

SECTION C

Public Meetings

This page intentionally left blank.

- PM1-1 This is the call to order and introductory information and general meeting information and overview information on the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM1-2 The commenter asks about SEZ credits in disturbed SEZ.
- The project would create new SEZ and enhance existing SEZ. Credits are believed to be given on new and disturbed SEZ. The accreditation of SEZ is to be determined through TRPA once the project is complete.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM1-3 The commenter asks whether fish passage is a short-term or long-term problem.
- Impacts associated with short- and long-term fish passage are discussed in Section 3.5, “Fisheries,” of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS under Impacts 3.5-3 and 3.5-4. Fish passage between Lake Tahoe and the Upper Truckee River could be impeded in the absence of a defined main channel or channels across the marsh connecting the river mouth to the upstream river. These conditions would persist until a channel or channels have formed to reconnect the river to the lake. Because of uncertainties about the period of time required for formation of a channel suitable for upstream fish passage and downstream dispersal, Alternative 3 (and the Preferred Alternative) has the potential to disrupt fish migrations for a substantial number of migration seasons, and it would increase the risk from stranding for downstream-moving fish in the river.
- PM1-4 The commenter asks whether a shallow introductory channel would assist in channel forming under Alternative 3.
- The Preferred Alternative does include a pilot channel to help direct the river flows from the existing, deeply incised channel out onto the surrounding terrace surface and reconnect with the remnant channels and swales in the middle of the marsh.
- PM1-5 The commenter asks how many seasons the project will take to complete.
- The project would take approximately 4–5 years to complete, with heavy construction expected to occur over approximately 2 years.
- PM1-6 The commenter asks whether fish will have to be rerouted twice.
- The final phasing, sequencing, and duration of construction activities would be determined during final design and permitting, including considerations of the likely lake level and streamflow conditions that could occur during the eventual construction seasons. These variables would control the number of times and/or locations requiring dewatering, flow bypassing, and fish rescue and relocation. It is possible that separate areas and timing for dewatering events would be planned, because there may be environmental benefits to the fish, water quality, and invasive-

species control to have discrete efforts at the Sailing Lagoon, lower Trout Creek, the river mouth, and the pilot channel. These considerations would be included in the crafting the aquatic-species rescue and relocation plan as part of Environmental Commitment 7. The plan would be completed, reviewed, and approved by both the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (for Lahontan cutthroat trout) before the start of construction.

PM1-7 The commenter asks about beavers during construction.

There may be situations during construction where removal of beaver dams is needed. Beavers would continue to use the study area after construction.

PM1-8 The commenter asks how the project addresses climate change and large storm events.

The project design approach considers the range of historic variability and trends, but the official design guidelines and performance criteria considered for design and impact thresholds are focused on current planning standards and regulatory requirements, which range up to the 1 percent annual chance (100-year) flood. Regionally downscaled simulations of future climate and hydrology under a range of climate change scenarios were considered during the development of alternative approaches and assessment of the hydrology, flooding, geomorphology, and water quality impacts of the proposed action alternatives and the no-action future condition (in Sections 3.8 and 3.9). Because the future conditions under various climate change scenarios have relatively high uncertainty, comparisons between alternatives and between the action alternatives and the no-action future are relative, rather than quantitative.

PM1-9 The commenter's preference of Alternative 3 and opposition to Alternative 1 is noted.

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

PM1-10 The commenter asks whether the inset floodplain alternative would be as effective as Alternative 3 at handling changes caused by climate change.

Alternative 3 was selected as the restoration basis of the Preferred Alternative partially because its reactivation of existing floodplain features, emphasis on use of natural geomorphic adjustments, reestablishment of a river-connected lagoon, and potential to raise groundwater levels and surface inundation across the meadow would all provide superior resilience to likely hydrologic and climatic changes forecast for the region. Alternative 4, which proposed an inset floodplain, would not be expected to have the same degree or type of advantages.

PM1-11 The commenter asks whether restoration projects are considering the Ark storm in the Lake Tahoe Basin.

The project design approach considers the range of historic variability and trends, but the official design guidelines and performance criteria considered for design and impact thresholds are focused on current planning standards and regulatory requirements, which does not include the very-low-probability, extreme events such as the "Ark storm."

PM1-12 The comment is unclear; however, if interpreted correctly, it discusses accommodating recreation access and natural processes.

The Preferred Alternative provides for recreation access as required under the litigation settlement agreement and the intent of acquisition while still allowing natural deltaic processes to occur.

- PM1-13 The commenter asks what type of fish would be affected by fish passage issues.
- Section 3.5, “Fisheries,” of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS includes a thorough discussion of the fish species that are or may be present in the study area and could be affected by fish passage issues. Impacts 3.5-3 and 3.5-4 for each of the alternatives include a description of the fish species that could be affected, depending on the season, flow conditions, and life-history phases of the various species.
- PM1-14 The commenter suggests restoring the TKPOA yard.
- The Preferred Alternative includes removal of the TKPOA yard and road, and restoration to meadow habitat, contingent on TKPOA consent. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM1-15 The comments are associated with other Advisory Planning Commission meeting topics.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

- PM2-1 This is the call to order and introductory information and general meeting information and overview information on the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-2 The commenter asks what percentage of sediment from all sources into Lake Tahoe is coming from the Upper Truckee River.
- As discussed in Section 3.8 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS, the Upper Truckee River is the largest source of fine sediment to Lake Tahoe. Although its unit-area rate of sediment generation is moderate, the basin is large. The Upper Truckee River's portion of the total fine-sediment load to Lake Tahoe is calculated to be 19.4 percent; another 8.9 percent generated in Trout Creek is also routed to the lake through the study area.
- PM2-3 The comment is unclear but seems to discuss financial feasibility.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-4 The commenter asks at what point in time the Lahontan RWQCB gets involved.
- The Lahontan RWQCB has been involved throughout the planning process. See Comment Letters AO5 and AO6 for additional information. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-5 The commenter asks where construction funding may come from.
- Construction funding has currently not been determined. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-6 The commenter asks for additional details on the four action alternatives; however, details requested are not provided.
- Chapter 2, "Project Alternatives," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS provides details on all the action alternatives. Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS provides details on the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-7 The commenter asks which alternative is most expensive.
- A cost analysis of the action alternatives was presented in Appendix E, "Alternatives Cost Estimate," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. Alternative 4 is estimated to be the most costly. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

- PM2-8 The commenter asks which alternative is preferred by the project proponents.
- See Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of the Preferred Alternative screening process. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-9 The comment is unclear but something about basic economics.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-10 The commenter’s opinion of the meadows, flooding, runoff, and conifer encroachment is noted.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-11 The commenter asks whether funding will be available if Alternative 4 is selected as the Preferred Alternative or whether the Conservancy will redesign to be consistent with money available.
- See Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of the Preferred Alternative screening process. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-12 The commenter asks about multiple projects along the Upper Truckee River and concerns with lack of funding and different design processes.
- Cumulative impacts associated with the project were discussed in Section 3.16, “Cumulative Impacts,” of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-13 The comment is unclear but appears to be associated with “acreage treated.”
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- PM2-14 The commenter discusses project-related workshops to be held by the Conservancy on May 2 and 3, 2013.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

This page intentionally left blank.