

“LOG MT GATE”

RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

08-18-2016 Email to Katy:

**1. I am going to keep a ledger of volunteer time at Mt. Gate. Maybe you can remember when/hours you have spent watering?**

**2. As to the kid's biking route, I was thinking an approach would be to ask the H.S./middle school to add to their announcements that we'd like to meet ones who are interested to advise us on a route at Mt. Gate. Say in early Sept.**

**Give us a call when you have an idea of when to water on Thurs. AM.**

**Thanks,**

**Bruce**

07-20-2016 Toni at sierraview equipment: she used the water wagon and water plants individually. Bought the water wagon from one of the equipment rental places. Will send the as-builts w/ irrigation plumbing next week.

07-14-2016 email

Hello Katy and Bruce,

Sierra View Equipment was the general contractor for Mountain Gate. Toni Van Winkle, [toni@sierraviewequipment.com](mailto:toni@sierraviewequipment.com), is the main contact at SVE. Our As-Built site plans do not include the temporary irrigation system that was set up by the landscaper. Our As-Built landscaping plans are attached.

Toni has generously reached out to the landscaper who will help add the irrigation system to the plan sheet. We're hoping to get this next week and will also pass it on to you.

Thank you for contributing to the maintenance of the park. To close out the grant for the state I will also be including a maintenance schedule with three “clean-ups” a year. Does the below schedule accurately reflect your plans?

1. Spring clean-up (May)
2. Summer weeding (July)
3. Fall winterization (October)

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

The state seemed most concerned about weeds growing in the par course exercise zones.

Best Regards,

Peter Chapman  
Project Manager  
Mono County Public Works  
O: (760) 932-5446  
M: (218) 269-0389

### **LOG MT. GATE DEVELOPMENT**

07-07-2016 Discussion at RPAC and after meeting, soliciting public thoughts:

Chuck (on Eastside Ln.) - good idea to have a path from Eastside Ln. along east side of 395, safely off the highway. Could serve as a means for the public coming from town to access a trail at the intersection of 395 & Eastside Ln. Grant money coming to Mt. Gate could include this.

Mike Curti recommended No Parking signs on Eastside Ln between 395 & the River and signage that directed fishermen/others to park at Mt. Gate Park.

Lou Rosier thought to elaborate on the par course in the Park with a toddler play area so parents could exercise while in view of their kids.

Several folks suggested a figure-8 trunk trail (with the center of the two loops at the current Park) a good basis for the full mile long Mt. Gate parcel. Radial trails off the trunk route could get fishermen to the River.

Claudia cautioned to seek out F&G biologist recommendations on the impact of whatever is being considered on the wildlife, specifically the deer. Also the solicitation of community input throughout.

A number of people thought parking could be expanded in the center of the Park so as to make parking closer to Eastside Ln. less necessary.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

06-28-2016 Working Group Meeting. Present: Arden, Ned & Diane Welsh, Katy, Mark & Bruce.

Both soccer and baseball/soccer fields will be deleted from any proposal from the Working Group, but their potential location will be held as raw land by planning other uses (such as trails) without intruding on the raw land. This will also accommodate keeping about 400' between a potential dirt parking area and the residential area north of Eastside Ln. Such parking would be additionally screened by a dirt berm.

Arden described the history of Mt. Gate, noting that having approvals and plans in place is vital to respond to grant offerings, as they are invariably short-noticed.

North Trails as shown on the discussion sketch (“MT GATE AERIAL 04-28-2016B PLAT” in Mt. Gate subfolder under RPAC) north of Mt. Gate Park development are acceptable to the Working Group.

South Trails need to be added to any proposal (south of Mt. Gate Park).

Diane and Ned pointed out that volunteers for Mt. improvement/maintenance might be found among the local Church congregations, both grade school and high school students and scouts. [Eagle scouts need to fulfill requirements that include a public service project.]

David Smith (Fisherama) might have some recommendations for handicapped fishing at the Park. Bruce is to contact him. Katy cautions that there are legal requirements for the heights of railings.

Local talent music events could be held at the assembly seating at the park, as it has been for bird and geology talks.

The Group generally supported the enhancement of the oxbow (a dry section of the historic riverbed) north of the Park with river bank protection in the form of native tree and shrub plantings, and use of the excavated sand from the oxbow to create a recreational “beach”.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Properly designed, the oxbow could restore the fishing for which the Antelope Valley was once well known, including a spawning habitat and side-channel fish refuge from fast spring runoff.

Mark mentioned that CA F&W & Caltrans approval would have to be sought along with cooperation with the Federal Water Master. Diane pointed out that there are drip irrigation mechanisms at the Park now.

In related discussions, we acknowledged that the Mt. Gate trails would be along the lines supported by Lou and Marye Rossier and that dissemination of Katy's on-going three dimensional mapping of existing public lands trails could be a benefit for improved community health. Further, that a path link between the Marine Base and the Coleville schools would be a good starting place for Beyond the Neighborhood trails, as there has been state funding for this kind of thing.

04-07-2016 Standard size for soccer field preferred size for many professional teams' stadiums is 105 by 68 metres. Other sources say 100-120 yards long by 60-80 yards wide.[1 yard = 3 feet]

Softball fields distance from Plate to Outfield Fence – 220' to 300'. Infield bases form a 60' on a side square. 90 degrees at each base.

04-07-2016. Ph. msg to Joe Blanchard – Parks & Facilities Superintendent (below) after no responses from Pam Hamic. Regarding key for display cases at Mt. Gate. Tim Fesko later provided the keys to BW and to Joe Blanchard.

Monday – Thursday

7:30 am to 5:30 pm

Telephone: 760-932-5440

Fax: 760-932-5441

[monopw@mono.ca.gov](mailto:monopw@mono.ca.gov)

“LOG MT GATE”

RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Minutes Working Committee 01-23-2016.

**Mountain Gate Working Committee**

**READERS OF THESE MINUTES SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT THE IDEAS EXPRESSED ARE ONLY RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE AV RPAC AND CARRY NO VALIDITY UNTIL APPROVED BY THE AV RPAC.**

01-21-2016

Present: Arden Gerbig, Katy Buell, Mark Langner, Bruce Woodworth.

RE: FUTURE MT. GATE PARK DEVELOPMENT.

Conclusions of a majority of the Working Committee.

Arden: Accepting that population pressure and water availability will dictate aspects of the Park, a master concept should include potential locations of ball fields (soccer, softball) on the successful pattern of Smith Valley. PHASING THE PLAN may extend out perhaps 20 years.

Bruce: See map “MT GATE AERIAL 11-20-2018 01-20-2016”<sup>1</sup>.

Use (grizzley-ed) sand borrowed from the dry “Folly” oxbow for a sand beach on higher ground northwest of the oxbow as well as for trail surfacing. This beach can be a recreational feature (picnicking, volleyball, frizbee etc.) The top of slope above the resulting deepened oxbow would be planted with natural Willows and Poplars<sup>2</sup> above the southwest edge to protect the oxbow bank<sup>3</sup> in the future when flood conditions spread the river. This resulting expanded river course would be designed to provide year-round fishing habitat within the Park, as well as flood protection of the town of Walker.

Prior to the natural re-watering of the oxbow, it would serve as part of the Park Trail System.

Katy: 1. Discuss with private owners (whose square property south of Eastside Ln. and West of the River) whether they might consider a land trade.  
2. Regarding the deer seasonally traversing the Park land south of Eastside Ln. Bridge, it does no benefit to them to encourage their location so near a lethal highway.

---

<sup>1</sup> Filed in Documents, RPAC, MT GATE

<sup>2</sup> Depends of availability of irrigation.

<sup>3</sup> Preferred over riprap.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Mark: 1. Utility lines (probably no longer functioning – Arden) crossing the Park from Hwy 395 eastward and those going to the USGS Gauging station (Liberty) should be eliminated or undergrounded.

#### Park Use Restrictions:

1. Motorized and Equestrian use may be able to be accommodated by location and timing.

#### Volunteer Days for the Park.

1. Dead tree cutting at the north side of the currently developed park would be a public benefit.
2. Willows should be cut back at the handicapped fishing pier.
3. Paths roughly cleared.

#### Phases:

1. Near term plans (if grant funding becomes available):
  - Removal of overhead utility lines.
  - Paths. One route as close to the River as practical from south to north extent of the Park lands.
  - Oxbow -- Beach development / Fishing Habitat / Flood mitigation
2. Longer term plans:
  - Fields
  - Parking
  - Second path, parallel with the first, but closer to the highway
  - Toilet at north end of Park

#### Later Phases Details:

- Parking near corner of Eastside Ln. and Highway 395.
1. Reset back from Eastside Ln. probably 200 feet.
  2. An earthen berm should be constructed on the west side of the parking to mask from residents on Eastside Ln.
- Toilet.
1. If a well is constructed at the intersection of Hwy 395 & Eastside Ln., it could be a flush toilet depending on the perc testing and location with regard to the River.

03-10-2013

Present: Arden Gerbig, Dan Anthony, Katie Buell, Orval Mosby, Bruce Woodworth, Mark Langner, Claudia Bonnet, Johnny Vannoy

Subject: Conceptual Plan for county owned property between existing Mt. Gate Park development area and Eastside Ln.

#### Conclusions of the majority of the Committee:

1. Restroom/Parking complex will be in the proximity of Eastside Ln. and Hwy 395.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

It will accommodate handicap parking and access to the restroom and autos. With sufficient funding and if design allows, RVs and Semis may be permitted with access from northbound 395 or perhaps from Eastside Ln. Access from southbound 395 is unlikely.

2. A well to support the restroom will be set in the same general area. Water from the well may be used for other purposes as to be determined by future detailed planning.
3. A dirt berm and foliage planting will shield Eastside Ln. from the proposed parking/restroom area.
4. Two trails will connect the proposed restroom/parking area to the currently developed area of Mountain Gate Park. One will closely follow the river, while a second will be midway from the highway to the river. No motorized access for either trail.
5. If practical and permitted, the County may consider contracting with (a) water sports concessionaire(s) who would operate with no permanent structure on the property.
6. If practical and permitted, the existing sandy oxbow could be enhanced as a year-round fish habitat.
7. This conceptual plan should be discussed by the AV RPAC and endorsed to the County to have in readiness for grant application opportunities.

Submitted,

Bruce Woodworth

Later Ideas not considered by the Committee:

- A. Power lines should be removed; B. Design for flush toilet restrooms need be considered; C.

03-05-0213 At Claudia’s suggestion, Bruce met with her and Mark and Katie on Mt. north portion; Bruce met afterward with Arden.

1. Parking.

No enthusiasm for accommodating semi-truck parking.

Evenly split on having a restroom or not - pit toilet like Mt. Gate would suffice. [Arden points out that a restroom alleviates the pressure on local businesses.]

10 diagonal parking spaces in an area parallel with and within 50’ of Eastside Ln., west end of lot

located as close to Highway 395 as practical.

Earthen berm with tree and other plantings between parking and Eastside Ln.

2. Access:

- a. Off Eastside a first preference.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

- b. Off 395 a second preference if Caltrans sight distance calculations for either 45 mph or 55 mph, if calculations allow. Bruce will ask the county for help on guidelines of what constraints will limit design of access.
3. Leashed animals allowed.
4. Well. For irrigation and other uses.
5. Handicapped boardwalks to water where practical.
6. Designing to maintain as much high sage and bitterbrush habitat at Eastside Ln. end of park.
7. Additional trail loop to south of current Mt. Gate developed area.

02-28-2013 (email from Claudia) Hi Bruce and Mark,

First, I don't have any issues with the minutes.

Second, I have some concerns after walking the whole area today with my husband, Dick. I would appreciate it if everyone would be willing to reconsider the whole idea.

I noticed evidence of heavy deer use in one particular area. I saw lots of fecal droppings and tracks all over. All of it is near Eastside Lane. I'll try to be more specific. There is fencing that runs along Eastside and turns the corner and runs parallel with the highway for a little bit until it makes another turn and runs perpendicular to the highway back towards the river. The latter stretch is in disrepair and in many places only posts remain.

The area of heavy deer use is, more or less, in a section with 4 sides as described below.

- 1) River
- 2) Perpendicular run of defunct fence
- 3) Highway, approximately down as far as the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> telephone pole from the corner of Eastside Lane
- 4) 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> telephone pole over to the river

It's obvious that the deer use the above area frequently. I would hate to see any kind of parking or heavy use in that area. It doesn't matter whether or not the deer use is only seasonal. I think it is necessary to consult with an expert regarding what kind of use may or may not have an impact on the deer.



## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

I didn't explore the area that lies within the old fencing. I would like to check it for evidence of deer. If there is such evidence, I wouldn't like to see that area developed for parking and restroom without consulting an expert on deer habits.

As you know, a little further along the highway going towards Bridgeport there are a couple of places with long wide, gravel shoulders. In at least a couple of places along these stretches, there is existing dirt road access off the highway into the area. I know that they are near curves in the highway, but it doesn't seem too bad for auto, camper and motor home access. I don't know how it would be for semis. The shoulders can accommodate semi-truck parking for trucks going towards Walker. I don't know about the semi traffic going towards Bridgeport. There is also an area where people have already driven along a dirt road/track right to the river. That area could possibly accommodate **water craft access**. We have to decide whether or not we want to accommodate parking and provide a restroom closer to Eastside Lane AND take away the little bit of habitat (and apparent access to the river) from the remaining deer that use the area. To me the answer is simple. We need to protect the deer access. There might be other areas for an additional bathroom and parking. A loop trail could be made so visitors could access the area going back towards Eastside Lane. That would be less invasive to the deer that obviously use the area.

I also think Cal-Trans needs to be consulted about other possible areas of ingress and egress between the stretch of highway from the fourth or fifth telephone pole from Eastside and Mt. Gate. I don't really understand the big need for parking in the Eastside Lane area. One could still drive their car to a parking area further down from Eastside and bike or walk the whole area on a loop trail. For community members, they could have walking and biking access to the loop trail from Eastside Lane. . . . just not auto access. What difference does it make if you start the auto access at Eastside Lane or not? If it's for safety reasons, then just have the one access where it is right now. Is it because there is a belief that people would be more likely to visit the businesses in Walker because they parked at Eastside Lane? I don't know what foundation there is for such a belief. By the way, why aren't the Walker businesses advertising their businesses on the kiosk at the existing restrooms? They all seemed to be so adamant about having an opportunity to advertise their businesses. There aren't any individual postings about any of the businesses at all. They don't seem to be making use of what is already available to them. Is there some county regulation preventing them from doing so?

Anyway, I think more exploration needs to be done in the area that is being proposed for parking, restroom, and water sports concessionaires. I would be happy to meet either or both of you to show you the area about which I speak. I hope I may have the opportunity to voice my thoughts at the RPAC meeting or that one or the other of you would be kind enough to bring them up.

“LOG MT GATE”

RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Thank you,

Claudia

**Mountain Gate Working Group  
Agenda 03-05-2015**

[This agenda is for planning the undeveloped County parcel just south of the town of Walker, north of Mt. Gate Park, south of Eastside Ln. Bridge and west of the West Walker River.]

Features to be incorporated into the project plan and their locations:

- Parking area.
- Pedestrian bridge across the river.
- Well which might serve for water needs of the project area.
- Circular trail to connect with the existing Mt. Gate Park.
- Launching site for a water sport concessionaire.
- Fishing platforms
- Motorized vehicle/equestrian/bicycling trails.
- Existing sandy Oxbow as a year-round fishery haven<sup>4</sup>.
- Deer crossing exclusion for migration seasons. Encourage bitter brush.
- Restrooms.
- Sports fields (frizbees, horseshoes, boccee).
- Handicapped boardwalks.
- River access paths off trails.
- Connection to rest of the AV Trail system.
- Bat habitat development (mosquito abatement).

Limitations on activities:

- Overnight camping.
- Non-pedestrian trail access.
- Leashed dogs only.

---

<sup>4</sup> It would be necessary to assure the continued water flow into the Main Canal ditch.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

#### Modifications to site:

- Dirt berm and plantings to shield nearby residents.
- Remove overhead utility lines.

#### Information needed

- Existing Deer habitat location.
- Costs of first stage of plan.
- Willing owner on east side of river for trail connection.
- Preliminary contact with permitting agencies (Fish & Wildlife, Caltrans...)

Public Access rights on: 1) River Rd. (a paper-only route from 395 to N. River Ln., 2) AVWD 16' strip, 3) N. River Ln., 4) Meadow Ln.

03-03-2013 (email from Katy) Have you buried the **river access** in here somewhere? I didn't see it. I agree with Mark's comments and only add that putting the power lines underground would be nice but probably expensive. Also, we need to be careful of paving over paradise to put a parking lot. Let's focus the handicap access stuff to the upper park (semi paved path, fishing..) I think we should think less than more. Having surveyed the lot a couple of times from the highway since our last meeting, there isn't a lot of room for things like truck parking, acceleration lanes, etc.

I am up for a float, too. Maybe we're on to something....

Katy

Katy Buell  
email: [ktbuell@hotmail.com](mailto:ktbuell@hotmail.com)  
PO Box 500  
Coleville, CA 96107  
(530)495-1642

02-24-2013 (email from Vianey)

Bruce,  
I discovered we are limited on the amount of money left in the grant that can be used for design, so I am working to get as much of the original design scope done with the money we have left. I may need to

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

obtain another engineer to do the design.

On Monday, I am meeting with the Bishop Rotary Club member in charge of construction of the Buckley Ponds ADA fishing platform. I hope to obtain ideas on how to save money on the design of a similar platform/overlook at Mountain Gate.

Vianey White

02-26-2013 (email from Mark)

lynn and i took a walk around the area we were talking about last night. it is a really nice place and would make a fine park. having the park connected to an existing bike lane is a real bonus - i think the valley has real potential to become a popular biking area.

i've a couple of ideas to add to the mix:

the **existing power lines on the property** (and there are a few of them) should be **placed underground**.

there should be a **single entrance located off of eastside lane**. having an entrance off the highway so near the curve and the eastside intersection could be hazardous. the entrance road and lot could be a big enough loop to handle larger rvs, but trailer trucks might be out of luck. we could have a foot path from the highway to the restrooms for the benefit of the truckers. it would be easy to widen eastside to fit in turn lanes.

will there be issues with having water at the site during winter? would the restrooms be seasonal? how do you keep pipes from freezing without spending big bucks on electricity? will the county pay for heating the restrooms in winter? from my bodie experience i know that keeping public restrooms open during the cold season is difficult, problematic and costly.

the idea of **a single loop trail** (part along the river and the other more inland) would work well.

are there any issues with the USGS gauging station being on the site?

i am game for a tub/canoe trip down the river to the lake this spring. it should be an adventure if nothing else.

take care,

mark

i don't have katie'e e-mail.

Mountain Gate Working Group

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

#### Agenda 03-05-2015

[This agenda is for planning the undeveloped County parcel just south of the town of Walker, north of Mt. Gate Park, south of Eastside Ln. Bridge and west of the West Walker River.]

Features to be incorporated into the project plan and their locations:

Parking area.

Pedestrian bridge across the river.

Well which might serve for water needs of the project area.

Circular trail to connect with the existing Mt. Gate Park.

Launching site for a water sport concessionaire.

Fishing platforms

Motorized vehicle/equestrian/bicycling trails.

Existing sandy Oxbow as a year-round fishery haven<sup>5</sup>.

Deer crossing exclusion for migration seasons. Encourage bitter brush.

Restrooms.

Sports fields (frizbees, horseshoes, boccee).

Handicapped boardwalks.

River access paths off trails.

Connection to rest of the AV Trail system.

Bat habitat development (mosquito abatement).

Limitations on activities:

Overnight camping.

Non-pedestrian trail access.

---

<sup>5</sup> It would be necessary to assure the continued water flow into the Main Canal ditch.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Leashed dogs only.

#### Modifications to site:

Dirt berm and plantings to shield nearby residents.

Remove overhead utility lines.

#### Information needed

Existing Deer habitat location.

Costs of first stage of plan.

Willing owner on east side of river for trail connection.

Preliminary contact with permitting agencies (Fish & Wildlife, Caltrans...)

Public Access rights on: 1) River Rd. (a paper-only route from 395 to N. River Ln., 2) AVWD 16' strip, 3) N. River Ln., 4) Meadow Ln.

02-25-2015 Met with Arden regarding stage 3:

Well, Ball fields, toilets, bridge, motorized, parking, fishing pier, kayak concessionaire, clean fill. Park Ranch has sand.

10-2014 Met with Artist group to request art for Mt. Gate.

08-07-2014 Sent email request to Nancy Sims to solicit art for Mt. Gate.

07-31-2014

Bruce,

“LOG MT GATE”

RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Contact information for the artists donating their artwork is allowed to be posted on the message centers, but must be reviewed and approved prior to posting.

Thank you!

Vianey White

07-17-2014

Vianey,

Good to catch up with developments yesterday.

I hope Arden was able put you and Dwain together on the water.

Stewart Barret is the local fellow I know who has a water truck and I mentioned the Weds. July 23 11:00 meeting at Mt. Gate to him, and that if he were interested it would be as a sub-contractor to the bidders who will be at the meeting.

As to Interpretive - the web site for the Easter Sierra Interpretive folks did not seem to be what I had in mind, and looking on line for interpretive sign pedestals I found they were expensive.

Soooo. Please let me know if the interpretive signage information could be placed in the Message Center signs? If so, please let me know how many signs there are. I would be looking to find out how many sq. ft. of space could be used for interpretive information (flora, fauna, historical).

My approach will be to contact local artists to see if we could get 6-8 renderings of flora, fauna, historical aspects of the Antelope Valley (no only limited to Mt. Gate Park). I would like to be able to offer them a little subtle commercial exposure (e.g. their website or phone number on the renderings) to thereby benefit local business.

Their work will be augmented by hopefully interesting facts about each and formatted in a uniform way. I can manage that, I think.

“LOG MT GATE”

RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Let me know if I am getting off the path and if the commercial exposure would be objectionable, as far as you know.

Great to be in the final laps.

Bruce

07-16-2014 Vianey White:

Sorry Bruce and Arden I tried to email you the final project plans but the file is too large - but I can drop off hard copies tomorrow - see below and let me know. Thank you!

Thank you so much for all your help! I would like to meet with you soon to also discuss your interest in helping me fill in the **message center signs with information on the history of the site and the native plants and critters found on the site.** Thank you again!!!

The **Resources Agency can only pay for the temporary irrigation for the duration of the grant – through May 2016** so I am submitting an amendment to the construction completion date to extend the date to May 2016. Yay!

Vianey White

06-08-2014 (email to Vianey)

**Vianey,**

- 1. Table. Drawing P-10135-c.**
- 2. Colors of the table - One color for each table (Multiple Colors)**

**TimberForm ColorBook Colors: preferences by RPAC**

**8011 eight votes**

**8002 five votes**

**8025 four votes**

**1021 four votes**

**6019 three votes**

**6033 one vote**



## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

#### 3. Color of PAR course fixtures - by Engineer.

Bruce

06-06-2013 (Vianey email)

Attached is the latest planting plan along with plant spec sheets (I will bring a hard copy for your use tonight). In speaking with the landscape architect, she has selected native or adaptive plants that are hearty enough to survive the harsh conditions of this site. Besides the concern about watering the plants regularly for the first two years, the soil isn't the greatest.

Watering is anticipated to be needed twice a week during the spring/summer/fall for approximately two years. Each plant needs about 5 gallons of water per watering session. I'm waiting to hear back from the Resources Agency to see if the grant will support a watering service or temporary tank.

06-05-2014 [Easter Sierra Interpretive Association]

06-03-2014

Good, quick, decisive meeting, Vianey.

1. We will get the color preferences from the RPAC to you Monday.

2. If you can:

- a. trees palette of choices
- b. construction plans when available
- c. budget for required (and actual amounts of water needed per tree and times per month and which months, if possible) watering.

3. I will be (mostly unreachable) June 13 thru July 5.

Thanks

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

04-02-2014

Gerry, Bruce, and Arden,  
tomorrow’s RPAC meeting lists me as presenting for Mtn. Gate, but I was not planning on attending as I have another meeting to attend.

Bruce and Arden have the project update, but I have great news to add to the update – we received approval from the Resources Agency to proceed with the design!!! So RO Anderson has received approval to continue onto construction drawings. I will attend May’s meeting if we have a draft set of drawings ready.

Thank you!

03-10-2014 Phone with Vianey

Vianey,

#### Some thoughts on Mt. Gate:

Arden and Bruce,

Attached is the draft conceptual plan proposed with some details below. I am taking copies for tonight’s meeting. Looking forward to seeing you both tonight and receiving input.

03/05/14

Based on the item’s listed in the latest draft of the project’s cost estimate we have developed the attached revised conceptual plan for the Mountain Gate Fishing Access Project.

We propose the following items to be installed as previously planned

1. Culvert 36" - no changes
2. Site Furniture with Pads - (2) post mounted, recycled plastic and powder-coated steel frame picnic tables on concrete pad.

ossible post mounted, recycled plastic and powder-coated steel frame picnic tables on concrete pad.

3. AC Paving - Pave and stripe (2) Van Accessible ADA accessible parking spots and access route to the existing restroom.
4. Signage - (4) free standing educational interpretive signs located in separate locations near the wetland and fishing platform (fishing pier). **Allowing for involvement**

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

of local artists for the signage, if possible. Difficulty with breaking out portions of a contract because of Co. Counsel. Possible

5. Revegetation - Throughout the site to enhance the wetland and site furniture areas as well as provide bank reinforcement along the river and buffering along US Highway 395. The arborist's judgment that smaller trees survivability is greater, I suppose need be respected, but the uniformity of a line of saplings is piteously unimaginative. Perhaps RPAC input could contribute, and perhaps we could take a chance on an intermittent larger tree. Can try

6. Par Course - (5) powder coated free standing elements. Typically (and preferably) the PAR course "stations" are at a distance (100') from one another and not clustered. Probably.

7. Fishing Platform (fishing Pier) - (1) 700 sf (approx.) wood platform and railing not to extend over the river edge. River side (front) railing to be lower than the side railings for enhanced ADA accessibility. Suggest TREX where structurally appropriate. 700 sq. ft. in pretty large. Make two smaller ones? Matter of costs (2 harder than one; TREX more than wood).

We also would like to present alternatives to the following planned amenities

1. River Interceptor - As an alternative to the previously proposed River Interceptor System we propose a Wetland Interaction Area comprising of a large flat stone area laid directly along the wetland edge to provide visitors direct interaction with the wetland environment. Need we be concerned with the stone area becoming mossy (slippery)? Warning signs

2. Fencing at Entrance - As an alternative to the previously proposed Fencing at Entrance feature we propose a log post style entry monument which will be tall enough to be seen by drivers traveling both north and south bound to alert them of the actual park entrance.

Let's leave some RPAC design review on this, perhaps being just generic in our application. BW to provide "v" shaped entrance sketch

3. Pedestrian Bridge - As an alternative to the previously proposed Pedestrian Bridge feature we propose a simple amphitheater style seating area. This area is intended to provide a gathering and seating areas for the youth educational sessions as expressed in the grant documents. Personally, I don't see this as being used often and would like to

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

fulfill the education with something else - perhaps more educational signage. Money saved to go to material upgrades throughout?

I don't imagine that using the pedestrian to cross the W. Walker River is economically possible within our budget. If it were, I might be able to volunteer to get approval of an east side of river land owner and prepare the necessary easement. Vianey will put this in the next Mt. Gate phase.

4. Boardwalk - As an alternative to the previously proposed Boardwalk feature we propose improving the existing pedestrian trail to an the river access location north of the proposed fishing platform to provide visitor and kayak/fishing access. In the water flow season where kayaks might be running the river, this is not a good spot to put in the river. Will pass on to designer.

With any remaining money we propose to install simple highway park signs north and south of the projects entrance to alert drivers of the park. Angling the tall entry 45 degrees to the highway (so a "v" shaped structure - visible from north and south along road) would probably be sufficient to draw attention to the park. AW sketch to Vianey in two weeks.

Where there is an opportunity to upgrade qualities of materials in the park would be a good choice; too soon dilapidated parks are a boon to no one.

Each of the proposed features we have listed above have a corresponding photo on the attached exhibit to serve as a visual explanation of the intended amenity. Based on initial cost estimates we believe that these items can be constructed within the allowed budget and leave a sufficient contingency amount. Please do not hesitate to contact myself or Jeremy directly if you have any further questions or if you would like any changes to this exhibit before your meeting.

Bruce

03-06-2014

**Arden and Bruce,  
Attached is the draft conceptual plan proposed with some details below. I am taking copies for tonight's meeting. Looking forward to seeing you both tonight and receiving input.**

**03/05/14**

**Based on the item's listed in the latest draft of the project's cost estimate we have developed the attached revised conceptual plan for the Mountain Gate Fishing Access Project.**

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

#### **We propose the following items to be installed as previously planned**

1. Culvert 36” – no changes
2. Site Furniture with Pads – (2) post mounted, recycled plastic and powder-coated steel frame picnic tables on concrete pad.

(2) ADA accessible post mounted, recycled plastic and powder-coated steel frame picnic tables on concrete pad.

3. AC Paving – Pave and stripe (2) Van Accessible ADA accessible parking spots and access route to the existing restroom.
4. Signage – (4) free standing educational interpretive signs located in separate locations near the wetland and fishing platform (fishing pier).
5. Revegetation – Throughout the site to enhance the wetland and site furniture areas as well as provide bank reinforcement along the river and buffering along US Highway 395.
6. Par Course – (5) powder coated free standing elements.
7. Fishing Platform (fishing Pier) – (1) 700 sf (approx.) wood platform and railing not to extend over the river edge. River side (front) railing to be lower than the side railings for enhanced ADA accessibility.

#### **We also would like to present alternatives to the following planned amenities**

1. River Interceptor – As an alternative to the previously proposed River Interceptor System we propose a Wetland Interaction Area comprising of a large flat stone area laid directly along the wetland edge to provide visitors direct interaction with the wetland environment.
2. Fencing at Entrance – As an alternative to the previously proposed Fencing at Entrance feature we propose a log post style entry monument which will be tall enough to be seen by drivers traveling both north and south bound to alert them of the actual park entrance.
3. Pedestrian Bridge – As an alternative to the previously proposed Pedestrian Bridge feature we propose a simple amphitheater style seating area. This area is intended to provide a gathering and seating areas for the youth educational sessions as expressed in the grant documents.
4. Boardwalk – As an alternative to the previously proposed Boardwalk feature we propose improving the existing pedestrian trail to an the river access location north of the proposed fishing platform to provide visitor and kayak/fishing access.

**With any remaining money we propose to install simple highway park signs north and south of the projects entrance to alert drivers of the park.**

**Each of the proposed features we have listed above have a corresponding photo on the attached exhibit to serve as a visual explanation of the intended amenity. Based on initial cost estimates we believe that these items can be constructed within the allowed budget and leave a sufficient contingency amount. Please do not hesitate to contact myself or Jeremy directly if you have any further questions or if you would like any changes to this exhibit before your meeting.**

# “LOG MT GATE”

## RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

02-25-2014. Hal said that the county could take river rocks (after grizzly-ing?) for Mt. Gate.

01-29-2014

**Thank you for the email Bruce. I will keep your options on the table for discussions with the Resources Agency.**

### Notes from our Thursday 01/23/14 Meeting

1. Design contract has been signed with RO Anderson Engineering. Environmental documents will be coordinated through the County Planning Department and their consultants

a. RO Anderson is currently working on a conceptual design that implements all the original application statutory conditions, except the diversion channel will be removed and replaced by another element.

2. Plant plaques/ID signs – attached is a photo of what I have used in the past along with a hefty concrete footing. We may want something a bit more “organic” yet sturdy enough to withstand the temperature changes.

a. Your assistance is requested in providing information on nature trail signage and verbiage

3. Bruce to look into bird types living/migrating to the project site (complete)

4. Entry Gate – was part of the original application, but vandalism/security has not been an issue. Prefer to leave the entry gate out of scope (if allowed by the Resources Agency) so that funds may be used elsewhere on the project

5. Picnic Areas – Bruce suggested these remain close to parking to avoid visitors driving in unwanted areas just to get closer to the picnic tables.

a. Bruce and Arden agreed minimizing the areas for vehicle access is preferred. Currently visitors drive in anywhere that doesn't have vegetation

6. Vianey to email pictures of Town of Mammoth Lakes Bridges available for usage (attached)

a. Bridge dimensions:

i. Short 9' wide x 19' long

ii. Long 9' wide x 34' long

b. As of September 2013 these bridges were available for use. Vianey to work with RO Anderson to determine if these bridge(s) will work for this project site and if the bridges are still available determine purchase price and cost to haul and install.

7. Wow factor needed with the deletion of the diversion channel (to be approved by resources agency prior to proceeding to construction drawings)

a. Ideas suggested – plant mature trees (will require temporary irrigation)

b. Make sure the new design meets the statutory conditions discussed in the application

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

**Thank you again for meeting and providing valuable input. I will email you the first conceptual design and then schedule another meeting for review and discussion (maybe attend the next RPAC)**

**Vianey White, LEED AP BD+C**  
*Project Manager*

01-31-2014

**Bruce - Here are some possible species:**

Belted Kingfisher (year-round, river)  
Bald Eagle (winter)  
Red-tailed Hawk (year-round)  
Common Raven (year-round)  
Northern Flicker (year-round, woodpecker)  
Bullock's Oriole (in cottonwoods, summer)  
House Finch (year-round)  
White-crowned Sparrow (winter)

**Graham Chisholm email 01/31/2014**

09-04-2013 Vianey email: Bruce, I received two proposals for the design of this project and am currently reviewing them. I will let you know who is selected.

04-04-2013 Ph. conversation with Vianey: Co. has requested RFQs from engineers with expectation of getting less costly fishing platform and trails. Ap. 11 will be deadline for receipt, then 1+ month to negotiate. CN on Grant is a 2015 deadline.

04-04-2013 Hello Vianey,

It sounds like the County is beginning to pursue development of the Mountain Gate/Walker River recreational site (northeast corner of Eastside Lane and US 395) and some are thinking that a direct US 395 access would be a good idea. As the Intergovernmental Review Coordinator, I had past project interaction, so I'm responding to you. (Neither site layout nor formal application had been provided to us, hence, no disapproval/approval actually occurred.)

**Caltrans** and Mono County (Planning and Public Works) have been interacting over the years to improve safety via access management during new development proposals. **Access management** techniques include **minimizing the number of access points** (driveways, roads, etc. - also known as conflict points) and optimizing spacing between access points - thus, minimizing interference of driveway usage.

The site plan you gave James is consistent with our past interaction during the Mountain Gate Parkway Acquisition Project, in which the County procured the private parcels for the recreational

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

site. While corresponding in 2009 we stated that **no direct access would be needed from US 395** since a county driveway could be built on Eastside Lane (County Rd 5007, which has lower traffic volumes) and there are existing dedicated turn lanes at Eastside Lane/US 395. The County (Kelly Garcia) concurred. So, the County only needs to build a driveway to its current standards on Eastside Lane, at an appropriate distance from the US 395 intersection (as to not compromise safe functionality of that intersection and also perhaps aligning it with a access on the west side of Eastside Lane.) The existing US 395 turn lanes (left and right) onto Eastside Lane already provide for speed differentials due to slowing traffic, so should minimize the chance of rear end collisions. As a public road connection, this existing intersection’s geometry is such that turning movements of larger vehicles – RVs, vehicles w/ trailers and buses would be provided for.

Since recreational site access can be easily and safely accommodated via existing turn lanes on Eastside Lane and the proposed driveway on Eastside Lane, Caltrans sees **no reason to permit an access on US 395.**

(In general, any additional access in a location such as this, would complicate the safety for both through US 395 traffic and recreational site users - due to the proximity of Eastside lane, the US 395 turn lanes, and highway speed. New highway access points must be paved and built (by the County, project proponent, etc.) to current Caltrans highway standards including adequate sight distance, turning radius geometry, along with possible turn and acceleration lanes on US 395 for expected vehicles types.)

To easily direct users to the site: for westbound traffic, on-site signage could indicate to turn right at Eastside Lane; for eastbound, signage indicating to turn left onto Eastside Lane could be considered (via Caltrans permit, signs provided by the County, and perhaps on the existing Eastside Lane sign).

To improve aesthetics and **prevent future use of the unauthorized US 395 dirt usage access, your project should include revegetation/landscaping accordingly for this area.**

Feel free to contact me with any other questions.

Regards,

**Gayle Rosander**  
**Local Development-Intergovernmental Review**  
**Caltrans District 9 (Inyo, Mono, eastern Kern counties)**

03-18-2013 Conversation with Garrett at Public Works: He has asked Vianey to check with CALTRANS regarding their design criteria for minimum sight-distance limitations. He cautions us that CALTRANS is pre-disposed to keeping **highway ingress/egress points to a minimum**, even if their design criteria are met. We would need an encroachment permit from them to allow access to/from 395.



## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Further they will be involved with CALTRANS with appropriate signage to make the Park noticeable.

03-05-0213 At Claudia’s suggestion, Bruce met with her and Mark and Katie on Mt. north portion; Bruce met afterward with Arden.

#### 1. Parking.

No enthusiasm for accommodating semi-truck parking.

Evenly split on having a restroom or not - pit toilet like Mt. Gate would suffice. [Arden points out that a restroom alleviates the pressure on local businesses.]

10 diagonal parking spaces in an area parallel with and within 50’ of Eastside Ln., west end of lot located as close to Highway 395 as practical.

Earthen berm with tree and other plantings between parking and Eastside Ln.

#### 2. Access:

a. Off Eastside a first preference.

b. Off 395 a second preference if Caltrans sight distance calculations for either 45 mph or 55 mph, if calculations allow. Bruce will ask the county for help on guidelines of what constraints will limit design of access.

#### 3. Leashed animals allowed.

4. Well. For irrigation and other uses.

5. Handicapped boardwalks to water where practical.

6. Designing to maintain as much high sage and bitterbrush habitat at Eastside Ln. end of park.

7. Additional trail loop to south of current Mt. Gate developed area.

02-28-2013 (email from Claudia) Hi Bruce and Mark,

First, I don’t have any issues with the minutes.

Second, I have some concerns after walking the whole area today with my husband, Dick. I would appreciate it if everyone would be willing to reconsider the whole idea.

I noticed evidence of heavy deer use in one particular area. I saw lots of fecal droppings and tracks all over. All of it is near Eastside Lane. I’ll try to be more specific. There is fencing that runs along Eastside and turns the corner and runs parallel with the highway for a little bit until it makes another turn and runs perpendicular to the highway back towards the river. The latter stretch is in disrepair and in many places only posts remain.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

The area of heavy deer use is, more or less, in a section with 4 sides as described below.

- 5) River
- 6) Perpendicular run of defunct fence
- 7) Highway, approximately down as far as the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> telephone pole from the corner of Eastside Lane
- 8) 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> telephone pole over to the river

It's obvious that the deer use the above area frequently. I would hate to see any kind of parking or heavy use in that area. It doesn't matter whether or not the **deer use is only seasonal**. I think it is necessary to consult with an expert regarding what kind of use may or may not have an impact on the deer.

I didn't explore the area that lies within the old fencing. I would like to check it for evidence of deer. If there is such evidence, I wouldn't like to see that area developed for parking and restroom without **consulting an expert on deer habits**.

As you know, a little further along the highway going towards Bridgeport there are a couple of places with long wide, gravel shoulders. In at least a couple of places along these stretches, there is existing dirt road access off the highway into the area. I know that they are near curves in the highway, but it doesn't seem too bad for auto, camper and motor home access. I don't know how it would be for semis. The shoulders can accommodate semi-truck parking for trucks going towards Walker. I don't know about the semi traffic going towards Bridgeport. There is also an area where people have already driven along a dirt road/track right to the river. That area could possibly accommodate water craft access. We have to decide whether or not we want to accommodate parking and provide a restroom closer to Eastside Lane AND take away the little bit of habitat (and apparent access to the river) from the remaining deer that use the area. To me the answer is simple. We need to **protect the deer access**. There might be other areas for an additional bathroom and parking. A loop trail could be made so visitors could access the area going back towards Eastside Lane. That would be less invasive to the deer that obviously use the area.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

I also think Cal-Trans needs to be consulted about other possible areas of ingress and egress between the stretch of highway from the fourth or fifth telephone pole from Eastside and Mt. Gate. I don't really understand the big need for parking in the Eastside Lane area. One could still drive their car to a parking area further down from Eastside and bike or walk the whole area on a loop trail. For community members, they could have walking and biking access to the loop trail from Eastside Lane. . . just not auto access. What difference does it make if you start the auto access at Eastside Lane or not? If it's for safety reasons, then just have the one access where it is right now. Is it because there is a belief that people would be more likely to visit the businesses in Walker because they parked at Eastside Lane? I don't know what foundation there is for such a belief. By the way, why aren't the Walker businesses advertising their businesses on the kiosk at the existing restrooms? They all seemed to be so adamant about having an opportunity to advertise their businesses. There aren't any individual postings about any of the businesses at all. They don't seem to be making use of what is already available to them. Is there some county regulation preventing them from doing so?

Anyway, I think more exploration needs to be done in the area that is being proposed for parking, restroom, and water sports concessionaires. I would be happy to meet either or both of you to show you the area about which I speak. I hope I may have the opportunity to voice my thoughts at the RPAC meeting or that one or the other of you would be kind enough to bring them up.

Thank you,

Claudia

03-03-2013 (email from Katy) Have you buried the river access in here somewhere? I didn't see it. I agree with Mark's comments and only add that putting the **power lines underground** would be nice but probably expensive. Also, we need to be careful of paving over paradise to put a parking lot. Let's focus the handicap access stuff to the upper park (semi paved path, fishing..) I think we should think less than more. Having surveyed the lot a couple of times from the highway since our last meeting, there isn't a lot of room for things like truck parking, acceleration lanes, etc.

I am up for a float, too. Maybe we're on to something....

Katy

Katy Buell

email: [ktbuell@hotmail.com](mailto:ktbuell@hotmail.com)

PO Box 500

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Coleville, CA 96107  
(530)495-1642

02-24-2013 (email from Vianey)

Bruce,

I discovered we are limited on the amount of money left in the grant that can be used for design, so I am working to get as much of the original design scope done with the money we have left. I may need to obtain another engineer to do the design.

On Monday, I am meeting with the Bishop Rotary Club member in charge of construction of the Buckley Ponds ADA fishing platform. I hope to obtain ideas on how to save money on the design of a similar platform/overlook at Mountain Gate.

Vianey White

02-26-2013 (email from Mark)

lynn and i took a walk around the area we were talking about last night. it is a really nice place and would make a fine park. having the park connected to an existing bike lane is a real bonus - i think the valley has real potential to become a popular biking area.

i've a couple of ideas to add to the mix:

the existing power lines on the property (and there are a few of them) should be placed underground.

there should be a single entrance located off of eastside lane. having an entrance off the highway so near the curve and the eastside intersection could be hazardous. the entrance road and lot could be a big enough loop to handle larger rvs, but trailer trucks might be out of luck. we could have a foot path from the highway to the restrooms for the benefit of the truckers. it would be easy to widen eastside to fit in turn lanes.

will there be issues with having water at the site during winter? would the restrooms be seasonal? how do you keep pipes from freezing without spending big bucks on electricity? will the county pay for heating the restrooms in winter? from my bodie experience i know that keeping public restrooms open during the cold season is difficult, problematic and costly.

the idea of a single loop trail (part along the river and the other more inland) would work well.

are there any issues with the USGS gauging station being on the site?

i am game for a tub/canoe trip down the river to the lake this spring. it should be an adventure if nothing else.

“LOG MT GATE”

RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

take care,

mark

i don't have katie'e e-mail.

Present: Arden Gerbig, Dan Anthony, Katie Buell, Orval Mosby, Bruce Woodworth, Mark Langner, Claudia Bonnet, Johnny Vannoy

Subject: **Conceptual Plan** for county owned property between existing Mt. Gate Park development area and Eastside Ln.

Conclusions of the **majority of the Committee**:

8. Restroom/Parking complex will be in the proximity of Eastside Ln. and Hwy 395. It will accommodate **handicap parking and access to the restroom and autos**. With sufficient funding and if design allows, RVs and Semis may be permitted with access from northbound 395 or perhaps from Eastside Ln. Access from southbound 395 is unlikely.
9. A **well to support the restroom** will be set in the same general area. Water from the well may be used for other purposes as to be determined by future detailed planning.
10. A **dirt berm and foliage planting** will shield Eastside Ln. from the proposed parking/restroom area.
11. **Two trails** will connect the proposed restroom/parking area to the currently developed area of Mountain Gate Park. One will **closely follow the river**, while a second will be **midway from the highway to the river**. **No motorized access for either trail**.
12. If practical and permitted, the County may consider contracting with (a) **water sports concessionaire(s)** who would operate with no permanent structure on the property.
13. If practical and permitted, the **existing sandy oxbow** could be enhanced as a year-round fish habitat.
14. This conceptual plan should be discussed by the AV RPAC and endorsed to the County to have in readiness for grant application opportunities.

Submitted,

Bruce Woodworth

Later Ideas not considered by the Committee:

- A. **Power lines should be removed**; B. Design for **flush toilet restrooms** need be considered; C

12-06-12 Met with Vianey and Joe Blanchard from Mono Parks. Showed them where Arden would have the fishing pier(s).

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

12-03-12 Ph Conversation with Vianey. I asked that Arden and I be participants in the redesign. Vianey agreed to meet at Mt. Gate 12-06-12. She says HDR is reworking the concept drawing to accommodate F&G concern (and potential need for permits via Corps) for any excavation in the wetlands by relocating the paths. Because of the need to redo the plans, even the one fishing pier is in peril by the budget, in part because of need to have an ADA path to it. She talked of a boardwalk, however. All changes must survive Resource Agency re-approval, and we could lose all funding if not expeditious. I asked to be privy to emails esp. .pdf drawings shared in HDR conversations.

11-10-12 Mt. Gate Working Group met on site: Arden Gerbig, Alison Woodworth, Katy Buell, Mark Langner, Bruce Woodworth.

Cantilevered fishing pier locations (1 or 2 depending on funds) were sited on east side of Park.

Intention to shave the height of the levee for safety reasons where it dangerously slopes toward the river. Sculpt the terrain westerly down to the side-channel.

Open swale from side channel northward to flow beneath the intra-park road through culvert to exit in River.

Compromise on future of the side-channel to allow for a potential future water feature. A smaller impound in the short term.

Need for clean fill.

Location of parking/or picnic tables in the current slash burning area.

Walked the River to the north from the Park where scenic trail building opportunities were evident.

Bruce,

It was a pleasure speaking with you this morning.

As requested below is an update on the Mountain Gate Project. As I mentioned on the phone we are waiting to meet with the Department of Fish & Game prior to going back to the RPAC and then Resources Agency with alternative designs.

#### Mountain Gate Phase 2 – same as September’s meeting

1. The Board directed staff to look at alternative designs which do not trigger a legal dispute over surface water,
2. Resources Agency is unwilling/unable to fund a well to support a water feature such as a pond due to grant constraints,
3. Resources Agency is willing to fund other alternative designs, and
4. Staff is working with HDR and will be back to the community to discuss options.

#### Mountain Gate Phase 3 Application

California Resources Agency provided Public Works with a courtesy phone call stating the Mountain Gate Phase 3 application was denied.

Please call me with any questions. Thank you.

Vianey (Contreras) White, LEED AP BD+C

*Project Manager*

“LOG MT GATE”

RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

*County of Mono*

*Department of Public Works*

PO Box 457

74 North School Street, Annex 1

Bridgeport, CA 93517

Office: 760-932-5446

Mobile: 760-814-7614

Fax: 760-932-5441

Email: [vcontreras@mono.ca.gov](mailto:vcontreras@mono.ca.gov)

09-08-12 Bruce:

It's 100 feet [from the river to a well] in most circumstances, with the ability to go down to as little as 50 if it can be determined that there is no connectivity to the surface source.

[Jim Shaw says concreted 50' deep as well.]

Stacey

09-04-12

Hi, Bruce. Here is the latest information we have on Mountain Gate. It is as follows:

1. The Board directed staff to look at alternative designs which do not trigger a legal dispute over surface water,
2. Resources Agency is unwilling/unable to fund a well to support a water feature such as a pond due to grant constraints,
3. Resources Agency is willing to fund other alternative designs, and
4. Staff is working with HDR and will be back to the community to discuss options.

Call or email with any questions?

Gerry Le Francois, Principal Planner

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

08-02-12 Met with Gerry, Garrett, Stacey briefly, Rita Sherman and Arden. Phase III has \$30 available for \$200M requested. Vianey (“Vienna” as pronounced) new project manager for Mono Pub Works. Agreed to request RPAC to endorse a non-water right solution to Mt. Gate. RPAC agreed. Letter to BOS.

07-17-12 Meeting with Garrett, Geri LeFrancious (sp), Arden, Mitch Bloom from HDR Eng., Linda Smith and two others including Chris, an hydrologist, all from CA Dept. of Nat. Resources at Mt. Gate.

In postmortem, Garrett concluded that without a fast resolution to show we can successfully resolve the Phase II Grant obstacles, we may blacklist ourselves for Phase III and subsequent grant applications. [The Agency decides on Phase III in late Sept.]

There were two prominent issues with Mt. Gate Phase II: 1) the pipe providing water to Mt. Gate – by preference it should not require manipulation. A natural entryway for water to the restored side channel is better. 2) The Agency will be reluctant to be embroiled in a water rights fight. It would seem this lays to rest the legal avenue on Mt. Gate, although it may be an option for other projects in the future.

The RPAC and other community stakeholders may have to decide whether to compromise on having an internal flowing water component at Mt. Gate or potentially losing the \$480,000 remaining on the Phase II grant altogether.

A Design Plan B which might restore us to good standing would a) provide a non-manipulative water entry from the river into Mt. Gate while seeking acquiescence by the U.S. Water Board/Water Master, or b) abandon the internal flowing water in favor of an enlarged picnic area and fishing access on the current river course. This would require further HDR design work, part of which might be pro bono.

Additionally, we are tasked with getting letters of support/participation from Caltrans (for upstream access for parking) and CAF&G (for streambed manipulation).

If we are to approach the U.S. Water Board in a non-legal, supplicant manner, we will need to get on their agenda soon. I have been told that the manipulative water pipe/valve has been an obstacle for them.

Bruce

530-402-6422

06-04-12 Arden: On Mt. Gate, Mary Ellen is no longer with the County. I spoke with Garrett (last engineer standing) today and he says that he is trying to get up on all Mary Ellen's and Kelly's projects. He had spoken with Stacey earlier and she says there is on-going stuff among the lawyers, but that Shaw is adamant against any diversion, even if temporary and insignificantly consumptive. Finally, the 2nd Grant that Mary Ellen was working on may have an announcement in June.

03-06-12 Emailed Cedrik at Caltrans to get angle on historic maps.



## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Mary Ellen will send CD of scanned USGS maps going back into 1800s.

I did some additional research on the **pumped option**, and it appears that the **potential for solar is very limited**. It turns out that many people use solar to power their wells (i.e. outback stations in Australia) but this option would not be powerful enough to produce flows adequate for a fishery. Additionally, given that the **system would only flow when the sun is shining**, a large battery back-up or a water tank would be needed to regulate flows in the channel.

It's still a feasible option if there are easily obtainable flows, but that won't be known until a preliminary well is dug and the relevant tests are completed.

Mary Ellen

03-05-12

Regarding Mountain Gate: The legal definition for a **“historic” channel** is very narrow in scope and is **only** considered for the immediate past (i.e. during the historical record, or approximately the **past 100 years**). I don't know how long the main building of the Lodge was in place, but the mapped record shows a building in its location from the 1800's, I believe.

Even though the river established itself in the channel that will potentially be re-watered in that immediate past, the re-establishment of the river by the Army Corps to its previous location negated the actions of the flood. The phrase “historic channel” was used throughout the project process without having in-depth knowledge that the scientific definition varied from the legal one, and Stacey has concerns that the support offered by the State Water Resources Control Board was based on the misuse of that phrase. She's going to contact them to discuss this. The Board has told her to continue negotiations with the Water Master, but she's worried that not having specific evidence that the channel was watered will undermine the County's argument.

Sorry the news isn't better, but it's also not over yet.

Mary Ellen Halpin

01-19-12 Mary Ellen, Garrett, Tony D., Stacey Simon, BW meeting. Co. seeking advice on whether to abandon water portion of Mt. Gate Park. Discussion continued, however on how to make that work.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

May 2015 is the end of the grant period, but must realistically start CN in 2013. So there is time to push for water and fall back to non-water provided we start CN on time.

M.E. – 5 cfs min. for trout fishery.

Letter from RPAC at Feb. 2 meeting since the BOS will take up the question of pursuing litigation at that meeting. Possible “delay”, “uncertainty” and “expense” – according to Stacey.

10-06-11 Mary Ellen says GPA not needed for trails on current Mt. Gate grant app. For the Bridge, Caltrans wants more of a specific commitment – Tony is point.

Mike Curti says that the AV Fire Dept. can help with a water tender for Mt. Gate.

10-05-11 wy 1) Use water truck for all or part of water requirements, available through Fire Dept.? 2) Change design, perhaps through F&W assistance. 3) Analyze water needs by season [in summer we get natural filling; in winter need less]. 4) Letter from Fishing Commission.

10-04-11 Tony Kawalchek, pump supplier, not well digger says 2000 gals is a lot of water and he thinks it is probably not possible. His guess is 70-80’ depth of well. Tom Bennedict (Blain Well) suggests a smaller bore test hole as the larger bore hole for production would be a lot more expensive. Further he says, the well must be sealed in concrete for the first 20-100’ so as not to be withdrawing river water. He will be in touch with Mono Health re: requirements.

10-01-11 Letters of Support from Mono Chamber & RCD

09-28-11 Hal Curti reluctant to have RCD endorse Mt. Gate Phase III because of the water embroglio over Phase II which could blowback to affect the farmers’ water position. Probably will as III is vanilla, trails and fishing piers in non-Park area. He went to US Water Board (ranchers including Jeff Hunewill with a staff attorney, Karen Peterson) where they felt they hadn’t been given good info (showed pond), concerned with precedent, especially with manipulatable water intake. They thought the well approach was fine.

Stacey Simon will discuss the Versachi Ranch story with Peterson – did Jim Shaw just arrive on site to bully them out of creating sinuous water course, or did he obtain a court action? She thinks the Oct. 20 line in the sand for US Water Board before we go ahead with building Mt. Gate with river water may not resolve the matter and that Mt. Gate could be completed before it is resolved. On the other hand, it could be Mono Co. (& Lahontan Water Board) could lose.

Mary Ellen Digan says there is a problem in just substituting the well water source for the river water source in that, unless we get 10 csf (for which it was designed) then the configuration would have to be redone – and Phase II does not have the money to do it. She says Water Agency is not encouraging on asking for more money for a project that had “issues” (e.g. Jim Shaw), so asking for design grant money for a well water source reconfiguration is unlikely.[wy-that’s a poor thing]

Notes for Mt. Gate Working Group Meeting 09-08-11:

A. Refill former side channel with well water.

Issues

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

#### Approaches

Expense of Well & Power sources (solar/wind) for pumping  
Part of 2011 Prop 84 Grant request (under  
conservation/restoration element)  
F&W support/partnering if Lahontan trout established  
as part of the fishery

Expense of Well maintenance

Woodworth has had no costs for 10 years

Silting of restored side channel

Minimized by using well-pumped water

Water volume

Question the calculated water volume required to simply  
provide fishery habitat & water flow to  
minimize mosquito problem.

Use terraced water impounds from the north end  
at W. Walker River and small informal, natural rock  
fish laddering for fish access to S. end of restored  
side channel.

Seasonally supplement with AV Fire water truck.

Mosquitos

Fish keep mosquitos in check. Sport version Cutthroat Trout  
or “mosquito” fish

Bat habitat

No nearby residences

Fishery health

Solar powered aeration, if needed

B. General Plan Amendment (Area Plan) needed to buttress new Prop 84 application (Oct., 2011). Suggested wording (in red) below.

#### OBJECTIVE C (Antelope Valley Area Plan)

Maintain and enhance natural resource based recreational opportunities in the Valley and the surrounding area.

Policy 1: Work with appropriate agencies to maintain or improve natural resource base needed for recreational opportunities in the Antelope Valley and vicinity.

Action 1.1: Restore the natural ecology of the Mountain Gate area south of Walker, in tandem with development of compatible recreational opportunities for the area. Enhancement of the formerly pristine fishery is both an economic and environmental priority and is envisioned as a keystone of a W. Walker River Parkway. Appropriate pathways to and within the site, will allow recreation and educational interpretation in the setting of a regional destination.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Policy 2: Work with appropriate agencies to initiate recreational facility development in environmentally suitable areas.

Action 2.1: Work with the Walker River Irrigation District and other appropriate agencies to develop a recreation management plan for Topaz Lake. Potential issues to address in the plan include:

- Provision of a designated boat launch area to provide boat access within California; and
- Creation of restricted boating areas to provide protected water bird nesting and rearing habitats at the south end of the reservoir.

Action 2.2: Trails and pathways should be encouraged where opportunities become available throughout the Antelope Valley. Where willing sellers choose to participate, these may traverse private lands. Where public lands and rights of way are suitable locations, the web of trails and pathways should be included within them. Especially valuable will be connections through Walker and extending to the Mountain Gate Park area. Americans with Disability Act accommodations shall be included where practical.

07-02-11 Meeting with Mary Ellen Halpin, Kelly Garcia, Arden, Bruce. Existing grant limitations include no motorized, no Little League.

Potential (Oct. 2011) grant application for largely separate equestrian and hiking trails.

Idea of using the northerly Oxbow has the difficulty of bypassing the intake for a major irrigation ditch.

Consensus to explore using ground water at spring near Mt. Gate entrance to pump into water impound at center of park in old side channel since the obstruction of Jim Shaw, short of litigation, is such a problem. This involves estimation of volume necessary. Cannot envision that this would vex Shaw.

07-13-11 Email & 07-19-11

We will be holding a brainstorming session at the address below, 6:00 PM on Weds, July 20th. A meeting earlier in the day which would have included F&W, has been postponed.

We will discuss the land use limitations (no little league parks) imposed by the grant.

More central to the meeting will be how to accommodate all parties in getting water into the Mt. Gate Park area as well as perhaps in the oxbow on the W. Walker further north. A vibrant fishery is possible in these areas, but a large obstacle are the concerns of the Water Master.

Crafting the water source is the most important aspect of the meeting.

- Purchasing water rights.
  - Expense
  - Limited seasonal availability

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

- Diversion amount vs. consumption amount
- Using non-mechanical means to re-water the existing damp side channel
  - From upstream to downstream flow through the park (requires bridge?)
  - From downstream only flow through the park (water health an issue)
  - **A box culvert where traffic must cross.**
- Water truck to supplement.
- **Flood mitigation by ready-ing side channels.**
- **Initial water from Rock Creek.**

We need an epiphany on this.

Bruce

07-12-11 Stacey Simon, Co. Assist. Counsel, indicates that Co. engineers designed water flow to be 10 cfs at Mt. Gate with the idea (per Mary Ellen Halpin) of being able to sustain a permanent fishery. Stacey says Jim Shaw would be content if we bought a water right (can be downstream) for the 10 cfs. Woodworth to shop for cost/availability [**equivalent of water for 1500 ac. of irrigation per Hal**], cancel July 20 meeting with Susan Abele until we have a plan on how to affect water at Mt. Gate. Change the meeting to 6:00 PM for locals/County only.

Mary Ellen says the schemes for ball parks and the like at Mt. Gate don't fit with the Grant requirements wording. May need to change the Mt. Gate design to use the existing grant funds (after CA Legis reauthorizes), rather than pay them back to CA. Another Grant could be applied for in Oct., but we must have a plan for that – trails would be easy.

07-07-11 Tim Hansen, Supervisor reported that Jim Shaw, Water Master was intransigent about Mt. Gate.

06-01-11 Kelly says that without the reauthorization of CA Legis, since we did not receive a grant extension, we will not receive the CN \$ for core Mt. Gate.

03-10-11 Meeting of the Mountain Gate Working Group. Attending: Arden Gerbig, Dan Anthony, Kristie Nelson, Johnny Vannoy, Rose & Dave Murray, Mike da Luca (Marine), Kelly Garcia, Bruce Woodworth.

The Mountain Gate Working Group is an advisory committee to Mono Co. Public Works on the Mountain Gate Park and Parkway, organizing volunteer efforts and planning for the area. The Parkway

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

is anticipated to extend over a mile south along the W. Walker River from Eastside Ln. in Walker. Meetings are announced by email and at RPAC meetings. Anyone is welcome.

List of potential uses for the area:

Kayaks, Softball/Tball Park, ATV uses, Trails, Swimming Hole, Equestrian loop including Burcham Flat, water fowl and other bird habitat (Kristie Nelson), fishing/habitat and the river frontage and in the playa oxbow, educational signing for flora/fauna/local history, outdoor museum, par course, geo-cache destination. North portion of Park may be more developed than the southern portion. Care to segregate incompatible uses such as habitat protection and ATV. Kelly Garcia points out that F&W can more easily contract for expertise & DG will be ultimately be available for trails from Auchoberry. Dirt trails are not as good for the handicapped.

02-16-11 Spoke with Hal Curti. His take is that Jim Shaw’s discomfiture comes from the entry drain pipe as being a human manipulation and might be a harmful precedent. Hal thought that by digging to restore the side channel, water would fill the excavation naturally (without direct river flow) and that the entry drain pipe might be unnecessary and Jim Shaw’s objection would be satisfied. Added benefit that the silting problem would be averted by not having direct river input. He said he could talk with Shaw, if useful. He & I would like to see a detail of the entry pipe box.

Bruce

02-12-11 CA Native Plant Society – Bristlecone Chapter includes Mono and Inyo counties.

Graves acquisition goes to BOS on Feb. 15<sup>th</sup>.

02-10-11 Mt. Gate Working Group convened. Kelly says that Jim Craig’s concerns still need to be navigated.

### Mountain Gate Working Group Meeting Notes 02-10-11

Present: Kelly Garcia, Public Works, Tim Hansen, Co. Supervisor, Bob Dunn, Mono Fishing Commission, Nancy Boardman and Hal Curti, landowners, John Peters, John Vannoy, Arden Gerbig Dan Anthony and Bruce Woodworth from the RPAC.

The Mountain Gate Working Group is an advisory committee to Mono Co. Public Works on the Mountain Gate Parkway, organizing volunteer efforts and planning for the area. The Parkway is anticipated to extend over a mile south along the W. Walker River from Eastside Ln. in Walker. Meetings are announced by email and at RPAC meetings. Anyone is welcome.

Kelly Garcia provided background and current stage of the Parkway, which was an early vision of Rich Boardman.

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

#### Highlighted discussion points:

- Handicapped use of the area is central to the project and a basis of its funding.
- Only the core (F.E.M.A. purchased) lands has constrained building and paving. The more recent (and future) land acquisitions are not legally limited in that way.
- Volunteer efforts for improvements are allowed, but need to be noticed to Kelly Garcia at Public Works. Hours should be tallied and reported to Kelly – it reduces the cost to the county for their participation in the grant programs.
- Habitat restoration funds may be available from U.S. Fish & Wildlife.
- Fishing Commission is petitioning CA Fish & Game to allow catch and release fishing on the W. Walker beyond the normal fishing season.

#### Future Decision Topics:

- Incorporation of bird habitat
- Solicitation of Tree planting
- Use of the property: (equestrian, vehicular, hiking) trails, habitat reserves, recreation (kayaking egress)
- Signage to protect neighboring private property
- Ideas from all comers.

#### Recognized Cautions:

- Handicapped access surfaces
- “Manipulation” of river and “consumptive use” – Jim Shaw issues as interpreted by Hal Curti. Could a water-right holder provide water for the only consumptive use which initial filling of the side channel?
- Silt occurs where the speed of the river slows because of runoff pressure or because the channel widens. Should ask for maintenance (dredging) permit as part of process.

01-06-11 Kelly: 1) New cost estimates from Eng. and Co. will set up phasing so that when bids come in, we will be able to work on some items even if not sufficient funding for all, 2) Extension to be applied for to go beyond May, 3) Acquisitions: Both Norberg and Joseph have been acquired. Graves has agreed to go ahead – has to be accomplished before May. 4) Stacey will pass it by Jim Shaw one more time.

12-02-10 Kelly at RPAC: Conflict with CA Wild and Scenic River is resolved; grant will probably be extended; talks with engineers now about how much we can afford to do; IRWMP grant for parking and toilet on Norberg property – which has been finalized as purchase; Joseph is in escrow; conference with Gaye Graves on several small pieces tomorrow.

10-10-10 BW to Stephanie Beyers, USF&W:

## “LOG MT GATE”

### RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01

Stephanie,

1. We have been told that the CAF&G objection to stocking Lahontan Cutthroat has been resolved.

2. The original Parkways Grant that Mono Co. secured for acquisition/development of the Mt. Gate property (Red Lined area) expects to add the Blue Lined area (attached Google Map) to the Parkway by the end of 2010.

3. There are perhaps Cutthroat potentialities in the sandy areas at the southeasterly end of the Blue Lined area being acquired that might fit in with F&W purposes.

Most probably the Working Group on the Parkway will reconvene in the next month or two and we would be pleased to hear of any F&W programs that might work well in the area. Obviously the non-source "takings" issue will need to be explored.

10-07-10 Supervisor tells RPAC that Lahontan disagreement on Cutthroat is resolved between F&G and F&W.

10-06-10 The Scenic River problem seems to be being resolved. Stacey argued that we have pre-existing riparian rights and has to document this with DWR. It's an exception to the Scenic River designation.

Gaye got a lawyer, which indicates that she is serious - hopeful, Kelly thought.  
Joseph wants to have it wrapped up by year's end.  
May 2011 is the end of the Grant period, although an extension is possible.

I asked if we might reconvene the Working Group to start planning what might be done with the new acquisitions. She thought that at a local level that would be fine - premature for the county to take an active part.

10-04-10 Kelly says DWR meeting to discuss Scenic River problem.

09-01-10 Kelly says DWR is still feeling like they've been played, so there is a meeting in the next three weeks to iron it out about the side channel restoration.

08-05-10. Kelly says 1) Wild and Scenic River problem with DWR which Stacey is going to smooth over problem that may have been provoked by our Reno Engineers. 2) Joseph is in active negotiations. 3) Gaye Graves has shown renewed interest. 4) Mt. Gate Working Group should hold off until Scenic River question revised. 5) We will not apply for SNC grant at this time.



“LOG MT GATE”

RPAC MT GATE T S 15-01