

Letter I49

Regarding River Project Plans and any usage of California Ave

From Jim and Barbara Randolph
2333 California Ave
So Lake Tahoe, Ca 96150

I am opposed to having our street as possible access for the project. I recommend you sit down and re-evaluate other options. This is a residential street with full time residences with children that walk and play in these streets. *It would be highly dangerous to use this street*

I49-1

We are all aware of the flood plain and that we live here and fear that by using our street for access and I believe that this project in an already land sensitive area will make it even worse.

I49-2

Please consider this opposition notice from us a legal notice. I truly fear some accident and/or damage would happen directly by the disregard of our concerns at this time.

I49-3

Also, I don't believe each resident was properly notified of this plan.

I49-4

- I49-1 The commenters' concern about access points on California Avenue is noted. As shown in Exhibit 2-2 in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not propose access points on or in the vicinity of California Avenue.
- I49-2 The commenters acknowledge that they are located in a floodplain and are concerned that accessing the site through their street will make flooding worse.
- Temporary use of a street or native ground surface for construction access would not result in any permanent modifications to the topography and/or flooding. Additionally, as discussed in response to Comment I49-1, adjustments to the access points and routes that eliminate California Avenue have been made for the Preferred Alternative.
- I49-3 The commenters' request to consider the comment letter as a legal notice is noted.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I49-4 The commenters' concern about noticing is noted.
- The Project mailing list was developed by obtaining the most recent County Assessor's information as well as contact information provided through outreach over the life of the project. The commenter's address was incorrect with the County and has been updated. For privacy purposes the address has been withheld in this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. See responses to Comments AO2-4 and I8-6 for a discussion of the project's history, planning context, and public outreach.

April 6, 2013

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

COMMENTS to the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project

Like the CTC, I don't have a preferred alternative, but I do tend to have a laissez-fair or don't worry twice attitude. I have serious doubts that the CTC, much less the City of South Lake Tahoe, will have funding come the CTC planned start-up of the Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration project in 2015. I'll be fine if the CTC doesn't get the funding and thus can only do restoration activity at the mouth of the Upper Truckee as it leads into the lake which is where the most human damage (besides by the Hwy 50 bridge) has been done; I agree we need some restoration. I'm happily signing a separate letter written by my husband embracing Alternative 3 for its most bang for the buck and the light recreational additions. We would like to see the most benefit with the least destruction.

I50-1

Recreation

The DEIR/DEIS/DEIS makes note that there is currently plenty of recreation available for residents and visitors. I see no benefit to providing footpaths, bicycle paths, wheelchair paths, signs or boardwalks to further denigrate the pristine nature of our meadows. Building more facilities for human interaction will result in the waste of natural resources including oil and gasoline, steel, and lumber (as you note in the Report) as well as further human encroachment. I don't personally see the need for many more recreational "tools".

I50-2

City of South Lake Tahoe

These recreational facilities will require upkeep (by means not outlined in the DEIR/DEIS/DEIS). Not only the City, but the County will need ongoing funding to maintain infrastructure changes suggested in the Recreational Alternatives. The CTC tasks the City of South Lake Tahoe (CSLT) for various causes. **"City of South Lake Tahoe:** The study area is located entirely within CSLT's jurisdictional limits. Chapter 8, "Building Regulations," of

I50-3

the CSLT Ordinance requires that projects prepare a grading plan for review and grading-permit approval by the CSLT building official.purpose of the review is for CSLT to safeguard adjoining properties and public streets and ways from damage by unnatural flows of surface waters, and to prevent construction of homes and other buildings in areas likely to become flooded. CSLT is the floodplain administrator for FEMA in the project area, responsible for implementing the federal policies and regulations for floodplain management." Does the City of South Lake Tahoe have ongoing funding for the construction and the upkeep of the proposals in the Alternatives?

150-3
cont.

Wildlife

It is my understanding that a current survey of migratory birds has not been completed. There are no doubt other such surveys incomplete – and again, the Report is 30%. We've noticed far fewer frogs over the last few years. A great blue heron has enjoyed voles from our lawn in springs past, as well as a snowstorm or two. Is he in your count?



150-4

You say "Compliance with the MBTA is being addressed through compliance with the ESA and CEQA and through an additional measure. As discussed in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources: Vegetation and Wildlife," adverse impacts on special-status migratory birds would be avoided and effects on other migratory species reduced by conducting preconstruction surveys and establishing exclusion zones and/or limiting construction activities to the period outside the breeding season. In addition to these measures, to comply with the MBTA, a preconstruction survey for migratory bird nests would be conducted to locate and avoid or minimize the loss of active nests during construction. For construction activities during the nesting season (approximately April 1 to August 15) and within suitable nesting habitat, a preconstruction survey for active nest sites of migratory birds would be conducted within 30 days before construction. The survey would be limited to areas where the loss of active nests could occur as a result of vegetation removal or other ground disturbance. If a migratory bird nest or likely nest site is located, a buffer around the nest would be avoided until the nest is no longer active." Please don't forget it.

We informed the CTC of the sighting of a possible mink, not seen in the Project area in over



"30 years" per CTC wildlife biologist.

If instead it's an **American Marten**, it too is a Federally sensitive species or TRPA special interest/threshold species. While the Report doesn't call these Endangered or Special, the FSS status comes close. We'd really like it if whatever alternative is chosen doesn't have any substantial adverse effect - I remind you - "Under CEQA, an alternative was determined to result in a significant effect related to vegetation and wildlife resources if it would: ► have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS (CEQA 1). I don't think this has been investigated well. PLEASE be sure! Again, it would be nice if whatever work gets done in our neck of the woods it will be light-footed.

California Avenue

My husband has written a truly cogent letter, expressing our neighborhood horror at the plans to use California Avenue and lots nearby as haul route staging sites. Not much thought was apparently given this by the CTC in that California Avenue is the smallest and most populated of all the streets in the Tahoe Island Park 4 district. The CTC has lots of its own, and main city streets to afford access to the project. The report states that the CTC will "...designate staging areas and haul routes in existing developed or disturbed areas where feasible, and where not feasible, in the **least sensitive** natural areas feasible." The proposed staging sites on California Avenue and Michael Avenue are both lots that were designated "sensitive" and all future use as developable removed.

Flooding

Also addressed in our mutual letter. Echoed by many others I've spoken with. Do not increase our flood risk. Have a plan in place if increased flooding, particularly during river re-routing while construction is occurring, should occur.

150-4

150-5

150-6

Invasive Critters

In the same category as flooding, I imagine the homes near the project area will be inundated with fleeing voles and mice. Does or will the CTC address and mediate this effect?

150-7

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Respectfully,



Catherine (Cass) Rosenberg

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

- I50-1 The commenter's support for the most cost effective restoration alternative (Alternative 3 and "light recreation" additions) 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.
- I50-2 The commenter's opposition to additional recreation facilities is noted.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate infrastructure on the west side of the marsh and no additional recreation access on the east side of the marsh. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I50-3 The commenter's concern regarding funding for long-term maintenance of recreation infrastructure is noted.
- The Conservancy would continue to maintain new recreation infrastructure similar to existing conditions. In addition, see Section 3.1.4, "Management," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I50-4 The commenter's concerns regarding potential impacts on migratory birds are noted.
- As discussed in Section 3.4, "Biological Resources," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS, Mitigation Measures 3.4-8A and 3.4-8B address construction-related impacts on wildlife and would be implemented during construction. The mitigation monitoring and reporting program prepared for this Final EIR/EIS/EIS would ensure the enforcement of these mitigation measures. See Appendix C of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I50-5 The commenter's concern about haul routes and staging areas on California Avenue is noted.
- As shown in Exhibit 2-2 in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative does not propose construction staging areas on or in the vicinity of California Avenue. See Section 3.1.2, "Traffic, Access, and Staging," and Section 3.1.3, "Construction Noise," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of construction-related noise and traffic.
- I50-6 The commenter is concerned about a potential increase in flood risk, including potential flooding during construction.
- An updated discussion of existing and potential flood hazards is provided in Section 3.1.1, "Flooding and Flood Hazards," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. The probability of a large flood event occurring during active construction would be very low because

major floods are typically associated with late-fall and winter rain-on-snow events, but the potential for flood peaks during construction is addressed in Section 3.9, “Geomorphology and Water Quality,” because flood peaks could result in water quality impacts. The Conservancy would implement Environmental Commitments 5 and 6, which would include management of the site and construction activities, including staging and storage of materials to avoid flood-prone areas and adjustment of the construction schedule and location in the unlikely event of a construction-season flood event.

I50-7

The commenter’s concern about voles and mice coming into neighborhoods because of flooding is noted.

Voles and mice would be expected to use the marsh as under existing conditions. Conservancy management activities to not include mowing of marsh grasslands that can typically cause rodents to flee an area, and the proposed project would not change flooding. An updated discussion of existing and potential flood hazards is provided in Section 3.1.1, “Flooding and Flood Hazards,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS.

April 8, 2013

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)

Reference: DRAFT Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement/
Environmental Impact Statement, "Upper Truckee River and Marsh
Restoration Project" SCH# 2007032099, February 2013 (Report)

Notes: Terminology introduced in the Report (reference above) will be used here
without further explanation.

Please withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent
allowed by law

Scott and whom it may concern:

My wife and I are full time residents and owners of a home on California Avenue, in the
Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. Our home is on the west side of the Upper Truckee
River, directly facing the river near RS 1700. Our home is one of the closest residences,
if not the closest, to the river in the Project Study Area. Its present river setting in every
way dominates and defines its aesthetic value. This river setting is the primary reason we
purchased this property more than 26 years ago and live here full time, year round. The
other reason is the privacy and peacefulness of this parcel, surrounded on all sides by
undeveloped and presumably undevelopable parcels. The potential Project staging site
designated in the Report as "California Ave. Access Point and Staging 0.8 Ac" is directly
adjacent to our property on one or more of those presumably undevelopable parcels.

I51-1

We are strong supporters of the Project purpose and objectives stated in the Report. We
are submitting the following comments as constructive suggestions in the hopes of
assisting you to develop a project that will achieve the stated purpose and objectives with
minimal undesirable impacts.

We have structured our comments as follows:

- ☐ Topic (heading)
- ☐ Background
- ☐ Specific issues concerning that topic
- ☐ Specific suggestion(s), if any, for addressing the issues

If, after the Agencies respond to public comments, a suggestion here is not accepted, or
an issue here is not otherwise resolved in our estimation, then any such issue will remain
as a formal specific objection by us to the Report and/or Project.

Topic 1: Use of CTC lots on or near California Avenue as a Project staging site and use of California Avenue as a haul route

Background: The Report, Section 2.6 “Construction” and Exhibits 2-5 to 2-8 “Storage and Access Plan” for each Action Alternative (the exhibits are maps), show:

- ☐ One or more CTC lots on or near California Avenue as an access point and staging site called “California Ave. Access Point and Staging 0.8 Ac”
- ☐ California Avenue as the only “haul route” on public roads to this staging site

The Report allows these uses to occur at any time, or continuously, from 8 AM to 6:30 PM, daily, for four years. We submit that each, or any, of the issues below is sufficient to require the removal of the above two construction options from the final Project.

Issues

1. Disruption of established neighborhood values in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision during construction: this is a peaceful small residential neighborhood and has been so for over 50 years. The proposed California Ave Staging site makes use of small, undeveloped residential lots in the neighborhood acquired by the CTC because of, and to prevent infringement on, their environmental sensitivity and natural state. The neighborhood had a reasonable expectation that these lots would always be peaceful natural neighborhood parcels and that they would never be used by the CTC or anyone else as a construction site for staging heavy equipment and fill materials. In fact, in conservation easements that the CTC accepted in lieu of purchase for lots of this type, such use is forever barred to the owner. The fundamental aesthetic nature of the neighborhood would be devastated for four years by use of these lots as construction staging sites for equipment and materials. Furthermore, California Avenue is a small street used by the residents for strolling and as an informal playground and meeting area for chats. The impact of this possible staging site to reasonable established neighborhood lifestyle and quality of life values is not recognized or assessed in the Report. We strongly object to use of the subject CTC lots, and California Avenue, by the Project, for staging, hauling, or similar construction purposes. It should not even be considered further without analysis of the impacts discussed above (and below), mitigations thereof, and subsequent public comment
2. Traffic in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision during construction: California Avenue, the only designated haul route in this subdivision, is one of its, and the city’s, narrowest streets. California Avenue is heavily used by residents, people walking with their children and pets, other 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. This traffic impact finding defies common sense. It does not address the residential nature of the neighborhood and the features of this particular street. Traffic impact assessment discussions in the Report cite only the Al Tahoe, Hidden Woods, and Tahoe Keys Neighborhoods, but not the TIP4 neighborhood; there is no evidence traffic

I51-2

I51-3

<p>impact was assessed in this neighborhood. For this neighborhood, we strongly disagree with this finding, and assert that the analysis it is based on is inadequate. We strongly request that California Avenue not be used for hauling and similar construction traffic.</p>	<p>I51-3 cont.</p>
<p>3. <u>Noise in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision during construction</u>: this is a quiet residential neighborhood with full time residents a mixture of retirees, young families, and assorted others. 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, and my neighbors', reasonable use and enjoyment of our homes and property. The Report states 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 here. The locations and streets cited in Appendix J of the Report as having been analyzed for noise impact do not include any streets or locations in the vicinity of California Avenue or its proposed staging site. We 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. We strongly request that California Avenue not be used for hauling and similar construction traffic because of the unacceptable noise impact to residents and the neighborhood.</p>	<p>I51-4</p>
<p>4. <u>Neighborhood safety in Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision during construction</u>: 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. We strongly object to unnecessary multi-year heavy construction activities, traffic, and equipment in the neighborhood and feel that the Report has not adequately assessed the impact of this proposed use to the safety of neighborhood children. <i>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?</i></p>	<p>I51-5</p>
<p>5. <u>Unclear and Infeasible specification of California Avenue staging site and haul route in Report</u>: The Report, Exhibit 1-2, shows several parcels near the intersection of California Avenue and Michael as CTC property. One of these parcels actually is located on California Avenue. The others are located on Michael. The construction maps and discussion in the Report, particularly Exhibits 2-5 to 2-8, refer to a "California Ave. Access Point and Staging 0.8 Ac". The arrows on these maps designating this site point to the CTC parcel on California Avenue. However, this parcel is not even close to 0.8 Ac in size. The Report may intend that all the CTC lots in this area comprise the "California Ave. Access Point and Staging 0.8 Ac" since together they might total 0.8 Ac. In that case, however, the only haul route designated in the Report, California Avenue, would not access most of the potential staging site (none of the parcels on Michael are contiguous with the California Avenue CTC parcel). No other public street in Tahoe Island Park 4, particularly Michael, could be used as a haul route to access these lots, since this is not described or assessed in the Report. Consequently the Michael Street CTC parcels could not be used for staging. And then the subject staging site in the Report is not 0.8 Ac. Consequently, the Report,</p>	<p>I51-6</p>

- as now written, inadequately and ambiguously describes the “California Ave. Access Point and Staging 0.8 Ac”. This ambiguity prevents reasonable comment on this use. We oppose further consideration of the various CTC lots in question as potential staging sites until the ambiguity, including haul routes and specific lots, is clarified. There are numerous issues with using either the California Avenue CTC parcel or the Michael CTC parcels, but specific comments require knowledge of which lots are being proposed in the Report. We strongly oppose the use of any of the subject lots for staging, and assert that the present Report is inadequate to permit approving this use because it is too ambiguous and inaccurate to allow the public to assess and comment on the use.
6. Failure to directly notify California Avenue residents and property owners the street in front of their home was being considered as a haul route: even though our California Avenue neighbors are potentially highly impacted by Project construction and located directly on a haul route, they were not directly notified of the Report or public comment period. Most of them were not even aware of this proposed use until we informed them of it in the last two days. Even if agency outreach and notification for the Project satisfied the letter of the law, and we don’t know that it did, it certainly did not satisfy the spirit of notifying impacted parties so they could comment. We assert that the notification process has been inadequate and ineffective, near the potential California Ave Staging site, and consequently the use of this site for staging and California Avenue for hauling should not be approved until proper notification and comment period are provided.
 7. California Avenue CTC parcel is inadequate and inappropriate for a staging site: the California parcel has occupied homes a few feet away on either side. Choice of this site, as opposed to virtually all other possible staging sites available to the Project for this purpose, maximizes the residential and aesthetic impact of staging. This parcel also has private land behind it, preventing access from it to the river without impacting other private property and securing additional permissions, increasing the impact on the public of the choice. The lot is so small that construction vehicles could not physically maneuver on it, particularly if material or other equipment is stockpiled on it as described in the Report. Construction vehicle access to it from California Avenue, the designated haul route, would require an enormously wide driveway to be constructed to accommodate the large turning radii of such vehicles and would disrupt traffic on both California and Michael. Approaching traffic, particularly on Michael, would have difficulty in seeing construction vehicles entering and exiting the parcel, due to existing trees not on CTC property. We strongly oppose the use of this parcel for staging or similar heavy construction use because of its highly excessive and unnecessary impacts on local residents and traffic
 8. The internal haul road shown from the California Avenue CTC parcel to the river maximizes the impact to our home and renders it virtually unusable: We are particularly concerned about the internal haul route shown from this parcel to the river. It goes directly in front of, and within a few feet of, our house. It is directly in front of the picture windows lining the back walls of our living room and dining room. It is even closer to our deck that we use for meals and entertaining.

151-6
cont.

151-7

151-8

151-9

When it is in use our view of the river would be blocked; dust would be generated and dispersed on our deck, house, and windows; and the noise would make our backyard unusable and require us to keep our windows closed. When not in use, the present beautiful, undisturbed, vegetated terrain would be a desecrated eyesore. The Project would attempt to “restore” the parcel and this internal access route from it to the river on Project conclusion, but it is unlikely that either would ever be what they are now. This impact would render our house virtually uninhabitable and unusable to us for four summers and impaired for years after.

I51-9
cont.

Suggestions:

1. Do not use the Tahoe Island Park 4 neighborhood, and particularly California Avenue and the CTC lots in the vicinity of California Avenue and Michael, for Project staging and hauling or other heavy construction activity. This eliminates every issue stated above. The CTC has other alternatives for siting and hauling that not only avoid all the issues and impacts cited here, but are practical and of comparable or less environmental impact. One of these that seems particularly attractive is use of CTC land on East Venice near Cove East for primary access and staging, and moving material and equipment from there to active work areas on internal haul routes such as those already planned. This eliminates the need for an internal haul route from California Avenue to the river, an environmental benefit. In addition, use of internal haul routes on the east side of the river whenever possible would minimize residential impact since most nearby occupied neighborhoods are on the west side. Internal haul route restoration after Project completion is already in the plan. Using indicated access points in the report just for personnel, and limited associated transportation vehicle parking, would not be an unusual or objectionable impact to us.
2. Alternatively, if the Project decides to retain the “California Ave. Access Point and Staging 0.8 Ac” and California Avenue as the only “haul route” to it, issue an updated and corrected environmental impact report addressing the above issues.

I51-10

Topic 2: Flood Risk

Background: A primary project objective is more frequent (e.g., annual) river over-banking (flooding) from the bridge to the lake. Since much of TIP4 is in or near the FEMA 100-year floodplain, and already flood-prone, changes to present flooding patterns here are of concern to TIP4 residents. The models cited in the Report predict no increased residential flood risk from any Action Alternative as a result of the Project.

Issues:

1. Model uncertainty and reliability is not provided in the Report: for the public, or anyone else, to assess the quality of the finding that residential flood risk will not be increased by the project for any Action Alternative, first the uncertainty in the calculated results should be provided. What is uncertainty, in both calculated floodplain area and mean flood height, calculated by that model given data uncertainties and assumption uncertainties? Then, what is the reliability or confidence level placed in that model – has it been fully validated for this site and application? (Best efforts and state-of-the-art do not mean accurate and reliable.)

I51-11

2. Has the potential damage and financial risk been estimated, in case the models prove incorrect? If the Project accepts the model results and proceeds, has it calculated the potential damages and costs that could result if the models underestimate flood extents by various amounts?
3. Would the lead Agencies be responsible, and have the funds, to financially compensate the property owners if the models are wrong?

151-12

Solution:

1. Estimate a conservative modeling error value and the corresponding financial risk and secure adequate insurance, or the equivalent, for that amount.

Topic 3: Miscellaneous Issues (Fire, Wildlife, Key Features, RS 1400 diversion point)

Background: the following issues are of concern to us and do not appear to be adequately addressed in the Report.

Issues and Solutions:

1. Increased fire risk due to additional fuel load: all Action Alternatives in the Report include extensive willow planting. Eventually these new willows will generate considerable dead limbs, increasing the fuel load along the river and the potential for this fuel to carry a wildfire into the developed residential neighborhoods. We don't think this impact has been adequately assessed in the Report. We recommend that a regular fuel load and fire risk inspection agreement and management plan be instituted with the cognizant fire fighting authority, analogous to the mosquito management plan now in the report.
2. Impact to non-endangered wildlife species: the wildlife environmental impact assessment in the Report addresses only endangered species. The study area, including the areas directly in front of our property, contain many non-endangered species that we and other members of the public treasure. Some of these are bears, coyotes, beavers, weasels, otters, mink, herons, owls, hawks, eagles, countless other bird species, rodents, and numerous others. The impact of a four year project with habitat destruction and intense human activity on wildlife nesting and breeding, may eliminate or greatly reduce the numbers some of these species, where a shorter project would not. This is particularly true on the private property in the upper reaches of the study area, because these areas are now wooded and secure sanctuaries for some of these species. We believe the Report has not adequately assessed the impact to the non-endangered species in the study area. We recommend that the project scale and duration be reduced where possible to limit the negative impacts to, and possible loss of, these non-endangered species.
3. Key features of value not noted in the Report:
 - a. Near RS1700, directly in front of our house, there is a moderate sized lone lodgepole pine within ~10 feet of the low water channel on the west bank. This tree is a favorite and heavily used perch for many raptors, including hawks, owls, and the occasional eagle. We bring this tree to your attention and strongly recommend that it be protected during construction to preserve its beneficial function to local raptors.

151-13

151-14

151-15

- b. There is a Blue Heron that annually frequents the river near RS1700 and downstream. We have been observing it for years. We bring this to your attention in the hopes that you can avoid harming it or totally preventing its use of this area.
4. RS 1400 is incorrectly shown as the diversion point to a new low water channel in some early maps of Alternatives 1 and 3 in the Report, whereas more recent maps and all detailed discussions in the Report show the point as RS 1700; we have been assured by CTC personnel that the recent maps and RS 1700 are correct. We strongly assert that only RS1700 would be acceptable to us and diverting the present low water channel at RS 1400 would enormously devalue our property.

Topic 4. Personal Project Preference

1. Our Preferred Action Alternative and/or Features: Our mutual preferred alternative is Alternative 3, Middle Marsh Corridor, but with 1) the point of diversion from the present low water channel not at RS1700, but on CTC property downstream of the Dunlap Ranch and 2) the recreation features to include the bike trail segment connecting Hidden Woods to Al Tahoe. With these modifications we feel Alternative 3 would
- ☐ prevent all the negative impacts and concerns of private property owners in the upper reaches of the study area such as ourselves, the Dunlap Ranch owners, and out TIP4 neighbors
 - ☐ reduce project cost and complications to the CTC and its partner agencies by a large factor, since the project would be smaller and less involved and would not require negotiations with private parties
 - ☐ provide a large fraction of the environmental benefits of the version of Alternative 3 in the Report now at considerably reduced cost and reduced negative impact.
 - ☐ move minimal amounts of soil to implement
 - ☐ establish the most natural wetlands closest in spirit to the original condition of the marsh

The river already overbanks regularly near RS 1700 (photos available) and onto the Dunlap Ranch, so active floodplains in this reach may already be adequate, and seem larger than indicated in the Report.

Work near the US50 bridge and in the west-side old floodplain just downstream could still be done. Repair and strengthening of problem bank spots between RS 1400 and the new diversion point into the west meadow could also be done, if either is deemed necessary.

It also would be nice to try to reattach the sailing lagoon to the new river channel to provide more marsh, wetlands, floodplain, and settling area, and eliminate the negative aspects of the present sailing lagoon, such as invasive species.

Finally, the bicycle path between Al Tahoe and Hidden Woods would be a wonderful addition to navigate between the neighborhoods and between present

lake access points in Al Tahoe and the Keys, without the need to go up to US50 which is not a pleasant place to ride for adults or children. We would use it a lot. We think this modified version of Alternative 3 is really good and well balanced and would make a highly beneficial project.

151-17
cont.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Rosenberg (Tom)

Catherine M. Rosenberg (Cass)

- I51-1 The commenters' support of the project purpose and objectives is noted. The commenters state that the comments are constructive suggestions to help achieve the stated purpose and objectives.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I51-2 The commenters' concern about the disruption of established neighborhood values in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision during construction is noted. The Preferred Alternative would use main arterials to access the study area, such as U.S. Highway 50 (Lake Tahoe Boulevard), Venice Drive, and Tahoe Keys Boulevard. Some activities would require the use of Silver Dollar Avenue, Silverwood Circle, Rubicon Trail, and Springwood Drive, as well as Lakeview Avenue and Lily Avenue to access the eastern lakeshore area. Staging and the majority of hauling would occur within the study area as shown in Exhibit 2-2 in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. The Preferred Alternative does not propose construction staging areas or access points on California Avenue and staging on Conservancy parcels in the neighboring communities has been removed to avoid conflicts of use. Haul routes have been selected to occur immediately adjacent to construction areas and access points, and staging areas have been identified, in part, to minimize construction activities and hauling within sensitive habitats.
- See Section 3.1.2, "Traffic, Access, and Staging," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion.
- I51-3 The commenters' concern about construction-related traffic in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision during construction is noted. As stated above, the Preferred Alternative does not include haul routes in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision; therefore, there would be no conflicts related to traffic on California Avenue.
- See Section 3.1.2, "Traffic, Access, and Staging," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of construction-related traffic.
- I51-4 The commenters' concern about construction-related noise in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision during construction is noted. As described above and in Section 3.11, "Noise," of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS, traffic typically must double to create a perceptible increase in overall traffic noise. Project construction would not contribute to a doubling of traffic on U.S. Highway 50 or Tahoe Keys Boulevard, and therefore would not generate a perceptible increase in overall traffic noise levels. General construction activities would generate perceptible increases in noise levels above ambient conditions that would exceed applicable noise thresholds (50 and 55 A-weighted decibels) within 2,500 feet for the Preferred Alternative. However, as described in Section 3.11, noise from construction activity is exempt from the provisions of the applicable TRPA regulations and applicable El Dorado County regulations if conducted within the allowable hours. Therefore, consistent with the action alternatives presented in the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS, the impact under the Preferred Alternative would be less than significant.
- The State CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR describe any feasible measures that could minimize significant adverse impacts, and the measures are to be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other legally binding instruments (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.4[a]). Mitigation measures are not required for impacts that are found to be less than significant. NEPA requires that an EIS identify relevant, reasonable mitigation measures that are

not already included in the project alternatives that could avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for the project's adverse environmental effects (40 CFR 1502.14, 1502.16, 1508.8). The analysis of the proposed project is consistent with these requirements.

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

- I51-5 The commenters' concern about the use of parcels on or near California Avenue as an access point, staging area, and haul routes creating a safety hazard in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision during construction is noted. As stated above, the Preferred Alternative does not include haul routes, staging areas, or access in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision; therefore, there would be no safety hazards associated with construction on California Avenue.
- I51-6 The commenters' concern about haul routes and staging areas on California Avenue is noted.
- See responses to Comments I8-1 and I51-2, as well as Section 3.1.2, "Traffic, Access, and Staging," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion.
- I51-7 The commenters' concern that notification was not provided to Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision residents is noted. The Project mailing list was developed by obtaining the most recent County Assessor's information as well as contact information provided through outreach over the life of the project. The commenter's address on the list developed for noticing. For privacy purposes the address has been withheld in this Final EIR/EIS/EIS.
- See responses to Comments AO2-4 and I8-6 for a discussion of the project's history, planning context, and public outreach.
- I51-8 The commenters' concern about staging sites on California Avenue is noted.
- See responses to Comments I8-3 and I51-2, as well as Section 3.1.2, "Traffic, Access, and Staging," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion.
- I51-9 The commenters' concern about the use of California Avenue as a haul road is noted. As stated above, the Preferred Alternative does not include haul routes on California Avenue.
- See responses to Comments I8-3 and I51-2, as well as Section 3.1.2, "Traffic, Access, and Staging," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion.
- I51-10 The commenters suggest that no staging or hauling roads be located on or in the vicinity of California Avenue and Michael Avenue. As stated above, the Preferred Alternative does not include haul routes on California Avenue. In addition, Michael Avenue would not be used as a haul route.
- See responses to Comments I8-3 and I51-2, as well as Section 3.1.2, "Traffic, Access, and Staging," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion.
- I51-11 The commenters are concerned about potential increased flood risk to the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision, lack of certainty in flood modeling, and lack of assessment of flood damages and financial liability for potential damages.
- See Section 3.1.1, "Flooding and Flood Hazards," in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion on flooding. The analysis of the proposed project is consistent with CEQA, NEPA and TRPA requirements because the project would not change the existing flood hazards

of the surrounding properties. See “Flooding and Flood Hazards,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. The analysis of the proposed project is consistent with CEQA, NEPA and TRPA requirements because the project would not change the existing flood hazards of the surrounding properties. See “Flooding and Flood Hazards,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. Furthermore, financial responsibility for flood damages is not an issue relating to effects on the environment that requires an analysis under CEQA.

- I51-12 The commenters inquire about whether the lead agencies would take financial responsibility for flood damages if the models are incorrect.
- See Section 3.1.1, “Flooding and Flood Hazards,” in Chapter 3 of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion on flooding. The analysis of the proposed project is consistent with CEQA, NEPA and TRPA requirements because the project would not change the existing flood hazards of the surrounding properties. See “Flooding and Flood Hazards,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. Furthermore, financial responsibility for flood damages is not an issue relating to effects on the environment that requires an analysis under CEQA.
- I51-13 The commenters’ concern about fire risk is noted. See response to Comment AO2-10 for information about fire risks associated with the project.
- I51-14 The commenters’ concern about impacts on nonendangered wildlife species is noted. Section 3.4, “Biological Resources,” of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS acknowledges that construction activities would affect both common and special-status wildlife species by the same mechanisms: (1) human disturbance (i.e., the sounds and motions of construction workers and machinery) that disrupts foraging, nesting attempts, or other wildlife use of the study area and concurrently causes physiological stress, energetic costs, and increased risk of predation; and (2) damage and removal of vegetation by clearing and grubbing, stockpiling of materials and soil, off-road operation of vehicles and other machinery, and earthwork that destroys nests or roost sites or harms or kills wildlife. However, as stated in chapter 5, Compliance, Coordination, and Consultation the project will comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MTBA) and complete pre-construction bird surveys in order to avoid direct loss of birds, nests, and eggs. The current list of species protected by the MBTA includes several hundred species, which essentially includes all native birds. Furthermore, construction activities would be temporary, restricted daily from 8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. Monday–Friday, and restricted seasonally to May 1–October 15 (or a more limited period if a limited operation period is necessary to avoid effects to sensitive wildlife).
- The increased area and improved ecosystem functions of SEZ, floodplain, and riparian and wetland communities along the Upper Truckee River under the Preferred Alternative would benefit wildlife communities. This long-term effect would be beneficial.
- As discussed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation, similar to existing conditions on the west side of the marsh and no additional recreation access on the marsh’s east side. .
- I51-15 The commenters’ request to avoid the lodgepole pine and protect the area near River Station (RS) 1700 is noted.
- Environmental Commitment 5, “Prepare and Implement Effective Construction Site Management Plans to Minimize Risks of Water Quality Degradation and Impacts to Vegetation,” includes tree protection measures.
- I51-16 The commenters support diverting the present low-water channel at RS 1700.

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

I51-17

The commenters' support for Alternative 3 is noted.

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

April 24, 2013

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

Subject: Additional Comments on Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project (Project) – Addendum to our Comment Letter of April 8, 2013

Reference: DRAFT Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Statement, “Upper Truckee River and Marsh Restoration Project” SCH# 2007032099, February 2013 (Report)

Notes: Terminology introduced in the Report (reference above) will be used here without further explanation.

Please withhold my home address from public disclosure to the extent allowed by law

Scott and whom it may concern:

As noted in our first comment letter

- My wife and I are full time residents and owners of a home on California Avenue, in the Tahoe Island Park 4 subdivision. Our home is on the west side of the Upper Truckee River, directly facing the river near RS 1700. Our home is one of the closest residences, if not the closest, to the river in the Project Study Area.
- We are strong supporters of the Project purpose and objectives stated in the Report. As with our earlier comments, we are submitting the following additional comments as constructive suggestions in the hopes of assisting you to develop a project that will achieve the stated purpose and objectives of the Project with minimal undesirable impacts.

I52-1

The present letter contains additional comments adding to those provided in our initial joint comment letter dated April 8, 2013. All comments in the initial letter still stand. The topic numbering here continues that used in the initial letter (i.e., does not restart at 1).

We are submitting these additional comments by email on April 26, 2013, pursuant to your email of 4/4/2013 stating that since the NEPA comment period does not end until April 26, 2013, you will honor any comments received until 4/26/2013.

Topic 3: Miscellaneous Issues (Fire, Wildlife, Key Features, RS 1400 diversion point, and following additions)

Background: the following issues are of concern to us and do not appear to be adequately addressed in the Report.

Issues and Solutions:

5. Signage at boat launch and take out locations: if the Project installs boat take outs or launches, it is effectively endorsing and encouraging watercraft use on the river. Consequently, it has an obligation to control the behavior of these parties or at least inform them of the relevant ordinances. At present, there are no restrooms along the river and no signage to that effect, or about respect for nearby residents, at the present informal launch points. As a result many of the rafters are extremely noisy and a considerable number urinate on the river banks, in plain sight of residences. This impact is not adequately identified, analyzed, or mitigated in the Plans in the Report. Please put in restrooms and trash receptacles and/or signage regarding noise, littering, and public urination.
6. Inadequate accounting for impact to individual city residents: This project is mainly or totally within a developed city, the city of South Lake Tahoe (CSLT). Consequently there may be project or construction impacts to single individuals that are of enormous consequence to the individual whose home is near what is reasonably expected to be a peaceful and protected setting. Examples include, but are not limited to construction noise, dust, and other effects, short and long term changes in character, aesthetic quality, and usefulness of home and yard, similar changes to nearby undeveloped and protected properties and terrain, etc. The Report does not appear to recognize or adequately analyze such impacts to residents. Apparently, on the scale used in the Report, such effects may be classified as LTS (Less Than Significant), either because they are short term (a few years) or because the detrimental effect is to only a few members of a non-endangered species (people, specifically local residents and their homes). Impacts to such directly effected residents should be analyzed and weighted differently than was done in the Report. Impacts to single individuals who have no recourse to avoid the impacts because they reside in the Study Area, and for whom the impacts are highly significant, should be weighted at least as heavily significant impact to individual members of an endangered species. The Report does not adequately recognize or analyze impact to individual residents, and it should, ethically and legally. Many of the effects analyzed as LTS in the Report would be catastrophic to individuals, and should be so identified and should be mitigated.
7. Effect of Seismically Generated Waves not adequately assessed: The Report primarily or solely addresses the effects of such waves on Project infrastructure improvements and on people and structures in the study area. It does not address the potential effects on existing nearby residences and other personal or public improvements, and it does not distinguish between the alternatives with respect to such effects. The impact analysis should address this issue and distinguish between the alternatives, both short and long term.
8. Preservation of existing or future "small" paths: Some local residents enjoy their experiences in the study area to be quiet and away from "infrastructure" and other such improvements. The recreation plan does not adequately address or allow for this activity. Please ensure that some unimproved, quiet, small, peaceful paths (footpaths) in some of the more remote parts of the study area are included, or at least tolerated, in the Plan.

152-2

152-3

152-4

152-5

access points and 2) primarily east side internal haul routes to access work areas from these two main access points.

152-9
cont.

- The recreation features of Alternative 3 should include a small or informal bike trail segment connecting Hidden Woods to Al Tahoe

152-10

With these modifications we feel Alternative 3, which we call Alternative 3 - Split Channel, would provide all the advantages of Alternative 3 described in the Report, and also would

- a. Be technically feasible and comparable in construction cost to the unmodified alternative
- b. Provide additional flood protection to our TIP4 neighborhood, not provided by the present Alternative 3, via the supplemental high water shallow overflow channel starting at RS 1700
- c. Be more compatible with the CSLT storm water management plans for the TIP4 neighborhood, which may require drainage ditches from Washington and Colorado Streets to the river channel
- d. Avoid all the negative impacts and concerns of private property owners in the upper reaches of the study area such as ourselves, the Dunlap Ranch owners, and out TIP4 neighbors
- e. Establish the most natural wetlands closest in spirit to the original condition of the marsh

152-11

We think this modified version of Alternative 3 is well balanced and would make a highly beneficial project. It is our most preferred alternative.

Respectfully submitted,

John T. Rosenberg (Tom)

Catherine M. Rosenberg (Cass)

- I52-1 The commenters state that the letter provides additional comments to the previous letters submitted on April 8, 2013.
- This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.
- I52-2 The commenters' concern about boat launches, increases in boaters, and the ability of the Conservancy to enforce ordinances is noted. Given the sensitive nature of the marsh, restrooms were not considered as part of the project. As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, the Preferred Alternative is proposing moderate recreation on the west side of the marsh and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side.
- The Preferred Alternative includes posting of signs educating users regarding trail etiquette and trespass issues; increased monitoring to reduce litter, trespass, or other problems associated with trail access parking; and increased use of fencing to better direct users to access points. Also, the Conservancy funds the Tahoe Resource Conservation District to contract with the Clean Tahoe Program for trash removal services, including weekly inspection and maintenance of 12 garbage cans located throughout the property. In addition, the Preferred Alternative would include installation of additional signage in appropriate locations throughout the site and near sensitive habitats to discourage disturbance of those areas by people and pets.
- 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.
- I52-3 The commenters' concern that the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS does not evaluate impacts on individual residents during construction is noted. See Section 3.1.2, "Traffic, Access, and Staging," and Section 3.1.3, "Construction Noise," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of construction-related impacts.
- I52-4 The commenters are concerned that the effects of seismically generated waves are not adequately addressed relative to the surrounding residences or other personal or public improvements.
- As discussed in Section 3.8.1 in Section 3.8, "Hydrology and Flooding," of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS/EIS, recent investigations of tectonic and seismic conditions in the Lake Tahoe region indicate the potential for earthquakes from three active normal faults of the magnitude that could produce waves on Lake Tahoe on the order of 10–30 feet. Earthquakes in the Lake Tahoe region shift fault blocks vertically, causing shoreline subsidence and subsequent inundation (Ichinose et al. 2000; Seitz 2014). The likelihood of such an event has been estimated to be between 10 and 12 percent (NESC 2007). None of the action alternatives would change the likelihood of a seismic event occurring or probability of tsunami or seiche waves resulting.
- As discussed in Section 3.8, certain action alternatives include recreation infrastructure and/or restoration features that could be damaged by wave action or overrun. The Preferred Alternative does not include vulnerable recreation infrastructure along and parallel to the shoreline as in Alternative 1. Final design of any structural elements of the Preferred Alternative (e.g., grade control structures, lagoon bulkhead) would meet standard engineering criteria for seismic stability. The recreational infrastructure under the Preferred Alternative would be concentrated in

a portion of the study area that already has urban development and similar recreational facilities, including residential housing and a marina, and would not introduce new influences on the potential risk of seismically generated waves or their pathways. The project would not modify the topography of the floodplain or channels in ways that could substantially modify the probability, magnitude, or routing of a seismically generated wave from the lake relative to the neighborhoods surrounding the project boundary.

I52-5 The commenters' opinion that small paths should be preserved 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 and no additional recreation access on the marsh's east side. Public access to the east side of the marsh would continue to be afforded through the current informal user-created trail system.

I52-6 The commenters' opposition to large paths is noted.

See response to Comment I52-5 above.

I52-7 The commenters' statement that the description of the project alternatives is vague is noted. The commenters state that because features and elements in an alternative may be interchanged among alternatives in selecting the preferred alternative, the preferred alternative will have a very different impact than any of the alternatives as described and analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

The Draft EIR/EIS/EIS adequately describes and analyzes the Project Alternatives, providing the public an informed opportunity to comment on the proposed improvements. By presenting and evaluating all of the possible actions within the environmental documents, we have fully disclosed the impacts that could occur if all actions were taken. There would not be additional adverse effects relative to baseline if some or all of the features on private land did not occur. The nature and severity of the impacts analyzed in the environmental document adequately encompass potential impacts of the recommended alternative. See response to Comment AO8-2 for a discussion of the selection of the Preferred Alternative, and Appendix D of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for additional responses to this comment.

I52-8 The commenters support a modified Alternative 3. Specifically, the commenters would prefer that the existing low-water channel be partially filled, not entirely filled, and that a new shallow-connection channel be created from RS 3100 that would link to the new pilot channel.

As discussed in Chapter 2, "Project Description," of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS, Alternative 3 is the recommended restoration approach under the Preferred Alternative. See Section 2.1, "Selecting a Preferred Alternative," of the Final EIR/EIS/EIS for a description of the approach to selecting recreation and restoration components of the Preferred Alternative.

The restoration element of the Preferred Alternative (described in Chapter 2 and illustrated in the schematic plans in Appendix A) is based on Alternative 3; however, modified to place the pilot channel on State-owned lands (near RS 32+00). The partial backfill of the existing oversized channel has been iteratively determined using the 2D hydraulic model to optimize for restoration of a functional floodplain swale surface while preventing any adverse changes to flooding. (See Section 3.1.1, "Flooding and Flood Hazards," in Chapter 3, "Master Responses," for further discussion of the modeling.)

I52-9 The commenters' suggestions about relocating haul roads and staging areas is noted. The Preferred Alternative would use main arterials to access the study area, such as U.S. Highway 50 (Lake Tahoe Boulevard), Venice Drive, and Tahoe Keys Boulevard. Some activities would

require the use of Silver Dollar Avenue, Silverwood Circle, Rubicon Trail, and Springwood Drive, as well as Lakeview Avenue and Lily Avenue to access the eastern lakeshore area. Staging and the majority of hauling would occur within the study area as shown in Exhibit 2-2 in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS. The Preferred Alternative does not propose construction staging areas or access points on California Avenue and staging on Conservancy parcels in the neighboring communities has been removed to avoid conflicts of use. Haul routes have been selected to occur immediately adjacent to construction areas and access points, and staging areas have been identified, in part, to minimize construction activities and hauling within sensitive habitats.

See Section 3.3.2, “Traffic, Access, and Staging,” in Chapter 3, “Master Responses,” of this Final EIR/EIS/EIS for further discussion of staging areas and access to the study area.

I52-10 The commenters’ suggestion for a small or informal bike trail segment connecting Hidden Woods to Al Tahoe is noted.

The Preferred Alternative does not include additional recreation access on the east side of the marsh. This comment does not raise issues regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the Draft EIR/EIS/EIS.

I52-11 The commenter’s support for a modified version of 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.