

RECEIVED

Letter I12

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

ALTAHOE  
TAHOE CONSERVANCY

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

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

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

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

112-1

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Name: MARILYN DOWN Date: 4/7/13

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

I12-1            The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

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

RECEIVED

CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

1651 Mulberry Lane  
San Jose CA 95125

October 4, 2011

Arlo Stockham, Regional Planning Coordinator  
Governing Board  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Stateline, NV 89449

*This letter & map mailed  
to*

Dear Members of the Board and Arlo Stockham,

In discussions with Janny Choy, Wendy Jepson, and John Hitchcock, regarding my property, APN 031-103-22, I discovered that the TRPA is currently reviewing Plan Areas and Zoning. We would like to request that you direct the TRPA staff to give particular consideration to this parcel for its potential to be redrawn into its neighboring Plan Area Statement.

113-1

I have owned the property since 1970 and it is located along Highway 50 at Blue Lake Rd adjacent to the Muffler Palace, in the Truckee Marsh Plan Area Statement. I have attached a map of the parcel boundaries, and you will see that my property is a peninsula surrounded by the Sierra Track Commercial Plan Area Statement. I am asking that this parcel be redrawn in the Sierra Track Commercial Plan Area.

Sincerely,

Helen Ebert

cc:  
Barrell Harris  
Paul Nielson  
John Hitchcock  
Janny Choy

*— also mailed to on 10/17/11*



Tahoe Plan Area.png  
622 KB

I13-1

The commenter requests information about plan areas and zoning for their property.

This comment is not associated with the Proposed Project and does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

TCM # 2453

541 8051

RECEIVED

CALIFORNIA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

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

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

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

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

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

114-1

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Name: Rich Elder Date: 4/8/13

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

**\*\*** Please No amount of affected property owners of any single street in your study - please use alternate plan!! Thank you.

114-1  
cont.

I14-1      The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

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

Letter I15

Jerome Evans  
PO Box 7101  
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96158

**UTR and Marsh Restoration Project**

The Upper Truckee River and Marsh Project is certainly one of the most important projects to be undertaken in the Lake Tahoe basin. It promises to be of substantial benefit to the lake, to wildlife on the South Shore, and to residents and visitors alike. Properly done, it should become one of the basin's principal natural attractions.

I do hope that the shoreline boardwalk in Alternative 1 will be included in the project as finally approved. Such a boardwalk will be a major attraction for visitors, provide an important connecting link in the bike trail, and reduce the likelihood of trespassing within the marsh itself.

This is the sort of project all in our community should support.

Jerome Evans

I15-1

I15-1

The commenter's support for the shoreline boardwalk under Alternative 1 is noted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I16-1

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Name:

John R. Galea  
222 Yoc

Date:

4-8-13

Address:

116-1  
cont.

I16-1            The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

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

RECEIVED

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

CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

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

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

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

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

I17-1

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Name: Chris Mathop

Date: 4/30/12

Address:

117-1  
cont.

I17-1            The commenter has concerns about construction activities resulting in increased noise, traffic, disruption of established neighborhood values, neighborhood safety, and increased flood risk in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. The commenter states that individual residents in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision were not directly notified of public outreach.

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

March 6, 2013

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

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

Dear Mr. Carroll,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me regarding the project referenced above. The Conservancy prepared an excellent presentation regarding alternatives for the restoration project. Thank you for allowing comments on your project and welcoming public opinion and concerns.

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

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

118-1

In addition to my recommendation that alternative # 3 be selected and implemented for the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project, I ask you to mitigate the problems caused by the roadway to the Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association (TKPOA) corporation yard storage area. During times of high water flow in and around the Mt. Tallac Village III subdivision, the TKPOA yard storage road becomes a dam and flood waters back up to the south of the roadway into our subdivision. The roadway caused a serious flooding problem in our subdivision in 1997 because of the back up of water that could not flow past the raised roadway. Boats and high wheeled vehicles were required to bring residents out of our subdivision during the 1997 flood event. Perhaps the TKPOA could share in the cost to install culverts under the raised corporation yard roadway to allow flood waters to escape the Mt. Tallac Village III subdivision. The roadway needs to be modified now. The safety of our subdivision residents and guests and protection of our property make it imperative that Conservancy and TKPOA act now to help prevent flooding in the Mt. Tallac Village III subdivision. The raised corporation yard roadway is a flood hazard for our subdivision and must be modified or removed. The Conservancy and TKPOA have a responsibility to property owners in Mt. Tallac Village III to mitigate the flood hazard caused by the raised road.

118-2

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

John Gonzales  
 PO Box 51234  
 Sparks Nevada  
 89435-1234

775-626-0250  
[gengm@charter.net](mailto:gengm@charter.net)  
 Tahoe property address – 791 Colorado Avenue SLT

I18-1           The commenter's support for Alternative 3 is noted.

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

I18-2           The commenter requests restoration of the roadway for the TKPOA storage yard.

The Preferred Alternative includes removal of the TKPOA yard and road, and restoration to meadow habitat, contingent on TKPOA consent.

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

RECEIVED

CA TAHOE CONSERVANCY

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

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

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

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

I19-1

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

Name:

Ryan Goralski and  
Catalina Goralster

Date:

4.6.2013

Address:

I19-1  
cont.

I19-1

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

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

March 13, 2013

Attn: Tahoe Conservancy and TRPA

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

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

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

I20-1

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

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

I20-2

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

I20-3

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

I20-4

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

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

I20-5

I20-6

I20-7

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

Sincerely,

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

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

I20-7

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

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

## Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

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

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

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

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

I21-1

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

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

I21-2

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

I21-3

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

I21-3  
cont.

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

I21-4

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

I21-5

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

Lynn Harriman

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

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

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

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

Dear Scott,

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

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

I22-1

Amongst other concerns, a bridged access could

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

I22-2

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

I22-3

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

I22-4

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

I22-5

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

I22-6

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

I22-7

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Sincerely,

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

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

Preferred Alternative,” of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

I22-7

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

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