In the summer kids ride their bikes around these streets and parents stroll pushing baby carriages. But there is also a shady spot to be had for those headed for a designated vista platform.

For those of us who love the meadow, it is painful to walk by Conservancy property every day and see this: a scrawl of graffiti in this place. And even upside down our word smith sends us a message. Now, put some viewing platforms out in the meadow and watch his opportunities proliferate. The graffiti and broken sign have been out there for about a year with no response from Conservancy personnel.

The following three photographs show a scary situation for two reasons: fire hazard and public safety.

Some person has entered the adjoining property that may or may not belong to the Conservancy. Dense thickets of willow bushes have been cut down and remain in large dry piles. As the neighbor to this property, it is your responsibility to be aware of a hazard that involves you and to respond to it appropriately. The well worn path shows continuous use so this problem has been ongoing.

The second problem is public safety. I would not want my child to wander into this place not knowing who else might be in there. Some transients set up housekeeping is such places. Occasionally, they are weird or unbalanced people. As more dense thickets spring up all over the meadow with no Conservancy management of them, this becomes a more pervasive problem. And a fire hazard too.

Here at the end of Belview Avenue please contemplate what you see in these three photographs.

They say "All roads lead to Rome." For us this is where the roads end up.

I conclude with the following thoughts:

I have shown you nothing in these photos that you should not have already seen for yourselves. People around here certainly get the picture and that's why they express so much anger and frustration with your meadow project.

Communicate and work with other agencies and city departments so that all of the needs of an area in which you have interests will be addressed together. For example, it is insulting to ask people to "share" their streets with tourists when their own needs for regularly maintained roads have gone unmet for over 25 years.

Please do not try to shove off unwanted project features onto the Tahoe Woodlands neighborhood or anywhere else. If other people had been informed about the March 24th meeting they would have protested the same project ideas that anger Al Tahoe residents.

We all want to be neighbors in neighborhoods, not stared attractions in the Automobile Association TourBook.

Reconsider your own core values and responsibilities to taxpayers.

Minimize your own footprint and egos in the " project area": No new parking lots and at most only a small self-service interpretive center. I'm not an engineer but Alternative 3 where " river flow would be dictated by natural processes" sounds pretty good to me. No observation platforms, no boardwalks or bike paths along the lake.

Finally, there is no Conservancy project that will succeed along this side of the meadow without the support of the surrounding neighbors. And perhaps there is some rough justice to that.

Very truly yours,

Gloria Horootunian

I will be sending copies of this letter to TRPA, the City Council, and the Lahontan Water Quality Review Board.

RECEIVED
APR 30 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

STATE OF CALIFORNIA ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *Governor*

CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION
100 Howe Avenue, Suite 100-South
Sacramento, CA 95825-8202

PAUL D. THAYER, *Executive Officer*
(916) 574-1800 FAX (916) 574-1810
Relay Service From TDD Phone **1-800-735-2929**
from Voice Phone **1-800-735-2922**

Contact Phone: **(916) 574-1814**
Contact FAX: **(916) 574-1885**

April 27, 2007

Jacqui Grandfield, UC Consultant, Wildlife
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Subject: Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

Dear Ms. Grandfield:

Staff of the California State Lands Commission (CSLC) has received the above referenced Notice of Preparation. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the California Tahoe Conservancy and the CSLC are Responsible and/or Trustee Agencies for any and all projects which could directly or indirectly affect sovereign lands, their accompanying Public Trust resources or uses, and the public easement in navigable waters.

The public lands under the CSLC's jurisdiction consist of two distinct types – sovereign lands and school lands. Sovereign lands include the beds of navigable rivers, lakes and streams and the state's tide and submerged lands along the coastline, extending from the shoreline out to three geographic miles. Sovereign lands encompass approximately four million acres. Sovereign lands are impressed with the Common Law Public Trust. Sovereign lands can be used only for public purposes consistent with the provisions of the Public Trust such as waterborne commerce, navigation, fisheries, water related recreation, open space, ecological preservation, scientific study or other recognized Public Trust purposes. School lands are what remain of the nearly 5.5 million acres throughout the state originally granted to California by the Congress in 1853 to benefit public education. The state retains fee ownership of approximately 471,000 acres, and the reserved mineral interest in another 790,000 acres. There are approximately 1,200 parcels of state fee owned school lands scattered across the state.

If you have any question on comments on the environmental review, please contact Eric Gillies at (916) 574-1853, gilliee@slc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Marina R. Brand

Marina R. Brand, Assistant Chief
Division of Environmental Planning
and Management

cc: Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Eric Gillies, CSLC
Scott McFarlin, CSLC

City of South Lake Tahoe

"making a positive difference now"

RECEIVED
APR 26 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Our Mission is:

Working together to create the best future for our community

April 24, 2007

Jacqui Grandfield
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Dear Ms. Grandfield,

As you know, the South Lake Tahoe Parks and Recreation Commission has requested that the EIR/EIS for the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project include an elevated boardwalk for pedestrians and cyclists crossing Trout Creek at the northern portion of the site. This boardwalk would link the bicycle trails at Lake View or Lily Avenues on the east with the trail at Cove East on the west and provide pedestrian views of the beach and lake.

The current draft includes a linking bicycle trail "in the southern portion of the site" (Alternative 1), which is not what was agreed. Please see that the EIR/EIS statement is amended to conform with our earlier agreement, which is recorded in commission minutes.

We assume that this boardwalk will be similar to that being considered for the Greenway Project where it crosses the Upper Truckee.

Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Sincerely

Jerome Evans
Chair

"Recreation...a positive choice!"
Parks & Recreation Department · 1180 Rufus Allen Blvd. · South Lake Tahoe, California 96150-8202 · (530) 542-6056 · (530) 542-2981 FAX
Email: recreation@ci.south-lake-tahoe.ca.us · www.recreationintahoe.com

JIM GIBBONS
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA

RECEIVED
APR 27 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

ANDREW K. CLINGER
Director

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
209 E. Musser Street, Room 200
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4298
(775) 684-0222
Fax (775) 684-0260
http://www.budget.state.nv.us/

April 24, 2007

Jacqui Grandfield
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Re: SAI NV # **E2007-267** Reference:

Project: **Continuance of Scoping for Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration**

Dear Jacqui Grandfield:

The State Clearinghouse has processed the proposal and has no comment. Your proposal is not in conflict with state plans, goals or objectives.

This constitutes the State Clearinghouse review of this proposal as per Executive Order 12372. If you have questions, please contact me at (775) 684-0209.

Sincerely,

for Gosia Sylwestrzak
Nevada State Clearinghouse

Enclosure

RECEIVED
APR 9 - 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Glen Smith
Chairman, Buildings and Grounds
Lake Tahoe Community Presbyterian Church
775 588 1550
glentsmith@juno.com

April 5, 2007

Jacqui Grandfield
State of California
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Re: Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

The Lake Tahoe Community Presbyterian Church, 2733 Lake Tahoe Blvd. is located adjacent to this project area. A portion of our property extends into the meadow. At a time unknown to present members of the church, several feet of fill material was placed in the meadow (SEZ). The fill covers an estimated ¼ acre.

In the interest of restoring the meadow to its full extent, the church would be willing to allow the Conservancy, or other public entity, to remove the fill and restore the underlying meadow to its original state. The church does not have the resources to do this restoration on its own.

If it is possible, the church would be willing to trade this portion of its property for adjoining or nearby land area that could be improved for our additional need for parking space.

Please consider this offer and request in your plans for the project. We would be pleased to meet with you to examine the property and the opportunity it offers.

Sincerely,

Glen Smith,
Lake Tahoe Community Presbyterian Church

KEEP TAHOE BLUE

League to Save Lake Tahoe

April 30, 2007

Ms. Jacquie Grandfield, UC Consultant
Wildlife Program
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Dear Ms. Grandfield:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the scope and content of the EIR/EIS/EIS to be prepared for the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project. The following comments are submitted on behalf of the League to Save Lake Tahoe ("League"), a 4500 member non-profit organization dedicated to "Keeping Tahoe Blue."

The League fully supports comprehensive restoration of the Upper Truckee River and surrounding wetland and meadow areas. Given that the California Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region, estimates that more than half of fine sediment delivered to Lake Tahoe from surface water sources flow out of the Upper Truckee River, the maximum possible restoration needs to be concentrated in the Upper Truckee River watershed to achieve Lake Tahoe clarity goals

Full restoration is particularly important in the absence of existing land use constraints such as airports and golf courses. This is the case within the Upper Truckee River and Marsh project area. Therefore, the League encourages the Conservancy to pursue the alternative that provides the greatest ecological restoration potential and best meets the project purpose and need – "to restore natural geomorphic processes and ecological functions….to improve ecological values of the study area and to help reduce the river's discharge of nutrients and sediment that diminish Lake Tahoe's clarity."

The Draft EIR/EIS/EIS should clearly describe the relative water quality and overall watershed benefits of a range of alternatives, and then identify and environmentally-preferred alternative. Project alternatives should be ranked as to which best meet project objectives, using evaluation criteria such as:

1. Length of sinuous channel through the project area
2. Length of channel receiving overbank flow
3. Area of floodplain receiving deposited sediment during overbank events
4. Expected floodplain retention time during overbank events
5. Extent of reduced streambank erosion
6. Greatest capacity for riparian vegetation to be re-established

Alternative 3 appears to be the alternative that would best satisfy these criteria, and would require the least amount of excavation and minimize engineering components. Whichever alternative is selected

as the environmentally-preferred alternative, we request that the following restoration components be included:

- Remove fill behind Hartoonian Beach to recreate lagoon and wet meadow conditions
- Restore sand ridges ("dunes") at Cove East
- Construct a bulkhead at the sailing lagoon to cutoff its open connection with the marina and Lake Tahoe and reconfigure the relationship between the sailing lagoon and the Upper Truckee River so that the river controls the hydrology of the lagoon. The EIR/EIS/EIS should describe the level of disturbance anticipated from this proposed activity.

In addition, the League requests that removal and restoration of the Tahoe Keys Corporation Yard be analyzed in the EIR/EIS/EIS, for potential inclusion in the environmentally-preferred alternative. The EIR/EIS/EIS should evaluate the environmental benefits of removing the Corporation Yard. The EIR/EIS/EIS should address questions such as: "Could restoring the Tahoe Keys Corporation Yard help alleviate flooding that occurs in its vicinity, and reduce pollutant loads delivered in stormwater runoff?"

The Draft EIR/EIS/EIS should describe the nature of the proposed hydraulic structure in Alternative 3, and the extent of disturbance anticipated with its placement and use.

It would be helpful to understand how restoration projects under consideration upstream from the Marsh will affect the likely success of the Marsh restoration project. For example, the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS should provide analysis of the expected benefits from alternative project designs in the Lake Tahoe Golf Course and Lake Tahoe Airport stretches of the river. How would full restoration vs. narrowly prescribed or no restoration in these project reaches affect the ability of the UTR and Marsh Restoration project to effectively filter nutrients and sediments from the Upper Truckee River before they empty into Lake Tahoe?

Public Access/Recreation/Education

The League supports low-impact measures to enhance outdoor public recreation. Therefore, the League would support inclusion of public recreation and education components in the project, so long as they do not create negative impacts on the sensitive wetland/meadow restoration areas or deprive the project of funds needed to implement the maximum restoration alternative. Trails should be minimal, and located on the highest capability land, with access to the project area carefully managed and controlled.

The following proposal, contained in Draft Alternatives 1, 3 and 4, strikes a good balance between protection of the most sensitive portions of the site and realities of how people access the site: "Constructing trails and boardwalks along the eastern perimeter of the site to help direct and control existing pedestrian access to Barton Meadow, and in particular the interior of the site. Wet swales and low mounds would be used to discourage visitor access to the sensitive areas in the center of the marsh. The function of the boardwalks would be to raise people out of the wetter portions of the site where they currently walk and damage wetland vegetation."

In addition to wet swales and low mounds, the EIR/EIS/EIS should propose protecting with fencing sensitive and recovering SEZ, with signage explaining the sensitivity of the restricted portions of the site. Re-routing the trail providing access to Cove East to west of the sailing lagoon on a new levee parallel to the marina channel is a prudent idea.

To help determine the appropriate scale and placement of recreational and educational infrastructure, the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS should better describe the purpose and need of the recreation and access component of the project. For example, is the intent to better manage current users of the area, or to encourage destination visitors to gain awareness of the importance of ecological restoration in the Basin?

If public access is managed appropriately, the League sees great potential for the project to raise awareness about the vital importance of ecological restoration and its significance to the health of Lake Tahoe, particularly of major tributaries such as the Upper Truckee River. The preferred project alternative should incorporate abundant educational signage about the project, especially along Highway 50. A visitor center is an excellent idea, as well as development of an interpretive program and interpretive signage in appropriate locations throughout the site. All of these measures would greatly enhance public education efforts.

The EIR/EIS/EIS should state a clear preference for low-impact, education-based visitation. The project should not attempt to be all things to all people. The EIS should clearly describe the proposed management and enforcement plan for the area, including regulation of snowmobiling and other high-impact uses of the area. How will snowmobiles be kept off the restored project area?

The Draft EIR/EIS/EIS should explore other low-impact recreation opportunities, such as provision of an access point for kayaks in the project area. The EIR/EIS/EIS should consider whether the project area could be formally designated as a wildlife protection zone to provide a greater level of protection against disruptive uses of the area.

The Draft EIR/EIS/EIS should explain how public recreation access will, or could, connect with existing or planned hiking and bicycle trails upstream from the project area. For example, could a connection with the proposed Greenway bicycle trail be established on high capability land? Could the informal and degraded trail south of Highway 50, on the east side of the Upper Truckee River in the Moser reach, be restored and relocated to serve as a connector between the project reach, the existing Class I bicycle trail paralleling Highway 50, and the airport project reach/Greenway bicycle trail?

The Draft EIR/EIS/EIS should describe how the restoration and recreation/access components of the Marsh restoration project relate to and connect with other Upper Truckee River restoration projects under development (Airport reach, Sunset Stables, Golf Course reach, Greenway bicycle trail),

Thank you very much for consideration of these comments. We look forward to working with the Tahoe Conservancy, other agencies and all interested persons to build support for maximum Upper Truckee River watershed restoration.

Sincerely,

Carl Young
Program Coordinator
League to Save Lake Tahoe

quiet of where we live. I hope you will realize the reasons we don't want this additional view point just beyond our yards. Thank you for your consideration!

-Russell & Mikayla Grant
657 El Dorado Ave.

To whom It may Concern- April 07

You have asked for our neighborhood's resons regarding not wanting viewing decks in our neighborhood meadow. As a fire fighter's wife - I am home alone two days a week, and enjoy knowing my neighbors around me. I think the access points would draw in traffic and people parking in front of our home. I also babysit for friends and family, and as it is - there is enough traffic going up and down our street. We are home owners who pay good money to enjoy the peace and

PATRICIA COX
2642 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864
916-483-3-0344

RECEIVED
MAY - 2 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

APRIL 30, 2007

JACQUI GRANDFIELD
CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY
1061 THIRD STREET
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96150

RE: UPPER TRUCKEE RIVER AND
MARSH RESTORATION PROJECT

GREETINGS

I AM PART OWNER IN THE DUNLAP RANCH FAMILY COMPOUND, WHICH INCLUDES PRIVATE PROPERTY ALONG THE TRUCKEE RIVER THAT IS INCLUDED IN THE RESTORATION PROJECT. I UNDERSTAND THAT TODAY IS THE LAST DAY TO REGISTER COMMENTS WITH YOUR OFFICE.

I AM CONCERNED WITH THE FOLLOWING ISSUES:

1) IF THIS AREA IS GOING TO BE OPENED TO PUBLIC ACCESS, PROPER FENCING SHOULD BE CONSTRUCTED TO RESTRICT TRESPASSING ON PRIVATE PROPERTY.

2) IF WATER FROM THE RIVER IS TO BE REDIRECTED TO THE MEADOWS, WILL THERE BE AN ACTIVE MOSQUITO ABATEMENT PROGRAM IN FORCE?

3) WILL THE GROUND BE PROPERLY GRADED TO PROTECT SURROUNDING PRIVATE PROPERTY FROM FLOODING?

4) ARE BEARS AND COYOTES INCLUDED IN THE PLANNED WILDLIFE HABITAT? THEY HAVE THE UNFORTUNATE REPUTATION OF BEING THREATENING TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY. WHAT PLAN OF PROTECTION FOR LOCAL RESIDENTS WILL BE INCORPORATED?

5) WILL FISHING BE ENCOURAGED ALONG THE RIVER? FISHERMEN AND HUNTERS HAVE BEEN PARTICULARLY PROBLEMATIC WITH TRESPASSING. (ON OUR PROPERTY, TRESPASSERS HAVE OFTEN COME THROUGH AND STOLEN WAGON WHEELS AND OTHER RANCH ITEMS.)

SO, THE KEY CONCERNS ARE FLOODING, MOSQUITOS, AND TRESPASSING.

THERE MAY BE OTHER CONCERNS WHICH ARE NOT YET REALIZED. I HAVE NOT READ THE PROJECT PUBLICATION IN ITS ENTIRETY YET, NOR DISCUSSED IT WITH ALL FAMILY MEMBERS.

I ASSUME THERE WILL BE PUBLIC MEETINGS WHICH WILL WELCOME AREA RESIDENTS AFFECTED BY THIS PLAN.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR MAILING THE PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT TO ME.

SINCERELY,

Patricia Cox

PATRICIA COX
SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE

April 30, 2007

California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Dear Conservancy,

It is our proposal that the Truckee River and Trout Creek stream beds be restored in such a way as to best benefit the meadow, marsh and lake.

For the Northerly (El Dorado) side of the meadow we propose:

- No change to existing perimeter foot paths
- Leave the path and plank bridge from Bellevue to highland woods intact
- Continued use of dog poop trash cans for poop, litter and signage
- Inclusion of interpretive signs specifying nesting season "closed to pedestrian traffic dates" Respect wildlife ect.
- Bicycles on existing trails only
- Dog owners control your dogs or go to jail
- No boardwalks
- No viewing platforms
- No specified viewing areas.
    - (These would mar the open beauty of the meadow)
    - Parking is a major issue, don't advertise, don't bring attention to any specific locations, don't build a parking lot on this side of a meadow

Sincerely,

Respectfully,
Jim & Kim Warbow
664 ELDORADO
So. LAKE TAHOE

Cc: Cathy Lovel
Norma Santiago

RECEIVED
MAY -1 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

April 29, 2007

To Whom It May Concern,

As a five year resident on the meadow, I have observed relatively very little foot traffic in the meadow, which my home faces. Footpaths and bridges will serve to increase traffic by untold numbers.

PLEASE, LEAVE IT ALONE!

LET IT BE.

Val Dearborn

Val Dearborn
652 ½ El Dorado Avenue
S. Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

RECEIVED
MAY - 1 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

April 30, 2007

California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Dear Conservancy,

It is our proposal that the Truckee River and Trout Creek stream beds be restored in such a way as to best benefit the meadow, marsh and lake.

For the Northerly (El Dorado) side of the meadow we propose:

- No change to existing perimeter foot paths
- Leave the path and plank bridge from Bellevue to highland woods intact
- Continued use of dog poop trash cans for poop, litter and signage
- Inclusion of interpretive signs specifying nesting season "closed to pedestrian traffic dates" Respect wildlife ect.
- Bicycles on existing trails only
- Dog owners control your dogs or go to jail
- No boardwalks
- No viewing platforms
- No specified viewing areas.
    - (These would mar the open beauty of the meadow)
    - Parking is a major issue, don't advertise, don't bring attention to any specific locations, don't build a parking lot on this side of a meadow

Sincerely,

Thomas [illegible]
Tahoe Residence Since 1989

Cc: Cathy Lovel
Norma Santiago

RECEIVED
MAY -1 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

1915 Blackfoot Rd
S.L.T. 96150

April 30, 2007

California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Dear Conservancy,

It is our proposal that the Truckee River and Trout Creek stream beds be restored in such a way as to best benefit the meadow, marsh and lake.

For the Northerly (El Dorado) side of the meadow we propose:

- No change to existing perimeter foot paths
- Leave the path and plank bridge from Bellevue to highland woods intact
- Continued use of dog poop trash cans for poop, litter and signage
- Inclusion of interpretive signs specifying nesting season "closed to pedestrian traffic dates" Respect wildlife ect.
- Bicycles on existing trails only
- Dog owners control your dogs or go to jail
- No boardwalks
- No viewing platforms
- No specified viewing areas.
    - (These would mar the open beauty of the meadow)
    - Parking is a major issue, don't advertise, don't bring attention to any specific locations, don't build a parking lot on this side of a meadow

Sincerely,

Ryan Cook
Ryan Cook

Cc: Cathy Lovel
Norma Santiago

RECEIVED

MAY - 1 2007

CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

April 30, 2007

California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Dear Conservancy,

It is our proposal that the Truckee River and Trout Creek stream beds be restored in such a way as to best benefit the meadow, marsh and lake.

For the Northerly (El Dorado) side of the meadow we propose:

- No change to existing perimeter foot paths
- Leave the path and plank bridge from Bellevue to highland woods intact
- Continued use of dog poop trash cans for poop, litter and signage
- Inclusion of interpretive signs specifying nesting season "closed to pedestrian traffic dates" Respect wildlife ect.
- Bicycles on existing trails only
- Dog owners control your dogs or go to jail
- No boardwalks
- No viewing platforms
- No specified viewing areas.
    - (These would mar the open beauty of the meadow)
    - Parking is a major issue, don't advertise, don't bring attention to any specific locations, don't build a parking lot on this side of a meadow

Sincerely,

Adrian Cook
lifetime resident – 1842 Apache Ave.
So. Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Cc: Cathy Lovel
Norma Santiago

RECEIVED
MAY - 1 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

April 30, 2007

California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Dear Conservancy,

We are 14 year homeowner-residents at 652 El Dorado Ave. at Bellevue. It is our proposal that the Truckee River and Trout Creek stream beds be restored in such a way as to best benefit the meadow, marsh and lake.

For the Northerly (El Dorado) side of the meadow we propose:

- No change to existing perimeter foot paths
- Leave the path and plank bridge from Bellevue to highland woods intact
- Continued use of dog poop trash cans for poop, litter and signage
- Inclusion of interpretive signs specifying nesting season "closed to pedestrian traffic dates" Respect wildlife ect.
- Bicycles on existing trails only
- Dog owners control your dogs or go to jail
- No boardwalks
- No viewing platforms
- No specified viewing areas.
    - (These would mar the open beauty of the meadow)
    - Parking is a major issue, don't advertise, don't bring attention to any specific locations, don't build a parking lot on this side of a meadow

Sincerely,

Doug and Darcy Wallace

Cc: Cathy Lovel
Norma Santiago

RECEIVED

MAY - 1 2007

CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

April 30, 2007

Jacqui Grandfield,
Wildlife Program
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Dear Ms Grandfield:

My wife and I are residents of the Al Tahoe neighborhood living on El Dorado Ave near the intersection of Bellevue. We were unable to attend the recent public meeting, but would like to submit our comments and concerns during this phase of the project.

In reading through the project I can see a need for doing the channel work on the west side of the project area. The Upper Truckee River has become constrained and incised from the construction and location of the Tahoe Keys. What I do not understand is the need for viewing platforms or boardwalks on the east side of the project area. Our two concerns with these improvements are: Is there a need and how will the additional people be accommodated.

Is there a need? Currently there is a foot trail that starts behind Meeks Lumber and runs along the east side of the meadow all the way to Harootunain Beach. We use the trail a lot to take our dogs for walks. The majority of the people I've seen in the Meadow have walked or ridden their bikes along this existing trail. For us the viewpoint is the entire trail and not just a few spots along the way. Why create infrastructure in the meadow that will cause an increase in foot traffic and potentially more disturbance to the meadow?

How will the additional people be accommodated? Al Tahoe is a neighborhood that has its areas of homes, businesses, and parks. Currently we have two "parks": El Dorado Beach and Reagan Beach, both of which have dedicated restrooms and parking. If you build viewpoints and boardwalks on the east side of the meadow you will increase the overall foot traffic. These people coming to the meadow will not park at El Dorado Beach or Reagan beach, but instead they will park along El Dorado Ave. This will increase the overall traffic on our narrow street and along with more litter.

We appreciate your request for input from local residents. Please keep us on your mailing list as this project goes forward.

Sincerely,

Daniel Kikkert and Linda J. Martinez

PO Box 16247
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96151

RECEIVED

MAY - 1 2007

CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Ralph Thomas

P.O.Box 14472 □ South Lake Tahoe, CA 96151-4472 □ 530.541.2543 □ e-mail: htayurt@yahoo.com
"4 Year Renter/Resident at 3043 Argonaut Avenue - Adj. to the Upper Truckee Wetlands"

Jacqui Grandfield April 25, 2007
Wildlife Program - California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third St.
South Lake Tahoe, Calif 96150

Dear Jacqui

Thank you so much for providing the opportunity to hear what you, Rick and our other neighbors think about the proposed future of the beautiful meadow we all share. I love the amazing view every morning and the sounds of the coyotes & frogs at night. I was glad to near that other people seem to appreciate it as much as I do. This meadow and wetlands is a very unique and precious.

I like dogs, but am not a dog owner and I too, yell at ignorant people to put their dogs on a leash to keep them from chasing the geese, ducks and other wildlife in this very sensitive area as well pick up bags of trash they so inconsiderately leave behind. I do not think that most of these people are locals but visitors from the urban areas or big cities. I can testify that only 30-40% obey the "Leash Law" and all the others let their dogs run free to chase birds and poop & pee wherever. Very few actually pick up the poop that their dogs leave on or near the trail. Nice effort on the providing the bags, but it's not working. Please consider a "NO Dogs" rule in this "Wildlife Sensitive" area.

The fact that the meadow is public land does not give every person the right to use & abuse it.
Yes, open recreation and accessibility is important for public land but not at the expense of destroying a sensitive wildlife and environmentally sensitive area! Please save it!!!! We need to think about the future of the Lake Tahoe Basin. What we do today will determine the outcome of what it will look like 20,30 and even 100 years from now. And we now know from experience , how important it is to save our wetlands for the clarity and health of the lake. And isn't that one of the main purposes of a "Conservancy"? The number one priority for this meadow should be restoration & preservation.Please do NOT build "viewing stands" or boardwalks on the east side of the meadow as proposed in Alternatives 1-4. "If you build it, THEY WILL COME!" Yes, we can (and do) share the meadow - but I think there must be better alternatives than what has been presented to us. As an alternative, why not expand and develop the area on the west side next to Tahoe Keys as proposed ... or look at expanding the Mackinaw area for development and parking? Our quiet little street does not need to be a parking lot for teenage beach parties & dog parks. Argonaut Avenue or El Dorado does not have the parking spaces, sanitary facilities, trash removal & other amenities to

accommodate a "public" wildlife viewing area. Let's try to keep it simple and private the way it is so
that only people who appreciate it & value it are those who use it. Educational signs about "No
disturbing the Wildlife", No Dogs, No Bikes seems much more realistic than building "Wildlife
Viewing Stands".

Please consider these alternatives in your future plans for the Upper Truckee Marsh.

Some other things to consider...

• No Smoking or campfires - the threat of wildfire in the open grasses and fallen trees on
the edges of the meadow is concerning to some of us.
• No Mtn Bikes or Motorized Vehicles - the dirt path seems to be just fine but the impact of
bikes is becoming more obvious. If someone is there to view the wildlife and appreciate the
beauty of the meadow - they can't do it traveling 5-10 miles peddling a bike , Let's keep the
bike path where it is - 1-5 blocks next to Hwy 50 on a safe path allowing access from one part
of town to another without having to risk their life on the Highway with all of the
high speed traffic. The City of South Lake really needs to deal with this.
• There also needs to be some enforcement of these rules. Unfortunately there will always be
people who will ignore any and all rules. But some type of patrols, "citizen arrest"
, neighborhood patrol or something? will have to be done for a while until people become educated and
understand why this meadow and the wildlife is worth saving. We love telling people that they'd
better put their dog on a leash because there's a pack of coyotes just around the corner waiting
to attack. (They still just don't get it! They think the meadow is a dog run and nothing more &
the coyotes should be shot! - Ha!) Information signs & maps directing people to other places
more appropriate to let their dogs run free in the woods, party beachs, picnic areas, Reagan,
Pope, or The "new improved Barton Beac " areas would be helpful suggestions for the general
public. Some out-of-town people don't realize how many public beaches are on the south
shore. In fact, we direct a lot of people over to the Camp Richardson & Pope Beach area who
get lost in our neighborhood trying to find a beach or river to hang out at for the afternoon.
In conclusion - I'd like to see the simple dirt path and minimal access points left the way they
are now, nothing more needs to be built on the northeast side of the meadow. Keep it simple.
I like the idea of expanding the already existing public access with a full-service Visitor center
next to the Tahoe Keys Marina as a vision for the future growth, 'Wildlife viewing"
and enjoyment of Barton Beach with ample parking & amenities.

And whatever restoration to the river, wetlands and meadow from years of abuse from the
cows and Tahoe Keys water diversions, etc. that needs to happen would be welcomed and this

should be your main focus.And the sooner the better. Mother Nature does have amazing ways
of healing itself. Please help restore & preserve the meadow and it's wildlife by eliminating
dogs and abuse by their disrespectful humans. I know this will be a huge challenge but feel that
something has to be done soon in order to save it - and that is part of your job.

I am thankful that you & others are trying to restore it and protect it for the future.
I am also willing to do whatever I can do to help - please keep us informed.

Sincerely -

Ralph Thomas
3043 Argonaut Ave.
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
htayurt@yahoo.com
530-541-2543

P.O. Box 8944
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96158

RECEIVED
APR 30 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

April 27, 2007

State of California
Jacqui Grandfield, UC Consultant
Wildlife Program
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Reference: Notice of Preparation, hereinafter referred to as NOP
Undated, unnumbered
By: State of California, California Tahoe Conservancy; United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation; Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (Lead Agencies)
Subject: "Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/EIS for the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project, South Lake Tahoe, California"

Subject: Comments to NOP by J.T. and C. Rosenberg, Affected Property Owners and Interested Parties

As requested, comments regarding the proposed Upper Truckee River and Wetland Restoration Project, as described in the NOP, are provided here for your consideration in further project planning and in preparing the EIR/EIS. We would be happy to provide further information if requested, and we would welcome the opportunity to help with this Project, if we can be of service.

Our comments are organized as follows:

- Our Relationship to Study Area and Project
- Comments on General Project Objectives and Directives
- Specific Comments on Components of the Project
- Project Component Selection Recommendations

1. Our Relationship to the Study Area and Project

We own a single family residence at 2376 California Avenue, South Lake Tahoe, CA, APN 023-700-18-100. We have owned this property and lived here for about 20 years. Our home is located in the Project Study Area in extremely close proximity to the Upper Truckee River, on the west side, at about RS 1600. Our home is one of the closest to the river of any in the study area, perhaps the closest by a measure such as weighted aggregate lateral and vertical distance. The river is the dominant near field feature of our location. We comment here both as potentially highly affected property owners and as members of the public.

2. Comments on General Project Objectives and Constraints

We generally support the missions and many activities of the NOP lead agencies in the Tahoe Basin. Below are some comments on general objectives and directives we support and recommend for your consideration in planning this specific proposed Project and in preparing the EIR/EIS.

2.1 Recommended Primary (Overarching) Project Objectives

2.1.1 Preserve and enhance the clarity of the lake. Conduct a phased project of Upper Truckee River and wetlands actions to measurably reduce fine sediment infiltration into Lake Tahoe from the Upper Truckee River.

This objective appears to us to be the greatest overall purpose of the whole Project and we feel it should either precede or supplement the present first objective in the NOP.

The following two bullets are descriptive guidance we hope will provided to the planners. It can be part of the objective or a complementary directive.

- Implement the actions in a step-by-step process. Quantitatively validate effectiveness of completed components and establish new baseline data. Use the new baseline to verify the ongoing need for and design of later phase components. The primary metric for validating an implemented component should be measurable reduction of fine sediment infiltration into the lake, rather than secondary derived metrics, such as areal extent of seasonal overspreading and the like, which are not in themselves sufficient to guarantee achieving the overarching objective.
- Among effective alternatives, give higher priority to lower alteration components performed as much as possible on Conservancy or public land. This will minimize short and long term public impact, the severity of possible design errors and unforeseen consequences, and public opposition to what may be perceived as large and unnecessary alterations to the status quo perceived by many as a natural equilibrium.

2.1.2 Preserve and enhance the present semi-natural state of the undeveloped low use and high sensitivity portions in the study area but allow relatively unassisted low impact public recreational use. Minimize to the extent possible the temporary and permanent developmental or engineering activities and permanent visible constructs in these "inner" and generally low use areas, while promoting desired Project biological and hydrology objectives. But allow continued recreational access with no constructed aids to those relatively few who wish to experience this area's semi-natural condition and beauty away from signs of development and who expend the effort to do so. The study area is located in an urban area and should remain available to those residents and visitors who value a nearby natural experience and are willing and able to access it without assistance; to not litter; and to not damage the environment.

2.1.3 Preserve and enhance assisted recreational use, with appropriate engineered facilitation and environmental protections, in the high use areas near the marina and lower west section, the upper southwest perimeter, and the lake shoreline. This can include a kayak/canoe take out near the marina, new raised or paved bike and pedestrian trails connecting the present trails to the west and south study area boundaries, and unmanned access points. However, major development actions, such as erecting an office/concessionaire building, an additional paved parking area in this already heavily paved area, or allowing a commercial vendor are remarkably incongruous with the objectives of restoring the river and wetlands. The lead agencies would be perceived by many, including us, to be developers, when we expect them to be mitigating development effects. Also, the overall goal is to get closer to nature, and away from pavement, buildings, and concessionaires. Some assistance such as paved or hard surface wheel chair accessible trails, signs, boardwalks along the lake, viewpoints to see the magnificent lake and new marsh are fine.

2.2 Recommended Project Directives (Mandatory Constraints)

2.2.1 Flood hazard on adjacent property shall not be increased. The NOP states this in very weak form, as an objective. No required confidence level is specified, no monitoring system to verify compliance, and no mitigations or remedies are discussed in case of failure to meet this objective. The net result is that a very ambitious project is being contemplated with possibly insufficiently validated models and assumptions, no confidence limits and sensitivity or perturbation studies, and no mitigation plan in case of error. The adjacent property owners appear to be in significant danger of being put at risk by this weak plan element. An accuracy of a few inches in estimating high water level, for all reasonable normal and abnormal ground table and lake water levels, and for all river flow rates, at a given or worst-case property probably is necessary to insure no increased flood risk. The adjacent developed area is low lying and presently in delicate balance with only this margin of safety (a few inches) against flood water intrusion into structures.

2.2.2. The fire danger in the study area and on adjacent property shall not be increased and shall be decreased where feasible. Positive fire risk control and mitigation elements are needed. Even at present, the public lands in the study area do not show evidence that this hazard is being actively or adequately managed. Several obvious risks are dead willow stands, transient encampments, and public parties. The proposed Project has various components that may increase these and other risks.

Increasing willow populations without managing dead stems, branches, and deadfall will surely increase the risk of, severity of, and difficulty in controlling fires in the study area. A full hazard analysis and active Project elements to identify and mitigate risk is needed.

2.2.3. The Project shall be sensitive to, and shall seek alternatives that avoid or minimize adverse effects on, the site's history, cultural heritage, and interfaces with adjacent property owners. The present objective on this subject in the NOP addresses history and heritage, but not present residents.

2.2.4 The Project shall implement a public health and safety program, including monitoring and control of mosquito and mosquito borne diseases, fire, trash, and sanitation. This expands the items to be addressed and calls for monitoring.

2.2.5 The Project shall be designed to be implemented in phases. Validating metrics and quantified baselines on completed phases shall be established as a requirement to implementing a new phase. Mitigation of larger adverse human alterations shall be addressed in the first phase. Highest benefit and least controversial elements should be collected and performed first to the extent practical. Then, the effects of these uncontroversial and completed elements can be measured used to establish the need for, and accurate design of, later phases.

Relevant metrics should be based on fundamental objective of that element, not on a secondary design parameter or objective. An example of relevant metrics might be frog, crustacean, and various trout populations and health, rather than mean water temperature, if the latter is meant to benefit the former.

The most extreme prior adverse human river alterations, which presumably are the primary root causes of the need for river and wetland restoration in the study area, should be addressed first. This is simply good public relations. These include channelization in the reach from about RS 6,300 to RS 9,300; hydrologic funneling at the highway 50 underpass; restoring sinuosity and functionality in the previously excavated lower west section; and upstream channelization adjacent to the airport. To first reengineer stretches which many see as a natural present equilibrium, would be unpopular and probably is not sound scientific prioritization.

2.2.6 The Project design shall identify and account for natural destabilizing factors to the reengineered flow that can strongly affect post-Project hydrology and cause river wandering. A post-Project management element shall be included to detect and mitigate such destabilizations. Destabilizing factors include but are not limited to: lack of soil cohesiveness causing potential post-Project channel alterations; future beaver and muskrat activities; tree falls; and debris jams. If major changes are implemented in this Project, even if they function properly and in accordance with design analyses when installed, effects such as the above can invalidate them. Some destabilizations must be anticipated, as they are inevitable and universal river characteristics. If the reengineered flow is changed by these later destabilization factors in ways that haven't been accounted for in the design, then long term control of hazards such as flooding will require active management, monitoring, and repair of the design to keep it stable.

In conclusion, as someone observed (probably a cat herder), anyone who thinks they can control the path of river will be provided guidance by the river. With that difficulty in mind, we suggest a cautious design philosophy in planning the present highly ambitious project:

- fix the very bad development damage first, especially what is now causing active degradation to the lake
- measure what happens (quantify effectiveness and new baseline)
- don't overstep the knowledge and abilities of modern technology, funds, and public will
- avoid unvalidated and/or unnecessarily heroic elements
- proceed cautiously and verify net fundamental good
- localize risk and adverse impact to public unpopulated property
- do no harm.

3. Specific Comments on Components of the Project

The NOP presents presently contemplated Project Components in terms of four "action" Alternatives, and a fifth Alternative called No Project/No Action. Components are stated in the NOP to be modular, meaning they can be

moved to other Alternatives or removed entirely in the final Project. Since the NOP Alternatives are highly changeable groupings, the following comments generally address Components rather than Alternatives, regardless of which Alternative they now appear in or are later moved to. Components in the NOP seem to us to separate fairly unambiguously into two categories: 1) river and marsh restoration and 2) recreational use.

3.1. Fire Hazard. We suggest addition of an Objective that calls for reducing fire risk by including design and management elements to decrease likelihood, intensity, and controllability of potential wildfires in the study area and surrounding areas.

Similarly, we suggest addition of a Directive: Under no circumstances shall the Project increase fire risk, including likelihood, intensity, and controllability of wildfires in the study area and surrounding areas.

Major factors to consider are the possible increase in mass and/or areal extent of brushy fire fuels, particularly mature, dried, and/or dead willow stems and branches that are an inevitable byproduct of unmanaged willow colonies. While riparian plants such as willows may provide environmental and river stabilization effects that promote one or more objectives of the Project, they also may increase fire risk, perhaps significantly. They increase laddering opportunities possibly leading to catastrophic canopy fires, they add significant fuel mass contributing to fire intensity, and they are easily ignited increasing the statistical likelihood for natural or human caused fire. One way the mature willows increase likelihood of human caused fires, and other public health issues, is by providing opportunities for clandestine transient camps or teenage parties. In fact, there have been instances of such human caused fires starting in willow clumps in the study area in the past.

A suggestion is that it may be possible to obtain the environmental benefits of these plants while not increasing, or even reducing, the fire risks they pose. This could be accomplished by a Project component that provides for some sort of public or private safety program to cut and chip or otherwise remove or harvest the mature willow growth of age 2 or more years. The mature drier or dead wood even may be recyclable in various ways, such as chipping on site, biofuels, furniture or basket weaving as practiced by the previous cultures and some local craftsmen, etc. The riparian willow root system is very hardy and extremely unlikely to be affected by such pruning, thus retaining soil stabilization benefits. Similarly, shade and other environmental benefits can be obtained by allowing young growth (green stems up to 1-2 years old), which do not pose significant fire risk. Additionally, beaver populations may be more easily managed. However, any such management program should be required to be conducted in an aesthetically responsible fashion, minimizing slash, stumps, and residual visual evidence of cutting.

3.2. Reconfiguration of split channel from RS 500 to RS 2600: We adamantly oppose moving the low flow channel from its present location to "the second east branch channel from RS 1400 to RS 2600." We request that the following factors and impacts of this potential Project component be considered in the EIR and in further Project planning.

3.2.1. Adverse impact to nearby established residents. Our home is located on the river at about RS 1600, essentially ground zero for this particular action. Our home site is below the split channel reach from RS 500 to RS 1400, and directly opposite the upper bifurcation of the split channel reach now running from RS 1600 to RS 2,600. This particular action, as described in the NOP, would be initiated just upstream of us and would remove the river from our location, an immense and hugely adverse impact to us.

Our home is a low visual impact residence built to experience the river. The house is within approximately 30 to 120 feet of the bank, depending on season and flow rate; was built over 35 years ago; and has never flooded. The terrain between our home and river is vegetated with meadow grass which we keep trimmed, but do not fertilize or apply any chemicals to. A broad variety of wildlife uses this area freely, and we do not interfere in any way. We try to act as informal and positive river stewards picking up litter and flotsam; warning the public about unecological activities; watching for and mitigating environmental and hydraulic hazards; and probably simply by our presence reducing adverse public impact to the west shore in this reach. The presence of the river is the defining characteristic of our site, visually, aesthetically, and physically. The presence of the river is the

reason we bought this property. Our location has been called by many the most beautiful they have seen in South Lake Tahoe, and we certainly feel that way. We tread lightly, but we are enormously dependent on the river.

This "taking" of the river would destroy the aesthetic charm and property value of our home and would crush us emotionally. When we purchased this property we considered it inconceivable that any public or other entity could or would take away the river; it seemed a permanent fixture of the landscape during our likely tenure, as much as anything is permanent. First of all, the river is not on public property in this area; and secondly it was not altered by development in this reach, and so it was not reasonable to consider it to be a candidate for a massive government modification, such as this diversion, in this area. This proposed action would be totally insensitive to the development history of this site and to our heritage on it, including our unofficial stewardship of the river and environment, our investment of time and resources as this is our retirement home, and our reasonable expectations as residents. We have been an extremely positive influence on this reach. This action would greatly reduce our usefulness, and the general public benefit of this nearby and low impact presence on a relatively undeveloped but still urban area that can easily be a site for various forms of environmental harm and public nuisance. Furthermore, our own risks due to less restrained human hazards also would be harder to manage.

The personal damage to us of this almost inconceivable action in our backyard could be enormous, and as affected property owners we would use every means available to us to prevent it. On the other hand, we would be willing to meet with the Project managers and technical representatives to determine if other modifications are possible in this reach which are less detrimental to us, but accomplish Project objectives for this particular component. These could include options such as easterly diversion downstream of us or even western diversion with increased sinuosity and/or a more threaded channel opposite us, as was the case about 15-20 years ago.

3.2.2. Inadequate quantitative evaluation of benefits of this eastern diversion. Some results of hydrologic modeling and geomorphic analyses of the present conditions (status quo) and estimated conditions after implementation of the various Alternatives are summarized graphically in the NOP document. These analyses and results are a, or the, primary justification for proposed river modifications, including the present diversion. The accuracy and confidence level of these analyses are not specified, but unless there is high confidence that the results accurately compare alternatives to each other and to the status quo, there is high risk of invalid comparisons, unexpected outcomes, potential environmental or public harm, and waste of resources.

Classic sources of uncertainty and errors in analysis and modeling include *faulty initial data*, a *high reliance on assumptions*, and *failure to include all key variables*. Since it appears to us that all three may be present in this case, we suggest that confidence and uncertainty levels of predicted benefits, and likelihood and hazard levels of errors or violations of directives, be provided and made part of the EIR/EIS and planning.

The particular *initial data concern* we cite is that the 2-5 year overspread area for the present configuration (status quo) starting at RS 1600 appears grossly understated in the NOP versus our on site observations over the last 20 years and the last 2-5 years. The river regularly overbanks and overspreads a much wider than depicted plane in this region. If present analyses do not give full credit to current seasonal high water out of channel flows, and resultant removal of sediment, in this reach, then any estimated incremental benefit of a diversion to the east channel will be overstated. Similarly, in this second split channel reach, the east channel, which was deselected by the river itself, has quite high banks which would presumably reduce its effectiveness in providing out-of-channel siltation planes. Again, the NOP diagrams do not indicate the high degree of confinement or mention any plans to reduce bank heights in this new proposed low water channel.

Our concern of a *high reliance on assumptions* stems from two factors. First, the full Project is likely to contain other river modifications, both upstream and downstream of the present split channel alteration. It cannot be known now which modifications will be implemented nor what will be their specific realized quantitative effects on the overall flow (how successful and close to prediction their results will be). Thus, the modelers and analysts had to rely on assumptions. Second, necessary assumptions should be stated and peer reviewed, and the effects of errors provided in a sensitivity

analysis, and assessed in the EIR/EIS. Without such thoroughness and review, assumptions are not a sufficient basis for any high risk decision.

Our concern of possible *failure to include all key variables* in the models is that the stability and permanency of the effects apparently has not been modeled in a perturbation analysis. Credible destabilizing factors that can strongly affect the model predictions are bank collapse due to lower than expected soil cohesion (the banks in this area have a very high sand content), beaver dams which have previously diverted the river in this area, and natural blockages which regularly develop in this reach and alter the flow and channel.

3.2.3. Insensitive selection of upstream diversion point. The proposed diversion to "the second east branch channel from RS 1400 to RS 2600" is proposed to occur at RS 1400, upstream from us. However, the actual present upstream bifurcation point between the east and west channels is well downstream of RS 1400, and actually downstream from us. It is just below RS 1600, and has been for the last 20 years and probably for much longer. Not only would a diversion to the east channel be highly detrimental to us, but moving the diversion point upstream to RS 1400 would probably be the most devastating means of implementing this component. We request that any plans to implement this channel consider the effect on our property, confirm the benefit with validated calculations and data, await implementation of other aspects to confirm their effects, and consider whether other options such as a diversion point downstream of us or other configurations near RS 1600 would provide reasonable benefits.

3.2.4. Inadequate justification and excessive adverse impact for this component. This component is not on public property, and hence should be held to higher standards of necessity non-adverse impact. The present channels seem to work, since overbanking and deposition occurs regularly and extensively with the present western low flow channel. This component is not solidly established as necessary or even preferable. It is the most adverse option of any in the plan (a maximum rather than minimum impact). The construction activities and their aftermath would be destroy the quality of life in our residence for years, if not permanently. This home site has always been on the river in our 20 years here, and in fact the river was even closer (farther west) until beaver and hydrologic action moved it to its present location.

3.3. Bank Protection from Highway 50 to unspecified endpoint near or beyond RS 1200: Aesthetic quality as seen from east and west banks as well as river should be required. To extent possible, the protection should look natural, with indigenous colors and materials, hopefully soft.

3, 4. In Alternative 3 there is a component to excavate portions of the meadow/terrace in the reach between Highway 50 and Big Bend [presumably located near RS 3,000]. This potentially highly invasive component does not seem to appear on the map, only deep within a bullet in the text, and so may have escaped public attention. If so, the public comment period on this feature should be extended.

We strongly oppose excavating meadow/terrace anywhere in this region. It would be a brutal disruption of the present natural environment and would massively impact adjacent property owners during implementation. The specified reach is very long, including both split channel sections, and long quasi-natural sections below them, including native meadows. Below the split channels this section is relatively untouched (naturalized) for decades and is heavily used by wildlife of all sorts. It is highly scenic. This concept as stated in the NOP is incredibly destructive and invasive, does not occur on public land, will be an eyesore and health hazard throughout implementation and for years thereafter, and cannot conceivably have sufficient benefit to even warrant consideration as stated.

In addition, as adjacent property owners, we file all the same comments and reactions as stated in our comment 2, above.

3.5. There is no component to tie in existing surface water channels and ponds in study area on west side from Highway 50 to about RS 1400. These should be explicitly and appropriately reattached to the river flow.

4. Project Component Selection Recommendations

For your consideration, here are some components in the NOP that we think would be desirable in the Project.

- All river channel features in Alternative 1 below RS 3,000. These all occur on public land, are minimal changes to existing flow, accomplish project goals of raising the river bed and reestablishing the connection between flood plains and river. They look like good science, minimum alteration to present status, good PR, low impact to adjacent properties, cheaper and less invasive than alternatives.
- No diversion to east split channel between RS 1400 and RS 2600.
- Bank stabilization near Highway 50.
- Minor restorative river and wetland actions, not now in NOP, near Highway 50 underpass and to the west "wetlands", ponds, and drainage channels, from Highway 50 to about RS 1400. Objectives are to reduce stagnant water, improve channel flow and aesthetics in immediate vicinity of highway underpass, and control fire risk in this area.
- No bank removal (incising). This is hard to like or comprehend, but particularly on non-Conservancy land where the impact to adjacent property owners would be large and adverse.
- No meadow/terrace removal. Same explanation and comment as for bank incising: hard to like or comprehend, but particularly on non-Conservancy land where the impact to adjacent property owners would be large and adverse.
- Bike trails in Alternative 1 along south and west study area boundaries. These are simply low impact and attractive additions to the town. The connection between the existing bike paths from Springwood to El Dorado will be very pleasant for family recreation. Much more scenic and logical than the present bike path.
- A bike path or option of any sort along the shore from near Lakeview to the Tahoe Key Marina area would be a huge boon to the town. It would be the kind of thing people who come here for a little nature would absolutely love. It could be really special. We highly encourage trying to include it.
- A boat takeout below RS 6,000 rather than near RS 200, or both.
- No office buildings, concessionaires, or new paved parking. This is excessive and unwanted development. Parts of it look like attempts to generate income at the expense of environment. There is plenty of parking here already. In addition, users probably want a lower rather than higher amount of development and government assistance. They are there to experience the great outdoors. Attractive self service gates, exhibits, and improvements would be plenty.

Thank you for allowing us to provide our comments and for your consideration. Please let us know if you would like further information or clarification.

Respectfully,

J.T. (Tom) and Catherine Rosenberg

530/541-8051

April 30, 2007

Dear Ms. Grandfield:

I am writing in response to the scoping packet for the Upper Truckee Marsh restoration project. This has the potential to be a really great project. As a resident of the Al Tahoe neighborhood, I have a special interest in the Upper Truckee Marsh. For me and for most of my neighbors, having access to the marsh is one of the very best things about living in Al Tahoe. So I was extremely disappointed and alarmed to see that all of the alternatives propose substantial restrictions on pedestrian access. I was equally disappointed and alarmed to see the phrases "discourage pedestrian use" and "discourage beach access" in several places in the document.

Most of the perimeter trail could be constructed using permeable pavers (with holes in them – as used in Paige Meadows). These armor the soil surface, prevent the trail from becoming incised, and clearly delineate the preferred route, thus discouraging additional user-created trails. Permeable pavers are very inconspicuous and would not impair the visual quality of the landscape (as well as being relatively inexpensive and requiring no maintenance). Raised boardwalks might be appropriate in a few of the wetter sections of the perimeter trail.

Being able to walk along the beach and behind the Yellow Cress preserve to the Upper Truckee is the greatest advantage of living in my neighborhood. I know that this value is shared by the vast majority of my neighbors and none of us want this amenity taken away. Yet none of the alternatives include pedestrian access to the beach from the trail near San Francisco Street. Clearly this access has been sanctioned for a number of years, as demonstrated by the trash cans and dog refuse stations placed at the San Francisco access and at the beach. Again, most resource damage could be prevented through the installation of permeable pavers to delineate a preferred pedestrian route.

I do not support "viewing platforms." I would prefer that any constructed improvements be less visually intrusive. Additionally, viewing platforms send the message that the site is an "attraction."

I do not support a bike trail in any part of the marsh. I do not believe a bike trail is an appropriate use for this land.

While it provided a lot of good detail, the scoping package did not provide any information about the expected results of any of the proposed channel restoration designs. Since I am not a channel restoration specialist, I have no way of forming an opinion on which of these designs would be preferable. Please provide information on the relative advantages and disadvantages of the channel designs in future mailings.

In general, I support minimal construction for recreation purposes. I support continued access to the beach from San Francisco Street, and a trail along the beach and behind the Tahoe Yellow Cress preserve. If visitor use is not significantly increased due to recreational improvements, we can continue to enjoy this landscape as we do now, without significant resource degradation. (If you build it, they will come, and you may not like the results.)

It is nice to see the river reconnecting to the lagoon system on its own, and to see the lagoon system becoming reconnected all the way across the marsh. I hope to be able to continue to enjoy the marsh and beach as I have during the years I have lived in Al Tahoe.

Sincerely,
/s/ Denise Downie

POB 1883
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96156

April 30, 2007

Rick Robinson
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Dear Rick:

I have reviewed the Public Announcement regarding the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project. I reside at 2836 Silverwood Court in Highland Woods for the past 20 years.

I have two major concerns regarding this project:

1. On page 7 of the document, Objective 10 states that implementation of "mosquito monitoring and control" will become a part of a project when adopted. The four action alternatives offer no specifics concerning mosquito abatement. The Barton Meadow, and specifically the "wetlands" behind my house are one of the worst mosquito breeding areas around the entire Lake Tahoe basin per El Dorado County Vector Control. Standing water is of course the perfect environment for the breeding of mosquitoes. I know from personal experience after wet winters, we are inundated with mosquitoes, case in point—last year. They were a serious nuisance before the emergence of West Nile Virus; now, they are a serious threat to our health and potentially our lives. I'm told the Trout Creek project a few years ago was a "model" of successful stream zone restoration, but I've heard from residents that certain "plugs" in the old, unrestored, creekbed have exacerbated mosquito problems for nearby residents. It appears the job was never completed with the revegetation and restoration of the old creekbed. I have serious concerns over the impact for Highland Woods, Al Tahoe and Tahoe Island Park Unit #4 in terms of increased mosquito populations resulting from a flooded meadow every year, which will lead to ponding and standing water well into the summer and even fall months. A flooded meadow would actually **prevent** mosquito abatement since Vector Control would be unable to gain access to a flooded meadow with their ATV's.

2. I cannot find identification of affected streets, cul-de-sacs and other present points of entry for public access in the document. I have concerns over where the proposed access points would lie for enhanced public access.

I would appreciate the opportunity to offer my comments in further public or agency hearings regarding these two matters. I also highly recommend including El Dorado County Environmental Health director Ginger Huber in future discussions. She has first hand knowledge of the West Nile Virus threat already discovered in the meadow areas under discussion, as well as the continuing problems stemming from the Trout Creek project.

Sincerely yours,

Doug Rosner
(530) 314-9221 (cellular); P.O. Box 9012 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96158

RECEIVED
APR 30 2007
CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Alpine Chiropratic & Sports Clinic

Glenn G. Miller, D.C.
Certified Chiropractic Team Physician
Certified Disability Evaluator
Certified Independent Medical Examiner
Certified Emergency Medical Technician

April 26, 2007

California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

RE: Meadow Proposals

Dear Conservancy Board Members:

My name is Glenn Miller and I live with my wife Jan, and son, Austin at 3053 Argonaut Ave. I bought this home in 1979, so I have seen many changes take place in the meadow. We attended your meeting last Tuesday night with those who reside on the meadow. We were asked to write a letter addressing our concerns about the proposed changes. Please consider the following before making your decisions.

There are two reasons why I have lived in this location so long.
Through the years, I have enjoyed our peaceful neighborhood. We all police almost every car that makes its way down to our street. Those who we don't know, we kindly give them directions out. The theft and vandalism is very low. I fear bringing in visitors will detract from the peace we all enjoy. The street parking has to be kept to a minimum due to narrow streets and lack of space. More and more cars will be parking in front of our homes. The more people you invite into these streets, the more chance for temptation to take what is not theirs. I believe vandalism and theft will go up proportionately. So that is what I fear will happen when more visitors are directed down our neighborhoods to view not only the meadow but the contents in our homes and garages. Please don't count on the city to police those who don't live here. I know that this is off the topic, but the city can't even take care of the cracks in our streets! Take a look at what has been getting progressively worse and has not been attended to since I've lived hear for almost 30 years!

3637 Larch Avenue #1 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 Phone: (530) 542-4778 Fax: (530) 544-9112

I enjoy the wildlife and untouched beauty of the meadow seen from our windows. The reason why I bought in this location was that I heard that no building would ever happen behind my home. Now, I'm hearing that paths and viewing stations are being considered. Maybe my side of the meadow doesn't get as many visitors, but I am totally in the dark about any problems with people. I see them walk/run by on the path beyond the trees out my window. My opinion is that the more you present this meadow as an attraction for all visitors to see, the more the wildlife will find other areas to live. Without this wildlife, you will have just another vacant field with viewing stations describing what use to be the normal habitat. I fear that the presence of too many people will certainly push the wildlife away.

Don't we have enough viewing sites around Lake Tahoe? Why do we need to bring visitors into our neighborhood streets and backyards? Aren't there viewing spots around this meadow that people can get to via the beach, by bike trail behind Meeks or near the Key's Marina that can expose the meadow enough for those so inquisitive to want to view it?

For the above reasons, we are against setting up viewing stations in back of our homes. Also, we are against allowing more residential street parking creating potentially more meadow entrances and paths for visitors to complicate and ruin what has been fine for so many years.

Please consider our right to peace and privacy.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Glenn C Miller DC
Jan Miller

Glenn & Jan Miller

quiet of where we live. I hope you will realize the reasons we don't want this additional view point just beyond our yards. Thank you for your consideration!

-Russell & Mikayla Grant
657 El Dorado Ave.

To Whom It May Concern- April 07'

You have asked for our neighborhood's resons regarding not wanting viewing decks in our neighborhood meadow. As a fire fighter's wife - I am home alone two days a week, and enjoy knowing my neighbors around me. I think the access points would draw in traffic and people parking in front of our home. I also babysit for friends and family, and as it is - there is enough traffic going up and down our street. We are home owners who pay good money to enjoy the peace and

From: Mike Elam [melam@trpa.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 7:44 AM
To: Jacqui Grandfield
Subject: FW: The Meadow

From: Bill Beall [mailto:bealljb@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 29, 2007 2:13 PM
To: Mike Elam
Subject: The Meadow

As a full time resident of the Al Tahoe community (866 Stanford Av), I would not want to see The Meadow turned into a tourist attraction. Although there are ample Vacation Rentals in the area, Al Tahoe is a family oriented neighborhood with children playing and folks walking the streets and the Meadow. We do not need an added influx of traffic speeding through the community and parking in our yards and driveways. Please leave The Meadow to it's natural beauty and peace.
Sincerely,
William Beall
530 544 1969

Ahhh...imagining that irresistible "new car" smell?
Check out new cars at Yahoo! Autos.
From: Mike Elam [melam@trpa.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 10, 2007 7:43 AM
To: Jacqui Grandfield
Subject: FW: Public Comment on Upper Truckee Restoration

From: Gantt Miller [mailto:ganttm@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 4:38 PM
To: Mike Elam
Subject: Public Comment on Upper Truckee Restoration

RESPONSE TO UPPER TRUCKEE RIVER AND MARSH RESTORATION PROJECT

FROM:
GANTT AND JAYME MILLER
871 MICHAEL DR.
SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96150

WE ARE HOME OWNERS ADJACENT TO THE MEADOW AND WORK IN THE COMMUNITY.

MIKE ELAM,

Thanks for allowing us the opportunity to comment on the scope of work proposed for the South Upper Truckee. What follows is our list of concerns and suggestions:

- It is our opinion that the river's current flow pattern is meandering and sinuous and relatively natural, therefore it should be left fundamentally undisturbed without additional human tampering and engineering.
- Some minimal recreational additions would be helpful, in order to minimize the impact of human activity, such as boardwalks, and/or foot and bike trails. However, as the area is so close to the lake, an improved recreational infrastructure would most likely bring more human use and therefore impact.
- Our other concern is our property. If the river is redesigned to flood onto our property with increased regularity, which appears to be the intent, then what, if any, protective measures are proposed by TRPA or CTC for the Tahoe Island Subdivision.

Thanks.
Gantt and Jayme Miller

From: Candy Young [candyyoung@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 7:44 PM
To: Peter Maholland
Subject: [UTM]Truckee River marsh

Dear Mrs. Grandfield - As an owner of one of the 3 parcels of privately owned land involved in this Truckee marsh issue, I would like to know why I wasn't notified about anything. There is no one authorized to speak for me, and as I just found out yesterday, I didn't make todays deadline to voice my concerns. Please respond at your earliest convenience. Thank you.
Candy Young candyyoung@sbcglobal.net
p.s. I understand that the largest shareholder - John Dunlap wasn't notified in a timely manner as well. I was told that he hasn't authorized anyone to speak for him either.
From: Laurel Ames [laurel@watershednetwork.org]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 5:10 PM
To: Jacqui Grandfield; MElam@trpa.org; mmayville@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: NOP Upper Truckee River Marsh Restoration

Please accept the attached comments on the NOP scoping for the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project.
From: Carl Young [Carl@keeptahoeblue.org]
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2007 4:19 AM
To: Jacqui Grandfield
Subject: Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

Dear Jacquie,

Please find attached the League to Save Lake Tahoe Comments on the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project.

Thank you,

Carl Young
Program Coordinator
League to Save Lake Tahoe
(530)541-5388
Carl@keeptahoeblue.org

From: Denise Downie [zenisee1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 2:29 PM
To: Jacqui Grandfield
Subject: Upper Truckee scoping comments

Dear Jacqui - my comments on the Upper Truckee Marsh restoration project are attached. Thank you for sending me a scoping packet, and please keep me informed of future opportunities for comment.

Denise Downie

Ahhh...imagining that irresistible "new car" smell?
Check out new cars at Yahoo! Autos.
From: Lisa Squire [lisahalo@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 8:09 AM
To: Jacqui Grandfield
Subject: Upper Truckee Marsh

Hi Jacqui,
My husband is dropping off a copy of this letter to your office today along with a map of some ideas for the Upper Truckee Marsh project. I wanted to send this also via email just in case the hard copy doesnt get to you today, considering it must be received today (April 30th).

Thanks for considering our ideas!

Lisa Nelson

Mortgage rates near historic lows. Refinance $200,000 loan for as low as $771/month*
From: crazy4k9@aol.com
Sent: Monday, April 30, 2007 12:23 AM
To: Jacqui Grandfield
Subject: Proposed meadow changes

Dear Tahoe Conservancy,

I was recently disturbed to find that there are proposed changes in the works for the Upper Truckee meadow. I have lived in Tahoe since I was a baby and have always loved living with nature. Few would disagree that Tahoe is one of the most beautiful places on earth and the Upper Truckee meadow is one of Tahoe's gems. Unfortunately, the dynamics in Tahoe seem to be changing. Tahoe is well on its way to becoming a "look, but don't touch" landmark. I fear that before long, locals will not have access to enjoy the wonders that make up Tahoe, unless they can afford to buy a multi-million dollar home with private access to our meadows, streams and beaches or else rent a condo from our Vale-like Heavenly Village.

I have enjoyed the Upper Truckee meadow for most of my life. After college, I moved into the Al Tahoe neighborhood so that I might have access to take my dogs on a nature walk where we can enjoy all the

spectacular wildlife this meadow attracts. Along with my fellow neighbors, I help pick up after careless tourists and maintain the meadow's natural state. As a dog behaviorist and trainer, I seek to educate people about the importance of being responsible, picking up after their pets and how to enjoy nature without being harmful. I walk down to the beach with my dogs almost everyday, where my dogs can romp in the lake without disturbing anything. Being there nearly everyday means that I can help to keep an eye on our valuable resource and be alert for any potential problems.

Please don't change this beautiful meadow. We locals care for it very deeply. It is the main reason I live in this area. The Ledbedders sold the land with good intentions that it might be a haven for the neighbors who so enjoy it. Walk ways and viewing areas would only serve to drive away locals and attract more visitors, who do not care about the long term effects of their visit. Please don't turn one more jewel of Tahoe into a tourist-only attraction.

Your concerned citizen,
-Tammy Cowen-

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at AOL.com.

From: Bill Beall [bealljb@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 29, 2007 2:34 PM
To: Jacqui Grandfield
Subject: The Meadow

As a full time resident of the Al Tahoe community (866 Stanford) I request that The Meadow be left as a place of natural beauty and peace. Although ample Vacation Rentals are sprinkled about, Al Tahoe is family oriented with children playing and many people walking the streets and Meadow. We do not need speeding, lost tourists endangering the population and parking in our driveways and yards. Please keep The Meadow natural, and available to the locals who have been The Meadows caretaker for years---we pick up after ourselves and only leave our footprints.
Sincerely,
William Beall
530 544 1969

Ahhh...imagining that irresistible "new car" smell?
Check out new cars at Yahoo! Autos.

From: clbrowncow@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, April 29, 2007 12:50 PM
To: Jacqui Grandfield; melam@trpa.org; trpa@trpa.org; tahoecons@tahoecons.ca.gov
Subject: Upper Truckee Wetlands Project

Dear Conservancy and TRPA,

I understand a decision is being made tomorrow regarding the fate of the Upper Truckee wetlands. A few of the neighbors in the area received a document listing the changes proposed to the meadow.

I have lived in the Al Tahoe neighborhood for 10 years but have gone to the meadow daily for almost 20 years. In fact, I moved to this neighborhood for the express purpose of living near the meadow. I walk my dogs there from the Sacramento side all the way to the beach, and along the shore of the lake to the mouth of the Truckee. As we walk, I clean up garbage (including my LEASHED dogs' waste), ask others to clean up after themselves, and generally act as a steward of the meadow. I love sitting at the beach watching the birds, the lake and the animals there. Several times I have called the police to report various troubles from fires to parties to snow mobiles zooming around.

Your plan of walkways, vistas, and closed access to the beach invites trouble. Law abiding citizens will be banned from the beaches, your eyes and ears in the neighborhood will be closed, and you will increase traffic on our dilapidated streets. Please leave the meadow alone. It is beautiful as it is. Do not restrict access to the locals. We love the meadow and take care of it daily....we are your eyes and ears. Please respect the intent of the Ledbetters in selling the land to you....they wanted the local neighbors to have access just as we did when they owned it. PLEASE LEAVE THE MEADOW AS IT IS and spend your monies on buying more land to stave off the incredible building going on. You money is better spent in that way.

Sincerely,

Cindy Cowen

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free from AOL at AOL.com.

From: Joybeeee@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, April 29, 2007 12:46 PM
To: Jacqui Grandfield; melam@trpa.org
Subject: Upper Truckee River Wetlands

I have lived near the corner of Sonoma and El Dorado Avenues for almost 20 years. And for even longer than that, I have enjoyed year-round recreational activities in the Upper Truckee River Wetlands, aka the meadow. Daily, I walk the dog (yes, on a leash and, yes, I clean up after her), sometimes I walk with friends, sometimes I hang out at the beach, and in the winter, I cross country ski. There are very few days in the year that I don't make it out to the meadow.

My neighbors and I like to think of ourselves as stewards of this meadow. We call authorities when inappropriate behaviors occur (like snowmobiles zooming around, for example). We pick up other people's trash. We take great pride in its beauty, whether it be full of wildflowers or a new foot of snow. It is our meadow.

I understand that there are plans to build wooden walkways, vista stations, and bike trails at the beach. I just don't understand why. The meadow is gorgeous just as it is. There was a song by Judy Collins back in the '60's that mentions "paving paradise" and "putting in a parking lot." I think this is rather similar – planking paradise and putting in walkways. It's simply not necessary.

Please leave the meadow alone. It is already perfect.

Thanks for your consideration.

Joy Rothschild

Box 14029

South Lake Tahoe, CA 96151

_____

See what's free at AOL.com.
From: clbrowncow@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, April 29, 2007 11:46 AM
To: Jacqui Grandfield
Cc: melam@trpa.org

To the powers that be:

I understand a decision is being made tomorrow regarding the fate of the Upper Truckee wetlands. A few of the neighbors in the area received a document listing the changes proposed to the meadow.

I have lived in the Al Tahoe neighborhood for 10 years but have gone to the meadow daily for almost 20 years. In fact, I moved to this neighborhood for the express purpose of living near the meadow. I walk my dogs there from the Sacramento side all the way to the beach and along the shore of the lake to the mouth of the Truckee. As we walk, I clean up garbage (including my LEASHED dogs' waste), ask others to clean up after themselves, and generally act as a steward of the meadow. I love sitting at the beach watching the birds, the lake and the animals there. Several times I have called the police to report various troubles from fires to parties to snow mobiles zooming around.

Your plan of walkways, vistas, and closed access to the beach invites trouble. Law abiding citizens will be banned from the beaches, your eyes and ears in the neighborhood will be closed, and you will increase traffic on our dilapidated streets. Please leave the meadow alone. It is beautiful as it is. Do not restrict access to the locals. We love the meadow and take care of it daily....we are your eyes and ears. Please respect the intent of the Ledbetters in selling the land to you....they wanted the local neighbors to have access just as we did when they owned it. PLEASE LEAVE THE MEADOW AS IT IS and spend your monies on buying more land to stave off the incredible building going

on. You money is better spent in that way.

Sincerely,

Cindy Cowen
868 Stanford Avenue

AOL now offers free email to everyone. Find out more about what's free
from AOL at AOL.com.

From: Ty N Baldwin [sltbjbty@juno.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2007 3:58 PM
To: Jacqui Grandfield
Subject: Meadow adjacent to the Al Tahoe community

To the configuration members of the Barton Meadow plan:

Jacqui Grandfield
Norma Santiago
Katy Lovell

For almost a century the residents of Al Tahoe have used a system of informal trails along the boarder that generally follows the Eldorado and Argonaut Streets. These trails currently blend in with the edge habitat of the meadow.

Now the California Conservancy wants to stop all foot traffic along these trails and put in intermittent viewing platforms that will become an attractive nuisance that will attract undesirable auto traffic to the neighborhood streets and subsequent parking on very narrow streets. Viewing platforms will attract beer parties, invite kids to climb on them, and block off access to the informal trail systems.

If the goal is to keep people and their dogs out of the more sensitive areas then put in a Forest Service type fence on the meadow side of these trails. This fence would be 4 feet high and constructed of rustic wood with an open wire mesh, see through barrier, that would stop foot and dog traffic. The fence would not be straight but rather meandering approximately 50 feet on the meadow side of the trails. The leash law has not worked but a fence would.

We strongly object to the very formal and restrictive platforms and doing away with the century old informal trail systems. Attendance of meetings, have shown us that the Conservancy wants the entire meadow for wild life, but we urge you to save some of it for these grand fathered in, self maintained hiking trails that surround Al Tahoe.

Arthur (Ty) N. Baldwin
and
Barbara J. Baldwin

Tel # 503-307-8981
e-mail sltbjbty@juno.com

Upper Truckee River & Marsh Restoration Project
EIR/EIS/EIS

COMMENTS
(please hand in during the meeting)

Name: Michael Farnon

Organization (if any):

Address (optional): 920 Sagewood Dr.

City, State, Zip: S.L.T, CA 96150

California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy), the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) are preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/EIS for the Upper Truckee River & Marsh Restoration Project. The Conservancy, TRPA, and Reclamation invite you to provide specific comments on alternatives and environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS/EIS.

If there is additional information that you believe should be incorporated into the EIR/EIS/EIS analysis, please identify what the issue is and the person we should contact about it. Thank you!

Comments: Really appreciate all you've done and all you continue to do to make a better Tahoe.

In regards to the Trout Creek meadow.

I would like to request you put a small part aside for people and their dogs. We in the city limits have so few areas for our dogs to play & exercise. It would really be great if they could also have access, small area, to the creek.

Please take the needs of your neighbors in least while making your decisions.

Thank you

Upper Truckee River & Marsh Restoration Project
EIR/EIS/EIS

COMMENTS

(please hand in during the meeting)

Name: Gloria Dorotheian

Organization (if any):

Address (optional): P.O. Box 106 SLT Ca 96156, 750 El Dorado Ave SLT 96150

City, State, Zip:

California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy), the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) are preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/EIS for the Upper Truckee River & Marsh Restoration Project. The Conservancy, TRPA, and Reclamation invite you to provide specific comments on alternatives and environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS/EIS.

If there is additional information that you believe should be incorporated into the EIR/EIS/EIS analysis, please identify what the issue is and the person we should contact about it. Thank you!

Comments: I would like to hear more from your biologist about possible wildlife species restoration and what that would take. What are the trade-offs with public access?

You might consider using channel 21 to do more advertising of meetings - Also, general information about your restoration plans.

I think your public meeting on the 24th was very informative and welcomed public input. Thanks to all.

Upper Truckee River & Marsh Restoration Project
EIR/EIS/EIS

COMMENTS
(please hand in during the meeting)

Name: JOHN COBOURN, HYDROLOGIST

Organization (if any): UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO

Address (optional): PO BOX 8208

City, State, Zip: INCLINE VILLAGE, NV ~~8942~~ 89452

COBOURNJ@UNCE.UNR.edu

California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy), the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) are preparing an Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/EIS for the Upper Truckee River & Marsh Restoration Project. The Conservancy, TRPA, and Reclamation invite you to provide specific comments on alternatives and environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS/EIS.

If there is additional information that you believe should be incorporated into the EIR/EIS/EIS analysis, please identify what the issue is and the person we should contact about it. Thank you!

Comments: Analyse both Upper Truckee River and Trout Creek within and above this project for channel incision. How much is each channel following the "channel evolution theory" of Andrew Simon, Schumm, and others? Will the channel gully widen? Where will this happen?

Would this project have any direct or indirect impact on future upstream restoration projects? Will upstream projects have adverse impacts on this project? Make sure all projects are integrated with each other.

I support alternatives which would raise the channel and create a new sinuous bankful channel that will flood over bank onto the meadow every 2-3 years.

Since the deep, straight channel

Comments

currently existing next to Tahoe Keys will be filled in, will flooding get worse in adjacent neighborhoods? If so, I suggest you consider what Jeff Mount calls "set-back" levees around the outer perimeter of the Upper Truckee and Trout Creek Marsh rather than increasing the capacity of the new channel, which could reduce water quality improvement.

I think the best solution for the channel is to fill in as much old channel as possible and construct a new sinuous channel through the lowest area of the meadow all the way to the lake. I don't think the inset floodplain shown on alternative 4 are wide enough (150') to be stable long term.

I like keeping recreational trails away from the channel and wetlands. Perimeter trail good.

Please fold in thirds

To turn in additional comments that were not submitted at the meeting: Fold this page into thirds, tape closed, affix postage and mail to be postmarked by Nov 2, 2006. Thank you!

Place Stamp Here

I suggest evaluating ways for hydraulic constrictions like highway bridges. Could some of these be modified to pass more flood flows?

Jacqui Grandfield, UC Consultant
Wildlife Program
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

A. Leslie & Karin Wright
2261 Cold Creek Trail,
South Lake Tahoe, Ca 96150
(530)544-7095 fax:(530)452-2844 cell:(530)559-2261

October 23, 2006

City Council
City of South Lake Tahoe

The Parks and Recreation Commission would like to recommend that the City urge the Conservancy to build a board walk between Cove East and Lily Street off of Lakeview Avenue.

The board walk should allow limited access to "Barton Beach" and the lake with no access to the meadow. The Yellow Cress should be protected by fence but available for viewing by the public.

The Park and Recreation Commission believe that a board walk would protect the meadow, but still give access to the lake and beach. The Boardwalk would help decrease vehicular miles by allowing a short cut from Tahoe Valley to the Middle School, and Recreation Center and in general encourage the use of bicycles. The board walk would increase the accessibility of local residents and visitors to the Camp Richardson and Tahoe Valley areas.

The Boardwalk would increase the quality of life for local residents of Lake Tahoe.

The Park and Recreation Commission strongly urges the City Council to ask the Conservancy to plan and build a aesthetically pleasing, an environmentally protecting, and functional boardwalk across Barton Meadow.

If there is hesitancy on the part of the council or the Conservancy we recommend a basin wide referendum to establish support for this endeavor.

Sincerely,

California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Lahontan Region

Linda S. Adams
Secretary for Environmental Protection

2501 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, California 96150
(530) 542-5400 • Fax (530) 544-2271
www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

NOV 0 2 2006

RECEIVED

NOV 2 2006

CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

Jacqui Grandfield
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

COMMENTS ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIR/EIS) FOR THE UPPER TRUCKEE RIVER AND MARSH RESTORATION PROJECT

California Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Water Board) staff have reviewed the subject document. The California Tahoe Conservancy proposes to restore portions of the Upper Truckee River near its mouth at Lake Tahoe to improve natural geomorphic processes and floodplain function.

The Regional Board is a responsible agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for this plan. We have reviewed all information submitted with regards to water quality and have the following comments:

Water Quality Impact - Construction

The EIR/EIS must include a detailed analysis of potential short term water quality impacts associated with each of the five alternatives. Specifically, the document must describe construction related water quality issues and discuss proposed mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels.

The EIR/EIS should also include information regarding construction methodologies, special equipment, temporary best management practices, design considerations, dewatering concerns, and other details to demonstrate the project can be constructed without discharging sediment or other pollutants to the Upper Truckee River. If your analysis concludes temporary construction activities will violate water quality objectives and standards contained in the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region* (http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb6/BPlan/BPlan_Index.htm), then the EIR/EIS must include a statement of overriding consideration that weighs the long term water quality effects against short term construction impacts. If possible, the EIR/EIS should include a numeric estimate of pollutant loading (sediment, nitrogen, and phosphorus) expected from construction and compare the short term impacts with expected long-term load reductions.

Water Quality Impact – Long Term

One of the stated project goals is to improve water quality through enhancement of natural physical and biological processes. The EIR/EIS must discuss the potential for the proposed alternatives to achieve this goal. Consideration should be given to each alternative's ability to reduce total suspended sediment and nutrient concentrations. If possible, the EIR/EIS should include a quantitative pollutant load reduction estimate for each of the evaluated alternatives and compare the estimate with loading estimates from existing conditions. In general, the draft EIR/EIS must include adequate information to identify which alternative has the greatest water quality benefit.

The document should also consider the river restoration project in the context of other stream restoration work in the Upper Truckee watershed. Specifically, the EIR/EIS should evaluate how this project might be impacted by sediment load reductions from other proposed projects.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation. If you have any questions or comments regarding this matter please contact me at (530) 542-5439 or Doug Smith, Tahoe TMDL Unit Chief, at (530) 542-5453.

Robert Larsen
Environmental Scientist

cc: Mike Elam, TRPA
Myrnie Mayville, US Bureau of Reclamation

BL/didT:/UTR.marsh.ceqacomments.doc

City of South Lake Tahoe

"making a positive difference now"

October 30, 2006

Jacqui Grandfield, UC Consultant Wildlife Program
California Tahoe Conservancy
1061 Third Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/EIS for the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project, South Lake Tahoe, California.

Dear Mrs. Grandfield:

Thank you for the opportunity for the City of South Lake Tahoe to comment on the NOP for this project. The City has the following comments:

- The proposed project lies within the boundaries of the City of South Lake Tahoe and as a public agency with discretionary approval power over the project the City is a Responsible Agency as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15381.
- As indicated in the NOP the project lies within Plan Areas 100 and 102. The Plan Area Statements (PAS) for these areas list "riding and hiking trails" as a special use that requires the approval of the Special Use Permit by the City. PAS 100 also lists "SEZ Restoration" as a special use.
- As required by City Code §5-17 the project will need Design Review approval from the City.
- I have enclosed the application forms for both the Special Use Permit and Design Review as well as an indication of the application fees. Ideally these applications should be submitted along with the draft EIR. Note that the "City Council, upon written request, may waive planning fees for permits required by this chapter for charitable or governmental organizations." (City Code § 32-8.1). If you choose to request a fee waiver please submit a written request to the City Planning Division prior to submitting the applications and expect that it will take approximately one month to schedule the item on the Council Agenda for action.
- The EIR will need to provide detailed analysis of the potential traffic impacts of the proposed alternatives. The analysis should include existing and forecast traffic volumes and levels of service for all public streets and intersections that may be affected and identify potential impacts to bicycle, pedestrian and transit circulation. The analysis should also include potential impacts to the public street

infrastructure and maintenance requirements. This analysis should apply to both construction traffic and long term traffic generated by the project alternatives.

- The EIR will need to provide detailed analysis of parking impacts associated with new recreation facilities and opportunities for each alternative.
- The EIR will need to provide detailed analysis of potential noise impacts on surrounding sensitive receptors, including residences. This analysis should apply to both construction related noise and long term affects of noise associated with traffic and recreation.
- The EIR will need to provide detailed analysis of existing flooding and drainage conditions and potential changes caused by the project alternatives.
- The EIR will need to address potential fire hazards associated with changes to the vegetation and fire management.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment on the NOP and I look forward to working with you as this project progresses. If you have any questions feel free to contact me. With questions specific to traffic or flood analysis please contact the City Engineering Manager, Stan Hill at 530-542-6039 and with questions specific to fire hazard please contact City Fire Marshal, Ray Zachau at 530-542-6166.

Sincerely,

Hilary Hodges

Hilary Hodges, Planning Manager
(530) 542-6024
hhodges@cityofslt.us