

## 3.5 PUBLIC MEETINGS

**Shoreline Plan  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting  
May 23, 2018, TRPA Office, Stateline, NV**

	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Summary of Comments</b>	
PM-1	Darcie Goodman-Collins, League to Save Lake Tahoe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General statement of support</li> <li>The League is currently working through mitigations in the EIS</li> </ul>	PM1-1
PM-2	Elie Alyeshmerni, Lake Tahoe Marina Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General statement of support</li> <li>Statement of appreciation for collective approach</li> </ul>	PM2-1
PM-3	Jennifer Quashnick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus of this process should be the fact that this is a Regional Plan amendment; therefore benefits to the environment and nonmotorized recreation should be acknowledged</li> <li>Will check to see if EIS reviews impacts to nonmotorized share of access adequately</li> </ul>	PM3-1
PM-4	Jessica Tucker-Mohl, Representative from California Attorney General's office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of Regional Plan as a means to attain thresholds</li> <li>Sufficient assumptions regarding boat use during low water years?</li> <li>Air/water reductions as a function of cleaner boats; appropriate use of fleet turnover?</li> <li>Structure caps under no project alternative portray no functional difference between alternatives 1 and 2</li> </ul>	PM4-1
PM-5	Robert Larsen, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appreciate the collective approach to planning</li> <li>Water Board intends to look at water quality impacts closely</li> </ul>	PM5-1
PM-6	Liz Kingsland, NDSL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General comment of support for the process</li> </ul>	PM6-1
PM-7	Jan Brisco, Lakefront Property Owners' Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General comment of support for the process</li> </ul>	PM7-1
PM-8	Laurel Ames, Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What about more beaches as a part of the Shoreline Plan? There should be more beaches at Lake Tahoe</li> <li>The overwhelming focus of the EIS/Plan is as a "boating plan" and that is not good. Does not adequately address nonmotorized and other types of recreation</li> </ul>	PM8-1
PM-9	Jim Lawrence, Governing Board Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Problems with in-lieu scenic fee program: be cognizant of success/detail of program when developing</li> <li>General FYI statement for the record: the Shoreline Plan is about development standards, and other programs are focused on open space access</li> </ul>	PM9-1

**Shoreline Plan  
Draft EIR/EIS Hearing  
TRPA APC  
June 13, 2018, TRPA Office, Stateline, NV**

	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
PM-10	Kristina Hill, APC member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is replacing the Marina Master Plan program?</li> <li>Do all marinas have to have a sewage pump out?</li> <li>Some concessions do not have fueling facilities – they fill rentals with upland fueling locations and BMPs. What will happen to these facilities?</li> <li>What will buoy filing fees be? Assume they will be adequate for the program?</li> <li>Will illegal buoys be dealt with prior to issuing permits for new buoys?</li> </ul>	PM10-1
PM-11	Zach Hymanson, APC member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aren't marina environmental programs supposed to be chiefly aimed at dredging and other environmentally degrading activities?</li> <li>What is the funding mechanism for expanded enforcement?</li> <li>Question regarding Impact 6.5 on littoral drift. What does the EIS mean when it refers to "littoral drift?"</li> <li>This analysis chiefly deals with wave height motion and may not adequately address the alongshore component of littoral drift.</li> </ul>	PM11-1
PM-12	Jennifer Carr, APC member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The analysis in the air quality section relies on engines getting cleaner. What is the basis for this, an adoption of new technology?</li> </ul>	PM12-1
PM-13	Mike Marini, Public Commenter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regarding the 2040 (roughly 20-year) planning horizon. Has the committee considered as a part of the visioning process what the lake will look like 100-200 hence? Is there consideration for a 200-year planning outlook?</li> </ul>	PM13-1
PM-14	Laurel Ames, Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mitigation for the GHG significant impact is too nebulous; not well defined (i.e. there are no specific steps or program to deal with it). Troubling the fact that mitigation measures will not be implemented until after adoption. The Plan indicates that ferries are not a part of the shoreline, but they <i>are</i> a part of the shoreline! There should be a cumulative analysis of ferries.</li> </ul>	PM14-1
PM-15	Nick Exline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Point of clarification regarding Alternative 2. There is a substantial increase in the amount of boating associated with Alt. 2. The mitigation measures that would be implemented limit the number of structures to much less than is proposed. Is that the correct interpretation?</li> <li>The pier construction restriction to the pierhead line and/or 6,219' would be difficult or problematic in some areas (east Incline Village, areas at Dollar Point) and could make construction of a functional pier in these areas difficult or even impossible.</li> <li>There are no marina facilities on the east shore, and there are limited boat ramps. The ramps at Incline Village and Tahoe Vista are narrow and difficult to launch and remove boats at during high wind conditions. Consider opportunities for additional marinas and/or launch facilities on the east and north shore.</li> </ul>	PM15-1

	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
PM-16	Steve Teshara, APC Member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What about classic boats, or the “cigarette” boats, so to speak? Has any consideration been given to these types of boats as a significant contributor to emissions since they will not be replaced by fleet turnover?</li> </ul>	PM16-1

### Shoreline Plan

#### TRPA Governing Board Meeting

June 27, 2018, North Tahoe Events Center, Kings Beach, CA

	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
PM-17	Steve Smith, Lake Tahoe resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The preferred Alternative 1 provides many new moorings, piers, and boat ramps and by the TRPA own estimates will increase boating activity by 16%. Let's not kid ourselves: this increase in motor boat traffic WILL have a significant, adverse effect on non-motorized users and this fact appears to have been conveniently ignored in the EIS draft. Why not throw in a modicum of protections for the nonmotorized recreationists to be fair, given the increase in motorized usage that would be allowed? Why not add to the Alternative 1 plans the proposed Alternative 4 priority areas, and increased no wake zone distances of 1,200 feet, with possible protective buoys at Emerald Bay, Sugar Pine Point and Bliss State Parks and Sand Harbor? This would be a win-win situation for all involved! The motorized users get a significant increase in lake access and moorage and the ever-growing numbers of nonmotorized users would get a bit of protection and safety. Lacking this, Alternative 1 appears to cater exclusively to the motorized users and excludes any improvements that would make the nonmotorized user experience safer and more enjoyable. I only hope that you are able to find some fairness and balance in the final Shore Zone Plan that will protect the ever-growing numbers of the most vulnerable lake users: those out there braving the water and waves of Lake Tahoe under their own power! Thanks for your time, hard work and efforts. Steve Smith, Lake Tahoe, Truckee Resident</li> </ul>	PM17-1
PM-18	Gregg Lien, Attorney, Tahoe City (represents property owners and HOAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A better definition of "littoral parcel" is required in the code. Tahoma Meadows case study example wherein littoral parcel right are ambiguous. Parcel owners with access to a littoral parcel w/ structures may not have fee title but shouldn't structures associated with their parcels be acknowledged/permitted?</li> </ul>	PM18-1
PM-19	Shelley Aldean, Governing Board Member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A point of clarification: The GHG analysis in the EIS states that Impact 11-1 is significant and unavoidable, but the ES table states it is LTS with mitigation. Which is correct?</li> </ul>	PM19-1

	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
PM-20	Jim Lawrence, Governing Board Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure that the process of updating the code deals with the definitions of littoral versus non-littoral parcels. John Marshall: In this respect TRPA not dealing with existing structures differently under the plan. Will be dealt with as they have been.</li> </ul>	PM20-1

<b>Oral Comment PM1</b>	<b>Darcie Goodman-Collins, League to Save Lake Tahoe</b> May 23, 2018 TRPA Governing Board Meeting
PM1-1	<p>The comment offers a general statement of support for the proposed Shoreline Plan and the process by which it was developed and states that the League to Save Lake Tahoe is reviewing mitigation measures in the EIS and will provide comments before the close of the comment period.</p> <p>The League to Save Lake Tahoe provided written comments on the Shoreline Plan Draft EIS in a letter dated July 9, 2018 (see Letter O6 in Section 3.3 of this Final EIS). The responses to comments in Letter O6 are provided in Section 3.3, "Organizations," of this Final EIS.</p>
<b>Oral Comment PM2</b>	<b>M. Elie Alyeshmerni, Lake Tahoe Marina Association</b> May 23, 2018 TRPA Governing Board Meeting
PM2-1	<p>The comment provides a general statement of support for the proposed Shoreline Plan and appreciation to TRPA for adopting a collective approach to plan development and review. Please refer to Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, in Section 3.1, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.</p>
<b>Oral Comment PM3</b>	<b>Jennifer Quashnick, Friends of the West Shore</b> May 23, 2018 TRPA Governing Board Meeting
PM3-1	<p>The comment states that the focus of the shoreline planning process should be benefits to the environment and nonmotorized recreation. The comment also states that the Friends of the West Shore organization would be reviewing the Draft EIS carefully.</p> <p>Friends of the West Shore provided comments on the proposed Shoreline Plan and alternatives and the Draft EIS in a letter dated July 4, 2018 (see Letter O2 in Section 3.2 of this Final EIS). The comments address the above-mentioned items, as well as the analysis of various resources areas, including recreation and nonmotorized boating. Responses are provided in Section 3.3, "Organizations," of this Final EIS.</p>
<b>Oral Comment PM4</b>	<b>Jessica Tucker-Mohl, California Attorney General</b> May 23, 2018 TRPA Governing Board Meeting
PM4-1	<p>The comment notes that implementation of the Regional Plan (of which the Shoreline Plan would become a part) is a means to attain environmental thresholds for the Tahoe Region. The comment raises three specific areas where the Attorney General's office has initial concerns: the assumptions regarding boat use during low-water years, the anticipated air</p>

and water quality improvements over the life of the plan, and the assumption that mitigation measures imposed on the No Project Alternative would result in no functional difference between Alternatives 1 and 2.

The California Attorney General submitted comments on the Shoreline Plan and Draft EIS in a letter dated July 9, 2018 (see letter A1 in Section 3.3 of this Final EIS). The comments cover a wide range of topics and address the above-mentioned items in detail. Comment A1-5 raises concerns regarding the use of boat use survey data collected during low-water years, and comment A1-11 discusses issues regarding how low lake level is addressed as a part of the baseline and the affected environment sections of the Draft EIS. Reductions in air emissions associated with boating activity and potential atmospheric deposition of such pollutants into the water column, are raised in comments A1-8, A1-9, and A1-10. The portrayal of Alternative 2 in the Draft EIS is raised in comment A1-4. See the responses to these comments in Section 3.3, "Organizations," of this Final EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM5**

**Robert Larsen, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board**  
May 23, 2018  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting

PM5-1 The comment offers a general statement of support for the collaborative approach to planning for the Shoreline Plan and notes that the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board intends to focus review of the Draft EIS on water quality impacts. Water quality impacts have been addressed in Chapter 6, "Hydrology and Water Quality." The agency did not submit written comments on the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM6**

**Liz Kingsland, Nevada Division of State Lands**  
May 23, 2018  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting

PM6-1 The commenter offered a general statement of support for the Shoreline Plan process. Please refer to Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, in Section 3.1, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM7**

**Jan Brisco, Lakefront Property Owners' Association**  
May 23, 2018  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting

PM7-1 The commenter offered a general statement of support for the proposed Shoreline Plan and process. Please refer to Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, in Section 3.1, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM8**

**Laurel Ames, Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group**  
May 23, 2018  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting

PM8-1

The comment asks why beaches were not addressed more in the context of the Shoreline Plan and suggests that preparation of the plan is an opportunity to support more public beaches at Lake Tahoe. The comment asserts that the Shoreline Plan does very little to address nonmotorized boating or other types of recreation.

The Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group submitted comments on the Shoreline Plan and Draft EIS in a letter dated July 9, 2018 (see letter O10 in Section 3.3 of this Final EIS). The above comment is addressed in response to comment O10-2. See also Master Response 2 – Effects on Recreation, which addresses this topic.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM9**

**Jim Lawrence, TRPA Governing Board Chairman**  
May 23, 2018  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting

PM9-1

The commenter suggests that there may be problems with proposing an in-lieu scenic mitigation fee program under Mitigation Measure 9-1a. Such programs have, in the past, struggled to be successful because of a lack of details on projects to be funded by the fee. The comment advises the planning team to be cognizant of the level of detail provided for programs developed under an in-lieu fee program because it will be the driver of success.

Mitigation Measure 9-1a has been revised, as identified in Chapter 4, “Revisions and Corrections to the Draft EIS,” of this Final EIS and the response to comment A1-22. The revised mitigation language would require TRPA to update the Scenic Quality Improvement Plan within 1 year of adoption of the Shoreline Plan to identify specific projects that could be funded with the in-lieu fee, consistent with the recommendation in this comment.

The comment also notes that the Shoreline Plan has been proposed as a means to create development standards for the shorezone and that other TRPA programs are focused on open space access. More information on this concept is included in Master Response 2 – Effects on Recreation.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM10**

**Kristina Hill, TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Member**  
June 13, 2018  
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

PM10-1

The commenter requests information and/or clarification on several points regarding the proposed Shoreline Plan, as follows: (1) information on what would replace the Marina Master Plan process, (2) clarification on the existing requirement for marinas to have a sewage pump-out, (3) information on what procedures would be implemented for concessions that do not have fueling facilities and that fill rentals at upland locations in accordance with BMPs, (4) information on the proposed mooring fees and confirmation that they would be adequate to support the program, and (5) confirmation that illegal buoys would be removed from Lake Tahoe before new mooring permits are issued.

Replacement of the Marina Master Plan program is explained in the response to comment 010-6. All marinas are required to have a sewage pump-out, and this requirement would not be changed under any of the alternatives. Concession facilities that rent motorized watercraft but do not have fueling facilities would continue to be required to fuel rentals at upland locations in compliance with BMPs. All concessionaires in the Shorezone would be required to file an application for a permit under the proposed Shoreline Plan, as described on page 2-38 of the Draft EIS. The proposed mooring fee program for the Shoreline Plan is described in Appendix A, "Shoreline Implementation Program," of this Final EIS. TRPA would identify illegal buoys on the lake and remove them before issuing permits for new buoys, as described in the response to comment 02-6.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM11**

**Zach Hymanson, TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Member**  
June 13, 2018  
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

**PM11-1**

The comment requests clarification that marina environmental programs should be aimed chiefly at environmentally degrading activities, such as dredging. Implementation of the proposed Shoreline Plan would require environmental improvements at marinas applying for expansions or reconfigurations commensurate with the amount of development requested in the permit application (as described on pages 2-34 and 2-35 of the Draft EIS). Dredging activities under the proposed Shoreline Plan would be required to comply with the federal nondegradation standard for dredging established under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

The comment inquires about the funding mechanism for the expanded enforcement program. The expanded enforcement program would be funded through annual mooring fees and boat rental concession fees. Additional detail is provided in Appendix A, "Shoreline Implementation Program," of this Final EIS.

The comment also that the littoral drift analysis appears to deal chiefly with wave height motion and may not adequately be considering the alongshore component of littoral drift. Littoral drift is addressed in the discussion of Impact 6-5: Interference with littoral processes from new or redeveloped shoreline structures, in Chapter 6, "Hydrology and Water Quality," of the Draft EIS. The EIS analysis is based on a review of applicable research on littoral drift in Lake Tahoe, including a study that concluded that floating piers can affect littoral transport if the floating section of the pier is at least 50 percent the length of a wavelength sufficient in size to cause littoral drift (Draft EIS:6-32). No evidence of other effects of piers on littoral drift was identified. Mitigation Measure 6-5b requires a site-specific littoral drift analysis for floating piers longer than 25 feet. It prevents the construction of floating piers longer than 25 feet unless they are designed so that wave heights are not reduced by more than 50 percent and the floating pier section is no greater than 50 percent of the length of the site-specific design wavelength. In response to this comment, Mitigation Measure 6-5b has been revised as shown below. The revised mitigation measure would require that site-specific littoral drift analysis also makes a finding that the pier would not otherwise substantially disrupt littoral drift. This revision would require that the site-specific littoral drift analysis also consider other factors that could affect littoral drift, such as nearshore currents.

In response to this comment, Mitigation Measure 6-5b is revised as shown below. This revision does not alter the analysis or findings in the Draft EIS.

### Mitigation Measure 6-5b: Require littoral drift analyses and incorporate design recommendations for floating piers longer than 25 feet

This mitigation measure would be required for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and 4.

TRPA will require all new pier and pier extension applications that include floating pier sections longer than 25 feet submit a site-specific littoral drift and wave analysis. The analysis will assess the dimensions of the proposed floating pier section and the ability of waves to initiate and sustain the movement of sediment along the lake bottom under conditions of low lake level (6,223 feet), mid-lake level (6,226 feet), and high lake level (6,229 feet) Lake Tahoe Datum. The lake level condition with the greatest effect on littoral transport and backshore stability shall be used to design the floating pier section. Floating piers may only be approved if they are designed so that wave heights are not reduced by more than 50 percent and the floating pier section is no greater than 50 percent of the length of the site-specific design wavelength, and if the littoral drift analysis finds that the pier will not otherwise substantially disrupt littoral transport.

#### Oral Comment PM12

Jennifer Carr, TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Member

June 13, 2018

TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

PM12-1

The comment notes that the air quality section of the Draft EIS shows an overall reduction in air emissions associated with buildout of the Shoreline Plan related to cleaner engines and asks if this outcome assumes adoption of new technology. The reduction in air emissions would be a result compliance with existing regulatory standards that set emission standards for new engines, not of new boating technology. As fleet turnover occurs, newer engines that are compliant with more recent emissions regulations would become more dominant. Further explanation is provided in Chapter 10, "Air Quality," and Master Response 4 – Watercraft Emissions.

#### Oral Comment PM13

Mike Marini, Public Commenter

June 13, 2018

TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

PM13-1

The comment raises concern regarding the 20-year planning horizon analyzed in the Draft EIS and asks if the planning committee has considered what Lake Tahoe may look like over a 100- to 200-year planning horizon. The Shoreline Plan is code amendment and associated implementation and monitoring programs that could be fully implemented (or "built out") by 2040. The EIS evaluates the effects of the Shoreline Plan at full buildout, that is after all structures that could potentially be authorized under the Shoreline Plan are constructed.

#### Oral Comment PM14

Laurel Ames, Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group

June 13, 2018

TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

PM14-1

The comment contends that the greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation measures, as laid out in the Draft EIS, are not well defined enough to support effective mitigation. The Sierra Club Tahoe Area Group submitted comments on the Shoreline Plan and Draft EIS in a letter dated July 9, 2018 (see letter O10 in Section 3.3 of this Final EIS). The above comment is addressed in response to comment O10-5.



**Oral  
Comment  
PM15**

**Nick Exline**  
June 13, 2018  
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

**PM15-1** The comment requests clarification regarding whether mitigation measures applied to Alternative 2 that involve the imposition of a cap on development effectively limit the number of structures at buildout to less than what is shown in the project description. Master Response 5 – Growth and Mitigation under the Existing Shorezone Regulations, addresses this topic.

The comment also states that pier design standards that would limit piers to within either the pierhead line or 6,219 feet Lake Tahoe datum would make construction of piers difficult or impossible in areas of the lake with a steep drop-off in lake depth (e.g., east end of Incline Village and Dollar Point). TRPA has taken these limiting geographies into consideration and has revised the proposed Code to accommodate construction of piers in such areas. Please refer to Chapter 2, “Revisions to the Proposed Shoreline Plan,” in this Final EIS for more information on this change.

Lastly, the comment notes that there are no marina facilities on the east shore of Lake Tahoe, that boat ramps in that area of the lake are limited, and that the boat ramps at Incline Village and Tahoe Vista are narrow and difficult to launch from during periods of high wind. For these reasons, the comment requests that TRPA consider additional marina and launch facilities for the east and north shores.

New boat ramps would be allowed under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Under Alternatives 1 and 3, TRPA would review boat ramp applications based on the merits of the proposed site, including the existing geographic distribution of boat ramp access, the relationship of the proposed site to upland development centers and transportation hubs, and the suitability of the site to accommodate low lake access (Draft EIS pages 2-34 and 2-47). Under Alternative 2, private boat ramps would also be allowed, although existing land coverage regulations would make it unlikely they would be authorized (Draft EIS page 2-42).

**Oral  
Comment  
PM16**

**Steve Teshara, TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Member**  
June 13, 2018  
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Meeting

**PM16-1** The comment addresses the approach for older, classic boats under the proposed Shoreline Plan. The commenter asks if these boats have been evaluated in the Draft EIS in the context of air emissions given that they would not be replaced by fleet turnover. Such boats represent an extremely small percentage of the total fleet on Lake Tahoe and therefore are not a significant source of emissions overall. Please refer to Master Response 4 – Watercraft Emissions, which describes how the emissions estimates are based on the California Air Resources Board’s emission inventory for the Lake Tahoe Air Basin. This emission inventory presents that best available estimate of emissions from recreational boating for all boats operating on Lake Tahoe, including classic boats.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM17**

**Steve Smith, Lake Tahoe Resident**  
June 27, 2018  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting

PM17-1

The comment states that the proposed Shoreline Plan would allow new shorezone development that would increase boating activity by 16 percent and disputes the finding in the Draft EIS that impacts on nonmotorized recreation would be less than significant. The comment suggests that the proposed Shoreline Plan should incorporate the expanded no-wake-zone feature proposed under Alternative 4 and generally supports better protection for users of nonmotorized watercraft.

The less-than-significant finding in the Draft EIS for Impact 8-1: Alter the quality of recreational experiences or create user conflicts, is based several factors, which are described in Master Response 2 – Effects on Recreation. In addition, in response to this and other comments, TRPA has revised the proposed Shoreline Plan to include an additional 200-foot no-wake zone around all structures, and a 100-foot moving no-wake zone surrounding nonmotorized watercraft and swimmers (see Chapter 2, “Revisions to the Proposed Shoreline Plan” in the Final EIS). TRPA would also provide additional recreational monitoring under the Environmental Threshold Monitoring Program, as described in Master Response 6 – Monitoring and Adaptive Management of the Shoreline Plan.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM18**

**Gregg Lien, Attorney, Tahoe City**  
June 27, 2018  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting

PM18-1

The comment requests a better definition of “littoral parcel” in the revised shorezone code. The comment cites the example of Tahoma Meadows, where littoral parcel rights are ambiguous. Parcel owners with access to a littoral parcel with structures may not have fee title, but the structures associated with such parcels should be acknowledged and permitted by TRPA. Please refer to Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, in Section 3.1, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM19**

**Shelley Aldean, TRPA Governing Board Member**  
June 27, 2018  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting

PM19-1

The comment requests clarification regarding whether Impact 11-1: Greenhouse gas emissions is significant and unavoidable or if it is less than significant after mitigation. This impact, as stated on pages ES-18 through ES-20 and 11-13 of the Draft EIS, would be significant and unavoidable even with implementation of mitigation measures.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM20**

**Jim Lawrence, TRPA Governing Board Chairman**  
June 27, 2018  
TRPA Governing Board Meeting

PM20-1

The comment references oral comment PM18 and states that TRPA staff should ensure that the revised code addresses the definitions of “littoral parcel” and “non-littoral parcel.” The proposed Code amendments include a definition for Littoral Parcel (TRPA 2018a). Any parcel that does not meet the definition of a littoral parcel would be considered a nonlittoral parcel.

Comment Number	Date	Location	
PM21-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	How will seasonal and/or private kayak rentals be dealt with?
PM22-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	Who will be making the final decisions?
PM23-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	Question on graph in EIS presentation: Is the annual percentage increase in use by year or at total buildout?
PM24-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	Who is going to enforce this?
PM25-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	Are you adding more buoys to indicate 600 feet? This is hard to enforce because people don't often know/agree on eyeballing distances.
PM26-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	What happens if someone breaks these rules?
PM27-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	How does alternative 1 impact public marinas?
PM28-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	What are they doing about the Tahoe Keys?
PM29-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	Incentivize improvements to recreation.
PM30-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	What constitutes a public pier preference for free access?
PM31-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	What is the criteria for public piers?
PM32-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	Can you replace piers?
PM33-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	More public piers dispersed evenly all over the lake
PM34-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	Criteria for ensuring adequate upland facilities for public piers.
PM35-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	Are there carbon impact fees?
PM36-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	What could you do with increased fees?
PM37-1	6/4/2018	Open House #1	What is the implementation strategy for increased public access, water quality projects?
PM38-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Consider geese as a source of AIS
PM39-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Do piers have an adverse effect on fish habitat?
PM40-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	How are single use piers going to be prioritized if available allocations are awarded to multiple use piers?
PM41-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Funneling boating and recreation to marinas will have negative community impacts and change the small town recreation access.
PM42-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	How is private access to shoreline considered in pier distribution and allocation?
PM43-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Can you give up a buoy for a pier?
PM44-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Don't restrict to 12 piers a year. Not fair to older people.
PM45-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Consider prioritizing shorter piers (less environmental impact than multi-use piers). Could serve more people with less impact with shorter piers
PM46-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	The plan should incentivize public/private/commercial solar powered electric boats for emissions and noise reduction.
PM47-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Suggest deed restricting moorings & piers.
PM48-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Do charter boats need to operate out of a marina?
PM49-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Public access for facility has Coast Guard regulations.
PM50-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Can a person rent a private buoy?
PM51-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	Why wasn't the 1,200 foot no wake zone considered for alternative 1?
PM52-1	6/6/2018	Open House #2	The 1,200 foot no wake zone should be expanded to Baldwin Beach (Alternative 4).

**Oral  
Comment  
PM21****Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018

Open House #1

TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

PM21-1

The comment asks how seasonal and/or private kayak rentals would be addressed under the proposed Shoreline Plan. The proposed Shoreline Plan would regulate both motorized and nonmotorized boat rentals in the shorezone through the review and issuance of concessionaire permits, as described on page 2-38 of the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM22****Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018

Open House #1

TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

PM22-1

The comment asks who would be responsible for final adoption of an alternative. The TRPA Governing Board will review the alternatives, Draft EIS, and staff recommendations and will be responsible for selecting and adopting a Shoreline Plan.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM23****Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018

Open House #1

TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

PM23-1

The comment requests clarification regarding whether the percentage increases associated with the alternatives depicted in the Draft EIS represent annual increases or the total increase at buildout. The percentage increase in shorezone structures and in boating activity under each alternative, as shown on pages 2-18 and 2-19 of the Draft EIS, is representative of the total increase at buildout (2040).

**Oral  
Comment  
PM24****Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018

Open House #1

TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

PM24-1

The comment asks who would be responsible for enforcing the Shoreline Plan after it is implemented. Enforcement of the Shoreline Plan programs, including no-wake zone and illegal buoy enforcement, would be the responsibility primarily of TRPA, which would be assisted by other enforcement agencies operating on Lake Tahoe. Additional detail on enforcement programs is provided in Appendix A, "Shoreline Implementation Program," of this Final EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM25**

**Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

- PM25-1 The comment asks if TRPA would be placing additional buoys to demarcate the 600-foot no-wake zone and states that in the absence of demarcation buoys, the no-wake zone may be difficult to enforce because the location of the boundary is difficult to determine. Initially, TRPA would implement an enhanced 600-foot no-wake zone enforcement program, which would include a smart phone application, expanded education program, and additional enforcement patrols. TRPA would also implement a program of monitoring visitor experience and user conflicts related to shorezone and lakezone activities. Based on the results of the monitoring, adaptive management options would include placement of demarcation buoys or expansion of the no-wake zone in priority areas (for more information, refer to Master Response 6 – Monitoring and Adaptive Management of the Shoreline Plan).

**Oral  
Comment  
PM26**

**Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

- PM26-1 The comment asks what would happen if TRPA rules relating to the no-wake zone are violated. TRPA has the authority to enforce civil penalties for violation of the TRPA Code in accordance with the TRPA Rules of Procedure.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM27**

**Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

- PM27-1 The comment asks what effect Alternative 1 would have on public marinas. The framework for marinas under the proposed Shoreline Plan (Alternative 1) is described on page 2-34 of the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM28**

**Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

- PM28-1 The comment asks how the Tahoe Keys are being addressed under the Shoreline Plan. As described on page 2-14 of the Draft EIS, “the development standards in the Shoreline Plan would not apply to the docks and slips located in the lagoons of the Tahoe Keys Property Owners Association (TKPOA) but would apply to the Tahoe Keys Marina.” TKPOA moorings would be subject to applicable fees associated with the proposed Shoreline Plan.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM29**

**Public Commenter**  
June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

PM29-1 The comment suggests using the Shoreline Plan as a vehicle to incentivize recreational improvements. The role of the Shoreline Plan within the context of recreation planning in Lake Tahoe is described in Master Response 2 – Effects on Recreation.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM30**

**Public Commenter**  
June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

PM30-1 The comment asks what constitutes a public pier. Public piers are described on page 2-3 of the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM31**

**Public Commenter**  
June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

PM31-1 The comment asks what the location criteria are for a public pier. Public piers would be evaluated under the proposed Shoreline Plan on a case-by-case basis, as described on page 2-28 of the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM32**

**Public Commenter**  
June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

PM32-1 The comment asks if piers could be replaced under the proposed Shoreline Plan. Piers could be replaced under the plan, as described on page 2-33 of the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM33**

**Public Commenter**  
June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

PM33-1 The comment suggests that there should be more public piers evenly distributed around the lake. Public piers would be evaluated under the proposed Shoreline Plan on a case-by-case basis, as described on page 2-28 of the Draft EIS. TRPA would consider the existing distribution of public piers in evaluating new project proposals.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM34**

**Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

- PM34-1 The comment asks what the criteria are for ensuring adequate upland facilities for public piers. Public piers would be evaluated under the proposed Shoreline Plan on a case-by-case basis, as described on page 2-28 of the Draft EIS. Public piers would be evaluated, in part, based on consistency with adopted plans and conformance with existing upland uses. Public piers would also be evaluated under a project-level environmental review process, which would consider the adequacy of parking, utilities, and other upland facilities.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM35**

**Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

- PM35-1 The comment asks if carbon impacts fees are associated with the Shoreline Plan. Although carbon impact fees are not specifically identified under the proposed Shoreline Plan and alternatives, Mitigation Measure 11-1: Develop and implement a GHG reduction policy, would require TRPA to develop, adopt, and implement a GHG emission reduction policy within 12 months of adoption of the Shoreline Plan. Development of this policy may involve the implementation of fee programs to support GHG reduction measures.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM36**

**Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

- PM36-1 The comment asks what TRPA would do with fees collected through the Shoreline Plan. Fee programs that would be implemented and funding allocations that would be made under the proposed Shoreline Plan are described in Appendix A, "Shoreline Implementation Program," of this Final EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM37**

**Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018  
Open House #1  
TRPA Offices, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada

- PM37-1 The comment asks what the implementation strategy is for increased public access and water quality improvement projects. The four Shoreline Plan alternatives all provide a different approach to balancing support for public and private recreation with protecting the environment, as described in Chapter 2, "Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives," of the Draft EIS. Resource protection measures under each of the four Shoreline Plan alternatives, including water quality improvement measures, are described in Table 2-3 on pages 2-20 and 2-21 of the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM38**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM38-1

The comment requests that the Draft EIS evaluate Canada geese as a source of aquatic invasive species. The Shoreline Plan is not anticipated to affect populations or habitat of Canada geese at Lake Tahoe; therefore, Canada geese are not evaluated within the context of impacts associated with implementation of the plan or alternatives. The spread and introduction of aquatic invasive species associated with implementation of the Shoreline Plan are addressed on pages 5-21 through 5-26 of Chapter 5, "Fish and Aquatic Biological Resources," in the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM39**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM39-1

The comment asks if piers have an adverse effect on fish habitat. As stated on page 5-26 of the Draft EIS, "the placement of piers and buoys in spawning or feed/cover habitat has limited impact on native fish populations and the impacts can be mitigated." The impacts of piers on fish habitat are addressed on pages 5-26 to 5-28 of Chapter 5, "Fish and Aquatic Biological Resources," in the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM40**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM40-1

The comment asks how single-use piers would be prioritized if available allocations would be awarded to multiple-use piers. Prioritization of private pier allocations is described on pages 2-31 through 2-33 of Chapter 2, "Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives," of the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM41**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM41-1

The comment states that concentrating boating and recreation at marinas would have adverse effects on small communities. This comment is speculative because it provides no evidence to support the assertion that boating and recreation would be concentrated at marinas, or that concentrated boating activity at marinas would harm other communities. The effects of the Shoreline Plan on recreation is described in Chapter 8, "Recreation," of the Draft EIS and in Master Response 2 – Effects of Recreation in this Final EIS.



**Oral  
Comment  
PM42**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

- PM42-1      The comment asks how private access to the shoreline was considered in pier distribution and allocation. As stated on page 2-28 of Chapter 2, "Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives," of the Draft EIS, "the 128 new private piers would be distributed around Lake Tahoe based on jurisdictional boundaries as shown in Table 2-6. The number of piers that would be allocated to each jurisdiction is based on the proportion of parcels eligible for piers within that jurisdiction." The distribution of public piers would be evaluated under the proposed Shoreline Plan on a case-by-case basis, as described on page 2-28 of the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM43**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

- PM43-1      The comment asks if buoys can be traded for piers. Buoys cannot be traded for piers. As stated on page 2-26 of Chapter 2, "Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives," of the Draft EIS, "marinas and public agencies could exchange new or existing buoys for slips on a 1:1 basis." Existing piers would be eligible for relocations, transfers, or conversions, as described on page 2-33 of the Draft EIS.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM44**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

- PM44-1      The comment suggests that limiting the rate at which pier permits are issued to 12 over each 2-year period is unfair to people who are older and may not gain access to a permit for many years under the plan.

The approach to regulating shorezone development and associated resource management under the proposed Shoreline Plan is identified on page 2-26 of Chapter 2, "Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives," of the Draft EIS:

The goal of this alternative is to enhance the recreational experience at Lake Tahoe while protecting the environment and responsibly planning for the future. This alternative, developed through a consensus-based approach, incorporates the policies developed by the Steering Committee and was endorsed by the RPIC of the TRPA Governing Board. The Shoreline Plan would meter out new private and public development over time. At buildout, it would allow for up to 2,116 new moorings (buoys, lifts or public slips), 128 new private piers, 10 new public piers, and two new public boat ramps. Some new and existing buoys could be converted to slips and vice versa at facilities open to the public (e.g., marinas).

Additional context and background related to the development of the proposed Shoreline Plan are provided on pages 1-1 and 1-2 of Chapter 1, "Introduction," of the Draft EIS. Please refer to Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, in Section 3.1, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM45**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM45-1

The comment suggests prioritizing short piers because they may be less environmentally harmful than multiple-use piers. The comment also appears to suggest that more users could be served with a lower degree of environmental impact by authorizing short, individual private piers.

Prioritization of private pier applications under the proposed Shoreline Plan is described on pages 2-31 through 2-33 of Chapter 2, "Description of Proposed Project and Alternatives," of the Draft EIS. Pier design standards under the proposed Shoreline Plan are presented in Table 2-5 on page 2-27 of the Draft EIS. Impacts associated with these proposals are evaluated in the resource chapters of the Draft EIS (Chapters 4–16). Exceptions to the pier design standards in Table 2-5 of the Draft EIS have been made for deep water areas adjacent to shore where placement of a pier meeting those design standards is not feasible. These exceptions have been incorporated into the proposed amended shorezone code under subsection 83.4.3.B (TRPA 2018b). See also Chapter 2, "Revisions to the Proposed Shoreline Plan," of this Final EIS, which describes this change.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM46**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM46-1

The comment suggests incentivizing the purchase and use of solar-powered electric boats to reduce emissions and noise. As described on page 2-34 of the Draft EIS, the Shoreline Plan incentivizes environmental improvements associated with marina expansions. One such improvement could include incorporating electric boats as part of a rental fleet. In addition, Mitigation Measure 11-1: Develop and implement a GHG reduction policy, would require TRPA to develop, adopt, and implement a GHG emission reduction policy within 12 months of adoption of the Shoreline Plan. Development of this policy may involve incentives for electric boats.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM47**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM47-1

The comment suggests incorporating features to deed-restrict moorings and piers. Moorings and piers are not features that themselves can be deed-restricted; however, parcels can be deed restricted to prevent certain types of development within the shorezone. The proposed Shoreline Plan would require the deed restriction of littoral parcels in certain situations,

which would prevent future development of piers on some parcels (as described on page 2-31 of the Draft EIS).

**Oral  
Comment  
PM48**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM48-1 The comment asks whether charter boats would be required to operate out of a marina. Charter boats (those operated by a licensed operator) would not need to operate from a marina provided that they have access to a valid, TRPA-permitted mooring, with adequate upland facilities properly permitted for such a commercial use.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM49**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM49-1 The comment states that public access is subject to U.S. Coast Guard regulations. The role of the U.S. Coast Guard on Lake Tahoe is described on page 15-15 of the Draft EIS.

**[Oral  
Comment  
PM50**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM50-1 The comment asks if private buoys can be rented. TRPA does not regulate the rental of private buoys.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM51**

**Public Commenter**

June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM51-1 The comment asks why the expanded 1,200-foot no-wake zone was not considered under Alternative 1. Alternatives 1 through 4 were developed to provide a reasonable range of alternatives for consideration. Features associated with each of the alternatives have been evaluated in the Draft EIS, and features proposed for any of the alternatives could be adopted in combination with features from other alternatives, provided that the appropriate mitigation measures are applied as necessary for significant impacts associated with a given feature. As described on page 1-2 of the Draft EIS, Alternative 1 (the Proposed Shoreline Plan) was developed through a consensus-based planning process. Please refer to Chapter 2, "Revisions to the Proposed Shoreline Plan," of this Final EIS, which describes changes to the proposed no-wake zone; and Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.

**Oral  
Comment  
PM52**
**Public Commenter**


June 6, 2018

Open House #2

North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, California

PM52-1

The comment asks why Baldwin Beach was not included as a potential no-wake zone expansion area under Alternative 4. Alternative 4 involves identifying areas around Lake Tahoe where recreation is greatest during peak periods relative to other areas. Please refer to Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, in Section 3.1, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.

PM53-1	<h1>COMMENT CARD</h1> <span style="font-size: 1.5em; font-family: cursive;">June 4th</span>
<b>Draft EIS Comments:</b> _____ <div style="text-align: center;"><i>[Signature]</i></div>	
<b>Comments on the Shoreline Plan:</b> _____ <div style="text-align: center;"> <i>Keep annual fee reasonable so as not to discourage registration</i>  <i>Tiered annual fee for moorings Kayaks vs speedboats/sail boats</i> </div>	
<b>Name (optional):</b> _____ <b>Phone (optional):</b> _____ <b>Email (optional):</b> _____	
	

**Comment  
Card  
PM53**
**Public Commenter**

June 4, 2018

Comment Card

PM53-1

The comment requests low fees associated with the Shoreline Plan, and tiered fees for motorized and nonmotorized users. The fee structure associated with the proposed Shoreline Plan is presented in Appendix A, "Shoreline Implementation Program," of this Final EIS.

PM54-1

## COMMENT CARD

RECEIVED

Draft EIS Comments:

JUN 14 2018

TAHOE REGIONAL  
PLANNING AGENCYComments on the Shoreline Plan: Traffic, congestion, garbage, toilets, enforcement

After listening to your presentation on June 6, it is obvious that studies and work has gone into this. It would have been interesting to know which groups supported each alternative. Since boating on L.T. is only for several months it seems harmful and unnecessary to allow the number of structures in Alternative 1. #2 is silly and #4 hardly allows for repairs. #3 seems most reasonable. → over

Name (optional): Jan Avilla

Phone (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

Email (optional): ja94228@yahoo.com

The fewer structures and constructions along our shoreline the better. The general public will hardly benefit from the 138 new piers and 2,116 new moorings. There was no mention of repair and upgrades to existing structures.

Please REMEMBER your mission statement.

Thanks so much,  
Jan Avilla

PM54-1  
cont.

**Comment  
Card  
PM54**

Jan Aville  
June 14, 2018  
Comment Card

- PM54-1 The comment provides support for Alternative 3. Please refer to Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, in Section 3.1, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.

PM55-1

## COMMENT CARD

Draft EIS Comments:

WAS A STUDY DONE: NEW BOUY FIELD  
VS THAT # OF MOTORIZED BOATS BEING LAUNCHED VIA  
BOAT RAMPS.  
IN OTHER WORDS... WHAT IS THE E.I. OF TRAILERING  
MY BOAT TO THE WATER VS PADDLING OUT TO MY  
BOAT THAT IS ON A BOUY.

Comments on the Shoreline Plan:

Name (optional):

KEN VIEL

Phone (optional):

775 742 8480

Email (optional):

INCLINERENTALS@GMAIL.COM



**Comment  
Card  
PM55**

Ken Viel  
No Date  
Comment Card

- PM55-1 The comment questions the difference between launching from a buoy versus launching at a boat ramp. Boat use assumptions used in the Draft EIS are described on pages 2-6 through 2-8 and in Appendix A of the Draft EIS and are further explained in Master Response 3 – Motorized Boat Use Estimates.

PM56-1

## COMMENT CARD

June 4th

Draft EIS Comments:

Why is TRPA collecting taxes + where do they go?

Comments on the Shoreline Plan:

2 boats not enough for enforcement

Application process for Kayak Racks  
↳ not aesthetically pleasing

Name (optional):

Roy Pike

Phone (optional):

Email (optional):



**Comment  
Card  
PM56**

Roy Pike  
June 4, 2018  
Comment Card

PM56-1

The comment asks why TRPA collects taxes and what is done with them. TRPA does not collect taxes. The proposed Shoreline Plan would be funded through a variety of fee programs as described in Appendix A, "Shoreline Implementation Program," of this Final EIS.

The comment also contends that two TRPA patrol boats would not provide sufficient enforcement, but does not provide evidence to support this claim. Please refer to Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, in Section 3.1, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.

PM57-1

## COMMENT CARD

Draft EIS Comments: *Study The Results of GOOSE SHIT  
Droppings as a Source of the Underwater  
Weed Problem*

Comments on the Shoreline Plan:

Name (optional):

Phone (optional):

Email (optional):



**Comment  
Card  
PM57**

**Public Commenter**

No Date

Comment Card

PM57-1

The comment requests that TRPA study goose feces as a mechanism for the spread of aquatic invasive species. The Shoreline Plan would not affect Canada goose populations and would therefore have no impact on the spread of invasive species via this vector.



PM58-1

## COMMENT CARD

Draft EIS Comments:

Comments on the Shoreline Plan:

Buoys- There are quite a few properties / ~~that~~ clients I have that have recently surfaced and never obtained buoy permits. I think all littoral parcels should be allocated buoys, even if they were never previously permitted. Does the current "cap" of # of "additional" buoys include 2 buoys per littoral parcel?

Name (optional):

Phone (optional):

Email (optional):



Comment  
Card  
PM58

Public Commenter

No Date

Comment Card

PM58-1

The comment asks if all littoral parcels could have two buoys under the cap. Each littoral parcel would be eligible for up to two new buoys, but the total number of buoys would be limited by the mooring cap. Thus, not every eligible parcel would be able to have two buoys.

PM59-1

## COMMENT CARD

Draft EIS Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---

Comments on the Shoreline Plan:

How will single residential  
piers be prioritized if over allocated  
amount allowed in 2 year period?

Name (optional): Abby Edwards  
 Phone (optional): 546-4402  
 Email (optional): \_\_\_\_\_



**Comment  
Card  
PM59**

**Abby Edwards**  
 No Date  
 Comment Card

PM59-1

The comment asks what the prioritization process would be for single parcel pier applications if more than 16 are received in a 2-year period. Single parcel pier applications would be processed by lottery in that case, as stated on page 2-33 of the Draft EIS. The pier application prioritization process is described on pages 2-31 through 2-33 of the Draft EIS.

PM60-1

## COMMENT CARD

Draft EIS Comments:

Environmental Strategies & Topics should include incentives for use of solar powered boats

i.e.: double opportunity to get a pier in the lottery, if pier awarded restricted to having only a solar powered boat on the lift.

Comments on the Shoreline Plan:

OR Between Alternative #1 & #2 if provided a pier when donate \$200,000 towards a Solar Ferry fund and the pier lift is also restricted to solar powered boat use -

Name (optional):

ELISE FETT

Phone (optional):

775 762 3388

Email (optional):

ELISE@ELISEFETT.COM or ELISEFETT@GMAIL.COM  
OR



Comment  
Card  
PM60

Elise Fett  
No Date  
Comment Card

PM60-1

The comment suggests different schemes for pier prioritization. Pier applications would be prioritized as described on pages 2-31 through 2-33 of the Draft EIS. Please refer to Master Response 1 – The Shoreline Plan and Planning Process, in Section 3.1, which provides details on how comments that express support for, or opposition to, a Shoreline Plan alternative or recommend changes to the proposed Shoreline Plan are considered.

PM61-1

## COMMENT CARD

Draft EIS Comments:

Can this language become "all proposed ~~structures~~ + ~~structures~~"  
(structures)

Comments on the Shoreline Plan:

1320 ft. trigger for consultation w/ water suppliers on proposed new pier is great. Buoy ~~fields~~ 'ZONE OF protection' trigger for consultation w/ water providers is not defined in the plan. Intakes have been damaged by buoy blocks, anchors + sinking boats. (lines + pumps) buoy location (natural + human buoy drift)  
\* Defining buoy placement + enforcement to protect intakes is needed.

Name (optional):

MADONNA DUNBAR / TAHOE WATER SUPPLIERS ASSN.

Phone (optional):

775-832-1212

Email (optional):

MOD@TVCID.ORG



Comment  
Card  
PM61

Madonna Dunbar, Tahoe Water Suppliers Association

No Date

Comment Card

PM61-1

The comment requests that permit applications for any shorezone structure within a "zone of protection" trigger consultation with public water providers. As stated on page 2-23 of the Draft EIS, "TRPA Code Section 60.3.3 requires that TRPA consult with water purveyors when evaluating applications and development of permit conditions for any proposed shoreline structure within 600 feet of a drinking water intake. The proposed Shoreline Plan would expand this requirement to apply to any proposed shoreline structure within one quarter mile of a drinking water intake." Please also refer to the response to comment 015-1, which addresses this topic.