



Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449
bjudge@trpa.org

Tahoe Transportation District
P.O. Box 499
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
aknotts@tahoetransportation.org

Central Federal Highway Division
12300 West Dakota Avenue
Lakewood, CO 80228
Matthew.Ambroziak@dot.gov

Placer County Public Works Department
P.O. Box 336
Kings Beach, CA 96143
PKraatz@placer.ca.gov

Date: March 6, 2015
To: Mr. Brian Judge, Principal Environmental Specialist, TRPA; Mr. Alfred Knotts, Transportation Projects Manager, TTD; Mr. Matthew Ambroziak, Project Manager, Federal Highways; Mr. Peter Kraatz, Assistant Director, Placer County
From: The League to Save Lake Tahoe

Re: Additional Comments Regarding State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft EIR/S and the Associated Project

Dear Mr. Judge, Mr. Knotts, Mr. Ambroziak, and Mr. Kraatz,

The League to Save Lake Tahoe thanks you for extending the comment period for the Draft EIR/S and for allowing continuous input on the project itself. This extension has given us the time to revisit the project documents as well as gather more information from stakeholders. The League submitted extensive comments on February 17, 2015 which are attached. The League also thanks all of you for discussing those comments with our staff and we hope to keep the communication open with our organization. After continued research and discussion with the public following the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Governing Board and public workshops held February 25th and 26th 2015 respectively, the League requests the following comments be further examined. These points of clarification may be responded through either

the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) or the continued stages of project development. We ask that they all be submitted for the public record.

1. As discussed at length in the League's February 17, 2015 comments, Placer County's role needs further clarification. League staff met with Mr. Kraatz on February 26, 2015 and he explained that the Granlibakken intersection had been listed as a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) before this project had been proposed. However, a timeframe for this CIP has not been created. There should be other mitigation measures considered other than just this CIP to be used as mitigation to Alternative 1's impacts to the Granlibakken intersection. The League also requests further clarification of Placer County's role as it relates to funding of the visioning, landscaping, and snow removal to the local street after it is relinquished under Alternative 1. Mr. Kraatz explained Placer County will seek federal funding for maintenance of the bridge and road itself, but the other elements are critical to the success of Alternative 1.
2. Mr. Jim Sajdak submitted an email to Mr. Ambroziak on February 25, 2015 titled Time line for SR 89/Fanny Bridge Project, (*see attached*). It references a question brought up by a TRPA Governing Board member from the February 25, 2015 workshop. This member asked if federal funding would be lost if a project alternative was not certified by April 2015. The League asks that this question be responded to as part of the public record. The League also asks for clarification on funding in general between Alternatives 1 and 6a. Specifically, clarification on if both of these alternatives would be federally funded through the same process and any differences between the two.
3. The Friends of West Shore (FOW) also submitted extensive comments on February 17, 2015. They cited a discrepancy between the vehicle miles travelled (VMT) analysis in this projects Draft EIS/R and from an August 27, 2008 Mobility 2030 report (*see attached*). The League asked for clarification on the VMT beneficial analysis in section 3.b of the League's February 17, 2015 letter. The Mobility 2030 report states,

"...Also scheduled for completion after 2022, this project [State Route 89 Realignment] addresses seasonal traffic congestion at the Tahoe City "Wye" in Placer County and the structural and seismic deficiencies of the Fanny Bridge over the Lower Truckee River. Fanny Bridge will be upgraded to provide improved pedestrian and bicycle safety with a new State Route 89 alignment through the 64-acre USFS parcel located west of the existing SR 89.

Based on the results of the TransCAD modeling and street network analysis, the resulting increase in daily VMT and vehicle trips from the two non-exempt projects have been estimated at 15,530 [US Highway 50 Stateline Project] and 2,283 [State Route 89 Realignment] respectively for the forecast year of 2030. In order to identify the county's (El Dorado and Placer) VMT and vehicle trip change contribution as inputs to the on-road source emission estimates created by the two projects, the TMPO staff utilized the TransCAD model to identify El Dorado and Placer VMT and vehicle trip changes for the 2030 forecast year.

Based on the results of this analysis...Placer County increases in VMT and vehicle trips were computed for the 2030 forecast year as VMTs + 4,669 and vehicle trips + 730)¹"

This is a clear discrepancy between a beneficial impact to VMTs relating to Alternative 1 as outlined in the Draft EIS/R and this report from 2008. The Regional Transportation Plan itself only refers to the Route 89 Realignment but not an associated VMT increase or decrease.² There must be a clarification between these.

4. After visiting and examining the proposed Alternative 1 site, the League staff is concerned about the dramatic change in height of where the new bridge will be constructed as compared to the current road. The League submitted comments relating to the scenic impacts associated with the bridge itself, but nighttime light considerations must also be examined. The TRPA has code requirements for area-planning to protect dark skies.³ The same consideration should be given for this project as head beams from cars will be directly impacting the nearby neighborhoods of the new bridge. This should be incorporated to the overall scenic analysis and findings.
5. The public workshop held on February 26, 2015 provided simulations of Alternatives 1 and 6a for the public. Alternative 6a was shown to have three crosswalks at each entry of the roundabout that would replace the wye as well as the current pedestrian crosswalk across Fanny Bridge. The simulation gave the appearance of congestion. There should be a serious consideration of different locations for crosswalks for Alternative 6a. The current crosswalk and its direct impact to current traffic congestion has been outlined in many public comments submitted on this project. The League requests that Alternative 6a and its various designs be discussed through the remaining project process.

The League would like to recognize the amount of effort and input given by the public through this process. Our staff will closely review the responses to all of their submitted comments and hope their concerns are also addressed either through the public process or FEIS.

Sincerely,

Shannon Eckmeyer
Policy Analyst
League to Save Lake Tahoe

Enclosures

(League Letter, February 17, 2015)
(Email from Mr. Jim Sajdak, February 25, 2015)
(Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, Mobility 2030 Report, August 27, 2008)

¹ TMPO Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, Mobility 2030 Report. Final August 27, 2008. Page 68, Figure 6.4

² Regional Transportation Plan, Mobility 2035. TMPO/TRPA. December 12, 2012.p 4-7.

³ TRPA Code. December 12, 2012. 13.5.3.5a. p.13-8.