

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix F Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

F1 Introduction.....	F-1
Comment Period	F-1
Responses to Comments	F-2
F2 Summary of Comments.....	F-2
F3 Comments from the Public Open House	F-9
Comment: Anderson, Will	F-10
Response: Anderson, Will	F-10
Anderson-1	F-10
Comment: Andrus, Bryan	F-11
Responses: Andrus, Bryan	F-11
Andrus-1	F-11
Andrus-2	F-11
Comment: Bowen, Garry	F-12
Responses: Bowen, Garry	F-12
Bowen -1	F-12
Bowen -2	F-13
Comment: Coleman, Colleen.....	F-14
Response: Coleman, Colleen	F-14
Coleman-1	F-14
Comment: Fairfield, Penny	F-15
Response: Fairfield, Penny	F-15
Fairfield -1	F-15
Comment: Feist, Travis.....	F-16
Response: Feist, Travis	F-16
Feist-1	F-16
Comment: Fong, Curtis.....	F-17
Responses: Fong, Curtis.....	F-17
Fong-1	F-17
Fong-2	F-17
Comment: Friedrich, John	F-18
Response: Friedrich, John.....	F-18
Friedrich-1.....	F-18
Comment: LeRoy, Jon	F-19
Response: LeRoy, Jon.....	F-19
LeRoy-1	F-19
Comment: Lorrie (No Last Name Provided)	F-20
Response: Lorrie (No Last Name Provided).....	F-20
Lorrie-1	F-20
Comment: Marino, Jim	F-21
Responses: Marino, Jim	F-21
Marino-1	F-21
Marino-2	F-21
Comment: Merkow, Josh	F-22
Response: Merkow, Josh	F-22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Merkow-1	F-22
Comment: Muscat, Marissa	F-23
Responses: Muscat, Marissa	F-23
Muscat-1	F-23
Muscat-2	F-23
Comment: Nelson, Charles	F-24
Response: Nelson, Charles.....	F-24
Nelson-1	F-24
Comment: Ottman, Bill.....	F-25
Response: Ottman, Bill	F-25
Ottman-1	F-25
Comment: Rego, Pat	F-26
Response: Rego, Pat.....	F-26
Rego-1	F-26
Comment: Usher, Balin	F-27
Response: Usher, Balin.....	F-27
Usher, B.-1	F-27
Comment: Usher, Dave.....	F-28
Responses: Usher, Dave.....	F-28
Usher, D.-1	F-28
Usher, D.-2.....	F-28
Comment: Wallstrom, Sterling	F-29
Response: Wallstrom, Sterling.....	F-29
Wallstrom-1	F-29
Comment: Whitcomb, Mary Lou.....	F-30
Responses: Whitcomb, Mary Lou.....	F-30
Whitcomb-1	F-30
Comment: Willison, Jaymee.....	F-31
Response: Willison, Jaymee	F-31
Willison-1	F-31
F4 Other Comments Received During the Public Review Period	F-32
Comment: Terri Marceron, U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit.....	F-33
Responses: Terri Marceron, U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit.....	F-34
LTBMU-1	F-34
LTMBU-2	F-34
LTMBU-3	F-34
LTMBU-4	F-34
LTMBU-5	F-34
Comment: Ken Anderson, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sierra District.....	F-35
Responses: Ken Anderson, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sierra District.....	F-41
State Parks-1	F-41
State Parks-2	F-42

TABLE OF CONTENTS

State Parks-3	F-42
State Parks-4	F-43
State Parks-5	F-43
State Parks-6	F-43
State Parks-7	F-43
State Parks-8	F-44
State Parks-9	F-44
State Parks-10	F-44
State Parks-11	F-44
State Parks-12	F-44
State Parks-13	F-44
State Parks-14	F-44
State Parks-15	F-45
State Parks-16	F-45
State Parks-17	F-45
State Parks-18	F-45
State Parks-19	F-45
State Parks-20	F-45
State Parks-21	F-45
State Parks-22	F-45
State Parks-23	F-46
Comment: Robert Erlich, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region	F-47
Responses: Robert Erlich, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region	F-53
LWRQCB-1	F-53
LRWQCB-2	F-53
LRWQCB-3	F-53
LRWQCB-4	F-54
LRWQCB-5	F-54
LRWQCB-6	F-54
LRWQCB-7	F-54
LRWQCB-8	F-54
LRWQCB-9	F-54
LRWQCB-10	F-54
LRWQCB-11	F-55
LRWQCB-12	F-55
LRWQCB-13	F-55
LRWQCB-14	F-55
LRWQCB-15	F-55
LRWQCB-16	F-55
LRWQCB-17	F-55
LRWQCB-18	F-55
LRWQCB-19	F-55
LRWQCB-20	F-56
LRWQCB-21	F-56

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LRWQCB-22	F-56
LRWQCB-23	F-56
Comment: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.....	F-57
Responses: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	F-58
TRPA-1	F-58
TRPA-2	F-58
TRPA-3	F-58
TRPA-4	F-58
TRPA-5	F-59
TRPA-6	F-59
TRPA-7	F-59
TRPA-8	F-59
TRPA-9	F-59
TRPA-10	F-59
TRPA-11	F-59
TRPA-12	F-59
TRPA-13	F-60
TRPA-14	F-60
Comment: Christian Svensk, City of South Lake Tahoe Community Development Department.....	F-61
Responses: Christian Svensk, City of South Lake Tahoe Community Development Department.....	F-62
SLT -1	F-62
SLT -2	F-63
SLT -3	F-63
SLT -4	F-63
SLT -5	F-64
SLT -6	F-64
SLT -7	F-64
Comment: Ty Polastri, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition.....	F-65
Response: Ty Polastri, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition	F-66
LTBC-1	F-66

Table of Responses

Anderson-1	F-10
Andrus-1	F-11
Andrus-2	F-11
Bowen -1	F-12
Bowen -2	F-13
Coleman-1	F-14
Fairfield -1	F-15
Feist-1	F-16
Fong-1	F-17
Fong-2	F-17
Friedrich-1	F-18

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LeRoy-1	F-19
Lorrie-1	F-20
LRWQCB-1	F-53
LRWQCB-2	F-53
LRWQCB-3	F-53
LRWQCB-4	F-54
LRWQCB-5	F-54
LRWQCB-6	F-54
LRWQCB-7	F-54
LRWQCB-8	F-54
LRWQCB-9	F-54
LRWQCB-10	F-54
LRWQCB-11	F-55
LRWQCB-12	F-55
LRWQCB-13	F-55
LRWQCB-14	F-55
LRWQCB-15	F-55
LRWQCB-16	F-55
LRWQCB-17	F-55
LRWQCB-18	F-55
LRWQCB-19	F-55
LRWQCB-20	F-56
LRWQCB-21	F-56
LRWQCB-22	F-56
LRWQCB-23	F-56
LTBC-1	F-66
LTBMU-1	F-34
LTMBU-2	F-34
LTMBU-3	F-34
LTMBU-4	F-34
LTMBU-5	F-34
Marino-1	F-21
Marino-2	F-21
Merkow-1	F-22
Muscat-1	F-23
Muscat-2	F-23
Nelson-1	F-24
Ottman-1	F-25
Rego-1	F-26
SLT-1	F-62
SLT-2	F-63
SLT-3	F-63
SLT-4	F-63
SLT-5	F-64
SLT-6	F-64
SLT-7	F-64

TABLE OF CONTENTS

State Parks-1	F-41
State Parks-2	F-42
State Parks-3	F-42
State Parks-4	F-43
State Parks-5	F-43
State Parks-6	F-43
State Parks-7	F-43
State Parks-8	F-44
State Parks-9	F-44
State Parks-10	F-44
State Parks-11	F-44
State Parks-12	F-44
State Parks-13	F-44
State Parks-14	F-44
State Parks-15	F-45
State Parks-16	F-45
State Parks-17	F-45
State Parks-18	F-45
State Parks-19	F-45
State Parks-20	F-45
State Parks-21	F-45
State Parks-22	F-45
State Parks-23	F-46
TRPA-1	F-58
TRPA-2	F-58
TRPA-3	F-58
TRPA-4	F-58
TRPA-5	F-59
TRPA-6	F-59
TRPA-7	F-59
TRPA-8	F-59
TRPA-9	F-59
TRPA-10	F-59
TRPA-11	F-59
TRPA-12	F-59
TRPA-13	F-60
TRPA-14	F-60
Usher, B.-1	F-27
Usher, D.-1	F-28
Usher, D.-2	F-28
Wallstrom-1	F-29
Whitcomb-1	F-30
Willison-1	F-31

F1 INTRODUCTION

Appendix F presents comments received on the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the El Dorado 50 and 89 Water Quality Improvement Projects, and Caltrans' responses to those comments. Any text changes resulting from the comments are summarized in the responses and have been incorporated into the text of this Final Program EIR.

Comment Period

The State Clearinghouse comment period officially began on June 7, 2007, and ended on July 23, 2007. A public open house was held to inform local residents, elected officials, and other interested parties about the proposed Program of water quality improvements on SR 89 and US 50. The public was notified of the comment period and public open house in the following ways:

- A mailer was sent on June 6, 2007, to the property owners of homes and businesses along US 50 and SR 89 within the Program limits.
- A press release describing the meeting was issued.
- Newspaper display advertisements were published in the *Mountain Democrat* and the *Tahoe Daily Tribune* on June 6, 2007. The advertisements included a brief description of the Program, a map of the study area, information on where the Draft Program EIR could be reviewed, and details about the public open house.

Copies of the Draft Program EIR or letters announcing the availability of the document were mailed directly to federal, state, regional, and local agencies and elected officials as well as other interested parties. Copies of the Draft Program EIR were also made available for public review at the following locations:

- South Lake Tahoe Branch of the El Dorado County Public Library, 1000 Rufus Allen Blvd., South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
- Caltrans North Region Office of Environmental Management, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833
- Caltrans District 3 Office, 703 B Street, Marysville, CA 95901

The technical documents that were prepared to support the Draft Program EIR were also available for public review at the Caltrans North Region Office of Environmental Management.

In addition, the Draft Program EIR was made available prior to and throughout the review period on the Caltrans Web site: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist3/departments/envinternet/ed50-89/ed50&89.htm>.

The public open house to discuss the proposed Program and solicit comments on the Draft Program EIR was held on July 12, 2007, at the Bijou Community School, 3501 Spruce Avenue, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 from 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Project staff members were available to answer questions, and displays provided information on the projects and the Program EIR. Comment cards were available and participants were encouraged to provide written comments at the meeting or send them to Caltrans.

Responses to Comments

The comments and responses are organized as follows:

- Section F2, Summary of Comments
- Section F3, Comments from the Public Open House
- Section F4, Other Comments Received During the Public Review Period

F2 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Table F-1 lists the names of the individuals, organizations, and agencies that provided comments on the Draft Program EIR. Each comment is briefly summarized to provide an overview of the nature of the comments, concerns, or issues raised. The actual comment submissions and corresponding responses follow Table F-1.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Table F-1
Summary of Comments Received on the Draft Program EIR

Name	Comment No.	Comment Summary
Comments received at Open House Meeting		
Anderson, Will	1	Requested Class II bike lane on US 50 from Meyers to the “Y,” or, at minimum, enough paved shoulder for safety. Also noted sections of Segments 1 and 2 that should be widened.
Andrus, Bryan	1	Expressed concern for safe, sustainable bike lanes throughout their city (South Lake Tahoe).
Andrus, Bryan	2	Referred to a grant for improvements to city/county bike trails, routes, and lanes.
Andrus, Lorrie	1	Thought purpose of meeting (or project?) was to improve bike lanes, which need improvement.
Bowen, Garry	1	What happened to Caltrans Deputy Directive 64 (Spring 2001)?
Bowen, Garry	2	Satisfying an EPA-directed Supreme Court decision on storm water runoff isn’t enough; let’s demonstrate another form of design.
Coleman, Colleen	1	Requested that Caltrans keep cyclists in their plans where possible.
Fairfield, Penny	1	Safe accommodations and direct routes are necessary for bicyclists and should be part of roadway projects. Rumble strips create unsafe road conditions. Cyclists need more space beyond the fog line to have separation from vehicular traffic.
Feist, Travis	1	Projects should account for bike lanes and coordinating traffic signals on Lake Tahoe Blvd. Addressing these traffic flow issues is related to water quality.
Fong, Curtis	1	On behalf of several bike organizations, requests that Caltrans implement bike lanes as part of all highway improvements on Lake Tahoe roadways including SR 89 and US 50.
Fong, Curtis	2	Requested that storm grates be installed level to roadway surface to allow bicyclists to safely ride over them.
Friedrich, John	1	Requests Class II bike lanes along US 50 through South Lake Tahoe and Meyers to benefit air and water quality and to add a critical component to South Lake Tahoe’s alternative transportation infrastructure.
LeRoy, Jon	1	Requests involvement in public participation in project, particularly for Segment 5 (Meeks Bay to Sugar Pine Point); possible inclusion of multipurpose trail.
Marino, Jim	1	Requested Class II bike lanes or paved shoulders on all highway repavement projects.
Marino, Jim	2	Pave shoulders and convey water via AC dike to treatment areas. Minimize shoulder sediment transport. Recess thermoplastic striping to minimize multiple restriping due to snow removal.
Merkow, Josh	1	Requested that bike paths be constructed along all roads around Tahoe Basin.
Muscat, Marissa	1	Request roadway widening for more bike paths to decrease automotive vehicular traffic.
Muscat, Marissa	2	Appreciates swales and erosion/runoff control measures.
Nelson, Charles	1	Consistent with the Governor’s campaign and proposed legislation, state highways in the Tahoe Basin should address and accommodate the needs of all users, including other non-automotive modes of transportation. Concerned that Phase 2 and Phase 3 plans for US 50 in South Lake Tahoe area reportedly do not provide for highway users other than motor vehicles.
Ottman, Bill	1	Requested status report on Segments 1, 2, and 3 outlining specific plans and time scheduling and the planned routes.
Rego, Pat	1	Suggested better maintenance of roads to reduce the number of flat tires that bicyclists get.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Table F-1
Summary of Comments Received on the Draft Program EIR

Name	Comment No.	Comment Summary
Usher, Balin (note: NOT Osher)	1	Supports Class II bike lanes and encourages better linkage between existing bike paths to increase bike and pedestrian safety and traffic congestion; notes benefits to tourism.
Usher, Dave	1	Requested that traction sand traps be installed safely outside of bike/pedestrian paths.
Usher, Dave	2	Supports Class II bike lanes and encourages better linkage between existing bike paths to increase bike and pedestrian safety.
Wallstrom, Sterling	1	Roadway projects around Lake Tahoe must include bike lanes, as automobiles are a major source of water quality impacts that affect the lake's clarity. Sustainable forms of transportation must be promoted at all levels of government.
Whitcomb, Mary Lou	1	Having safe bike trails/lanes on US 50 from Stateline to the "Y" and along SR 89 to Meyers is imperative. Bike trails address many policy concerns expressed by community leaders and politicians. It is false savings to omit bike lanes from highway projects.
Willison, Jaymee	1	Interested in Project 43601
Written Comments Submitted During the Public Comment Period		
City of South Lake Tahoe	1	Significant portions of the project are within the City of South Lake Tahoe, and with its discretionary approval is a Responsible Agency.
City of South Lake Tahoe	2	The Draft Program EIR does not discuss the Program's consistency with the city's redevelopment policies and city-specific TRPA plan areas. The Program would affect two parcels that are part of a future Redevelopment Agency/City project and will significantly impact the efficacy of the future project, the environmental benefits of which outweigh those of the proposed Program. All parcels should be evaluated based on future development and use.
City of South Lake Tahoe	3	The Draft Program EIR lacks adequate documentation about parcels that could be affected by the Program and should include APNs and maps of all parcels. Two parcels along US 50 may be owned by the Redevelopment Agency and are part of the Triangle Project Area.
City of South Lake Tahoe	4	The EIR does not address the impact of using the Triangle Project Area parcels or the other 206 parcels that would be affected by the Program, which would provide fewer environmental benefits than redevelopment.
City of South Lake Tahoe	5	Table 3.12-1 omits three projects outlined in the Five Year Implementation Plan (2/15/05).
City of South Lake Tahoe	6	Program design and landscaping must be consistent with city design standards and will need design review from the city.
City of South Lake Tahoe	7	Encroachment permits are required for work in city right-of-way.
LTMBU	1	Clarify Section 2.3.1 to reflect that projects that affect National Forest lands must comply with NEPA regardless of funding source.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Table F-1
Summary of Comments Received on the Draft Program EIR

Name	Comment No.	Comment Summary
LTMBU	2	Section 2.3.2: Forest Service does not issue Encroachment Permits. An easement and/or Special Use Permit may be required.
LTMBU	3	Section 3.1.2 does not include Forest Service land use and planning, which is outlined in the LTBMU Land and Resource Management Plan.
LTMBU	4	Section 3.3.2 does not include LTBMU Land and Resource Management Plan visual quality objectives to apply to activities on National Forest lands.
LTMBU	5	Section 3.6 does not include National Historic Preservation Act - Section 106 compliance for activities on National Forest lands.
State Parks	1	The Program will likely affect many State Parks properties and will need specific mitigation in accordance with State Parks requirements, which is not considered or included in the EIR. Caltrans should quantify impact areas, either in the EIR or subsequent documents, so State Parks can develop mitigation.
State Parks	2	The EIR should specify what further environmental documents will be prepared for the Program. If Categorical Exemptions are planned, all required mitigation should be included in the EIR.
State Parks	3	State Parks cannot permit the proposed facilities on its land unless a joint mitigation plan is developed and signed by State Parks and Caltrans.
State Parks	4	Off-site mitigation will be required to fully mitigate for Program impacts to State Parks lands. As part of off-site mitigation, Caltrans should construct specified facilities at the Tahoe State Recreation Area.
State Parks	5	P. S-2: State Parks will require prior approval for cutting trees, approval of planting list, and off-site mitigation for visual impacts.
State Parks	6	P. S-5: Off-site mitigation is required for loss of natural resources on State Parks lands.
State Parks	7	P. S-8 + Section 4.2: The EIR does not address the visual impact of Program facilities, which cannot be fully mitigated and will require off-site mitigation.
State Parks	8	P. S-10: State Parks will require a Mitigation Plan per Comment 4.
State Parks	9	P. 1-2: Are Segment 1 and 2 facilities along the Lake Tahoe Golf Course?
State Parks	10	P. 2-2: State Parks requires prior approval of tree removal. Before it can issue an Encroachment Permit, a jointly signed mitigation plan is required. Before those two things can happen, Caltrans must identify the number and area of specific project facilities and provide design drawings of each one.
State Parks	11	P. 2-4: Utilities may not be relocated further onto State Parks property. If required, each utility relocation impact must be disclosed in the EIR and fully mitigated.
State Parks	12	P. 2-5: See Comment 4.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Table F-1
Summary of Comments Received on the Draft Program EIR

Name	Comment No.	Comment Summary
State Parks	13	P. 3.1-11: The Program EIR lists the Lake Valley State Recreation Area and therefore State Parks assumes facilities are proposed on the Lake Tahoe Golf Course. Be aware that an El Dorado County bike path project and a SW Gas utility line project are proposed in the vicinity.
State Parks	14	P. 3.1-14: See Comment 4.
State Parks	15	P. 3.1-15: The impacts discussion fails to discuss permanent loss of resources due to the Program. See Comments 4 and 5.
State Parks	16	P. 3.1-22: The EIR does not acknowledge the permanent loss of recreational land use from the Program. See Comment 7.
State Parks	17	P. 3.2-11: See Comment 10 (+ easement).
State Parks	18	P. 3.2-15: State Parks requests no staging of Program equipment or materials on its property.
State Parks	19	P. 3.3-1: The EIR does not acknowledge the permanent loss of visual quality where Program facilities are constructed.
State Parks	20	P. 3.3-25: Widening shoulders and paving turnouts will result in permanent loss of natural forest ground and push dirt shoulders onto State Parks property. These impacts should be evaluated and off-site mitigation provided.
State Parks	21	P. 3.3-29: Add the following mitigation measures: jointly signed mitigation plan; prior approval for plant list for revegetation; no equipment stockpiling or staging on State Parks property; leave existing narrow vegetative buffer strips in place on State Parks property; replace State Parks signage affected by the Program to the satisfaction of State Parks.
State Parks	22	P. 3.7-7: Indicate on maps where pullouts are to be paved.
State Parks	23	Appendix C: Aesthetics (b) and (c) should be checked as Potentially Significant.
LRWQCB	1	The EIR should consider other viable Program alternatives that employ a wider range of BMPs and best available technology. The preferred alternative may not comply with NPDES permit requirements, resulting in a violation that necessitates additional projects.
LRWQCB	2	Caltrans should consider using new technology or treatment BMPs that provide more water quality benefits even if they are not Caltrans-approved and/or mentioned in the EIR. The EIR should specify that other alternatives that provide water quality benefits will be evaluated for individual project elements.
LRWQCB	3	Caltrans should consider alternatives that (3a) install additional control and treatment BMPs; (3b) that consider maintenance needs and costs; (3b) focus improvements at locations with the greatest opportunity to reduce pollutant loading; and/or (3d) provide more water quality treatment by using other BAT measures.
LRWQCB	4	Caltrans has limited the Program to using Caltrans-approved BMPs. If the Program doesn't meet water quality requirements, additional projects may be needed, with additional impacts.
LRWQCB	5	The EIR doesn't discuss Caltrans' coordination with other agencies to minimize vector control risks associated with Program facilities that have stagnant water.
LRWQCB	6	Inadequate funding for maintenance or selection of BMPs is provided based on the assumption that increases in maintenance funding are not feasible. (See Comment 3.)

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Table F-1
Summary of Comments Received on the Draft Program EIR

Name	Comment No.	Comment Summary
LRWQCB	7	Table S-1: Land Use/Community Impacts. Discuss post-construction traffic impacts related to Program facility maintenance, and consider mitigation in the form of maintenance turnouts.
LRWQCB	8	Table S-1: Water Quality. Avoidance column should mention temporary BMPs for dewatering, diversion, or other impacts from shoulder widening or cuts.
LRWQCB	9	Table S-1: Wetlands and Natural Environment. Impact areas for wetlands, other waters, and SEZs should be increased if needed for wider range of water quality improvements.
LRWQCB	10	Table S-1: Geology. Other improvements such as large vaults, cut slopes, fill slopes, and brow ditches may also have impacts.
LRWQCB	11	Section S.4.3. Some wetland impacts could be avoided by using nonapproved BMPs or BATs.
LRWQCB	12	Section S.4.4. Mitigation for SEZ impacts should consider Water Board as well as TRPA policy.
LRWQCB	13	Section 1.4.3. This should also discuss the need to comply with Tahoe Construction NPDES General Permit or Waste Discharge Requirements for Construction of Small Projects in Lake Tahoe Basin for projects less than 1 acre in size.
LRWQCB	14	Section 2.1 does not mention new cut or fill slopes and indicates retaining walls as the only improvement for shoulder widening. Sheet flow should be used wherever feasible. Appendix A maps should include sheet flow spreading areas on public and private lands.
LRWQCB	15	Section 2.1 should refer to the 2005 or most current Storm Water Quality Handbook, which contains several additional approved BMPs, and should include all approved treatment BMPs.
LRWQCB	16	Section 2.1 should refer to storm water pilots such as media filters used on the US 50 airport project.
LRWQCB	17	Section 3.2.1.3. Discussion of impacts to 303(d) waters should mention Lake Tahoe as impaired by sediment and nutrients. Road sand from Caltrans operations and highway runoff including nitrogen and phosphorus are recognized sources of lake pollution.
LRWQCB	18	Table 3.2-1. Eliminate reference to Willow Creek in Herlong HA.
LRWQCB	19	Section 3.2.2.2/State. Refer to Non-Degradation Objective, update reference to LTHU General Construction Permit, and add reference to Board Order No. 6-91-31 (see Comment 13).
LRWQCB	20	Section 3.5.4.6. Differentiate between impacts from clear water diversions and from dewatering in excavations, which may not require disposal to a temporary sediment-settling basin. Discuss other temporary BMPs.
LRWQCB	21	Section 3.10.3.1. Groundwater seepage does occur seasonally at existing road cuts, and additional seepage should be expected. Seepage can carry sediment to surface waters.
LRWQCB	22	Appendix B. Update 2003 field review information in EIR if possible to identify other locations for treatment BMPs.
LRWQCB	23	Appendix C. Potential significant impacts to wetlands and riparian communities were identified but not mentioned in mandatory finding of significance.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Table F-1
Summary of Comments Received on the Draft Program EIR

Name	Comment No.	Comment Summary
LRWQCB	24	Appendix C, Hydrology and Water Quality. The Program, during and after construction, may violate water quality standards if effective treatment BMPs are not installed and maintained.
TRPA	1	P. S-1. Delete EIP #794; insert EIP #s 9, 551.2, 608, 708, 749, 795, 809, 822, 874, 993, 995, 1012; add TRPA approval for water quality treatment.
TRPA	2	Section S.2. Add bike lanes and scenic to list of improvements.
TRPA	3	P. S-6. Add any outstanding noise ordinance issues under "Noise." CNEL noise levels attainment status.
TRPA	4	Section S.4.1. Add potential for improving LOS through areas.
TRPA	5	Section S.4.2. Mitigation for all manmade structures should incorporate native rock. Delete "If consistent with maintenance and drainage needs,".
TRPA	6	P. 1-6. Delete EIP #794; insert EIP #s 9, 551.2, 608, 708, 749, 795, 809, 822, 874, 993, 995, 1012; does the water quality language include the recently adopted BMPs?
TRPA	7	P. 2-1. Add install Class II and III bike lanes where feasible; add correct previous project violation throughout project area; add minimize all driveways.
TRPA	8	Section 2.1.3. Make sure bike lanes are accounted for in the number of parcels needing right-of-way acquisition.
TRPA	9	P. 3.1-10. Double check future traffic estimates. Caltrans is indicating a traffic increase in 2008 and TRPA is indicating reductions.
TRPA	10	P. 3.1-11. Discuss how bike lane was converted to shoulder parking through Meyers and water quality improvements were deleted and new coverage was added.
TRPA	11	Section 3.1.1.7. Discuss other bike lanes: Pat Low bike lane needs to be restored through portions of Meyers; SR 89 over Luther Pass is heavily used by bicyclists; bike lane on US 50 from Meyers to the "Y" is needed.
TRPA	12	P. 3.1-15/CEQA Considerations: Change "... all segments along the two highways affected by the program would be the same as they were prior to construction in terms of flow and access to existing parcels." Improved bike lanes will provide additional access.
TRPA	13	P. 3.1-16/Community Cohesion: State that these projects will improve cohesion by correcting current project violations and implementing EIP projects, which are included in community plans, in conjunction with the proposed projects.
TRPA	14	P. 3.1-17/Property Acquisition. Ensure that property acquisitions address any necessary right-of-way for all water quality treatment, bike, and pedestrian facilities.
Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition (Ty Polastri)		Caltrans should provide Class II bike lanes throughout the City of South Lake Tahoe as part of the proposed project. To not do so would be a loss and future detriment to the community, and it would be decades before there is another opportunity to add bike lanes. The Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition insists that Caltrans fulfill its promise to add Class II bike lanes on US 50.

F3 COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE

Comments received during the public open house are presented in alphabetical order by the commenters' last names. Individual issues within each comment are numbered. Responses are labeled by the commenter name plus the comment number and are presented below each comment card. The Table of Contents of this appendix includes an alphabetical Table of Responses.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Anderson, Will

2	<p>State of California Department of Transportation PUBLIC COMMENT CARD</p>	 <p>TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT Thursday, June 12, 2007 Bijou Community School 3501 Spruce Street South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150</p>
	<p>Name: <u>Will Anderson</u></p>	
	<p>Address: <u>P.O.Box 550842, So. Lake Tahoe 96155</u></p>	
1	<p>Comment: <u>First priority is Class 2 bike lane on U.S. 50</u> <u>Meyers to the "Y." Or just enough PAVED</u> <u>SHOULDER for increased safety. Currently most dangerous</u> <u>segment is Airport north to where it widens to four lanes. This is</u> <u>under the domain of Project #8 mile 73.7-75.4 (segment 2).</u> <u>Also segment 1 from Meyers North (Project 7) to Airport - please include</u> <u>widened shoulder.</u></p>	
	<p>Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to: <u>Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans - District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.</u></p>	

Response: Anderson, Will

Anderson-1

Many commenters at the public open house expressed concerns about safe bicycle facilities on the state highways and local roads. In general, these comments noted that existing roadways do not provide enough room for bicyclists, and Caltrans projects should use the opportunity to widen shoulders or otherwise provide or accommodate bicycle facilities.

The proposed Program evaluated in the Draft Program EIR will involve construction work on specific segments of SR 89 and US 50 to improve storm water runoff quality. As part of Program construction, the paved shoulders on some segments of SR 89 and US 50 may be widened to accommodate drainage facilities. However, the widening will not be completed throughout the study area to the extent that continuous bicycle lanes or paths could be designated.

The proposed Program will not preclude the future installation of bicycle facilities. However, the funding to purchase the necessary right-of-way and construct continuous bicycle lanes or paths has not been included or authorized as part of this Program. The priority for this Program is to comply with regulatory requirements for improving highway runoff water quality within the Program limits.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Andrus, Bryan

State of California Department of Transportation PUBLIC COMMENT CARD	 TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT Thursday, June 12, 2007 Bijou Community School 3501 Spruce Street South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
Name: <u>Bryan Andrus</u>	
Address: <u>1934 Linda Ave S.L.T. Ca. 96150</u>	
1	Comment: <u>We came as a family to voice our concern for safe sustainable bike lanes throughout our city. We are aware of a grant which is suppose</u>
2	<u>to allow improvements to our city/county bicycle trails, routes, lanes. Also for our children</u>
Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to: Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans –District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.	

Responses: Andrus, Bryan

Andrus-1

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Andrus-2

This comment does not state which grant it refers to. Various grants and funding sources are available for bicycle or trail funding, but these grants and improvements are separate from and independent of the Caltrans Program to improve the quality of storm water runoff from the state highway system.

The California Tahoe Conservancy has authorized grants or other expenditures for trails and bikeways in the Lake Tahoe area. Since 1985, the Conservancy has authorized the expenditure of \$22.9 million to carry out 35 public access and recreation projects in the Tahoe Basin, some funded directly and some through grants to other agencies. More than 355 acres of land has been acquired for recreation and public access.

In the Program vicinity, the Conservancy, LTBMU, and TRPA are conducting environmental studies for the proposed South Tahoe Greenway Multi-Use Trail, which would link Meyers to Stateline. The trail would generally follow the former Caltrans US 50 Bypass Corridor, which roughly parallels US 50 to the east.

In addition, the Recreational Trails Program provides grants and other funding for recreational trails and trails-related projects. The program is administered at the federal level by the Federal

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Highway Administration (FHWA) and at the state level by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks). Nonmotorized projects are administered by State Parks' Office of Grants and Local Services, and motorized projects are administered by its Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division.

In 2003, the City of South Lake Tahoe received about \$47,000 of funding under the Recreational Trails Program through Proposition 40 for unspecified future projects.

Comment: Bowen, Garry



State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD

TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: GARRY BOWEN

Address: SOUTH LAKE TAHOE - NATIVE

Comment: _____

1 [WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO CALTRANS DEPUTY DIRECTIVE 64 (spring 2001?)]

2 [SATISFYING AN E-PA-DIRECTED SUPREME COURT DECISION ON STORMWATER W/NOFF IS NOT ENOUGH - LET'S DEMONSTRATE ANOTHER FORM OF DESIGN. . .]

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans -District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Responses: Bowen, Garry

Bowen -1

Deputy Directive DD-64, "Accommodating Non-Motorized Travel," became effective on March 26, 2001. The directive established the policy that Caltrans fully consider the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, and other nonmotorized travelers; incorporate the best available standards in all Caltrans practices; and adopt the best practice concepts in the U.S. Department of Transportation Policy Statement on Integrating Bicycling and Walking into Transportation Infrastructure. Deputy Directive DD-64 also assigns specific responsibilities for implementing the policy to Caltrans deputy directors, district directors, and division chiefs.

The directive states in its "Definition/Background" section that the planning and project development process should seek to provide Californians with a degree of mobility that is in balance with other values. In doing so, Caltrans must consider issues including attainment of

Appendix F

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

community goals and objectives, and elimination or minimization of adverse effects on the environment, natural resources, public services, aesthetic features and the community.

In planning the proposed Program, Caltrans balanced the primary purpose of improving runoff water quality on the project segments with minimizing potential Program-related environmental effects. To do so required complying with applicable laws, regulations, and local and regional plans designed to preserve the natural environment and visual character of the area. This included designing Program features to avoid removing trees, encroaching on wetlands and stream environment zones, visually contrasting with the surrounding environment, and creating additional sources of erosion from new areas of cut and fill. Throughout the approximately 35 linear miles that fall within the eight project segments, new or improved drainage features were located in areas that would result in the fewest effects to the environment and would most effectively serve the primary purpose of the Program.

Within the 35 linear miles of Program limits are areas with existing bicycle trails or paths. Some limited portions of the highways may have sufficient shoulder space to accommodate potential bicycle trails or paths but they are not continuous, as needed to allow designation of a bicycle facility. Other areas have minimal shoulder space and physical constraints along the roadway that prevent widening without substantial roadway cross-section reconstruction. Extensive reconstruction would be needed to provide a continuous paved shoulder or path that meets bicycle facility standards. Addition of bicycle trails or paths is not planned or funded as part of this Program, and the reconstruction of slopes, retaining walls, culvert crossings, and bridges that would be required are not related to the primary objective and mandatory requirement of improving the quality of runoff from the state highways within the Program area. The improvements made as part of this Program are compatible with and would not interfere with separate future bicycle facility improvement projects, when they are funded and advanced for construction.

The projects proposed in this Program EIR would not preclude the implementation of projects for nonmotorized travel, which would not be constructed until after the 2008 deadline for water quality improvements imposed by the Caltrans Statewide NPDES permit. Caltrans is required to comply with the Statewide NPDES permit as well as TRPA environmental thresholds for water quality designated in the EIP. For that reason, the project purpose outlined in Section 1.3 is limited in scope to water quality improvements.

Bowen -2

See the Response to Comments Anderson-1 and Bowen-1.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Fairfield, Penny

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD



TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: Penny Fairfield

Address: 2601 Alma Ave, S&T

1. Comment: Bicycles provide a mode of transportation. Safe accommodation, direct routes etc are necessary. Now is the time include lanes, paths etc when roadways are being widened, repaired, re-striped. We all know the benefits of a bicycle-friendly communities. It's time to deliver the means of attaining the benefits. better health, reduced pollution, congestion, etc friendly

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans - District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863. over

(See other side)

1, Cont. {

tourism -

→ Rumble strips - create unsafe road surfaces -

→ We need more space beyond the fog line to have separation from vehicles - traffic.

→ I support and subscribe to the ideas and suggestions of the Lake Tahoe Coalition -

lets make it happen! South Lake Tahoe, CA can be a model community.

Response: Fairfield, Penny

Fairfield -1

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Feist, Travis

74

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD


TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: TRAVIS FEIST

Address: 3044 SOUTHBROUGH TRAIL SGT, CA 96150

1 Comment: VERY GLAD TO SEE PROJECTS, BUT VERY DISAPPOINTED
NOT TO SEE ANY INFO ON BIKE LINES, OR ON
CO-ORDINATING TRAFFIC SIGNALS ON LAKE TAHOE BLVD.
ADDRESSING THESE TRAFFIC FLOW ISSUES IS RELATED
TO WATER QUALITY!

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans –District 3, 2800
Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Feist, Travis

Feist-1

The proposed Program does not include bicycle facilities or traffic signalization, but also does not affect independent implementation, either existing or planned, of these transportation facilities.

The Program will improve the quality of runoff from the state highways within the Program limits. It is assumed that this comment refers to additional improvements to water quality that might be achieved by improving traffic flow and congestion (and potentially reducing vehicle emissions and associated deposition of pollutants). While improved traffic flow can indirectly lead to incrementally lower pollutant deposition in water runoff, traffic flow improvement is not a purpose of this Program. This Program focuses on the direct removal of pollutants from roadway runoff, based on studies and pilot programs that support the effectiveness of the proposed features in achieving the objectives of water quality improvement. Improved traffic flow is not an approved Best Management Practice (BMP) that can be implemented for this Program.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Fong, Curtis

6

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD



TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT

REP: ALTA ALPINE CYCLING CLUB
LEAGUE OF AMERICAN BICYCLIST
LAKE TAHOE BICYCLE COALITION
TGET PRODUCTIONS/BIKE THE WEST

Name: CURTIS FONG/

Address: P.O. BOX 5123, STATELINE, NV 89449

Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Comment: REPRESENTING A VARIETY OF BICYCLING ORGANIZATIONS, I AM REQUESTING THAT CALTRANS PLANS, DESIGNS AND EXECUTES BIKE LANES WITH ALL HWY IMPROVEMENTS FOR ROADWAYS AROUND LAKE TAHOE. TO INCLUDE HWY 50, HWY 89 & HWY 28. ALSO REQUESTING THAT ANY CONSTRUCTION OF STORM GRATES BE DESIGNED PROPERLY TO ALLOW BICYCLISTS TO RIDE OVER/AROUND THESE SAFELY-- LEVEL TO THE ROADWAY SURFACE.

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans -District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Responses: Fong, Curtis

Fong-1

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Fong-2

Bicycle-proof grates will be installed flush with the roadway surface, in accordance with Caltrans design standards.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Friedrich, John

2)

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD

TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: John Friedrich

Address: 986 Washoan Blvd., South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

1 [Comment: Please build class 2 bike trails along the length of Hwy 50 through South Lake Tahoe + Meyers. This would be a real air+water quality benefit to the Tahoe, and would add a critical component to S Lake Tahoe's alternative transportation infrastructure.

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to: Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans -District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Friedrich, John

Friedrich-1

See the Responses to Comments Anderson-1 and Feist-1.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: LeRoy, Jon

19


TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD

Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: JON LEROY

Address: 221 FAIRWAY DR, TAHOE CITY PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT
P.O. BOX 5249, TAHOE CITY, CA. 96145

1 Comment: WE WOULD APPRECIATE INVOLVEMENT AS PROJECT
PROGRESSES PARTICULARLY RELATING TO SEGMENT 5 FROM
MILLS BAT - SUGAR PINE POINT. POSSIBLE CO-OP/INCLUSION
OF MULTI-PURPOSE TRAIL.

jleroy@tcpud.org

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans -District 3, 2800
Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: LeRoy, Jon

LeRoy-1

The request is noted; the Tahoe City Public Utility District will be included in notifications and mailings for the Segment 5 project.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Lorrie (No Last Name Provided)

13

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD



TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: Lorrie

Address: 934 Linda Ave

Comment: I'm disappointed. I thought
it was about improving the bike lanes
or empty from a person (family) who ride
all the time.

we need improved bike lanes 542-3197

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans -District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Lorrie (No Last Name Provided)

Lorrie-1

The purpose of the public hearing was to inform the public about the proposed Program of water quality improvements on a total of eight segments of US 50 and SR 89.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Marino, Jim

18	 TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT Thursday, June 12, 2007 Bijou Community School 3501 Spruce Street South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
State of California Department of Transportation PUBLIC COMMENT CARD	
Name: <u>Jim Marino</u>	
Address: <u>1151 CREEDAS STREET SOUTH LAKE TAHOE, CA 96150</u>	
1	Comment: <u>WOULD LIKE TO SEE CLASS II BAKE LANSAS OR PAVED SHOULDERS ON ALL HIGHWAY REPAVE PROJECTS - PAVE SHOULDERS</u>
2	<u>CONVEY WATER VIA AC DIKE TO TREATMENT AREAS.</u> <u>MINIMIZE SHOULDER SEDIMENT TRANSPORT.</u> <u>RECESSED THERMOPLASTIC STRIPING TO MINIMIZE MULTIPLE RESTRIPING DUE TO SNOW REMOVAL OPERATIONS.</u>
Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to: Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans -District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.	

Responses: Marino, Jim

Marino-1

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Marino-2

The Program includes installation of asphalt-concrete or PCC dikes and curbs or gutters to convey storm water runoff to treatment facilities, as well as other improvements. Where feasible, some shoulders will be paved. There is a Caltrans Standard Specification for installation of recessed thermoplastic striping in areas of snow removal (SSP #84-055), which will be considered where feasible during the design phase for the individual segments.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Merkow, Josh

7

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD


TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: JOSH MERKOW

Address: POB 17811 SLT, CA 96151

1 [Comment: NEED TO CONSTRUCT BIKE PATHS
ALONG ALL ROADS AROUND TAHOE BASIN

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans –District 3, 2800
Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Merkow, Josh

Merkow-1

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Muscat, Marissa

15

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD



TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: Marissa Muscat

Address: 3044 Sourdough Trail, SLT, 96150

1 [**Comment:** Request Consideration of widening roads for
more bike paths to decrease # of autos on road

2 [for commutes; Appreciate swales & erosion/runoff control
measures

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans –District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Responses: Muscat, Marissa

Muscat-1

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Muscat-2

The comment is noted.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Nelson, Charles

12

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD



TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT

Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: Charles Nelson

Address: P.O. Box 16987, So. Lake Tahoe, CA 96151 chasbikes@sbcglobal.net

Comment: Consistent with Gov. Schwarzenegger's campaign and support for health/anti-obesity programs including Complete Streets and Safe Routes to Schools, state highways in the Lake Tahoe Basin should address the needs of all ^{and accommodate} road users, including bicycles, disabled, children and all other modes of transportation. I am very concerned that the Phase 2 and Phase 3 plans for Hwy 50 improvement projects in South Lake Tahoe reportedly do not include provisions for highway users other than motor vehicles.

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans –District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Nelson, Charles

Nelson-1

The proposed Program would implement water quality improvements and would not affect the planning and funding for completion of any bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

As of May 2008, the Complete Streets Act (California Assembly Bill 1358) referred to in this comment has been moved to the legislative Inactive File. If approved, the Act would require cities and counties to identify accommodation of all users of transportation facilities in their general planning.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Ottman, Bill

16

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD



TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: BILL OTTMAN

Address: 2151 VENICE DR. SO. LAKE TAHOE, CA 96150

Comment: I am a member of the SLT - PARKS & REC. COMMISSION
I would like a status report on segments #1, 2 & 3
outlining specific plans and time scheduling and the proposed
routes. Phone (530) 541-3121
e-mail tahoe@charter.net

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans - District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Ottman, Bill

Ottman-1

As detailed plans are developed for each project segment, Caltrans will communicate with the communities and motorists and conduct outreach activities to alert them about temporary changes related to Program construction. Information will be provided to potentially affected institutions in the local area, such as school districts and local agencies, and, if appropriate, provide for public informational meetings, events, and specific stakeholder coordination to notify the public about construction activities that might affect the community or individual residences.

Caltrans is committed to working with local stakeholders and will ensure that the City of South Lake Tahoe is fully informed regarding the development of segments within, or affecting, the city limits. Caltrans staff members attend regular focus meetings with the City of South Lake Tahoe and TRPA to ensure that all interested parties are kept informed of project progress and evolution.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Rego, Pat

3

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD



TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: Pat Rego

Address: 3330 #1 LET Blvd, SLCCT ca 96150

Comment: Maybe more bikes would
not get so many flats if there
was a maintained road. Teach cars
some e.d.

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans –District 3, 2800
Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Rego, Pat

Rego-1

As discussed in Section 2.1, the proposed Program will include paving some existing pullouts and installing an asphalt-concrete (AC) overlay on the roadway surface. The AC overlay will produce a smoother roadway surface.

Appendix F
Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Usher, Balin

4


TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD

Name: Balin Usher

Address: 4074 Manzanita Ave. SLT CA 96150

Comment: I support class. 2 bike path. I encourage implementation; as well as linking them together.
I see this would improve biker, ped. safety. traffic congestion. It would also be a plus for visitors to our beautiful area. Thank you!

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans - District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Usher, Balin

Usher, B.-1

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Usher, Dave

5

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD



TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT

Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: DAVE USHER

Address: 4074 MANZANITA AVE SLT CA 96150

1 Comment: *Make sure traction sand traps are placed safely, outside of bike/peds paths. As 25 year resident, I urge you to support interconnecting bike/ped paths throughout Caltrans jurisdiction. I had to buy a mtn. Bike to negotiate the broken, incomplete bike/ped paths we*

2 *now have some are some sort of sidewalk, creating pedestrian and bike conflicts. Very dangerous for all involved!! And sidewalks..*

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to: *Visitors don't want Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans - District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863. pushing their baby strollers out in the road. These folks will not be returning. Please support CII Bike Paths. Thanks for this opportunity.*

Responses: Usher, Dave

Usher, D.-1

The recommendation is noted. In general, sand traps will be installed along the edges of the roadway surfaces, away from the travel lanes. The proposed improvements would not preclude a future project from widening SR 89 or US 50. Widening the roadway would require significant roadwork, including relocation of drainage systems and other utilities and regrading of the road to support drainage. Relocation of sand traps, vaults, and drainage systems would be a small element of such a project and is unlikely to significantly affect its feasibility.

Usher, D.-2

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Wallstrom, Sterling

17

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD

TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT

Thursday, June 12, 2007
 Bijou Community School
 3501 Spruce Street
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: STERLING WALLSTROM

Address: PO Box 17260, SLT CA 96151

1 **Comment:** TO PROTECT LONG TERM WATER QUALITY GOALS FOR THE LAKE TAHOE BASIN, ANY ADDITION TO ROADWAYS AROUND THE LAKE MUST INCLUDE BIKE LANES. AUTOMOTIVES ARE A MAJOR FACTOR IN LOSS OF LAKE CLARITY. SUSTAINABLE FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION MUST BE EMBRACED AND PROMOTED AT ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans –District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Wallstrom, Sterling

Wallstrom-1

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Whitcomb, Mary Lou

9

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD

TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT

Thursday, June 12, 2007
 Bijou Community School
 3501 Spruce Street
 South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Name: Mary Lou Whitcomb

Address: 1881 Cascade Court, South Lake Tahoe, CA

Comment: It is imperative that we have safe bike trails/lanes on Highway 50 from Stateline to The Yard following Highway 89 to Meyers. With all that is stated by our community leaders (inc. Arnold Schwarzenegger) about health and exercise and pollution, bike lanes address health, safety, pollution - quality of life.

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans - District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

It is a false savings to omit bicycle lanes from highway projects

Responses: Whitcomb, Mary Lou

Whitcomb-1

See the Response to Comment Anderson-1.

Comments and Responses on the Draft Program EIR

Comment: Willison, Jaymee

20

State of California Department of Transportation
PUBLIC COMMENT CARD

Name: Jaymee Willison

Address: 988 Gold Top Ave SLD CA 96150 5442657

1 [Comment: I am interested in Project 43601



TAHOE ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT
Thursday, June 12, 2007
Bijou Community School
3501 Spruce Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Additional questions, comments, and requests for special needs are to be addressed to:
Jody Brown, Environmental Branch Chief, Attn: Christopher Carlton, Caltrans –District 3, 2800 Gateway Oaks Drive, Sacramento, CA 95833 or christopher_carlton@dot.ca.gov; Phone: (916) 274-5863.

Response: Willison, Jaymee

Willison-1

Project 43601 is one of a series of Caltrans projects under way to support the Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Improvement Program. Project 43601 is not part of the proposed Program, and the limits of Project 43601 fall between US 50 Segments 2 and 3 of the proposed Program. However, Project 43601 shares the same primary goal of the proposed Program: to manage storm water and improve water quality along the State Highway system in the Lake Tahoe region.

Project 43601 will collect and treat roadway storm water runoff from US 50, reconstruct the existing drainage system, widen the roadway, and provide streetscape improvements between Trout Creek and Ski Run Blvd. (Post Miles 77.3 to 79.3). The project is currently in the design phase, with final plans scheduled for mid-2008. Construction is scheduled to begin in spring 2009 and end in fall 2012.