

I. Overview

On August 7th, 2008, Boulder Bay hosted a community input meeting at the Tahoe Biltmore to garner feedback on 4 proposed road scenarios. Streamline Consulting Group, a local firm specializing in community input, facilitated and recorded the input for the meeting. Following are the notes from the meeting including input from the small group breakout sessions and evaluation forms. Approximately 60 community members attended the meeting.

All attempts were made to record comments, questions and responses as accurately as possible. Comments highlighted in blue represent additional comment, made by Boulder Bay project staff, after the meeting.

Boulder Bay used the following input from the community as a significant factor in their decision making process.

II. Summary

The process for garnering feedback from the community took place in 4 ways:

- 1) Public input (at start of meeting/2 minutes per person/all comments welcome)
- 2) After each scenario was presented
- 3) In small group break out sessions
- 4) Meeting evaluation forms

Below is a summary per each input area. Full details per each section are included in the summary notes starting on page 3.

Public input

Nine people made public comments and their comments included concerns around: traffic, density issues, height of building, beach access issues for visitors, landscaping, carbon neutrality and regulation changes with TRPA. Some people gave general comments supporting the project.

Questions/Comments per scenarios presented

Many people had questions per each scenario and are recorded in the following notes. After hearing the 4 scenarios, one participant requested that "Keeping Roads As They Are" be a 5th option in the small group input session. As you will see, a 5th option was added to the small group input as well to the evaluation forms by those who wanted this option.

Small Group Break-out Sessions

Participants were asked to give input on 5 scenarios in 3 breakout groups. Input was requested for what they liked, didn't like, and would like to see changed for each option. Across all 5 road options, many people would like to see the addition of sidewalks, bikeways and a pedestrian bridge. The status quo option (E) had six comments stating they liked this option. Options A and B seemed to be the most favorable of the

**Boulder Bay LLC
Community Meeting
Summary Notes
August 7, 2008**



proposed scenarios by Boulder Bay staff based on comments listed in the “like” section as compared to scenarios C, D and E.

Meeting evaluations

At the sign-in desk, participants were asked to record their name and take 2 handouts--- a meeting evaluation form and an upcoming meeting form. Streamline reminded participants to fill out the form including road scenario preferences. Once #5 was added as an option (status quo) Streamline asked people to add that to their form as an option. In total, 17 people completed the evaluation form.

In general, comments reflected a need for Boulder Bay staff to provide more detailed information about community meeting topics, with plenty of time for people to review. This includes better visual aids, project details (height/distance), and slope grades. What also came up several times is the need to include impacts to the Brockway neighborhood. As far as future topics people would like to see covered at upcoming community meetings, density came up multiple times as did height.

When asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 4 which road scenarios they prefer here is what they said: 1=highest, 4=lowest. 17 people completed evaluations.

Scenario A:

59% Ranked #1 or #2

Scenario B:

29% Ranked #1 or #2

Scenario C:

18% Ranked #1 or #2

Scenario D:

6% Ranked #1 or #2

Scenario E: (status quo)

24% Ranked #1 or #2

III. Detailed Notes: Public Comment & Presentation Section

Welcome

- Thank you for coming
- Introductions
- Handouts
 - Evaluations
 - Next meetings
- Meeting purpose
 - Education (2 ways)
 - Topic specific input
- TODAY: Safety/Roads
- Process
 - Public comment: 2 minutes each, all topics
 - Presentation of information on roads
 - Input recorded in small groups
 - Goal: capture as many ideas as possible

Community Outreach Update

- Recent updates
 - 370 letters sent out about this meeting
 - Web updated – new posting section, “Input”
- Newsletter: coming soon
- Upcoming meetings (handout)
 - EIS Scoping, August 13

Community Outreach Update: July Meeting Input

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Status</u>
Roads	Topic for today
Community Announcements	Updates today
Community Input	Updates today
Beach Access	Topic for future
Height/Design	Incorporating in planning & topic for future
Traffic/Density	Incorporating in planning & topic for future

Thank you for your good ideas.

Public Comment

- 2 minutes per person
- Please sign in to speak, after sign-in sheet, we will take others
- Comments are being recorded and will be used to design future meetings & responses will be posted on Boulder Bay website

Public Comments

1. Bob: One of the first things I saw was that under each scenario, it protects neighboring streets from excessive traffic, however, everyone shows the new traffic proposals going right through the Brockway neighborhood. You have forgotten that the closest neighbor here is the California neighborhood, my neighborhood. Our streets are much worse over there than over here. There will be serious injuries, accidents, and winter accidents, especially with those who are unfamiliar with the area. The traffic impact with this project will basically make me a prisoner in my own home. The only time during rush hour (which will happen everyday now, for the next thirty days) that I can get on the road is when the traffic light breaks the traffic and I can sneak out. Please pay attention to the California neighbors. None of these four solutions offer proper traffic solutions.
2. Jack: I would like to wait and speak later.
3. Paul Reynolds: I'm surprised we are here tonight again, because I feel just as strongly as I did when I testified a year ago. I feel as though that the original project proposals were good. I find that the traffic flow in this area currently is down considerably than it was a year ago. I think we should get behind these people and support his project; I hope to see it to its fruition. I hope that they will work out the problems in the project. The TRPA will regulate and manage all the requirements necessary for the project. I hope that we can all see the benefit to our area.
4. Shirley: I am a neighbor to the South. I applaud the effort of Boulder Bay to come forward and improve the neighborhood. But, our concerns are with traffic impacts and density issues. My comment today is on something I noticed a few weeks ago. I was driving home a couple weeks ago and I could see CalNeva from the lake. I found out later that this development will be higher than the CalNeva, and consequently it will be visible from much farther away. I think that the height of the buildings and the density are two things that are of biggest concern.
5. Lynn: I would support some improvement of this area, but I am very concerned, as a lucky waterfront person, about drunken visitors endangering themselves on the water and on boats. I don't see a lot addressed in the plan in respect to where these people could go, because this development, although called "lakeside", is not actually on a beach. I am talking about public safety here. There are children, and other boaters. Safety is an issue not only on the road, in cars, but also on the lake.

I want to avoid having folks wandering on others' private property. This is a common decency issue, as well as a public safety issue. These folks won't sit in the casino all day, so please tell me where the beach access is for these people.

Post Meeting Comment: As a follow-up to this comment, the project team will address recreation access in a future meeting.

6. Alfie Aldridge: I would like to speak in support of the development. Tahoe Biltmore, over the years, is attracting more and more of a low quality visitor to the lake. I like the quality restaurants, retail, and wellness center ideas. These will add to our neighborhoods instead of enhancing the gambling aspect.
7. Ron: What I'm concerned of mostly is that I see landscaping plans and happy people pushing strollers and restaurants, shops, etc. But after the construction is over on a lot of these projects, I see trees wilting up and visions not met. The fire station had this end result as well. At the end, the landscaping did not match the vision. I worry a lot about the long-term viability of everything, but mostly, what it would look like if it didn't go as planned. I am concerned that this project is overly optimistic.
8. Rick: I'm concerned about how the project will help us meet our goal of reducing greenhouse gases, becoming carbon neutral, and moving toward zero waste.

Post Meeting Comment: These impacts will be evaluated in depth for the proposed project as well as the existing conditions and project alternatives as part of the TRPA lead Environmental Impact Statement.

9. Ann Nichols: I am concerned that people aren't realizing that Boulder Bay is proposing a code change which will result in an unlimited height change, and change the lot sizes so that the density will be three-fold. If these changes are made, the density will increase significantly. I am concerned that this development will eventually be a negative aspect of our community.

Post Meeting Comment: The proposed height ordinance has been written to apply very narrowly to a defined project area and will limit height to maximum of 86 ft or three-fourths of the maximum height of the tree canopy, whichever is lower, as measured by the TRPA Code. Visual simulations will be completed by TRPA and the Environmental Consultant to determine the potential impacts to scenic quality from the lake and Highway 28.

Safety Update

4 Road scenarios were presented including the Boulder Bay project staff's initial set of pros and cons per each scenario

Process reminder

- Save clarification questions for after each option is presented
- Save comment/opinions/input for small groups and evaluations

Following presentation by Boulder Bay project staff (Brian Helm, Phil Gilanfarr)

Background

- Received Community input at previous meeting
- Communicated this input to Washoe County Community Development, Engineering, Roads and Fire Safety staff to design potential alternatives
- Developed new scenarios: TODAY
- New submission to Washoe County based on input from TRPA, Washoe County and community (tonight)
- Will resubmit to Washoe County in Mid August
- Challenges addressed in design

Boulder Bay (Brian): What everyone wanted to know at the last meeting was if we could share our thinking process for creating these scenarios. The other stakeholders were not able to be here, but we communicate this input to them to arrive at what feels like a set of options that work the best for all the parties in mind. What we've done since the last meeting is have a sit-down with Washoe County and the Fire Department and talked about how important the 4th access point for Highway 28 is. We asked them for their restrictions in that regard. From there, we've come up with 4 scenarios, and listed some initial pros and cons for each. Remember that a pro for someone might be a con for someone else, so let's be sure to turn those thoughts into notes in the breakout sessions. Then, we can take it from there and share again with Washoe County and TRPA.

Challenges in developing road scenarios

- Provide four access points
- Provide improved access for Fire and Emergency Services
- Design with safe stopping conditions
- Design according to Washoe County code
- Accommodate site slope conditions
- Respond to TRPA request to minimize coverage
- TRPA request for an open space park

Boulder Bay (Brian): This is just a quick summary of the different things that push and pull this project in different directions. This is just the process that we go through; its not always perfect, and may not allow for 100% satisfaction for all the stakeholders, but we

try to do the best we can. For instance tonight, our aim is to take input and incorporate those comments into our final decision about the roads.

Boulder Bay (Phil): Before we get started, I wanted to say that I am excited to see those of you who did come tonight, we were happy to work with everyone at the last meeting. I think Streamline will do a great job taking community input and we are excited to add them to the project team.

Scenario A - Wassou Linkage to Building A Entry at SR28—presented by Boulder Bay (Phil Gilanfarr)

This scenario provides pros and cons, but remember they may be different for you. It is important that the loop road in this situation be here to be able to let people out another way, around the light. This road can also be heated, because it will be a private road with public accessibility. This brings a new issue into maintaining the road, but the benefit is that it is snow melted. Washoe County Code currently does not allow for snow melting on public roads, which is another reason that we would keep this road as private with a public easement. This particular road alignment puts the slope at 13.5%, which is a con.

By creating this additional access point, we are reducing the possibility of having a stoplight at Stateline on Route 28.

Pros

- Creates a loop road
- Allows for level park
- Roadway is heated/snow melted
- Second public access point to Hwy 28
- Creates 4% stopping condition

Cons

- Reduces chance of signal at 28
- Requires excessive grading
- Exceeds Washoe County slope at 13.5%

Post Meeting Comment: Upon final design, the actual slope is 13.6%

Clarification questions per scenario A

Question: What is the benefit of having a private road that is publicly accessed and heated?

Response (Phil): This means that there is an easement, or a deed restriction, stating that the public has access to this road. However, under this easement, the private landowner is responsible for maintaining that road.

**Boulder Bay LLC
Community Meeting
Summary Notes
August 7, 2008**



Question: So the deed restriction does not require that the landowner heat the road?

Response (Phil): Actually, it does. The deed restriction can pertain to maintenance, striping, heating, landscaping, and a variety of requirements.

Question: Is this a 2-lane or 3-lane scenario (referring to Highway 28 turn lane)?

Response (Phil): The proposal is to extend the 3-lane past the development point, up to the point where the required turning lane ends at the light.

Question: Is the entire road pertaining to Scenario B? Or just the red section?

Response: Actually, we are looking at the whole road to be heated. It would be heated from Wassou to Route 28.

Question: What happens when the heating mechanism fails?

Response: That's part of the public easement.

Question: So in that event, Boulder Bay will be responsible for providing snowplows?

Response: Yes.

Question: In the event of bankruptcy, etc. would they still be responsible?

Response: If you are in support of scenario A, then you have valid points. Bring these to the breakout session.

Question: How much of the road is at 13.5%?

Response: Based on the visual, it's about 75 or 80 feet. I apologize if I'm wrong, but based on projections it looks like 75 or 80 feet.

Post Meeting Comment: As was commented during the meeting, this estimate seemed way too low. A preliminary estimate puts this length of snow-melted road at 13.6% for approximately 450 ft. We will be posting the road profile for scenario A to the website. Included on this profile will be the slopes and lengths.

Question: It would be useful to have profiles of each of these options. For instance how long, slope, etc.

Response: We can post those profiles on the web as a result of this meeting.

Question: Once again back to the heating mechanism. Is it electrical?

Response: The proponent of the project is interested in their carbon footprint, LEED certification, and overall environmental friendliness. If possible, we will be using geothermal or solar, but this is a good comment to record. If we go with scenario A, you will be in favor as long as we look at this kind of stuff.

Scenario B - Realign Wassou Linkage to SR28—Boulder Bay—Phil Gilanfarr

This particular situation was based on an idea to shift the proposed section of Wassou downhill, in order to bring an ability to have a downhill grade through the park and out onto 28. There would be no purpose of the center road besides delivery. It still does create a loop road, not necessarily what is there now, but it does create an 8-10.9% slope. It could be a pro if you look at it as less than the slope in Scenario A. It would be a county road, creating a year-round second access point to 28. From a negative side, there would be changes of a signal at SR28, if that is a negative for you. It does reduce the area for the future park, because the road travels alongside and through it. It would require grading of the slope around the road, which uses more space around the road. Our initial chitchat with the county has brought up other issues. It does introduce more traffic to the neighborhoods, but I find that I might have more opportunity to avoid it if I have a second road to use to get around traffic. This also adds more asphalt, which means more coverage area.

Pros

- Creates a loop road
- Less slope than Reservoir
- County Standard road width and design
- Second public access point to Hwy 28
- Creates 4% stopping condition

Cons

- Reduces chance of signal at 28
- Reduces area for park
- Requires excessive grading
- Exceeds Washoe County slope at 10.9%
- No snow melt system
- Potential for more traffic to neighborhood streets
- Requires more coverage

Clarification questions per scenario B

Question: Currently Reservoir Rd. has three steps to it, the upper section, the flat section, and the bottom section next to 28. What grades are those, so I can have a handle on what that will look like?

Response (Brian): 10-12% on top, 7% in the middle, then dips to 12-13%, then back up to 6-10%.

Post Meeting Response: 8-14% on top, 7-8% in the middle, then dips to 10-14% at the bottom, with a short stopping condition at 10-4%.

Question: Will TRPA require less coverage on other parts of the project if this road will create more coverage?

Response (Brian): In a commitment that I've made to TRPA, yes, we will still get to an 11% reduction in coverage. There will be a net reduction of 11%.

Question: Are the red points going to be heated as well?

Response: No, the red simply shows the proposed area. Only the bottom of the center road will be heated. The county road, in this scenario, will not be heated.

Question: But it won't meet county standards?

Response: It will meet county standards except in the slope.

Question: Will the middle turning lane extend all the way out to that road?

Response: In this case, unless the county decided to make it a requirement, it will still end just after the project.

Post Meeting Comment: In the event that this option is chosen, the need for the extension of the third turn lane would be evaluated based upon additional traffic studies.

Comment: I think the required grade is 12.7%, so really, 10.9% isn't as bad.

Response: Yes.

Scenario C - Wassou Linkage with possible future stoplight—Boulder Bay, Phil Gilanfarr

In this scenario, we have narrowed the road to 16 feet and put in bollards, so that this would be strictly delivery and emergency access. No winter access. In planning this, it was to meet the requirements that we provide a 4th emergency access point. This could mean a winter emergency or an emergency requiring that everyone evacuate. One of the things it does allow for is that if NDOT says that we need 1,000 cars a day at Stateline to create the need for a stoplight, this is a scenario that potentially allows for that in the future. I am assuming that putting in a stoplight is a pro; according to some comments I've heard.

Post Meeting Comment: Please note that the example of 1,000 cars was purely arbitrary and has no relation to the project itself. It was used only for example purposes.

**Boulder Bay LLC
Community Meeting
Summary Notes
August 7, 2008**



Pros

- Creates fourth emergency egress point
- Minimal impervious coverage required
- Allows for level park
- Path is snow melted
- Allows for pedestrian/bike movement
- Reduces neighborhood traffic
- Allows for possibility of future light at 28

Cons

- Restricts access except in the case of an emergency
- Exceeds Washoe County slope at 13.5%

Clarification questions per scenario C

Question: If you have a stoplight, does it reduce the need to have a pedestrian walkway?

Response: That would be for NDOT to determine.

Question: In the scenario, there's a pedestrian/bike area. At either end of these roads, are you sharing the road with cars? Or are there bike paths and sidewalks? The people need to come out at either end; they will not ride back and forth in the same section. Do the bikers join traffic, or will they stay on a bike path?

Response: I appreciate this comment, and I also feel that we should incorporate a safe point for the pedestrian and the bicycle, and also allow for the opportunity to link with the lake path.

Question: It's a yes or no question. Is there a bike path or not?

Response: It would be striped on the road.

Question: It's a simple question. Is there a path in each scenario on any of your new proposed roads, or not?

Response: There would be a striped section separating the bikers from the road. As far as the other roads go, we are looking into this.

Question: But at this point, they are not there? On the new road, Stateline, or Wassou? So if I come out that road, there's not a bike path?

Response: No but we are hearing this, and recording it, and taking it into consideration.

**Boulder Bay LLC
Community Meeting
Summary Notes
August 7, 2008**



Question: My comment is that, for those who are frustrated with traffic, when its busy, funneling traffic and increasing congestion in order to get a stoplight is a con for me, not a pro.

Question: Will there be sidewalks on all the new roads?

Response: No.

Post Meeting Comment: This comment has been taken into advisement and will be discussed with Washoe County and TRPA for consideration as an addition to the design.

Response (Brian): This is something we can review with Washoe county, so please insert your comments and we can push that with Washoe county. Some of these will eventually become Washoe county roads.

Question: The way I look at it, the traffic from the parking garage is now forcing traffic down Lakeview road and Brockway road, instead of down Stateline. Why is that?

Response: They wouldn't exactly exit naturally into that area, though. The traffic in the parking garage is one-way.

Question: Your plans all show an underground parking lot. What is the building above that? D? There is a parking garage under there with an exit onto the road. You can't exit from there?

Response: No. The autos would enter on Stateline, and then exit onto 28. It is difficult to fit an on ramp and an off ramp in both directions.

Question: About the stoplight - of all the talk about reducing traffic, now you are telling me it will take 1,000 cars to get a stoplight there, which is not a pro to me. The stoplight here lines up with cove, and so people will be stopping on both sides to let people through. This traffic will increase throughout the whole area. This is not a pro. Are there any studies on this?

Response (Phil): I apologize for using the number 1,000. It might be 10. Its whatever NDOT decides is a level of traffic that warrants a light.

Question: Will there be a traffic analysis?

Response: Yes, TRPA has a traffic consultant, and NDOT will have his or her own do another study. Hopefully we will find more data than we have right now.

Post Meeting Response: A second transportation study will be completed by TRPA and the Environmental Consultant as part of the Environmental Impact Statement.

Facilitator (Seana): Boulder Bay is telling us that they've heard the neighborhoods say they want to know about the possibility of a light.

Scenario D - Emergency Exit through Parking Garage—Boulder Bay, Phil Gilanfarr

Here, the exit strategy is through the parking garage. I know this is a stretch – lets just look into it. Here, we are offering an emergency shelter.

Pros

- Creates fourth emergency egress point
- Minimal impervious coverage required
- Allows for level park
- Allows for pedestrian/bike movement
- Reduces neighborhood traffic
- Allows for possibility of future light at 28
- Provides House-In-Place option in the event of an emergency

Cons

- Restricts access in the case of an emergency

Clarification questions per scenario D

Question: There was an emergency evacuation a couple years ago in the event of an avalanche, and no one showed up at the designated shelter, so maybe this is a case in point.

Question What's the clearance of the garage?

Response: 9-foot ceilings.

Question: Is this the minimal level of clearance?

Response: Yes, this would be only for people in autos.

Question: Clarify the mid-end-August submissions to Washoe on all of our comments. We've talked about this in respect to the county commissioners. Do you or don't you consider the project in front of the county commissioner? How are you going to make the decision on all of our comments at the end of August?

Facilitator (Seana): This is where the comments come in. We take "like", "dislike", and "changes", and where preferences fall and frequency of comments, the major concerns will become apparent.

**Boulder Bay LLC
Community Meeting
Summary Notes
August 7, 2008**



Response (Phil): Even if you like all 4, or none of them, if you have a thought, write it down. We are breaking into groups to get a routine going. Next meeting, when 300 people show up, we will be thankful that we have many places to speak our voices.

Facilitator (Seana): There will be many opportunities to give input. The process is, we take the notes and input and find where the public opinion is strongest, and then use that to determine the major concerns.

Response (Brian): When we go to TRPA, we will be able to talk about their requirements but also use your comments as leverage to bring back to the TRPA and say to them, "we have had a lot of public comment about this subject".

Question: Well, is our input going to be 5% of your decision or 50%? I would like to know this.

Question on 4: Is it not possible to comply with the commissioner and give us our Reservoir Road? I thought they were saying that one of their dictations was that Reservoir Road not be abandoned.

Response (Brian): What we've tried to do is take Reservoir and balance all the thoughts coming in. We are trying to create a more coherent community with an internal, pedestrian walking scenario. What I've heard is that both the two solutions with the loop road, create the fourth emergency access point.

Question: Yes, they did say that, but right now the emergency egress is flat, and all the new scenarios are 10% grade. I think what we have right now is what we wanted.

Post Meeting Response: The current Reservoir Road is 8-14% on top, 7-8% in the middle, then dips to 10-14% at the bottom, with a short stopping condition at 10-4%.

Question: My concern is that when you bring options to the community, the status quo is always an option, and here, the status quo is not an option.

Facilitator (Seana): Lets add a scenario E, status quo, to the breakout session.

Question: There is an implicit assumption that abandonment of Reservoir Road will happen. Why is this? Why is the developer assuming this?

Response (Phil): The original North Stateline Community Plan Team spent countless hours on a Community Plan for this area. The Community Plan team went through an extremely thorough process to which the community took part in and TRPA and Washoe County adopted. Boulder Bay is helping to achieve the goals laid out by this plan and create this comprehensive plan for our community. What you are seeing here, is a developer whose first question was "how can we make this development fit with the Community Plan?" These visions are about creating a place for people to walk and

**Boulder Bay LLC
Community Meeting
Summary Notes
August 7, 2008**



bike. This is what we decided as a community! I urge everyone to get a copy of the Community Plan and reread it, because it is exactly what we are trying to accomplish here.

Facilitator (Seana): There is no answer to the percentage question as to how much of your input is used in the decision making process. The project team will use your input to improve the project and design future meetings.

Question: If we all decide something, and you do the opposite, then is it 0%?

Response (Brian): We are deciding on viable solutions for each of the many decisions based upon input from many different parties. Each decision is different and we will incorporate the input from the community differently in each case. Sometimes the Community voice will be weighted more heavily than everyone else and other times TRPA or Washoe county requirements might be most heavily weighted. In the case of the 4th ingress/egress, the community is taking the lead.

Question: What is the website?

Response: [www. Boulderbayresort.com](http://www.Boulderbayresort.com)

Question: So is Boulder Bay Ave. going to be 2-way roadway or one-way?

Response: It will be one-way toward the cove.

Post Meeting Response: This was a misstatement by the group. The road is in fact two ways at the either end of the internal road up to the entrance to the parking garage. The middle of the street is one-way towards the post office (away from Cove).

Question: As a designer, I find that your website is not updated accurately. I couldn't find the most updated plan, so that did not help to prepare me for tonight.

Question: I would like to see more information and specifics. How in the world are we supposed to be making choices if you don't even know what you're doing?

Comment: That's correct. This is all moot, if we don't have information or specifics.

Facilitator (Seana): We are hearing you, and we are making these comments heard and they will be used at a later date. I am asking you to trust in the process. We are going into breakout sessions, so please bring your comments to a station.

IV. Breakout Sessions Notes

- Break into 3 groups
- Name tags indicate group #
- Facilitator in each group to record your comments:
 - Per each scenario, what did you like, not like, like to see changed
 - Open Space for other topics
 - Evaluations: please fill out
 - Addition: 5th scenario---keep roads as they are (added per request during meeting)

**Multiple comments and frequency are noted as: (x #), e.g. (x3)

Scenario A

Like:

- Provides another way out
- Not just an emergency exit
- Like this scenario
- Heated road (x2)
- Road is always open, but not a county road
- Route and location are most acceptable
- This scenario is most like the status quo

Dislike:

- Lack of pedestrian walkways and bikeways on new roads
- Service entrance is too centralized and in a high-traffic area
- Centers around being private; i.e., risky if 1 piece of snow removal equipment breaks down
- Dependent upon private 3rd party for general maintenance, risky
- Snow not removed in case of power failure

Changes:

- Extend #1 from Wassou over to Reservoir
- Add internal walkways and bike paths
- Make it a county road if slope issue can be worked out with Washoe County
- I would like scenario A much better if it was a county road; What about road proposal based on current Community Plan density?

Scenario B

Like:

- Creates a loop road
- Relocates Reservoir
- Access to Wassou (in & out)
- Access to upper roads without going through the project

**Boulder Bay LLC
Community Meeting
Summary Notes
August 7, 2008**



- County road
- Bypasses project
- Least difficult slope
- Ease of turning around important
- Best option so far
- Like this scenario

Dislike:

- Still funnels traffic through the neighborhood
- Lack of bike and walking paths
- Inexperienced drivers on narrow, blind curves (15mph)
- Wide road funneled into narrow, blind curves
- Dangerous, one lane in winter
- Cuts back
- Reduces area of level park (x2)
- More blacktop
- Intersection between Wassou and new proposed road looks potentially dangerous
- Concern about stoplight
- Slope
- Making two turns off Wassou

Changes:

- Concern: What is the slope?
- Add biking and walking paths
- Extend the 3 lanes to meet the exit
- Widen and improve park by moving or removing building 1 further west/left

Scenario C

Like:

- Location and routing
- Nothing
- Like this scenario
- Stoplight possibility on 28 & Stateline

Dislike:

- No viable 4th egress point (x2)
- Emergency use only
- Concern about intersection at Route 28 and Stateline if signal is built
- Does not solve upper Crystal Bay traffic issue
- Risky because it is dependent on Boulder Bay and the county to open the emergency road; private (x2)
- Narrow and gated aspect of road
- Not really a road, not acceptable
- Restricting automobile access (x2)

**Boulder Bay LLC
Community Meeting
Summary Notes
August 7, 2008**



- Do not like C (x3)
- Doesn't comply with commissioner
- Seems silly to have an exit cut through open space for a few residents that need an emergency exit

Changes:

- No comments

Scenario D

Like:

- Emergency shelter

Dislike:

- Hate D, worst of four (x2)
- Haha, silly, ridiculous (x2)
- No viable 4th egress point (x2)
- Does not meet community requirement
- Does not solve traffic situation
- Dependent upon Boulder Bay and garage not being open
- Flood risk
- Possible future stoplight
- Denied on appeal by Washoe County commissioner

Changes:

- No comments

Scenario E – Status Quo

Like:

- First choice (x6)
- Road options are based on current Community Plan density
- Doesn't require change (x3)
- Keep Reservoir
- Abandon Wassou behind parking lot, put loop road around
- Upgrade to any additional usage, i.e. Sidewalks and improvements on Reservoir
- Access point method
- Grade/slope

Dislike:

- No comments

Changes:

- Add bike paths and walking paths

**Boulder Bay LLC
Community Meeting
Summary Notes
August 7, 2008**



- Make Wassou more evident through Biltmore parking lot
- Put in Stateline park, per the Community Plan

Other Topics

- Move post office onto Boulder Bay property (people have no reason to walk across Reservoir Road)
- Open current post office as retail

All Scenarios

- Add pedestrian bridge or tunnel
- Take stoplight away
- Prefer a roundabout to a stoplight at Stateline; keeps traffic flowing but allows pedestrian crossing and turns into CalNeva & Stateline
- Heated roadway is a great idea for the private road scenarios and you may want to explore geothermal options given the hot springs

V. Meeting Evaluations

1. What did you like about the meeting process/format tonight?

- Not too much, public comments should have followed presentation
- Having the opportunity to provide input
- Public comment should be after presentation
- Effort to listen
- Good
- Plenty of time for public comment
- Too controlled
- Streamline ladies
- Clarification of objectives

2. Suggestions for meeting format improvements:

- Make information available before the meeting, with adequate detail
- Better visualization aids (elevations)
- Provide collateral in advance
- Have comment period after presentation
- More group discussion
- Stay on comment/structure – don't allow comments after you said you wouldn't
- Liked small format

3. How did you hear about this meeting?

- Mailed letter (x9)
- Email (x2)
- Bonanza
- Newspaper (x2)
- Friends of Crystal Bay

4. Please list any questions that were not answered this evening.

- Please include Brockway when stating: "Protects neighborhood streets from excess traffic"
- Details of project; show profiles of streets and elevations of buildings
- Include impacts to Brockway
- Too many to list, but why is all you asked for South Shore density and height?
- What weight do we actually have in the process decision?
- How long are the different grades?
- Stateline and Route 28 signal

5. Suggestions on additional ways to involve the community and/or get the word out to the community about this project:

- Tell the truth more
- Newspaper announcement 1 month in advance

- I think some have forgotten this is a private project and BBLCC is being very tolerant
- Use your email list!
- More detailed plans
- Don't have meetings in the summer - busiest time of year for residents; schedule conflicts

6. What additional topics would you like to see covered at future community meetings?

- A better emergency evacuation plan
- Project details
- Density (x5)
- Scope
- Height (x2)
- Variances
- Recent shadowing of developer children out recreating, etc.
- Workforce housing
- Green building

7. Per the outlined four safety road scenarios presented tonight, please rank each in order of preference (1=most preferred, 4=least preferred)

Total: 17 responses

A: 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3

B: 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3

C: Do not support, 1, 1, 1, 3, 4, 4

D: Do not support, 1, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 5

E (no change/status quo): 1, 1, 1, 1, 2