TAHOE DONNER DOWNHILL SKI LODGE STUDY Planning Criteria - to be used in programming the new Lodge May 14, 2020 Task Force Answer

Page 1 of 2

Response from the Task Force to the following Planning Criteria Questions is requested to inform the Building Programming. The Working Paper, dated May 13, 2020, provides definitions of terms and background information for these questions.

Planning Criteria Questions

Peak Day – Based on 2015/16 and 2016/17 seasons, Ecosign calculated from Tahoe Donner's **Skier** records the "Peak Day" as average of top 10 days for those two seasons - 1700 Skiers.

What "Peak Day" average should be used?

We agreed to 3 models for use – todays lodge sq ft, 1000 CCC, and a 25000sq ft solution. Not sure how this question enters in to the programming effort. Discuss with Larry. JB – went back and reviewed '18-'19 and '16-'17 high peak days. '16-17 = 1298 top 6 days; '16-17 = 1645 top 8 days. Seems like going with 1500 is more than fair.

Is Peak Day that important if we are designing for a CCC of 1000, which is analogous to Design Day?

Design Day / CCC – The Design Day is the number of **Skiers** for which a ski area's base facilities are designed. Per Ecosign, typically, the Design Day is 15% to 25% less than the anticipated peak business level (see "Peak Day" above), on the basis that should be adequate for most days of the year. At 1700 Peak Day **Skiers**, that would be a Design Day of 1300 **Skiers**.

What is the Design Day number of Skiers the Lodge should be designed for?

• To meet current demand?

• Should some percentage increase for potential of future growth be accommodated? Unless we go back to the Board, the TF will stick with 1000 CCC.

As for growth, we agreed to 3 models for use – todays lodge sq ft, 1000 CCC, and a 25000sq ft solution. No growth to these 3 models.

I think the Task Force is committed to a 1000 skier Design Day.

Visitors / guests – represent Skiers and non-skiers; TD staff estimate non-skiers add 30% - 50% to the number Skiers using the Food & Beverage seating and service areas, and restrooms.

What percentage should be used – 30, 40, or 50%? TF recommends going with Staff response here.

I think accuracy is always preferable to precision in exercises like this. How about we use 40% and split the difference.

Existing Lodge Food & Beverage seating capacity -

There are 150 seats, not including bar seats. Staff's assessment is:

- 350 Skiers on a bad weather day (max. capacity/"seating area is packed", with little or no use of Deck for eating);
- 700 800 **Skiers** on sunny days when deck is in use;
- 1000 Skiers (1300 1500 Visitors) is "pushing the limit".
- Of the 150 seats indoors, 30% of the seats do not turn over, due to non-skiers "camping out" for a good part of the day.
- For various reasons stated in the Working Paper (May 13), seats can only be expected to turn over 1.5 times.

Therefore, the comfortable capacity (Design Day Capacity) of the existing 150 seats is 225 people indoors during 2 to 3-hour lunch period.

Can these figures be used in planning for the Design Day needs of the new Lodge? TF recommends going with Staff response here.

Isn't this a question for staff?

TAHOE DONNER DOWNHILL SKI LODGE STUDY

Study Assumptions - to be used in programming the new Lodge May 14, 2020

Page 2 of 2

Design Day capacity for Food & Beverage seating capacity -

The Design Day seating area sizing should accommodate the Design Day with bad weather conditions – satisfying the demand indoors. This seems a reasonable approach for a positive user experience.

Is the Task Force comfortable with using this approach to sizing the seating area? Requires discussion with Larry. On bad weather days 1000 CCC doesn't seem to be required as we don't have 1000 skiers on bad days. Not sure how one tempers down the 1000 for bad weather.

Yes, seems ok to me.

Staff's recommendation is that the new Lodge should be sized to accommodate a minimum of 300 seats in the Cafeteria seating area.

What is the minimum number of seats that should be planned -

- To meet current demand?
- Should some percentage increase for potential of future growth be accommodated?

Do not plan for future growth. This is not agreed to by the Board, or was part of the original SoW. Let's start the programming effort with the 300 Staff recommends. May be a variable to adjust down given the economics of how the overall programming exercise pans out.

We need to trust the management team on this. They are the experts. I don't want to prematurely "value engineer" the project at this stage. I think current capacity is fine, with a 5%-10% increase for growth over the expected 30-year life of this building. At 10%, it's a very modest annual increase. One option to accommodate seating capacity growth is Butch Rohrback's suggestion. That is, construct an exterior wall adjacent to the deck that can be pushed out to add more enclosed seating similar to what was done at the Lodge.

Rental Shop –

Staff indicates the existing Rental Shop is undersized by 30% – 40% of industry standards for the number of rental units. With minimal increase in number of units to better serve existing demand, not to serve increased number of renters, and to increase operational efficiency and decrease customer time to rent equipment, a minimum of 33% more space is needed for existing operations. Given the high volume and current conditions, this increase seems reasonable and justified.

How much larger should the Rental Shop be planned -

- To meet current demand?
- Should some percentage increase for potential of future growth be accommodated? Program based on Rob M's original input.

No growth plans.

I think current capacity is fine, with a 5%-10% increase for growth over the expected 30-year life of this building. At 10%, it's a very modest annual increase.

Ditto. We need current state vs. idealized future state comparisons on many of the design elements. And in the case of the rental shop, what assumptions/industry rules of thumb have been made about required rental space vs. our CCC and skiers-asrenters profile?

Bottom Shop –

Staff suggests removing the existing stand-alone building at the bottom of the Race Course run and incorporating the equipment, parts, and vehicle storage uses in the new Lodge. The existing Bottom Shop is 660 gross sq. ft. Staff reports this amount of space is adequate.

Should space for a new "Bottom Shop" be incorporated in the new Lodge?

Can program in for initial pass, as requested by Staff. May be a variable to adjust down based on total Sq ft results.

Yes. The 'Bottom Shop" interferes with the ski run (is this a safety issue) and increases operating costs and inefficiency due to distributed operations.

Covered Vehicle Parking for Shuttle Busses and Operations vehicles -

Should the Building Program address this need? (Feasibility will be evaluated and determined during building design)

Not sure how this affects the programming effort. OK to deal with during building design. Yes. Parking is a relevant constraint and we need to consider off-site parking to alleviate this constraint. Having a covered area to load and unload makes sense. Again, I would defer to staff on this one.