

4 REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR/EIS/EA

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes revisions to the text in the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA following its publication and circulation for public review. The changes are presented in the order they appear in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA and are identified by page number, where relevant. The changes shown in this chapter originate either from responses to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS/EA that resulted in text modifications or corrections or from modifications included by TTD, TRPA, or FHWA-CFLHD staff that occurred after circulation of the Draft EIR/EIS/EA for public review. In some instances, where a comment provides information or a correction that does not contribute substantively to the environmental analysis, the response incorporates the requested change by reference only.

The Draft EIR/EIS/EA modifications in this chapter do not result in new significant effects or substantial increases in previously identified significant effects, so there is no need to recirculate the Draft EIR/EIS/EA for additional public review (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5). Revisions shown as excerpts from the Draft EIR/EIS/EA text include strikethrough (~~strikethrough~~) text for deletions and underline (underline) text for additions.

4.2 DRAFT EIR/EIS/EA REVISIONS AND CORRECTIONS

4.2.1 Editorial Corrections, Clarifications, and Revisions

TEXT CHANGES BY SECTION AND PAGE NUMBER

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

Page 1-1 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

1.1 BACKGROUND

The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), ~~Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)~~, and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are proposing improvements to resolve the existing and future traffic congestion at the wye intersection of State Route (SR) 28 and SR 89, enhance multi-modal options, improve safety and access, and address the long-term structural integrity of the Truckee River Bridge #19-0033 (locally known as “Fanny Bridge”).

CHAPTER 2 – SUMMARY

Page 2-1 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), ~~Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)~~, and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are proposing improvements to resolve the existing and future traffic congestion at the wye intersection of State Route (SR) 28 and SR 89, enhance multi-modal options, improve safety and access, and address the long-term structural integrity of the Truckee River Bridge #19-0033 (locally known as “Fanny Bridge”).

Page 2-1 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

As discussed above, the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Project is a joint project proposed by TTD, ~~TRPA~~, and CFLHD, and is subject to state and federal environmental review requirements.

Pages 2-7, 3-25, and 4.11-9 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

To implement Alternative 6, acquisition of three properties would be required: Swigard’s True Value Hardware (assessor’s parcel number [APN] 094-190-013), Bridgetender Restaurant (APN 094-540-025), and River Grill (APN 094-540-023). In addition, an existing structure on the Liberty Utilities ~~Power~~ parcel would need to be relocated within that parcel. Access would be maintained to all parcels affected by this alternative.

Pages 2-7 and 3-26 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

To implement Alternative 6A, acquisition of two properties would be required: Gary Davis Group Design and Engineering (APN 094-190-006) and Bridgetender Restaurant (APN 094-540-025). In addition, as under Alternative 6, an existing structure on the Liberty Utilities ~~Power~~ parcel would need to be relocated within that parcel. Access would be maintained to all parcels affected by this alternative.

CHAPTER 3 – PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

Page 3-15 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

The Truckee River Interceptor (TRI) pipeline is a trunk sewer line that serves the North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD), the Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD), the Alpine Springs County Water District, the Squaw Valley Public Service District, and the ~~Tahoe~~ Truckee Sanitary District (T-TSD). Portions are owned by T-TSA, and portions are owned jointly by TCPUD and NTPUD and operated by TCPUD. The TCPUD/NTPUD segment is known as the North Shore Export Facility Line (NSEL). The TRI segment that would require relocation under some of the project alternatives includes both T-TSA and TCPUD/NTPUD-owned segments. ~~It is owned jointly by NTPUD and TCPUD, and operated by TCPUD.~~ A portion of the TRI sewer line is located beneath the area of the proposed roundabout or

intersection near the Caltrans maintenance yard and would require relocation. The area underneath the roundabout is where ownership changes between TRI and TCPUD/NTPUD. The TRI pipeline connects to the North Shore Export Facility (NSEF) line, which is located beneath SR 28 and SR 89 near the existing wye intersection.

Alternatives 1 through 4 would include installation of new manholes and relocation and associated replacement of the TRI sewer line either beneath or around the western roundabout (or signalized intersection) at the western end of the new SR 89 alignment. Additionally, the North Shore Export Facility Line (NSEFL) would also be modified to accommodate the relocation of the TRI sewer line. Flow monitoring equipment and radio telemetry system equipment would also be relocated ~~to one of the new manhole locations~~. This relocation would be completed within existing disturbed areas (e.g., within the roadway cross-section) and would be sized to maintain the existing flow capacity.

Page 3-17 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Under Alternative 1, SR 89 would be realigned as a new two-lane segment of roadway that would cross through USFS's 64-Acre Tract. The western end of the new segment would be constructed as a new single-lane roundabout (i.e., western roundabout), which would serve as the new SR 89/SR 28 intersection. A new bridge over the Truckee River would be constructed immediately to the southeast of the roundabout on the realigned highway segment. The new alignment would continue east and reconnect to existing SR 89 at a second roundabout (i.e., the eastern roundabout) near the existing changeable message sign and sled hill (Exhibit 3-2). The realigned portion of SR 89 would be elevated on an earthen embankment from 3 feet near the eastern roundabout, up to 9 feet approaching the bridge at an approximate 2 percent grade. Slopes of the embankment would be vegetated to blend it into the surrounding forest. Fanny Bridge would be rehabilitated or replaced to address the long-term structural integrity and resolve safety issues. . The existing section of SR 89 between Fanny Bridge and the eastern roundabout would be relinquished by the state to Placer County and become a local street (see Exhibit 3-9). Traffic calming and aesthetic features would be installed within this section of roadway (e.g., reduced speed limit, bulb-outs, landscaped areas, raised landscaped median, on-street parking, sidewalks, street lighting, benches, etc.).

SECTION 4.3 – BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Page 4.3-1 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

In accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C 1531 et seq.), FHWA has initiated informal consultation with ~~the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service~~ USFWS on the proposed SR 89/Fanny Bridge Project. On January 20, 2014, a list of threatened and endangered species with the potential to occur within the vicinity of the project site was retrieved from the online database maintained by the Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office. In addition, FHWA staff had an informal discussion with USFWS on October 7, 2014 to provide information on the project alternatives and on issues regarding listed species that may be affected by project activities directly or indirectly, and to determine the appropriate section 7 consultation pathway. As a result of these discussions, a biological assessment (BA) was prepared and submitted to USFWS on January 30, 2015 as part of the Section 7 consultation process. The BA concluded that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect Lahontan cutthroat trout (listed as threatened under the ESA). On February 23, 2015, USFWS issued to FHWA a letter of concurrence with this determination. The Final EIS/EIR/EA will disclose the results of the consultation. At the time of release of this Draft EIR/EIS/EA, informal consultation has also occurred with USFS-LTBMU biologist as appropriate and as necessary.

Page 4.3-33 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Low. Potential foraging habitat is present on the project site, but the area is highly disturbed by commercial/urban and recreational uses, and mostly surrounded by Highway 89. Additionally, forest habitat on the site lacks structural complexity and late-seral forest characteristics; down woody debris, standing dead trees (snags), and dense canopy closure are limited on the disturbed project site. ~~Potential foraging habitat is present on the project site, however it is highly disturbed. Species has been detected within approximately 1 mile of the project site.~~

Page 4.3-34 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Low. In the Tahoe Basin, bald eagle is known to nest only in two locations (Emerald Bay and Marlette Lake). Because of the very low summer/breeding density of bald eagle in the Tahoe Basin, and the distance from the project site to the two known nest sites, bald eagle is not expected to be affected by project construction. Potential perch sites may be located on the project site, due to the close proximity to Lake Tahoe, and the project site could be used during winter. However, use of the project site would be limited due to the level of disturbance and the presence of more suitable habitat located nearby.

Page 4.3-35 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Low. Potential foraging habitat is present on the project site, but the area is highly disturbed by commercial/urban and recreational uses, and mostly surrounded by Highway 89. Additionally, forest habitat on the site lacks structural complexity and late-seral forest characteristics; down woody debris, standing dead trees (snags), and dense canopy closure are limited on the disturbed project site. More suitable habitat exists nearby, and the species has been detected within 0.85 mile of the project site.

Page 4.3-37 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Low. Suitable habitat is not present on the project site. The project site is highly disturbed by commercial/urban and recreational uses, and mostly surrounded by Highway 89. Additionally, forest habitat on the site lacks structural complexity and late-seral forest characteristics; down woody debris, standing dead trees (snags), and dense canopy closure are limited on the disturbed project site.

Page 4.3-56 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Impact 4.3-6. Potential effects on Lahontan cutthroat trout.

Lahontan cutthroat trout is listed as ~~endangered~~ threatened under the ESA. Although LCT could potentially occur in the Truckee River on the project site due to hydrologic connectivity with occupied habitat, LCT is not known or expected to occur there due to degraded habitat conditions and overall rarity in the watershed. Under Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 6a, project construction and staging near the Truckee River could temporarily result in adverse impacts to fish habitat. Because TRPA, State and Regional WQCB, and Placer County regulations are in place to minimize erosion and transport of sediment and other pollutants during construction, and appropriate project-specific measures would be defined to secure necessary permits and approvals, construction-related impacts to aquatic resources would be minimized and would not result in substantial adverse effects

on fish habitat quality and functions in the Truckee River within or downstream of the project site. Additionally, because Lahontan cutthroat trout is not known or expected to occur on the project site, potential impacts to Lahontan cutthroat trout are considered **less than significant**. Because no project-related grading, ground disturbance, vegetation removal, or in-channel construction would occur under Alternative 5, there would be **no impact** to Lahontan cutthroat trout from this alternative.

Page 4.3-57 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

With the exception of Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c (Obtain and Comply with a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement; Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of Stream and Riparian Habitat) and 4.3-2d (Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of SEZ), the following mitigation measures were included in or adapted from those in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. These mitigation measures would apply for Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 6a

Page 4.3-58 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

The following text is added to page 4.3-58 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EA, following Mitigation 4.3-2c.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-2d: Compensate for unavoidable loss of SEZ.

The following measures would be implemented to ensure consistency with TRPA Code Section 61.3 and Fish and Game Code Section 1602 and further reduce potential adverse effects on SEZs, streams, and riparian habitat. Because SEZ boundaries may generally correspond with wetlands and riparian zones regulated under Section 404 of the CWA or Fish and Game Code Section 1602, implementation of these measures shall be planned in conjunction with Mitigation Measures 4.3-2b (Conduct Delineation of Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization for Fill and Required Permits) and 4.3-2c (Obtain and Comply with a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement; Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of Stream and Riparian Habitat).

- ▲ SEZ lands within the project area shall be delineated, mapped, and TRPA-verified. All reasonable alternatives/options shall be implemented to avoid or reduce the extent of encroachment into SEZs.
- ▲ In instances where there is no feasible alternative to avoid an SEZ, the project proponent shall mitigate all impacts within the boundaries of SEZs by restoring SEZ habitat (land capability district 1b) in the surrounding area, or other appropriate area as determined by TRPA, at a minimum ratio of 1.5:1, consistent with TRPA Code.
- ▲ The project proponent shall retain a qualified restoration ecologist to prepare a restoration plan that will address final clean-up, stabilization, and revegetation procedures for areas disturbed by the project. The restoration plan for SEZs shall include the following:
 - ▲ identification of compensatory mitigation sites, with emphasis on sites within the Truckee River watershed, and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites;
 - ▲ complete assessment of the existing biological resources in the restoration areas;
 - ▲ in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory SEZs (using performance and success criteria) to document success;
 - ▲ monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (Compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention

(including recontouring and grading), or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer.);

- ▲ ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80 percent survival of planted vegetation by the end of the five-year maintenance and monitoring period or dead and dying plants shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80% survivorship is achieved;
- ▲ corrective measures if performance standards are not met;
- ▲ responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and
- ▲ responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.

Page 4.3-59 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-2a, 4.3-2b, ~~and~~ 4.3-2c, and 4.3-2d would reduce the significant impacts on sensitive habitats (Impact 4.3-2) to a **less-than-significant** level because they would require that sensitive habitat is avoided to the extent feasible and that sensitive habitats that cannot be avoided are restored following construction, or if the habitat cannot be restored, that the applicant compensates for unavoidable losses in a manner that results in no net loss of sensitive habitats.

Page 4.3-59 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3a: Implement invasive plant management practices during project construction.

In consultation with TRPA and USFS, the project proponent shall implement appropriate invasive plant management practices during project construction. For aquatic invasive plants, management practices will be implemented in coordination with current efforts of the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Management coordination group. Recommended practices generally include the following:

Page 4.3-60 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3b: Implement aquatic invasive species management practices during project construction.

In consultation with TRPA and consistent with USFSWS Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) planning guidance, the project proponent shall develop and implement a plan that includes appropriate aquatic invasive species management practices during project construction. The plan will be prepared in coordination with current efforts of the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Management coordination group. Recommended practices include the following:

SECTION 4.4 – CULTURAL RESOURCES

Page 4.4-1 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

Federal protection of resources is legislated by (a) the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 as amended by 16 U.S. Code 470, (b) the Archaeological Resource Protection Act of 1979, and (c) the Advisory Council on Historical Preservation. These laws and organizations maintain processes for determination of the effects on historical properties eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Federal and federally-sponsored programs and projects are reviewed pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects of proposed federal undertakings on historic properties, NHPA requires federal agencies to initiate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) as part of the Section 106 review process. FHWA ~~has~~ initiated consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as part of the Section 106 review process California SHPO on January 23, 2015 on the proposed SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project. On February 23, 2015 the SHPO responded with a request for further project information. On March 17, 2015, FHWA submitted revised documentation of Section 106 Finding of No Adverse Effect to the SHPO. FHWA anticipates SHPO concurrence with this finding by April 20, 2015. No construction activity will be allowed until concurrence is obtained from the SHPO.

Section 106 of the NHPA and accompanying regulations (36 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 800) constitutes the main federal regulatory framework guiding cultural resources investigations and requires consideration of effects on properties that are listed in, or may be eligible for listing in the NRHP. The NRHP is the nation's master inventory of known historic resources. It is administered by the National Park Service and includes listings of buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts that possess historic, architectural, engineering, archaeological, and cultural districts that are considered significant at the national, state, or local level.

SECTION 4.7 – HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Page 4.7-7 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Waste Discharge Prohibition for the Truckee River Hydrologic Unit

The Basin Plan prohibits the discharge of any waste or material which would cause, or threaten to cause violation of any water quality objective, or otherwise adversely affect the beneficial uses of water described above (Lahontan RWQCB ~~1995~~2014). Additionally, the Basin Plan prohibits the discharge of soil or liquid waste materials containing soil or other earthen material to the surface waters of the Truckee River Hydrologic Unit, or the 100 year flood plain of the Truckee River. Exemption from this prohibition may be granted by the Lahontan RWQCB for the repair or replacement of existing structures (provided that there is not additional loss of floodplain or volume no adverse effect to existing floodplain function). An exemption may also be granted for projects and activities essential for transportation, including stream crossings and associated facilities such as bridge abutments, approaches, installation and maintenance of storm drains and storm water treatment facilities, and road and highway maintenance activities or other essential transportation facilities identified in an approved county general plan, or project necessary to protect public health or safety or to provide essential public services provided that the project meets the following exemption criteria (Lahontan RWQCB 2014 ~~1995~~, pages 4.1-5 through 4.1-7):

- ▲ There is no reasonable alternative that avoids or reduces the extent of encroachment by the project within the 100-year floodplain.

- ▲ All applicable and practicable control and mitigation measures have been incorporated such that potential adverse impacts to water quality are the minimum necessary to complete the project and beneficial uses are protected.
- ▲ The project will not reduce or adversely affect the existing floodplain function. This shall be ensured by restoration of previously disturbed areas within the 100-year floodplain within the project site, or by improvement of floodplain function within or as close as practicable to the project site. The restored, or improved 100-year floodplain function must more than offset the floodplain function lost by construction of the project. This finding will not be required for: (1) essential public health or safety projects, (2) projects to provide essential public services that the Regional Board finds such mitigation measures to be infeasible because the financial resources of the entity proposing the projects are severely limited, or (3) monitoring or scientific research projects where the Board finds the floodplain function will not be significantly reduced.
- ~~▲ There is no reasonable alternative to locating the project or portions of the project within the 100-year floodplain~~
- ~~▲ The project, by its very nature, must be located within the 100-year floodplain~~
- ~~▲ The project incorporates measures which will insure that any erosion and surface runoff problems caused by the project are mitigated to levels of insignificance.~~
- ~~▲ The project will not, individually or cumulatively with other projects, directly or indirectly, degrade water quality or impair beneficial uses of water.~~
- ~~▲ The project will not reduce the flood flow attenuation capacity, the surface flow treatment capacity, or the ground water flow treatment capacity from existing conditions. This shall be ensured by restoration of previously disturbed areas within the 100-year floodplain within the project site, or by enlargement of the floodplain within or as close as practicable to the project site. The restored, new or enlarged floodplain shall be of sufficient area, volume, and wetland value to more than offset the flood flow attenuation capacity, surface flow treatment capacity, and ground water flow treatment capacity lost by construction of the project. This finding will not be required for: (1) essential public health or safety projects, (2) projects to provide essential public services for which the Regional Board finds such mitigation measures to be infeasible because the financial resources of the entity proposing the projects are severely limited, or (3) projects for which the Regional Board finds (based on evidence presented by the proposed discharger) that the project will not reduce flood flow attenuation capacity, the surface flow treatment capacity, or the ground water flow treatment capacity from existing conditions.~~

The text starting on page 4.7-9 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity

The statewide Construction General Permit (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ) was adopted by the SRWCB on Sept. 2, 2009 and amended twice since then. A portion of the project site lies within the Lake Tahoe Hydrologic Unit (HU), and is subject to the Lake Tahoe HU Construction General Permit, Order No. ~~R6T-2011-0019~~. The state requires that projects disturbing more than 1 acre of land during construction file a Notice of Intent with the RWQCB to be covered under this permit. Construction activities subject to the General Construction Permit include clearing, grading, stockpiling, and excavation. Dischargers are required to eliminate or reduce non-stormwater discharges to storm sewer systems and other waters. A storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) must be developed and implemented for each site covered by the permit. The SWPPP must include BMPs designed to prevent construction pollutants from contacting stormwater and keep products of erosion from moving off-site into receiving waters throughout the construction and life of the project;

the BMPs must address source control and, if necessary, pollutant control. The statewide Construction General Permit would be applicable to construction activity associated with all action alternatives.

A portion of the project site associated with Alternatives 6 and 6a extends into the physical jurisdiction of the Lake Tahoe hydrologic unit, which is managed under the Construction General Permit for the Lake Tahoe Basin. However, because the actual ground disturbance associated within these alternatives would be less than one acre, no State or Regional WQCB permit would be required. Additionally, this area is not hydrologically connected to Lake Tahoe because the actual drainage conditions within the disturbance areas of the project site direct stormwater runoff to the Truckee River Watershed (USACE 2012).

The Tahoe Basin General Permit provides for increased monitoring and oversight for construction activities resulting in greater than one acre of disturbance, including daily rather than weekly monitoring, sampling for any discharges from a construction site rather than only during a qualifying storm event, triggering a Rain Event Action Plan when there is a 30 percent chance rather than a 50 percent chance of precipitation, and requiring all projects to be suspended or completed and winterized by October 15th. Under the Tahoe Basin General Permit any stormwater generated from an active construction site is to be sampled to determine if it exceeds the effluent limits shown in Table 4.7 4, Lake Tahoe Stormwater Effluent Limits (LRWQCB 2011b).

Table 4.7 4 — Lake Tahoe Stormwater Effluent Limits		
Parameter	Units	Maximum Daily Effluent Limitations for Discharge
Total Nitrogen (as-N)	mg/l	0.5
Total Phosphorus (as-P)	mg/l	0.1
Total Iron	mg/l	0.5
Turbidity	NTU	20*
Grease and Oil	mg/l	2

*Note: For Active Treatment Systems use 10 NTU as daily average and 20 NTU for any single sample
 Source: LRWQCB 2011b.

Under the NPDES post construction stormwater requirements, the counties and cities must design projects according to their respective stormwater NPDES permit and low impact development techniques and onsite infiltration of stormwater must be integrated into all new and redevelopment projects. Under the Tahoe Basin permit, stormwater facilities must be designed and constructed to infiltrate runoff generated under a 20 year, one hour storm event at a minimum, which is approximately one inch of runoff during a one hour period. If site conditions do not allow for the required infiltration, the applicant must either: (1) propose and provide information on treatment facilities to meet the Tahoe 208 Plan effluent limits; or (2) demonstrate that the public or municipal stormwater facilities are sufficient to provide adequate treatment of the project runoff to meet the sediment and nutrient load reduction requirements. Parking lots and other land uses that may contribute hydrocarbon pollutants are also required to implement pre-treatment devices to remove hydrocarbons before infiltration or discharge (LRWQCB 2011a).

Page 4.7-21 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

If the construction plan included discharge back to the Truckee River, the LRWQCB Basin Plan prohibition on discharge to the Truckee River and 100-year floodplain would apply. It would require

that dewatering discharge only be returned to the Truckee River after the project has received an exemption from the Lahontan Regional Board. Bridge abutments, approaches, and essential transportation facilities may be granted an exemption provided that ~~the project incorporates measures that would insure that any erosion and surface runoff problems caused by the project are mitigated to levels of insignificance, and the project would not individually or cumulatively degrade water quality~~ all applicable and practicable control and mitigation measures have been incorporated such that potential adverse impacts to water quality are the minimum necessary to complete the project and beneficial uses are protected (Lahontan RWQCB 2014). The NPDES California general construction permit allows dewatering operations and river diversions provided that the dewatering discharge cannot be eliminated, complies with the BMPs described in the SWPPP, is filtered or treated, does not exceed numeric action levels for pH and turbidity, and will not cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards (SWRCB 2009).

SECTION 4.8 – HAZARDS, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND RISK OF UPSET

Page 4.8-16 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Construction of Alternative 1 would result in the temporary use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. As discussed above, plans would be developed for the project that outline procedures and responsibilities for rapidly, effectively, and safely cleaning up and disposing of any spills or releases, in compliance with federal and state regulations.

Alternative 1 includes installation of new manholes and relocation and associated replacement of the TRI sewer line, the North Shore Export Line (NSEL) and other sewer facilities within the project site. As with other project component, activities associated with the TRI sewer line, NSEL, and other related sewer facilities would be subject to BMPs for spill prevention and response plans, the SWRCB Construction General Permit, and other federal and state regulations described above.

SECTION 4.10 – NOISE

Page 4.10-24 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

As described in Section 4.10.3, Affected Environment, two long-term and five short-term measurements were used to record existing noise levels in the project area and calibrate modeled changes in noise associated with the project alternatives. When compared to existing noise levels predicted by TNM it was determined that no calibration was necessary, per Caltrans guidance. Further detail is provided in Section 6.3, Noise Model Calibration, of the Noise Study Report provided in Appendix E.

SECTION 4.11 – POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

Page 4.11-9 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Full acquisition of three of the five privately-owned parcels affected by Alternative 6 could be required: Swigard's True Value Hardware (assessor's parcel number [APN] 094-190-013), Bridgetender Restaurant (APN 094-540-025), and River Grill (APN 094-540-023). In addition, an existing structure on the Liberty Utilities ~~Power~~ parcel would have to be relocated within that parcel.

Page 4.11-10 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

To implement Alternative 6A, acquisition of two properties may be required: Gary Davis Group Design and Engineering (APN 094-190-006) and Bridgetender Restaurant (APN 094-540-025). In addition, as under Alternative 6, an existing structure on the Liberty ~~Utilities~~ Power parcel would have to be relocated within that parcel.

SECTION 4.12 – PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Page 4.12-5 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

ELECTRICITY, NATURAL GAS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

Electrical service for the project site is provided by Liberty Utilities. Liberty Utilities is planning a rebuilding project for one major transmission line on the North Shore, and a variety of smaller projects are underway to ensure system-wide reliability for their planning horizon. Liberty Utilities estimates that demand is increasing by approximately one percent per year. ~~Liberty Utilities and NV Energy both anticipate having enough excess capacity to accommodate future development proposed in the Tahoe Region under the Regional Plan (Matthews, pers. comm., 2012).~~ Segment 625-1 of the existing 60 kilovolt (kV) power line crosses through the project site. Reconstruction and upgrade of this line to 120 kV is planned. The segment 625-1 would cross the Truckee River and SR 89 on the same alignment as the existing line.

SECTION 4.14 – SCENIC RESOURCES

Page 4.14-22 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Alternatives 1 through 4 would increase built environment features within the 64-Acre Tract and across the Truckee River. Views from the Tahoe Rim Trail in the 64-Acre Tract near the new bridge approach and from the river, itself, would experience visual change; however, the area is already altered by the presence of urban features. Due to the visibility of the new, realigned highway and bridge approach within the forest of the 64-Acre Tract, changes to visual character of the forest landscape would be a significant impact for Alternatives 1-4. Because the reduction in the quality of scenic resources would be substantial near the bridge in the 64-Acre Tract and within the river corridor, this impact would be potentially significant for Alternatives 1–4. Alternatives 6 and 6a would rehabilitate or replace Fanny Bridge and reconfigure the existing wye intersection, but would not substantially alter the appearance of the bridge, once completed, nor the scenic quality of views in the area. Therefore, impacts under Alternatives 6 and 6A would be **less than significant**. Alternative 5, the No Action Alternative, would have **no impact** on visual quality or character.

Page 4.14-24 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

The T-TSA sewer trunk line relocation and modifications to the NSELF sewer export main would be installed in the SR 89 roadway and would not be visible upon completion of the project. Some components associated with these modifications would require relocation of above-ground structures, such as the radio telemetry system equipment. Equipment would be placed near T-TSA facilities, along the roadway, in areas where public utility infrastructure is typical (e.g., utility poles, electrical equipment boxes). These changes would be consistent with the visual character or quality along the SR 89/SR 28 corridor. ~~Therefore, this project component~~ Installation of the sewer trunk line and NSEL sewer export main would have no effect on scenic resources.

Page 4.14-32 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

ALTERNATIVE 3: NEW ALIGNMENT – EXISTING SR 89 BECOMES A CUL-DE-SAC ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE BRIDGE
Post-completion scenic impacts would be the same as described for Alternative 1, because this alternative would include the same components as Alternative 1 with the exception of the proposed operation of SR 89 following relinquishment to Placer County and that 15 fewer trees would be removed than under Alternative 1. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Page 4.14-38 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Mitigation Measure 4.14-2: Visually soften and blend realigned highway visibility within the forest landscape.

The following mitigation applies to Alternatives 1 through 4.

To decrease the visual effects caused by the realigned highway and bridge approach built with an elevated profile on an earthen embankment, the following design and construction actions will be implemented. These actions will soften the visual intrusion of the new bridge approach and realigned highway within the 64-Acre Tract and blend them into the forest landscape.

- ▲ Minimize tree removal and retain existing rock outcroppings to the extent feasible.
- ▲ Restore forest vegetation, including trees, within the disturbed areas of the realigned highway following construction. As a supplement to standard revegetation for erosion control, trees and understory vegetation will be planted on the earthen slopes of the elevated embankment supporting the realigned highway. Forest restoration will be conducted in accordance with a replanting plan approved by the USFS, the public agency landowner of the 64-Acre Tract, and by TRPA.
- ▲ Select forest-appropriate species and design plant spacing for a natural appearance and for achieving scenic and fire fuel objectives of the USFS and TRPA.
- ▲ Save, stockpile, and reapply duff and topsoil on disturbed slopes to reduce the newly constructed look and to promote natural revegetation.
- ▲ The forest restoration plantings will be designed by a Landscape Architect or similar qualified specialist. All vegetation planting on USFS lands shall be approved by USFS botanist for areas on National Forest System lands.
- ▲ During the design development process, reduce the length and/or height of the embankment supporting the realigned SR 89 highway through the 64-Acre Tract will be reduced to the maximum extent feasible.
- ▲ Implement embankment slope design options to reduce the visible mass and enhance the appearance of the slope, including rockery walls, stepped design with planting areas, and bridge abutment concrete staining/stamping with natural colors to soften the visual intrusion.

SECTION 4.15 – TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

Page 4.15-17 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Based on the above estimates, an overall growth in study area site traffic of approximately 3 percent is projected between the baseline (2013) and project opening day (2018) conditions. This is a lower estimate than the 5 to 10 percent growth projected by the 2012 RTP. The 0.5 percent annual growth rate for the years 2018 through 2038 was agreed among the lead agencies based on a review of historical data and development projections. Exhibit 14.5-4 shows the opening year traffic volumes for the study area roadway segments and intersections. These volumes were redistributed as necessary to determine the appropriate volumes for each action alternative. The redistribution is based on turn and through movement percentages at each intersection that were determined during previous traffic studies and based on discussions with local agencies. The following generally describes the logic behind the redistributions:

- ▲ For Alternative 1, 65 percent of the volume approaching the project area from the south is assumed to use the new SR 89 segment while the remaining 35 percent stay on existing SR 89. Visitors were assumed to use the new SR 89 because it will be signed as the highway route. Some locals are assumed to take the new SR 89 segment because of traffic calming measures that will be installed along the existing SR 89, and to a minimal degree, because of potential delay encountered at the at-grade pedestrian/bicyclist crossing at the south end of Fanny Bridge.
- ▲ For Alternative 2, only the traffic that will serve existing land uses is assumed to travel along existing SR 89 while the rest of the volume to/from the south travels along the new SR 89 segment. The volume generated by the existing land uses is assumed to represent about 11 percent of the total traffic on the new and existing SR 89 segments in the morning and evening peak periods.
- ▲ For Alternative 3, only the traffic that will serve existing land uses is assumed to travel to the 64-Acres Access Road and Tahoe Tavern Road while the rest of the volume to/from the south travels along the new SR 89 segment. The volume generated by the existing land uses is assumed to represent about 6 percent of the total traffic on the new and existing SR 89 segments in the morning peak period and 9 percent in the evening peak period.
- ▲ For Alternative 4, all the volume to/from the south is assumed to travel on the new SR 89 segment because the option to continue north on existing SR 89 does not exist. Only the traffic that will serve existing land uses is assumed to use existing SR 89 south of the Wye; this is estimated to be less than 4 percent of the total traffic on the new and existing SR 89 segments in the morning and evening peak hours.

Page 4.15-45 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Alternative 1 would reduce vehicular traffic through the existing wye intersection (annual average and peak hour volumes are projected to decrease approximately 60 percent along this segment of SR 89), and extend the pedestrian/bike path from south of Fanny Bridge to further south of proposed New SR 89 to connect with the existing bike path. Fewer vehicles reduces exposure along this roadway segment and reduces the potential for vehicular crashes to occur. Pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicular traffic would also be reduced because project features associated with Alternative 1 would provide a grade-separated crossing for the pedestrian/bike path on proposed New SR 89 at the west leg of proposed New SR 89/Old SR 89 intersection (connecting it to the existing path in the southwest quadrant of the proposed intersection). The exposure due to crossing the roadway is eliminated, which reduces the potential for pedestrian/bicyclist collisions

with motor vehicles. Likewise, absence of an at-grade pedestrian/bike path crossing that necessitates motorists to stop reduces the potential for rear-end vehicular crashes to occur.

Page 4.15-46 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Alternative 2 would eliminate through traffic (with the exception of emergency vehicles) on the bridge. Removal of this travel mode eliminates the potential for collisions to occur between motorists and pedestrians/bicyclists traveling along SR 89. Also, pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicular traffic would be reduced because project features associated with Alternative 2 would provide a grade-separated crossing for the pedestrian/bike paths under the new bridge. Reduced exposure due to crossing the roadway lowers the potential for pedestrian/bicyclist collisions with motor vehicles. Likewise, absence of an at-grade pedestrian/bike path crossing that necessitates motorists to stop reduces the potential for rear-end vehicular crashes to occur.

Page 4.15-46 of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/EIS/EA is revised as follows:

Alternative 3 would reduce vehicular traffic on the segment of SR 89 south of the bridge. The new SR 89/28 intersection would be constructed as a single-lane, hybrid roundabout. Roundabouts tend to reduce the severity of traffic crashes because the geometric design of the entry points eliminates right angle crashes and high entry speeds as well as reduces conflict points. The low-speed, sideswipe collisions that can occur in roundabouts generally result in a less severe outcome. Revised pavement markings on the northbound and eastbound approaches and the elimination of free-flowing right turn lanes at the existing wye intersection will eliminate conflicting maneuvers and reduce the potential for rear-end collisions to occur (the most common crash type in the study area). Furthermore, the existing wye with Alternative 3 improvements is projected to operate at a higher LOS during summer peak hours in 2018 than the existing signalized wye intersection, which should reduce queues on the SR 89 approaches. Shorter queue lengths may lead to a reduction in rear-end crashes. Also, pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicular traffic would be reduced because project features associated with Alternative 3 would provide a grade-separated crossing for the pedestrian/bike path under the new bridge. Reduced exposure due to crossing the roadway lowers the potential for pedestrian/bicyclist collisions with motor vehicles. Likewise, absence of an at-grade pedestrian/bike path crossing that necessitates motorists to stop reduces the potential for rear-end vehicular crashes to occur. Thus, because many design features would improve traffic and pedestrian safety, implementation of Alternative 3 would result in **beneficial** impacts

Alternative 4 would reduce vehicular traffic on the segment of SR 89 south of the bridge. Revised pavement markings on the northbound and eastbound approaches and the elimination of free-flowing right turn lanes at the existing wye intersection will eliminate conflicting maneuvers and reduce the potential for rear-end collisions to occur (the most common crash type in the study area). Furthermore, the existing wye with Alternative 4 improvements is projected to operate at a higher LOS in 2018 than the existing signalized wye intersection, which should reduce queues on the SR 89 approaches. Shorter queue lengths may lead to a reduction in rear-end crashes. Also, pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicular traffic would be reduced because project features associated with Alternative 4 would provide a grade-separated crossing for the pedestrian/bike path under the new bridge. The exposure due to crossing the roadway is eliminated, which reduces the potential for pedestrian/bicyclist collisions with motor vehicles. Likewise, absence of an at-grade pedestrian/bike path crossing that necessitates motorists to stop reduces the potential for rear-end vehicular crashes to occur. Thus, because many design features would improve traffic and pedestrian safety, implementation of Alternative 4 would result in **beneficial** impacts.

5 REFERENCES

Introduction

Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. 2012. Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement. Available: <http://tahoempo.org/Mobility2035/>. Accessed March 13, 2015.

Project Alternatives Features and Preferred Alternative

Tahoe Transportation District, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and Federal Highway Administration – Central Federal Lands. 2014 (December) State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Assessment. Available: www.tahoetransportation.org. Accessed March 13, 2015.

List of Commenters and Responses to Comments

Cardno-Entrix. 2012 (February). State Route 89 and Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project, Land Capability and Land Coverage Report.

Council of Environmental Quality. 2011 (January 14) Memorandum for Heads of Federal Departments and Agencies – Appropriate Use of Mitigation and Monitoring and Clarifying the Appropriate Use of Mitigated Findings of No Significant Impact. Available: https://ceq.doe.gov/current_developments/docs/Mitigation_and_Monitoring_Guidance_14Jan2011.pdf. Accessed: March 13, 2015.

Federal Highway Administration. 1990. *The Importance of Purpose and Need in Environmental Documents*. Available: <http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/guidebook/Gjoint.asp>. Accessed: March 13, 2015.

----- . 2012 (July 20). *FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Planning, Environment and Realty Project Development and Environmental Review. Washington, D.C.

Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2014 (April 9). Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region.

Litman, Todd. 2015 (January 27). Generated Traffic and Induced Travel. Implications for Transport Planning. Victoria Transport Policy Institute. Available: <http://www.vtpi.org/gentraf.pdf>. Accessed March 13, 2015.

Nolan, Robert B. 2001. Relationships between highway capacity and induced vehicle travel. *Transportation Research Part A* 35, pp. 47-72. Available: <http://www.sensibletransportation.org/pdf/noland.pdf>. Accessed March 13, 2015.

State Water Resources Control Board. 2009. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Statewide Construction General Permit Fact Sheet. Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. 1994. *Tahoe City Community Plan*. Stateline, NV.

----- . 2010. Mobility 2030: Transportation Monitoring Program 2010.

Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. 2012. Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement. Available: <http://tahoempo.org/Mobility2035/>. Accessed March 13, 2015.

- Tahoe Transportation District. 2012 (May). Preliminary Drainage Report for State Route 89/ Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project in Placer County on State Route 89 from SR-89 – PM 7.5/9.4 to SR-28 – PM 0.0/0.1. Wood Rodgers.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2012. Delineation of Waters of the United States, State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project. Prepared by Nichols Consulting Engineers.
- U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 1983. *Final Environmental Impact Statement for Transfer of the 64-Acre Tract*. Sacramento, CA: Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior.
- U.S. Forest Service. 2015. Penny Pines Reforestation Program. Available: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/detailfull/sbnf/home/?cid=STELPRDB5289898>. Accessed: March 12, 2015.
- Wood Rodger. 2014 (January). Technical Memorandum - SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Report (PR). Traffic Forecasting and Operations Analysis.

Revisions and Corrections to the Draft EIR/EIS/EA

(No references cited.)