

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

RECEIVED
 JUN 18
 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.

137-1
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. *+ a plan to repave the street if it is indeed used as a haul route*

Respectfully submitted,

Name: Michael Ledesma Carol 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/stereo. 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

- 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.

I38-1

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.

I38-2

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

- 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

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.

140-1

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.

My first concern is with the proposed alternatives that increase public access to the meadow in the Al 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. Al Tahoe is a residential NEIGHBORHOOD with legitimate concerns about the environmental impacts of any project in the Upper Truckee Meadow.

140-2

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.

140-3

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.

140-4

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?

140-5

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?

140-6

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

140-7

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.

140-8

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

- 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.

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



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 Soott,

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 oppotunities, but it would attract too many people and would end up destoying 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.

I43-1

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

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.

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

- 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.

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.

146-1

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.

146-1
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,

Name:

Ellen Palazzo
Gene Palazzo

Date:

4/7/13

Address:

I46-1

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.

From: Mark Anton [antonsingers@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 08, 2013 10:21 AM
To: Carroll, Scott@Tahoe
Subject: Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

I live in the Tahoe Keys and one of my favorite trails for hiking and running is located in Cove East.

It would be great to have that trail run all around the perimeter of the marsh, with bridges across the Upper Truckee and Trout Creek, ending close to the Lake in the Al Tahoe neighborhood. This trail would connect the Keys, Highland Woods and Al Tahoe for hikers and runner, without having to be close to Highway 50. It would give people the opportunity to enjoy the beauty and the wildlife in the marsh with little disturbance.

147-1

I would prefer to see the river returned to a more natural state if the financial resources can be found. I think a trail like I am suggesting would be a relatively low cost improvement. It would be of great benefit to many people, as well as the City of Tahoe, in providing a vast segment of connected trails right in town.

Mark A. Pevarnic
439 Ala wai Blvd. no. 158
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Mark Anton Singers' Studio
founded 1981
Mark Anton, Owner and Artistic Director
Locations in Burbank, California and Olympia, Washington
818-955-9535 or 360-870-7575

I47-1

The commenter's support for a trail around the perimeter of the marsh and restoration of the Upper Truckee River 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.

From: Greg Poseley [g.poseley@gmail.com]
 Sent: Friday, April 26, 2013 5:33 PM
 To: Carroll, Scott@Tahoe
 Cc: Greg Poseley
 Subject: Upper Truckee Marsh Restoration Project-Public Comment

Dear Mr. Carroll:

Thank you for your comprehensive and compelling document related to the proposed project in the Upper Truckee River floodplain. My wife and I are property owners adjacent to the east side of the Truckee Marsh and are therefore keenly interested in the potential impact the Project will have in the area. Please accept the following comments related to the proposed project. I realize that I am submitting this far beyond your deadline, however I do hope there may be some useful food for thought here.

OBJECTIVES:

The Draft EIR/EIS/EIS document clearly states that the particular issue related to the proposed Project is the sediment and nutrient load imparted into Lake Tahoe due to channelization and other human disturbances to the Upper Truckee River primarily throughout the current city limits of the City of South Lake Tahoe. Additional needs include habitat restoration and preservation and recreational opportunities.

148-1

It is hoped that in this less-than-one square mile unique environment that ecological priorities will out-weigh recreational pursuits variously proposed. Indeed, at least one preliminary study by the United States Forest Service Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit does not mention recreation at all in its document describing needs, goals and objectives of the project.
 (Please see: http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5143256.pdf)

FUNDING

I do not see this fundamental project element addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. The public should be made aware of the scope of costs related to the various proposed Alternatives in order to gain a more balanced and realistic appraisal of the Project and its funding priorities within each. If no funding source has been identified, then this statement should be made evident early on. A discussion of possible, and more suitably, likely funding sources, amounts and continued maintenance budget should be presented.

148-2

LONG TERM STABILITY OF STRUCTURES CREATED BY ALTERNATIVES 1- 4

While there is discussion of the effectiveness of the new infrastructure created through the engineering efforts proposed in the Draft EIR's Alternatives 1 through 4, stability and long term effectiveness of these elements must also be considered. The vagaries and extremes of the Tahoe Basin's seasonal and annual weather patterns, particularly the susceptibility to high level, unregulated storm or snowmelt runoff, may well physically undermine the Projects efforts in a relatively short time. Despite the extensive treatise on flooding developed in Section 3.8 Hydrology and Flooding, I am not convinced the physical structures proposed could withstand above-moderate to severe storm runoff.

148-3

TROUT CREEK IMPACT

While the Upper Truckee River has undergone substantial human induced disturbance, the course of Trout Creek along the eastern edge of the Marsh currently supports a wide variety of ecosystems and habitats much revered by local property owners. There should be more discussion of the impact the Project will have on the relatively undisturbed Trout Creek. There is a serious potential for negative impact on the current idyllic condition of the creek by further engineering operations in the Marsh and the construction of recreationally related boardwalks, bike paths, pedestrian bridges, observation sites, interpretive centers and vehicle parking lots. Indeed, the mere construction of these latter entities in the Trout Creek area will create environmental impacts that will take years to erase. The impact of the proposed recreational components of the Project on long-established neighborhoods and the positive aesthetic appeal of the area in its current minimalist recreational condition needs additional discussion.

148-4

RECREATION, MONITORING and ENFORCEMENT

Despite whatever efforts have been previously made to educate users of this area as to the sensitivity of the wildlife, there is continued abuse. Dogs regularly run unleashed throughout the Marsh, dog waste and litter is common, and evidence of homeless camps and illegal fire rings are occasionally seen. Four of the Project alternatives identify the creation of recreational infrastructure, yet there is no discussion of on-going maintenance, monitoring and law enforcement in this area. The proposed Project should address on-going monitoring and enforcement within the area to ensure neighborhood security, safety and long term habitat and wildlife preservation efforts.

148-5

Again I apologize for the tardiness of this feedback, yet I thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Project.

Yours Truly,

Gregory Poseley
g.poseley@gmail.com

- I48-1 The commenter’s support of making restoration a priority over recreation 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.
- I48-2 The commenter’s request for additional information on the cost of the alternatives is noted.
- See response to Comment AO8-7.
- I48-3 The commenter’s concern regarding the long-term stability of proposed restoration features required under any of the action alternatives is noted.
- High flows have the potential to damage or erode restoration features or recreation infrastructure required in channels or on floodplains. As noted by the commenter and discussed in Section 3.8, “Hydrology and Flooding,” of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS, high unregulated flows periodically occur through the project area, particularly associated with rain-on-snow events and localized high-intensity summer thunderstorm events. The restoration elements included in all the alternatives would emulate natural riverine processes and functions, including allowing for some channel erosion and movement that is typical for sinuous channels through meadows. It is possible that extreme events may cause erosion of channel banks and shifts in channel position, as would be expected under natural conditions. The commenter is correct in noting that some engineered features and/or structures necessary to relocate or redirect flows, support certain stream bed or bank locations, and/or protect vital infrastructure must be designed to remain stable and static. The concept-level Preferred Alternative presented in this Final EIR/EIS/EIS (see schematic diagrams in Appendix A) would be further refined through the final design process. Any constructed features would meet specific parameters for stability under the design flows, including the 100-year event for permanent structures that must remain in place to support the restored channel position and/or protect infrastructure.
- I48-4 The commenter’s concern regarding potential impacts of recreation components of the project along the east side of the marsh on Trout Creek is noted.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not propose additional recreation infrastructure on the east side of the marsh. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I48-5 The commenter’s concern about off-leash dogs and public safety 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 police protection and other public services in the study area. Furthermore, 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 and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side.