

Commenter	Comment	Response to Comments
Edwin Bustillos (see Comment #1)	<p>The commenter objected to the B/ATCP IS/ND conclusions.</p> <p>The commenter stated that amendment would result in a flat-roof industrial building next to a federally sanctioned highway and review under the state and National Historic Preservation Acts is required due to the Pony Express Trail.</p> <p>The commenter further stated that the city was segmenting the CEQA analysis because the impacts of the proposed facility were not analyzed in the EIS.</p>	<p>Comment noted: As stated in the IS/ND under aesthetics (5.4.3-2, page 29), US 50 is not an officially designated state scenic highway in the project area, though it is listed as an eligible route. The proposed amendment would result in the development of a project located next to US 50; however, it will be located south of US 50 and setback from the highway 140 feet and will not impact Lake Tahoe's views.</p> <p>Per the Pony Express EA submitted by the commenter, there are few historic remains of the actual Pony Express Trail because the solitary rides left little physical trace of their passage. Also, the trail alignment often changed from week to week so a precise location has not been mapped in the Lake Tahoe Basin. It is true that numerous historic sites are associated with the trail, including within the Lake Tahoe Basin. However, none of these mapped historical sites (i.e., Friday Station, Pony Express Rider statue, and the Lincoln Highway/Lake Tahoe) are located in the project area.</p> <p>The city has not segmented the environmental analysis. The IS/ND was prepared to analyze the impacts of the proposed Community Plan amendment to allow additional height and lower roof pitches for public and quasi-public facilities in the 56-acre project area – no amendment to the list of allowed land uses is proposed. The analysis concluded that implementing the design standards of the Bijou/Al Tahoe</p>

		<p>Community Plan, the City Code, and the TRPA Code for any future project would not have a significant effect on the environment. Nevertheless, pursuant to the CEQA guidelines, project-level analysis would be required for any future project within the amendment area.</p>
<p>Granville Fortescue (see Comment #2)</p>	<p>The commenter objects to the proposed B/ATCP amendments due to impacts to the scenic shoreline and states there are better locations for the recreation center or buildings.</p>	<p>Comment noted: As stated in the IS/ND under aesthetics (5.4.3, pages 24-33), the proposed amendments would either have a less than significant impact or no impact provided that future project's implement the design standards of the Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan and the requirements of the City and TRPA Codes.</p> <p>Any future project would be required to implement the design standards of the B/ATCP, and be in compliance with TRPA and City requirements to ensure no significant impact to scenic vistas would occur as these standards offset the potential impacts of additional height.</p> <p>The TRPA and City requirements include preserving the maximum number of trees, shrubs, boulders and other natural amenities on site. Standards also require architectural treatments that limit box forms and create variations in elevations and facades to blend with the natural landscape. The standards also require the use of earthtone colors and the use of natural and natural-appearing materials. Moreover, due to the existing major conifers located within the 56-acres project area south of US 50, any proposed project would not be allowed to extend above the forest canopy,</p>

		<p>reducing the visibility of future structures from Lake Tahoe viewpoints.</p> <p>Therefore, implementation of these design measures along with making TRPA findings for additional height for future projects within the amendment area would not result in a significant impact on scenic vistas, scenic quality, or community character when viewed from major arterials, scenic turnouts, public recreation areas, or the water of Lake Tahoe.</p> <p>The city conducted a robust master planning process that identified the northern portion of 56-acres project area as suitable for development. As stated above, no significant impacts were identified, if standards of the B/ATCP, City Code and TRPA Code are implemented. Moreover, a project-level analysis would be required for any future project within the amendment area.</p>
<p>Paul Thorpe (see Comment #3)</p>	<p>The commenter objects to the proposed B/ATCP amendments. However, the commenter did not raise any environmental issues with the proposed amendment.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This comment does not address environmental issues and does not require a response under 14 Cal. Code Regs. section 15204(a).</p>
<p>Richard Smothers (see Comment #4)</p>	<p>Commenter objects to the proposed B/ATCP amendments IS/ND. However, the commenter did not raise any environmental issues with the proposed amendment.</p> <p>The commenter states that Director of Development Services, Hilary Roverud, had a conflict of interest.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This comment does not address environmental issues and does not require a response under 14 Cal. Code Regs. section 15204(a).</p> <p>The City notes for the record that Development Services Director Hilary Roverud received formal advice from the Fair Political Practices Commission and has not</p>

		participated in governmental decisions on this project.
Saundra Edwards (see Comment #5)	<p>Commenter objects to the proposed B/ATCP amendments IS/ND and states that it is deficient and does not consider impacts to the Pony Express Trail, the Lincoln Highway, the TRPA designated scenic corridor, or the California State Scenic Highway.</p> <p>The commenter states that Director of Development Services Hilary Roverud, and Councilmember Middlebrook, have a conflict of interest.</p>	<p>Comment noted: Please see response to comment number 1 regarding potential impacts to historic resources.</p> <p>As stated in the IS/ND under aesthetics (5.4.3-2, page 29), US 50 is not an officially designated state scenic highway in the project area, though it is listed as an eligible route.</p> <p>The IS/ND did consider the impacts on TRPA scenic corridor (5. 4.3-5, page 30) and concluded that the proposed amendment would have less than significant impact on the environment.</p> <p>The comments alleging conflicts of interest do not address environmental issues and do not require a response under 14 Cal. Code Regs. section 15204(a). The City notes for the record that Development Services Director Hilary Roverud received formal advice from the Fair Political Practices Commission and has not participated in governmental decisions on this project. Additionally, Councilmember Middlebrook confirmed with the Fair Political Practices Commission that his income from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency does not create a financial conflict of interest under the Political Reform Act, Government Code section 82030.</p>
TRPA (see Comment #6)	TRPA staff provided comments and suggested editorial changes for ease of readability and clarity and requested	The B/ATCP IS/ND was edited to incorporate TRPA suggested edits. Analysis in the aesthetics section (5.4.3-1, pages 25-29) was

	additional analysis for impacts on scenic vistas.	expanded to include additional analysis on the proposed amendments' potential impact on existing scenic vistas. Though additional analysis for scenic vistas was provided based on the TRPA comments, conclusions of the B/ATCP Draft IS/ND were not changed.
--	---	---