

California Tahoe Conservancy  
ATTN: Scott Carroll  
1061 Third Street  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

RECEIVED

CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the Al Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

119-1

4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site.

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted,

Name:

Ryan Goralski and  
Catalina Goralski

Date:

4.6.2013

Address:

I19-1  
cont.

Letter  
I19  
Response

Ryan & Cataline Goralski  
April 6, 2013

I19-1            The commenters have concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenters state that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

March 13, 2013

Attn: Tahoe Conservancy and TRPA

I attended the March 13<sup>th</sup> meeting on the Truckee Marsh Restoration Project at the TRPA headquarters. Both the presenters were thorough and concise in their presentations.

As a long time Tahoe Keys resident (my apologies for that) I have come to understand the impact that such an ill-advised project has had on a very important and fragile ecosystem.

I walk the Cove East trail several times each week and also utilize the trail on the east side of the Upper Truckee Marsh. I am a birdwatcher, kayaker and nature lover so I treasure this oasis in the middle of our developed town.

I20-1

I am definitely in favor of restoring the area further even if it curtails the access I currently enjoy. The objective is to return to a healthier and more natural habitat and increased human access would work against this goal.

I myself have organized an informal clean-up at Cove East and a group of about 10 of us took away more than a dozen large bags of trash. I frequently pick up trash during my regular walks and even while kayaking. It's an unfortunate reality that more people will bring more trash. I also observe many dogs off leash and owners allowing them to run through the fence into the marsh area. Dog waste is a problem despite the signs and waste bags available.

I20-2

After reviewing the alternatives I would support a hybrid plan of restoration, creating the inset floodplain from Alternative 4 and connecting the lagoon to the river and minimal public access as directed in Alternative 2. Limited human access is necessary for the success of the restoration.

I20-3

*I vehemently oppose the access presented in Alternative 1 with the beach bike bath and bridge.* I would support a limited improvement such as a boardwalk on the periphery at the east side of the marsh and perhaps an observation point on each side of the marsh.

I20-4

No matter which alternative is chosen I think these concerns must be addressed:

- Timing of project (bulldozers) to not disturb the spring nesting season of birds in the marsh
- Impact of public access on disturbing wildlife, increased trash and dogs/people entering the restricted area
- Keeping sight of the main goal of natural habitat restoration, not a Disneyland experience

I20-5

I20-6

I20-7

Please share this input with the other agencies and planners involved in this project. I thank you for your time in considering my concerns.

Sincerely,

Alice Grulich-Jones  
PO Box 8555  
S Lake Tahoe CA 96158

Letter  
I20  
Response

Alice Grulich-Jones  
March 13, 2013

- I20-1           The commenter’s support for restoration of the study area is noted.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, “Selecting a Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative.
- I20-2           The commenter’s concern about dogs and littering in the study area is noted.
- See Section 3.1.4, “Management,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a discussion of trash pickup and animal control services in the study area.
- I20-3           The commenter’s support for a hybrid alternative including the inset floodplain under Alternative 4 and minimal public access under Alternative 2 is noted.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, “Selecting a Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative.
- I20-4           The commenter’s opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, “Selecting a Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative.
- I20-5           The commenter states that the timing of project construction should not disturb the spring nesting season.
- As described in Section 3.4, “Biological Resources,” of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS, construction activities that would occur in suitable habitat during the nesting season (April 1 through August 31) would require a qualified wildlife biologist to conduct focused surveys for active nest sites of the yellow warbler, willow flycatcher, waterfowl, and long-eared owl (see page 3.4-52 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS).
- I20-6           The commenter’s concerns about the impacts of public access on wildlife and increased trash, dogs, and people in the study area are noted.

See Section 3.1.4, “Management,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a discussion of trash pickup and animal control services in the study area.

I20-7

The commenter’s support for restoration of the study area is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, “Selecting a Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative.

Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

California Tahoe Conservancy  
Attn: Scott Carroll  
1061 Third Street  
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Comments From:  
Lynn Harriman  
2535 Cold Creek Trail  
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

[lynnhxsc@gmail.com](mailto:lynnhxsc@gmail.com)

I wish to commend the CTC and other agencies involved with the Upper Truckee marsh projects to this point. Before completion of the Cove East portion of this project, I was very uncertain that it would be an improvement from the damages of the past. However, time has proved me to be wrong. My husband and I visit either the Cove East side or the Upper Truckee marsh from Al Tahoe tract every week and we are never disappointed at the wildlife we are able to observe. We have noticed the improvement in the quality and quantity of our observations since the first phase of the Cove East project was completed and the spring dog ban was put in to effect. Thank you for a job well done.

I21-1

Now the next phase of the project is beginning and I have looked at the maps and alternatives that are proposed during the workshop on February 27<sup>th</sup>. I realize none of these alternatives are set in stone. They are ideas to get discussion moving and the thought process going.

I ask you to make sure you do not add more human impact to this fragile space. I realize you have to keep public access on the Cove East side and I enjoy using that very much but the other side is not too developed and I do not believe it should be. I realize some meadow protection and erosion control needs doing but don't make it too grand. As much as I would love to ride my bike on a boardwalk across the beach and mouth of the Truckee River and on through the keys and around the entire south shore, it would not be good for the wildlife, or the plants. Such a path would bring in more people, trash, dogs, poop, noise, trampling the Tahoe yellow cress, disruption of nesting birds, illegal overnights, campfires, and parking madness at one end or the other. Law enforcement would have to patrol more. These problems already exist but on a small manageable scale. Keep it low key and keep the problems down to what a limited budget can control.

I21-2

I know that getting the Truckee River to flow freely and out of the channel is the major goal of the project and it is a good one. I am just not sure how feasible the horizontal flow/gradient controllers are going to be. I am a white water boater and my experience with these types of barriers is that they can be or become dangerous as debris from spring runoffs builds up. Some of them make hydraulics that are dangerous to the family in their k-mart raft or me in my whitewater kayak. People need to be warned about what those

I21-3



barriers may mean to their fun. **This needs to be clear in the planning phase.** Are there any types of barriers that will accomplish the goal of spreading out the flow but allow continued boating or is take out going to have to be higher up with no way to float out to the lake? People will probably just carry boats around barriers. Will this be good for the marsh? The Stand-Up-Paddle board people are quickly making their presence known in the marsh, going upstream and down. Is there to be a “mouth” of the river or is it going to be blocked so the water spreads out and is filtered? Is there to be no direct access from the lake to the marsh? The rental companies need to know what to tell people. While I love floating through the willows, climbing over beaver dams and getting out in to the middle of the marsh in my little boat, as more people are doing the same, the marsh will be impacted negatively. My first trip down the Truckee River from the highway 50 bridge in Meyers was when I was about 8 years old in 1969. Only a few people had this adventure back then but now there are more people. I am sad to think I would have to give up this yearly joy but we have to do what will be best for the wetland habitat and wildlife. The impact of people in the marsh needs to be considered if we are going to do anything that will make the edges more attractive to more people.

I21-3  
cont.

All of the alternative plans have view points and observation points on them. They are not all located in the very best spots. More input on where those places should be and what they should look like is needed. I would love to see raised observation platforms (like at the Visitors Center at Taylor Creek or Sacramento Wildlife Refuge). This would get the viewer up above the willows overlooking the entire 360 degree marsh and lake view without needing to put people **in** to the marsh.

I21-4

Please try to keep this gem of a place a little bit of a secret for us Tahoe locals to enjoy and newcomers to have to work to discover. Keep it simple. But more importantly, we have an opportunity to improve wetland habitat to encourage the return of migratory birds and marsh plants that have almost been lost. A wetland corridor to the lake with minimal human presence is a habitat that has vanished on Lake Tahoe. We have a chance to restore a piece of it now.

I21-5

Thanks for taking the time to read my comments. Keep up the good works. You are making a difference in the health, beauty, and future for Lake Tahoe.

Lynn Harriman



Letter  
I21  
Response

Lynn Harriman  
March 10, 2013

- I21-1           The commenter’s support for the previous projects in the study area is noted.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I21-2           The commenter’s support for restoration and limiting public access is noted.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, “Selecting a Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. See Section 3.1.4, “Management,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a discussion of trash pickup, animal control services, and police protection services in the study area.
- I21-3           The commenter is concerned about flow/gradient controls on boaters and kayakers. The commenter also asks whether the mouth to the river will be blocked and whether there will be direct access from the lake to the marsh. The commenter is concerned about the impact of public access on the study area.
- The Preferred Alternative would make some modifications near the mouth of the river and reconstruct a more natural connection between the lagoon and the river. These changes would not be adverse for nonmotorized water recreation relative to existing conditions or the No Action Alternative. Access during normal to high-water conditions would be increased, and access during low-water conditions would be similar to present access with safer access for non-motorized use with the sailing lagoon connected to the river. The planned vertical and lateral grade controls/bed stabilization features would be designed to limit degradation, not to promote aggradation, so they would not create net barriers or blockage to low flow relative to existing conditions. The Preferred Alternative’s pilot channel inlet and the vertical and lateral barriers between the pilot channel and the backfilled channel would also emphasize features that are buried and limit the potential for debris accumulation, because their hydraulic and geomorphic functions need relatively smooth transitions to ensure flow and sediment passage. Within the remnant channel sections of the middle of the marsh, the natural complexity of multi-thread channel segments, beaver ponds, and backwaters could continue to exist, but may be modified by natural geomorphic processes to define one or more distinct flow-through segments.
- I21-4           The commenter’s request for more input on the observation points is noted.
- See responses to Comments AO2-4 and I8-6 for a discussion of the project’s history, planning context, and public outreach.
- I21-5           The commenter’s support for restoration is noted.
- Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, “Selecting a Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to

selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

From: Judith Hildinger [jhildinger@sbcglobal.net]  
Sent: Monday, April 08, 2013 3:12 PM  
To: Carroll, Scott@Tahoe  
Subject: Comments UTRM DRAFT EIR

Scott.Carroll@tahoe.ca.gov  
April 8, 2013

California Tahoe Conservancy  
1061 Third St.  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96158

Dear Scott,

I am writing to comment on the proposed alternatives for restoration of the Upper Truckee River Marsh.

I am commenting primarily to register strong opposition to Alternative 1, particularly the proposed recreation infrastructure. The Conservancy's work should be primarily one of restoring the marsh, not expanding recreational activities. Building a parking lot, bike trails, and two bridges would bring hundreds of additional people into the marsh annually and is not in the best interests of conservation goals.

I22-1

Amongst other concerns, a bridged access could

--lead to such concerns as: will the bikepaths (as well as the parking lot) eventually require safety lighting and thus add yet another lightsource to an area that currently provides starry dark skies?  
(adding an ongoing maintenance issue for Conservancy staff?)

I22-2

-- potentially detract from the boaters' viewshed; elevated manmade structures in the marsh are contrary to restoration.

I22-3

-- allow even more invasive species pathways into the sensitive marsh area.

I22-4

--impact surrounding neighborhoods with additional through traffic and parking concerns.

I22-5

I understand the need for some educational signage, pedestrian trails, and viewpoints, but not to the extent suggested in Alternative 1.

I22-6

To summarize, from the executive summary itself: "The purpose of the proposed action is to restore natural geomorphic processes and ecological functions in this lowest reach of the Upper Truckee River and the surrounding marsh to improve ecological values of the restoration area and help reduce the river's discharge of nutrients and sediment that diminish Lake Tahoe's clarity."

I22-7

Please keep in mind this primary purpose rather than expansion of recreational infrastructure. Also keep in mind that recreational infrastructure requires a huge annual commitment of maintenance funds. Does the Conservancy have resources and strategic direction to provide for maintenance and upkeep of any infrastructure built and associated 'public management' required?

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Sincerely,

Judith Hildinger  
PO Box 8897  
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 96158

Letter  
I22  
Response

Judith Hildinger  
April 8, 2013

- I22-1      The commenter’s opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, “Selecting a Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I22-2      The commenter is concerned about additional recreation facilities requiring nighttime lighting.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate infrastructure on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. The Preferred Alternative does not include new bike trails or parking that would need nighttime lighting.
- I22-3      The commenter is concerned that a bridged access will detract from the viewshed for boaters.
- See response to Comment AO5-6.
- I22-4      The commenter is concerned that the bridge and boardwalk proposed under Alternative 1 will result in additional invasive species within the marsh. Additionally, the commenter cites increased bridge access in Alternative 1 as a potential risk factor for the spread of aquatic invasive species.
- Impacts of the alternatives on the spread of invasive species are discussed in Section 3.4, “Biological Resources: Vegetation and Wildlife,” of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. Impact 3.4-2 (Alt. 1), “Introduction and Spread of Invasive Plants by Recreational Activities,” states that under Alternative 1, there would be an expected increase in the number of visitors to the study area, and these visitors could contribute to the introduction and spread of invasive plants by dispersing these plants and disturbing habitat. The Preferred Alternative does not include the bridge and boardwalk.
- I22-5      The commenter is concerned that a bridged access will result in additional traffic for adjacent neighborhoods.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not include construction of bridged access to the east side of the marsh. Traffic impacts were discussed in Section 3.16, “Traffic, Circulation and Parking,” of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I22-6      The commenter’s opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, “Selecting a Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

I22-7

The commenter reiterates the primary purpose of the proposed project and requests consideration of the annual cost of maintaining additional recreation facilities.

The Preferred Alternative does not include these additional recreation elements. The recreation elements of the Preferred Alternative are expected to require similar maintenance costs as under existing conditions. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

Subject: Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project  
From: Anjanette Hoefer

Dear Mr. Scott Carroll,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project DEIR/DEIS.

After reviewing the volumes of documents for the DEIR/DEIS I support Alternative 3 to restore the river channel and its connection to the floodplain. This is truly a unique opportunity to restore the current channelized river and allow the river to naturally flood the marsh.

I23-1

I do not support any recreation improves along the marsh and the currently undeveloped beach areas. The current recreation opportunities in these areas are dispersed and should stay that way. Recreation opportunities in the project study area include numerous existing developed activities for the public. Since no alternatives propose to develop parking and sanitation facilities, any recreation improvements should be limited to Cove East Beach.

I23-2

Thank you for considering these comments,

Anjanette Hoefer

Letter  
I23  
Response

Anjanette Hoefler  
April 7, 2013

I23-1           The commenter's support for Alternative 3 is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

I23-2           The commenter's opposition to constructing additional recreation facilities is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.



**Comments on the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project**

Monday, April 8, 2013

Scott Carroll  
California Tahoe Conservancy  
1061 Third Street  
SLT, Ca. 96150

NOTE: Please withhold my address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law.

We are residents and property owners on California Avenue in South Lake Tahoe. We live here full time and have done so at this residence since 1998. At one point during the summer of 2012 we heard about the Truckee River Project that is currently on the drawing board. At that time we did not hear any news as to the timeline for the project. Until yesterday, we were still completely unaware of this projects future and whether this was just a vision or a reality. We travel frequently in the winter and just returned home a few days ago and fortunately were notified by our anxious neighbors about the possibility of staging areas for this project to be located right here on California and Michael avenue's. We were also advised of the possibility of a truck route for removal of material (not to mention the additional traffic by employees, equipment, etc) on California Avenue for a four year term. Please tell us this is not a fact!! We are stunned at the prospect!! We are completely appalled that we were never notified of this possibility for a project of this magnitude right in our front yard. How can this be???? We certainly hope that all of the agencies involved in this project are considering the impact this would have on our quiet neighborhood and the hardships it would bare on the residence here. We observed the Cove East project a few years ago and if the trucks that will be used for this project are at all like the trucks that will be used in the upcoming project, please advise us in advance so we can sell our home and move before this begins. We will not sit in our yard and watch this type of traffic, noise and dust for some of our later years in life. There is an option to use the Venice Drive East ingress and egress for this work without the impact to those of us here in Tahoe Island Park 4. Another issue to consider is the many bicycles and pedestrians that use Michael and California Ave to stay off of and away from Tahoe Keys Blvd traffic. If you knew how many people used these narrow streets, the number of cars that park along them and the impact large trucks would have on everybodys safety, we know you would agree that these streets are not the best choice for the use you have intended. Please put yourself in our living room for a moment. When the UPS truck drives by, our windows shake. When the snowplow drives by, our whole house shakes. This is tolerable as infrequently as it occurs. Imagine now a large dump truck driving by all day, every day. This we can't imagine. How about you?

I24-1

I24-2

Please consider the commercial, Venice Drive East staging area and truck route over this quiet, residential area. Or please find a safer alternative.

We would appreciate hearing from you on what we can expect in the future in regards to this project.

Regards

Harley and Tammy Hoy

Letter  
I24  
Response

Harley & Tammy Hoy  
April 8, 2013

- I24-1           The commenters states that no noticing of the project was provided.
- The Project mailing list was developed by obtaining the most recent County Assessor’s information as well as contact information provided through outreach over the life of the project. The commenter’s address on the list developed for noticing. For privacy purposes the address has been withheld in this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. See responses to Comments AO2-4 and I8-6 for a discussion of the project’s history, planning context, and public outreach.
- I24-2           The commenters have concerns about construction noise associated with the use of California Avenue and Michael Avenue for staging and access.
- As shown in Exhibit 2-2 in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not propose construction staging areas or access points on California Avenue and Michael Avenue. See Section 3.1.3, “Construction Noise,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of construction-related noise.

California Tahoe Conservancy  
 ATTN: Scott Carroll  
 1061 Third Street  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the AI Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.


I25-1

4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site.

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted,

Name: HARLEY HOY Date: 4-7-13  


Address:

I25-1  
cont.

Letter  
I25  
Response

Harley Hoy  
April 7, 2013

I25-1            The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

California Tahoe Conservancy  
 ATTN: Scott Carroll  
 1061 Third Street  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the AI Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

I26-1

4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site.

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted,

Name:

TAMARA HOU  
Tamara Hou

Date:

4/7/13

Address:

I26-1  
cont.



Letter  
I26  
Response

Tamara Hoy  
April 8, 2013

I26-1           The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

California Tahoe Conservancy  
 ATTN: Scott Carroll  
 1061 Third Street  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

RECEIVED  
 APR 11 2018  
 CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the AI Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

I27-1

4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site.

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted,

Name:



Date:

4/6/13  
4/16/13

Address:

127-1  
cont.

Letter  
I27  
Response

? Hughes  
April 6, 2013

I27-1            The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

Letter I28

From: Mark Johnson [markyboy57@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2013 1:09 PM  
To: Carroll, Scott@Tahoe  
Subject: Upper Truckee Marsh restoration project

Hello, As for someone who has a residence on El Dorado Ave, I am concerned with adding bike paths on the meadow. Not because I don't want a path down at the bottom of my property, but because of the added traffic and parking on El Dorado Ave. My preference would be for leaving the Marsh as is and only to improve the channeling of the creeks to improve clarity in the lake.

I28-1

I28-2

Thanks  
Mark Johnson  
700 El Dorado Ave.

Letter  
I28  
Response

Mark Johnson  
March 11, 2013

I28-1           The commenter is concerned about the traffic and parking on El Dorado Avenue associated with constructing bike paths.

As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate infrastructure on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. In addition, the Conservancy would continue to manage and reduce the impacts of recreational use.

I28-2           The commenter’s support for only improving the river channels is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, “Selecting a Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative.

This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

California Tahoe Conservancy  
 ATTN: Scott Carroll  
 1061 Third Street  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

RECEIVED

CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the Al Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

I29-1



4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site.

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted,

Name:

GARY P. JONES

Date:

4/7/13

Address:

129-1  
cont.

Letter  
I29  
Response

Gary Jones  
April 7, 2013

I29-1            The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

Letter I30

Box 18802  
South Lake Tahoe, CA. 96151  
March 3, 2013



RECEIVED  
MAR - 5 2013  
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project.

I own property at 2331 Lake Tahoe Blvd on Highway 50 and the back of my property will be marsh land affected by the projects you are proposing. It is my understanding you have 4 projects you are considering. Several questions have entered my mind since receiving your letter. I understand the reasons for attempting to restore the marsh to its natural state and prevent sediment from entering the Lake. It is important for the conservation of our Lake. What is concerning me is the amount of flooding that may occur if we have heavy spring rains or heavy winter snows. The Truckee River project that occurred behind my home (which took almost 4 years to complete) flooded the marsh behind this Lake Tahoe Blvd. property. The past two years have been nearly drought years as far as water is concerned. I am concerned that "returning the marsh to its natural state" will lose control of where the water goes. If we have heavy rains or snows, it could cause flooding on Highway 50 and local businesses, not to mention overloading the drainage system in place.

I30-1

Sincerely,

Joanne Jones

Letter  
I30  
Response

Joanne Jones  
March 5, 2013

I30-1            The commenter is concerned about increased flooding from implementation of the project.  
  
                  An updated discussion of existing and potential flood hazards is provided in Section 3.1.1, “Flooding and Flood Hazards,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS.

**Public Comment Form**  
Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

**AGENCIES:** California Tahoe Conservancy, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:** Comments on the DEIR/DEIS/DEIS will be accepted throughout the review period in compliance with the time limits mandated by State law and TRPA. Your response should be sent at the earliest possible date, but received no later than **April 8, 2013**.

Oral and written comments, including names and home addresses of respondents, will be made available for public review. Individual respondents may request that we withhold their home address from public disclosure, which will be honored to the extent allowable by law. If you wish to have your name and/or address withheld, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public disclosure in their entirety.

**SEND COMMENTS TO:** All comments will be combined and addressed in the Final EIR/EIS/EIS. It is only necessary to send comments to one agency.

Please submit comments via email to [Scott.Carroll@tahoe.ca.gov](mailto:Scott.Carroll@tahoe.ca.gov).

- Subject Line: Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project  
 (1) Attach comments in an MS Word document  
 (2) Include commenter's U.S. Postal Service mailing address in MS Word.

Written comments can be sent to the following address:

California Tahoe Conservancy  
 ATTN: Scott Carroll  
 1061 Third Street  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

**COMMENTS:**

Name: Jordans & Foudys  
 Address: Springwood, Highland Woods SLT  
 Email (optional): bobbiejordan@yahoo.com

*No bikes*

*- a bike trail across lakefront (Benton Beach) connecting Mt Tahoe & Keys if one could be constructed without harming Tahoe Yellow Cross* I31-1

*- returning flow of Upper Truckee River to its "natural state" if it is available* I31-2

*We don't feel a bike to on pedestrian trail should be installed around breed area where "cultural evidence" could be disturbed* I31-3

*Thank you for accepting our comments*

Letter  
I31  
Response

Jordans & Foudys  
April 10, 2013

I31-1           The commenter's support for a bike trail across Barton Beach if it can be constructed without affecting the yellow cress is noted.

Potential impacts on Tahoe yellow cress are discussed in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources: Vegetation and Wildlife," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. The Preferred Alternative does not include the bridge and boardwalk.

I31-2           The commenter's support for restoring flows to the Truckee River is noted.

Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

I31-3           The commenter's opposition of constructing a trail that would disturb cultural resources is noted.

Potential impacts on cultural resources are discussed in Section 3.3, "Archaeological and Historic Resources," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. See response to Comment Letter AO12 for additional information.

California Tahoe Conservancy  
 ATTN: Scott Carroll  
 1061 Third Street  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the Al Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

I32-1



4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site.

132-1  
cont.

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted,

Scott Karpinen

Date: 4-8-13

Letter  
I32  
Response

Scott Karpinen  
April 8, 2013

I32-1            The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

March 20, 2013

Mr. Scott Carroll, Project Manager  
California Tahoe Conservancy  
1061 Third Street  
South Lake Tahoe CA  
96150-3475



Subject: Upper Truckee River & Marsh Restoration and TKPOA maintenance yard roadway

Dear Mr. Carroll,

Thank you for taking input regarding the project referenced above. I have read your material and choices regarding alternatives for the restoration project. Thank you for allowing comments on your project and welcoming public opinion and concerns.

Based on review of the four alternatives presented by your office, I am respectfully requesting that alternative number 3 be selected for the project. Reasons for my request are summarized below:

- 1. By allowing the Truckee River to flood more to the east as shown in alternative 3, more of the former river paths and meanders will fill with flood water and the water will be spread out over more acres of grasses and other meadow vegetation.
- 2. Alternative 3 allows more area for the river water to flow slowing river flow velocities; therefore allowing more sediment to be removed before river water enters Lake Tahoe.
- 3. The Upper Truckee Marsh lies primarily east of the current river path and aerial photographs of the marsh show that the Truckee River once meandered through the east marsh area. Allowing the river to return to its former natural flow channels would allow better removal of sediment and nutrients from the Truckee River before the river water enters Lake Tahoe.
- 4. Alternative 3 is the best choice when consideration is given to those of us who own property on Michael Dr. north of Colorado St and Mt. Tallac Village III. All other alternatives direct flood water flow from the Truckee River toward our subdivision. Flooding is a concern for Michael Dr. and Mt. Tallac Village III property owners.

I33-1

In addition to my recommendation that alternative # 3 be selected and implemented for the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project, I ask you to mitigate the problems caused by the roadway to the Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association (TKPOA) corporation yard storage area. During times of high water flow in and around the Mt. Tallac Village III subdivision and the homes north of Colorado St. on Michael Dr., the TKPOA yard storage road becomes a dam and flood waters back up to the west of the roadway into this area. The

I33-2

roadway caused a serious flooding problem in 1997 because of the backup of water that could not flow past the above grade roadway. The existing drainage is furnished by a small culvert that becomes blocked by brush and debris. Perhaps the TKPOA could share in the cost to install box culverts under the raised corporation yard roadway to allow flood waters to escape this area. The roadway needs to be modified or demolished now. The safety of this area's residents and guests and protection of our property make it imperative that Conservancy and TKPOA act now to help prevent flooding in the Michael Dr. area and Mt. Tallac Village III subdivision. The raised corporation yard roadway is a flood hazard for our property and must be modified or removed. The Conservancy and TKPOA have a responsibility to property owners on Michael Dr. and Mt. Tallac Village III to mitigate the flood hazard caused by the raised road and corporate storage yard.

I33-2  
cont.

Thank you for your consideration and for allowing me to express my support and concerns.

Thomas and Martha Keating  
161 Plantation Dr.  
Carson City NV 89703



Tahoe property address – 701 Michael Dr.

Letter  
I33  
Response

Thomas & Martha Keating  
March 21, 2013

I33-1           The commenters' support for Alternative 3 is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

I33-2           The commenters request that the project include modifications to or removal of the roadway for the TKPOA storage yard to alleviate localized drainage and flood problems.

See response to Comment I18-2 for further discussion of the TKPOA Corporation Yard and road restoration. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

California Tahoe Conservancy  
 ATTN: Scott Carroll  
 1061 Third Street  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the Al Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

I34-1

4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site.

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted,

Name:

Rick Kniesee  
[Signature]

Date:

4-7-13

Address:

I34-1  
cont.

Letter  
I34  
Response

Rick Kniesec  
April 7, 2013

I34-1            The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.



Page 3 – Additional comments for:

California Tahoe Conservancy  
ATTN: Scott carroll  
1061 Third st  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee Rive and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

.....  
As a resident and property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision, in addition to pages 1 and 2 attached regarding the inadequacy of addressing the previously stated possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood I'd like to add the following concerns:

More water in the Project area means more breeding ground for mosquitoes. Any increase in the mosquito population not only creates additional nuisance while trying to enjoy outdoor activities, but also directly increases the health risks associated with mosquito-borne diseases.

In the United States, Mosquitoes spread several types of encephalitis. They also transmit heart worms to cats and dogs.

We already know as it has been well documented that there have been several dead birds found in our area over the past few summers that tested positive for West Nile Virus. More mosquitoes only increase our chance of exposure for both humans as well as our beloved animals.

What plans if any are there to control the inevitable increase in mosquito population? This is not a short term problem, as it will remain a problem for as many years as there are springs and summers.

What impact will it be to tax payers? Will it be considered as part of the Grant funding? What happens if grant funding runs out in our state that is already fiscally challenged? Would mosquito abatement, if any is granted, just fade away?

I believe that river restoration might be beneficial closer down by the mouth, and I may be supportive to restricting the project to that area. However, I do not believe that the impact that the project would have directly to California Ave and other State Street residents is worth the cost that I should have to bear as a tax paying citizen - either short term or long term.

Thank you for your consideration.

Linda Kosciolik



*dated 4/11/13*

I35-1

I35-2

California Tahoe Conservancy  
ATTN: Scott Carroll  
1061 Third Street  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

RECEIVED

CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the Al Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

135-3

4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, ~~I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period.~~ Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site. *I did receive notification by mail, but not to the heavy impact planned for California Ave. I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.*

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted

Name: LINDA KOSCIOLEK  
Linda Kosciolok

Date: 4/6/13

Address: 23:  
50

Letter  
I35  
Response

Linda Kosciolk  
April 7, 2013

I35-1           The commenter has concerns about increases in mosquito-borne diseases and the plans to control the mosquito population.

See response to Comment I4-4. In addition, see Section 3.1.4, "Management," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of mosquito control.

I35-2           The commenter's concern about the impact of the project on residents on California Avenue and State Street is noted.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

I35-3           The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

California Tahoe Conservancy  
 ATTN: Scott Carroll  
 1061 Third Street  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the Al Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

I36-1

4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*

5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners

6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, ~~I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period.~~ Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site. *I did receive notification by mail, but not to the heavy impact planned for California Ave*

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.



1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted,

Name: Stan Kosciolok  
Stan Kosciolok

Date: 4/6/13

Address: 2  
 \_\_\_\_\_

136-1  
cont.

Letter  
I36  
Response

Stan Kosciolek  
April 6, 2013

I36-1            The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

California Tahoe Conservancy  
 ATTN: Scott Carroll  
 1061 Third Street  
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

RECEIVED  
 JUN 18 2018  
 CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations. *see next sheet*
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the Al Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

I37-1



4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site.

I37-1  
cont.

*see next sheet*

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain. *+ a plan to repave the street if it is indeed used as a haul route*

Respectfully submitted,

Name: *Michael Ledesma* Date: *4/6/13*  
*Michael Ledesma Carol Ledesma*

Address: *E*  
*F*  
*S*

1. I am aware that city ordinances regarding noise are in effect 24/7 and complaints regarding noise can be called in for dogs barking, musical instrument practice or TV/steros. I can't imagine a California live construction site to be less noisy than any of the above. Michael works nights & relies on our quiet neighborhood to get the rest he deserves.

137-2

6. We received no notification of the Project. What was reported in the papers was too vague to even allow me to imagine that my neighborhood would be affected.

137-3

Letter  
I37  
Response

Michael & Carol Ledesma  
April 6, 2013

I37-1           The commenters have concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenters state that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

I37-2           The commenters have concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise on California Avenue.

See Section 3.1.3, "Construction Noise," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of construction-related noise.

I37-3           The commenters state that they were not notified of the proposed project.

The Project mailing list was developed by obtaining the most recent County Assessor's information as well as contact information provided through outreach over the life of the project. The commenter's address is on the list developed for noticing. For privacy purposes the address has been withheld in this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. See response to Comment I8-6 for further discussion of notification of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS to Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision residents.

From: KATHY AND JOE LINK [kwl@sbcbglobal.net]  
 Sent: Monday, April 08, 2013 1:15 PM  
 To: Carroll, Scott@Tahoe  
 Subject: Proposed changes to Upper Truckee Marsh

Scott,

We wanted to respond to the proposed changes to the Upper Truckee Marsh. We have had a home on the edge of the meadow for almost 15 years. It was our understanding that when the conservancy took over the meadow it was an effort to improve the clarity of the lake and maintain the delicate balance of nature for this environmentally sensitive area. Sadly, what we have seen over the last few years is the wildlife and flora diminish. The coyotes howls have been replaced by barking dogs chasing the geese.

138-1

Another issue that must be addressed is the lack of restroom facilities. If you move forward with adding walkways and viewing areas you are inviting more people in and you will need to take this into consideration. I am not sure that outhouses in the meadow is what the conservancy had in mind and we certainly don't want to look at them from our yard, but please be mindful that it is an issue. We can't tell you the number of times we have had to avert our gaze, (and our young daughters), as someone has relieved themselves in the meadow, not to mention those who do not cleanup after their dogs. The patrol has tried to address these issues, but unfortunately, they have barely made a dent since they are spread so thin.

138-2

We love the meadow and want to be able to enjoy it too, but honestly, we fear that making it another tourist destination will do irreparable harm and I hate to think what the meadow will be like in the next 15 years.

Thank you for your consideration, and let us know if you any additional questions.

Regards,

Kathy and Joe Link

Letter  
I38  
Response

Kathy & Joe Link  
April 8, 2013

I38-1           The commenters' concern about the loss of wildlife and plants and the increase in dogs in the Upper Truckee Marsh is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side. Section 3.4, "Biological Resources," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes impacts of the project on plants and wildlife. The Preferred Alternative would enhance wildlife habitat by reducing human disturbance.

See Section 3.1.4, "Management," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a discussion of animal control services in the study area.

I38-2           The commenters' concern about the lack of restrooms is noted.

Given the sensitive nature of the marsh, restrooms were not considered as part of the project. As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side.

From: BM [bmhburg@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Sunday, April 07, 2013 11:22 PM  
To: Carroll, Scott@Tahoe  
Subject: Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

Regarding the Restoration project, I would like to see public access on the outer perimeter of the marsh (similar to the trail along Taylor Creek), an unpaved hiking trail matching the one in Cove East off Venice Drive. I think the Cove East Trail has been a wonderful success, given the opportunity to walk along the marsh and watch the wildlife and the vegetation. It is used by many people.

It would be great to have such a trail run all around the marsh, starting anywhere by Lily Ave, along the Al Tahoe neighborhood, with a bridge crossing Trout Creek towards the Highland Woods area (through the forested area along Springwood), behind Silverwood Circle, continuing over a bridge over the Upper Truckee River, ultimately joining the Cove East Trail. The trail should be dirt and mostly used by pedestrians, since a bike trail is already in place through Al Tahoe and along Highway 50.

Informal trails are already in place along the Al Tahoe neighborhood and along Springwood, so obviously quite some people walk there. It should be relatively easy and cost efficient to incorporate these. A missing piece that I really would like to see, since I live in the Highland Woods area, is a continuing trail from Springwood Drive along Silverwood Circle, with access points from the cul de sac and perhaps the forest lot on Springwood Drive.

I am in favor of returning the Upper Truckee River to a more natural state. By running a hiking trail around the perimeter of the marsh, without disturbing the interior, I think a balance between nature and humans can be found. This would also create a low key natural counterpoint to the "over" development of the Tahoe Keys.

Respectfully submitted  
Barbara Marsden  
915 Comstock Way  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150  
Sent from my iPad

I39-1

Letter  
I39  
Response

Barbara Marsden  
April 7, 2013

I39-1            The commenter's support for recreation around the perimeter of the marsh and for unpaved trails is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

Lynne Mersereau

836 El Dorado Ave. • South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150  
Phone: (530) 541-3256 • E-Mail: GabBarrett@hotmail.com

Date: March 15, 2013

Scott Carroll  
California Tahoe Conservancy  
1061 Third Street  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 916150

Subject: Comments on the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

Dear Mr. Carroll;

I have some concerns about the proposed alternatives for the Upper Truckee Marsh restoration and the recreation impacts disclosed by the EIR/EIS.

Before I list my concerns, I would like to say the environmental restoration in the marsh and the upgrades at Cove East are commendable. In addition, I consent with the public access and recreational opportunities that are being provided in Cove East next to the marina commercial area.

I40-1

My first concern is with the proposed alternatives that increase public access to the meadow in the AI Tahoe residential area. In the South Lake Tahoe area, there is already public beach access in sensitive areas (e.g. Cove East, Pope Beach, Baldwin Beach, Taylor Creek and Rabe Meadow). The need for encouraging more public access on the east and southeast side of the sensitive Upper Truckee Marsh is perplexing. AI Tahoe is a residential NEIGHBORHOOD with legitimate concerns about the environmental impacts of any project in the Upper Truckee Meadow.

I40-2

As to the EIS/EIR, there are the obvious issues and impacts related to added traffic, parking, noise, fire, and litter. The analysis is not clear to how many additional people are projected for each alternative. Thus, the impacts for each alternative are hard to determine.

I40-3

I would like to understand why the transportation Section 3.16 uses San Francisco Avenue instead of Tallac Avenue or Los Angeles Avenue as a main thoroughfare access. San Francisco Ave. does not have a signal on Hwy 50 and has many stop signs on its way to the meadow. Los Angeles Ave. seems to be the main access to El Dorado Ave. and the meadow. Also, I could not find any description of impacts of traffic, parking and user impact on El Dorado Ave. by alternative.

I40-4

In addition, by alternative, there is the question of who will maintain the recreational facilities in the future? Where is that stated in the document?

I40-5

Furthermore, in the summer, the strong prevailing winds are from the southwest. Over the years, I have observed numerous people smoking in the meadow. With added public access so close to homes, the potential for fire is upgraded. Fire protection, as stated under Public Service Impacts on page 3.12-7 and 3.12-8, says that the impact is less than significant. I am wondering if that was the answer for the Gondola EIS?

I40-6

Under Methods and Assumptions 3.13-9, point number 2 states: "The most popular recreational uses of the study area are dispersed outdoor recreation. The Tahoe Basin has an abundance of locations where

I40-7



people can engage in the same recreational activities on public lands; thus, there is not a substantial unmet demand for such recreational opportunities.”

As for the options presented in the four alternatives of the Truckee Meadows EIS/EIR, I am not in agreement. In my opinion, the best proposal is the added restoration of the Truckee, or letting it go back to the natural course. Maybe, something as simple as using more funding for enforcement could produce the best results for the meadow, wildlife and the lake, as well as public use and education.

I40-8

Please do not publish my address. If possible, I would like to have a written response to my comments sent to me.

Thank you,

Lynne Mersereau

Letter  
I40  
Response

Lynne Mersereau  
March 13, 2013

I40-1 The commenter's support for restoration of the study area and for public access and recreational opportunities in Cove East is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

I40-2 The commenter's concerns about increased public access and impacts on the east meadow in the Al Tahoe area are noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side near the Al Tahoe neighborhood. Section 3.4, "Biological Resources," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS analyzes impacts of the project on plants and wildlife. The Preferred Alternative would enhance wildlife habitat by reducing human disturbance.

I40-3 The commenter's concern that it is difficult to estimate the increased amount of public use with each alternative is noted.

As described in Section 3.13, "Recreation," long-term effects on recreation resources and activities would result from providing infrastructure that changes the spectrum of recreation settings from dispersed to more developed and from altering accessibility throughout the site to varying degrees, depending on the alternative, which may lead to an increase in visitors within the study area. As described in Chapter 2, "Project Alternatives," the action alternatives were developed to balance recreation and public access with ecosystem restoration and habitat protection. This balance would be attained by providing well-designed public access and recreation facilities in nonsensitive areas and habitat protective elements and environmental education to direct use away from sensitive areas.

The evaluation of long-term effects of the alternatives considered how recreation use could increase proportionally to the change in the amount and connectivity of public access— and recreation-related infrastructure, because the proposed infrastructure would affect (increase) the accessibility of the project study area to recreational users. A record of precise counts of visitors does not exist for the study area, although the Conservancy has a comprehensive qualitative understanding of recreation use from staff observations and the activities of a site steward during summer months. Without a quantified inventory record of visitors, it is not feasible to develop precise quantitative estimates of changes in recreation users for each alternative. However, qualitative assessment is feasible based on the relative degree of proposed recreation and access infrastructure for each alternative. Based on this qualitative assessment of the alternatives relative to each other, implementing Alternative 2 (minimal recreation infrastructure) is expected to result in the least increase in visitation.

Implementing Alternative 1 (maximum recreation infrastructure) would result in the greatest increase in visitation, and implementing Alternative 3 or 4 (moderate recreation infrastructure) would result in an intermediate increase, between Alternatives 1 and 2 in magnitude, but negligibly different between Alternatives 3 and 4. The potential increase in the number of visitors is not considered to be substantial enough to create new or unmitigable impacts on recreation resources for the following reasons:

- (1) The recreation and public access elements of the alternatives are related to reducing the impacts on natural resources of the existing use of the study area.
- (2) The most popular recreational uses of the study area are dispersed outdoor recreation. The Tahoe Basin has an abundance of locations where people can engage in the same recreation activities on public lands; thus, there is not a substantial unmet demand for such recreational opportunities.
- (3) Even though the action alternatives would move recreational uses from dispersed toward developed outdoor recreation (with Alternative 1 having the most change), the recreation uses proposed are not categorically fully developed facilities (e.g., campgrounds, marinas), and the increase in the number of visitors would not be similar to the increase associated with those uses.
- (4) Adjacent neighborhoods account for a substantial portion of visitors to the study area, and implementing the project would not alter the number of residents in adjacent neighborhoods or substantially alter access to the study area from adjacent neighborhoods.

Nonetheless, several aspects of the proposed public access infrastructure could increase the number of visitors to the study area. The Preferred Alternative does not include any additional recreation access features on the east side of the marsh, access features on the west side of the marsh include a moderate level of infrastructure, similar to existing conditions, with improved ADA access, therefore, increase in visitor use would not be expected beyond that under Alternative 5, the No Project/No Action Alternative.

- I40-4           The commenter’s concerns about use of San Francisco Avenue instead of Tallac or Los Angeles Avenue is noted.
- See Section 3.1.2, “Traffic, Access, and Staging,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. See response to Comment AO2-7 for information on parking.
- I40-5           The commenter’s concern about long-term maintenance of the study area is noted.
- As stated in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Conservancy has been maintaining existing infrastructure as part of its management of land in the study area, and implements management actions supporting public access, recreation, and habitat protection. Under the Preferred Alternative, the Conservancy would continue to provide maintenance of facilities. In addition, see Section 3.1.4, “Management,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I40-6           The commenter’s concern about increase in fire risk is noted.
- See response to Comment AO2-10 for information in fire risks associated with the project.
- I40-7           The commenter reiterates that there is not a substantial unmet demand for dispersed recreation in the Tahoe Basin.

This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

I40-8

The commenter's support for restoration of the study area and increasing enforcement is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

RECEIVED

Letter I41

California Tahoe Conservancy  
ATTN: Scott Carroll  
1061 Third Street  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Subject: Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project)

Note: Withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

I am a resident and/or property owner in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. I believe the Project planning and its environmental impact report (Report) do not adequately address the following possible real impacts to me and my neighborhood:

1. Construction noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: this is a quiet residential neighborhood. Use of California Avenue as a haul route, and CTC neighborhood lots for the California Avenue Staging site, will generate abnormal and unacceptable local noise preventing my reasonable use and enjoyment of my home and property. The Report implies this noise could occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. Nevertheless, the Report assesses the short-term noise impact, for all project alternatives, as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. This finding defies common sense for significant residential impact, and the locations cited in Appendix J of the Report that were analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. I strongly disagree with this finding for this neighborhood and consider the noise impact analysis for this neighborhood inadequate since it does not include any nearby locations.
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: California Avenue, designated as the only haul route in this subdivision, is one of its narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking their children and pets, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The street is too narrow for large vehicles to pass each other or turn around, or even for normal vehicles to navigate without evasive maneuvers. When cars are parked along it, it is effectively single lane. Yet the Report assesses the short-term potential for conflict between construction traffic, local traffic, pedestrians, and bicycles as Less Than Significant, No Mitigation Needed. For this neighborhood, I strongly disagree with this finding and consider the analysis it is based on to be inadequate. The finding defies common sense, does not seem to address the residential nature of the neighborhood, and the traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the Al Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not this neighborhood.
3. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: the proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small undeveloped residential lots acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent damage to, their environmental sensitivity. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that they would never be used by the CTC as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. The aesthetic fundamental nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by this use. This impact is not recognized or assessed in the Report. I strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots by the Project for this or other construction purposes.

I41-1

4. Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: construction activity on the subject CTC lots in conjunction with neighborhood children playing near their homes creates a safety hazard that does not appear to be identified or analyzed in the Report. I strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the safety of neighborhood children. *Will a four year old neighborhood child not be able to play catch outside his or her home in the summer until he or she is 8?*
5. Increased Flood Risk in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk as a result of the Project. If the models prove incorrect, no assessment has been included of how expensive the damages to property owners would be or whether the lead Agencies would be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners
6. Neighborhood notification in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision: even though my neighborhood is potentially highly impacted by Project construction, I was not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Even if agency outreach and notification satisfied the letter of the law, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. Few of my neighbors are aware of the possible impacts even now, and there has been little public response to the few recent outreach meetings. I feel the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, at least near the potential California Ave Staging site.

I believe these and other potential impacts to my neighborhood are excessive, unnecessary, and unacceptable. Therefore, I respectfully request that the preferred alternative and final plans, include the features below. If this isn't done, I respectfully request that additional impact analyses and public comment be undertaken to address the inadequacies cited above from these features.

1. No use of the CTC lots designated as California Ave Staging for any Project construction activities. It is not necessary for either environmental or practical reasons. The CTC has other alternatives that do not require disrupting this, or other, residential neighborhoods.
2. No use of California Ave as a haul route for Project construction activities.
3. No use of any streets or parcels in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision as Project haul routes or staging sites.
4. Locating internal haul routes for river work on the east side of the river to the maximum extent possible to minimize impact to close-by residential neighborhoods which are primarily on the west side of the river.
5. Posting a bond or securing insurance to compensate property owners for damages and loss of property value, if the Project increases residential flood risk and the FEMA 100-year floodplain.

Respectfully submitted,

Name:

*Jayme Miller*  
 Jayme Miller Date: 4/8/13  
 Grant Wilson 4/8/13

Address:

141-1  
cont.

Letter  
I41  
Response

Gantt & Jayme Miller  
April 8, 2013

I41-1            The commenters have concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenters state that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

See response to Comment Letter I8 for a discussion regarding these concerns.

Comments on the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project  
From Property Owners Gantt and Jayme Miller at 871 Michael Drive

April 5, 2013

Scott,

My family and I live at 871 Michael Drive and our property backs directly to the meadow area of the Upper Truckee watershed. I have two concerns about the proposed restoration project on the Upper Truckee River Marsh area behind our house.

1. Don't run over our kids with your construction equipment. I have two small children ages 3 and 1-1/2 years old and we live next to a conservancy lot, which according to your maps, may be used as a "staging area" for construction. While my son would very excited by the prospect of having dump trucks, front-end loaders, and other heavy equipment right next to our house, my wife and I have some reservations about how prudent it would be to use a residential lot surrounded by numerous families as a "staging area." They take a nap around noon for about 2 hours. They run all over the place. It's just not a very well thought-out approach plan when there are current construction corridors for the TKPOA and directly off of highway 50, which do not impact the numerous children and families in our area. The Tahoe Island neighborhood is one of the few areas in Tahoe with majority year-round residents; it would be a crime to turn one of the last bastions of community into a highway for heavy equipment.

I42-1

2. Flooding is also a concern. We currently pay flood insurance on our home and have seen high water impact the Tahoe Island neighborhood. As it appears that the goal of the project is to essentially allow the Upper Truckee to flood with greater regularity thereby restoring a more natural wetland habitat, my question is one of responsibility. Since the restoration project will produce greater flooding, will the conservancy also take financial responsibility for any property damage caused by that flooding? In the maps and alternatives outlined in your vast project documentation, nowhere were dykes or berms indicated to protect the residential neighborhood from increased flooding. My only assumption then would be that the indirect goal of the restoration is to use the Tahoe Island neighborhood as an overflow area for the Upper Truckee. Why not flood the Tahoe Keys instead? After all, it was that development that severely altered the hydrology of the Upper Truckee Delta.

I42-2

It would have been nice if we were notified about the plan earlier. Thankfully one of my neighbors alerted me to the expiration of the public comment period, but no outreach was conducted to our family even though we would be directly impacted not only by the project's overall goals, but also by the construction process.

I42-3

With all of the above being said, I do believe that it makes sense to do something to help restore the Upper Truckee and am glad that this project exists. I would just ask that in the implementation of the project consideration is taken for the safety of the residential community surrounding the work and consideration be given to the ultimate liability for property damage that could result from the well-intentioned efforts of the conservancy.

I42-4

Thank you.

Gantt and Jayme Miller  
871 Michael Drive  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150



Letter  
I42  
Response

Gantt & Jayme Miller  
April 5, 2013

- I42-1           The commenters' concern regarding safety of staging areas in neighborhoods is noted.
- As shown in Exhibit 2-2 in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not propose construction staging areas on or in the vicinity of Tahoe Island neighborhood. See Section 3.1.2, "Traffic, Access, and Staging," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for additional discussion.
- I42-2           The commenters are concerned about increased flooding and increased flooding-related financial burdens in the Tahoe Island neighborhood.
- See Section 3.1.1, "Flooding and Flood Hazards," in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion on flooding. The analysis of the proposed project is consistent with CEQA, NEPA and TRPA requirements because the project would not change the existing flood hazards of the surrounding properties. See "Flooding and Flood Hazards," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. Furthermore, financial responsibility for flood damages is not an issue relating to effects on the environment that requires an analysis under CEQA.
- I42-3           The commenters' concern about noticing and public outreach is noted.
- The Project mailing list was developed by obtaining the most recent County Assessor's information as well as contact information provided through outreach over the life of the project. The commenter's address was incorrect with the County and has been updated. For privacy purposes the address has been withheld in this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. See responses to Comments AO2-4 and I8-6 for a discussion of the project's history, planning context, and public outreach.
- I42-4           The commenters' support for restoration of the study area with consideration for neighborhood safety and liability is noted.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. See Section 3.1.1, "Flooding and Flood Hazards," in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion on flooding. The analysis of the proposed project is consistent with CEQA, NEPA and TRPA requirements because the project would not change the existing flood hazards of the surrounding properties. See "Flooding and Flood Hazards," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. Furthermore, financial responsibility for flood damages is not an issue relating to effects on the environment that requires an analysis under CEQA.
- See Section 3.1.4, "Management," in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion on safety. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

From: theochoas3@charter.net  
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 7:57 PM  
To: Carroll, Scott@Tahoe  
Subject: Comment: Upper Truckee Marsh  
Attachments: DSC\_0144-002.JPG

Hello Scott,

Please accept my comments on the restoration of the upper Truckee Marsh.

I live on the east side of the meadow a block from El Dorado Avenue and have spent many hours walking in the meadow. The Conservancy has a real challenge protecting the meadow and at the same time allowing people to enjoy it.

Alternative 1 would have great recreation opportunities, but it would attract too many people and would end up destroying the meadow. It would be impossible to keep everyone out of the sensitive areas.

The Alternative I favor is Alternative 2. I like the Boardwalk suggested on the east side where the water tends to flood in the spring. There are many birds nesting in the spring where the property line turns north, though. The boardwalk would disturb this prime nesting area. If the boardwalk was put close to the property line, then I would favor Alternative 4. I selfishly would like to see a boardwalk put in to have more access even in a high spring-run off year, but it is important to protect that area.

Sincerely,  
Cindy Ochoa  
530-542-2943

FYI - I have attached my favorite photo of the marsh.

143-1

Letter  
I43  
Response

Cindy Ochoa  
April 1, 2013

I43-1           The commenter's opposition to Alternative 1 and support of Alternatives 2 and 4 are noted. The commenter's support for a boardwalk if the area can also be protected is also noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not include construction of a boardwalk. The Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

From: Pete O'Hara [pete20077@msn.com]  
Sent: Sunday, April 07, 2013 5:21 AM  
To: Carroll, Scott@Tahoe  
Cc: Pete; Leslynn  
Subject: Comment: Upper Truckee Marsh/ Law Enforcement Impact

Mr. Carroll:

Thank you for your review of this comment. I am available at the District Attorneys' Office (# 530-573-3100) if I can be of further assistance.

I am in favor of the watershed restoration. I am opposed to building anything, especially kiosks, bike/pedestrian paths in the marsh.

Crime has increased in the marsh since the Barton family left and removed the supervision of the cowboys who were there for the cattle. The opportunity for criminal behavior in the marsh will be enhanced if improvements are placed in this secluded area. I have worked with law enforcement in So. Lake Tahoe for more than 25 years. Improvements will put more demands on the Sheriff and Police. Criminal suspects already flee to the marsh and/or use natural seclusion of the area for 'cover' for bad acts. Infrastructure will enhance the already established homeless camp behind the Motel and under the two HY 50 bridges. This hidden cost to community safety and to the taxpayers by increasing law enforcement calls to this huge area is an unintended impact.

I44-1

Peter O'Hara

Letter  
I44  
Response

Peter O'Hara  
April 7, 2013

I44-1           The commenter's support for restoration of the study area and concern about increased public access and associated crime is noted.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions, and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side. Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative.

See Section 3.1.4, "Management," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a discussion of police protection services in the study area.

Letter I45

From: Ellen Palazzo [ellentahoe@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Monday, April 08, 2013 9:46 AM  
To: Carroll, Scott@Tahoe  
Subject: Upper Truckee River Marsh Restoration Project  
Attachments: Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project Ltr.pdf

CTC

RE: Upper Truckee River Marsh Restoration

My husband and I are homeowners at 2343 California Ave in South Lake Tahoe and we are concerned about the proposed project that would affect the public open space in this area. We have quietly enjoyed this meadow for many years and are disturbed by

I45-1

the desire of CTC to "improve" the area for wildlife and endangered species without regard for the residents that live in the area and enjoy this public open space.

Concerns

1) Creating a wetland restricts walking in the area as it will become too marshy to walk in

I45-2

2) Increased mosquitos in the area affecting the enjoyment our own outdoor space at our homes

I45-3

3) Increased coyote population (we have seen this already in our neighborhood and have actually named the coyotes that frequent the streets and our yards tormenting our pets.

I45-4

4) Devalue our homes - One of the biggest reasons we purchased our home was the location and the fact we didn't need to drive to enjoy walking in public open space.

I45-5

5) too many restrictions on using the area, especially if you have a family dog.

I45-6

6) considering only the wildlife and not the residents who use the area.

I45-7

7) Increased risk of flooding in the neighborhood

I45-8

8) Increased urbanization of Cove East destracts from the natural beauty and steers people away, particularly residents.

I45-9

9) please see the attached letter for additional concerns regarding the use of my street as a hauling route for trucks.

I45-10

Public space should not have the type of restrictions that you have placed on us. It is apparent that the CTC is not considering the residents using this "public" open space and you're long term intent is to keep people from using that area.

I45-11

Respectfully submitted

Gene and Ellen Palazzo

Letter  
I45  
Response

Gene & Ellen Palazzo  
April 8, 2013

- I45-1           The commenters' concern about neighborhood use of open space is noted.
- Potential impacts related to public access and recreation are discussed in Section 3.13, "Recreation," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. See response to comment I40-3 for a discussion of the methods and assumptions used to evaluate impacts on recreation and public access. The Preferred Alternative would continue to provide public access on the west side of the marsh consistent with the project goals and purpose of the property acquisition. The Conservancy would continue to manage user-created trails (dispersed recreation access) on the east side of the marsh similar to existing conditions.
- I45-2           The commenters' concern about increased marsh habitat reducing access is noted.
- Potential impacts related to public access and recreation are discussed in Section 3.13, "Recreation," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. The Preferred Alternative would continue to provide public access on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions.
- I45-3           The commenters' concern about additional mosquito production is noted.
- See response to Comment I4-4. In addition, see Section 3.1.4, "Management," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of mosquito control.
- I45-4           The commenters' concern about an increase in the coyote population is noted.
- The proposed project would not affect coyote populations.
- I45-5           The commenters' concern about the proposed project devaluing adjacent homes is noted.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I45-6           The commenters' concern about restrictions on dog use is noted.
- See Section 3.1.4, "Management," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of animal control.
- I45-7           The commenters' concern about neighborhood use instead of wildlife use is noted.
- Potential impacts related to public access and recreation are discussed in Section 3.13, "Recreation," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. The Preferred Alternative would continue to provide public access on the west side of the marsh, similar to existing conditions.
- I45-8           The commenters are concerned about potential increases in neighborhood flooding.
- An updated discussion of existing and potential flood hazards is provided in Section 3.1.1, "Flooding and Flood Hazards," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS.

- I45-9           The commenters’ concern about urbanization of Cove East is noted.
- The Preferred Alternative would provide a “moderate” level of recreation infrastructure similar to existing conditions and would include a modified Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)–accessible pedestrian trail to Cove East Beach, a viewpoint and observation point, a fishing platform, and signage.
- I45-10           The commenters’ concern about designated haul routes is noted.
- See Section 3.1.2, “Traffic, Access, and Staging,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for additional discussion.
- I45-11           The commenters’ concern about restrictions on public access is noted.
- The Preferred Alternative would continue to provide public access consistent with acquisition and litigation settlement agreements as described in Chapter 2 of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS.