for corporate sponsorship involvement.

- There was general discussion re bike trails/pedestrian trails:
 - There could be a range of options from connecting to trails of USFS land for long rides, to a small loop.
 - Some trails in the network could be multiple use. Trails should not be duplicated and should have minimal environmental impact.
 - Pedestrians and bikes sometimes conflict with one another resulting in safety issues. Some bike trails should be kept separate from pedestrians and graded.
 - Multi-purpose trails could have signage, advising pedestrians to move to the left if a bike comes. This consistent movement would reduce conflict between users.
 - There are resources to build trails in the Basin with volunteer labor and workshops for training.
 - Existing trails should be mapped, restored and used where possible.

- Ski-between cabins were discussed:
 - Ski-in cabins exist at Spooner Lake.
 - Yurts would give flexibility to this idea and would not require an EIR.

- Does the rim trail come close to the park?
 - Not really. We may be able to have a connecting trail and are working with a representative from the Tahoe Rim Trail Association.

- Will hike-in tent camping be limited to designated spaces?
 - Probably so.

What next?

Participants were asked to fill out comment sheets (summary attached) and thanked for their attendance. Any additional feedback can be sent to Lindy Hulton-Larson at Design Workshop lhulton@designworkshop.com.

Next Meeting

Date: Tuesday August 19, 2003
 Time: 6:00 – 8:00 pm
 Location: TRPA – Governing Board Room

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

VAN SICKLE BI-STATE PARK

Public Workshop #2

Thursday, August 19, 2003

Attendees

Scarlett Skelton

Brian Jones

Don Lane

Jerry Yeazell

Bill Kingman

Bruce Eisner

Bill Chernock

Jason Rixey

David Fournier

Jennifer Hannum

Dave Hamilton

Kristine Roberts

Paulette Irving

Al Bonadonna

Joseph Fidel

Daniel Cressy

Shawn Butler

Jennifer Roman

Comments received after Workshop

Karla Jacobson

Cindy Beberg

Jan Carr

Stephanie McKinnon

Garry Bowen

Mark D. Voorhies

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record

To: Meeting Attendees
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Steve Noll
Date: September 05, 2003
Project Name: Henry Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Public Workshop #2
Meeting Date: 8/19/03
Start/End: 6:00 – 8:00
Location: Board of Directors Meeting Room,
TRPA
Attendees: see attached list

The following is a summary of the discussions held at the above referenced meeting.

Introductions:

A welcome and introductions were given by Steve Noll from Design Workshop Inc.

Powerpoint Presentation:

A brief powerpoint presentation was given by Steve Weaver from Nevada State Parks to locate the site, and to outline the history and process the establishment of the park has followed to date. Some existing site conditions were discussed, followed by an explanation of the design process.

Potential Alternatives:

Three potential alternative schemes for the park were presented by Lindy Hulton-Larson and Steve Noll from Design Workshop. All options included day use and overnight facilities but the mix of these varied. The first option focused on day use facilities, the second option focused on overnight facilities and the third included a mix of both.

The workshop participants were asked to comment on the schemes and indicate a preference if any.

Questions and comments:

Below is a list of questions and comments recorded on flip charts as participants spoke:

- Does everyone get charged? Vehicles/Pedestrians
- Staff on site? Homeless use – Permanent State Park Residence
- Entrance station would connect fees
 - CSP doesn't charge walk-ins

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Aspen • Denver • Jackson Hole • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Vail • Santa Cruz • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

- NSP does – flexible, operations agreement
- May have concessionaires
- Number of campsites?
 - Day focus – 50-60 vehicle, 10 walk-in
 - Day/Overnight Focus
 - 35-50 upper
 - 10-20 lower
- Camping limit – 14 days
- Campgrounds too close to roads?
 - Day and Day/Overnight
- Parks w/o hookups have noise issue, generators
- Separate campground areas for tents?
- Basin RV campgrounds not full in winter
 - Phase facilities depending on demand
- Walk-in campsites Zephyr Cove. 60% occupancy
- Visitors center should be linked to the barn area
- Disc golf and dog park?
 - Designated area/trail
 - Not a good mix with hiking trails
- Dog park
 - Possibility for funding through CSP
 - Not necessarily a local use
 - Traveling dogs need facilities
 - Maybe possible to have trails for dogs and owners
 - People and dogs like to socialize
- Amphitheatre
 - Programs needs though – too big/too small
 - Campfire
 - Could provide facility to intermix locals and visitors
 - Interpretive performances
 - Associate with visitors center?
- Forestry management?
 - Forest health needs to be addressed
- Provide facilities for hotel visitors, environmental education
- Demand for camping areas?
- Overnight/day use option preferred
- Don't duplicate camping facilities
 - Demand – close to lake? Location
 - Marketing study information
 - Other service providers
 - Feasibility for concessionaire
 - Demand addressed by phasing?
- Urban oriented day use
- Trail system only with trailheads + visitors center
- Skiing cross country?
- Alternatives in paper?

Steve Weaver from Nevada State Parks reiterated that the park is in the beginning stages of planning. The process will involve application of rules and regulations required by each agency in

addition to environmental planning. These will influence the final recreation uses provided for in the park.

Comment sheets:

Questionnaires and comment sheets were handed out to people as they arrived at the workshop. Below is a summary of the responses to each question:

1. How and when did you find out about the Public Workshop?
 - Post office
 - Member of advisory committee
 - Tahoe Daily Tribune
 - Design Workshop Poster at the USFS
 - Via mail
 - Tahoe Daily Tribune

2. What are your thoughts regarding tonight's presentation?
 - Thoughtful and thought provoking
 - Excellent presentation
 - Informative
 - I feel better informed as to the area of potential development
 - Good information - thank you

3. Do you have a preferred alternative?
 - Overnight use with campsites higher up
 - Day use alternative
 - Day use with walk-in campsites shown in overnight use alternative
 - Day/Overnight Use with initial higher elevation campgrounds phased
 - The overnight focus, perhaps with the visitor center closer to the entrance
 - Day use alternative – maximize facilities wherever possible.
 - Day and overnight use should be separated
 - Barn should be an interpretive center
 - Dog park should go in next to day use area. No green turf, only natural grasses and vegetation
 - Scenic resources should be accessible to all. If camping area includes scenic overlooks, camping spaces should be located away from there
 - Access points should be identified with trailhead markers on fringe area at CTC trail and eastern topmost access
 - Make rim trail connection if possible
 - Utilize existing trails and roads where possible

4. Are there any specific issues you feel we should address?
 - Use of volunteers and local non-profit agencies to help get the park started (Al Bonadonna – Tahoe Hardrockers Volunteer Group & Tahoe Youth Volunteers ph. 530 541 4594, e-mail al_bonadonna@hotmail.com)
 - Emphasis should be on day use and nature experience with environmental education
 - Cross country skiing – a groomed trail system
 - Dogs – but I understand the state parks' position
 - Really need a controlled area for a dog park. This location makes sense

5. Additional comments received post the workshop?

1. by e-mail:

I would really like to see a park that has trails where dogs, on leashes, could go. There should be wooden stands along the trail that hold poop bags, provided by the city and replenished by the park ranger. This makes it convenient for dog owners to pick up after their dogs (one of the biggest complaints in the dog park). Dogs are allowed off leash at certain times like in the mornings, before 10:00 or after 4:00 until dusk. This allows for those people that don't want dogs around to be able to enjoy the park as well.

Regarding the disc golf course, I would have to agree with the fact that it could pose a liability risk. I am a huge disc golf player and Santa Cruz has a huge area designated for just the disc golf course. This is because discs are flying everywhere. Sometimes discs can fly right in front of your car while you're driving up to the parking lot. If people are jogging with walkmans on the park trails, they might not hear someone warning them about a flying disc. I could see maybe a little par 3 putting course going in but not a course that would go around the park. I just feel that would cause more problems than it's worth.

2. by e-mail

Regarding your stance that dogs aren't consistent with park policy, then change the policy. Be bold, venture forward. This is 'our' community's chance to lead, instead of follow the tired, worn out old ways of thinking. Your old way of thinking isn't working and policy makers are excluding too many people when they don't include dogs or horses (if trails are going to be there).

We live in a wilderness area that keeps shrinking the 'acceptable' places that one can be outside in Tahoe with our pets. We pay taxes too and deserve to be able to take our furry friends and family members with us - outside - in a rural mountainous area that has beaches. And access is becoming available to only the rich, because they can pay the fines, they buy up the land and limit public use.

Because of the 'few' ignorant and lazy dog owners, our government keeps taking the easy 'let's just ban them all' stance, instead of going after irresponsible owners. I happen to work at a place that gets many calls asking for legal areas that visitors and locals alike can take their dogs to walk. Most are puzzled and a little angry that there is no place to take their dogs outside and be able to play off lead. The constant theme being "this is Tahoe, the mountains and I can't take my dog anywhere to roam and play outside".

If the new park is to become a reality - then our park needs to accommodate all - not just the ones who have the strongest voices at a meeting.

Please reconsider your stance and include all of our citizens' needs for this new park. Be inclusive, not restrictive.

What next?

Participants were thanked for their attendance. A public presentation will be held to present a preferred alternative and get input from members of the public. Attendants of Public Workshop #2 will be notified by mail. Any additional feedback can be sent to Lindy Hulton-Larson at Design Workshop lhulton@designworkshop.com.

Next Meeting Date & Location to be Determined

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

VAN SICKLE BI-STATE PARK

Public Workshop #3

Thursday, October 14, 2004

Attendees

Brad Eckert

David Morrow

Steve Weaver

Garrett Villanvera

Peter Eichar

R.S. Lynn

Eileen Pope

Bruce Pope

Bruce Eisner

Mark Kimbrough

Jerry Yeazell

Shawn Butler

Clay Grubb

Carolyn Grubb

Michael Donahoe

Erik Larson

Stephanie Grigsby

Patty Hill

Mike Arkell

Melanie Greene

Garth Alling

John Upton

Suzanne & Darryl Huff

Carol Vickrey

Bill Kostad

Nathan Rause

Virginia Mahacek

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record

To: Steering Committee
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Date: October 22, 2004
Project Name: Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Public Workshop #3
Meeting Date: 10/14/04
Start/End: 6:00 - 8:00 pm
Location: USFS Forest Service Offices
Copy To:

Meeting Telephone Conference Call

Following is a copy of the flip chart notes taken at the above referenced meeting. Refer to sign-in sheet for list of participants:

1. Public transit options?
2. Connection to Heavenly
 - a. Could there be a bike trail connection to/from Heavenly?
 - b. Dependent on TRPA regulations
3. What type of trails will be at the park? Multi-use?
 - a. Trail type depends on terrain and volume of use – may require parallel system
 - b. CSP prefers multi-use trails
4. Interface with South Lake Tahoe
 - a. Parallel trails in lower park to ensure “nature” trail feel
 - b. Multi-use trail in upper park
5. Specific trail plan is needed
 - a. Can maximize funding potential from federal sources
6. Lower mountain bike trail has sections up to 40% - needs rerouting
7. Tahoe Rim Rail is working with agencies and some corridors have been mapped

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Denver • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

8. Are equestrian trails going to be provided?
 - a. There is a deed restriction for commercial use
 - b. Possible to designate some trails accessible to equestrians
 - c. 3 different groups of equestrians were represented at the workshop
 - d. Can existing routes be used?
 - Rim trail access is desired
 - e. Construction for equestrians is possible
 - f. One potential issue is space for unloading horses
 - g. A group camping area could be dedicated to equestrian use
 - h. Multiple use trails are the main goal of equestrian use

9. Transit Center
 - a. Visitor information
 - b. Visitors have been asking for trails close to the transit center. This is consistent with trail concepts

10. #'s of visitors should be determined
 - a. Casino information – is there a way to gain access to this?
 - b. Caretaker living on site reports that the park currently gets a lot of use
 - c. If there are facilities, there could be many, many visitors

11. Size of CTC trailhead?
 - a. Approximately 20 parking spaces

12. Historical center? Museum of the Sierras
 - a. Eg. Buffalo Bill historical center Cody, Wyoming
 - b. Partners for funding
 - c. The historical center could be part of the Marriott Convention Center in the urban area

13. Winter use potential is still being considered
 - a. Grooming routes for cross country skiing?
 - b. Maintenance/management funding an issue
 - c. Trails could be used for cross country

14. Wildfire

15. Dogs in park – do they need to be leashed in more remote areas?

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Denver • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

Response to Questionnaire handed out at the Workshop

1. *How and when did you find out about the Public Workshop?*

- Flyer at CTC
- Email from M. Donahoe
- 10/13/04 Tribune article
- Bob Kingman and newspaper
- Jay Howard - if not for him we wouldn't have known. Why is this?
- Workshop was discussed during our Back Country Horseman October meeting.
- Jay Howard
- Jay Howard said equestrian never come. We said it is because we didn't know about it
- Flyer posted on door of League to Save Lake Tahoe , Monday
- Email from Michael Donahoe, today
- Bob Kingman suggestion

2. *What are your thoughts regarding tonight's presentation?*

- Very well run and organized
- View with more reference points/landmarks would be helpful (i.e. a small scale topo view showing upper level roads and access points)
- Very good and open in our interest i.e. horse/mule access
- Sounds like many supportive people looking at multi-use for park
- Glad I came, but felt the attendance was not predominately public, but employees of agencies working on this project. Very concerned and disappointed "multi-use" trails did not include equestrian use at all.
- Very informative
- Some handouts for those few who wanted them would have been nice
- Very informative

3. *Would you like to be involved in developing a detailed trails plan?*

- Mike Arkell 4051 Mulpoon Street Carson City NV 89701
- Darryl Huff 421 Hansen Lane Gardnerville NV 89460 (775 783-9608)
- Back Country Horseman
- Patty Hill email: doug@GBIS.com
- highmeadowhiker@yahoo.com

4. *Are there any specific issues that you feel we should address?*

- Sustainability of the property in terms of use – and potentially a tremendous amount of use
- My main interest is planning of a state of the art visitor center to replace the visitor center proposed for Taylor Creek
- Campground – NO generators, NO amplified sound systems – “music”
- Will hikers be allowed off trails?
- Will hikers be allowed with dogs anywhere in the park?
- Maximum opportunity for non-auto access from core (people mover?)

DESIGNWORKSHOP

- Visitor center potential as historical center
- Equestrian trailer parking
- Horse access to trails and trailhead horse trailer parking
- Reasonable equestrian use in park
- Horse access to trails and trailheads for horse and trailer usage.
- Equestrian parking and access to trail (unpaved)
- Winter use – very supportive
- Please consider outdoor ice rink – year round use

5. *Additional comments*

- Museum of the Sierras concept paper attached.
- If the horse community knows about meetings such as these, we will attend and provide help and input.
- Three horse groups were represented here tonight Back Country Horsemen of Nevada Carson City Chapter “BCHNCV”, NASTR – Nevada All State Trailriders and Carson City Equestrian Alliance. Both BCHNCV and NASTR have been instrumental in trail repair and maintenance.

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Denver • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Santiago • São Paulo
 298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record

To: Meeting Attendees
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Steve Noll
Date: June 3, 2003
Project Name: Henry Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Kickoff Meeting
Meeting Date: 5/28/03
Start/End: 9:00 – 11:00
Location: Design Workshop
Attendees:
Steve Weaver, NSP Rick Hydrick, STPUD
Ken Anderson, CSP Bob King, USFS
Bob Kingman, CTC Scott Morgan, Douglas County
Jennifer Hannum, TRPA Gary Marchio, CSLT
Kristine Roberts, TRPA Steve Noll, DW
Peter Eichar, TRPA Lindy Hulton-Larson, DW
Kara Thiel, LRWQB

Meeting Telephone Conference Call

The following is a summary of the discussions held and decisions reached at the above referenced meeting.

Items in **bold** print are action items.

Introductions:

A contact list will be created and distributed.

Overview of Project History:

Steve Weaver gave a summary of the conception and history of the park. It is intended that the park will be managed as a single entity that is unique to other parks with dual ownership.

Steve Noll summarized the process undergone to date for the Nevada portion of the park, including the development of four design alternatives by Design Workshop and public workshops. Information gathered at the first public meetings was useful but did not necessarily represent the

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Aspen • Denver • Jackson Hole • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Vail • Santa Cruz • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

visitors to the basin. This is consistent with other meetings the CSP have had where local representation makes up the majority of the audience. It was noted that a broader representation of user groups should be encouraged to attend public workshops.

Request for Survey/Background Information:

Steering Committee members were asked to provide any survey information or resources that will provide background information. Utility information would be helpful in addition to advice regarding if utilities can service both states?

The team should be aware of the traffic study being completed for the Casino Corridor Loop Road. The current preferred proposal is for Highway 50 traffic from Nevada to California to move to Parkway Avenue with Highway 50 in the vicinity of the casinos being reduced to 3 lanes for California to Nevada traffic.

The CTC is commissioning a 1' contour aerial survey for the Former Hwy 50 Bypass Bike Trail. Extra sections could be added to this contract to reduce survey costs but will need to be organized ASAP. The survey equipment will read through tree canopies.

Action:

- Steering committee members to check for relevant information and forward it to Design Workshop
- Steering Committee should ensure interaction with the traffic task force investigating traffic management proposals for the Casino Corridor Loop Road
- Roadway layout for intersection of Park Avenue and Montreal Road to be forwarded to Gordon Shaw by Design Workshop

Content of Public Workshop #1:

A wide range of images should be presented to stimulate discussion of a range of possible uses including examples of different kinds of facilities that may be appropriate and their relative density and aesthetic quality. Other resources should also be employed to gain a good understanding of desired activities/uses. Information detailing other projects that may link in to Van Sickle Bi-State Park should be referenced, for example, the Former Hwy 50 Bypass Bike Trail.

Action:

- Public meetings should attempt to reach out to a broader clientele
- Design Workshop will generate a preliminary list of public workshop invitees
- Steering Committee members are to make suggestions re publicizing the meetings and add to the list
- It was suggested an advertisement for the public workshop be run in the paper and a list of participants be generated from people who respond
- Flyers can be circulated by Douglas County and potentially STPUD (decided by the District's Customer Service Office)
- Community centers are a good location for flyers
- Electronic invitations can be sent once a mailing list is established
- Information from recreation needs surveys can provide useful data. TRPA has provided a Summer 2000 User Survey and a Desired Condition Survey. More surveys are due out in August

- CSP and USFS could hand out voluntary surveys at campgrounds in the Basin to collect base info

Level of information required by agencies/Approval process:

There was discussion regarding what form of document the agencies require to submit for approval. Requirements are outlined below:

California State Parks:

- A General Plan will be required that will cover conceptual and general planning, outlining goals and policies. A general CEQA document will be required as part of the General Plan – it could take the form of a tiered EIR that analyzes the program of uses, identifies issues and lists constraints. The General Plan will be submitted to the State Park Recreation Commission (meets quarterly) for adoption. It will form a part of the overall Master Plan. The Burton Creek General Plan could be up for adoption around the same time – could combine presentations.
- Development plans will then be required for each specific ‘project’ or phase of construction. These can be approved at a local level but will be required to go through a more detailed CEQA process, probably with a negative declaration. Mitigation measures would be shown in this phase. It is a possibility that CSP could compile the information required for CEQA.

Nevada State Parks:

- A General Plan will be required in addition to a more specific Nevada Development Plan that will identify the location of parking, campsites, location of roads and location of the entrance on the California side. Basic infrastructure will be provided in Phase 1 of construction (up to \$2.8 million in value).

California Tahoe Conservancy:

- The CTC will approve the same level of plans as California State Parks. It is to be determined if the California State Park Recreation Commission can approve the General Plan before the CTC. If it is first approved by the CTC, it may provide impetus for the Commission, and vice versa.

TRPA:

- The TRPA doesn’t need to formally approve the Master Plan but it should be presented to the Board so they are familiar with the proposal. The construction phases of the project will require environmental assessment (an EIR or EIS depending on the construction proposed).
- The Master Plan will need to conform with the Kingsbury Grade Drainage Plan Area Statement 080. The park is in a conservation plan area so planning will need to take uses into consideration. There are many special uses allowable for the area but if a use is not on the list it is not permissible and will need to be addressed.

Action:

- Design Workshop is to use the Donner Memorial State Plan adopted by the State Park Recreation Commission in April/May 2003 as a reference document for the General Plan
- A BMP Masterplan should be incorporated into the documents
- Consideration should be given to preparing a presentation showing the Master Plan and explaining the approval and implementation processes that can be used as a travelling road show. It could be presented on the Douglas County access channel and could also be used for presenting at the National Partnership Conference in LA in November (Steve Weaver).

Outline of Process:

A work program, schedule and meeting roster was distributed and discussed. A to do list will be put together by Design Workshop and distributed. Any feedback can be sent to Lindy Hulton-Larson at Design Workshop lhulton@designworkshop.com at any time.

Next Meeting (will be a site visit)

Date: Tuesday June 10, 2003

Time: 8:15 am

Location: intersection of Park Avenue and Montreal Road, Van
Sickle Bi-State Park

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record

To: Meeting Attendees
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Steve Noll
Date: July 13, 2003
Project Name: Henry Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Meeting #2
Meeting Date: 7/8/03
Start/End: 9:00 – 11:00
Location: Design Workshop

Attendees:

Steve Weaver, NSP	Jennifer Hannum, TRPA
Jay Howard, NSP	Peter Eichar, TRPA
Randy Moore, NSP	Bob King, USFS
John Knott, CSP	Steve Noll, DW
Bob Kingman, CTC	Lindy Hulton-Larson, DW

Meeting Telephone Conference Call

The following is a summary of the discussions held and decisions reached at the above referenced meeting.

Public workshop notification:

The steps taken to notify the public of the public workshop process were outlined, together with the strategy for the two public workshops to come. There was general agreement as to the process outlined. Suggestions from the steering committee included:

Action:

- providing directional signage at Caesars so participants could find their way to the Augustus Room (DW)
- contacting a wider range of radio stations (probably more applicable for the workshops to come – it was noted we need to give plenty of lead time). Bob Kingman suggested he may be able to organize a recording with appropriate information to distribute to the radio stations.
- contacting TV stations (DW)
- setting up a web-site (budget dependent)
- talking specifically to Susan Wood about future coverage in the Tribune (DW)

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Aspen • Denver • Jackson Hole • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Vail • Santa Cruz • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

Public Workshop #1:

The content of the Workshop #1 was discussed. Design Workshop presented the powerpoint presentation and the steering committee suggested changes as necessary for clarity and ease of understanding. There was much discussion about how the participants at the workshop should be asked to respond, and how the 'dot exercise' should be organized. The following approach was decided upon:

Action:

- a state park should be defined to explain that the recreation opportunities found in a state park vary from those provided in a regional or local park, and must cater for people from all over the state
- the approval process and the role of agencies in the basin should be mentioned but not presented in detail. Involvement of key agencies in the project should also be mentioned.
- all comments/suggestions should be taken at the first workshop, discussed and then run through at the second workshop with a brief explanation of why or why not the suggested uses are appropriate
- visitor use survey information should be provided as a resource to represent out-of-basin users. This should be explained at the workshop
- a comment sheet should be provided at the public workshop

Master Plan Workshop:

The Master Plan Workshop is to be held at Design Workshop on July 15, 2003. A draft agenda was presented and comments requested.

It was decided that the group would prefer to work as one group rather than splitting into smaller work groups. The objective is to consider various design approaches and develop some options for the site, based on the feedback from Public Workshop #1.

Base material will be provided, including topographic maps, the trail information currently available, slope analysis, SEZ location and templates of RV parks and campgrounds to assist with scale and density. Steve Weaver noted that State Parks have a campground density of 4-6 sites per acre, in contrast to KOA at 15 sites per acre.

Sewage connections were noted to be important to any design options. Confirming possible sewage arrangements is still in progress. There are 15 sewer connections on the CA side. Can we connect from Nevada to these connections. It was believed that water supply was not an issue? To be confirmed with Rick Hydrick

Next Meeting (will be a one day Master Plan Workshop)

Date: Tuesday July 15, 2003

Time: 8:30 am

Location: Design Workshop

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record

To: Steering Committee
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Steve Noll
Date: August 5, 2003
Project Name: Henry Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Meeting #3
Meeting Date: 8/5/03
Start/End: 9:00 – 11:00
Location: Design Workshop
Attendees:
Steve Weaver, NSP Kristine Roberts, TRPA
Jay Howard, NSP Gary Marchio, CSLT
Randy Moore, NSP Peter Eichar, TRPA
Ken Andersen, CSP Steve Noll, DW
Bob Kingman, CTC Lindy Hulton-Larson, DW

Meeting Telephone Conference Call

The following is a summary of the discussions held and decisions reached at the above referenced meeting.

Preliminary comments:

- picnic areas should not occupy a large part of the site
- SEZ and land classification is still being finalized. If we need to classify areas of SEZ as human-modified, it is a long process
- At the Master Plan Workshop there were 3 approaches identified in defining the program for the park. These were named “minimum use”, “low use” and “moderate use”.

Strategy for presenting the program to the public:

There were 2 main recreation uses brought up at the Public Workshop #1 that we will need to address in presenting the proposed program for the site, disc golf and dog facilities.

These activities were identified at the workshop but a high demand for them is not indicated in the recreation surveys conducted by Nevada State Parks, California State Parks and the TRPA. The site is relatively small in terms of usable land and may not support these activities as well as

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Aspen • Denver • Jackson Hole • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Vail • Santa Cruz • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

higher priority uses. After higher priorities are met, the steering committee will consider their inclusion.

Disc golf:

- Will disc golfers pay to get in the park? It is likely that they would.
- A formal course does not necessarily need to be provided. A dedicated trail could be provided and players make up their own course as they play. Some baskets could be provided. A short course could also be provided instead of a long course.
- A course may have less environmental impact if it is organized.

Dog park:

- It doesn't make sense to put a dog park in the limited space we have available. Dogs are not conducive to State Park Policy. If space is left over it will be considered.
- There may be the possibility to look into adjoining property to develop a facility.
- The CTC just hosted a symposium for the provision of dog facilities. There is a strong desire in the community to provide facilities for dogs, especially related to water play. Generally the CTC adopts the ordinances of the city/county in which their property is located, but these are rarely enforced. There is a need to discuss jurisdictional crosses and how to manage property, especially for the CTC 10 mile trail.
- In California State Parks, dogs are allowed on a leash on paved trails. It is possible to change regulations but this would have to go to the legislator. There have been some challenges re dogs in other parts of the State. **Ken Anderson is to confirm the status of these challenges.**
- Would dog users pay to use the facilities?
- If a dog park was provided where people could socialize their dogs, it may be possible to generate income from the facility. Campers could use the dog facilities as part of their camping fee.
- A high end dog facility could attract events such as dog shows and provide a source of revenue.
- A survey of vets in the area could give input to the types of facilities visitors and residents require.
- Would high dog use result in plague warnings?

Preliminary Alternatives:

Preliminary alternatives were presented. Notes below refer to suggested changes/inclusions.

Option 1 – Minimum Use

- no dump station should be shown for the minimum option
- 10 walk-in sites should be included
- entrance road need to have enough area for RV's to turn around
- 50 vehicle/tent sites
- reference should be made to the intent to minimize impact by maximizing the use of existing roads
- equestrian use may be possible

Option 2 – Low Use

- the Class 2 land on option 2 could be considered for disc golf – may have too high an impact
- include a dump station
- reduce picnic area – place emphasis more on group picnic areas
- maximize use of existing roads
- 50-70 vehicle/tent sites
- 15 walk-in sites
- provide hook-ups to one loop of upper area

Option 3 – Moderate Use

- include a dump station
- each tent area needs its own parking lot
- maximize use of existing roads
- 20 walk-in sites
- group camping – provide one RV group camping area with hook-ups and one group tent area (for youth groups etc) with a central open space for games
- concessionaire at entrance or visitor center – hire out bikes, snow shoes
- move overnight access road to the edge of RV camping area. Maybe all camping should be on the Nevada side?
- STPUD road could be devoted to the bike trail. Could be used for emergency egress?
- Provide sewer to the upper portion of the site. Locate dump station up there too
- Provide hookups to half the sites

Public Workshop:

- Make sure the suggestions made at the Public Workshop are incorporated into the next presentation.
- We should address trails, disc golf, dog park, mountain course, bouldering (top rope area).
- If a museum is provided we should be clear on what kind of museum. Staffing requirements would change significantly depending on the size and kinds of displays.

General:

- Keep day use access separate from overnight access.
- The park is too small for numerous multi-purpose trails.
- There should be a shuttle link to/from the casinos.
- The maintenance facility should include employee housing that interfaces with the affordable housing on Randy Lane’s property.
- The moderate use option should be discussed with Gordon Shaw in terms of traffic impacts. **DW to co-ordinate.**
- The steering committee needs to be involved with Forest Stewardship Day to ensure the planning process and potential for the park is maximized. A planning session is to be held at 8:30am, September 21 at the barn. **Ken Andersen and Jay Howard are likely to attend.**
- An offer has been extended by KRLT to host an interview to publicize the project. It was agreed that this occur before Public Workshop #3.
- Public Workshop #2 is at 6-8:00pm, 19 August at TRPA Governing Board Room, 128 Market Street, Stateline.

Next Steering Committee Meeting

Date: August 20, 2003

Time: 9:00-11:00am

Location: Design Workshop

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record

To: Steering Committee
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Steve Noll
Date: September 5, 2003
Project Name: Henry Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Meeting #4
Meeting Date: 8/20/03
Start/End: 9:00 – 11:00
Location: Design Workshop
Attendees:
Steve Weaver, NSP Peter Eichar, TRPA
Randy Moore, NSP Steve Noll, DW
Ken Andersen, CSP Lindy Hulton-Larson, DW
Bob Kingman, CTC

Meeting Telephone Conference Call

The following is a summary of the discussions held and decisions reached at the above referenced meeting. Action items are in bold.

Potential Facilities:

Camping:

- If there is a camping market attached to the casinos, it will be worthwhile to invest in facilities. The operation needs to be self-sufficient and overnight spaces may not generate enough revenue. It is currently thought that 50% of vehicle/RV spaces should have hook-ups.
- Minimize walk-in camping to 10 spaces. If there is demand for these, 10 more could be added at a later date.
- Provide multi-use group areas for camping and day use.

Day Use:

- The park could provide a focus for day use and become a major trailhead. One trailhead can serve multiple trails.
- There is the potential for a connection to be made to the Rim Trail, utilizing old Kingsbury Grade. The Douglas County trails Master Plan uses this route.

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Aspen • Denver • Jackson Hole • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Vail • Santa Cruz • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

- There could be another stop added to the gondola to bring people into the park. The stop could be associated with a national ski museum, snow play and trailheads. Would need to strike an operating deal with Heavenly and find funding for construction work. Is a gondola stop consistent with State Park regulations?
- Is there a demand for sophisticated trail systems?
- A trailhead should be provided at the end of the road on the upper slopes with 20-25 spaces.

Visitor Center/Event Center:

- A visitor center may be included in the Master Plan and its development phased.
 - Phase 1 - open or semi-open information center with no staff or office space
 - Phase 2 – add onto Phase 1 and incorporate partial restoration of the barn
 - Phase 3 – restoration of the barn – consider using as an interpretive center
- An event center with a wide range of possible uses for flexibility was discussed as a potential facility. This could provide a staging area for Tahoe races/events and a venue for festivals and cultural events.
- A concession may be included in the park, with a bike rental component close to the CTC multi-purpose trail.

Amphitheatre:

- There could be a commercial opportunity to combine a visitor center with an amphitheatre and group use area, possibly also incorporating a snow play area.
- Camping facilities could support performances at an amphitheatre with group sites.
- Amphitheatre statistics could possibly be gained from Keith Gout from “Ovation”? on the North Shore. **Bob Kingman to follow up on contact details.**
- An amphitheatre would be difficult to get permitted in this area as it will be seen as a commercial use (Peter Eichar). It may be a temporary use facility?

Snow Play:

- A snow play area with a fire pit should be included if a suitable location can be found. Behind the barn and the meadow may be a suitable location?

Collection:

- Fees should be collected from all vehicles.
- There could be an annual pass for local day use.
- The size and nature of the trailhead for CTC multi-purpose trail will be determined as part of the planning process. It may not need to be incorporated into the park. If it is, it is likely that users would be charged as they will be using State Park facilities.
- Fee collection tubes could be located at minor access points into the park, and parking potentially provided for 6-8 cars where feasible.

Process:

- Planning and financing should be aligned
 - Phase 1 – day use facilities only including the road into Nevada, utilities (dependent on budget), stabilization of barn, open air interpretive facility and parking, restrooms and water, parking area for CTC bike trail (CTC funding?), fee booth?, no snow removal and a maintenance yard.

- ii. Phase 2 – overnight facilities added (may have casino input/funding?). This phase would also include adding a small building and office in the maintenance yard and possibly a ranger residence (may be Phase III).
- The environmental document will analyze the full buildout and no buildout

Where to from here?

- Additional information needs to be collected and an additional steering committee meeting held to clarify direction for developing the proposed alternative. The details of the meeting are to be determined.

Next Steering Committee Meeting

Date: To be determined

Time: TBD

Location: TBD

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record (revised)

To: Steering Committee
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Date: October 18, 2004
Project Name: Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Steering Committee Meeting
Meeting Date: 10/6/04
Start/End: 9:00 - 12:30
Location: Design Workshop Office
Copy To:

Meeting Telephone Conference Call

Following are the minutes of the above referenced meeting. The following people were present:

STEVE WEAVER, NSP
RANDY MOORE, NSP
BOB KINGMAN, CTC
KEN ANDERSON, CSP
PETER EICHAR, TRPA
BOB KING, USFS
DOUG SMITH, LAHONTAN
STEVE NOLL, DWI
LINDY HULTON-LARSON, DWI
VIRGINIA MAHACEK, VALLEY & MOUNTAIN CONSULTING

Items in **bold** print indicate what action is required, who will perform the action and the deadline to complete action.

1. Planning Approvals

- a. Planning Approvals that will be required:
 - Transfer of NDOT property
 - Operations plan between parks
 - Environmental assessment

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Denver • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

- Develop partnerships
- Trail master plan
- TRPA/State Agency approval
- CTC operations of Bike Trail

2. Environmental Process

- The environmental process will consist of taking a programmatic level for the whole project with specific project action identified for Phase I (this should provide basic information for USFS NEPA, and **future CEQA for California State Parks**)
- California State Parks can use CEQA information to put into program EIR for General Plan **(after CSP takes ownership)**
 - Phase 1 projects will be a pre-existing condition so CSP will be a stakeholder agency – not the lead
 - Individual CEQA (mitigated negative declaration) will occur with development plans for individual projects
- NSP and CTC would be co-leads for Phase I projects (joint document process to fulfill **TRPA approvals & CEQA**)
 - Nevada State Parks will provide general oversight of project including:
 - Funding for Phase 1
 - Lead agency for TRPA approval/EA FONSI
 - The CTC will provide the CEQA lead which should be covered by a Mitigated Negative Declaration
 - The CTC would likely approve/adopt master plan as a step to implement and fund Phase I work.
 - The CEQA environmental document will assess impacts of **Phase I and Master Plan.**
- TRPA Requirements
 - Master plans are only required to be approved/adopted by the TRPA for marinas and ski resorts
 - TRPA can adopt the CSP master plan if desired but this would generate a need for an EIS. **Not necessarily, but typically. The TRPA Master Plan has formal approval steps along the way – process is very similar to what has occurred, however, a TRPA process would require Board approval of the Steering Team members as well as a work program.** It is not mandated to do this.
 - **TRPA would review and approve on a project specific level. Suggest using any state-level environmental analysis as supporting documentation for project application.**
 - Restoration of SEZs in Nevada require TRPA approval at a project level.

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Denver • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Santiago • São Paulo
 298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
 www.designworkshop.com

- Controversy can elevate a project to an EIS R. When this would be required is up to the discretion of the TRPA.
 - If project needs EIS R from TRPA, should be separate environmental consultant operating independently. Working for/contracted with TRPA, paid for by applicant.
 - If the project reasonably expects requirements will be fulfilled by submitting an environmental checklist IEA/FONSE going through the approval process, environmental review could be part of the design team scope.
- e. Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board Requirements
- Would use for assessment the Master Plan adopted by the CTC. There is benefit in the projects being part of a recreation master plan instead of individual projects when SEZ disturbance is being considered.
 - Public outdoor recreation facilities (pedestrian paths or stream crossings) can be located in SEZ if impacts are fully mitigated.
 - Lahontan adopts land capability and land coverage designated by the TRPA per inter-agency MOU.
 - Lahontan will treat as a project
 - Projects where there is new disturbance or coverage of SEZ for recreation need to go to Board to get a prohibition exemption
 - Look at alternatives for crossings of SEZ
 - If a water quality improvement project, does not have to go to Board – 10 day public notice
 - Lahontan Board requirements are for projects involving in excess of these amounts in an SEZ or floodplain: either 1000 sq ft new coverage, or 2000 sqft new disturbance, or 100 cubic yards of excavation or fill:
 - If part of a water quality restoration project, this has to go to the Board
 - If existing SEZ disturbance or coverage being relocated, may not have to go through the Board. Should be in same project area.
 - During construction, if more than 1 acre will be disturbed (including staging areas) there is still a NPDES stormwater construction requirement, but the project doesn't have to go to the Board
 - NPDES will require stormwater monitoring to ensure BMP's are working. Amendment will be brought to February Board meeting
 - SWPPP requirement – BMP type construction phase plan will be needed.
 - Permit condition requires annual reporting (Annual fees apply until permit is revoked - when construction completed and all conditions met)
 - The Board has 10 meetings per year – 5 in north and 5 in south
 - February and April will be in the north
 - Will hear while in South unless there is some controversy.
 - A permit for each Phase is advisable

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Denver • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Santiago • São Paulo
 298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

- Can issue permit for whole site while recognizing that only Phase 1 is in construction
- The Phase 1 permit will be issued to CTC and when ownership is transferred, a Board Order Transfer can transfer permit to new title owner of property (CSP).
- It was recommended to give a Master Plan presentation to Boards of agencies to give heads up a couple of months before project submitted including:
 - Lahontan – Executive Officers Report
 - TRPA APC
 - TRPA Governing Board
- The public information process should be continued, potentially using the resource analysis report

3. Draft Resource Analysis Report

- a. A cultural record search will be done for Phase 1 project level
- b. Future phases will each have to do a cultural record search

4. RV Market Study

- a. Presented and briefly discussed

5. Master Plan/Phasing Update

After reviewing the phasing plan recommendations, the following modifications were suggested by the Steering Committee **(by DWI)**:

- a. Phase I
 - Basic stabilization of barn and fire protection system for barn needs to be in Phase 1 but there is not funding available in EIP funds. Money would need to be raised. Include in Phase 1 plans.
 - Picnic areas on NV side
 - Could potentially have a picnic area and a group picnic area (1 larger group shelter and 1 smaller group shelter)
 - Group picnic area for 100 people could also be add alternate
 - CA side – have group facility (small) in picnic area close to barn – approximately 30 people.
 - Phase II road could be incorporated into Phase I if enough funding (add alternate)
 - Public safety issues need to be addressed
 - should cabins be removed/moved to reduce public hazard?
 - Maybe restore 1 or 2 and remove others?
 - Employee housing
 - Would maintain existing - location of pads may change
 - Will need to be added to Plan Area Statement. As will any other intended use not currently on the permissible use list for PAS 80. PAS amendment must be complete prior to permit application – apply ASAP, as we get closer to 2007, these

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Denver • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Santiago • São Paulo
 298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

amendments may not get processed individually and may have to wait for the overall approval of the Regional Plan components, of which the PAS's are one part.

- 7 sewer hookups bought by CTC with property. (2 being used by existing employees)

b. Phase II

- Extra parking near barn – reverse color of circles (green inside, orange outside)

c. Phase III

- Develop campsites with 25-40 with no hookups
- Entrance station Phase III

d. Phase IV

- 25-30 campsites with hookups

6. Trails

- Need to recognize trails at a programmatic level
- 1 loop trail through Nevada and California
 - Acknowledge level of use – what is the known degree of access likely to be and what amount of accidental use?
 - There is a significant amount of existing use – foot and bike
 - Restoration work on existing trails should be discussed
 - If there are developed facilities to give access to unmanaged trails, BMP's may be required – how do we address phasing of BMP's?
 - Identify current use and pattern of trails
 - () How many miles high use?
 - () How many miles low use?
 - () How many miles relocated out of SEZ?
 - () How many miles relocated from private land?
- There is additional funding through EIP in addition to federal & state funding for restoration of trails and improving directing use
- Trail connection to casino corridor will happen in Phase II and possibly later
- CTC trail connection to Nevada
 - Use Douglas County Plan this trail is also called out for in the TRPA Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan, approved in July (?) also in the Regional Transportation Plan – RTP, scheduled for adoption in next month or two. Contact Alfred Knotts, ext. 204 for more info. **Design Workshop to obtain a copy.**
- Needs a trail master plan as part of master plan
 - GPS information from Jay – show a trail phasing plan with 4 phases
 - There should be a phased conceptual trail plan as part of master plan
 - Phase I plan should show trail up to burn area & decommissioned trails along SEZ
- Detailed Trails master plan has to be part of the next phase of work
 - Detail and integration with other trail systems

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Denver • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

- Formalize in Phase I – can then develop mitigation strategy and assess existing use
- Funding available for construction and deferred maintenance

7. Public Workshop

- a. In the presentation we should tell participants when meeting is expected to close
- b. Steve Weaver to give 5 minute background of Bi-State Park
- c. Give history of public workshop processes
- d. Mention that there will be the opportunity for public comment in Summer 2005 and 2006 through the project approval process
- e. Ask if anyone wants to volunteer to participate in trails workshop
- f. Questionnaire okay

8. Operations Issues

- a. Set a meeting date soon to discuss **(NSP, CSP, CTC will attend)**
 - Will CTC maintain ownership of bike trail?
- b. Do people have to pay to use the park?
 - Do people on bike trail have to pay entrance fee?
 - Pay fee for reservation of group areas?
- c. Group sites are highly sought after by weddings – needs to be addressed in operations plan
 - **Probably Is** not a permissible use for this area
- d. Information on Redwood/Prairie Creek National/State Park operations. **(Ken Anderson to obtain information)**
- e. Who will service the Iron Ranger? Which phase?

Next Meeting (Public Workshop)

Date: 14 October 2004

Time: 6:00-8:00pm

Location: US Forest Service Conference Room (35 College Drive)

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Asheville • Aspen • Denver • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record (revised)

To: Advisory Committee
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Steve Noll
Date: August 21, 2003
Project Name: Henry Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Meeting #2
Meeting Date: 8/5/03
Start/End: 1:00 – 3:00pm
Location: Design Workshop

Attendees:

Steve Weaver, NSP	Bill Chernock, LTVA
Randy Moore, NSP	Kathleen Farrell, TDCC
David Hamilton, TAMBA	Steve Noll, DW
Jerry Yeazall, Sierra Club	Lindy Hulton-Larson, DW
Mark Kimbrough, Tahoe Rim Trail	

Meeting Telephone Conference Call

The following is a summary of the discussions held and decisions reached at the above referenced meeting.

Introductions:

Steve Weaver gave a summary of the history of the park and the project.

Steve Noll gave a summary of the base information that has been put together, the master plan process to date, the schedule and the outcome of Public Workshop #1. Issues identified at the public workshop were identified and discussed. These included the possible provision of facilities for mountain biking, dogs and disc golf.

- the intent for mountain bike trails is to identify existing trails and formalize, making connections into trails on surrounding property where possible and feasible
- disc golf is not prohibited but primary uses for the park will be identified first and then disc golf facilities considered
- there are different regulations in state parks in CA and NV concerning dogs. We need to know the plans of local jurisdictions re provision of dog parks before committing to providing these facilities in a State Park. It is not really an appropriate use for a State Park.

Preliminary Alternatives:

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Aspen • Denver • Jackson Hole • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Vail • Santa Cruz • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

Preliminary alternatives were presented with general discussion following. The notes below record the main points of the discussion.

- all alternatives would require a day use fee
- picnic sites are not anticipated to be in high demand – most people want to picnic next to the lake
- group picnicking may have greater demand

Trails:

- overflow parking for camp areas could double as trailhead parking
- bike trail connections to the rim trail are not necessarily sustainable. The trail could be designed well but would be costly
- a bike trail down under the gondola would not be sustainable
- trail signage needs to be clear, especially at trailheads and parking areas to access the trailheads
- connecting bike trails to Kingsbury and Nevada Beach?
- formalizing existing trails may not be the best option in terms of sustainability. Could check out which sections of existing trails are sustainable and keep them, redesigning some sections that need improvement.
- provide walking/bike trails to vista area to cater for a range of users
- there could be one multi-use trail with specific group use trails going off from it
- there should be a wide range of trails
- investigate a hiking trail down under the gondola

Camping:

- demand for RV camping is questionable (Bill Chernock). Existing parks do not run to full capacity. There are 60 RV spaces at Zephyr Cove in winter and it runs at approx. 12% occupancy. Summer occupancy is around 90%. The recreation surveys conducted by Nevada State Parks, California State Parks and the TRPA suggests that there is a demand for additional RV camping facilities
- **Kathleen is going to survey RV parks in the basin to determine usage**
- given that there are 4000 rooms in close proximity, is camping the best option for this site? Is there another program that could make better use of the uniqueness of the site? Should it have a more urban character – perhaps a performance space?

Other uses:

- there is a need to provide facilities for kids of all ages (Kathleen Farrell)
- we should focus on day use facilities while still providing camping sites. Day use should be the focus as so many people will be able to access the site quickly. Facilities such as a visitor center and an event/performance space with 500 seasonal seats and a controlled event schedule (encourage cultural/educational events) should be considered. Camping area could provide facilities for this use
- winter use should be encouraged, due to close proximity to the core accommodation area of Stateline
- a shuttle could be provided to the park from Stateline
- any facilities should be developed to the level that is feasible to maintain
- CSP regulations may not allow a performance space. **DW to check.**

Meeting Wrap-up:

- the components of the preliminary alternatives can be mixed and matched

- the public workshop will have an influence on the elements and their configuration in the Master Plan
- the Master Plan will be long term and will be phased
- any further comments can be sent to Lindy at lhulton@designworkshop.com
- Public Workshop #2 is at 6-8:00pm, 19 August at TRPA Governing Board Room, 128 Market Street, Stateline.

Next Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: August 20, 2003

Time: 1:00-3:00pm

Location: Design Workshop

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.

Design Workshop, Inc.
Landscape Architecture
Land Planning
Urban Design
Tourism Planning

Meeting Record

To: Advisory Committee
From: Lindy Hulton-Larson
Steve Noll
Date: September 5, 2003
Project Name: Henry Van Sickle Bi-State Park
Project #: 3053
Subject: Meeting #3
Meeting Date: 8/20/03
Start/End: 1:00 – 3:00pm
Location: Design Workshop

Attendees:

Steve Weaver, NSP	Mark Kimbrough, Tahoe Rim Trail
Randy Moore, NSP	Bill Chernock, LTVA
Dave Morrow, NSP	Steve Noll, DW
David Hamilton, TAMBA	Lindy Hulton-Larson, DW
Jerry Yeazall, Sierra Club	

Meeting Telephone Conference Call

The following is a summary of the discussions held and decisions reached at the above referenced meeting. Action items are in bold.

Potential facilities:

A discussion of the potential facilities was held. A number of issues were identified as needing to be explored before a recommended plan is put together:

Camping:

- The demand for camping needs to be explored. If it is a niche, it will be pursued, if not, it will not be included in the Master Plan.
- There may be a marketing survey done by the casinos that may provide useful information. **Steve Weaver to meet with Yale Spina.**
- There may be visitor survey information at the LTVA. **Steve Weaver & Dave Morrow are to provide a list of specific questions to Bill Chernock for research.**
- The Nevada Commission of Tourism may also have useful statistics.
- If camping is provided, the majority should be RV sites with hook-ups. Will this recoup some operations costs? There may be the possibility that the casinos could provide some funding for this. **Steve Weaver to follow up with Yale Spina.**
- If camping is competitive with private industry should we be proposing this use?

DESIGNWORKSHOP

Aspen • Denver • Jackson Hole • Park City • Phoenix • Santa Fe • Tahoe • Vail • Santa Cruz • Santiago • São Paulo
298 Kingsbury Grade, First Floor, #3, PO Box 5666, Stateline, NV 89449 • (tel) 775-588-5929 • (fax) 775-588-1559
www.designworkshop.com

- Group sites may be an appropriate niche to explore, particularly if they can also serve as group day use areas.

Day Use Facilities:

- The road to the upper area of the park could continue back into California and end as a trailhead. Walk-in camp sites could also be located in this area if there was enough demand.
- The Sierra Club is supportive of day use and interpretive facilities incorporating environmental education.
- The possibility of organizing a gondola drop off point within the park was discussed at the steering committee meeting.

Amphitheatre:

- There may be permitting issues with an amphitheatre. It could be permitted as a special event use.
- The Sierra Club would not support a large amphitheatre.
- It could be a smaller flexible event space that could grow into accommodating approx. 100 people and double as an event staging area. Parking could be limited by providing connections to the transit system. Day users should not be displaced if there were a special event. This could potentially use part of the meadow space behind the barn.
- An amphitheatre/temporary performance space could be associated with group facilities and a visitor center.

Trails:

- The proposed rim trail connection uses the old Kingsbury Grade and then follows the back of the ridge.
- The Gondola presently drops people off to the rim trail.
- A trail under the gondola line down to the park may not be feasible.
- If trails are built well there should be little maintenance.
- Trailheads need to be clearly defined.
- Recreational trails will need to be relocated to be sustainable.
- Interpretive trails need to provide a number of levels and lengths and be progressive.
- Equestrians could connect to the rim trail – water for horses and parking facilities need to be provided for trailers.
- Extreme mountain bike trails should to be isolated so there are no user conflicts.
- There could be a technical trail for learners. A beginner loop could be a 1.5 - 2 miles with different levels catered for and the opportunity to teach responsible riding and trail etiquette.
- IMBA (International Mountain Bike Association) may be a good resource for trail funding, design and building. Dave Hamilton is to provide contact details.

Alternative Schemes:

Steve Weaver identified that the overnight option seemed to be the preferred alternative of the steering committee.

Phasing:

- The provision of facilities in the park would occur in phases.
- Phase 1 would include stabilizing the barn and providing; an outside interpretive center, a small staff office, a day use picnic area with parking, snow play areas and a maintenance yard.

- Phase II would include a shop and office associated with the maintenance yard.
- It was noted that only 9.2% of the total park area is developable which equates to 67 acres. This may alter once TRPA provides the final land capability classification.

Where to from here?

Additional information needs to be collected and an additional advisory committee meeting held to clarify direction for developing the proposed alternative. The details of the meeting are to be determined.

Next Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: To be determined

Time: TBD

Location: TBD

END OF NOTES

The record herein is considered to be an accurate depiction of the discussion and/or decisions made during the meeting unless written clarification is received by Design Workshop within five (5) working days upon receipt of this meeting record.
