

3.5 PUBLIC HEARING

Draft EIR-EIS Meeting Notes TRPA Advisory Planning Commission

**Letter
112**

Date: Wednesday, July 13, 2016
Time: Beginning at 9:30 a.m.
Location: TRPA's Offices, Stateline, NV

Meeting Purpose:

Receive oral comments on the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Project Draft EIR/EIS.

Attendees: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC) members, TRPA staff, Placer County staff, and interested stakeholders.

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments
1	Carol White	Full-time resident at Tahoe City Marina Lakefront (TML). Residential community of 48 townhouses. Concerned about trail between Fanny Bridge and Commons Beach. The preferred alternative for a bike trail connecting Fanny Bridge to Commons Beach along a shoreline path is shown in the Area Plan. It is buried in text, but Figure 5.5 of the Area Plan shows it in detail. Not shown or described in the Draft EIR/EIS. It should be. It also was not included in the NOP. June 2015 EIR for Fanny Bridge showed a gap in the connection, a missing link. The September 2015 Area Plan showed the shared-use path on the town side of the path. TML agreed to remove a portion of the reception area to allow the path to be constructed, which was reflected in a plan TML has worked on with the county and TCPUD. Alignments that avoid SEZ are not shown. The path shown is on private property. The Mobility Plan showed 10 to 12 path alternatives. None of the town side alternatives in the Mobility Plan are shown in the Area Plan and EIR/EIS. There is no discussion to explain why only the lakeside is shown. The reasonable range of alternatives required by CEQA is completely missing from the EIR. There is no analysis of the path impacts. There are multiple alternatives other than the lake side alignment that meet the basic objective of a safe path. These alternatives should be included. The waterside path would require recirculation. There is a failure to provide adequate scoping, alternatives analysis, and an inconsistency with the Regional Plan for failing to address impacts on threshold attainment. A decision on which alternative to include the Area Plan and EIR should not have been included without careful analysis. We are now left with a deficient EIR.
2	Pat Davidson, Executive Director of Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe	Association has identified affordable housing as a priority for many years. Two issues with second units. (1) All residential parcels in the Area Plan should be eligible for second residential units. The change in the Area Plan limits second units to parcels within ¼ mile of transit. Worked with Placer County staff to determine how many parcels would not be eligible, and only 10 parcels would not be eligible. Will need to be some environmental review to add 10 parcels, so all residential parcels would be eligible for second units. (2) The second residential units that require full-time time residency should be able use TRPA pool allocations and bonus units rather than market-rate allocations. This may need environmental review and analysis. Wants to

112-1

112-2

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
		incentivize second units. These two things should not be considered an exceedance of the growth caps established for the basin. There is a severe housing crisis; it affects employers, employees, families, and the community. Need housing for full-time residences. We believe 2 nd residential units are an easy way to address this.	112-2 cont
3	Robert White	Tahoe City resident. Concern about proposed waterside path between Fanny Bridge and Commons Beach. Have already heard about the lack of scoping and alternatives, and not even a basic analysis of issues. There is no analysis of safety issues. The path would divide the grassy and beach areas with a 10-foot wide paved path. Children and toddlers run between grass and beach. With path users crossing this area, this would be significant safety issue. Another issue is the shoreline disturbance that would be caused by placing a bike path in the SEZ. The air and water quality issues need to be analyzed under CEQA. The path would generate significant noise issues (during evening hours and path maintenance), and crime and tort liability issues that result in significant impacts. The path would create unintended trespassing. The grassy area would become a public park. Privacy and tranquility would also be an issue. The path would be highly visible from the lake; it would not be screened like the town side alternatives. Any path needs a full socioeconomic analysis that considers impacts to the county and the homeowners. The mobility plan never went out for public comment.	112-3
4	Steve Teshara, APC Member	Will the Mobility Plan bike trail be analyzed in the County Parks and Recreation Master Plan? <u>Response from Crystal:</u> The Area Plan talks about three path alignments, and describes the preferred. The map in the recreation element includes the preferred alternative. Yes, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan team will look at the path. The path will also be reviewed at a project level.	112-4
5	Sam Rudnick	Owner of Bechdolt building next door to the Tahoe City Lodge. They were not aware of the NOP. NOP showed parking and other issues that aren't true. There are issues with easements and parking, and this and that. On a weekend we cannot park our buildings as it is. The golf course users use their parking, because there is not enough parking at the golf course. Sees real issues in the shared parking. To say the project would not generate traffic is just wrong. Probably going to need another 100 parking spaces. A little surprised that the public land owners most affected by the project were not included in the process. My family owns the Tahoe Raft Company, and the plan doesn't even address rafting.	112-5
6	Ellie Waller	My minor changes in the NOP were not addressed. I want corrections made – little things like there are 51 plan area statements not 57. The Tahoe City Lodge – the specificity of the type of units is wrong. It is a 40-unit lodge with 68 condos. Condos have different impacts. A parking assessment needs to be done. An assessment of the impacts on the Bechdolt building and winter activities at the golf course needs to be done. All of these things together will have an effect on parking. I don't know what the North Tahoe West area is. Is it a town center or a community center? The word community center should not be used. It should be called a village center.	112-6
7	Jan McLay	On the Board of Directors of TML. We request based on the comments that neighbors have made that the path shown along the water be removed from the map in the Area Plan. There is not room for a bike path on the water side. A 10-foot wide path would take out units. Requests that their zoning remain a residential mixed-use property.	112-7
8	Ann Nichols, North Tahoe	The Tahoe City Lodge has captured this process, and made it confusing. Ascent has not analyzed an environmentally superior alternative that is available. They have mixed and matched alternatives. With Alternative 3 the desire for reduced	112-8

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
	Preservation Alliance	height was included, but the desire for not including increased density to 40 units per acre was not analyzed. The Tahoe City Lodge computes density based on the use of someone else's property. The only public benefit of the lodge project is that we get a better clubhouse. People are fed up with traffic gridlock. Not buying the thing about reduced vehicle miles. The existing condition is already bad. It's bad and we haven't finished all the projects, like Boulder Bay, Joerger Ranch, and Brockway Campground. It's a flawed document and includes bad alternatives. It failed to analyze an alternative that is reasonable. The modest tenant improvements as a baseline for the Tahoe City Lodge; will that include doing their required BMPs. For the conversion from CFA to TAUs, is that out of the bonus units? Re: Ridgeline protection. Where is it and where can I find it and what does it say?	112-8 cont
9	Shannon Eckmeyer, League to Save Lake Tahoe	Excited about a lot of components of the Area Plan. Excited by deed-restriction language for the golf course. Truly an example of stakeholder collaborative effort. Will lead to a direct SEZ restoration. Also, wants to recognize the TART Management Plan, and the work to improve transit. Comments will be focusing on traffic and VMT impacts. The League is hiring a traffic consultant. Not sure what Martis decision will mean for the Area Plan traffic analysis.	112-9
10	Dan Edwards	40-year homeowner at TML. The lakeside trail would severely change the tranquility of the property. It would go adjacent to the pool and would affect the privacy of the pool. At least nine mature aspen trees would need to be taken out. It would be a severe impact on the environment. Suggests deleting it from the plan. It would also affect local businesses by diverting foot traffic away from businesses.	112-10
11	Susan Gearheardt, Friends of the West Shore	President of Friends of the West Shore. Interested in significant and unavoidable impacts and how you get away with that. The traffic going to the west shore is incredible. We don't have a plan for emergency evacuation. Also, concerned about cumulative impacts of traffic coming inside of Tahoe. It should be calculated. The pilot project should not be part of the Area Plan. The lobby location doesn't work for crowding that you could have for people coming in at peak times. Need to decrease land coverage to improve soil quality, and water quality. Need to know that BMPs work.	112-11
12	Roger Kahn	Lives in Tahoe City. Owns three commercial properties in Tahoe City; two are developed. The Tahoe City Lodge property is blighted. It's time for that to change. Tahoe City has deteriorated over the years. This is an opportunity to adopt the Area Plan. As a property owner in town, there will be more of an opportunity and incentive to fix up their properties with the Tahoe City Lodge. Urges support of the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge project.	112-12
13	Cindy Gustafson, Tahoe City Public Utility District	Offered compliments to Placer County and TRPA staff. Described golf course acquisition process and goals. The deed-restriction language is intended to lead to environmental benefits, recreational benefits, and redevelopment of commercial properties. The community needs revitalization; the plan addresses degradation that has occurred.	112-13
14	Ron Treabass, North Lake Tahoe Resort Association	The environmental document is excellent and well produced. They have great analysis included. Placer County has done a terrific job on the Area Plan. They conducted great outreach. Many of the visioning options and principles have been integrated in the Area Plan and it would be implemented by the Tahoe City Lodge now being proposed. Relocating and increasing the bed base in the Town Center is what we've wanted. Lodging at the lake is part of the NLTRA's long-term goals. It is important the Area Plan is meeting the visions that have been discussed widely over years. Starting this winter there will be 30-minute headway, not a 1-	112-14

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
		hour headway for transit service. Service will be longer into the evenings in the off season.	112-14 cont
15	Zach Hymonson, APC Member	<p>Re: restoration performance targets. Chapter 8, page 169. It seems to say that all of the restoration is privately funded.</p> <p><u>Response from Crystal:</u> It is in addition to the EIP.</p> <p>I think the Area Plan and environment document missed an opportunity regarding restoration. The Chapter 13 directives allow for special considerations for SEZ restoration, parking, etc. Thinks the Area Plan should do more to make gains in SEZ restoration. The public opportunities for SEZ restoration referenced include Burke Creek and Pomin Park. These types of project can result in a benefit with respect to TMDL.</p> <p>In terms of the transit mobility policies. One thing that is missing from the Area Plan and the EIR/EIS is snow storage and the effects it can have on parking and mobility. Snow storage can be a real impactful thing in Kings Beach and Tahoe City.</p> <p>Proposal is for 1.7 acres of SEZ restoration. Where does this occur in the project timeline? The SEZ restoration should come at the beginning of the project.</p> <p>Related to the Tahoe City lodge parking, I didn't see any options considered for two-story parking. Suggest that be considered as part of an alternative.</p>	112-15
16	Jason Drew, APC Member	<p>Has a detailed parking management study been done in Tahoe City?</p> <p><u>Response from Crystal:</u> A study was done for the Area Plan. It looked for community wide parking solutions, and contributed to the revised parking standards in the Area Plan. Chapter 10 of the EIR/EIS includes a detailed parking discussion for the Tahoe City Lodge.</p>	12-16
17	John Hitchcock, APC Member	<p>Is the scenic analysis based on the proposed standards or the current standards in the Area Plan?</p> <p><u>Response from Adam:</u> The Tahoe City Lodge implements the Area Plan standards and the impacts are analyzed against the TRPA thresholds.</p>	112-17
18	Eric Guevin, APC Member	Are the minimum parking spaces met for the lodge without including the parking for the golf course and clubhouse? On one hand you are saying people will park their cars and not need to use them, but they need to have a car somewhere. Just want to make sure minimum parking is met. It affects public safety. When people can't find parking they double park and park in areas that affect our access.	112-18
19	Steve Teshara, APC Member	USFS no longer funds the west shore transit service. That is funded through the Tahoe Transportation District. Will provide a list of similar comments. Should be an economic discussion of the alternatives. This should be part of the decision making.	112-19
End of Discussion Item			

**Letter
112**

**TRPA Advisory Planning Commission Draft EIR/EIS Meeting Notes
July 13, 2016**

-
- 112-1 The comment raises concerns about the trail between Fanny Bridge and Commons Beach as it relates to the Tahoe Marina Lakefront condominium community. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted on behalf of the Tahoe Marina Lakefront titled “Tahoe Basin Area Plan DEIR/DEIS.” The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 16. Please see responses to comment letter 16 and Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 112-2 The comment pertains to affordable housing, and the suggests that all residential parcels within the Plan area should be eligible for second residential units and that second residential units that require full-time residency should be eligible for TRPA pool allocations and bonus units rather than market-rate allocations. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted on behalf of the Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe titled “Comments on Draft EIR/EIS for the Tahoe Basin Area Plan.” The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 11. Please see responses to comment letter 11 and Master Response 3, Affordable Housing, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 112-3 The comment expresses concern about the proposed waterside path between Fanny Bridge and Commons Beach and the impact on the Tahoe Marina Lakefront Community. The oral comments are similar to a written letter submitted by the commenter and Carole White, titled “Tahoe Basin Area Plan DEIR/DEIS.” The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 107. Please see responses to comment letter 107 and Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 112-4 The comment questions county staff as to whether the Mobility Plan shared-use path would be analyzed in the Placer County Parks and Recreation Master Plan. County staff responded that indeed the Parks and Recreation Master Plan would look at the path, and that the path would also be subject to project-level environmental review. This comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the environmental document. The comment is noted for consideration during project review.
- 112-5 The comment states he was not aware of the Notice of Preparation (NOP), expressed concern about parking spillover, and states that to say the project would not generate traffic is just wrong. With respect to the comment regarding the NOP, CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, requires that lead agencies send the NOP to the Office of Planning and Research (i.e., State Clearinghouse) and each responsible and trustee agency. The lead agencies not only met the above requirements, as described on page 1-4 of the Draft EIR/EIS, but also posted the NOP on the agency websites, sent the NOP to interested parties, posted the notice in a local newspaper of general circulation, and posted a large sign in front of the Henrikson building providing information on the project and project contacts at the county. With respect to the comments parking and traffic concerns, these oral comments are similar to those in a written letter provided by the commenter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 85. Please see responses to comment letter 85.
- 112-6 The comment states that minor changes submitted on the NOP were not addressed, articulates concerns about inconsistencies in the document, and requests that a parking assessment be completed for the Tahoe City Lodge. These oral comments are similar to those provided by the commenter in eight written letters included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 98 through 105. Please see responses to comment letters 98 through 105.

- 112-7 The comment expresses opposition to the lake side alignment of the shared-use path between Commons Beach and Fanny Bridge. See Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 112-8 The comment expresses concern about including the Tahoe City Lodge Project and the Area Plan in the same environmental document, concern about the transportation and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis, and dissatisfaction with the Draft EIR/EIS alternatives. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted on behalf of the North Tahoe Preservation Alliance entitled “Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) and Tahoe City Lodge Project (TCLP) EIR/EIS.” The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 15. Please see responses to comment letter 15 and Master Response 1, VMT and LOS Analysis, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 112-9 The comment expresses support for components of the Area Plan, particularly deed restriction language for the golf course that would lead to direct SEZ restoration, and the TART management plan work that would improve transit. These comments do not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the environmental document, but are noted for consideration in the review of the merits of the alternatives. The comment also references future written comments to be submitted on behalf of the League to Save Lake Tahoe that will focus on traffic and VMT. Those comments are included in a written letter titled “Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Report/Statement for Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Project.” The letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 13. Please see responses to comment letter 13 and Master Response 1, VMT and LOS Analysis, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 112-10 The comment expresses concern about the impact on the tranquility and privacy of Tahoe Marina Lakefront owners if the lakefront shared-use path is built. The comment also expresses concern about the need to remove aspen trees for the proposed trail alignment, and the effect on businesses of losing foot traffic that would be diverted away from the roadside. The comment requests that the Area Plan not include a lakeside alignment for the proposed waterside path between Fanny Bridge and Commons Beach. Please see Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 112-11 The comment expresses concern about the significant and unavoidable impacts described in the Draft EIR/EIS, traffic impacts resulting from the plan, the need for an emergency evacuation plan, the inclusion of the Tahoe City Lodge in the analysis, and the need to reduce land coverage for soil and water quality improvements. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted on behalf of the Friends of the West Shore together with the Tahoe Area Sierra Club Group titled “Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Draft Environmental Impact Report/Study.” The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 12. Please see responses to comment letter 12, as well as Master Response 1, VMT and LOS Analysis, and Master Response 6, Emergency Access and Evacuation, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 112-12 The comment expresses support for the Area Plan and the need to reverse the deterioration of commercial properties in Tahoe City such as the site of the Tahoe City Lodge. The comment states that the Area Plan provides the opportunity and incentives to improve properties in Tahoe City, and urges the approval of the Area Plan and the Tahoe City Lodge. These comments do not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the environmental document, but are noted for consideration in the review of the merits of the project.

- 112-13 The comment compliments Placer County and TRPA for the work on the Area Plan Draft EIS/EIR. The comment further states that the deed-restriction language for the golf course will lead to environmental and recreational benefits, and that the plan will lead to redevelopment of commercial properties and community revitalization that is needed.
- 112-14 The comment compliments the quality of the environmental document and analysis, the public outreach efforts made for the Area Plan, and the integration of public visioning options and principles in the Area Plan. The comment also praises the efforts to relocate and improve lodging in Town Centers, and points out improvements in transit service. These comments do not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the environmental document, but are noted for consideration in the review of the merits of the project.
- 112-15 The comment questions county staff as to whether all restoration described in Chapter 8 of the Area Plan would be privately funded. County staff responded that it was in addition to publicly-funded restoration included in the Environmental Improvement Program. The commenter expresses that the Area Plan should do more to make gains in SEZ restoration, including public projects that benefit TMDL. The commenter also expresses concern about the impact of snow storage on mobility and parking in Kings Beach and Tahoe City, about the timing of the 1.7 acres of SEZ restoration associated with the Tahoe City Lodge project, and the need to consider two-story parking for the Tahoe City Lodge. Portions of these comments are addressed in Master Response 2, SEZ Restoration, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS. Other aspects of this comment do not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the environmental document. The comment is noted for consideration during project review.
- 112-16 The commenter questioned county staff as to whether a parking management study had been prepared for Tahoe City. County staff responded that a parking study had been performed for the whole Area Plan, resulting in community-wide parking solutions and revised parking standards for the Area Plan. In addition, a detailed parking discussion is included for the Tahoe City Lodge in Impact 10-8 of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 112-17 The commenter questioned whether the scenic analysis was based on the proposed standards in the Area Plan or the current standards. Ascent Environmental responded that the Tahoe City Lodge complies with the proposed Area Plan standards, and impacts are analyzed against the existing TRPA thresholds.
- 112-18 This comment does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the environmental document, but is noted for consideration in the review of the merits of the project.
- 112-19 This comment pertains to the Area Plan. It does not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the environmental document.

Draft EIR/EIS Meeting Notes TRPA Governing Board

**Letter
113**

Date: Wednesday, July 27, 2016
Time: Beginning at 9:00 a.m.
Location: North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, CA

Meeting Purpose:

To hear and record comments on the Draft EIR/EIS.

Attendees: TRPA Governing Board members, TRPA staff, Placer County staff, and interested stakeholders.

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
1	Clem Schute, GB Member	Will hold comments until RPIC meeting in the afternoon.	I 113-1
2	Shelly Aldean, GB Member	<p>Re: Tahoe City Lodge. Alternative 1 makes a lot of sense in terms of shared uses. Obviously there are environmental benefits with Alternative 2. Would Alternative 2 be financially feasible?</p> <p><u>Samir Response:</u> We would not pursue, because it would not meet our goals. In looking in alternatives in the Area Plan. Disappointed that affordable housing didn't make it into the secondary residential units. This sort of thing needs to be deed restricted. We need to have a guarantee that these will be used for affordable housing. Would like the deed restriction affordable housing provision to be included in the Area Plan.</p> <p><u>Crystal Response:</u> County is open to considering that.</p>	113-2
3	Larry Sevison, GB Member	<p>In doing the analysis of drainage, it use to go toward the Lucky site. Was this factored into the analysis?</p> <p><u>Adam Response:</u> yes, a large portion of Tahoe City does drain to the Tahoe City Wetlands and that is accounted for in the PRLM modeling. It looked at loads outside and inside the Basin.</p>	113-3
4	Bill Yeates, GB Member	<p>Confused on page 142 of the staff report, and on page 3-26 of the Draft EIR/EIS dealing with the various lodge alternative. Points out inconsistency in Table 3-5 on page 3-26 summing up the TAU units. Help describe the hotel versus timeshare aspect.</p> <p><u>Samir Response:</u> The owner of the suites will have a limitation on how long they can stay. They will not include lock off units. They will be deed restricted that shows them the number of nights they will be allowed to stay.</p>	113-4
5	Ellie Waller	Draft EIR/EIS has too many inconsistencies. Implementing ordinance terminology conflicting language. In Chapter 1, definition in TRPA Code. Placer County Code is also confusing. Tahoe Vista should be a village center. I requested at RPIC June 24, 2015 wanted to cite to RPU and Regional Plan page numbers. Requested Tahoe City Lodge project application from Placer County, and still have not received. I will go into more detail at RPIC. There is a request for an amendment to the Tahoe City Lodge if the Area Plan is not approved. Asking that the APC and GB presentations be on the web.	113-5

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
6	Pat Davison, Executive Director of Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe	Involved with RPU and residential allocation program. Strong supporter of the Truckee North Tahoe Regional Housing Study. Employee housing, workforce housing, and housing for the missing middle. Moderate income housing. We support a strong program that meets this need, and supports the 2 nd residential units. Include all residential parcels (only 10 parcels wouldn't be eligible for the proposed changes), environmental analysis should include those 10. Willing to help with policy options. Opposed to market rate housing for all second residential units. Then they could possibly go through the bonus pool process of get an allocation from the county's pool. Bonus pool units were already contemplated in the Regional Plan. Ultimate goal is to increase more housing supply for the workforce housing population.	113-6
7	Carol White	TC resident. Representing Tahoe Marin Lakefront Homeowner Association. This is a hybrid Area Plan. The Area Plan has preemptively selected a preferred alignment along the lake. Appreciates Crystal's comments about conceptual. If this is truly conceptual the map should be revised to reflect no specific alignment. At no point were we engaged in the process. No scoping of the shoreline path and no analysis of the path. TML is a residential condominium community. The Area Plan calls for implementing the Tahoe City Mobility Plan. The Mobility Plan only recommends the lakefront route. The EIR is deficient in analyzing the impacts of the trail. We want to support a continuous path from Fanny Bridge too. Want to collaborate on a mobility enhancing solution.	113-7
8	Robert White	Tahoe City Marina resident. Has concern for the lakeside alignment. The alignment is between the beach and the grass area. Unsafe to have a path crossing where kids play. Need to analyze air and water quality impacts. Originally 12 path alignments were being considered. The socioeconomic impacts have never been analyzed. Went to a townside alignment in September 2015. This new path was added in the Area Plan with no analysis in the EIR/EIS.	
9	Carol Hester	Tahoe City resident. Business owner in Tahoe City. Tahoe City has declined over the years. It has lost overnight visitors. New and improved lodging is long overdue. The Tahoe City Lodge project provides an infill project in the Town Center. The golf course gets a clubhouse upgrade at the developer's expense. The environmental and economic benefits are huge. Also Douglas Dale (owner of Wolf Dale's) is also a supporter.	113-8
10	Don Holbrant	Tahoe City Marina Lakefront president. Gary Davis prepared a plan showing a better alignment. Putting a connection on the lakeside of TML or as a boardwalk, is not a practical approach.	
11	Steven Swan	Owned at Tahoe Marina Lakefront for 14 years. The lakeside alignment will affect the privacy and security for the units (residents and guests). Has had prior security issues on the property. I'm assuming part of the path would go into the lakebed and SEZ.	113-9
12	Dave Edwards	Owner at TML for 40 years. TML includes 48 condos. Concerned about the lakeside alignment. Impacts to safety of children, noise from path use in bedrooms, people sleeping on their patios (security).	
13	Steve Glazer	Some aspects I'm an advocate for (e.g., workforce housing). Supports public/private partnerships. 2980 North Lake Tahoe Blvd. Seek correction on property and the Lake Forest Glen PAS. A letter will be submitted to address this. Property has been used for many uses. They were downzoned to a commercial designation.	113-10

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
14	Sam Rudnick	Tahoe Sierra Recreation owner. The Tahoe City Lodge has decided they would use our driveway for free. There is an easement there. Owns the Bechdolt building. There are uses on the property that would negatively affect his family. Wants the Henrikson property redeveloped. Has issues with the easement being used for coverage for the Tahoe City Lodge when it is our property. The easement is used by many (TCPUD, private residences, Kila). Where the fountain is our property starts. We need the ability to address this with the powers that be. The ingress and egress is going to be crazy. We'd like to see a block wall between our property and the project site.	113-11
15	Aaron Rudnick	Where is the coverage coming from, as well as the parking. Concerned that the distance of some parking will cause people to use their property. A lot of clarifying issues. Page 9-16 there is a discussion of commercial use. Is the easement being used for coverage? There isn't a single alternative that doesn't use their easement. Disappointed that Alternative 2 won't be done. If there are alternatives that won't be implemented, then they are not alternatives. The setback affects the view corridor.	
16	Gary Davis	Supports the Area Plan as presented. Offered support for the Tahoe City Lodge. Tahoe City is suffering economically. Tremendous amount of benefits related to getting rid of the Henrikson property.	113-12
17	Sandy Evans Hall	CEO North Lake Tahoe Resort Association. The Tahoe City Lodge project is important to our area. Good quality lodging is really important. We are a stakeholder in the ownership of the golf course. It helps them meet goals that led to their purchase of gold course.	
18	Lee Connent	Alpine Meadows resident. Offered that family support the Tahoe City Lodge project. Adds a great aesthetic and beautiful design.	113-13
19	Shannon Eckmeyer, League	Will be submitting comments. Wanted to highlight the deed restriction portion of the Tahoe City Lodge. Also supports Placer County transit approach. Comments will be focused on traffic. Concerned about VMT capacity, and what out-of-Basin projects will do to VMT.	
20	Roger Kahn	Offered support for work done on the Area Plan, and to support the Tahoe City Lodge Project. The existing property is an eye sore. Owns a couple of parcels in Tahoe City. Believes Tahoe City Lodge will motivate other property owners to redevelop their properties.	113-14
21	Jennifer Quashnick, FOWS	Concern is traffic. The RPU EIS promised that the VMT impacts would be looked at. This EIR/EIS does not look at localized VMT. The mitigation talks about TART report. The Area Plan isn't considering the mitigation fee programs, so how is this funded. With traffic congestion comes health and safety issues, such as emergency evacuation.	113-15
22	Alex Mourelatos	TOT \$s were used to purchase golf course. Agreed that was a good investment, as it would lead to an overall increase in TOT. Endorses the Tahoe City Lodge.	113-16
23	Joe Lanza	Offered support to the Tahoe City Lodge project.	
24	Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club	Concerned about the efforts that are promised as environmentally beneficial results. Document says there are matching SEZ tradeoffs. Can have 1:1 mitigation, need 4:1? The SEZ restoration is shrinking. Concerned about loose use of significant. Will look at significant and unavoidable.	113-17

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
25	Cindy Gustafson	Thanked TRPA and PC staff for extensive outreach. TCPUD will be commenting on utility issues and parks and recreation issues. There hasn't been a private investment. It's going to take public/private partnership. Tahoe City is the most physically constrained town center. Board agreed to take areas TCPUD owns out of the Town Center boundary to support environmental gain.	113-18
26	Billy MacDonald	Tahoe Marina Lodge. Reasons why private properties don't w 1) crime rate; trespass, liability, noise, accident, surrounding traffic, risk of fire increase, etc. Peace and quiet decreases. Ruins their view.	113-19
27	Jeff Oxanderboard	Sunnyside Resort. Offered support for Tahoe City Lodge Project. Tahoe City Lodge used to be the hub of activity. There is a desperate need for lodging.	113-20
28	Stacy Lions	Executive Director of Tahoe City Downtown Association. Offered support for the Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge.	
29	Larry Sevison, GB Member	Tahoe Tavern used to be the largest hotel. It had a train through it from Truckee.	

**Letter
113****TRPA Governing Board Draft EIR/EIS Meeting Notes
July 27, 2016**

- 113-1 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 113-2 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 113-3 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 113-4 The comment identifies an error in Table 3-5 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Table 3-5 is corrected in this Final EIR/EIS. Please see the changes shown in Chapter 2, "Corrections and Revisions to the Draft EIR/EIS."
- 113-5 The comment states that the Draft EIR/EIS has inconsistencies and that terminology and language is confusing. The commenter also states that information previously requested has not been provided, that Tahoe Vista should be a Village Center, and that APC and Governing Board presentations be available on the web. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by the commenter in eight written letters included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 98 through 105. Please see responses to comment letters 98 through 105.
- 113-6 The comment pertains to affordable housing, and the commenter's suggestion that all residential parcels within the Plan area should be eligible for second residential units, and that second residential units that require full-time residency should be eligible for TRPA pool allocations and bonus units rather than market-rate allocations. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted on behalf of the Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe titled "Comments on Draft EIR/EIS for the Tahoe Basin Area Plan." The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 11. Please see responses to comment letter 11 and Master Response 3, Affordable Housing, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 113-7 The comment relates to the selection of an alternative for the Tahoe Marina Lakefront shared-use path alignment. It states that no specific alignment should be identified, and that the Draft EIR/EIS did not adequately analyze the shared-use path. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by the commenter in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 107. Please see responses to comment letter 107 and Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 113-8 The comment expresses support for the Tahoe City Lodge project and its importance as an infill project providing new and improved lodging options. These comments do not raise environmental issues or concerns regarding the adequacy, accuracy, or completeness of the environmental document, but are noted for consideration in the review of the merits of the project.
- 113-9 These comments express concerns regarding the lake side shared-use path and potential adverse impacts associated with the shared-use path. In addition, they suggested an alternative location for the shared-use path alignment. See Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 113-10 The comment indicates support for parts of the plan such as workforce housing and public/private partnerships. The commenter indicated he would submit comments on the Lake Forest Glen PAS due to down-zoning to commercial. These are oral comments that are

similar to those provided by the commenter in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 69. Please see the response to comment letter 69.

- 113-11 These comments express concerns of adjoining landowners to the Tahoe City Lodge, including use of easements, ingress/egress, and incompatible uses. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by these commenters in written letters included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 82 and 85. Please see responses to comment letters 82 and 85.
- 113-12 These comments express support for the Tahoe City Lodge project and its importance in providing a good quality lodging option with a beautiful design.
- 113-13 The comment expresses support for some components of the Area Plan, particularly the deed restriction portion of the Tahoe City Lodge and the Placer County transit approach. The commenter also references future written comments to be submitted on behalf of the League to Save Lake Tahoe that will focus on traffic and VMT. Those comments are included in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 13. Please see responses to comment letter 13 and Master Response 1, VMT and LOS Analysis, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 113-14 The comment expresses support for the Area Plan and the need to reverse the deterioration of commercial properties in Tahoe City such as the site of the Tahoe City Lodge. The comment states that the Area Plan provides the opportunity and incentives to improve properties in Tahoe City, and urges the approval of the Area Plan and the Tahoe City Lodge.
- 113-15 The comment expresses concern about the traffic impacts resulting from the plan, the need for an emergency evacuation plan, and the lack of consideration of a mitigation fee program. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted on behalf of the Friends of the West Shore and the Tahoe Area Sierra Club Group titled "Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Draft Environmental Impact Report/Study." The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 12. Please see responses to comment letter 12, as well as Master Response 1, VMT and LOS Analysis, and Master Response 6, Emergency Access and Evacuation, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 113-16 These comments express support for the Tahoe City Lodge project and the use of Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) dollars to purchase the golf course as it would lead to an overall increase in TOT dollars.
- 113-17 The comment expresses concern about the significant and unavoidable impacts described in the Draft EIR/EIS, the adequacy of SEZ restoration and mitigation, and the use of the term significant. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted on behalf of the Friends of the West Shore together with the Tahoe Area Sierra Club Group titled "Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge Draft Environmental Impact Report/Study." The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 12. Please see responses to comment letter 12, as well as Master Response 2, SEZ Restoration, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 113-18 The comment compliments Placer County and TRPA staff for their extensive outreach on the Area Plan Draft EIR/EIS, and states that TCPUD will be submitting future comments on utilities, and parks and recreation issues. The comment referred to the need for a public/private partnership, and TCPUD's efforts to remove lands owned by TCPUD from the Town Center boundary. The oral comments are similar to those submitted in writing by letter the commenter. The letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 8. Please see responses to comment letter 8 for additional discussion.

- 113-19 This comment expresses concern regarding the lake side shared-use path and potential adverse impacts associated with the shared-use path, including crime, trespass, liability, noise, accidents, risk of fire, and loss of peace and quiet. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by the commenter in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 63. Please see responses to comment letter 63, as well as Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 113-20 These comments express support for the Tahoe City Lodge project and its importance in providing a needed lodging option in Tahoe City.

Draft EIR-EIS Meeting Notes

**Letter
114**

TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee

Date: Wednesday, July 27, 2016
Time: Beginning at 11:30 a.m.
Location: North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, CA

Meeting Purpose:

To hear and record comments on the Draft EIR/EIS.

Attendees: TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee (RPIC) members, TRPA staff, Placer County staff, and interested stakeholders.

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
1	Jim Lawrence	<p>Is the bike trail alignment near Tahoe Marina Lakeside meant to be conceptual, and can you confirm there will be a separate environmental review and alternative selection process for the bike trail alignment?</p> <p>John Marshall response: Yes, the Area Plan does not make a decision on the trail alignment. Conceptual trail alignments are included in maps for illustrative purposes only and they do not trigger environmental review, at this time. There would be a separate environmental review prior to selection of specific trail alignments.</p> <p>Jim Lawrence: As a land manager he can recognize concern with maps that show conceptual alignments. The Area Plan should be clarified to show that the trail alignment is only conceptual and Area Plan is not proposing a specific route.</p>	114-1
2	Mark Bruce	<p>Would an Area Plan decision influence the bike trail route to be selected in subsequent project?</p> <p>John Marshall response: Need to clarify in Area Plan that this shows types of projects that may come forward, but is not intended to decide on a route.</p> <p>Crystal Jacobson response: The intent is not to decide on an alignment. The County will revise the map to show 3 alternate routes and include language to clarify that a route has not been decided.</p>	
3	Larry Sevinson	He believes lakeside trail alignment is on public land and the existing pier is public. Suggests that the County leave plan as is, recognizing the alignment is just an option.	
4	Clem Shute	Clarify how mobility plan is incorporated into Area Plan.	114-2
5	Shelly Aldean	<p>Is an adjacent property owner's land being used to calculate coverage for the lodge project?</p> <p>Lucia Maloney response: Reference Appendix G in the Draft EIR/EIS, which includes coverage calculations. As shown in the appendix, the allowable coverage calculations exclude neighboring property.</p>	114-3

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
6	Bill Yeates	<p>Has concerns related to Fanny bridge and entrance into Tahoe City. He appreciated the addition of the Fanny bridge district, but there was also discussion about pedestrian crossings, one-way traffic, and CalTrans Corp yard in this area.</p> <p>Baseline traffic conditions on SR 28 in Tahoe City are not good, and any increases result in significant and unavoidable impacts. He does not like the sense that this is just accepted. He wants to include mitigation strategies with targets. We can't expand road capacity, so we need to restrict car use, consistent with compact. We need out of the box strategies to get people out of cars. We need to have a balance of economic and environmental improvements.</p> <p>He is in favor of many area plan policies and having visitor serving improvements. But we need to address transportation issues and need a reliable transit system. We should build on successful programs elsewhere (e.g., providing visitor information on transit). We need to move beyond legal findings and CEQA obligations and come up with solutions in the Area Plan and take advantage of Fanny Bridge project by providing parking at the CalTrans Corp yard; and consider off-site parking in partnership with resorts. CEQA is moving away from LOS because it kills in-fill and VMT used instead. Currently, TRPA assumes projects are OK if they don't exceed VMT thresholds. We need a better understanding of traffic control options, and work with County to enhance visitor experience without cars.</p>	114-4
7	Clem Shute	<p>The region is within 10% of the VMT threshold. We need a different significance standard for VMT, and the EIS is not defensible, as is. Otherwise only the last project that exceeds standards is significant.</p> <p>The transit zone of benefit is not viable mitigation because it does not identify performance standards like funding level, and does not explain whether it would continue in perpetuity.</p>	114-5
8	Larry Sevinson	Much traffic in the plan area is from elsewhere. Sacramento and other areas are growing leading to more visitors. Need to provide funding for transit and alternative modes like water transit. There are concerns in Martis Valley regarding emergency evacuation. Consider rail as an option. He is frustrated that there is not an easy solution.	
9	Bill Yeates	Need to separate the discussion of the project from plan. The plan is the place to come up with solutions. Traffic is an issues all the way to Sacramento. No matter what is done for Water Quality, we can't achieve our mission without addressing traffic and transit. Many people are not used to transit, but some in Bay Area are very used to it, and it can be viable in Tahoe if it is more convenient. We need to not just accept traffic as significant and unavoidable. We need to lay out all strategies.	114-6
10	Jim Lawrence	He would like to see more detail in EIS transportation sections, including the level of funding generated by zone of benefit. He would like future plans to include more creative alternatives at address transportation. He likes the Area Plan and doesn't want to limit moving forward with Area Plans until all transportation issues are solved.	114-7
11	Hall Cole	Does not want individual projects to limit parking to promote transit. This causes unintended impacts.	114-8

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
12	Clem Shute	Broad issues require Area Plan or regional solution, but individual projects will cause impacts that need to be addressed.	114-8 cont
	Shelly Aldean	Individual projects may have environmental benefits even though they contribute VMT. Need to use creative thinking; consider trains and trolleys. Mode of transit should be enticing: not a bus but trolley or train.	
	Ellie Waller	<p>She sent in written comments but has not seen an affordable housing requirement for the Tahoe City Lodge. Even without displacing housing every other project has needed to provide in-kind or in-lieu affordable housing. For example, Martis Valley provided funding but has not built anything.</p> <p>There are errors and typos. With Tahoe City Lodge Alternative 2 not being pursued, it is not a viable alternative and should be removed and additional alternatives added.</p> <p>Non-contiguous project area provision needs to be vetted to see if it is causing more harm. If SEZ restoration is required for the Tahoe City Lodge, why hasn't it been done already. Why are we giving them so many incentives for 1.7 acres of restoration?</p>	114-9
	Sam Rudnick	Exhibits in the EIR/EIS show access and parking on his property. Parking is very valuable and lodge parking is already impacting his business. He has been required to provide parking for his business, bought off-site area for parking, and provides discounted parking with free shuttle for rafters. Consider off-site parking for lodge project.	114-10
	Aaron Rudnick	So much parking and transportation planning has occurred. It seems like information is not being coordinated between projects. There is lots of easements overlap on his driveway. He wants the Bechtel building shown on all maps to provide context related to parking and access. He would like a required separate ingress and egress for the lodge project. There are inconsistencies, need more clarity. Has questions and concerns related coverage. Refer to the 4/22/2016 letter of intent regarding deed restrictions - it seems like deed restriction is just to facilitate transfers of TAUS.	
	Samir Tuma	There is a low income housing component in the lodge project. There is no use of Rudnick property for calculation of allowable. The lodge property has a 50-foot easement over the driveway.	114-11
	Clem Shute	<p>For the Tahoe City lodge project, given the ownership structure, what is the length of time that owners can use their unit?</p> <p>Samir Tuma response: There are discussions underway as to the exact length of time an owner could stay in their unit, but they will operate as TAUS</p> <p>John Marshall response: TRPA is reviewing this as a tourist accommodation project and will require that the units operate as TAUs, as a condition of approval.</p>	114-12
	Aaron Rudnick	The lodge property's easement is for ingress/egress not parking.	114-13

**Letter
114****TRPA Regional Plan Implementation Committee Draft EIR-EIS Meeting Notes
July 27, 2016**

- 114-1 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 114-2 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 114-3 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 114-4 This comment expresses concern regarding the traffic congestion in Tahoe City and states that vehicle use should be restricted and transit options improved, and that traffic analysis should move beyond the use of VMT and LOS. The Draft EIR/EIS made use of VMT and LOS in the traffic analysis they are standard metrics required by TRPA and CEQA. Please see Master Response 1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 114-5 This comment states that the region is nearing its VMT threshold and questions the sufficiency of the Transit Zone of Benefit as mitigation. Please see Master Response 1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 114-6 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 114-7 This comment requests additional detail regarding the proposed Transit Zone of Benefit. Please refer to Master Response 1 of this Final EIR/EIS and the response to comment 13-8.
- 114-8 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 114-9 The comment expresses concern about the affordable housing requirement for the Tahoe City Lodge, whether Alternative 2 should be removed if it is not being pursued, what the timing of SEZ restoration should be, and if the non-contiguous project provision needs to be vetted. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by the commenter in eight written letters included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 98 through 105. Please see responses to comment letters 98 through 105, as well as Master Response 3, Affordable Housing, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 114-10 These comments express concerns of adjoining landowners about the Tahoe City Lodge, including use of easements, ingress/egress, parking, coverage, and incompatible uses. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by these commenters in written letters included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 82 and 85. Please see responses to comment letters 82 and 85.
- 114-11 This comment is a response by the applicant for Tahoe City Lodge to the previous three comments.
- 114-12 This comment expresses uncertainty about the potential use of the Tahoe City Lodge as TAUs versus residential units. In the discussion following this comment, the project applicant clarified that the Lodge units would be operated as TAUs. This is discussed in the fifth paragraph on page 3-23 of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 114-13 The comment states the adjacent landowner's position that the easement held by Tahoe City Lodge is for ingress/egress, not parking. This is an oral comment that is similar to those provided by this commenter in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 82. Please see responses to comment letter 82.

**Draft EIR-EIS
Meeting Notes
Placer County Planning Commission**

**Letter
115**

Date: Thursday, July 28, 2016
Time: Beginning at 10:00 a.m.
Location: North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, CA

Meeting Purpose:

To hear and record comments on the Draft EIR/EIS.

Attendees: Placer County Planning Commission members, TRPA staff, Placer County staff, and interested stakeholders.

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
1	Wayne Nader, commissioner	<p>Section 5.10 question – lots that still have development rights (820), rights? Rights that could be built?</p> <p>Crystal Jacobsen: The lots would still need to get a residential allocation. Referring to vacant lots. Developer would be required to get an allocation. Placer County is allocated a specific number each year.</p> <p>Wayne: How many each year?</p> <p>Steve Buelna: 2012 Regional Plan anticipated a total of 2,600 residential allocations. Every other year, there is an evaluation to see how jurisdictions are implementing this program and how many will get allocated.</p> <p>Wayne: Fire risk and safety is important. The fire district that represents this area – there is a challenge in providing services to some residential lots with narrow access points.</p> <p>Larry Sevison: TRPA ties allocation to other things like water quality and forest health. Lowering the allocation could be used as a penalty.</p> <p>Wayne: Being on this side of the Basin has lots of implications – more regulation of development.</p>	115-1
2	Wayne Nader, commissioner	<p>Section 6.5, population in Basin Area – population has gone down substantially. Curious about what the reason for that. Is it because of second homes?</p> <p>Crystal: There is an increase in vacation rentals in the Basin. The Existing Conditions Report found that population and economy has been declining. The intent of the plan is to help improve the economy.</p> <p>Wayne: Is there less of an impact to an area because of vacation homes?</p> <p>Adam Lewandowski: There would be more of a seasonal impact from vacation homes – summer, winter weekends.</p>	115-2
3	Wayne Nader, commissioner	Correction – Section 6.3 on employment – trade, transportation, and utilities in 2014. Number looks funny. Percent change indicates there should be an increase.	115-3
4	Wayne Nader, commissioner	Chapter 18, related to fire risk – comments, in general, are related to a regional impact. The community's biggest concern is related to the risk of fire because of high risk in the area. Risk is on the higher end of the scale. Question is on 18.3 with fuel reduction, a lot of what is stating here is related to fuel reduction. There are specific acreage numbers of fuel reduction. It would be interesting to know how far these projects have gotten. If this is the main process for reducing risk, it would be good to know how this is progressing. Issues related to isolated communities with poor access. Is fuel reduction enough to lessen those risks?	115-4

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
5	Jeffrey Moss, commissioner	Serves on the Conservancy. The work that gets done initially is in conjunction with local fire districts. The work is in the areas around the residential areas that are treated. Beyond that area is treated by the Forest Service. It started as a 3-year program and the Forest Service is on track to meet that goal. If your property is inspected and not in compliance they will write you up, which is partly a County project. The other thing is the Tahoe Basin has national exposure, which helps prioritize getting equipment to fight a fire here. There is a much better outlook for fire safety in the future. One of the big issues is dealing with the fuels that get taken out. It is costly. Trying to get a cogenerator at the landfill to help with this. Everyone is moving forward to address this issue. Can't speak to road access.	115-5
6	Carol White, Tahoe Marina Lakefront resident	Lives in Tahoe City at Tahoe Marina Lakefront. Line drawn in Area Plan showing shared use path in front of their homes. The Area Plan shows the preferred alignment. None of these are analyzed in the document. Yesterday, it was stated that this is preferred. Urge and request that this line in the map (Area Plan Exhibit 5-5) be replaced in June 2015 Area Plan, which accompanied the NOP. Project level specificity at this time without analysis should not be allowed. Modify language in Policy TP-31. Map should be as neutral as the county says that it is. Has a map drawn up by an engineer for another alternative?	115-6
7	Don Hillebrant, Tahoe Marina Lakefront resident	Gary Davis group has a map showing an alternative path. TML is willing to compromise on alternate path location.	115-7
8	Aaron Rudnick, local citizen and property owner	Clarity and inconsistency issues. TC Lodge project site described as 1.4 acres sometimes, but rest of time is 3 acres. Need final determination whether this is a 3-acre project or a 1.4-acre project. Bechtel building should be on the map. 3 alternatives identified but would not see Alternative 2 built. Request another alternative to be identified that could be built. Ingress/egress – Bechtel property as the main entrance. Very congested already. Would like to see something about the safety – 118 new hotel rooms. Not everyone is going to come in one car. A lot of cars for one driveway that is already used for two other uses. CFA to TAUs – will result in losing small businesses and they have nowhere to go. Would like to see better consistency and fewer errors.	115-8
9	Aidan Miles, property maintenance and management business owner	Discussion of jobs to housing ratio – this is the toughest year to attract employees. Project proposed 118-unit hotel. Project creates jobs but not housing. Parking demand – at Bechtel building. Majority of golfers come in the morning, bulk of traffic before noon. Access easement eliminates roughly a dozen spaces for the Bechtel building. Taking away parking from a commercial building. Would eliminate future ability to develop parking.	115-9
10	Shannon Eckmeyer, League to Save Lake Tahoe	Thanks to Crystal for all of her work, left lines of communication open that resulted in the Tahoe City town center modification and deed restriction language. Thanks to TART update plan that is part of Area Plan – hoping Placer can find funding. Focusing on traffic impacts – issues related to the Squaw and Martis projects. Cumulative impact analysis touches on this, but the League has hired traffic expert to look at north shore impacts and overall VMT thresholds. Robust discussion at RPIC yesterday about thinking outside of the box for mitigating traffic impacts.	115-10

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
11	Sam Rudnick, Tahoe Sierra Recreation	<p>Easement – they (Bechtel property owners) own that property, maintain that property, liable for that property.</p> <p>Has not seen an easement included in the project boundary for access. PUD and residents and utilities have easement through property. Going to get more easements as we develop.</p> <p>Parking will be lost from the main entrance for the project. Pictures don't understand where the entrance really is.</p> <p>You can't get out of that driveway on a busy day. Typically, people go through three parking lots to get to the lighted intersection.</p> <p>Pedestrians are at risk.</p> <p>Realign project and put it where it needs to be.</p> <p>Parking – 90 percent of shared parking looks like it will be for condo/hotel. People who use the golf course are concerned.</p> <p>I hope that you can help us with confusion about where the traffic/access will flow.</p> <p>We support development of the property without a detrimental effect on our property or our tenants.</p>	115-11
12	Ellie Waller, resident	<p>Echoes the League comments. Tahoe City Lodge alternative with density of 56 units is unacceptable? If not acceptable then what would be a better alternative? A superior alternative not clearly identified in EIR.</p> <p>There are a lot of inconsistencies – Lodge numbers... implementing ordinances, lack of definitions that don't exist in Chapter 90 (RPU required?), and amendment.</p> <p>Asking for addendum to show corrections.</p> <p>Identify page numbers in references. At RPIC in July 2015, asked staff to identify sections in RTP, TMDL, and Regional Plan where we tiered.</p> <p>Assess the mixed use overlay for currently zoned recreation at Tahoe City Lodge. If overlay and community plan boundary are not changed – changes dynamic of hotel. There is a section in the EIR that says they are asking for these extraordinary measures even if Area Plan is not approved.</p> <p>Is a minimal restoration of 1.7 acres over entire worth extraordinary measures? TC lodge is too large for 1.4 acres. Entrance should not go through easement.</p> <p>Requesting that we get in kind response back.</p>	115-12
13	Robert White, Tahoe Marina Lakefront resident	<p>Alignment of shared use path connecting Commons Beach with Fanny Bridge. Exactly divides grassy area from beach. Alignment is above the play area, grassy area, and beach. No one thinks the alignment makes any sense. No room for path envisioned by the county unless it's located in the lake bed.</p> <p>Recreation area would be destroyed by multi-use path and creates barrier between TML and the lake. County should provide senior level oversight and get this back on track to get to a path alignment that everyone can live with.</p>	115-13
14	Ed Svenson, resident behind Tahoe City Golf Course	<p>247 West Lake Blvd – get to this property through an easement off Highway 28, which is the proposed entrance for the lodge.</p> <p>Concerns are traffic – not sure how he'll get to use his driveway.</p>	115-14
15	Ron Treabass, North Lake Tahoe Resort Association	<p>Speak about people in the planning of TC and north shore for many years. NLTRA Board has and is committed to being in favor of the high capability land transfer of golf course and deed restriction included.</p> <p>Pilot program of Tahoe City Lodge, road map for the future – good to evaluate a project of this scope and context within the Area Plan analysis because it is a plan that is nearing the ready to go stage. An opportunity to test environmental statements, town center and infill development, walkability and bikability, investment of lodging in town near [amenities].</p>	115-15

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
		Feels the environmental document has solid analysis. Would like impacts of both projects thoroughly analyzed in the EIR.	115-15 cont
16	Pat Davison, Executive Director of Contractors Association	Executive Director of Contractors Association – involved with affordable and workforce housing issue in the area Sits on technical advisory group – housing study There is a need for moderate housing. There is a lack of full time rental properties contributes to a shortage. Among other things, should include all residential parcels in secondary unit program, only 10 residential parcels not included, we ask that you include those parcels. There is a fear of increased density on already developed parcels. Alternative 3 does include analysis of secondary units wherever residential is allowed. Opposed to market rate allocation for all second rate units. Suggesting use TRPA bonus unit program if owner of second unit puts local occupancy or deed restriction is put in place. Alt 2 does include analysis of secondary units if there is a TRPA-certified housing program in place. Have you mixed components from multiple alternatives or bonus units outside of town centers?	115-16
17	Cindy Gustafson, General Manager of TCPUD	TCPUD does provide parks and rec in addition to sewer services... involved throughout the process... confident in policies and parameters of AP and EIR/EIS. Commend staff in public outreach efforts. History... 2012 purchase of property by TCPUD, County, airport district, and resort association for different purposes. We feel strongly this is a win-win for public and private. Board has agreed to deed restriction. Easements – 1 st easement was given by golf course to the Henrickson property owners, other properties split off and those easements are all recorded.	115-17
18	Alex Mourelatos, hotel owner in Tahoe Vista	Was on board of NLTRA and Tahoe Vista plan team. Echoes kudos to Steve and Crystal. On the proposed lodging, applaud and acknowledge collaboration to get a well thought out solution in Tahoe City region for economic redevelopment. There have been so many stakeholders involved to get this lodging solution approved.	115-18
19	Mickey Gray, commissioner	Easement access and bike path – most comments – additional investigation may be needed on these issues	115-19
20	Larry Sevison, commissioner	This is a regional plan [in response to comment about bike path].	
21	Crystal Jacobsen, Placer County staff	In response to the comments on the trail – future implementation of that trail would require its own analysis – feasibility, CEQA, and hearing.	

**Letter
115****Placer County Planning Commission Draft EIR/EIS Meeting Notes
July 27, 2016**

- 115-1 The comment consists of inquiries and discussion about the project itself, and does not pertain to the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 115-2 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 115-3 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 115-4 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 115-5 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 115-6 The comment relates to the selection of an alternative for the Tahoe Marina Lakefront shared-use path alignment. It states that no specific alignment should be identified, and that the Draft EIR/EIS did not adequately analyze the shared-use path. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by the commenter in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 107. Please see responses to comment letter 107, and Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 115-7 The comment states that an engineer has prepared a map with an alternative alignment for the Tahoe Marina Lakefront shared-use path, and that the Tahoe Marine Lakefront homeowners are willing to compromise on a location. Please see Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 115-8 This comment expresses concerns of the adjoining landowner about the Tahoe City Lodge, including the actual size of the project site, ingress/egress, safety, and conversion of CFA to TAUs. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by this commenter in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 82. Please see responses to comment letter 82.
- 115-9 This comment expresses concerns about the Tahoe City Lodge, including parking demand, access easements, ingress/egress, safety, and conversion of CFA to TAUs. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by another commenter in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 82. Please see responses to comment letter 82.
- 115-10 The comment expresses support for some components of the Area Plan, particularly Placer County outreach that led to the modification of the Tahoe City Town Center and the Placer County transit approach. The comment also references future written comments to be submitted on behalf of the League to Save Lake Tahoe that will focus on traffic and VMT. Those comments are included in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 13. Please see responses to comment letter 13 and Master Response 1, VMT and LOS Analysis, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 115-11 These comments express the concerns of adjoining landowners about the Tahoe City Lodge, including use of easements, ingress/egress, parking, safety and incompatible uses. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by commenters in written letters included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 82 and 85. Please see responses to comment letters 82 and 85.

- 115-12 The comment states support for earlier comments, that the Draft EIR/EIS has inconsistencies, that a superior alternative has not been identified, that the density of Tahoe City Lodge is unacceptable, and that mixed-use overlay should be assessed. The comment also states that an addendum to the Draft EIR/EIS should be prepared. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by the commenter in eight written letters included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 98 through 105. Please see responses to comment letters 98 through 105.
- 115-13 The comment relates to the alignment of the Tahoe Marina Lakefront shared-use path, expressing the opinion that it is in the wrong location and should be reassessed. These are oral comments that are similar to those provided by the commenter in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 107. Please see responses to comment letter 107 and Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 115-14 The comment expresses concern by a landowner behind the Tahoe City Golf Course who is concerned about access to his property because of increased traffic. The proposed Tahoe City Lodge project would not preclude access through the golf course property to residences located behind the clubhouse. Residences just north of the clubhouse also have access via a private road that connects to Fairway Drive. The number of daily trips generated by the Tahoe City Lodge action alternatives are lower than those associated with Alternative 4 (No Project) (Tables 10-7 through 10-10 of the Draft EIR/EIS).
- 115-15 The comment supports the actions proposed in the Area Plan, states that the environmental document has solid analyses, and supports using the Tahoe City Lodge as a pilot to test the environmental statements, Town Center and infill development, walkability and bikability, and investment in lodging in town near amenities.
- 115-16 The comment pertains to affordable housing, and the comment's suggestion that all residential parcels within the Plan area should be eligible for second residential units, and that second residential units that require full-time residency should be eligible for TRPA pool allocations and bonus units rather than market-rate allocations. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted on behalf of the Contractors Association of Truckee Tahoe titled "Comments on Draft EIR/EIS for the Tahoe Basin Area Plan." The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 11. Please see responses to comment letter 11 and Master Response 3, Affordable Housing, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 115-17 The comment commends Placer County and TRPA staff for their extensive outreach on the Area Plan Draft EIS/EIR, stating that TCPUD will be submitting future comments on utilities, and parks and recreation issues. The comment provided some history and background on TCPUD involvement with the Area Plan and the benefits of a public/private partnership to implement actions. The oral comments are similar to those submitted in writing by the commenter. The letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 8. Please see responses to comment letter 8 for additional discussion.
- 115-18 This comment expresses support for the Tahoe City Lodge project and a solution in Tahoe City for economic redevelopment.
- 115-19 These comments relate to the Tahoe Marina Lakefront shared-use path and the need for future site-specific analysis. Please see Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.

**Draft EIR-EIS
Meeting Notes
Placer County NTRAC Meeting**

**Letter
116**

Date: Thursday, August 11, 2016
Time: Beginning at 6:00 p.m.
Location: North Tahoe Event Center, Kings Beach, CA

Meeting Purpose:

To hear and record comments on the Draft EIR/EIS.

Attendees: Placer County North Tahoe Regional Advisory Commission members, TRPA staff, Placer County staff, and interested stakeholders.

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
1	Don Fulda - NTRAC	Questioned whether the environmental document addresses the displacement of small business, and shading impacts of the higher buildings? He is also concerned about light and glare, in particular light emanating from rooms of taller structures? He also questioned whether the EIR/EIS addresses construction staging for any projects.	116-1
2	John Jewett - NTRAC	Questioned whether programmatic mitigation measures for the Area Plan would apply to the Tahoe City Lodge Project.	116-2
3	Megan Chillemi - NTRAC	Concerned with traffic and ridgeline protections. Concerned with secondary dwelling unit specifically whether it requires a TAU allocation. Kings Beach does not want to become the affordable housing center. Non-contiguous project area provision is problematic on lake side of the road.	116-3
4	Rebecca McFadden - NTRAC	Concerned about small business displacement from new redevelopment and the potential for a roundabout at 28 and 267.	116-4
5	Nicole Lukelmuller - NTRAC	Is there enforcement to make sure secondary dwelling units are used as residential rather than tourist rentals? There needs to be enforcement. Regarding the EIR analysis of the Tahoe City Lodge Project, the project would not reduce the jobs to housing ratio, it would add jobs that would require housing. The project also needs to specifically identify restoration areas.	116-5
7	Ann Nichols - NTPA	This is a very important document. If new projects conform to what is proposed future projects wouldn't require environmental review. The Tahoe City Lodge is calculating density based on easements and it allows double density: 118 on 1.4 acre. Including Tahoe City Lodge and Kings Beach redevelopment concept obscures the EIR analysis. Second Dwelling Units are market rate not affordable – in Washoe Co there is no enforcement of residential use, only by complaint. RPU allows 600 residential units and AP would add 400 more TAUs a 67% increase that is additive. The Area Plan wouldn't reduce traffic. The Tahoe City Lodge would be 56 feet tall and the building next door is 34 ft. She wants to see Hendrickson site redeveloped but doesn't want more loopholes.	116-6 116-7
8	Carol White	Provided handout with a transcript of her comments.	116-8

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
9	Robert White	Spoke at 3 prior hearings about trail alignment. Not going to go through all impacts tonight. Major impact is that the trail skirts TML shoreline and divides the grass play area from beach. Children play constantly in this area just like Commons Beach. The Commons Beach trail alignment is above grass and play area. No one he's talked to thinks lake side alignment makes sense. There is no room unless it is in the lakebed. TML is not a bunch of mansions. They are 48 families with a somewhat constrained recreation area. County should provide senior level oversight to get to an alignment that everyone can live with.	116-8 cont
10	Joy Doyle-NTBA	NTBA has submitted a formal written comment. She learned a lot about how difficult planning is, and applauds the Area Plan teams. NTBA is pleased to be involved. They are happy that the Area Plan would improve parking for small and irregular lots, and may support a modest expansion of small business. They support community wide snow storage, reduced parking, and setbacks. NTBA encourages adoption of Area Plan for Kings Beach and Tahoe City prosperity.	116-9
11	Karen Wagner	She has been a TML resident since 1974. Her unit is directly across the street from the Henrikson site and she is concerned about the Tahoe City Lodge Project. She has existing light and noise issues. A new restaurant and bar would impact TML with light and noise. The project should reduce a story or include noise control for open air areas. She agrees with the Whites about the trail alignment. Need to consider alternatives to trail placement. Need to consider effects on homeowner privacy and impacts on WQ related to the trail alignment. She is also concerned about safety on path related to large numbers of people near homes. She is concerned about public along trail. The trail by River Ranch is closed due to lack of maintenance. How would this new trail be maintained?	116-10
12	Sandy Evans-Hall NLT Chamber_CVB_Resort Assoc	The NLT Chamber, CVB, and Resort Association board has been involved. It has been a robust process of community engagement that included everyone. There were two visioning processes. She commends Placer County and encourages it to move forward. You could tweak the EIR but it is very thorough. NLTRA also advises County board of Supervisors on the expenditure of TOT tax. They recommended purchasing the Tahoe City golf course in order to promote redevelopment and revitalization of downtown Tahoe City. NLTRA has put funding into the Placer County transportation plan. There is also a ballot measure for sales tax for transit. Her organization is also looking for other sources to provide frequent and free transit funding.	116-11
13	Richard Cooper	He has historic lakefront cabin near Deer St. Nothing has changed in this area since the '30s. He's now in a Town Center and subject to high-rise and high density development. It's now a residential area. Several neighbors agree that a commercial Mixed Use and Town Center designation is not appropriate. As with Tahoe Vista, there is high pressure to redevelop historic areas with corporate development. Extending South Lake Tahoe style sprawl will impact scenic quality. He asks that the County re-designate the area as residential. He also requests a 30-day extension on the public comment period so more neighbors can provide input.	116-12
14	Rachel Rudnick	It is important to have a cohesive strategy. There are many ways to manipulate data. Any hypothesis can be supported with right assumptions. She analyzed how firms fail by growing too quick without infrastructure to support them. She recommends digging deeper than a superficial environmental review. Come to Kings Beach and see semis drive over roundabouts, see the traffic in Tahoe City, talk to locals about help wanted signs and how hard it is to find housing, and sit in traffic. The impacts are bigger than identified in the EIR. We need to include concrete mitigations not just fees.	116-13

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments
15	Amy Loebel	She agrees with Ms. Rudnick. She is the 5 th generation at the lake but not full time resident. She lives right across street from Lanza's restaurant in an 11 family single family residential enclave from North Tahoe Beach to Beach St. She just learned of the plan and zoning changes a couple of weeks ago. She went online and has a lot of questions. She is confused by the Area Plan maps and verbiage. She is just trying to enjoy the lake and realized all this is happening. Her question to TRPA and Placer County: why have we never formally been notified? Nobody has received mail or email to inform them about the Area Plan. She learned that they are not currently zoned single family residential, or it has been recently changed. When did that change and why are they included in the Mixed-Use zoning of downtown KB? She is pleased with stormwater and sidewalk improvements, but very unhappy with the current proposals. Why increase population density with larger and taller buildings? She is concerned with increased heights affecting sewer capacity and emergency services, and concerned about trash and scenic views and sightlines. She would like their residential area to be zoned residential, and would like the comment period to be extended by 30 days.
16	Tom Gordon	He agrees with Ms. Loebel. There are eight private residences in an enclave built in the 1920s. Currently they are in Special Area 2, which is a commercial zone. The proposed zoning calls for Mixed-use with a bike path. There is little to no advantage to the changes. The plan should redevelop commercial areas, but don't extend the commercial area. His house is just outside FEMA floodplain but in SEZ limited to 1% coverage. Single Family Residential FR makes sense in this area and there is no need to include this area in the Town Center. There is more than enough existing area for commercial and tourist uses. Would support economic uses. Traffic from additional commercial and tourist uses would impact the area. There are two sections of Brockway Vista – the east end has a finger of residences along Lake outside of the Town Center. The Area Plan should do the same on the west side to the Ferrari property (up to Special Area 4). Include existing businesses in a different area. There is no need for a bike trail along the beach in that area, people can already walk along beach, and a new walkway would be under water. He requests: 1) modify the Town Center to exclude residences off of Brockway vista by Secline, 2) remove the bikeway along lake in that area, and 3) rezone and reduce density along the area.
17	Fred Loebel	He agrees with Mr. Gordon. He only recently learned about the proposed zoning change, and he heard from neighbors not the county or TRPA. He has researched and informed other property owners about the plan. The design team for the commercial core designated the residential areas as a residential zone on page 63 of the Kings Beach vision plan in August 2015. Now the plan is contemplating changing zoning, which would damage character of homes and impact usability and aesthetics. It would allow monstrous buildings next to small private residences, resulting in scenic impacts. Similar zoning changes have occurred in Tahoe City with small homes converted to luxury day spas and residences. Also, this results in increases in boating uses along with noise, water quality and pier construction. He encourages TRPA and the League to Save Lake Tahoe to oppose this change. He formally proposes that the plan rezone the area a single family residential between Beach St. and the west border of North Tahoe Beach, which would maintain its existing character.
18	Gene Eber	Resident at TML agree with Whites and Carol Wagner with respect to shared use path. Don't know how alt was designated as preferred. Understands there was some type of survey but residents most impacts have received no notice. TML works with PUD on non-water side options. Totally unexpected, prior versions showed on Mt side. Alignment would have WQ and resident impacts. TRPA

116-14

116-15

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
		requires BMPS to be maintained. TML is in sensitive stream zone. Hard scape path with in lake construction and adding pollutants and trash to lake is inconsistent. Requests removing water side path from AP because not analyzed in EIS and other options. Impacts lake clarity and safety issues noise, privacy to residents. Would require encroachment onto private prop. Return to alignment behind TML. Q: Status on fire station next to property	116-15 cont
19	Richard McDonald	He echoes others comments against lake side trail alignment near TML. The relative economics of the lake side alignment, with acquisition and eminent domain would be costly compared to commercial side alignment. He agrees with other TML owners in the strongest terms possible.	
20	Aaron Rudnick	<p>He owns the Bechtel building next to the Tahoe City Lodge. Stop calling the easement a parking easement, parking is not in the easement language. He has already submitted written comments. The EIR/EIS needs to show the property boundary to show that the Tahoe City Lodge is taking parking away from Bechtel buildings. The conference center is not shown in parking analysis graph is that used only by hotel. Traffic is already dangerous on the easement and they can't add another 120 cars on easement. There is no snow storage or emergency access shown on map. He wants more details in the Final EIR in maps. He provided some density comparisons of the Tahoe City Lodge to other nearby property, which are included in his written comments.</p> <p>Lodging is not full unless it is the 4th of July or Christmas. Tahoe City Lodge alternative 2 is only alternative with VMT reduction and water quality improvements, but the developer will not build Alternative 2. The lodge and Area Plan are not linked. Replace Lodge Alternative 2 with another Alternative. Shading from the Tahoe City Lodge is an issue. The easement does not address an ice rink and it will be overloaded with the proposed uses. He would like to see employment numbers for the Tahoe City Lodge showing how many jobs are from summer peak season and Christmas.</p>	116-16
21	Ellie Waller	She has submitted written comments, please refer to those. Her major concern is inconsistencies that she pointed out since the NOP was released. New inconsistency is that FTE employees for the lodge is 76 but the EIR says 66.4. She is confused about affordable housing related to new employees are from hotel and lodge. The RPIC meeting heard the same presentations and Shelly Aldean asked the applicant about alternative 2, and 56 units is not realistic. The financials of the alternatives are not discussed in the EIR. If Alternative 2 is not viable then we need another alternative. Hal Cole cautioned about reduced parking and loss of business. The project is called 3 acres but the lodge is 1.4. If SEZ restoration is 1:1 it needs to be 3 acres. CFA conversion would result in 400 proposed new TAUs, which may violate growth management ordinance. This was not analyzed in the RPU EIS. The Attorney General submitted comments on Squaw that this EIR needs to consider. The EIR fails to analyze impacts from increased VMT in the Tahoe Basin. The RPIC expressed concerns related to the increase in VMT and LOS and lack of solutions. Need out of the box solutions for traffic. Listen to RPIC comments online, they really get to the crux of Governing Board looking at Fanny Bridge and related issues. Refer to her written comments.	116-17
22	Jeff Oxandabourne - Sunnyside resort	Tahoe City used to be booming, but its market share has declined. Winter guests don't come to Tahoe City. We need quality lodging. We need to work it out and not drag out the project. It's tough to make a living in Tahoe and we don't need to fight over the project but sit down and work it out.	116-18

#	Commenter	Summary of Comments	
23	Carry Danzer	She agrees with other TML commenters regarding the bike path. She likes the idea of a bike path but doesn't want the public by her bedroom window. She is concerned about children in bike path. She doesn't understand how the path alignment got changed to in front of the Lake. Doesn't want to see people's property being cut in half by the path.	116-19
24	Lee Cumming	He agrees with Jeff. There is a debate going on over redevelopment in Tahoe. Do we want to be a world class destination? Tahoe doesn't do it well. Other places have transit and infrastructure to avoid gridlock. He turns around on the way to Squaw Valley due to gridlock. Gridlock won't be resolved by not allowing development. It will be solved by investing in the area and infrastructure. If no redevelopment occurs the government will not invest in infrastructure. The community needs to invite sound investment in the area. He encourages the Tahoe City Lodge and Area Plan to support investment.	116-20
25	Cindy Gustafson - TCPUD	She commends the County and TRPA over last 4 – 5 years. The plan is not perfect but it has a lot of benefits. She is submitting minor technical corrections. She discussed the partnership on golf course. The property had been for sale for a long time, and TCPUD the saw the potential for public agencies to protect the site for recreation and support reinvestment in downtown. The acquisition went through about 50 meetings with strong support. They needed to preserve recreation and support redevelopment. Tahoe City Lodge is not the only project that can benefit. There are incentives for other commercial projects to improve and revitalize the area. TCPUD board has agreed to deed-restriction to ensure no development on Golf Course.	116-21
26	Dana Bridgeman	She echoed comments of other TML residents. The bike trail would be steps away from homes. She's concerned about kids on the bottom floor near hundreds of people passing through. TML allows pets, there are kids leaving things on path, and little space for a trail. She strongly opposes the beach path. Dealing with blight on the Henrikson property is good, but the density is more than is prudent. How would it impact the occupancy in renting TML units? She would prefer development that is a destination that would allow TML to rent units to visitors. Have you looked at combined effects at TML of the bike path, Tahoe City Lodge and Squaw project. How does that effect property values? Why isn't traffic an impact from the Tahoe City Lodge Project? Are we just taxing the next projects to mitigate for the Tahoe City Lodge? She supports lodge alternative 2.	116-22
27	Joe Lanza	He's not here to criticize the EIR and Area Plan. The Tahoe City Lodge will do wonderful things. Does anyone think the Henrikson building is better than the Tahoe City Lodge? At TRPA they asked about alternative 2 and the applicant said it may be feasible, but they wouldn't do it. He understands that, if you are going to invest in a project you're going to do it right. Has a lot of kids who drive and there is no way to mitigate trips – that's what happens. He supports the project.	116-23
28	Don Fulda - NTRAC	He's concerned about the traffic identified in the in EIR, and about improving crosswalks, funding transit, and paying mitigation fees. Does that really mitigate the impacts of traffic? He doesn't think its addressed.	116-24
29	Megan Chillemi - NTRAC	Asked staff to clarify the comment from Ann Nichols that no future environmental review would be needed for projects in the Area Plan. Crystal Jacobson clarified: future projects requiring a discretionary action would require future CEQA and TRPA environmental review.	116-25

**Letter
116**

**Placer County, North Tahoe Event Center Draft EIR/EIS Meeting Notes
July 27, 2016**

- 116-1 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 116-2 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 116-3 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 116-4 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 116-5 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 116-6 and 7 The comments express concern about including the Tahoe City Lodge Project in the Area Plan document, concerns about density and market rate second dwelling units, concerns about enforcement of residential use, traffic, and building height. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted on behalf of the North Tahoe Preservation Alliance titled “Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) and Tahoe City Lodge Project (TCLP) EIR/EIS.” The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 15. Please see responses to comment letter 15 and Master Response 1, VMT and LOS Analysis, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 116-8 The comments express concern about the proposed waterside path between Fanny Bridge and Commons Beach and the impact on the Tahoe Marina Lakefront community. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter and his wife, Carole, submitted titled “Tahoe Basin Area Plan DEIR/DEIS.” The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 107. Please see responses to comment letter 107 and Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 116-9 The comment notes that the Area Plan includes parking solutions for small businesses. The comment is noted for consideration of the review of the merits of the project.
- 116-10 The comment expresses concern about the light and noise issues that may be associated with the Tahoe City Lodge. The comment states opposition to the lake side alignment of the shared-use path between Commons Beach and Fanny Bridge, and shared concerns regarding the potential negative impacts associated with this shared-use path alignment. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted titled “Comments on Tahoe City Lodge and Multi-Use Path.” The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 97. Please see responses to comment letter 97 and Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 116-11 These comments express support for the Area Plan and urges Placer County to support it. The comment also supports the Tahoe City Lodge project and the use of Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) dollars to purchase the golf course.
- 116-12 The comment expresses opposition to the Mixed-Use zoning of the portion of the Kings Beach Town Center south of SR 28 and west of Secline Street. The oral comments are similar to written letters the commenter and his wife, Alexandra, submitted, both titled “Comments on the Tahoe Basin Area Plan/EIR/EIS (Kings Beach).” The written letters are included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 28 and 29. Please see responses to comment letters 28 and 29, as well as Master Response 4, Kings Beach Zoning and Shared-Use Path along Brockway Vista Avenue, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.

- 116-13 The comment urges Placer County to consider the cumulative effects of projects within the Plan area and the vicinity and requests that Placer County decision makers spend time in Tahoe City in order to experience the traffic congestion first hand. The oral comments are similar to written letters the commenter submitted, titled "Area Plan Draft EIR/EIS Comments." The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 84. Please see responses to comment letter 84,
- 116-14 These comments express agreement with comment 116-13. Please see the response above. They also express opposition to the Mixed-Use zoning of the portion of the Kings Beach Town Center south of SR 28 and west of Secline Street, and recommend a number of proposed specific changes to zoning and uses in Kings Beach. The oral comments are similar to written letters that two of the commenters submitted, one titled "Appeal of the Proposed Kings Beach Vision Plan" and one untitled. The written letters are included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 55 and 56. Please see responses to comment letters 55 and 56 as well as Master Response 4, Kings Beach Zoning and Shared-Use Path along Brockway Vista Avenue, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 116-15 The comments express concern about the proposed waterside path between Fanny Bridge and Commons Beach and the impact on the Tahoe Marina Lakefront community. The oral comments are similar to written letters the commenters submitted titled "Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan Public Review Draft, June 2016 and Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement" and "Tahoe Basin Area Plan Proposed Shared Use Path – Commons Beach to Fanny Bridge," respectively. The written letters are included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 37 and 64. Please see responses to comment letters 37 and 64 as well as Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 116-16 The comment expresses the concerns of the adjoining landowner about the Tahoe City Lodge, including the nature of the easement, parking, ingress/egress, safety, and employment numbers. These oral comments are similar to those provided by this commenter in a written letter included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 82. Please see responses to comment letter 82.
- 116-17 The comment states that written comments have been submitted and that she has previously raised questions and made comments at other public hearings. The comment reiterated some of those concerns that are in her written comments. These oral comments are similar to those provided by the commenter in eight written letters included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letters 98 through 105. Please see responses to comment letters 98 through 105.
- 116-18 The comment states that Tahoe City needs quality lodging and the community needs to work it out and not drag this process out. The comment is noted for consideration of the review of the merits of the project during project review.
- 116-19 The comment expresses concern about the proposed waterside path between Fanny Bridge and Commons Beach and the impact on the Tahoe Marina Lakefront Community. The oral comments are similar to an untitled written letter submitted by the commenter. The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 33. Please see responses to comment letter 33 and Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 116-20 The comment states that Tahoe City needs quality lodging and the community needs to work it out and support redevelopment so government will invest in transportation infrastructure. The comment is noted for consideration of the review of the merits of the alternatives and during project review.

- 116-21 The comment commends Placer County and TRPA staff for their extensive outreach on the Area Plan Draft EIR/EIS, stating that TCPUD will be submitting future comments on utilities, parks and recreation issues. The comment provided some history and background on TCPUD involvement with the Area Plan and the benefits of a public/private partnership to implement actions. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted. The letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 8. Please see responses to comment letter 8 for additional discussion.
- 116-22 The comment expresses concern about the proposed waterside path between Fanny Bridge and Commons Beach and the impact on the Tahoe Marina Lakefront community. The oral comments are similar to a written letter the commenter submitted titled “Tahoe City Area Plan/EIR”. The written letter is included in this Final EIR/EIS as comment letter 23. Please see responses to comment letter 23 and Master Response 5, Tahoe Marina Lakefront Shared-Use Path Alignment, in Section 3.1 of this Final EIR/EIS.
- 116-23 The comment supports the Tahoe City Lodge project. The comment is noted for consideration of the review of the merits of the project during project review.
- 116-24 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- 116-25 This is not a comment on the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR/EIS.