U.2	Responses to Comments on Draft EA/EIR/EIS

U.2 Responses to Comments on Draft EA/EIR/EIS

This chapter documents the responses to public comments on the draft EA/EIR/EIS. The comment letters, emails, comment cards from the public workshops, and verbal comments received are listed in and presented in Section U.1.

The draft EA/EIR/EIS was circulated for review and comment by the public, other interested parties, agencies that commented on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the document, and surrounding jurisdiction. A large number of comment letters on the draft EA/EIR/EIS were received from individuals.

As stated in State CEQA Guidelines 15088(a) and 15088(b) and Rule 6.14 of TRPA's Rules of Procedure, comments that raise environmental issues are provided with responses. Reasoned, factual responses have been provided to all comments received during the public review period, focusing specifically on the environmental issues raised in the comment. In general, the responses provide explanation or amplification of information contained in the draft EA/EIR/EIS. Comments that are outside of the scope of CEQA review will be forwarded to the decision makers for consideration as part of the project approval process. These comments are answered with a general response.

Section U.1 lists the individuals and agencies that commented on the draft EA/EIR/EIS. The comment letters are divided into Individual from Placer County (IP), Individual from TRPA (IT), Local (L), Nongovernmental Organization (NGO), Public Workshop (PW), and State (S) and then presented by date. The comments are presented in this order in the chapter. The responses to each comment letter appear directly after each comment letter. When comments resulted in changes to the EA/EIR/EIS, reference is made to the pages in the text of the final EA/EIR/EIS where the changes were made.

Master Responses

For the purpose of concision in the final EA/EIR/EIS, multiple comments on the same topic are responded to with a Master Response. Master Responses are presented below and correspond to those referenced in the *Individual Responses* section of this chapter.

Master Response 1: Traffic Congestion on SR 28/Diverted Traffic through Residential Neighborhoods

This response is intended to address multiple comments regarding increased traffic congestion and diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods in Kings Beach as a result of Alternatives 2 and 4 of the proposed action.

Alternatives 2 and 4 would each reduce the level of service (LOS) below TRPA standards on SR 28. This is described in *Chapter 3.6* and *Chapter 5* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-1 from *Chapter 3.6* in the final EA/EIR/EIS. Under Alternatives 2 and 4, the TRPA LOS standard would be exceeded on 108 days per summer in the eastbound direction, including approximately 670 hours that result in LOS F by 2028. The TRPA LOS standard would be exceeded on 104 days per summer in the westbound direction, including approximately 774 hours that result in LOS F by 2028. Peak winter day conditions would exceed TRPA LOS standards on as well. All impacts related to traffic under all alternatives can be found in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Under all of the alternatives (including the no project alternative), minor legs of uncontrolled intersections will operate at LOS F in 2028, as shown in the project traffic study (Appendix L).

Although not a part of this project, under Alternatives 1 and 3, the intersection at Fox Street is likely to require a traffic signal in the future.

In addition, Alternatives 2 and 4 would each increase the average daily traffic (ADT) on residential streets, as described in *Chapter 3.6* and *Chapter 5* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-2 from *Chapter 3.6* in the final EA/EIR/EIS, due to drivers avoiding congestion on SR 28. Without the proposed action, ADT is expected to increase to 2,000

on Coon Street between Trout Avenue and Rainbow Avenue, 3,200 on Chipmunk Street between SR 28 and Minnow Avenue, and 3,400 on Fox Street between Minnow Avenue and Salmon Avenue by the year 2028. Existing ADT on these streets ranges from 600 to 2,000. Under Alternative 2, it is expected that ADT would be 5,400 on Fox Street between Minnow Avenue and Salmon Street and 4,000 on Chipmunk Street between SR 28 and Minnow Avenue. Under Alternative 4, diverted traffic is expected to exceed 3,000 ADT by 2028. It is expected that ADT would increase to 4,000 and Fox Street would increase to 5,400.

If Alternative 2 or 4 were selected, Placer County will allocate funds to implement a NTMP to help alleviate diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP process will involve traffic engineering professionals working with the community to help design traffic-calming features (e.g., seasonal speed bumps, shifts in roadway alignment, signage, etc.), which will help to alleviate diverted traffic but will not reduce diverted traffic to less-than-significant levels. The NTMP will establish and implement the NTMP) prior to construction activities. Text has been added to pages 3.6-30 through 3.6-32 in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS to include implementation of a NTMP as a mitigation measure. However, this mitigation measure is not sufficient to mitigate this impact to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the NTMP will require its own subsequent environmental review before it is implemented.

The NTMP developed for the KBCC improvement project outlines a process for handling neighborhood issues. In general, NTMPs are a guideline for neighborhoods with traffic problems to complete further analysis of traffic conditions and to design and construct engineering solutions, if necessary. The projects developed for this plan are based on mitigating areas identified with neighborhood traffic issues. One of the intrusions that can negatively impact the safety of residents is excessive speed on local streets. The NTMP that Placer County has committed to implement has several components, including educational, enforcement, and enhancement (i.e., traffic-calming devices) ones. The goal of the NTMP is to minimize the effects of cut through traffic on neighborhood

streets, predominantly by reducing traffic speeds.

The educational component of the NTMP will provide the community with a means of understanding traffic management tools and processes and also increase public awareness of the impact that traffic will have on the neighborhood. Educational efforts that Placer County will implement as part of the NTMP include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Coordination of school and neighborhood NTMP meetings,
- Development/maintenance of an NTMP website,
- Coordination of a speed watch program,
- Coordination of the placement of temporary NTMP yard signs with volunteers,
- Design and distribution of NTMP brochures,
- Coordination of staff presentations to neighborhood groups, and

The enforcement component of the NTMP entails focusing law enforcement efforts to acknowledge areas of concern. Enforcement efforts that Placer County will implement as part of the NTMP include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Increased enforcement,
- Real-time speed feedback signs,
- Photo-enforced speed limits,
- Signage ("Entering residential neighborhood..."),

The enhancement component of the NTMP consists of physical transportation system improvements. Numerous traffic-calming devices may be selected by a neighborhood for placement on a street. Policy guidelines that Placer County will implement as part of the NTMP include, but are not limited to:

- Seasonal summer temporary speed bumps,
- Neckdowns/bulbouts (extensions of curbs/corner sidewalks at an intersection),
- Medians,

• Choker/Chicane (chokers are build-outs added to a road to narrow it, while chicanes are sequences of tight serpentine curves designed to slow roadway traffic),

- Traffic circle,
- Seasonal partial or full street closures,
- One-way streets,
- Turn movement restrictions,
- Diagonal intersection diverters,
- Median barrier through intersection, and
- Forced turn island.
- Roundabouts encourage slower travel speeds.

Placer County will also establish and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) prior to construction activities. The CTMP indicates how traffic, parking, and pedestrian operations will be managed during construction of the proposed action. The plan contains strategies and tactics for mitigating travel impacts identified prior to the commencement of construction, and aims to improve the transportation during construction. The CTMP will include, but is not limited to, the following measures:

- Maintain two lanes of traffic at all times through the commercial core of Kings Beach during construction of the new curb, gutter, and sidewalk. (Not required that existing lanes of traffic be provided throughout the proposed action).
- Require that one lane of traffic be open during working hours.
- Maintain a maximum vehicle delay of 20 minutes.
- Disperse public information such as brochures and mailers.
- Hold public meetings.

- Install changeable message signs (portable) and ground mounted signs.
- Utilize the highway advisory radio and the Caltrans Highway Information Network.
- Implement a Construction Zone Enhanced Enforcement Program.
- Devise construction strategies such as lane closure charts, reduced speed zones, moveable barriers, K-Rails, staged construction, and Traffic Contingency Plan/Emergency Detour Plan.
- Enforce alternate route strategies and parking restrictions.
- Implement BMPs to avoid impacting the Griff Creek Watershed.
- Maintain pedestrian and bicycle traffic during construction.
- Allow active construction on one side of the roadway at a time.
- Mitigate the loss of parking before construction as much as possible.

Caltrans shall develop a Regional Transportation Management Plan (RTMP) due to the large number of transportation improvement proposals scheduled to occur within a similar timeframe in the greater action area. The RTMP would be expected to promote greater coordination between agencies and projects to minimize potentially significant impacts associated with multiple construction projects.

The following are objectives to be achieved from the RTMP, as described in the Caltrans draft *Guidelines for Projects Located on the California State Highways in the Lake Tahoe Basin* (California Department of Transportation n.d.).

- Provide accurate and timely information to the public.
- Minimize traffic delays while maximizing public and worker safety during construction.
- Minimize impacts on businesses, residences, schools, public services, and special events during construction.

 Provide design and instructional information regarding traffic management to the Project Engineer, Resident Engineer, and project specific Standard Special Provisions (SSPs) to be included in the project contract.

• Ensure that no more than 30 minutes of cumulative corridor delay will occur.

Timing and execution remain the greatest concern for most proposed construction projects in the immediate and greater action area. Project coordination between Caltrans' functional units is crucial and will take place. In particular, interagency synchronization within Caltrans will include the TMP Unit, Environmental Management, District 03 Public Information Office, Construction Engineering, and the project development teams. Close contact with local stakeholder agencies will be maintained in order to minimize cumulative socioeconomic-related impacts that would otherwise result from these related projects.

As noted in Impacts TRA-1 and TRA-2, impacts related to traffic LOS and increased ADT on residential streets are considered adverse. If an alternative is selected that has significant and unavoidable impacts, Placer County, as the lead agency under CEQA, would adopt a Statement of Overriding Consideration in order to identify substantive evidence that the proposed action's specific benefits would outweigh the adverse environmental effects. Pursuant to TRPA's Compact, TRPA would be required to make a similar action.

Master Response 2: Traffic Calming on SR 28

This response addresses multiple comments on traffic-calming devices associated with the KBCC project. Comments included concerns about crosswalks, roundabouts, stoplights, and safety.

One of the main goals of the Kings Beach Commercial Core (KBCC) Improvement
Project is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety through the KBCC.

Dedicated bike lanes and sidewalks; enhanced pedestrian crossings; installation of
controlled intersections; and traffic-calming devices, such as roundabouts, are a large part

of the proposed improvements. Currently, pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles all compete for travel space along the KBCC; sidewalks and bike lanes do not exist in several areas of the KBCC. Consequently, pedestrians must walk along the edge of the roadway or along undeveloped portions of the right-of-way (ROW). In addition, bicyclists have to compete with vehicles and pedestrians on SR 28, as there are no dedicated bicycle facilities within the KBCC.

As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, tourism is an important part of Kings Beach, and, at times, the local population increases by 5.5% over full-time residents. Additionally, bicycle use is increasing in Kings Beach and in the Lake Tahoe area and is expected to continue to increase over time. In order to both meet the current and future needs for mobility and safety of pedestrians and bicyclists, bike lanes, sidewalks, and enhanced intersections need to be provided.

Safety for pedestrians will actually increase under any alternative of the proposed action. Currently, no sidewalks or bike lanes exist in the KBCC. Each alternative includes the addition of sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and curbs and gutters (including planters) to separate pedestrians and bicyclists from traffic. In addition, Alternatives 2 and 4 include roundabouts at Bear and Coon Streets. Roundabouts traditionally allow for more capacity than provided by a traffic signal. In addition, roundabouts are included in some of the project alternatives for the following reasons:

- Roundabouts typically require less space for vehicle queuing than a signalized intersection, potentially allowing a reduction in the number of travel lanes and a parallel increase in ROW available for other uses such as sidewalks.
- Roundabouts encourage slower travel speeds.
- Properly designed roundabouts have proven to be safer, particularly with regards to serious accidents that result in injuries or fatalities. The potential for serious accidents is reduced for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as motorists, because there are fewer opportunities for vehicle to vehicle and vehicle to pedestrian conflicts.

Roundabouts have a relatively low accident rate in comparison to other types of
intersections for motor vehicles and, when accidents do occur, they are often less
severe than those that occur at other types of intersections.

- Bypasses for on-street cyclists will be included in order to provide a dedicated space to cycle, as well as to provide increased separation from motor vehicles.
- Roundabouts are typically considered to improve visual quality, compared with a signalized intersection.

Several commenters expressed the concern regarding roundabouts in a high pedestrian/high traffic volume area. A good example of a roundabout with both high traffic volumes and high pedestrian volumes is the roundabout at the intersection of Bogue Street and Shaw Lane on the campus of Michigan State University in East Lansing, Michigan. This two-lane roundabout accommodates roughly 1,900 entering vehicles per hour along with 700 pedestrians. Even with these high levels of activity, only 0.91 pedestrian accidents per year have occurred over the 5 years that the roundabout has been in place. The traffic volume at this intersection is roughly equivalent to peak volumes in Kings Beach, while the pedestrian activity is much greater.

Another consideration is the effect that high-pedestrian volumes have on the capacity of a roundabout, specifically on the capacity of an entry lane. The National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 572: Roundabouts in the United States (Transportation Research Board, 2007) Appendix D presents an evaluation of the effect that pedestrian activity has on entry capacity. This effect increases with increasing pedestrian volumes, but decreases with increasing circulating traffic volumes in the roundabout, reflecting the fact that entering drivers are more often required to wait for a gap in the circulating roundabout volume as this volume increases, and pedestrians can more easily walk between vehicles queued on the approach without requiring a driver to make a special stop. For the circulating flows that would be faced by drivers entering a roundabout in Kings Beach along SR 28, entry capacity would be reduced by 2% by 100 pedestrians crossing the highway per hour and would be reduced by roughly 6% by 200

pedestrians crossing the highway per hour. Although it is not possible to accurately forecast typical peak pedestrian crossing volumes after completion of the sidewalks, the methodology in this report indicates that impact on traffic flow along the highway would be relatively minor.

Master Response 3: Effects on Local Businesses/Parking

The final EA/EIR/EIS evaluated the proposed action's potential to cause effects on local businesses, especially as a result of a change in parking availability. As stated in *Chapter 3.3*, ROW acquisition and changes in access and parking could cause impacts on businesses located adjacent to SR 28. However, impacts are not considered significant. Impact SOC-5: Revenue Effects on Local and Roadside Businesses, describes impacts on specific businesses as a result of the proposed action. Under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, improvements at the intersection of SR 28/SR 267 would affect access points to some businesses along on SR 28. However, these impacts are not considered adverse. Placer County will work with all adjacent property owners to ensure access to all affected properties will continue to be maintained along SR 28 and that access is not denied. All changes in access are described in *Section 3.3* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Changes in access would not create major problems for businesses; consequently, no mitigation is required.

All alternatives would result in a loss of existing parking spaces either in lots or along the SR 28 ROW that would require replacement. As stated in *Chapter 3.7*, Alternatives 2 and 4 would both result in a loss of 280 parking spaces in the action area, and Alternative 3 would result in a net loss of 220 parking spaces in the action area. The parking planning profession generally considers an effective maximum utilization of parking spaces to be 90 to 95% of all spaces in order to provide availability of parking during peak periods. To compensate for the loss of parking, Placer County will provide new parking spaces to meet the 90% utilization rate through potential on-street and off-street parking proposed as part of the proposed action. Placer County will also ensure that the new parking spaces are located in close proximity to the impacted areas. This would

result in adequate parking availability. Three parking lots will be constructed prior to the start of construction for the proposed action, and an additional parking lot will be provided to offset impacts during construction of the proposed action (refer to Tables 3.7-2 and 3.7-3 in the final EA/EIR/EIS regarding the parking spaces associated with the proposed action). Therefore, these impacts are not considered significant and no mitigation is required. Furthermore, as stated in Mitigation Measures LU-1 and TRA-3, Placer County will implement a Community Involvement and Public Participation Plan (CIPP) and a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) during the construction of the proposed action. These measures would spread awareness and minimize the effects of construction.

Several commenters stated that the proposed action will place an undue burden on businesses for upkeep and maintenance of the proposed sidewalks. Because adjacent business owners will see the direct benefits associated with sidewalks, sidewalk maintenance as well as insurance costs and liability associated with the sidewalks and sidewalk maintenance will be the responsibility of property owners, as is the case in Tahoe City. Various options are being explored. Placer County is currently pursuing the establishment of a Property-Based Business Improvement District (PBID) to address the maintenance and upkeep of the proposed sidewalk improvements and is soliciting feedback from the business community to determine which business owners in the KBCC are interested in participating in the PBID and how to implement the PBID. Placer County will work with businesses regarding how sidewalks and other features of the KBCC will be maintained, and options for local businesses to pay on an individual or group basis are potential maintenance options.

Commenters were also concerned with how delivery trucks will be able to access businesses. The project alternatives would not change access to delivery vehicles and would still allow access to driveways, while parking on side-streets will still be available for delivery vehicles. Under Alternative 3, delivery trucks would deliver to businesses in the same way that they deliver currently, as Alternative 3 would be similar to existing conditions. For Alternatives 2 and 4, Placer County will consider adjusting sidewalks

and parking widths to allow for clearly defined truck loading zones. In addition, although it is beyond the scope of the proposed action to control delivery activities that are illegal (i.e., double parking, parking in the center lane), planters, signs, and traffic-calming/control measures would be used to designate the truck loading zones.

Master Response 4: Selection Process for Alternatives Preference

Placer County thanks the commenter for this input regarding the selection of an alternative. Since the publication of the Draft EA/EIR/EIS, Placer County has identified a Preferred Alternative, which is a hybrid of Alternatives 2 and 4, which were previously analyzed in the Draft EA/EIR/EIS. The Preferred Alternative has been determined based, in part, on the public comments that have been received, as well as potential impacts associated with all alternatives.

All build alternatives (Alternatives 2 through 4 and the hybrid) are illustrated in Figure 2-1 of the Final EIR. The hybrid alternative includes three travel lanes, bike lanes, seasonal on-street parking and sidewalks. Roundabouts are included at the intersections of SR 28/Bear Street and SR 28/Coon Street (Figure 2-4 of the Final EA/EIR/EIS). The Hybrid Alternative would include \$100,000 in traffic calming improvements in the adjacent neighborhood to minimize some effects of anticipated cut through traffic identified in the Final EA/EIR/EIS. Although all alternatives will replace parking off the highway, the Hybrid Alternative will replace more parking off highway than other alternatives. For more information on the Hybrid Alternative, please see Chapter 2 of the Final EA/EIR/EIS.

Master Response 5: Snow Removal

Some commenters have expressed concern regarding keeping sidewalks clear of snow during winter. The clearing of sidewalks will be the responsibility of the adjacent property owners. Placer County is currently pursuing the establishment of a PBID to address the maintenance and upkeep of the proposed sidewalk improvements and is soliciting feedback from the business community to determine which business owners in the KBCC are interested in participating in the PBID and how to implement the PBID.

Placer County will work with businesses regarding how sidewalks and other features of the KBCC will be maintained, and options for local businesses to pay on an individual or group basis are potential maintenance options.

Master Response 6: Traffic Speeds and Parking Enforcement

Some commenters expressed concern regarding speed limits in the action area. The speed limit on SR 28, which is administered by Caltrans, is 30 mph, and enforcing the speed limit is the responsibility of the California Highway Patrol (CHP). These comments do not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS, and changes to the speed limit and increases in CHP patrol are not proposed as part of the proposed action.

Placer County may consider mitigation to address the relatively high traffic speeds that would result from implementation of Alternative 3; this mitigation would work with Caltrans to reduce traffic speeds entering the commercial core area from the east. Some measures Placer County may consider include, but are not limited to, changes in speed limits, horizontal changes in roadway alignment, "real time" speed signs, and increased enforcement.

Parking enforcement along SR 28 is under jurisdiction of the CHP, while parking enforcement off of the state ROW is under the jurisdiction of Placer County. There are no current plans to charge a parking fee in the lots or to place time restrictions other than no overnight parking. In addition, parking on SR 28 will be limited to 2-hour parking from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. under Alternatives 2 and 3. Local citizens will not receive any special preferences for parking. Increasing parking patrols are not proposed as part of the proposed action. However, changes in parking management may change over time based on the needs of the community. It is unlikely that parking in the KBCC will need more active parking management in the near future.

Master Response 7: Cost of Parking

Several commenters voiced the concern that parking continue to be free. Parking restrictions may be considered, although currently the alternatives do not include parking

restrictions since current parking is not restricted. Parking in the off-street parking lots is proposed to be free.

Master Response 8: Public Involvement

Many commenters expressed an opinion on the public involvement process. Placer County adopted the Kings Beach Community Plan in 1996. Currently, Placer County distributed a notice of preparation (NOP) of a final EA/EIR/EIS for the proposed action on November 30, 2002. This began the start of a comment period that lasted until December 23, 2002. A public notice was printed in four local newspapers. In addition, Placer County held a public scoping meeting on the proposed action on December 5, 2002, so that the public could provide input regarding issues they wanted addressed in the document.

In addition, Placer County has held eight public workshops/meetings during the 60-day public comment period to receive questions and solicit comments to aid the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation to assist in choosing a preferred alternative based partly on input from the community:

- Open House: April 25, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.
- Public Workshop: May 1, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.
- Public Workshop: May 2, 2007 at the Kings Beach Elementary School.
- Public Workshop: May 15, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.
- Public Workshop: May 29, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.
- Placer County Planning Commission: April 26, 2007 at the Granlibakken Conference Center.
- TRPA Advisory Planning commission: May 9, 2007 at the South Lake TRPA Office.
- TRPA Governing Board: May 23, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.

Also, some commenters implied that the actions of the Sierra Business Council (SBC) show bias. The SBC was retained to run public meetings so that the meetings would be facilitated by an independent third party organization. At the conclusion of each meeting, Placer County took each of the comment cards from each of the public meetings. Master Response 4 describes how a preferred alternative was selected.

Master Response 9: Signal Warrant at Deer Street

As stated in the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS) *The California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (MUTCD), signal warrants are used to assess the appropriateness of the traffic control devices (either signal or roundabout). A signal warrant analysis was conducted for the study area intersections for existing summer p.m. peak-hour design volumes, forecasted 2008 p.m. peak hour design volumes, and forecasted 2028 peak hour design volumes. Because Caltrans has jurisdiction along SR 28, the signal warrant analysis is based upon Caltrans standards.

The MUTCD (September 26, 2006) is the current adopted document used by Caltrans to determine whether a signal is warranted. Caltrans' Traffic Manual (November 1966) incorporates the MUTCD warrants as important elements in the decision to locate a new traffic signal, as seen in the traffic study. After the signal warrant analysis, it was determined that three stoplights at SR 267, Bear Street, and Coon Street would be included under Alternative 3. Others may be added in the future under Alternative 3.

An original signal warrant was conducted several years ago, which indicated that signals were warranted at Coon and Bear Streets, and possibly in the future at Fox Street. In 2006, however, Caltrans revised their signal warrant analysis procedure. In December 2006, LSC conducted an updated signal warrant analysis, which indicated that at least three of the eight warrants are met at all intersections in KB. All intersections meet the three volume-based warrants, none meet the accident warrant, and two (Bear and Coon) meet the pedestrian volume warrant.

It is important to consider that the signal warrant procedure does not require that a signal be installed if warrants are met, but rather that it is then a feasible option. Many factors must be considered when assessing the overall benefit versus impacts of a signal, including the overall impact on traffic delays, how it functions as part of the corridor, noise, air pollution, impacts on parking, need for additional turn lanes, and impacts on pedestrian conditions. In the case of Secline Street, pedestrian volumes at this location are relatively low, pedestrians have a protected crossing opportunity at the SR 267 signal 475 feet away, and there is a potential for queue blocking issues associated with the nearby SR 267 signal. However, Placer County will consider crosswalks at the Secline Street intersection during final project design

Chapter 1 of the on the final EA/EIR/EIS indicates that Caltrans conducted a warrant analysis on five intersections throughout the action area and concluded that Bear and Coon Streets met signal warrants. An updated warrant analysis conducted for this environmental analysis has indicated that a signal at Fox Street and Deer Street may be warranted for future years. However, the determination of traffic control devices at these intersections will be considered as a separate roadway improvement project, and the design of improvements proposed by these separate roadway improvement projects (roundabouts/signals) must be consistent with this project.

Master Response 10: Estimates of Future Year Growth and Traffic Volumes

An alternative traffic analysis to evaluate roadway conditions for future years was performed. There are three general ways to forecast long-range traffic volumes on a major roadway:

Traffic Model—A calibrated and up-to-date computerized traffic model, developed with accepted land use forecasts, is used to forecast future year traffic volumes.
 TRPA is currently developing a new regional traffic model; this model does not yet develop future traffic forecasts, as future land use assumptions are not yet available.
 While the TRPA regional traffic model is currently unavailable, Placer County has never developed a traffic model for use in the Kings Beach area. Consequently, there

is currently no valid model to calculate future traffic conditions in the Kings Beach area.

- 2. Buildout of Currently Approved General Plans—In the absence of a valid traffic model, Caltrans traffic study guidelines indicated that traffic forecasts should be based on the assumption that existing approved land use plans that would add traffic to the study area roadways are fully built out. As Caltrans required this methodology to be used for the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project traffic analysis, and this approach was approved by the study technical committee, the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project assumed full buildout of the Community Plans across the North Shore, Town of Truckee General Plan, and Martis Valley Community Plan, as well as an allocated portion of the unused Placer County housing allocations.
- 3. Trend Analysis—Another approach, which typically results in more probable forecasts, is to evaluate recent trends in traffic volumes, and to extrapolate these trends to a future analysis year. Oftentimes, this approach is dependent upon the length of time used to evaluate this trend. An evaluation of yearly traffic counts over the last five to ten years yields a valid trend in traffic volumes. Table U.2-1 summarizes Caltrans traffic count data on SR 28 between SR 267 and Coon Street for the years 1994 through 2006. A regression analysis for the years 2001-2006 indicates that traffic volumes increased by an average of 0.15 percent per year, while a regression analysis for the years 1996-2006 indicates that traffic volumes increased by an average of 0.66 percent per year. Extrapolated over 20 years, 2028 volumes would be 14.1 percent higher than 2008 volumes using 2001–2006 growth rates and 3.0 percent higher than 2008 volumes using 1996–2006 growth rates.

Table U.2-1. Caltrans Peak Month Average Daily Two-Way Traffic Volumes on SR 28 between SR 267 and Coon Street

Year	Total two-way daily v	olume
1994	24,200	
1995	23,700	
1996	23,700	
1997	24,900	
1998	24,700	
1999	24,100	
2000	24,100	
2001	24,100	
2002	24,100	
2003	23,000	
2004	26,000	
2005	24,800	
2006	24,200	
Average annual growth 1996–2	2006	0.15%
Average annual growth 2001–2	2006	0.66%
20-year total growth based on n	nost recent 10-year trend	3.0%
20-year total growth based on n	nost recent 5-year trend	14.1%

To provide an indication of future 2028 roadway traffic conditions more consistent with recent trends in traffic volumes, 2028 volumes were assumed to be 10 percent above 2008 volumes, which is between the forecasts based on the five- and ten-year trend estimates. Using the 10 percent 2008 to 2028 growth rate, a revised analysis of future roadway LOS for every hour throughout the summer was conducted. Table U.2-2 summarizes roadway LOS conditions assuming a 10 percent growth rate, while Table U.2-3 summarizes the number of hours per day in which LOS F traffic conditions are forecast to occur assuming a 10 percent growth rate. Based on the revised analysis assuming a 10 percent growth rate, it was found for Alternatives 2 and 4 that:

• The TRPA LOS standard would be exceeded 40 days in the eastbound direction and 21 days in the westbound direction during the summer peak season. During days

Table U.2-2. 2028 Summer Traffic Queuing¹

	Direction of travel		
	Eastbound	Westbound	Both
Number of days per summer queuing would occur	40	21	17
Number of hours per summer of queuing	111	52	37
Average daily hours of queuing			
– On Fridays in August	2.8	1.0	_
- On Saturdays in August	4.0	1.6	_
- On Sundays in August	0.5	2.8	_
- On other weekdays in August	1.4	0.4	_
- Maxumum number of hours of queuing per day	8	8	-

Number of days per summer in which queuing would occur by number of hours per day				
Number of hours queuing per day	Eastbound	Westbound	Both	
0	69	88	_	
1	9	9	_	
2	13	6	_	
3	9	1	_	
4	3	2	_	
5	2	0	_	
6	1	2	_	
7	2	0	_	
8	1	1	_	
9	0	0	_	

	Eastbound	Westbound
Number of summer hours when North Stateline creates eastbound queues forming back into Kings Beach	0	-

¹ Assuming 10 percent traffic growth over 2008 forecast

Table U.2-3. 2028 Calendar of summer Hours of Traffic Queues¹

Week _	Day of the week						
Beginning	Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
Eastbound d	aily hours o	of traffic queu	ie				
09-Jun	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16-Jun	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
23-Jun	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
30-Jun	0	0	3	5	4	8	6
07-Jul	0	0	2	0	1	3	0
14-Jul	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
21-Jul	0	0	1	1	1	4	7
28-Jul	2	0	2	0	2	3	5
04-Aug	3	1	3	2	3	4	7
11-Aug	0	0	2	2	2	3	3
18-Aug	0	0	2	2	2	2	0
25-Aug	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
01-Sep	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
08-Sep	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15-Sep	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westbound o	laily hours	of traffic que	ue				
09-Jun	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16-Jun	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23-Jun	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30-Jun	0	0	0	0	0	6	8
07-Jul	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
14-Jul	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
21-Jul	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
28-Jul	6	0	0	0	0	1	1
04-Aug	3	0	0	0	2	2	4
11-Aug	4	1	1	2	1	2	0
18-Aug	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
25-Aug	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
01-Sep	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
08-Sep	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15-Sep	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

¹ Assuming 10 percent traffic growth over 2008 forecast

N	Number of summer hours of diverted traffic volumes			
Diverted traff	ic volume			
(one-way vehicle	es per hours)		Hours per summer	
From	То	Eastbound	Westbound	Both
1	100	80	35	_
101	200	22	12	_
201	300	9	4	_
301	400	0	1	_
401	500	0	0	_
Total		111	52	_

	Eastbound	Westbound	Both
Number of days per summer on which TRPA LOS E standard would be exceeded for at least one hour	40	21	-

Number of days per summer on which TRPA LOS E standard would be exceeded by number of hours per day $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1}$

Number of hours of LOS F	Eastbound	Westbound	Both
0	38	54	_
1	7	18	_
2	11	9	_
3	19	8	_
4	10	6	_
5	7	3	_
6	6	4	_
7	5	5	_
8	5	1	_
9	1	1	_
10	0	0	_
Number of days per summer on which TRPA Los D standard is exceeded more than 4 hours	24	14	-
Number of days per summer on which TRPA Standard is exceeded (Maximum of #1 or #2)	40	21	-

when the TRPA LOS standard would be exceeded, traffic queues generated by volumes exceeding the roadway link capacity would form for one or more hours per day.

- On most days in which traffic queues would occur, traffic queues would occur for one
 or two hours, although queues could form for up to eight hours.
- Traffic queues would most often form on Fridays, and would form every day of the week only in the busiest mid-August period.
- Traffic volumes diverting off of SR 28 onto local streets would range up to 300 vehicles per hour. In the majority of hours in which queuing would occur, diverted traffic volumes would be no more than 100 vehicles per hour.

The traffic analysis in the Final EA/EIR/EIS indicated that TRPA LOS standards would be exceeded and traffic queues would form on 10 days in the eastbound direction and 5 days in the westbound direction during the summer peak season in 2008. Assuming zero growth from 2008, these conditions would also occur in 2028. Increasing traffic volumes by 10 percent would create traffic queues on 30 days in the eastbound direction and 16 days in the westbound direction.

For Alternatives 1 and 3, LOS B would be provided through the summer 2028 design period.

Individual Placer County (IP) Responses

Comment Letter IP1—Frank Maguire, April 22, 2007

Response to Comment IP1-1

Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP1-2

The commenter indicates that the environmental document focuses on traffic data from the summer months. However, as shown in the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS) winter peak hour traffic conditions were also evaluated. Winter pedestrian and bicycle counts, as well as peak hour winter intersection turning movement volumes and peak winter peak hour intersection LOS information was used. A full evaluation of winter conditions is found in the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS), and in the environmental document as well.

Response to Comment IP1-3

The commenter expresses concern that roundabouts will slow down the flow of traffic. Please see Master Response 2.

Response to Comment IP1-4

Please see Master Response 3 the effects of parking on businesses and the potential creation of loading zones.

Response to Comment IP1-5

The commenter expresses concern that roundabouts will slow down the flow of traffic. Please see Master Response 2.

Please see Master Response 3 the effects of parking on businesses and the potential creation of loading zones.

Response to Comment IP1-6

Please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter IP2—Larry W. Dowdle, April 24, 2007

Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

The commenter should also be aware that Caltrans is currently developing plans for environmental retrofit of SR 28 between Kings Beach and North Stateline, which could potentially provide a sidewalk in this pedestrian corridor. Information can be found at http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist3/departments/envinternet/placer28/plac28.htm.

Response to Comment IP2-1

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IP2-2

Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IP2-3

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

It should be noted that Caltrans officials do not advise individuals or the public about what they may or may not say or express themselves.

Response to Comment IP2-4

The commenter expresses an opinion about the speed limit entering the California state line. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter IP3—Anne Chartier, April 29, 2007

Response to Comment IP3-1

Please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter IP4—Maggie Schumacher, May 2, 2007

Response to Comment IP4-1

Placer County thanks the commenter for this input regarding issues of the grid and the suggestion to include more stop signs. Traffic control measures along SR 28 are evaluated in the environmental document. In addition, Master Response 1 discusses Placer County's intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Response to Comment IP4-2

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding issues of the grid and diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. Placer County has considered the comment in choosing a preferred alternative. Also, please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IP4-3

As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the proposed action's goals is to increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety. The proposed action also aims to improve aesthetic values of the KBCC. Both of these goals are expected to induce tourism and a resident-friendly community because they would result in increased business revenues and greater willingness on the part of businesses and private property owners to invest in building renovations and other additional community improvements. Also, please see Master Response 2.

Response to Comment IP4-4

Please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IP4-5

As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the proposed action's goals is to increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety. The proposed action also aims to improve aesthetic values of the KBCC. Both of these goals are expected to induce tourism and a resident-friendly community because they would result in increased business revenues and greater willingness on the part of businesses and private property owners to invest in building renovations and other additional community improvements. Also, please see Master Response 2.

Response to Comment IP4-6

The commenter expresses an opinion about the need to improve aesthetic appeal in Kings Beach. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the main goals of the proposed action is to provide a more attractive pedestrian environment. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, trash receptacles, organized parking, and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment IP4-7

Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP4-8

The commenter suggests that vertical parking be considered instead of parallel parking in some areas. There is not sufficient roadway width to allow for vertical parking.

Response to Comment IP4-9

Please see Master Response 3 regarding delivery trucks.

Comment Letter IP5—John and Julie Wainscoat, May 5, 2007

Response to Comment IP5-1

It should be noted that Placer County will work with property and business owners regarding access to their property to ensure that access is not denied.

Response to Comment IP5-2

The commenter expresses concern about locating a Tahoe Area Regional Transit stop in front of their business. The location will be reviewed during detail design. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required. However, it should be noted that Placer County will work with property and business owners regarding access to their property to ensure that access is not denied. Also, please see Master Response 3.

Comment Letter IP6—John and Julie Wainscoat, May 5, 2007

Response to Comment IP6-1

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and effects on businesses. The final EA/EIR/EIS identifies potential parking lots on the south side of Highway 22 (see Figure 3.7-1). It should be noted that parking lots are precluded from being located directly north of the beach area due to space constrains from the beach and the lack of readily available parcels to site parking lots in this area. However, potential parking lots and spaces are also being considered immediately north of the SR 28 in the vicinity of the beach area, and the pedestrian crossings at Deer, Bear, and Coon Streets will help to facilitate pedestrians accessing the businesses on the south side of SR 28 from the parking locations north of SR 28. Placer County will work to ensure that ample parking is distributed throughout the KBCC.

Comment Letter IP7—Kali Kopley, May 9, 2007

Response to Comment IP7-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP7-2

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of the three-lane alternatives and states that many of the people in support of a four-lane alternative are not residents of Kings Beach. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter IP8—Rick Papaleo, May 9, 2007

Response to Comment IP8-1

Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP8-2

The commenter expresses an opinion support the three-lane alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not support for the proposed action. However, comments supporting the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based on all information available, including input from the community.

Response to Comment IP8-3

Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP8-4

The commenter expresses concern for pedestrian safety and other issues if the four-lane alternative is adopted. Please see Master Response 2 regarding safety. The commenter also expresses concern that a four-lane alternative will both discourage vacationers and negatively impact the scenic quality of Kings Beach. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action includes improving the scenic quality of the KBCC. Improvements to aesthetics are included under all alternatives. Placer County thanks the

commenter for this input and has considered the comments in choosing a preferred alternative.

Comment Letter IP9—David McClure, May 10, 2007

Response to Comment IP9-1

Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IP10—David McClure, May 10, 2007

Response to Comment IP10-1

No change in pedestrian and bicycle volumes are assumed in the analysis of 2028 roundabout operations. The roundabout capacity software program required by Caltrans (SIDRA) is not affected by pedestrian activity. In addition, pedestrian crossings would result in a relatively low (5% or less) reduction in roundabout approach capacity, even with significant increases in pedestrian flows (see Figure 4-7 of the FHWA "Roundabouts: An Informational Guide").

Comment Letter IP11—Kathryn Kelly and Family, May 13, 2007

Response to Comment IP11-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP11-2

The commenter expresses support for Alternative 4. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not support for the proposed action. However, comments on support for the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input.

Response to Comment IP11-3

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Comment Letter IP12—Randy Williams, May 15, 2007

Response to Comment IP12-1

Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP12-2

Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IP13—John Bergmann, May 16, 2007

Response to Comment IP13-1

Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP13-2

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IP13-3

The commenter expresses their preference of Alternative 2. Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP13-4

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter, and decision makers have considered the comment during deliberations on project approval, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IP13-5

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The issue of additional pedestrian crossings in Crystal Bay, although perhaps a good idea, is outside of the scope of the proposed action. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP13-6

The commenter suggests that a model of the three-lane alternative take place this summer. Temporarily restriping the roadway would require its own environmental review and is not being considered at this time.

Comment Letter IP14—Sue Daniels, May 16, 2007

Response to Comment IP14-1

The commenter expresses concern regarding the goals of the proposed action, traffic congestion, air quality, and water quality. The goals of the proposed action are clearly outlined in the *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

These goals include improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, water quality, and the aesthetic character of the KBCC. Traffic-calming improvements are included in the proposed action in order to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Regarding air quality, as stated in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's thresholds under any alternative, and impacts are not considered adverse. Mitigation measures AIR-1 through AIR-4 would further minimize air quality effects.

The construction of new collection and conveyance infrastructure implemented as part of the proposed action will improve water quality in the KBCC, as stated in *Chapter 3.13* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IP14-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental document. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP14-3

The commenter expresses concern regarding the goals of the proposed action, traffic congestion, air quality, and water quality. The goals of the proposed action are clearly outlined in the *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

These goals include improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, water quality, and the aesthetic character of the KBCC. Traffic-calming improvements are included in the proposed action in order to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Regarding air quality, as stated in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's thresholds under any alternative, and impacts are not considered adverse. Mitigation measures AIR-1 through AIR-4 would further minimize air quality effects.

The construction of new collection and conveyance infrastructure implemented as part of the proposed action will improve water quality in the KBCC, as stated in *Chapter 3.13* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IP14-4

The commenter expresses concern that pedestrian safety would decline under Alternatives 2 and 4. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses pedestrian safety under all alternatives. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility would be improved under each of the alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included in the proposed action to enhance safety. In addition, please see Master Response 2 regarding pedestrian safety and roundabouts. The commenter is correct that Alternatives 2 and 4 would divert traffic

to the grid. Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IP14-5

The commenter expresses an opinion on stoplights. Three additional stoplights are proposed under Alternative 3 at SR 267, Bear Street, and Coon Street. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP14-6

The commenter expresses that there are no crossings at the school and hotel on the west side of Kings Beach. Impacts on the school would be beneficial, as the NTMP would improve safety at the school and in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IP14-7

The commenter expresses that 17-foot sidewalks are not necessary. Nominal 17-foot sidewalks would occur only under Alternative 4. Alternative 2 includes nominal 9.5-foot sidewalks, and Alternative 3 includes 5.6-foot sidewalks. Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP14-8

The commenter expresses their support of the 5.6-foot sidewalks and bike lane that would occur under Alternative 3. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not support for the proposed action. However, comments on support for the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IP14-9

The commenter suggests that stoplights should be timed at reasonably spaced intervals. As stated in the traffic study, observations conducted by LSC staff indicate that during periods of peak pedestrian activity, this signal currently operates on a 95-second cycle length, with 65 seconds of green time for SR 28 traffic, 26.5 seconds of red time, and 3.5

seconds of yellow time. However, with increases in delays and congestion in the future, it is reasonable to expect that the Nevada Department of Transportation would extend the roadway's green time to increase capacity up to a maximum cycle length of 2.5 minutes.

Response to Comment IP14-10

Please see Master Response 5 regarding snow removal issues and Master Response 3 regarding delivery trucks.

Response to Comment IP14-11

Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IP15—William McClure, May 16, 2007

Response to Comment IP15-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter IP16—Brian Silverman, May 16, 2007

Response to Comment IP16-1

The commenter expresses support for the public involvement process and does not address environmental impacts of the proposed action. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not support for the proposed action. However, comments on support for the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

The commenter also expresses interest in seeing positive growth in Kings Beach. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter IP17—Gabrielle Dentraygues, May 18, 2007

Response to Comment IP17-1

The commenter expresses concerns about emergency response and evacuation due to increased traffic congestion. The Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District has indicated that none of the alternatives would be cause for concern with regards to emergency response (see *Section 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS for a copy of a comment letter from Duane L. Whitelaw, Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District). Regarding issues with evacuation from traffic congestion, although Alternatives 2 and 4 would slightly worsen traffic congestion, emergency services would take over evacuation in the event of an emergency. In addition, other routes would be available for evacuation throughout the area, as discussed in the Community Impact Assessment (Appendix F of the final EA/EIR/EIS) and Impact TRA-6 in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IP17-2

As stated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-6, impacts on emergency access would not be significant. The reduction of capacity under Alternatives 2 and 4 would be reduced; however, the addition of bike lanes along both sides of SR 28 would allow motorists to move out of travel lanes to clear the path for emergency fire or medical vehicles. The situation is similar to Tahoe City. When roads in Tahoe City are congested, autos are able to maneuver out of the traffic lane to open the road for emergency access, and emergency vehicle travel speeds are not significantly reduced. In addition, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This plan would include provisions to minimize impacts on public services, including emergency access.

Response to Comment IP17-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding preference and selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP18—Carol Savary, May 18, 2007

Response to Comment IP18-1

The commenter offers support for the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter IP19—Carol Savary, May 18, 2007

Response to Comment IP19-1

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly and safety-oriented alternative that is a compromised solution. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional various pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach. In addition, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP19-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and delivery zones and Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Response to Comment IP19-3

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking issues and the effects changes in parking will have on businesses.

Response to Comment IP19-4

The commenter expresses their support for roundabouts. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not support for the proposed action. However, comments on support for the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their

consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input.

Comment Letter IP20—Basilio Procissi, May 21, 2007

Response to Comment IP20-1

The commenter expresses an opinion on Caltrans, not on the adequacy of the environmental document. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP20-2

Placer County thanks the commenter for this input regarding preferences in project design. Under all alternatives, curbs, gutters, on-street parking, and planters are included. The narrowest sidewalk considered, however, is nominally 5.6 feet. The comment was considered by the decision makers during deliberations on project approval, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IP20-3

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IP20-4

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and effects on local businesses.

Response to Comment IP20-5

Placer County thanks the commenter for this input regarding preferences in project design. Under all alternatives, curbs, gutters, on-street parking, and planters are included. The narrowest sidewalk considered, however, is nominally 5.6 feet. The comment was considered by the decision makers during deliberations on project approval, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IP20-6

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP21—Bill and Pat Russell, May 21, 2007

Response to Comment IP21-1

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects of the proposed action on local businesses.

Response to Comment IP21-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods and Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IP21-3

The commenter states that roundabouts would cause congestion and consequently result in idling and air pollution in the Tahoe Basin. As stated in *Chapter 3.1*, emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, and PM10 for future-year conditions would be well below the PCAPCD's thresholds for all alternatives.

Response to Comment IP21-4

The commenter expresses their support of Alternative 3, which includes traffic signals at SR 267, Bear Street, and Coon Street. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP21-5

The commenter expresses an opinion of 17-foot sidewalks, which would occur under Alternative 4. Alternative 2 includes 9.5-foot sidewalks and Alternative 3 includes 5.6-foot sidewalks. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP22—Meera Beser, May 22, 2007

Response to Comment IP22-1

The commenter offers an opinion on the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP22-2

The commenter states an opinion that the final EA/EIR/EIS does not serve the community and does not present a reasonable alternative. The purpose and need of the proposed action is stated in *Chapter 1*. The proposed action will help achieve planning goals by improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety, improving water quality, and improving the scenic character of the KBCC.

TRPA, CEQA, and NEPA all require that consideration be given to a range of alternatives that could feasibly achieve the goals of the proposed action. It has been determined that the EA/EIR/EIS analyzes a sufficient range of feasible alternatives.

Response to Comment IP22-3

The commenter expresses concern that drivers speed through Kings Beach on SR 28, and suggests that law enforcement be increased in the KBCC area. This is not a comment on the environmental document. However, the proposed action does include some traffic-calming improvements such as roundabouts and controlled intersections that are expected to slow down the flow of traffic.

Response to Comment IP22-4

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IP22-5

The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic congestion and diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. Placer County has committed to implement a NTMP to help minimize the impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods, which would also help to alleviate safety and pedestrian issues associated with increased cut-through traffic. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IP22-6

The commenter expresses their opposition to narrowing SR 28. Please see Master Response1 regarding significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP22-7

The commenter states that the increased in traffic will result in idling, which will negatively impact air, noise, and water pollution. As stated in *Chapter 3.1*, emissions of ROG, NO_x, CO, and PM10 for future-year conditions would be well below the PCAPCD's thresholds for all alternatives. In addition, the construction of new collection and conveyance infrastructure will improve water quality in the long-term, as stated in *Chapter 3.13* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Finally, none of the alternatives would result in a 3 dB or greater increase in traffic noise relative to 2028 no-build conditions, as stated in *Chapter 3.9* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IP22-8

The commenter expresses their support of additional stoplights along SR 28. Three additional stoplights are proposed under Alternative 3 at SR 267, Bear Street, and Coon Street. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP22-9

The commenter suggests adding stoplights at Bear, Fox, and Secline Streets. Please see Master Response 9 regarding signal warrants.

Response to Comment IP22-10

This is not a comment on the adequacy of the environmental document. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP22-11

The purpose and need of Placer County's proposed action is outlined in the final EA/EIR/EIS. Caltrans will most likely be required to construct water quality improvements on SR 28 if the No Project Alternative in the document is selected.

Response to Comment IP22-12

The commenter suggests including curbs, gutters, drains, and basins as well as 5 to 6-foot sidewalks. These suggestions are already a part of the proposed action under Alternative 3. Comment noted and no changes have been made to the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IP22-13

The commenter expresses their opposition to wide sidewalks and a two-lane alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP22-14

As stated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-6, impacts on emergency access would not be adverse. The reduction of capacity under Alternatives 2 and 4 would be reduced, but the addition of bike lanes along both sides of SR 28 would allow motorists to move out of travel lanes to clear the path for emergency vehicles. The situation is similar to Tahoe City. When roads in Tahoe City are congested, autos are able to maneuver out of the traffic lane to open the road for emergency access, and emergency vehicle travel speeds are not significantly reduced. In addition, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This plan would include provisions to minimize impacts on public services, including emergency access. The proposed action will be Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) compliant, as it is a federal requirement, and will not preclude, prohibit, or limit ADA compliance or accessibility.

Also, please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion and Master Response 3 regarding parking and effects on businesses.

Comment Letter IP23—Tom Burt, May 22, 2007

Response to Comment IP23-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP23-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion and diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods, and Master Response 2 regarding safety.

Response to Comment IP23-3

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IP23-4

The commenter suggests using raised crosswalks at Fox, Bear, and Deer Streets in order to slow down traffic and increase pedestrian safety. Typically these speed tables would not be considered for a state highway in snow country. They have not been included in the project description.

Response to Comment IP23-5

The commenter expresses their opposition of 9.5- and 17-foot sidewalks, which would occur under Alternatives 2 and 4, respectively. Alternative 3 includes 5.6-foot sidewalks. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP24—Scott Copeland, May 22, 2007

Response to Comment IP24-1

The commenter expresses a concern about the public outreach efforts associated with the proposed action. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public outreach.

Response to Comment IP24-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding access to businesses.

Response to Comment IP24-3

The commenter expresses an opinion of 17-foot sidewalks, which would occur under Alternative 4. Alternative 2 includes 9.5-foot sidewalks and Alternative 3 includes 5.6-foot sidewalks. Placer County thanks the commenter. Decision makers have considered the comment during deliberations on project approval, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IP24-4

Impacts on the school would be positive, as the NTMP would benefit safety at the school and in the surrounding neighborhoods. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding safety, and also Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IP24-5

The commenter expresses their opposition to reducing the amount of lanes, which would occur under Alternatives 2 and 4. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP25—Ed Granzow, May 22, 2007

Response to Comment IP25-1

The commenter is opposed to the proposed action and suggests that the community involvement process is inadequate. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Response to Comment IP25-2

The commenter is correct that the purpose and need identified for this proposed action does not include improving traffic conditions. The document does not directly compare the various aspects of the individual alternatives but rather provides the information needed for the reader to understand the relative impacts the alternatives. A preferred

alternative was chosen based on community input. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.

The commenter also expresses concern regarding the purpose and need of the proposed action. The *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS clearly outlines the goals of the proposed action. These goals include improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, water quality, and the aesthetic character of the KBCC.

The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic congestion and diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. Placer County has committed to implement a NTMP to help minimize the impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods, which would also help to alleviate safety and pedestrian issues associated with increased cut-through traffic. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Master Response 1.

The commenter also expresses concerns regarding environmental justice. As stated on pages 3.3-12 and 3.3-13 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, environmental justice impacts were found to be less than significant because the proposed action would not cause disproportionately high or adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low-income residents.

Response to Comment IP25-3

The commenter states an opinion that the purpose and need of the final EA/EIR/EIS is inadequate. The purpose and need of the proposed action is stated in *Chapter 1*. Currently, the KBCC is failing to meet traffic, water quality, and scenic thresholds established by agencies with jurisdiction in the action area. The proposed action will help achieve planning goals by improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety, improving water quality, and improving the scenic character of the KBCC. It has been

determined that the purpose and need is adequate and that the EA/EIR/EIS analyzes a sufficient range of feasible alternatives.

Response to Comment IP25-4

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts. In addition, the commenter expresses concern that alternate bike routes were not considered under the proposed action. As stated in the *Purpose and Need* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the major goals of the proposed action is to increase pedestrian and bicycle safety in the KBCC. Currently, bike lanes and sidewalks do not exist along the KBCC, and bicyclists and pedestrians compete with motorists for space along the edge of the road. Therefore, bike lanes are proposed along the KBCC under all alternatives to meet the goals of the proposed action.

Response to Comment IP25-5

Placer County feels that the public involvement process, which included several workshops and opportunities for public input, was sufficient to facilitate participation from the public. Placer County staff attended each of these workshops. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

A preferred alternative was selected based on community input.

Response to Comment IP25-6

The traffic analysis was based on traffic associated with cumulative growth in the northern Lake Tahoe area. Cumulative traffic impacts are discussed on pages 4-10 and 4-11 of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The cumulative analysis included in the final EA/EIR/EIS included proposed development projects within the north Lake Tahoe area, including proposed development projects in the Truckee area. This approach was used to ensure that the cumulative analysis, including cumulative traffic projections, represented reasonable worst case conditions in the Kings Beach area. Regarding the commenter's comment that the traffic analysis in the EA/EIR/EIS overestimates future year growth and traffic volumes, please refer to Master Response 10.

The commenter indicates that discussion of system benefits to traffic operations has not been adequately identified. It should be noted that the purpose and need identified for this proposed action does not include improving traffic conditions. The document does not directly compare the various aspects of the individual alternatives but rather provides the information needed for the reader to understand the relative impacts the alternatives. A preferred alternative was chosen based on community input. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.

Response to Comment IP25-7

The commenter indicates that impacts to traffic operations associated with roundabouts, including evacuation and emergency vehicles, were not evaluated in the final EA/EIR/EIS. Traffic impacts, associated with all alternatives, including the roundabout alternatives (Alternative 2 and Alternative 4) are clearly evaluated in *Section 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. In addition, the commenter expresses concerns about emergency response and evacuation due to increased traffic congestion. The Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District has indicated that none of the alternatives would be cause for concern with regards to emergency response (see *Section 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS for a copy of a comment letter from Duane L. Whitelaw, Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District). Regarding issues with evacuation from traffic congestion, although Alternatives 2 and 4 would slightly worsen traffic congestion, emergency services would take over evacuation in the event of an emergency. In addition, other routes would be available for evacuation throughout the area, as discussed in the Community Impact Assessment, which was included as (Appendix F of the final EA/EIR/EIS) and Impact TRA-6 in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IP25-8

Impacts on business revenue in the KBCC are addressed on pages 3.3-13 through 3.3-18 of the final EA/EIR/EIS and were found to be less than significant. In addition, please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IP25-9

As stated in *Section 3.3* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, the proposed action would have beneficial impacts on minority or low-income populations. Construction and operations-related effects of the proposed action would occur along the length of the commercial corridor, with effects spread evenly across all populations residing near the action area. As stated under impact SOC-3, environmental justice impacts would not be adverse. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IP25-10

TRPA, CEQA, and NEPA all require that consideration be given to a range of alternatives that could feasibly achieve the goals of the proposed action. It has been determined that the EA/EIR/EIS analyzes a sufficient range of feasible alternatives. In addition, please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IP26—Pam Jahnke, May 22, 2007

Response to Comment IP26-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP26-2

Table 2-1 has been revised to reflect changes recommended by the commenter.

Response to Comment IP26-3

Out of necessity, any analysis reflects conditions (or future plans) at a specific point in time. As for revising the analysis every time a development project is approved for landuse quantities different from initial assumptions, the traffic analysis has not been updated to reflect changes in the potential buildout development under the Martis Valley Community Plan. However, a review of the impacts that reductions in Martis Valley land uses would have on the results of the traffic analysis has been conducted. Assuming that settlement agreements have reduced 2,000 single family residences from the plan area,

the total trip generation of Martis Valley land uses would be reduced by roughly 9% (as much of the trip generation is associated with multifamily or tourist uses). Future Martis Valley Community Plan land uses generate 22% of total future growth in traffic volumes in Kings Beach, as identified in the traffic study. Overall, therefore, this level of reduction in Martis Valley land uses would only reduce total future growth in traffic through Kings Beach by 2%. This would not significantly change the results of the traffic analysis. In addition, please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion of estimates of future year growth and traffic volumes.

Response to Comment IP26-4

On-street parking along SR 28 is eliminated in peak seasons under both Alternative 2 and Alternative 4 (though off-season on-street parking would be provided under Alternative 2). As a result, the peak season roadway LOS provided by these two alternatives is identical. Not presented in the final EA/EIR/EIS (as it is not an alternative) is a previous analysis conducted as part of initial studies for the proposed action that indicated that providing on-street parking during peak seasons with a three-lane cross section would result in roadway LOS conditions significantly worse than those alternative brought forward into the environmental document.

Response to Comment IP26-5

As discussed on page 5-35 from the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS), no means of mitigating the impact on residential street volume were found to be feasible, and thus this impact was identified as significant and unavoidable. Several steps could be implemented to reduce the effects of increased traffic volumes on residential streets, such as a traffic-calming program to reduce traffic speeds, and roadway/sidewalk improvements to reduce conflict between autos, bicyclists, and pedestrians. However, previous analyses indicated that no traffic-calming measures short of full closure of residential streets could eliminate the "cut through" volumes, given the delays forecasted on SR 28. The study steering committee determined that full closures were not feasible

because they would concentrate existing traffic on the residential street (including the commercial uses in the industrial area) on other remaining through streets.

Response to Comment IP26-6

Assuming the commenter is focusing on the days and hours per year that LOS standards would be exceeded, this analysis is presented on pages 50 through 62 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). In short, traffic volumes for every hour of every day across a summer in 2008 and 2028 were compared against the roadway capacity levels, and the number of individual hours where volumes exceed capacity were tallied. The analysis indicates that, while the number of hours per summer with volumes exceeding capacity are relatively few, there are a substantial number of hours per year that are close to the capacity figures, so the hours per year exceeding capacity grows rapidly with an increase in traffic levels.

Response to Comment IP26-7

It is not possible to calculate a specific length of queue associated with the limited roadway capacity, as it will depend upon driver's individual decisions to divert off of SR 28 and use residential streets to avoid the queue or to change their travel times to avoid periods of congestion. If it is assumed that no drivers change their travel route or time, traffic queues on peak summer days would be roughly 1 mile in length or more in 2008 conditions and increasing with any growth in traffic in the future. However, unlike SR 28 entering Tahoe City from the east where there are no alternative routes, the residential street grid in Kings Beach provides many alternative routes to avoid congestion and delays along SR 28. Once the queue along SR 28 exceeds one to two blocks in length, it is expected that individual drivers will begin to decide that using the residential streets will reduce their travel time. In addition, drivers familiar with traffic conditions can be expected to adjust their travel pattern to avoid typical congestion periods. As a result, queues will not form that are longer than a few blocks in length.

Response to Comment IP26-8

TRPA data indicates that 54% of traffic on Tahoe roadways over a peak summer day is generated by residents, rather than visitors (and thus they will be aware of the availability of alternate routes). Moreover, many of Tahoe's visitors are repeat visitors, such as visitors owning timeshares in Incline Village. In addition, experience in other areas indicates that drivers in a traffic queue who see other drivers divert into residential streets are likely to follow, even if unfamiliar with the local street network.

Response to Comment IP26-9

An extensive review of the traffic engineering literature yielded no other studies or data collection efforts applicable to a three-lane roadway cross-section in a resort setting. As a result, it was necessary to develop an original methodology, based upon as similar conditions to those provided under Alternatives 2 and 4 as possible. However, without conducting original research in other settings, it is not possible to compare the factors used in the analysis to those in other locations.

Response to Comment IP26-10

The commenter asks what "intersections with mitigation" refer to on Page 3.6-2332 in *Chapter 3.6, Traffic* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. This refers to Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Provide Westbound Right-Turn Lane at SR 28/267 Intersection, which is the provision of a separate westbound right-turn lane at the SR 28 / SR 267 intersection.

Response to Comment IP26-11

Please see Master Response 4 regarding the preferred alternative.

Response to Comment IP26-12

Several steps could be implemented to reduce the effects of increased traffic volumes on residential streets, such as a traffic-calming program to reduce traffic speeds, and roadway/sidewalk improvements to reduce conflict between autos, bicyclists, and pedestrians. However, previous analyses indicated that no traffic-calming measures short of full closure of residential streets could eliminate the "cut through" volumes, given the

delays forecasted on SR 28. The study steering committee determined that full closures were not feasible, as they would concentrate existing traffic on the residential street (including the commercial uses in the industrial area) on the remaining through streets.

In addition please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IP26-13

It is true that a "transportation system" serves those traveling by all modes (cars, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians). There are advantages and disadvantages to all the alternatives. All alternatives provide similar beneficial impacts to bicycle mobility; Alternative 4, with no parking, eliminates conflicts between bicyclists and parked/parking cars on SR 28. All alternatives benefit pedestrian mobility, although the three lane alternatives provide wider sidewalks and shorter crossing distances across SR 28. The three lane alternatives do have more adverse impacts to vehicular traffic (including transit), as outlined in Section 3.6 of the Final EA/EIR/EIS and the project traffic study (Appendix L). Table 3.6-8 has been revised to identify these differences.

Response to Comment IP26-14

This is a typo. The discussion should read "Roadway and intersections meet LOS standards through 2024, with mitigation."

Response to Comment IP26-15

The standard minimum sidewalk width is 5 feet and traffic in the section cited does refer to vehicular traffic.

It is true that a "transportation system" serves those traveling by all modes (cars, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians). There are advantages and disadvantages to all the alternatives. All alternatives provide similar beneficial impacts to bicycle mobility; Alternative 4, with no parking, eliminates conflicts between bicyclists and parked/parking cars on SR 28. All alternatives benefit pedestrian mobility, although the three lane alternatives provide wider sidewalks and shorter crossing distances across SR 28. The three lane alternatives

do have more adverse impacts to vehicular traffic (including transit), as outlined in Section 3.6 of the Final EA/EIR/EIS and the project traffic study (Appendix L). Table 3.6-8 has been revised to identify these differences.

Response to Comment IP26-16

Under all alternatives, 202 existing public spaces would be eliminated (in the peak summer season) along with access to 78 private spaces, for a total of 280. Under Alternatives 2 and 4, a total of 220 new parking spaces would be provided. This results in a net reduction of 60 spaces, but it provides adequate parking supply to result in no more than a 90% utilization rate (defined as the peak demand divided by resulting supply). Replacement parking supply would be provided to ensure replacement within a one block walking distance.

Under Alternative 3, as many parking spaces as possible will be provided on SR 28, with the remainder of the parking spaces provided on adjacent county roads and off-street parking lots.

Response to Comment IP26-17

The figure of 91 on-street spaces occupied at the peak time does not include an additional 78 spaces on private property behind the ROW line that would be effectively eliminated as access would be eliminated by the provision of sidewalks and defined driveway locations. In addition, the need for parking varies over the course of the day (such as being higher near a coffee shop in the morning or near a theater in the evening). Given the size of the area (which precludes effective shared use of specific parking spaces for all uses), it is necessary to provide adequate parking within each subarea, which in turn increases the overall need for replacement parking spaces.

Response to Comment IP26-18

Several steps could be implemented to reduce the effects of increased traffic volumes on residential streets, such as a traffic-calming program to reduce traffic speeds and roadway/sidewalk improvements to reduce conflict between autos, bicyclists, and

pedestrians. However, previous analyses indicated that no traffic-calming measures short of full closure of residential streets could eliminate the "cut through" volumes, given the delays forecasted on SR 28. The study steering committee determined that full closures were not feasible, as they would concentrate existing traffic on the residential street (including the commercial uses in the industrial area) on the remaining through streets.

In addition please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IP26-19

In an environmental document, impacts are measured against the "no-project" condition, rather than against the other alternatives. Alternative 3 would improve bicycle and pedestrian conditions compared against no-project conditions, in that it would (1) provide sidewalks along both sides of the highway, (2) provide bicycle lanes along both sides of the highway, and (3) provide an additional protected crossing of SR 28 at Bear Street. Higher traffic speeds (compared with existing conditions) are not expected.

Alternatives 2 and 4 would provide similar benefits to bicycle mobility, as compared to Alternative 3, but Alternatives 2 and 4 provide an enhanced level of pedestrian mobility, as shown in Table 2-1. In addition, travel speeds would likely be reduced on a narrower highway. Lower speeds typically translate into less serious accidents, and, therefore, enhanced safety.

Response to Comment IP26-20

Infiltration in the lower watershed (i.e., commercial core area) is extremely difficult because of the depth to seasonal high groundwater and high lake levels. Lahontan RWQCB requires a 5-foot separation between infiltration areas and seasonal high ground water. With seasonal high groundwater being less than 8 feet and in most locations within the commercial core, less than 5 feet, and the availability of area to infiltrate and maintain the 5-foot separation is minimal to nonexistent. Additionally, because the commercial core is considered a high use area, with heavy impact and maintenance,

harder improvements are required to provide long term durability and performance of stormwater quality treatment facilities.

Response to Comment IP26-21

Please see Master Response 1 for a discussion of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods and Placer County's proposed NTMP.

Response to Comment IP26-22

Text has been revised on page 6-3 of the final EA/EIR/EIS to address this comment.

Response to Comment IP26-23

Please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter IP27—David McClure, May 22, 2007

Response to Comment IP27-1

For the *intersections*, LOS was calculated (and is reported) for the design peak-hour in summer and in winter. Evaluating intersection LOS for each individual hour of the summer (in order to identify the number of hours with a specific LOS) would require very extensive additional analysis. For *roadway* segments, the number of hours that summer volumes are forecasted to exceed capacity (LOS F) were calculated and summarized in the lower portion of Table 3.6-7. The analyses show that the roadway LOS does not degrade to LOS F under Alternative 3, but it does under Alternatives 2 and 4. Also, it is important to consider that the LOS results presented in Tables 3.6-5 and 3.6-7 present average delay for all vehicles on all approaches at signalized intersections, but the "worst case" LOS on the individual approach with the highest delays at unsignalized intersections (including roundabouts). Because signal timing can typically be adjusted to balance delays at signalized intersections, the overall average LOS is roughly equivalent to that of the worst-case approach. For unsignalized intersections, the LOS reflects left-turn movements onto the highway, while LOS for through movements along the highway is unimpeded. A review of Tables 3.6-5 and 3.6-7 indicates that

adequate (LOS D or better) is provided for all signalized intersections under Alternative 3. Therefore, no LOS conditions are forecasted to degrade movements *along* SR 28 in 2008 or 2028 under Alternative 3. Under all of the alternatives (including the no project alternative), minor legs of uncontrolled intersections will operate at LOS F in 2028, as shown in the project traffic study (Appendix L).

Response to Comment IP27-2

A review of available data indicated no existing examples of a roundabout meeting these criteria. Although there are single-lane roundabouts of similar size and volumes up to approximately 25,000 vehicles per day, data is not available on pedestrian volumes.

Response to Comment IP27-3

In addition to reflecting the local economy, changes in traffic levels since 1980 reflect other factors, such as the shift from permanent residences to second homes and the price of gasoline. The 2028 forecasts reflect *full* development of all approved Community Plans and General Plans in the North Tahoe, Martis Valley, and Truckee area. Under these current plans, future land-use growth under redevelopment would be legally precluded from exceeding these levels. While there are currently planning efforts under way (such as "Pathway 2007") that could potentially result in higher development levels, these plans are far from approval and any assumption as to the results of these planning processes would be conjecture.

The assumptions for the future traffic levels are very conservative, particularly considering that full build out of any of the community plans is not anticipated within the typical 20 year planning horizon.

Regarding the commenter's comment that the traffic analysis in the EA/EIR/EIS overestimates future year growth and traffic volumes, please refer to Master Response 10.

Response to Comment IP27-4

In addition to reflecting the local economy, changes in traffic levels since 1980 reflect other factors, such as the shift from permanent residences to second homes and the price of gasoline. The 2028 forecasts reflect *full* development of all approved Community Plans and General Plans in the North Tahoe, Martis Valley, and Truckee area. Under these current plans, future land-use growth under redevelopment would be legally precluded from exceeding these levels. Although there are currently planning efforts under way (such as "Pathway 2007") that could potentially result in higher development levels, these plans are far from approval and any assumption as to the results of these planning processes would be conjecture.

Response to Comment IP27-5

The commenter is not correct in stating that the capacity used in the analysis is 1,500 per hour. Rather, the key capacity identified in the analysis is 1,171 vehicles per hour, as shown near the bottom of Table 36 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). As the traffic engineering profession has no commonly accepted methodology for evaluating roadway capacity of a three-lane roadway, a detailed study was conducted of a very similar existing condition (Tahoe City) to provide an analysis procedure, and adjustments were made to reflect differences between existing conditions in Tahoe City and potential future conditions in Kings Beach under Alternative 2 or 4. This can be considered to be as close a match to conditions in Kings Beach under three-lane alternatives, as the roadway cross-section is virtually identical and the same mix of visitor and resident drivers are present in both areas. The difference between theoretical capacity and actual capacity is an observed fact. As much as possible, the proportion of the reduction in capacity that is attributable was quantified, such as the observed delays associated with pedestrian crossing or parking maneuvers. This methodology and results were approved by traffic engineering staff at Caltrans District 3 and at Placer County.

Response to Comment IP27-6

Actual pedestrian count data for the SR 28/Coon Street intersection is provided in Table 11 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS).

Response to Comment IP27-7

The commenter is correct that no change from existing counts in pedestrian and bicycle volumes is assumed for the analysis of future conditions. In discussions with the study steering committee, it was decided to not assume any future growth, as any assumption would be conjecture and not supportable by analysis. That said, the analysis procedure can be readily used to estimate traffic capacity under any assumption regarding future pedestrian/bicycle levels that the reader would like to apply. If, for example, it is assumed that pedestrian and bicycle activity doubles over existing levels, a reanalysis of Table 36 from the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS) indicates that the critical lowest capacity would drop from 1,317 to 1,167 in the eastbound direction and from 1,176 to 1,026 in the westbound direction. A rough estimate of the impact that this reduction in roadway capacity would have on the number of hours per summer that volume would exceed capacity can be made based upon the data regarding the existing number of hours by traffic volumes in increments of 100, as shown in Table 3 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). This data indicates that the hours per summer in which roadway capacity would be exceeded under this assumption of pedestrian and bicycle growth would increase by roughly 100 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 50 hours per in the westbound direction. Added to the 2008 figures of 28 hours eastbound and 15 hours westbound shown in the final EIR/EIS/EIS, this indicates that—under this assumption—roadway LOS F conditions would occur roughly 130 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 65 hours per summer westbound.

Response to Comment IP27-8

The commenter is correct that no change from existing counts in pedestrian and bicycle volumes is assumed for the analysis of future conditions. In discussions with the study

steering committee, it was decided to not assume any future growth, as any assumption would be conjecture and not supportable by analysis. That said, the analysis procedure can be readily used to estimate traffic capacity under any assumption regarding future pedestrian/bicycle levels that the reader would like to apply. If, for example, it is assumed that pedestrian and bicycle activity doubles over existing levels, a reanalysis of Table 36 from the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS) indicates that the critical lowest capacity would drop from 1,317 to 1,167 in the eastbound direction and from 1,176 to 1,026 in the westbound direction. A rough estimate of the impact that this reduction in roadway capacity would have on the number of hours per summer that volume would exceed capacity can be made based upon the data regarding the existing number of hours by traffic volumes in increments of 100, as shown in Table 3 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). This data indicates that the hours per summer in which roadway capacity would be exceeded under this assumption of pedestrian and bicycle growth would increase by roughly 100 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 50 hours per in the westbound direction. Added to the 2008 figures of 28 hours eastbound and 15 hours westbound shown in the EIR/EIS/EIS, this indicates that—under this assumption—roadway LOS F conditions would occur roughly 130 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 65 hours per summer westbound.

Response to Comment IP27-9

The commenter is correct that no change from existing counts in pedestrian and bicycle volumes is assumed for the analysis of future conditions. In discussions with the study steering committee, it was decided to not assume any future growth, as any assumption would be conjecture and not supportable by analysis. That said, the analysis procedure can be readily used to estimate traffic capacity under a reader's assumption. *If*, for example, it is assumed that pedestrian and bicycle activity doubles over existing levels, a reanalysis of Table 36 from the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS) indicates that the critical lowest capacity would drop from 1,317 to 1,167 in the eastbound direction and from 1,176 to 1,026 in the westbound direction. A rough estimate of the impact that this reduction in roadway capacity would have on the number

of hours per summer that volume would exceed capacity can be made based upon the data regarding the existing number of hours by traffic volumes in increments of 100, as shown in Table 3 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). This data indicates that the hours per summer in which roadway capacity would be exceeded under this assumption of pedestrian and bicycle growth would increase by roughly 100 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 50 hours per in the westbound direction. Added to the 2008 figures of 28 hours eastbound and 15 hours westbound shown in the EIR/EIS/EIS, this indicates that—under this assumption—roadway LOS F conditions would occur roughly 130 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 65 hours per summer westbound.

Response to Comment IP27-10

The commenter is correct that some of the "parking space searching" reduction factor will remain even if no on-street parking is provided because of drivers that are searching for available nearby off-street parking spaces or who are slowing as they consider their parking options. This factor is reduced from that observed in Tahoe City (with on-street parking), however, because drivers searching for an on-street space must travel slower to avoid missing an available space just ahead of their travel path, while drivers searching for parking further from their travel path can drive at a higher rate of speed without missing a parking opportunity. As a result, traffic speed will increase to a level where this factor does not affect the overall capacity of the travel lane.

Response to Comment IP27-11

Under Alternatives 2 and 4, curbside truck loading zones (signed to prohibit on-street parking) could be provided to avoid the need for center-lane truck parking. Moreover, observations regarding the impact of center-lane truck parking in Tahoe City indicate that this is not a significant factor in determining overall roadway capacity even when it is used, as truckers tend to avoid making deliveries in the peak traffic congestion periods.

Response to Comment IP27-12

The 2028 forecasts reflect *full* development of all approved Community Plans and General Plans in the North Tahoe, Martis Valley, and Truckee areas. Under these current plans, future land-use growth under redevelopment would be legally precluded from exceeding these levels. Although there are currently planning efforts under way (such as "Pathway 2007") that could potentially result in higher development levels, these plans are far from approval and any assumption as to the results of these planning processes would be conjecture.

In addition, as discussed in the Response to Comment IP27-9, a differing assumption regarding future pedestrian and bicycle levels would also result in lower capacities in Kings Beach.

Response to Comment IP27-13

More detailed analysis conducted as part of the environmental document, in addition to input provided by commenting public agencies, has changed the results of the roadway capacity analysis from previous versions.

Response to Comment IP27-14

The commenter is not correct in stating that the capacity used in the analysis is 1,500 per hour. Rather, the key capacity identified in the analysis is 1,171 vehicles per hour, as shown near the bottom of Table 36 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). As the traffic engineering profession has no commonly accepted methodology for evaluating roadway capacity of a three-lane roadway, a detailed study was conducted of a very similar existing condition (Tahoe City) to provide an analysis procedure, and adjustments were made to reflect differences between existing conditions in Tahoe City and potential future conditions in Kings Beach under Alternative 2 or 4. This can be considered to be as close a match to conditions in Kings Beach under three-lane alternatives, as the roadway cross-section is virtually identical and the same mix of visitor and resident drivers are present in both areas. The difference between theoretical capacity and actual capacity is an observed fact. As much as possible, the proportion of

the reduction in capacity that is attributable was quantified, such as the observed delays associated with pedestrian crossing or parking maneuvers. This methodology and results were approved by traffic engineering staff at Caltrans District 3 and at Placer County.

Response to Comment IP27-15

The data regarding the existing number of hours by traffic volumes in increments of 100, as shown in Table 3 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS), can be used by a reviewer to evaluate the impact of reduced traffic flow assumptions on the number of hours per summer of traffic queues. As reflected in Response to Comment IP27-10, the number of hours increases significantly with reduced assumed capacity. Approach capacity of 800 vehicles per hour is not consistent with roundabout capacity methodologies, such as the SIDRA software methodology used by Caltrans.

Response to Comment IP27-16

The point of the block-by-block roadway segment analysis is to identify the *minimum* capacity provided by any one segment—the constriction point that establishes minimum traffic flow throughout the corridor. Any "backup" effect of one segment on the previous segment causes additional delays in the previous segment but does not change the capacity of the critical segment.

Response to Comment IP27-17

It is true that, near capacity, roundabout operation is very sensitive to traffic flow, and any congestion that is present can rapidly increase. This is reflected in the discussion of forecasted traffic queues, as that presented on page 48 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). Combined with the LOS results, presented in Table 34 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS) the analysis indicates that, even though overall average LOS in 2008 may be acceptable, side street LOS (delays entering the highway from the side streets) will be E or F, and the roundabouts will create queues along the highway extending over 2,000 feet. Note that this result does not reflect diversion of traffic to alternate routes. However, the delays generated for drivers traveling along the highway by the roundabouts are not expected to be long enough to

result in a significant diversion of traffic (though the roadway capacity limitations would create diverted traffic).

Response to Comment IP27-18

The Deer Valley Drive roundabout in Park City (constructed based upon an initial study by LSC) is located two blocks from Park City's pedestrian center. Although it is true that pedestrian volumes are relatively low, this roundabout does experience high peak traffic flows as it is on the sole access route to Deer Valley Ski Area. It is not comparable to Kings Beach, as it is a relatively large two-lane roundabout and pedestrian volumes are low. However, there are successful examples of roundabouts with high pedestrian volumes, such as the roundabout on the Michigan State University campus that is the site of over 1,000 pedestrians per hour at peak times. Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IP27-19

This comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental document. No response is required.

Comment Letter IP28—Charles Robert Pyle, May 22, 2007

Response to Comment IP28-1

Please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IP28-2

Please see Master Response 1 and Master Response 2 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods and pedestrian safety through the KBCC.

Regarding emergency access, as stated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-6, impacts on emergency access would not be adverse. The reduction of capacity under Alternatives 2 and 4 would be reduced, but the addition of bike lanes along both sides of SR 28 would allow motorists to move out of travel lanes to clear the path for emergency fire or medical vehicles. The situation is similar to Tahoe City.

When roads in Tahoe City are congested, autos are able to maneuver out of the traffic lane to open the road for emergency access, and emergency vehicle travel speeds are not significantly reduced. In addition, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This plan would include provisions to minimize impacts on public services, including emergency access.

Response to Comment IP28-3

The commenter offers an opinion on the public involvement process for this proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response in required.

Response to Comment IP28-4

The commenter expresses concern regarding the scenic quality of the Kings Beach downtown area, as well as what effects a two-lane road would have on businesses. First, improving the aesthetic quality of Kings Beach is one of the proposed action's goals, as indicated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options, and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC, the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, trash receptacles, organized parking, and additional landscaping. Regarding the selection of alternatives, please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter IP29—John and Julie Wainscoat, May 22, 2007

Response to Comment IP29-1

Improvements to bicycle safety would occur under all alternatives. These improvements would include dedicated on-highway bike-lanes, as outlined in the Kings Beach Community Plan. Under all alternatives, safety for bicyclists would improve over existing conditions, where bicyclists must compete with vehicles and pedestrians on the

shoulder of SR 28. In addition, bike lanes on side streets are not part of the proposed action.

Response to Comment IP29-2

As indicated Figure 2-3 in the final EA/EIR/EIS, potential off-street parking locations analyzed for the proposed action are located both north and south of SR 28. Comment noted; no changes made to the final EA/EIR/EIS. Also, please see Master Response 7 regarding parking costs.

Response to Comment IP29-3

On- and off-street parking spaces are proposed as part of the proposed action; please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IP29-4

The proposed action will in increase pedestrian safety and mobility through the KBCC, as the KBCC currently lacks sidewalks and pedestrian crossings. The proposed action will be ADA compliant, as it is a federal requirement, and will not preclude, prohibit, or limit ADA compliance or accessibility. Regarding snow removal, please see Master Response 5.

Response to Comment IP29-5

Please see Master Response 3 regarding deliveries.

Response to Comment IP29-6

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts and safe zones.

Response to Comment IP29-7

The commenter expresses concerns regarding unfair costs to business owners. Please see Master Response 3.

Response to Comment IP29-8

The commenter expresses concerns regarding a potential lack of enforcement for design issues. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. However, as stated in *Chapter 3.15* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, design standards in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Design Review Guidelines, Scenic Quality Improvement Program, and Technical Appendices of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, the Draft Roadway Design Standards and Guidelines, Draft Guidelines for Projects Located on the California State Highways in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and the Placer County Tahoe Area Sign Ordinance will be used to develop mitigation measures. TRPA is responsible for the implementation of these measures. In order to ensure that the mitigation measures are implemented, TRPA will adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

Comment Letter IP30—Kenneth R. Arnett, May 23, 2007

Response to Comment IP30-1

The commenter expresses concern regarding the impacts of Alternative 3. All alternatives have been analyzed in context with the Kings Beach Community Plan, and, as stated in *Chapter 5* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, Alternative 3 would be consistent with this plan. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP30-2

The commenter expresses their approval of Alternatives 2 and 4. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP30-3

The commenter expresses their support for Alternatives 2 and 4. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not support for the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. This concept will be evaluated during final design.

The commenter also suggests using the areas within the roundabouts as potential locations for drainage structures. Caltrans will not allow the installation of any detention ponds or infiltration vaults within the ROW.

Response to Comment IP30-4

The commenter suggests modifications to Alternatives 2 and 4, including a realignment of the highway centerline and corresponding street intersection to minimize ROW acquisition of private lands. This option was not considered because realigning the roadway centerline would require more property acquisitions than proposed under project alternatives; the alternatives were designed to minimize the amount of property takes from private and public park lands.

Response to Comment IP30-5

The commenter suggests that the SR 267 intersection be incorporated into the action area. As indicated in Figure 2-1 in the final EA/EIR/EIS, project boundaries extend west of the SR 267 interchange, although no substantial changes are proposed at the intersection.

Response to Comment IP30-6

The commenter states that the existing signal at the intersection of SR 267 and SR 28 should be replaced with a roundabout. As stated on page 2-19 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, an alternative with a roundabout located at the intersection of SR 28 and SR 267 was evaluated but withdrawn. However, extensive roadway and driveway modifications, as well as ROW acquisitions would be required. Additional geometric difficulties made this alternative infeasible.

Response to Comment IP30-7

This option was initially considered and then dropped, as it does not solve the issue of roadway capacity in the eastbound direction (which actually has more high-volume periods than the westbound direction. In addition, eliminating the center turn lane (requiring a raised median) would increase volumes through the roundabouts. Revising

Alternative 4 to provide on-street parking year-round would significantly reduce roadway capacity, exacerbating the roadway LOS problems under the three-lane alternatives.

In addition, the commenter supports a hybrid alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP31—Curt Wegener, May 23, 2007

Response to Comment IP31-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP31-2

The commenter expresses their support for a hybrid of Alternatives 2 and 4. Placer County thanks the commenter. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP32—Illegible Name, May 23, 2007

Response to Comment IP32-1

The commenter expresses concern regarding the impacts of Alternative 3. All alternatives have been analyzed in context with the Kings Beach Community Plan, and, as stated in *Chapter 5* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, Alternative 3 would be consistent with this plan. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP32-2

The commenter expresses their approval of Alternatives 2 and 4. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP32-3

The commenter expresses an opinion on the merits of Alternatives 2 and 4. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on

the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. This concept will be evaluated during final design.

The commenter also suggests using the areas within the roundabout planters as potential locations for drainage structures. Caltrans will not allow the installation of any detention ponds or infiltration vaults within the ROW.

Response to Comment IP32-4

The commenter suggests modifications to Alternatives 2 and 4, including a realignment of the highway centerline and corresponding street intersection to minimize ROW acquisition of private lands. This option was not considered because realigning the roadway centerline would require more property takes than proposed under project alternatives; the alternatives were designed to minimize the amount of property takes from private and public park lands.

Response to Comment IP32-5

The commenter suggests that the SR 267 intersection be incorporated into the action area. As indicated in Figure 2-1 in the final EA/EIR/EIS, project boundaries extend west of the SR 267 interchange, although no substantial changes are proposed at the intersection.

Response to Comment IP32-6

The commenter states that the existing signal at the intersection of SR 267 and SR 28 should be replaced with a roundabout. As stated on page 2-19 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, an alternative with a roundabout located at the intersection of SR 28 and SR 267 was evaluated but withdrawn. However, extensive roadway and driveway modifications, as well as ROW acquisitions would be required. Additional geometric difficulties made this alternative infeasible.

Response to Comment IP32-7

This option was initially considered and then dropped, as it does not solve the issue of roadway capacity in the eastbound direction (which actually has more high-volume periods than the westbound direction. In addition, eliminating the center turn lane (requiring a raised median) would increase volumes through the roundabouts. Revising Alternative 4 to provide on-street parking year-round would significantly reduce roadway capacity, exacerbating the roadway LOS problems under the three-lane alternatives.

In addition, the commenter supports a hybrid alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP33—David Bruening, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP33-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP33-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and Master Response 2 regarding safety.

Response to Comment IP33-3

The commenter suggests including parking garages on backstreets, walking tunnels, and skywalks. Walking tunnels are not feasible in the action area due to ground water depth constraints. Parking garages could be considered, although parking is proposed to be spread throughout the commercial core.

Comment Letter IP34—Joe Bucher, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP34-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP35—Mona Bucher, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP35-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP36—Scott Copeland, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP36-1

The commenter states that a roundabout should be placed at the intersection at SR 267 and SR 28. As discussed in *Section 2.5.1* of *Chapter 2* in the final EA/EIR/EIS, this alternative was considered and withdrawn due to extensive roadway and driveway modifications and ROW acquisitions would not be feasible.

Response to Comment IP36-2

The commenter states that roundabouts should be maximized to allow two westbound lanes and one eastbound lane. As discussed in *Section 2.5.2* of *Chapter 2* in the final EA/EIR/EIS, this alternative was considered but withdrawn due to operational issues, Section 4(f) conflicts and the expected cost of property acquisitions.

Response to Comment IP36-3

The commenter expresses an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IP36-4

The commenter expresses an opinion on design features that should be implemented as part of the proposed action. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. It should be noted, however, that Caltrans will not allow the installation of any detention ponds or infiltration vaults within the ROW.

Response to Comment IP36-5

The commenter expresses that 17-foot sidewalks are not necessary. Nominal 17-foot sidewalks would occur only under Alternative 4. Alternative 2 includes 9.5-foot sidewalks, and Alternative 3 includes 5.6-foot sidewalks. Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP36-6

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IP36-7

The commenter indicates that off-street parking lots should be kept away from the school zone. As indicated in Figure 2-3 in the final EA/EIR/EIS, potential off-site parking lots are not located near the school zone.

Response to Comment IP36-8

Placer County may consider modifying an alternative based on community input, which may include differing sidewalk widths and/or different areas where on-street parking may occur. Placer County thanks the commenter. Decision makers have considered the comment during deliberations on project approval, and a preferred alternative has been chosen based on all available information, including input from the community.

Response to Comment IP36-9

The commenter expresses that 17-foot sidewalks are not necessary. Seventeen-foot sidewalks would occur only under Alternative 4. Alternative 2 includes 9.5-foot sidewalks, and Alternative 3 includes 5.6-foot sidewalks. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options, and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking, and additional landscaping. Placer County may consider modifying an alternative based on community input. Placer County thanks the commenter; decision makers have considered the

comment during deliberations on project approval, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IP36-10

As indicated in Figure 2-1 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, the proposed action will incorporate rounded/vertical curbs to better protect sidewalk areas.

Response to Comment IP36-11

The commenter suggests a realignment of the highway centerline. Other options were not considered, but realigning the roadway centerline would require more property takes than proposed under project alternatives; the alternatives were designed to minimize the amount of property takes.

Response to Comment IP36-12

Please see Master Response 1 for a discussion of Placer County's proposed NTMP.

Response to Comment IP36-13

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus and a vote by the public regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. However, please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IP37—Jerry Dinzes, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP37-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IP37-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods, as well as Master Response 2 regarding safety.

Response to Comment IP37-3

The commenter is correct that roundabouts would result in traffic queues at peak times exceeding 2,000 feet in length. Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IP37-4

The commenter correctly summarizes some of the results of the traffic analysis. The proposed action would result in significant and unavoidable traffic impacts; mitigation would reduce these impacts, but not to a less than significant level. It is also true that a traffic-calming program could reduce the speed/noise impacts of traffic diverting onto residential streets, but that it would not eliminate the increase in traffic. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the preferred alternative.

Response to Comment IP37-5

Significant pedestrian volumes can be accommodated at roundabouts without significant reductions in traffic capacity. Comparing the signal versus roundabout alternatives, the single-lane roundabouts (as designed to minimize ROW requirements) provide a lower capacity than the signals with two through lanes in each direction. Moreover, for the three-lane alternatives, the analysis indicates that the roadway capacity will be reached before the roundabout capacity is reached.

Response to Comment IP37-6

Please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion.

Response to Comment IP37-7

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Comment Letter IP38—Dave Ferrari, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP38-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP38-2

Placer County may consider modifying and combining aspects of the alternatives based on community input. Placer County thanks the commenter; decision makers have considered the comment during deliberations on project approval, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IP38-3

The commenter suggests that diagonal parking be considered instead of parallel parking in some areas. There is not sufficient roadway width to allow for diagonal parking, and diagonal parking is typically not considered on high-volume roadways.

Response to Comment IP38-4

The commenter suggests time restrictions on parking. Parking restrictions can be considered, although currently the alternatives do not include parking restrictions because current parking is not restricted.

Response to Comment IP38-5

In general, the environmental document considers the worst case scenario for parking. Some changes may be considered during the final design phase. Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IP38-6

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IP38-7

Placer County may consider modifying and combining aspects of the alternatives based on community input. Placer County thanks the commenter; decision makers have considered the comment during deliberations on project approval, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IP38-8

Please see Master Response 9 regarding signal warrants.

Response to Comment IP38-9

The commenter indicates that controlled intersections were not considered at Deer, Secline, and Fox Streets. Please see response to comment IP38-8.

Response to Comment IP38-10

The commenter suggests a roundabout should be considered at Deer Street. As discussed in *Sections 2.5.4* and *2.5.5* of *Chapter 2* in the final EA/EIR/EIS, this alternative was considered but withdrawn because it would involve substantial intrusions onto private property and would not meet the performance objectives/existing conditions that need to be maintained.

Response to Comment IP38-11

The commenter suggests an overpass in Crystal Bay, which is outside of the scope of the proposed action.

Comment Letter IP39—Jim Gardiner, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP39-1

The commenter expresses an opinion on Alternative 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. It should be noted that each of the alternatives would increase pedestrian mobility, as there are currently no sidewalks in the KBCC and pedestrians compete for space with bicycles on the shoulder of the road.

Response to Comment IP39-2

The commenter suggests a roundabout should be considered at all intersections. As discussed in *Section 2.5* of *Chapter 2* in the final EA/EIR/EIS, roundabouts at additional intersections were considered but withdrawn because they would involve extensive

roadway and driveway modifications and substantial intrusions onto private property, which would not be feasible.

Response to Comment IP39-3

The capacity of a travel lane between Kings Beach and North Stateline is not reduced by any turning movements, bicycle/pedestrian crossing, or other factors. As a result, the capacity of a travel lane outside of the commercial core area is greater. Without additional travel lanes, SR 28 does not have adequate capacity to accommodate peak traffic flows.

Response to Comment IP39-4

Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP39-5

Please see Master Response 3.

Response to Comment IP39-6

The commenter is in favor of increasing pedestrian mobility, which is one of the goals of the proposed action. No response is required.

Comment Letter IP40—Peter Grant, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP40-1

Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP40-2

Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IP40-3

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IP40-4

Please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion and Master Response 2 regarding traffic calming.

Response to Comment IP40-5

Please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion and Master Response 2 regarding traffic calming.

Response to Comment IP40-6

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IP40-7

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IP40-8

The commenter expresses merits of wider sidewalks, which are included in the three-lane options. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP40-9

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IP40-10

The commenter expresses the necessity of working closely with residences and businesses to solicit community input for a modified or combined alternative. Please see Master Responses 4 and 8 regarding selection of alternatives and public involvement, respectively.

Response to Comment IP40-11

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods and Placer County's proposed NTMP.

Response to Comment IP40-12

Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IP41—Susan Kyler, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP41-1

All of the alternatives would meet the purpose and need of the proposed action, which is described in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP41-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP42—Phil McPhail, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP42-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP43—Frank F. Mooney, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP43-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP43-2

The commenter expresses an opinion about the efficiency of roundabouts. Please see Master Response on traffic congestion. The commenter also indicated that Caltrans should be involved in the design of the proposed action. Placer County is the Lead Agency for the proposed action. For the final EA/EIR/EIS, Caltrans is evaluating and concurring on the preparation of the environmental document.

Response to Comment IP43-3

The commenter states that bike lanes should be unobstructed because if the bike lane is not free of friction (such as car doors opening), then increased traffic congestion and delays would occur. All alternatives considered would have 1.5 meter- (5 foot-) bicycle lanes in both directions. This width allows cyclists to ride out of the auto travel lane, and at this width most cyclists are observed to use the bike lane even if adjacent to parallel parked cars. A driver opening a door just in front of a cyclist could require the cyclist to slow/stop or move into the travel lane, but this is a relatively infrequent occurrence. It should also be noted that bicycle volumes along SR 28 in Kings Beach are not particularly high (roughly 20 cyclists per hour in one direction). Overall, the fact that Alternative 3 would provide parallel parking adjacent to the 5-foot bicycle lanes would not have a significant or noticeable effect on overall roadway capacity. Comment noted and no changes have been made to the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IP43-4

Please see Master Response 3 regarding maintenance costs of sidewalks.

One of the stated goals of the proposed action is to improve aesthetic values of the KBCC. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options, and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, trash receptacles, organized parking, and additional landscaping. The design standards in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Design Review Guidelines, Scenic Quality Improvement Program, and Technical Appendices of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, the Draft Roadway Design Standards and Guidelines, Draft Guidelines for Projects Located on the California State Highways in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and the Placer County Tahoe Area Sign Ordinance will be used to develop signage and aesthetic improvements in the KBCC.

As indicated in Figure 2-1 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, the proposed action will incorporate rounded/vertical curbs to better protect sidewalk areas.

Comment Letter IP44—Carol Savary, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP44-1

The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response in required.

Comment Letter IP45—Carol Savary, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP45-1

The commenter expresses an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IP45-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP46—Susan Schaub, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP46-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IP47—Ron and Suzanne Sergi, Undated

Response to Comment IP47-1

Please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion.

Response to Comment IP47-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding deliveries and also Master Response 1 regarding congestion.

Comment Letter IP48—Edee Campbell, May 25, 2007

Response to Comment IP48-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP48-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses. In addition, it should be noted that Placer County will work with property and business owners to ensure that access to their property is not denied.

Comment Letter IP49—Lee Ciszewski, May 25, 2007

Response to Comment IP49-1

As stated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-6, impacts on emergency access would not be adverse. The reduction of capacity under Alternatives 2 and 4 would be reduced; however, the addition of bike lanes along both sides of SR 28 would allow motorists to move out of travel lanes to clear the path for emergency fire or medical vehicles. The situation is similar to Tahoe City. When roads in Tahoe City are congested, autos are able to maneuver out of the traffic lane to open the road for emergency access, and emergency vehicle travel speeds are not significantly reduced. In addition, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This plan would include provisions to minimize impacts on public services, including emergency access.

Response to Comment IP49-2

The commenter expresses concerns that the sidewalks will take away space from a park, which will not occur under the proposed action. Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking. Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Comment Letter IP50—George Koster, May 27, 2007

Response to Comment IP50-1

The commenter supports public safety in Kings Beach. As stated in the *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving pedestrian safety is one of the main objectives of the proposed action, and measures to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety are included under all alternatives. Please see Master Response 2 regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety and mobility.

Response to Comment IP50-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP50-3

The commenter expresses an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IP50-4

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and delivery zones and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP50-5

The commenter expresses an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IP50-6

The commenter expresses concerns regarding the aesthetics of a multistory parking garage. There are no parking garages proposed under any alternative of the proposed action. In addition, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IP50-7

Please see Master Response 3 regarding the establishment of a PBID.

Response to Comment IP50-8

The commenter does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required. However, the comment will be considered by the decision makers during deliberations on project approval.

Response to Comment IP50-9

Please see Master Response 2 regarding pedestrian mobility and safety.

Response to Comment IP50-10

The commenter offers an opinion on the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP50-11

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Comment Letter IP51—George Koster, May 27, 2007

Response to Comment IP51-1

The commenter expresses their support of a combined Alternative 2 and 4, with some onstreet parking. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Response to Comment IP51-2

The commenter states the benefits of walkable downtown commercial districts. Placer County thanks the commenter. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Response to Comment IP51-3

The commenter supports public safety in Kings Beach. As stated in the *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving pedestrian safety is one of the main objectives of the proposed action, and measures to improve pedestrian and

bicycle safety are included under all alternatives. Please see Master Response 2 regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety and mobility.

Response to Comment IP51-4

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP51-5

The commenter expresses an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IP51-6

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and delivery zones and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP51-7

The commenter expresses an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IP51-8

The commenter expresses concerns regarding the aesthetics of a multistory parking garage. There are no parking garages proposed under any alternative of the proposed action. In addition, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IP51-9

Please see Master Response 3 regarding the establishment of a PBID.

Response to Comment IP51-10

The commenter does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required. However, the comment will be considered by the decision makers during deliberations on project approval.

Response to Comment IP51-11

Please see Master Response 2 regarding pedestrian mobility and safety.

Response to Comment IP51-12

The commenter offers an opinion on the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP51-13

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Comment Letter IP52—Petition with Signatures, Kings Beach/Tahoe Vista Local Business Owners, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP52-1

The commenter expresses concern regarding congestion associated with the proposed action. These issues were evaluated and disclosed in Chapter 3.7 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, and it was found that traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable for Alternatives 2 and 4 and less than significant for Alternative 3.

Response to Comment IP52-2

The commenter expresses concerns regarding the loss of on-street parking. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the loss of on-street parking and effects to businesses.

Response to Comment IP52-3

As stated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-6, impacts on emergency access would not be adverse. The reduction of capacity under Alternatives 2 and 4 would be reduced, but the addition of bike lanes along both sides of SR 28 would allow motorists to move out of travel lanes to clear the path for emergency fire or medical vehicles. The situation is similar to Tahoe City. When roads in Tahoe City are congested, autos are able to maneuver out of the traffic lane to open the road for

emergency access, and emergency vehicle travel speeds are not significantly reduced. In addition, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This plan would include provisions to minimize impacts on public services, including emergency access.

Response to Comment IP52-4

The proposed action will be ADA compliant, as it is a federal requirement, and will not preclude, prohibit, or limit ADA compliance or accessibility.

Response to Comment IP52-5

Please see Master Response 3.

Response to Comment IP52-6

Please see Master Response 2 and Master Response 3.

Response to Comment IP52-7

Please see Master Response 6 regarding parking enforcement and Master Response 7 regarding parking costs.

Response to Comment IP52-8

Please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IP52-9

The commenter offers an opinion on the allocation of money spent on the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP52-10

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IP52-11

The commenter states a cost estimate of \$7,500, which is inaccurate. The cost of sidewalk maintenance depends on the level and frequency of maintenance needed. Placer County will not pay for sidewalk maintenance through bank interest or other means. As in Tahoe City, the adjacent property owners will be responsible for their fair share of maintenance, which is the sidewalk area adjacent to their property. Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses and also Master Response 6 regarding snow removal.

Response to Comment IP52-12

Please see Master Response 3 regarding maintenance costs to local businesses.

Comment Letter IP53—Bob Alessandrelli, Sweetbriar Owners Association, May 21, 2007

Response to Comment IP53-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Response to Comment IP53-2

The commenter recommends the project boundary be extended farther west past the commenter's business. It is not within the scope of the proposed action to add the additional distance. It is at the discretion of the lead agency to determine the extent of the proposed action, and Placer County determined that the action would be within the commercial core of Kings Beach. In addition, extending the boundary of the proposed action would be cost prohibitive and is therefore infeasible. No change has been made.

Comment Letter IP54—Megan and Jack Chillemi, May 21, 2007

Response to Comment IP54-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Comment Letter IP55—Jim Gardiner, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IP55-1

This comment letter is similar to Comment Letter IP39; please see Responses to Comment Letter IP39.

Comment Letter IP56—Leland Ciszewski, May 31, 2007

Response to Comment IP56-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Response to Comment IP56-2

The commenter indicates that the road needs to be improved and bus/train services need to be changed. Improving the road within the project limits is a part of the proposed action. Implementation of the alternatives would require repaving of the SR 28 road surface. As indicated in Impact TRA-5: Degradation of Transit Operations in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, transit operations will be degraded with implementation of Alternatives 2 and 4, and no mitigation is available (including changing bus schedules) to reduce this impact to less than significant. In addition, changing transit operations are beyond the scope of the proposed action.

Comment Letter IP57—Mark and Jessica Flaa, June 11, 2007

Response to Comment IP57-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Response to Comment IP57-2

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts, traffic calming, and pedestrian mobility and safety.

Response to Comment IP57-3

The commenter offers an opinion on the need for a "downtown" and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment IP57-4

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Comment Letter IP58—Theresa May Duggan, May 9, 2007

Response to Comment IP58-1

The commenter expresses their support for Alternative 2 and also states that Alternative 3 would cost too much. Each of the alternatives has been more expensive than the others at different times, and the cost of each alternative has changed as the proposed action has developed. Funding is not tied to a specific alternative. In addition, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IP58-2

The commenter offers an opinion on the allocation of money spent on the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. It should be noted that funding is not tied to a specific alternative.

Individual Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (IT) Responses

Comment Letter IT1—Tom Turner, May 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT1-1

The commenter supports a four-lane alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT1-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding the effects of parking on businesses, as well as maintenance costs of sidewalks.

Response to Comment IT1-3

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IT1-4

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT1-5

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IT1-6

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and diversion of traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IT1-7

Bicycle use is increasing in Kings Beach and in the Lake Tahoe area and is expected to continue to increase over time. In order to both meet the current and future needs for mobility and safety of pedestrians and bicyclists, bike lanes, sidewalks, and controlled intersections need to be provided. Currently, pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles all compete for travel space along the KBCC; sidewalks and bike lanes do not exist in several areas of the KBCC. Consequently, pedestrians must walk along the edge of the

roadway or along undeveloped portions of the ROW. In addition, bicyclists have to compete with vehicles and pedestrians on SR 28 because there are no dedicated bicycle facilities within the KBCC. Therefore, one of the main goals of the KBCC Improvement Project is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety through the KBCC. Dedicated bike lanes, sidewalks, and enhanced pedestrian crossings; installation of controlled intersections; and traffic-calming devices, such as roundabouts, are necessary components of the proposed improvements. However, a separate bicycle or multipurpose path around Kings Beach (or through the Kings Beach neighborhoods) is not in the scope of the study. By providing dedicated bicycle lanes along both sides of SR 28, any of the project alternatives would improve bicycle safety over current conditions.

Response to Comment IT1-8

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IT1-9

With regards to air quality, as stated in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's thresholds under any alternative, and impacts are not considered adverse. Mitigation measures AIR-1 through AIR-4 would further minimize air quality effects.

Response to Comment IT1-10

The commenter would like to see the roadway closed to help visualize impacts that may occur. This would greatly delay the proposed action's water quality, pedestrian/bicyclist mobility, and aesthetic components. Furthermore, Placer County does not have the funding to undergo such a demonstration, and delaying the proposed action could result in the loss of funding available for the proposed action.

Response to Comment IT1-11

The commenter does not address and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter IT2—Susan Daniels, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment IT2-1

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of Alternative 3 with modifications. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT2-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IT2-3

This is not a comment on the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT2-4

The commenter expresses concern regarding the purpose and need of the proposed action. The *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS clearly outlines the goals of the proposed action. These goals include improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, water quality, and the aesthetic character of the KBCC. Traffic-calming devices are included in the proposed action in order to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety. However, traffic improvement along SR 28 are not part of the purpose and need of the proposed action.

Response to Comment IT2-5

It is unclear what inadequacies the commenter is referring to.

Response to Comment IT2-6

The commenter expresses an opinion that the access issues, traffic congestion, and unsafe pedestrian crossing conditions created by the proposed action will adversely affect local businesses. One of the goals of the proposed action is to improve pedestrian safety. Furthermore, as stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving scenic quality of the area as well as improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility will lead to positive

economic growth. Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses and Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment IT2-7

The commenter expresses concern regarding the purpose and need of the proposed action. The *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS clearly outlines the goals of the proposed action.

These goals include improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, water quality, and the aesthetic character of the KBCC. Traffic-calming devices are included in the proposed action in order to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Response to Comment IT2-8

As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action includes improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility throughout the KBCC. Such improvements are included under all alternatives.

Response to Comment IT2-9

As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action includes improving the scenic quality of the KBCC. Improvements to aesthetics are included under all alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input.

Comment Letter IT3—Michael Lefrancois, May 30, 2007

Response to Comment IT3-1

The commenter expresses their support of the public process and of Alternative 4. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT3-2

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all

alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach.

Response to Comment IT3-3

The commenter offers an opinion on the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT3-4

This is not a comment on the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter IT4—Adrian Tieslau, May 30, 2007

Response to Comment IT4-1

As stated on page 2-19 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, an alternative with a roundabout located at the intersection of SR 28 and SR 267 was evaluated but withdrawn. However, extensive roadway and driveway modifications, as well as ROW acquisitions, would be required. Additional geometric difficulties made this alternative infeasible.

Response to Comment IT4-2

At Secline Street, Placer County will consider crosswalks at this intersection during final project design.

Comment Letter IT5—Resident, June 2007

Response to Comment IT5-1

Placer County is currently working on a Kings Beach Watershed Improvement Project that is separate from the Kings Beach CCIP project. Each of the proposed action's build alternatives would include water quality alternatives that are consistent with the Watershed Improvement Project. However, the Watershed Improvement Project is

distinct and separate from the proposed action and includes improvements outside of the KBCC. It will proceed even if a proposed action build alternative is not selected. The Watershed Improvement Project will proceed once the environmental documents are approved and an alternative has been selected.

Response to Comment IT5-2

The proposed action alternatives were selected based on their ability to make Kings Beach a more walkable, liveable, workable community.

Response to Comment IT5-3

The cumulative analysis included in the final EA/EIR/EIS included proposed development projects within the north Lake Tahoe area, including proposed development projects in the Truckee area. This approach was used to ensure that the cumulative analysis, including cumulative traffic projections, represented reasonable worst case conditions in the Kings Beach area.

Response to Comment IT5-4

Placer County feels that the public comment period, which included several workshops and opportunities for public input, was sufficient to obtain comments from the public. The Placer County staff attended each of these workshops.

Response to Comment IT5-5

The community selection process was needed to gain a sense of what the community desires to see in the downtown area and to develop a sense of their preference between the alternatives. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement and also Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT5-6

Placer County felt that it was important to obtain comments from the Spanish-speaking community.

Response to Comment IT5-7

The commenter expresses concern with the third workshop, which was used to vote with play money on the preferred alternative. This one of several workshops held by Placer County, and the decision as to which alternative will be selected will not be based on only this workshop. Instead the selected alternative will be based on the entire volume of comments received during the public comment period.

Response to Comment IT5-8

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT5-9

The commenter asks whether a comparative analysis of a roundabout in "Snow Country" has ever been evaluated as feasible. Please see Master Response 2.

Response to Comment IT5-10

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. The decision as to which alternative to select as the preferred alternative is based on comments received during the entire comment period and not be based solely on the comments received during a single workshop.

Response to Comment IT5-11

Placer County is currently working on a Kings Beach Watershed Improvement Project that is separate from the proposed action. Each of the proposed action's build alternatives would include water quality alternatives that are consistent with the Watershed Improvement Project. However, the Watershed Improvement Project is distinct and separate from the proposed action and will proceed even if a proposed action build alternative is not selected. The Watershed Improvement Project will proceed once the environmental documents are approved and an alternative has been selected.

Response to Comment IT5-12

The commenter is correct that the traffic issue is more a matter of roadway lane capacity than intersection capacity, which is described in the project traffic study (Appendix L). The three lane alternatives provide less vehicle capacity than the four lane alternative. Under the three lane alternatives, traffic-calming measures in the adjacent residential neighborhood would be beneficial and mitigate some of the effects of cut-through traffic, but not to a less-than-significant level under CEQA.

Response to Comment IT5-13

The environmental document does not provide an overall evaluation of the various alternatives, giving differing weights to the various impacts. Rather, the document provides the information to the reviewer, allowing the reviewer to come to an individual decision regarding overall relative costs and benefits. No further analysis of safety or environmental impacts of diverted traffic on residential streets is planned to be provided in the final EIR.

Response to Comment IT5-14

The roundabouts are designed to provide sidewalks around the circumference of each roundabout. Roundabouts have proven to be safer for pedestrians and cyclists than signals (for example, see *Roundabouts in the USA*, National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 572, 2007), due in large part to the reduction in travel speed. Roundabouts are provided with raised "splitter islands" to provide pedestrian refuge, and crosswalks are provided one car length outside the roundabout. As a result, the car immediately entering the roundabout does not conflict with pedestrians. In addition, pedestrian crossings would result in a relatively low (5% or less) reduction in roundabout approach capacity, even with significant increases in pedestrian flows (see Figure 4-7 of the "FHWA Roundabouts: An informational Guide").

Response to Comment IT5-15

One of the goals of the proposed action is to improve pedestrian safety. Furthermore, as stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving scenic quality of the area as well as improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility will lead to positive economic growth.

The commenter also indicates that increased infrastructure and increased rents may result as a result of implementation of the proposed action, citing communities such as Squaw Valley, Truckee, Tahoe City, and Northstar as having losses of viable businesses due to lacking year-round population to support increased infrastructure and having increased rents due to so that few businesses can survive. A community impact analysis was conducted as part of the final EA/EIR/EIS, and it found that impacts on business revenue were found to be less than significant. That analysis can be found in Appendix F of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Furthermore, it should be noted that much of the economic decline cited by the commenter is mainly due to expansion of ski resorts and similar developments and not due to the types of improvements proposed as part of the proposed action. Finally, please see Master Response 3 regarding costs to commercial property owners and the PBID to address the maintenance and upkeep of the proposed sidewalk improvements.

Response to Comment IT5-16

The proposed action is a road project rather than a land-use development project. Land-use projects are typically associated with trip generation, rather than road improvement projects. However, all three of the build alternatives would likely result in some trip reduction compared to the No Project Alternative because the improvements to bike paths and sidewalks would encourage bicycling and walking.

Response to Comment IT5-17

The proposed action evaluated cumulative impacts as well as the impacts of the individual project. CEQA and NEPA both require that the cumulative environmental impacts of a project be evaluated. For example, the traffic analysis evaluated the cumulative trip generation resulting from land-use development proposed for the entire

north Lake Tahoe area, including Truckee. Because the air quality and noise analyses were based in part on the traffic study, those analyses also evaluated cumulative effects associated with regional development and associated trip generation. Please refer to the air quality analysis, which is found in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, and the noise analysis, which is found in 3.9 of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IT5-18

The proposed action evaluated cumulative impacts as well as the impacts of the individual project. CEQA and NEPA both require that the cumulative environmental impacts of a project be evaluated. For example, the traffic analysis evaluated the cumulative trip generation resulting from land-use development proposed for the entire north Lake Tahoe area, including Truckee. Because the air quality and noise analyses were based in part on the traffic study, those analyses also evaluated cumulative effects associated with regional development and associated trip generation.

The traffic analysis evaluated the cumulative effects of land development in the North Shore area, including projects proposed for Tahoe Vista and other North Shore projects.

The 2028 forecasts reflect *full* development of all approved Community Plans and General Plans in the North Tahoe, Martis Valley, and Truckee area, including the Tahoe Vista area. Under these current plans, future land-use growth under redevelopment would be legally precluded from exceeding these levels. Although there are currently planning efforts under way (such as "Pathway 2007") that could potentially result in higher development levels, these plans are far from approval and any assumption as to the results of these planning processes would be conjecture. In addition, please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion of estimates of future year growth and traffic volumes.

Response to Comment IT5-19

The transportation analysis examined the impacts associated with each of the project alternatives. The transportation section did not evaluate the environmental effects of a

revamped bus service because that represents a different project that would need to be studied in a separate environmental analysis.

Response to Comment IT5-20

Transit stops are the jurisdiction of TART. The quality of the TART bus stops were not evaluated in the final EA/EIR/EIS because they are not a part of any of the proposed alternatives. However, transit stops will be considered as part of the proposed action during final design. How they fit into the streetscape will depend on the chosen alternative.

Response to Comment IT5-21

The proposed action's objectives are clearly described in the final EA/EIR/EIS. It is not clear how two separate projects would be evaluated, or what their key elements would be. Consequently, the best approach is the one evaluated in this environmental document.

Response to Comment IT5-22

An evacuation plan is distinct and separate from the proposed action. It is not clear why the commenter is asking why an evacuation plan be studied. Such a plan is beyond the scope of the environmental documents that have been prepared for the Kings Beach project. Additionally, the Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District has indicated that none of the alternatives would be cause for concern with regards to emergency response (see *Chapter 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS for a copy of a comment letter from Duane L. Whitelaw, Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District). Regarding issues with evacuation from traffic congestion, although Alternatives 2 and 4 would slightly worsen traffic congestion, emergency services would take over evacuation in the event of an emergency. In addition, other routes would be available for evacuation throughout the area, as discussed in the Community Impact Assessment, which was included as Appendix F of the final EA/EIR/EIS

Comment Letter IT6—Dave Byam, June 1, 2007

Response to Comment IT6-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT7—Meera Beeser, June 4, 2007

Response to Comment IT7-1

Placer County feels that the public comment period, which included several workshops and opportunities for public input, was sufficient to obtain comments from the public. Placer County staff attended each of these workshops.

Response to Comment IT7-2

The goals of the proposed action are clearly outlined in the *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic impacts.

Response to Comment IT7-3

The commenter expresses concern that an alternative that analyzes just the TRPA BMPs was not included in the analysis. However, the TRPA BMPs would not be implemented under the No Project Alternative because no actions would trigger their use. If the proposed action did not go through, other water treatment projects continue, but funding for the proposed action would not transfer over to projects focused solely on water quality improvements. In addition, Caltrans or Placer County may consider additional water quality improvements on SR 28 as part of a future project.

Response to Comment IT7-4

Please see Master Response 1 regarding significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.

Response to Comment IT7-5

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT7-6

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts. In regards to air quality, as stated in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, emissions would not exceed PCAPCD's thresholds under any alternative, and impacts are not considered adverse. Mitigation measures AIR-1 through AIR-4 would further minimize air quality effects.

Response to Comment IT7-7

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diversion of traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IT7-8

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IT7-9

Please see Master Response 9 regarding signal warrants.

Response to Comment IT7-10

Currently, no sidewalks or bike lanes exist in the KBCC. Each alternative includes the addition of a sidewalk. Under Alternative 3, 5.6-foot sidewalks are included, which is similar to the width requested by the commenter. Each of the proposed action's build alternatives will include landscaping and dedicated bike lanes. Also, please see Master Response 2 in regards to parking.

Response to Comment IT7-10

Currently, no sidewalks or bike lanes exist in the KBCC. Each alternative includes the addition of a sidewalk. Under Alternative 3, 5.6-foot sidewalks are included, which is similar to the width requested by the commenter. Each of the proposed action's build alternatives will include landscaping and dedicated bike lanes. Also, please see Master Response 2 in regards to parking.

Response to Comment IT7-11

Currently, no sidewalks or bike lanes exist in the KBCC. Each alternative includes the addition of a sidewalk. Under Alternative 3, 5.6-foot sidewalks are included, which is similar to the width requested by the commenter. Each of the proposed action's build alternatives will include landscaping and dedicated bike lanes. Also, please see Master Response 2 in regards to parking.

Response to Comment IT7-12

Please see Master Response 1 regarding significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.

Response to Comment IT7-13

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IT8—Theresa Duggan, June 4, 2007

Response to Comment IT8-1

Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives.

Response to Comment IT8-2

Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives.

Response to Comment IT8-3

Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives.

Response to Comment IT8-4

Impacts on pedestrian safety and quality of life are a more subjective field of analysis than the analysis of traffic congestion. All of the action alternatives will increase pedestrian safety through the provision of sidewalks and one additional protected

crossing location. Alternatives 2 and 4 would result in additional benefits to pedestrian safety due to the traffic-calming effects of roundabouts and the reduction in the roadway-crossing distance. However, these alternatives would also result in diversion of traffic onto neighborhood streets, with a reduction in pedestrian safety along the residential streets. Placer County has committed to implement a NTMP to help minimize the impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods, which would also help to alleviate safety and pedestrian issues associated with increased cut-through traffic. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IT8-5

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of the three-lane alternative with wide sidewalks. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IT8-6

The commenter expresses their opposition to the four-lane alternative. Pedestrian mobility would improve under all alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IT8-7

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of the three-lane alternative with wide sidewalks. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. Also, please see Master Response 4.

The commenter expresses their opposition to the four-lane alternative. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter IT9—Richard Smith, June 6, 2007

Response to Comment IT9-1

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of Alternative 4. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter IT10—Jim Gardiner, June 7, 2007

Response to Comment IT10-1

The commenter states that a four-lane highway is not pedestrian friendly. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of this proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included in the proposed action to enhance the pedestrian safety of Kings Beach. The proposed action is consistent with existing local plans.

Response to Comment IT10-2

As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action includes improving the scenic quality of the KBCC. Improvements to aesthetics are included under all alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input and has considered the comments in choosing a preferred alternative. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding safety.

Response to Comment IT10-3

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of a three-lane alternative. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IT10-4

The commenter expresses their support of creating a more pedestrian friendly KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1, Purpose and Need*, sidewalks and other measures to induce pedestrian mobility are included under all alternatives.

Comment Letter IT11—Jim Gardiner, June 7, 2007

Response to Comment IT11-1

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement. The commenter also states that the Kings Beach Community Plan states that 4 lanes on SR 28 is not pedestrian friendly. Nowhere in the Kings Beach Community Plan is it stated that four lanes are not pedestrian friendly. Rather, the Kings Beach Community Plan states that "the four lane highway has adversely affected the character of the community." To remedy this, the Kings Beach Community Plan further states that "[p]rograms should be implemented to facilitate pedestrian activity along the State Highway." As clearly outlined in the *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the goals of the proposed action is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility. Implementation of the proposed action, which would include the installation of sidewalks and bicycle lanes, would serve to satisfy purpose and need of the proposed action, as well as the Kings Beach Community Plan.

Response to Comment IT11-2

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of the three-lane alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Furthermore, the proposed action is consistent with existing local plans.

Comment Letter IT12—Carolyn and Marshall Nixon, June 7, 2007

Response to Comment IT12-1

The commenter expresses an opinion that traffic be slowed in order to increase safety in the KBCC. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT12-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding safety through the side streets and Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IT12-3

The commenter expresses an opinion that street vendors should not be allowed and does not provide a comment on the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT12-4

The commenter expresses an opinion that street vendors should not be allowed and does not provide a comment on the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT12-5

The comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter IT13—Carolyn Nixon, June 7, 2007

Response to Comment IT13-1

The commenter expresses an opinion that traffic should be slowed in order to increase safety in the KBCC. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT13-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IT13-3

The commenter expresses an opinion that street vendors should not be allowed and does not provide a comment on the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT13-4

The commenter expresses an opinion that street vendors should not be allowed and does not provide a comment on the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT13-5

The comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter IT14—William and Patricia Russell, June 7, 2007

Response to Comment IT14-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding Roundabouts. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT14-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT14-3

Please see Master Response 3 regarding deliveries and access to businesses.

Response to Comment IT14-4

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IT14-5

The commenter expresses their support for Alternative 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT15—Ellie, June 9, 2007

Response to Comment IT15-1

The commenter would like to see the roadway closed to help simulate impacts that may occur. This would greatly delay the proposed action's water quality, pedestrian/bicyclist mobility, and aesthetic components. Furthermore, Placer County does not have the funding to undergo such a demonstration, and delaying the proposed action could result in the loss of funding available for the proposed action.

Comment Letter IT16—Norma J. Carder, June 10, 2007

Response to Comment IT16-1

The commenter expresses an opinion about development. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT16-2

The commenter expresses an opinion about development. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT16-3

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts and Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IT16-4

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding public meetings and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Response to Comment IT16-5

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IT16-6

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IT16-7

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter IT17—William and Betty Browning, June 13, 2007

Response to Comment IT17-1

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding public meetings and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Response to Comment IT17-2

Please see Master Response 2 regarding safety and also Master Response 1 regarding congestion.

Response to Comment IT17-3

The commenter is in support of stoplights and is opposed to an alternative with two lanes and roundabouts. Please see Master Response 2 regarding traffic-calming devices.

Comment Letter IT18—John and Julie Wainscoat, June 14, 2007

Response to Comment IT18-1

A separate bicycle or multipurpose path around Kings Beach (or through the Kings Beach neighborhoods) is not in the scope of the study. By providing dedicated bicycle lanes along both sides of SR 28, any of the project alternatives would improve bicycle safety over current conditions.

Response to Comment IT18-2

Although it would be beneficial to provide a balance of replacement parking spaces on both sides of SR 28, the land availability options on the southern side of the highway are substantially more limited than on the northern side. However, all specific sites for replacement parking have not been identified, and Placer County will continue to pursue parking opportunities on the south side of the highway. Sites not yet identified and evaluated in the environmental document must be addressed as separate projects.

Response to Comment IT18-3

The commenter discusses lopsided costs to commercial property owners. Please see Master Response 3 regarding costs to commercial property owners and the PBID to address the maintenance and upkeep of the proposed sidewalk improvements.

Response to Comment IT18-4

The proposed action increases pedestrian safety and mobility through the KBCC because the KBCC currently lacks sidewalks and pedestrian crossings. The proposed action will be ADA compliant, as it is a federal requirement, and will not preclude, prohibit, or limit ADA compliance or accessibility. Regarding snow removal, please see Master Response 5.

Response to Comment IT18-5

Please see Master Response 3 regarding deliveries.

Response to Comment IT18-6

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IT18-7

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses. In addition, funding for the proposed action will come from a variety of sources, including Placer County and Caltrans.

Response to Comment IT18-8

The commenter indicates there is a lack of manpower to enforce present code enforcement for signage and other design and review issues. For example, how would street vendors would be reviewed and allowed within the action area? This comment does not provide a comment on the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter IT19—Cammie Anooshian, June 15, 2007

Response to Comment IT19-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT19-2

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of this proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding traffic calming.

Comment Letter IT20—Sean Cleary, June 15, 2007

Response to Comment IT20-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT20-2

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for increased pedestrian safety and mobility in the KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space

on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding traffic calming and safety.

Response to Comment IT20-3

Although it would be beneficial to provide a balance of replacement parking spaces on both sides of SR 28, the land availability options on the southern side of the highway are substantially more limited than on the northern side. However, all specific sites for replacement parking have not been identified, and Placer County will continue to pursue parking opportunities on the south side of the highway.

Response to Comment IT20-4

Although it would be beneficial to provide a balance of replacement parking spaces on both sides of SR 28, the land availability options on the southern side of the highway are substantially more limited than on the northern side. However, all specific sites for replacement parking have not been identified, and Placer County will continue to pursue parking opportunities on the south side of the highway.

Comment Letter IT21—Jeff Cutler, June 15, 2007

Response to Comment IT21-1

The commenter expresses the merits of the public involvement process. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT21-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter IT22—Monte Gants, June 15, 2007

Response to Comment IT22-1

The commenter expresses the need for a more pedestrian-oriented and aesthetically pleasing KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the proposed action's goals is to increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety. The proposed action also aims to improve aesthetic values of the KBCC. Both of these goals are expected to induce tourism and a resident-friendly community because they would result in increased business revenues and greater willingness on the part of businesses and private property owners to invest in building renovations and other additional community improvements. For additional information, please see the Community Impact Assessment, which was included as Appendix F of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IT22-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT23—Peter Morris, June 15, 2007

Response to Comment IT23-1

The commenter offers an opinion on the public involvement process for this proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT23-2

The commenter expresses the necessity of listening to the majority in selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IT24—Wyatt Ogilvy, June 15, 2007

Response to Comment IT24-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT24-2

The commenter expresses merits of roundabouts, which are included in the three-lane options. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT24-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT24-4

Please see Master Response 2 regarding traffic calming.

Response to Comment IT24-5

The commenter states that no empirical evidence is given regarding the assertion that the four-lane alternative could result in fewer economic benefits to the KBCC area than would occur under the three-lane alternative because less pedestrian and bicycle mobility could result in fewer shoppers in the KBCC area. This statement is based in the intrinsic idea that more walkable, pedestrian-friendly environments would result in more pedestrian and bicyclist activity in the KBCC, which, in turn, could lead to more economic benefits. A study conducted by the Victoria Transport Policy Institute and Local Government Commission found that there are solid connections between walkable environments and economic viability (Litman 2007 and Local Government Commission n.d.). Consequently, it is anticipated that an alternative with more walkable, pedestrian-friendly design features could result in more economic benefits. However, it should be noted that all three alternatives would result in more walkable, pedestrian-friendly design features then exists currently, and implementation of any of these alternatives could result in more economic benefits then under existing conditions.

Response to Comment IT24-6

The Deer Valley Drive roundabout in Park City (constructed based upon an initial study by LSC) is located two blocks from Park City's pedestrian center. Although it is true that pedestrian volumes are relatively low, this roundabout does experience high peak traffic flows because it is on the sole access route to Deer Valley Ski Area. It is not a good comparison to Kings Beach, as it is a relatively large two-lane roundabout and as pedestrian volumes are low. However, there are successful examples of roundabouts with high pedestrian volumes, such as the roundabout on the Michigan State University campus that is the site of over 1,000 pedestrians per hour at peak times. In addition the City of Truckee currently has roundabouts that operate well in a snowy environment.

Response to Comment IT24-7

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter IT25—Rick Papaleo, June 15, 2007

Response to Comment IT25-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT25-2

The commenter is opposed to the four-lane alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT25-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT25-4

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of the three-lane alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not

the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IT25-5

Please see Master Response 2 regarding safety.

Response to Comment IT25-6

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT25-7

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT25-8

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT25-9

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT26—Regina Straver, June 15, 2007

Response to Comment IT26-1

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of the three-lane alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment IT26-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT26-3

The commenter expresses merits of roundabouts. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input.

Response to Comment IT26-4

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT26-5

The commenter expresses an opinion on the outcome regarding the selection of alternatives. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT27—Melanie Cleary, June 16, 2007

Response to Comment IT27-1

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for increased safety in the KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses this issue. Please see Master Response 2 regarding safety.

Response to Comment IT27-2

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses this issue. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that

pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to increase pedestrian mobility and safety.

Response to Comment IT27-3

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses this issue. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to increase pedestrian mobility and safety.

Response to Comment IT27-4

The commenter expresses concern that drivers speed through Kings Beach on SR 28, and suggests that law enforcement be increased in the KBCC area. This is not a comment on the environmental document. However, the proposed action does include traffic-calming devices such as roundabouts and controlled intersections in some of the alternatives that are expected to slow down the flow of traffic.

Response to Comment IT27-5

A center two-way left-turn lane (like that provided in Tahoe City) would be provided in Kings Beach under Alternatives 2 or 4, which improves traffic capacity of the through travel lane. Under any alternative, bicycle lanes and sidewalks would be provided in Kings Beach.

Comment Letter IT28—Carina Cutler, June 16, 2007

Response to Comment IT28-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT28-2

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for sidewalks and traffic calming. These elements are included under all alternatives. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT29—Katie Zanto, June 16, 2007

Response to Comment IT29-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT30—Crin Connolly, June 17, 2007

Response to Comment IT30-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT30-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT30-3

Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IT31—Susan Hall and Karen Buckter, June 17, 2007

Response to Comment IT31-1

The commenter expresses concerns regarding extensive development in Kings Beach.

This is not expected to be a result of the proposed action. The commenter also expresses concerns regarding gridlock. Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment IT31-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IT31-3

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IT31-4

The proposed action will in increase pedestrian safety and mobility through the KBCC, as the KBCC currently lacks sidewalks and pedestrian crossings. The proposed action will be ADA compliant, as it is a federal requirement, and will not preclude, prohibit, or limit ADA compliance or accessibility. Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IT31-5

The commenter expresses concerns regarding the aesthetics of a multistory parking garage. There are no parking garages proposed under any alternative of the proposed action.

Response to Comment IT31-6

The commenter expresses concerns regarding the "Pedestrian Village" proposed for the corner of Coon and SR 28. The traffic projections from the traffic analysis focuses on reasonably foreseeable projects that are planned, programmed, and projected, which includes development of the "Pedestrian Village" proposed for the corner of Coon Street and SR 28.

Response to Comment IT31-7

The commenter expresses an opinion on the proposed action. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT32—Pam Lefrancois, June 17, 2007

Response to Comment IT32-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT32-2

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IT32-3

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of the three-lane alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IT32-4

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IT32-5

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IT32-6

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IT32-7

Please see Master Response 1 regarding the Neighborhood Traffic Mitigation Plan.

Response to Comment IT32-8

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of this proposed action addresses this issue. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28.

Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach.

Response to Comment IT32-9

As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the proposed action's goals is to increase the aesthetics of the KBCC. The proposed action also aims to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility. Both of these goals are expected to induce tourism and a resident-friendly community because they would result in increased business revenues and greater willingness on the part of businesses and private property owners to invest in building renovations and other additional community improvements. Also, please see Master Response 2.

Response to Comment IT32-10

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT33—Maggie J. Schumacher, North Shore Resort Realty, June 17, 2007

Response to Comment IT33-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT33-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT33-3

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of the three-lane alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter IT34—Suzy Shoberg, June 17, 2007

Response to Comment IT34-1

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly and safety-oriented KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of this proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach.

Comment Letter IT35—Heidi Bushway Verkler, June 17, 2007

Response to Comment IT35-1

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for increased safety in the KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of this proposed action addresses this issue. Pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach.

Response to Comment IT35-2

The commenter expresses concern regarding safety, parking, and the scenic quality of the Kings Beach downtown area. First, improving the aesthetic quality of Kings Beach is one of the proposed action's goals, as indicated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping. Safety will increase under all alternatives, as the KBCC currently does not have any sidewalks or bike lanes. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding safety and Master Response 3 regarding parking.

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IT35-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT35-4

The commenter expresses an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required. However, the comment will be considered by the decision makers during deliberations on project approval.

Comment Letter IT36—Ann C. Weiss, June 17, 2007

Response to Comment IT36-1

The commenter expresses an opinion on the merits of roundabouts. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. In addition, please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts. Safer pedestrian sidewalks and bike lanes are included under all alternatives.

Response to Comment IT36-2

As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the proposed action's goals is to increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety. The proposed action also aims to improve the aesthetic values of the KBCC. Both of these goals are expected to induce tourism and a resident-friendly community because they would result in increased business revenues and greater willingness on the part of businesses and private property owners to invest in building renovations and other additional community improvements. Also, please see Master Response 2.

Response to Comment IT36-3

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter IT37—Tamara Blanco, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT37-1

Placer County will work with property and business owners regarding access to their property to ensure that access is not denied. Also, please see Master Response 3.

Response to Comment IT37-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IT37-3

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IT37-4

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IT37-5

Please see Master Response 5 regarding snow removal issues.

Response to Comment IT37-6

The commenter offers an opinion on the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. However, please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement and the SBC.

Response to Comment IT37-7

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT38—Lesley Bruening, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT38-1

The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT38-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT39—Kevin Carrillo, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT39-1

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IT39-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT40—Michael DaRe, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT40-1

The commenter states that access to their home will be eliminated under the proposed action. Placer County will work with property and business owners to ensure access to all commercial and retail businesses will continue to be maintained along SR 28 and that access is not denied. Changes in access are not expected to create major problems for businesses and consequently no mitigation is required. The business located at 8593 North Lake Boulevard would have a one-way access from SR 28, which will be included in the proposed action's final design. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts and Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses. Bus stops would be located on every block in the KBCC.

Response to Comment IT40-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Comment Letter IT41—Andy Deinken, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT41-1

The commenter expresses the merits of roundabouts and also supports the three-lane alternatives. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. However, it should be noted that improving pedestrian safety is not the "ultimate" goal of the proposed action, but it is one of several important goals, including improving water quality and the aesthetics of the KBCC.

Response to Comment IT41-2

The commenter is incorrect that the construction time frame is less for the three-lane alternatives. The time frames are comparable, as the ROW between the three alternatives are relatively comparable. In addition, it is anticipated that construction equipment and duration are not anticipated to substantially differ between the three alternatives.

Comment Letter IT42—Jerry Dinzes, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT42-1

Please see Master Response 4 for a discussion of the alternatives selection process.

Response to Comment IT42-2

The proposed action's social impacts were evaluated in the final EA/EIR/EIS. A community impact analysis was prepared for the project alternatives and can be viewed in its entirety in Appendix D. The results of that analysis are summarized in *Chapter 3.3*, *Social Environment*, of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IT42-3

The proposed action's social impacts were evaluated in the final EA/EIR/EIS. A community impact analysis was prepared for the project alternatives and can be viewed

in its entirety in Appendix D. The results of that analysis are summarized in *Chapter 3.3*, *Social Environment*, of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IT42-4

The commenter is correct that the three-lane alternatives do not meet current adopted roadway level of service standards.

Response to Comment IT42-5

The commenter is correct in his citation of the traffic volumes on residential streets and also that sidewalks are not provided along the residential streets.

Response to Comment IT42-6

The proposed action's social impacts were evaluated in the final EA/EIR/EIS. A community impact analysis was prepared for the project alternatives and can be viewed in its entirety in Appendix D. The results of that analysis are summarized in *Chapter 3.3*, *Social Environment*, of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IT42-7

Please see Master Response 1, as well as Response to Comment IP26-8.

Response to Comment IT42-8

There has been significant controversy as to whether roundabouts improve or degrade bicycle safety compared with signalized intersections. The most recent and comprehensive evaluation of roundabouts in the US (*Roundabouts in the USA*, National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 572, 2007), indicates that roundabouts do not increase safety hazard to cyclists.

Response to Comment IT42-9

Traffic calming is typically considered to refer to programs to reduce the impacts of traffic on residential streets. *Context sensitive design* is the term that is typically applied to higher volume roadways, such as arterial streets and highways. Regardless of the

terminology, there are aspects of both approaches that can be applied to roadways of any volume. It is true that most guidebooks and manuals regarding either approach focus on roadways with traffic volumes lower than those carried on SR 28 in Kings Beach during the peak seasons.

Response to Comment IT42-10

The fact that another proposed project elsewhere with lower volumes created controversy does not pertain to the proposed action's issues and is not a comment on the environmental document. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT42-11

It is not true that a decision regarding selection of an alternative has already been made. In Alternatives 2 and 4, unacceptable LOS F conditions would occur both on the SR 28 approaches as well as the side street approaches (and the intersections as a whole) in 2028, at both SR 28/Coon and SR 28/Bear, as shown in Table 35 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). In 2008, LOS E conditions would occur for both of the intersections as a whole, which we are identifying as unacceptable per *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. It is true that diverted traffic could increase accident hazard on the neighborhood streets. Implementation of the NTMP would reduce this potential. In addition, roundabouts will reduce traffic speeds on SR 28 and, thereby, increase overall safety on SR 28. Also, please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IT42-12

In addition to reflecting the local economy, changes in traffic levels since 1980 reflect other factors, such as the shift from permanent residences to second homes or the price of gasoline. The 2028 forecasts reflect *full* development of all approved Community Plans and General Plans in the North Tahoe, Martis Valley, and Truckee area. Under these current plans, future land-use growth under redevelopment would be legally precluded from exceeding these levels. While there are currently planning efforts under way (such as "Pathway 2007") that could potentially result in higher development levels, these plans

are far from approval and any assumption as to the results of these planning processes would be conjecture.

Projects such as Tonapalo or a Kings Beach County office are within the land uses identified in the various plan buildouts assumed in the traffic projections. The additional land uses available in the Kings Beach Industrial plan area is very limited. It is true that the traffic analysis for this plan area assumed that truck traffic on the north-south streets would be regulated to result in most traffic accessing the area from SR 267 via Speckled Avenue. In addition, please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion of estimates of future year growth and traffic volumes.

Response to Comment IT42-13

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the public process of the proposed action. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

The commenter also states that a traffic expert should have been hired. A traffic engineer was hired to assist with the process, including preparation of the project traffic study, and was available to discuss the proposed action with the public during the process.

Response to Comment IT42-14

Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Response to Comment IT42-15

Please see response to comment IT42-14.

Response to Comment IT42-16

The relative growth in traffic in the off-peak months (reflected in the higher growth in AADT than in peak-month ADT) could be a result of many other factors, such as changing school years (that affect vacation trip patterns), an increasing active elderly population, and changes in how second home residents visit their units. Please see also Response to Comment IP26-8.

Response to Comment IT42-17

The commenter summarizes literature SBC that was distributed at a public workshop. That literature points out the pros and cons of the alternatives. The commenter implies that the literature shows bias. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement. In addition, Master Response 4 describes how a preferred alternative was selected. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT42-18

The commenter summarizes literature SBC that was distributed at a public workshop. That literature points out the pros and cons of the alternatives. The commenter implies that the literature shows bias. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement. In addition, Master Response 4 describes how a preferred alternative was selected. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT42-19

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus and a vote by the public regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT42-20

The purpose of an EIR is not to redesign or improve on alternatives but rather to identify significant impacts and mitigation measures to address any significant impacts. That said, additional strategies to reduce traffic speeds and improve pedestrian safety as part of Alternative 3 (if selected) could be considered as part of detailed design.

Response to Comment IT42-21

Of these recommended items, those that would be most feasible would include horizontal changes and reductions in speed limits, additional streetscaping, and signal timing to progress traffic at the speed limit. Raised intersections or crosswalks would not be

acceptable to Caltrans. It should be noted that some locations identified are outside of the Urban Improvement Program project area.

Response to Comment IT42-22

Of these recommended items, those that would be most feasible would include horizontal changes and reductions in speed limits, additional streetscaping, and signal timing to progress traffic at the speed limit. Raised intersections or crosswalks would not be acceptable to Caltrans. It should be noted that some locations identified are outside of the UIP project area.

Comment Letter IT43—John and Helen Foster, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT43-1

The commenter expresses the merits of the public involvement process. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT43-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT43-3

The commenter expresses the merits of roundabouts and also supports the three-lane alternatives. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT43-4

The commenter supports public safety in Kings Beach. As stated in the purpose and need section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving pedestrian safety is one of the main objectives of the proposed action and measures to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety are included under all alternatives. Please see Master Response 2 regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety and mobility.

Response to Comment IT43-5

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. However, Placer County has held eight public workshops/meetings during the 60-day public comment period to receive questions and solicit comments to aid the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation to assist in choosing a preferred alternative based partly on input from the community:

- Open House: April 25, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.
- Public Workshop: May 1, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.
- Public Workshop: May 2, 2007 at the Kings Beach Elementary School.
- Public Workshop: May 15, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.
- Public Workshop: May 29, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.
- Placer County Planning Commission: April 26, 2007 at the Granlibakken Conference Center.
- TRPA Advisory Planning commission: May 9, 2007 at the South Lake TRPA Office.
- TRPA Governing Board: May 23, 2007 at the North Tahoe Conference Center.

Comment Letter IT44—Edward F. Granzow, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT44-1

The commenter is opposed to the proposed action and suggests that the community involvement process is inadequate. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Response to Comment IT44-2

The commenter is correct that the purpose and need identified for this proposed action does not include improving traffic conditions. The document does not directly compare the various aspects of the individual alternatives, but rather provides the information needed for the reader to understand the relative impacts the alternatives. A preferred alternative was chosen based on community input. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.

The commenter also expresses concern regarding the purpose and need of the proposed action. The *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS clearly outlines the goals of the proposed action. These goals include improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, water quality, and aesthetic character of the KBCC.

The commenter expresses concerns regarding traffic congestion and diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. Placer County has committed to implement a NTMP to help minimize the impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods, which would also help to alleviate safety and pedestrian issues associated with increased cutthrough traffic. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Master Response 1.

The commenter also expresses concerns regarding environmental justice. As stated on pages 3.3-12 and 3.3-12 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, environmental justice impacts were found to be less than significant because the proposed action would not cause disproportionately high or adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low-income residents.

Response to Comment IT44-3

The commenter states an opinion that the purpose and need of the final EA/EIR/EIS is inadequate. The purpose and need of this proposed action is stated in *Chapter 1*.

Currently, the KBCC is failing to meet traffic, water quality, and scenic thresholds established by agencies with jurisdiction in the action area. The proposed action will help achieve planning goals by improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety, improving water quality, and improving the scenic character of the KBCC. It has been determined that the purpose and need is adequate and that the EA/EIR/EIS analyzes a sufficient range of feasible alternatives.

Response to Comment IT44-4

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts. In addition, the commenter expresses concern that alternate bike routes were not considered under the proposed action. As stated in the purpose and need of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the major goals of the proposed action is to increase pedestrian and bicycle safety in the KBCC. Currently, bike lanes and sidewalks do not exist along the KBCC and bicyclists and pedestrians compete with motorists for space along the edge of the road. Therefore, bike lanes are proposed along the KBCC under all alternatives to meet the goals of the proposed action.

Response to Comment IT44-5

Placer County feels that the public involvement process, which included several workshops and opportunities for public input, was sufficient to facilitate participation from the public. The Placer County staff attended each of these workshops. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement. It should be noted that a preferred alternative was selected based partially on community input.

Response to Comment IT44-6

Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

The commenter states the opinion that the purpose and need of the final EA/EIR/EIS is inadequate. The purpose and need of the proposed action is stated in *Chapter 1*. Currently, the KBCC is failing to meet traffic, water quality, and scenic thresholds established by agencies with jurisdiction in the action area. The proposed action will

help achieve planning goals by improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety, improving water quality, and improving the scenic character of the KBCC. it has been determined that the purpose and need is adequate and that the EA/EIR/EIS analyzes a sufficient range of feasible alternatives. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.

Response to Comment IT44-7

The traffic analysis was based on traffic associated with cumulative growth in the northern Lake Tahoe area. Cumulative traffic impacts are discussed on pages 4-10 and 4-11 of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The cumulative analysis included in the final EA/EIR/EIS incorporates proposed development projects within the north Lake Tahoe area, including proposed development projects in the Truckee area. This approach was used to ensure that the cumulative analysis, including cumulative traffic projections, represented reasonable worst case conditions in the Kings Beach area. However, as explained in the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS), full build out of all of the community plans accounted for is not likely to occur, particularly within the twenty year time frame. Please refer to Master Response 10 for a discussion of alternative estimates of future year growth and traffic volumes using a more probable trend analysis based on recent traffic data.

The commenter indicates that discussion of system benefits to traffic operations has not been adequately identified. It should be noted that the purpose and need identified for this proposed action does not include improving traffic conditions. The document does not directly compare the various aspects of the individual alternatives, but rather provides the information needed for the reader to understand the relative impacts the alternatives. A preferred alternative was chosen based on community input. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.

The commenter indicates that impacts to traffic operations associated with roundabouts, including evacuation and emergency vehicles, were not evaluated in the final EA/EIR/EIS. Traffic impacts, associated with all alternatives, including the roundabout

alternatives (Alternative 2 and Alternative 4) are clearly evaluated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. In addition, the commenter expresses concerns about emergency response and evacuation due to increased traffic congestion. The Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District has indicated that none of the alternatives would be cause for concern with regards to emergency response (see *Chapter 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS for a copy of a comment letter from Duane L. Whitelaw, Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District). Regarding issues with evacuation from traffic congestion, although Alternatives 2 and 4 would slightly worsen traffic congestion, emergency services would take over evacuation in the event of an emergency. In addition, other routes would be available for evacuation throughout the area, as discussed in the Community Impact Assessment, which was included as (Appendix F of the final EA/EIR/EIS) and Impact TRA-6 in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IT44-8

The traffic analysis presented in the Final EA/EIR/EIS evaluated impacts related to traffic congestion, and found that significant and unavoidable traffic impacts would occur under all alternatives with regard to congestion under CEQA and the TRPA Regional Plan. The Final EA/EIR/EIS identified mitigation to reduce the severity of these impacts, although not to a less-than-significant level. Furthermore, Table 3.6-7 in the final EA/EIR/EIS identifies the duration and severity of congestion impacts under all alternatives. It is also true that a traffic-calming program could reduce the speed/noise impacts of traffic diverting onto residential streets, but that it could not eliminate the increase in traffic. The commenter is incorrect that diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods is proposed as mitigation. Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods and the NTMP.

Response to Comment IT44-9

As stated in *Chapter 3.3* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, the proposed action would have beneficial impacts on minority or low-income populations. Construction and operations-related effects of the proposed action would occur along the length of the commercial

corridor, with effects spread evenly across all populations residing near the action area. As stated under impact SOC-3, environmental justice impacts would not be adverse. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment IT44-10

Impacts on business revenue in the KBCC are addressed on pages 3.3-13 through 3.3-18 of the final EA/EIR/EIS and were found to be less than significant. In addition, please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment IT44-11

TRPA, CEQA, and NEPA all require that consideration be given to a range of alternatives that could feasibly achieve the goals of the proposed action. It has been determined that the EA/EIR/EIS analyzes a sufficient range of feasible alternatives. In addition, please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Comment Letter IT45—Mike Kirkwood, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT45-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT45-2

The commenter expresses the merits of the proposed action. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IT45-3

The commenter supports a hybrid alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT46—Kali Kopely, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT46-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. The commenter also expresses the necessity of public consensus regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Response to Comment IT46-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter IT47—Sarah Lagano, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT47-1

The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT47-2

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement, and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT48—David McClure, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT48-1

For the intersections, LOS was calculated (and is reported) for the design peak-hour in summer and in winter. Evaluating intersection LOS for each individual hour of the summer (in order to identify the number of hours with a specific LOS) would require very extensive additional analysis. For *roadway* segments, the number of hours that summer volumes are forecasted to exceed capacity (LOS F) were calculated and summarized in the lower portion of Table 3.6-7. The analyses show that the roadway LOS does not degrade to LOS F under Alternative 3, but does under Alternatives 2 and 4. Also, it is important to consider that the LOS results presented in Tables 3.6-5 and 3.6-7 present average delay for all vehicles on all approaches at signalized intersections, but the "worst case" LOS on the individual approach with the highest delays at unsignalized intersections (including roundabouts). As signal timing can typically be adjusted to balance delays at signalized intersections, the overall average LOS is roughly equivalent to that of the worst-case approach. For unsignalized intersections, the LOS reflects leftturn movements onto the highway, while LOS for through movements along the highway are unimpeded. A review of Tables 3.6-5 and 3.6-7 indicates that adequate (LOS D or better) is provided for all signalized intersections under Alternative 3. Therefore, no LOS conditions are forecasted to degrade movements along SR 28 in 2008 or 2028 under Alternative 3.

Response to Comment IT48-2

A review of available data indicated no existing examples of a roundabout meeting these criteria. Although there are single-lane roundabouts of similar size and volumes up to approximately 25,000 vehicles per day, data is not available on pedestrian volumes.

Response to Comment IT48-3

In addition to reflecting the local economy, changes in traffic levels since 1980 reflect other factors, such as the shift from permanent residences to second homes and the price of gasoline. The 2028 forecasts reflect *full* development of all approved Community

Plans and General Plans in the North Tahoe, Martis Valley, and Truckee area. Under these current plans, future land-use growth under redevelopment would be legally precluded from exceeding these levels. Although there are currently planning efforts under way (such as "Pathway 2007") that could potentially result in higher development levels, these plans are far from approval and any assumption as to the results of these planning processes would be conjecture. In addition, please refer to Master Response 10 for discussion of estimates of future year growth and traffic volumes.

Response to Comment IT48-4

In addition to reflecting the local economy, changes in traffic levels since 1980 reflect other factors, such as the shift from permanent residences to second homes and the price of gasoline. The 2028 forecasts reflect *full* development of all approved Community Plans and General Plans in the North Tahoe, Martis Valley, and Truckee area. Under these current plans, future land-use growth under redevelopment would be legally precluded from exceeding these levels. Although there are currently planning efforts under way (such as "Pathway 2007") that could potentially result in higher development levels, these plans are far from approval and any assumption as to the results of these planning processes would be conjecture.

Response to Comment IT48-5

The commenter is not correct in stating that the capacity used in the analysis is 1,500 per hour. Rather, the key capacity identified in the analysis is 1,171 vehicles per hour, as shown near the bottom of Table 36 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). As the traffic engineering profession has no commonly accepted methodology for evaluating roadway capacity of a three-lane roadway, a detailed study was conducted of a very similar existing condition (Tahoe City) to provide an analysis procedure, and adjustments were made to reflect differences between existing conditions in Tahoe City and potential future conditions in Kings Beach under Alternative 2 or 4. This can be considered to be as close a match to conditions in Kings Beach under three-lane alternatives, as the roadway cross-section is virtually identical and the same mix of

visitor and resident drivers are present in both areas. The difference between theoretical capacity and actual capacity is an observed fact. As much as possible, the proportion of the reduction in capacity that is attributable was quantified, such as the observed delays associated with pedestrian crossing or parking maneuvers. This methodology and results were approved by traffic engineering staff at Caltrans District 3 and at Placer County.

Response to Comment IT48-6

Actual pedestrian count data for the SR 28/Coon Street intersection is provided in Table 11 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS).

Response to Comment IT48-7

The commenter is correct that no change from existing counts in pedestrian and bicycle volumes is assumed for the analysis of future conditions. In discussions with the study steering committee, it was decided to not assume any future growth because any assumption would be conjecture and not supportable by analysis. That said, the analysis procedure can be readily used to estimate traffic capacity under a reader's assumption. If, for example, it is assumed that pedestrian and bicycle activity doubles over existing levels, a reanalysis of Table 36 from the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS) indicates that the critical lowest capacity would drop from 1,317 to 1,167 in the eastbound direction and from 1,176 to 1,026 in the westbound direction. A rough estimate of the impact that this reduction in roadway capacity would have on the number of hours per summer that volume would exceed capacity can be made based upon the data regarding the existing number of hours by traffic volumes in increments of 100, as shown in Table 3 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). This data indicates that the hours per summer in which roadway capacity would be exceeded under this assumption of pedestrian and bicycle growth would increase by roughly 100 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 50 hours per in the westbound direction. Added to the 2008 figures of 28 hours eastbound and 15 hours westbound shown in the EIR/EIS/EIS, this indicates that – under this assumption – roadway LOS F conditions

would occur roughly 130 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 65 hours per summer westbound.

Response to Comment IT48-8

The commenter is correct that no change from existing counts in pedestrian and bicycle volumes is assumed for the analysis of future conditions. In discussions with the study steering committee, it was decided to not assume any future growth, as any assumption would be conjecture and not supportable by analysis. That said, the analysis procedure can be readily used to estimate traffic capacity under a reader's assumption. If, for example, it is assumed that pedestrian and bicycle activity doubles over existing levels, a reanalysis of Table 36 from the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS) indicates that the critical lowest capacity would drop from 1,317 to 1,167 in the eastbound direction, and from 1,176 to 1,026 in the westbound direction. A rough estimate of the impact that this reduction in roadway capacity would have on the number of hours per summer that volume would exceed capacity can be made based upon the data regarding the existing number of hours by traffic volumes in increments of 100, as shown in Table 3 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). This data indicates that the hours per summer in which roadway capacity would be exceeded under this assumption of pedestrian and bicycle growth would increase by roughly 100 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 50 hours per in the westbound direction. Added to the 2008 figures of 28 hours eastbound and 15 hours westbound shown in the EIR/EIS/EIS, this indicates that – under this assumption – roadway LOS F conditions would occur roughly 130 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 65 hours per summer westbound.

Response to Comment IT48-9

The commenter is correct that no change from existing counts in pedestrian and bicycle volumes is assumed for the analysis of future conditions. In discussions with the study steering committee, it was decided not to assume any future growth, as any assumption would be conjecture and not supportable by analysis. That said, the analysis procedure

can be readily used to estimate traffic capacity under a reader's assumption. If, for example, it is assumed that pedestrian and bicycle activity doubles over existing levels, a reanalysis of Table 36 from the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS) indicates that the critical lowest capacity would drop from 1,317 to 1,167 in the eastbound direction and from 1,176 to 1,026 in the westbound direction. A rough estimate of the impact that this reduction in roadway capacity would have on the number of hours per summer that volume would exceed capacity can be made based upon the data regarding the existing number of hours by traffic volumes in increments of 100, as shown in Table 3 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). The data indicate that the hours per summer in which roadway capacity would be exceeded under this assumption of pedestrian and bicycle growth would increase by roughly 100 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 50 hours per in the westbound direction. Added to the 2008 figures of 28 hours eastbound and 15 hours westbound shown in the EIR/EIS/EIS, this indicates that—under this assumption—roadway LOS F conditions would occur roughly 130 hours per summer in the eastbound direction and 65 hours per summer westbound.

Response to Comment IT48-10

The commenter is correct that some of the "parking space searching" reduction factor will remain even if no on-street parking is provided, due to drivers that are searching for available nearby off-street parking spaces or are slowing as they consider their parking options. This factor is reduced from that observed in Tahoe City (with on-street parking), however, as drivers searching for an on-street space must travel slower to avoid missing an available space just ahead of their travel path, while drivers searching for parking further from their travel path can drive at a higher rate of speed without missing a parking opportunity. As a result, traffic speed will increase to a level where this factor does not affect the overall capacity of the travel lane.

Response to Comment IT48-11

Under Alternatives 2 and 4, curbside truck loading zones (signed to prohibit on-street parking) could be provided to avoid the need for center-lane truck parking. Moreover, observations regarding the impact of center-lane truck parking in Tahoe City indicate that this is not a significant factor in determining overall roadway capacity even when it is used because truckers tend to avoid making deliveries in the peak traffic congestion periods.

Response to Comment IT48-12

The 2028 forecasts reflect *full* development of all approved Community Plans and General Plans in the North Tahoe, Martis Valley, and Truckee area. Under these current plans, future land-use growth under redevelopment would be legally precluded from exceeding these levels. While there are currently planning efforts under way (such as "Pathway 2007") that could potentially result in higher development levels, these plans are far from approval and any assumption as to the results of these planning processes would be conjecture.

In addition, as discussed in the Response to Comment IP27-9, a differing assumption regarding future pedestrian and bicycle levels would also result in lower capacities in Kings Beach.

Response to Comment IT48-13

More detailed analysis conducted as part of the environmental document, in addition to input provided by commenting public agencies, has changed the results of the roadway capacity analysis from previous versions.

Response to Comment IT48-14

The commenter is not correct in stating that the capacity used in the analysis is 1,500 per hour. Rather, the key capacity identified in the analysis is 1,171 vehicles per hour, as shown near the bottom of Table 36 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). As the traffic engineering profession has no commonly accepted

methodology for evaluating roadway capacity of a three-lane roadway, a detailed study was conducted of a very similar existing condition (Tahoe City) to provide an analysis procedure, and adjustments were made to reflect differences between existing conditions in Tahoe City and potential future conditions in Kings Beach under Alternative 2 or 4. This can be considered to be as close a match to conditions in Kings Beach under three-lane alternatives, as the roadway cross-section is virtually identical and the same mix of visitor and resident drivers are present in both areas. The difference between theoretical capacity and actual capacity is an observed fact. As much as possible, the proportion of the reduction in capacity that is attributable was quantified, such as the observed delays associated with pedestrian crossing or parking maneuvers. This methodology and results were approved by traffic engineering staff at Caltrans District 3 and at Placer County.

Response to Comment IT48-15

The data regarding the existing number of hours by traffic volumes in increments of 100, as shown in Table 3 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS), can be used by a reviewer to evaluate the impact of reduced traffic flow assumptions on the number of hours per summer of traffic queues. As reflected in Response to Comment IP27-10, the number of hours increases significantly with reduced assumed capacity. Approach capacity of 800 vehicles per hour is not consistent with roundabout capacity methodologies, such as the SIDRA software methodology used by Caltrans.

Response to Comment IT48-16

The point of the block-by-block roadway segment analysis is to identify the *minimum* capacity provided by any one segment—the constriction point that establishes minimum traffic flow throughout the corridor. Any "backup" effect of one segment on the previous segment causes additional delays in the previous segment but does not change the capacity of the critical segment.

Response to Comment IT48-17

It is true that, near capacity, roundabout operation is very sensitive to traffic flow, and any congestion can rapidly increase. This is reflected in the discussion of forecasted

traffic queues, such as that presented on page 48 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS). Combined with the LOS results, as presented in Table 34 of the traffic study (Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS), the analysis indicates that, even though overall average LOS in 2008 may be acceptable, side street LOS (delays entering the highway from the side streets) will be E or F and the roundabouts will create queues along the highway extending over 2,000 feet. Note that this result does not reflect diversion of traffic to alternate routes. However, the delays generated for drivers traveling along the highway by the roundabouts are not expected to be long enough to result in a significant diversion of traffic (though the roadway capacity limitations would create diverted traffic).

Response to Comment IT48-18

As stated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-2, the proposed action would result in significant and unavoidable impacts by increasing traffic on residential streets under Alternatives 2 and 4. The NTMP would include traffic-calming measures to help alleviate diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic to less-than-significant levels.

Response to Comment IT48-19

The Deer Valley Drive roundabout in Park City (constructed based upon an initial study by LSC) is located two blocks from Park City's pedestrian center. Although it is true that pedestrian volumes are relatively low, this roundabout does experience high-peak traffic flows as it is on the sole access route to Deer Valley Ski Area. It is not a good comparison to Kings Beach, though, as it is a relatively large two-lane roundabout and as pedestrian volumes are low. However, there are successful examples of roundabouts with high pedestrian volumes, such as the roundabout on the Michigan State University campus that is the site of over 1,000 pedestrians per hour at peak times. Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IT48-20

This comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental document. No response is required.

Comment Letter IT49—Phillip Mosby, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT49-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT49-2

As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action includes improving the scenic quality of the KBCC as well as improving water quality. Improvements to aesthetics are included under all alternatives. Additionally, the construction of new collection and conveyance infrastructure implemented as part of the proposed action will improve water quality in the KBCC, as stated in *Chapter 3.13* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Comment Letter IT50—Christopher Nolder, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT50-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT50-2

The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT50-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT51—Dave Schiessl, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT51-1

The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT51-2

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT52—Renee Shadforth, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT52-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT52-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT52-3

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts and other traffic-calming devices.

Comment Letter IT53—Stanley Sokolow, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT53-1

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Comment Letter IT54—William B. Stelter, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT54-1

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly and safety-oriented KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding safety.

Comment Letter IT55—Lisa J. Trainor, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT55-1

The commenter suggests that the three-lane alternative will most improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, as well as result in economic benefits. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT56—Petition with Signatures, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT56-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT57—Linda Bennett, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment IT57-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment IT57-2

Placer County will work to minimize the number of roadway signs while still meeting the signage requirements of Placer County, TRPA, and Caltrans. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT58—Jerry Dinzes, Undated

Response to Comment IT58-1

The commenter indicates that in 20 years, the KBCC will have high levels of traffic congestion. The traffic analysis in the final EA/EIR/EIS indicates that, if the traffic associated with full buildout of all adopted plans in the region is generated and the roundabouts are constructed as proposed in Alternatives 2 and 4, traffic congestion would be a common condition in peak seasons in 20 years. The final EA/EIR/EIS has identified this as a significant and unavoidable impact. No response is required.

The commenter indicates that traffic queues would extend over 2,000 feet by 2010. It is true that traffic queues in peak periods would be extensive, although no analysis was conducted of 2010 conditions. Rather, the final EA/EIR/EIS concluded that traffic queues would extend over 2,000 feet in 2008. No response is required

The commenter indicates that smart growth organizations are waging a war on traffic congestion. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

The commenter indicates that there is no plan to cure cut-through traffic. Please refer to Master Response 1 discusses Placer County's intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The comment indicates that cut-through traffic endangers residents and harms pedestrian mobility. The NTMP, as discussed in Master Response 1, would help to alleviate safety and pedestrian issues associated with increased cut-through traffic.

The commenter indicates that traffic congestion harms the economy. Economic effects associated with project alternatives are evaluated in the final EA/EIR/EIS, and the

analysis presented in *Chapter 3.3* of the final EA/EIR/EIS indicates that the proposed action would not result in adverse effects to local and roadside businesses. No changes have been made to the final EA/EIR/EIS.

The commenter indicates that the effects of roundabouts have been underestimated. The final EA/EIR/EIS evaluated roundabouts under Alternatives 2 and 4.

The commenter states that the SBC meetings were biased and did not promote the truth. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Response to Comment IT58-2

The commenter states that North Shore communities should make decisions that are most conducive to all methods of travel (walking, biking, driving). One of the main goals of the KBCC Improvement Project is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety through the KBCC. Dedicated bike lanes; sidewalks; enhanced pedestrian crossings; installation of controlled intersections; and traffic-calming devices, such as roundabouts, are a large part of the proposed improvements. Currently, pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles all compete for travel space along the KBCC; sidewalks and bike lanes do not exist in several areas of the KBCC. Implementation of the proposed action will help to ensure all three modes of travel discussed by the commenter are allowed to coexist within the KBCC.

Response to Comment IT58-3

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT58-4

The commenter indicates that roundabouts will decrease the level of service at all Kings Beach intersections. Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion associated with Alternatives 2 and 4.

Response to Comment IT58-5

The commenter indicates that the congestion resulting from Alternatives 2 and 4 will result in increased noise pollution and road rage that does not enhance bicycle and pedestrian mobility. Noise impacts associated with the proposed action have been evaluated in *Chapter 3.9* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, and it was found that noise impacts would be less than significant. The comment on road rage does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required for this comment, although the addition of sidewalks and bike lanes will increase pedestrian and bicycle mobility, as discussed in the final EA/EIR/EIS.

The commenter further states that traffic congestion will be unacceptable in 2008 and 2028, with long queue lengths. These issues were evaluated and disclosed in *Chapter 3.7* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, and it was found that traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable for Alternatives 2 and 4 and less than significant for Alternative 3.

Response to Comment IT58-6

The commenter states that Alternative 3 would provide acceptable levels of service, while Alternatives 2 and 4 would not. These issues were evaluated and disclosed in *Chapter 3.7* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, and it was found that traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable for Alternatives 2 and 4, and less than significant for Alternative 3.

Response to Comment IT58-7

The commenter indicates that roundabouts will not be safe and efficient for pedestrian crossing and also result in cut-through traffic. Please refer to Master Response 2 regarding roundabout/pedestrian interactions and Master Response 1 regarding cut-through traffic.

Response to Comment IT58-8

The commenter indicates that roundabouts would result in cut-through traffic. Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding cut-through traffic.

Response to Comment IT58-9

The commenter indicates that roundabouts would result in cut-through traffic. Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding cut-through traffic.

Response to Comment IT58-10

The commenter indicates that roundabouts would decrease bicycle motility. One of the main goals of the KBCC Improvement Project is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety through the KBCC. Dedicated bike lanes; sidewalks; enhanced pedestrian crossings; installation of controlled intersections; and traffic-calming devices, such as roundabouts, are a large part of the proposed improvements. Currently, pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles all compete for travel space along the KBCC; sidewalks and bike lanes do not exist in several areas of the KBCC. Implementation of the proposed action will improve bicyclist mobility over existing conditions. Please refer to Master Response 2 regarding roundabout/pedestrian interactions.

Response to Comment IT58-11

The commenter indicates that roundabouts would decrease bicycle motility and safety. Please refer to Master Response 2 regarding roundabout/pedestrian interactions.

Response to Comment IT58-12

The commenter states that the SBC was biased in the fact they overstated the aesthetic benefits of Alternatives 2 and 4 and understated the aesthetic benefits of Alternative 3. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Response to Comment IT58-13

The commenter indicates that long queues of traffic associated with Alternatives 2 and 4 would divert vehicles from the main street and result in negative economic effects to local business owners. The commenter also indicates that prominent North Shore business owners have signed a petition in support of Alternative 3. The economic effects associated with implementation of the proposed action are addressed in *Chapter 3.3* of final EA/EIR/EIS and found that economic impacts associated with the proposed action

are less than significant. Regarding the petition in support of Alternative 3, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT58-14

The commenter indicates that the traffic study failed to account for increased traffic from Crystal Bay. Future traffic volumes were estimated based on Community Plan buildout in Incline Village/Crystal Bay, as well the Community Plans to the west of Kings Beach. The traffic analysis is based on anticipated buildout and growth and does not include mitigation measures that "may" occur in the future. Rather, the analysis focuses on reasonably foreseeable projects that are planned, programmed, and projected, none of which include a pedestrian bridge or roundabout discussed by the commenter.

Response to Comment IT58-15

The commenter indicates that the traffic predictions for the Kings Beach Industrial Area are incorrect, which underestimated neighborhood cut-through traffic. The traffic projections from the traffic analysis focuses on reasonably foreseeable projects that are planned, programmed, and projected, which includes development as part of the Kings Beach Industrial Area. The traffic analysis assumes that traffic associated with the Kings Beach Industrial Area would exit Speckled Avenue onto SR 267.

Response to Comment IT58-16

The commenter indicates that the traffic analysis did not evaluate the development on the eastern side of Kings Beach. The traffic projections from the traffic analysis identified growth associated with Kings Beach and evaluated traffic volumes for the major roadways affected by the proposed action.

Response to Comment IT58-17

The commenter comments that there was no community consensus that adequately represented the community at large. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT58-18

The commenter comments on the notification postcards for the public workshops. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT58-19

The commenter expresses an opinion about the Sierra Business Council. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT58-20

The commenter expresses an opinion about the Sierra Business Council, Jim Doolittle, and developers in the area. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment IT58-21

The commenter expresses an opinion. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter IT59—Alex Mourelatos, Undated

Response to Comment IT59-1

The commenter expresses concern that drivers speed through Kings Beach on SR 28 and suggests that law enforcement be increased in the KBCC area. This is not a comment on the environmental document. However, the proposed action does include traffic-calming devices, such as roundabouts and/or controlled intersections, that are expected to slow down the flow of traffic.

Response to Comment IT59-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT59-3

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT59-4

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment IT59-5

Improved water quality and increased pedestrian and bicycle safety are main objectives of the proposed action, as stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Parking issues are addressed in *Chapter 3.7* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment IT59-6

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of the three-lane alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

The commenter indicates that a backstreet traffic mitigation plan must be implemented before design of any alternative is approved. As indicated in Master Response 1, Placer County has committed to implement a NTMP to help minimize traffic impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood and will be implemented before construction of the proposed action. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The commenter indicates that parking lots should be constructed in parallel with the core improvement work. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the construction of the parking lots.

The commenter indicates that the effects of parking to businesses should be evaluated. Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and effects on businesses.

The commenter indicates that pervious sidewalks and other "green" design elements should be implemented. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment IT59-7

The commenter indicates that there is need for outreach to the business and residential community in addition to expressing support of three lane alternatives. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public outreach and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT60—John Shuff, Undated

Response to Comment IT60-1

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IT60-2

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Comment Letter IT61—Petition with Signatures, Undated

Response to Comment IT61-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT61-2

The commenter expresses concern that drivers speed through Kings Beach on SR 28 and suggests that law enforcement be increased in the KBCC area. This is not a comment on the environmental document. However, the proposed action does include traffic-calming device such as roundabouts and/or controlled intersections that are expected to slow down the flow of traffic. Also, please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Comment Letter IT62—Petition with Signatures, Undated

Response to Comment IT62-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT62-2

The commenter expresses concern that drivers speed through Kings Beach on SR 28, and suggests that law enforcement be increased in the KBCC area. This is not a comment on the environmental document. However, the proposed action does include traffic-calming device such as roundabouts and/or controlled intersections that are expected to slow down the flow of traffic. Also, please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Comment Letter IT63—Petition with Signatures, Business Owners and Members of Kings Beach Community, Undated

Response to Comment IT63-1

The commenter expresses concern regarding congestion associated with the proposed action. These issues were evaluated and disclosed in *Chapter 3.7* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, and it was found that traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable for Alternatives 2 and 4 and less than significant for Alternative 3.

Response to Comment IT63-2

The commenter expresses concerns regarding the loss of on-street parking. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the loss of on-street parking and effects to businesses.

Response to Comment IT63-3

As stated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-6, impacts on emergency access would not be adverse. The reduction of capacity under Alternatives 2 and 4 would be reduced, but the addition of bike lanes along both sides of SR 28 would allow motorists to move out of travel lanes to clear the path for emergency fire or medical vehicles. The situation is similar to Tahoe City. When roads in Tahoe City are

congested, autos are able to maneuver out of the traffic lane to open the road for emergency access, and emergency vehicle travel speeds are not significantly reduced. In addition, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This plan would include provisions to minimize impacts on public services, including emergency access.

Response to Comment IT63-4

The proposed action will be ADA compliant, as it is a federal requirement, and will not preclude, prohibit, or limit ADA compliance or accessibility.

Response to Comment IT63-5

Please see Master Response 3.

Response to Comment IT63-6

Please see Master Response 2 and Master Response 3.

Response to Comment IT63-7

Please see Master Response 6 regarding parking enforcement and Master Response 7 regarding parking costs.

Response to Comment IT63-8

Please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment IT63-9

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment IT63-10

The commenter states a cost estimate of \$7,500, which is inaccurate. The cost of sidewalk maintenance depends on the level and frequency of maintenance needed. Placer County will not pay for sidewalk maintenance through bank interest or other means. As in Tahoe City, it is the adjacent property owners will be responsible for their fair share of

maintenance, which is the sidewalk area adjacent to their property. Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses and also Master Response 6 regarding snow removal.

Response to Comment IT63-11

Please see Master Response 3 regarding maintenance costs to local businesses.

Comment Letter IT64—Petition with Signature, Undated

Response to Comment IT64-1

Please see Responses to Comment Letter IP52.

Comment Letter IT65—Anonymous, Undated

Response to Comment IT65-1

Currently, no sidewalks or bike lanes exist in the KBCC. Each alternative includes the addition of a sidewalk and other barriers (including planters) to separate pedestrians and traffic.

Response to Comment IT65-2

Alternative 3 would accommodate the forecast traffic volumes, while Alternatives 2 and 4 would not accommodate peak traffic flows.

Response to Comment IT65-3

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment IT65-4

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment IT65-5

The CHP is outside of Placer County's control, as the CHP is a state agency.

Response to Comment IT65-6

There are pull outs for buses included in the proposed action alternatives. Please see Master Response 3 regarding delivery zones.

Response to Comment IT65-7

The commenter indicates that there should be cut outs for bus stops. As indicated in Figure 2-1 in final EA/EIR/EIS, bus pullouts will be implemented into project design for all alternatives in locations close to the existing bus stops.

Response to Comment IT65-8

Each of the proposed action's build alternatives will include landscaping. Please see Master Response 2 regarding maintenance and upkeep.

Response to Comment IT65-9

Seventeen-foot sidewalks would occur under Alternative 4. Alternative 2 includes 9.5-foot sidewalks, and Alternative 3 includes 5.6-foot sidewalks. Please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment IT65-10

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT65-11

Currently, no bike lanes exist in the KBCC. Each alternative includes the addition of a bike lane to separate bicyclists from pedestrians and traffic.

Response to Comment IT65-12

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT65-13

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and Master Response 5 regarding snow removal issues.

Response to Comment IT65-14

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT65-15

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Comment Letter IT66—Anonymous, Undated

Response to Comment IT66-1

The commenter is in favor of a three-lane alternative and provides examples of a similar project in Buffalo, New York. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment IT66-2

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter IT67—Anonymous, Undated

Response to Comment IT67-1

The commenter expresses an opinion. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Local Agency (L) Responses

Comment Letter L1—Denise Clark, Tahoe Truckee Unified School District Transportation Department, May 1, 2007

Response to Comment L1-1

The commenter recommends a left turn lane onto Deer Street. Alternatives 2 and 4 provide for a left turn lane onto Deer Street, while Alternative 3 does not. Placer County may consider a left turn lane at the Deer Street intersection, as this would help to mitigate the LOS F condition for the movement out of Deer Street (but not to a less-than-significant level). Placer County will evaluate the inclusion of left turn lanes at the Deer Street intersection, and feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Also, please see Master Response 4. It should be noted that Placer County coordinated with the school district and considered this input for the proposed action.

Comment Letter L2—Brent Backus, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, May 23, 2007

Response to Comment L2-1

Table 3.1-1 in the final EA/EIR/EIS has been revised to reflect updated air quality standards.

Nongovernmental Organization (NGO) Responses

Comment Letter NGO1—Cheri Sprenger, North Tahoe Business Association, May 23, 2007

Response to Comment NGO1-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO1-2

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of Alternative 4 with modifications. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based on all available information, including input from the community. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment NGO1-3

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of Alternative 4. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment NGO1-4

Please see Master Response 3.

Response to Comment NGO1-5

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding benefits of the proposed action. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the

final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment NGO1-6

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding benefits of the proposed action. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment NGO1-7

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of Alternative 4 with modifications. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter NGO2—Benjamin Pignatelli, League to Save Lake Tahoe, June 11, 2007

Response to Comment NGO2-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of the alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO2-2

Please see Master Response 2 regarding bicyclist safety. The commenter also recommends the inclusion of surveys of bicyclists and related studies that indicate safety concerns being the primary impediment to more frequent use of the bicycle for transportation and/or recreation. One purpose and need of the proposed action is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety along the KBCC (*Chapter 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS). Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach. These issues have been addressed in Impact TRA-4: Degradation of Bicycle and Pedestrian Conditions along SR 28 in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS; the inclusion of bicyclist surveys would not change this analysis.

Response to Comment NGO2-3

The commenter indicates the final EA/EIR/EIS should more clearly distinguish pedestrian safety and mobility among the alternatives. Table 2-1 in the final EA/EIR/EIS compares the relative pros and cons of the various alternatives. No change is made to the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment NGO2-4

The commenter indicates the final EA/EIR/EIS should clearly identify which alternative meets the identified purpose and need to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety through the KBCC. The decision to select an alternative was based on which alternative best meets the project objectives, is economically feasible, and results in the least amount of impacts on environmental issues.

The commenter indicates the final EA/EIR/EIS should more clearly distinguish improved aesthetics of the KBCC among the alternatives through better differentiation among the alternatives considering factors such as the presence of parked cars along the road and total area dedicated to landscaping and pedestrian amenities. Table 2-1 in the final

EA/EIR/EIS compares the relative pros and cons of the various alternatives. No change has been made to the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment NGO2-5

The commenter indicates the final EA/EIR/EIS should more clearly distinguish air quality impacts among the alternatives. Impact AIR-5: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Elevated Levels of Diesel Exhaust and an Increased Health Risk from *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS identifies this impact as being similar for the Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. This is because construction equipment and duration are not anticipated to substantially differ between the three alternatives. In addition, the three alternatives are not anticipated to result in differences in traffic volumes, so operational impacts are anticipated to be similar among the three alternatives. No changes have been made to the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment NGO2-6

The commenter indicates the final EA/EIR/EIS should more clearly distinguish air quality impacts among the alternatives related to parking spaces. As indicated in *Chapter* 2 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, potential on-street and off-street parking locations are the same for the three alternatives. Consequently, impacts are anticipated to be similar among the three alternatives. No changes have been made to the final EA/EIR/EIS.

The commenter indicates the air quality analysis presented in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS should implement air quality mitigation measures contained in the air quality technical study. The air quality analysis presented in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS does implement air quality mitigation measures contained in the air quality technical study, in addition to an additional mitigation measure, Mitigation Measure AIR-4: Implement Construction Emissions Control Technology. No changes have been made to the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Finally, the commenter indicates the air quality analysis presented in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS should identify air quality benefits associated with KBCC shoppers

walking from store to store and eliminating car starts. Traffic data is not available to quantitatively discuss this impact. However, it is reasonable to assume that Alternative 4 would result in the greatest emissions reductions associated with reduced vehicle starts, due to the elimination of all on-street parking spaces on SR 28 and the relocation of parking to off-street locations, which would facilitate shoppers walking from store to store, rather than driving. However, it is anticipated that these emissions reductions are minimal, as parking limitations in the KBCC require most shoppers to park in one location and walk to other shopping locations so as to not lose their parking space. Conversely, Alternative 3 would result in the fewest emissions reductions, as on-street parking would remain on a year-round basis.

Response to Comment NGO2-7

The commenter indicates Placer County should consider installation of speed bumps on residential side streets to discourage use by nonlocal traffic. Please see Master Response 1 for a discussion of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods and Placer County's proposed NTMP.

The commenter indicates Placer County should increase the frequency of local and regional transit service to reduce the number of private automobiles in the action area. As indicated in Impact TRA-5: Degradation of Transit Operations in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, transit operations will be degraded with implementation of Alternatives 2 and 4, and no mitigation is available (including changing bus schedules) to reduce this impact to less than significant. In addition, changing transit operations are beyond the scope of the proposed action.

The commenter indicates Place County should charge basin entry fees for day visitors traveling by automobiles. This is beyond the scope of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO2-8

The commenter indicates Placer County should provide economic data from other communities that have shifted from car/parking-oriented to pedestrian/bicycle-oriented

shopping districts, indicating that sales are higher per square foot for stores in revitalized, pedestrian-friendly, main street redevelopment areas. The analysis presented in *Chapter 3.3* of the final EA/EIR/EIS indicates that the proposed action would not result in adverse effects to local and roadside businesses. No changes have been made to the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment NGO2-9

The commenter indicates that it has been brought up several times in public meetings that "people will not walk more than 300 feet" to shop or for other purposes. The commenter requests documentation for this fact. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment NGO2-10

The commenter indicates the final EA/EIR/EIS should more clearly distinguish pedestrian safety and mobility among the alternatives. Table 2-1 in the final EA/EIR/EIS compares the relative pros and cons of the various alternatives.

Chapter 3.3 of the final EA/EIR/EIS evaluates environmental justice and finds that implementation of the proposed action would result in largely beneficial impacts due to improved safety for pedestrians and bicyclists along SR 28, which would serve low-income residents who may rely on transportation other than motor vehicles. In addition, please refer to Master Response 1 discusses Placer County's intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Regarding the need for safety on the main street, one of the main goals of the KBCC Improvement Project is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety through the KBCC. Dedicated bike lanes and sidewalks; enhanced pedestrian crossings; installation of controlled intersections; and traffic-calming devices, such as roundabouts, are a large

part of the proposed improvements. Currently, pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles all compete for travel space along the KBCC; sidewalks and bike lanes do not exist in several areas of the KBCC. Implementation of the proposed action will improve bicyclist mobility over existing conditions. Please refer to Master Response 2 regarding roundabout/pedestrian interactions.

Comment Letter NGO3—Lesley Bruening, Mick Horn, Leah Kaufman, Mike LeFrancois, Chris Oberle, Steve Rogers, and Andrew Ryan, North Tahoe Business Association Main Street Design Committee, Undated

Response to Comment NGO3-1

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of Alternative 4 with modifications. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment NGO3-2

The commenter has indicated that the proposed action should have a variety of sidewalk widths. Sidewalk width as referenced in this document refers to the pedestrian area that would comprise of landscaping and other pedestrian uses. Parking was not originally included.

The commenter has indicated that the proposed action should have ADA accessible parking. The proposed action will be ADA compliant, as it is a federal requirement, and will not preclude, prohibit, or limit ADA compliance or accessibility.

Regarding truck delivery zones and pickup and drop off zones, please see Master Response 3 regarding delivery trucks.

Response to Comment NGO3-3

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. A neighborhood traffic management plan will be implemented if Alternative 2 or 4 is selected.

Response to Comment NGO3-4

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment NGO3-5

The commenter indicates that enhanced pedestrian crossing elements must be put in place at all unsignalized crosswalks. Alternatives 2 and 4 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267 and Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk Street intersections (with a signal at the SR 267 intersection), while Alternative 3 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267 and Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk Street intersections (with signals at the SR 267, Bear, and Coon intersections). Please see Master Response 9 regarding signal warrants. At Secline Street, Placer County will consider crosswalks at this intersection during final project design.

The commenter indicates that the final EA/EIR/EIS should address pedestrian paths from satellite parking to the business core with evaluation of pedestrian LOS. As specific parking locations have not been determined, it is not possible to specify exact pedestrian routes. Subsequent planning and permitting for individual parking facilities will need to address provision of adequate pedestrian paths to the SR 28 sidewalks and the commercial core areas. The proposed action does include pedestrian paths to satellite lots along the roadways that intersect SR 28.

Response to Comment NGO3-6

The ROW will be relinquished back to Placer County, who will be responsible for maintenance after construction. Please see Master Response 3 regarding maintenance costs to local businesses and property owners.

Response to Comment NGO3-7

The commenter expresses concerns regarding signage in the KBCC. As stated in Chapter 3.15 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, design standards in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Design Review Guidelines, Scenic Quality Improvement Program, and Technical Appendices of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, the Draft Roadway Design Standards and Guidelines, Draft Guidelines for Projects Located on the California State Highways in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and the Placer County Tahoe Area Sign Ordinance will be used to develop signage along the KBCC. Placer County is responsible for the implementation of these measures into the design of signage. In order to ensure that the mitigation measures are implemented, Placer County will adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Plan. Placer County will ensure parking way-finding signage.

Response to Comment NGO3-8

The commenter expresses an opinion about the need to improve aesthetic appeal in Kings Beach. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the main goals of the proposed action is to provide a more attractive pedestrian environment. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, trash receptacles, organized parking, and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO3-9

The commenter states that a detailed construction schedule should be included to clearly identify alternative access to minimize impacts on businesses during construction. A final construction schedule is unavailable until the project construction contractor has been identified. However, as indicated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This plan would include provisions to minimize impacts on traffic and business access.

Comment Letter NGO4—Petition with Signatures, Kings Beach Business and Citizens Alliance, May 29, 2007

Response to Comment NGO4-1

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more safety-oriented KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, one of the proposed action's goals is to increase pedestrian and bicyclist safety. The proposed action also aims to improve aesthetic values of the KBCC. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach. Currently, there are no barriers to separate pedestrians and bicyclists from traffic. Therefore, safety will be improved under all alternatives. In addition, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO4-2

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment NGO4-3

The effects of traffic are clearly described in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic.

Response to Comment NGO4-4

The purpose and need of this proposed action is stated in *Chapter 1*. Currently, the KBCC is failing to meet traffic, water quality, and scenic thresholds established by agencies with jurisdiction in the action area. The proposed action will help achieve planning goals by improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety, improving water quality, and improving the scenic character of the KBCC. A project that solely focuses on water quality does not meet the purpose and need of this proposed action, which also includes necessary changes to improve aesthetics and pedestrian and bicycle mobility.

TRPA, CEQA, and NEPA all require that consideration be given to a range of alternatives that could feasibly achieve the goals of the proposed action. It has been determined that the EA/EIR/EIS analyzes a sufficient range of feasible alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO4-5

Traffic calming, beautification, and water quality improvements under Alternative 3 are adequately described in the final EA/EIR/EIS. Traffic-calming measures are described in *Chapter 3.6*, beautification is described in *Chapter 3.15*, and water quality improvements are described in *Chapter 3.13*. Under this alternative, 5.6-foot sidewalks and 5-foot bike lanes would be built along both sides of SR 28. Installation of street lights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, trash receptacles, and additional landscaping are common to Alternatives 2, 3, and 4.

Response to Comment NGO4-6

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment NGO4-7

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment NGO4-8

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment NGO4-9

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO4-10

The commenter offers an opinion on the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response in required. However, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives and Master Response 8 regarding the public involvement process.

Response to Comment NGO4-11

The goals of the proposed action are clearly outlined in the *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. These goals include improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, water quality, and aesthetic character of the KBCC. Improvements to pedestrian and bicycle mobility are needed to increase pedestrian safety and accommodate for the growing amount of bicyclists in the KBCC. In addition, existing stormwater treatment facilities currently do not meet standards set by local regulatory agencies. Aesthetic improvements are also needed in the KBCC in order to meet the thresholds of the TRPA EIP.

As stated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under Impact TRA-6, impacts on emergency access would not be adverse. The reduction of capacity under Alternatives 2 and 4 would be reduced, but the addition of bike lanes along both sides of SR 28 would allow motorists to move out of travel lanes to clear the path for emergency fire or medical vehicles. The situation is similar to Tahoe City. When roads in Tahoe City are congested, autos are able to maneuver out of the traffic lane to open the road for emergency access, and emergency vehicle travel speeds are not significantly reduced. In addition, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This plan would include provisions to minimize impacts on public services, including emergency access. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment NGO4-12

The proposed action will in increase pedestrian safety and mobility through the KBCC, as the KBCC currently lacks sidewalks and pedestrian crossings. The proposed action will be ADA compliant, as it is a federal requirement, and will not preclude, prohibit, or limit ADA compliance or accessibility. In addition, please see Master Response 5 regarding snow removal issues.

The commenter asks what will be done to address cut-through traffic in the neighborhoods. Please refer to Master Response 1, which discusses Placer County's

intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Response to Comment NGO4-13

The commenter indicates that many of the residents living within the grid neighborhood are Hispanics whose main mode of transportation if via walking or bicycle riding. *Chapter 3.3* of the final EA/EIR/EIS evaluates environmental justice and finds that implementation of the proposed action would result in largely beneficial impacts due to improved safety for pedestrians and bicyclists along SR 28, which would serve residents who may rely on transportation other than motor vehicles. In addition, please refer to Master Response 1 discusses Placer County's intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Regarding the need for safety on the main street, one of the main goals of the KBCC Improvement Project is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety through the KBCC. Dedicated bike lanes and sidewalks; enhanced pedestrian crossings; installation of controlled intersections; and traffic-calming devices, such as roundabouts, are a large part of the proposed improvements. Currently, pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles all compete for travel space along the KBCC; sidewalks and bike lanes do not exist in several areas of the KBCC. Implementation of the proposed action will improve bicyclist mobility over existing conditions. Please refer to Master Response 2 regarding roundabout/pedestrian interactions.

Finally, refer to Master Response 5 regarding snow removal.

Response to Comment NGO4-14

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion. As analyzed in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, impacts on air quality have been fully addressed. There are no adverse impacts on air quality as a result of the proposed action. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure AIR-1 will implement all applicable PCAPCD Best Available Mitigation Measures to further reduce impacts on air quality.

Response to Comment NGO4-15

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects of loss of parking, costs of sidewalk maintenance and snow removal, and deliveries to businesses.

Response to Comment NGO4-16

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter NGO5—Various, <u>north_tahoe@yahoogroups.com</u> on Behalf of Ellie, June 14, 2007

Response to Comment NGO5-1

The commenter implies that the actions of the SBC show bias. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement. In addition, Master Response 4 describes how a preferred alternative was selected. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment NGO5-2

Placer County feels that the public involvement process, which included several workshops and opportunities for public input, was sufficient to obtain participation from the public. The Placer County staff attended each of these workshops.

Response to Comment NGO5-3

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required. No response in required.

Response to Comment NGO5-4

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required. No response in required.

Response to Comment NGO5-5

Detailed construction plans and phasing are not available at this time. However, Placer County thanks the commenter. The comment will be considered by the decision makers during deliberations on project approval.

Response to Comment NGO5-6

Caltrans would typically not allow raised medians in "snow country," particularly if they are short and discontinuous. Medians could preclude certain traffic movements (such as two-stage left-turn movements) and thus increase traffic congestion; they would also need to be carefully designed to avoid eliminating driveway access. However, Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO5-7

Dining tables are not included in the proposed action. In addition, the ROW will be relinquished to Placer County after construction is completed.

Response to Comment NGO5-8

As stated in *Chapter 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, Alternative 2 includes 9.5-foot sidewalks, Alternative 3 includes 5.6-foot sidewalks, and Alternative 4 includes 17-foot sidewalks.

Response to Comment NGO5-9

Visual cues are not included under the proposed action. However, traffic-calming devices such as crosswalks and roundabouts are included. Please see Master Response 2 regarding traffic-calming devices.

Response to Comment NGO5-10

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-11

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-12

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-13

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-14

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could

include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-15

Caltrans would typically not allow raised medians in "snow country," particularly if they are short and discontinuous. Medians could preclude certain traffic movements (such as two-stage left-turn movements) and thus increase traffic congestion; they would also need to be carefully designed to avoid eliminating driveway access. However, Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO5-16

Alternatives 2 and 4 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267 and Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk Street intersections (with a signal at the SR 267 intersection), while Alternative 3 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267 and Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk Street intersections (with signals at the SR 267, Bear, and Coon intersections), which are improvements over existing conditions. Regarding recessed lights, Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO5-17

The consideration of pedestrian-activated crossing signals could be considered as part of final project design. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Caltrans has allowed use of "ornamental" signal poles, such as two recent signals in Nevada City.

Response to Comment NGO5-18

Raised intersections or crosswalks would not be acceptable to Caltrans.

Response to Comment NGO5-19

After the signal warrant analysis, it was determined that three stoplights at SR 267, Bear Street, and Coon Street would be included under Alternative 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO5-20

Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment NGO5-21

Signals that sense approaching vehicle speed and provide a stop indication are not allowed under Caltrans regulations. Timing signals to allow traffic to progress along the highway is a feasible and appropriate strategy, particularly in periods with a high proportion of traffic in one direction.

Response to Comment NGO5-22

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements could include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-23

Under all alternatives, safety for bicyclists would improve over existing conditions, where bicyclists must compete with vehicles and pedestrians on the shoulder of SR 28. In addition, bike lanes on side streets in not part of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO5-24

Detailed construction plans and phasing are not available at this time. However, Placer County thanks the commenter. The comment will be considered by the decision makers during deliberations on project approval.

Response to Comment NGO5-25

All of the alternatives incorporate sidewalks, which is an improvement over existing conditions. As stated in *Chapter 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, Alternative 2 includes 9.5-foot sidewalks, Alternative 3 includes 5.6-foot sidewalks, and Alternative 4 includes 17-foot sidewalks.

Response to Comment NGO5-26

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment NGO5-27

Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment NGO5-28

Traffic lanes will not be narrowed under the proposed action. However, other traffic-calming devices such as crosswalks and roundabouts are included and are described in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment NGO5-29

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-30

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-31

Speed tables or speed bumps are not allowed under Caltrans regulations; they impede snow removal and create the potential for icy spots in winter.

Response to Comment NGO5-32

Although typically not allowed by Caltrans in "snow country," raised median islands may be considered as part of final design. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO5-33

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO5-34

Raised crosswalks or other vertical roadway changes are not allowed under Caltrans regulations; they impede snow removal and create the potential for icy spots in winter. In-pavement flashers delineating the pedestrian crossing are a feasible alternative and could be considered as part of final design. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO5-35

Timing signals to control traffic speed is a valid and appropriate strategy for closely spaced signals. The distance between Bear and SR 267 is too great to provide any speed control benefit. At least one additional signal in the core area would be required to make this strategy effective.

Response to Comment NGO5-36

The commenter expresses the need for an aesthetically pleasing KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, the proposed action aims to improve aesthetic values of the KBCC.

Response to Comment NGO5-37

Traffic lanes will not be narrowed under the proposed action. However, other traffic-calming devices such as crosswalks and roundabouts are included and are described in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment NGO5-38

Timing signals to control traffic speed are a valid and appropriate strategy for closely spaced signals. The distance between Bear Street and SR 267 is too great to provide any speed control benefit. At least one additional signal in the core area would be required to make this strategy effective.

Response to Comment NGO5-39

Textured pavements can be an effective tool in increasing driver's attention to pedestrians. They would not typically be allowed by Caltrans regulations, but could be evaluated as part of final design. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO5-40

Neckdowns or bulbouts can be beneficial to pedestrians, by reducing crossing distances and increasing a driver's ability to see pedestrians who are about to cross. These can be considered as part of final design. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment NGO5-41

Rumble strips in a built-up area such as Kings Beach would not be appropriate due to the noise impacts on nearby businesses and residences.

Response to Comment NGO5-42

The commenter expresses concern regarding speeding in the KBCC area. This is not a comment on the environmental document. However, the proposed action does include traffic-calming device such as roundabouts and controlled intersections that are expected to slow down the flow of traffic.

Response to Comment NGO5-43, NGO5-44

Raised crosswalks or other vertical roadway changes are not allowed under Caltrans regulations; they impede snow removal and create the potential for icy spots in winter.

Response to Comment NGO5-45

The commenter expresses the need for an aesthetically pleasing KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, the proposed action aims to improve aesthetic values of the KBCC.

Response to Comment NGO5-46

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-47

Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights,

benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO5-48

The commenter expresses the need for an aesthetically pleasing KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, the proposed action aims to improve aesthetic values of the KBCC.

Response to Comment NGO5-49

The consideration of pedestrian-activated crossing signals could be considered as part of final project design. Caltrans has allowed use of "ornamental" signal poles, such as two recent signals in Nevada City.

Response to Comment NGO5-50

Signage is intended to induce pedestrian safety, which is one of the goals of the proposed action. Signage is included under all alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO5-51

The commenter also expresses interest in economic growth in Kings Beach. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving scenic quality of the area as well as improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility will lead to positive economic growth.

Response to Comment NGO5-52

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter NGO6—John Bergman, Dave Ferrari, Sue Kyler, Nathan Plunkett, Carol Savary, Allana Spencer, North Tahoe Main Street Economic Restructuring Committee, June 15, 2007

Response to Comment NGO6-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO6-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding the NTMP, and also Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment NGO6-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO6-4

One of the main goals of the KBCC Improvement Project is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety through the KBCC. Dedicated bike lanes and sidewalks; enhanced pedestrian crossings; installation of controlled intersections; and traffic-calming devices, such as roundabouts, are a large part of the proposed improvements. Currently, pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles all compete for travel space along the KBCC; sidewalks and bike lanes do not exist in several areas of the KBCC.

Response to Comment NGO6-5

The commenter also expresses interest in economic growth in Kings Beach. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving scenic quality of the area as well as improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility will lead to positive economic growth.

Response to Comment NGO6-6

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment NGO6-7

The commenter expresses an opinion on the merits of roundabouts. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input.

Response to Comment NGO6-8

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO6-9

The commenter expresses concerns regarding signage in the KBCC. As stated in Chapter 3.15 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, design standards in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Design Review Guidelines, Scenic Quality Improvement Program, and Technical Appendices of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, the Draft Roadway Design Standards and Guidelines, Draft Guidelines for Projects Located on the California State Highways in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and the Placer County Tahoe Area Sign Ordinance will be used to develop signage along the KBCC. Placer County is responsible for the implementation of these measures into the design of signage. In order to ensure that the mitigation measures are implemented, Placer County will adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Plan. Placer County will ensure parking way-finding signage. Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment NGO6-10

If Alternative 2 or 4 were selected, Placer County will allocate funds to implement a NTMP to help alleviate diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP will include traffic-calming features (e.g., speed bumps, signage, etc.), which will help to alleviate diverted traffic but will not reduce diverted traffic to less-than-significant levels. Please see Master Response 1.

Response to Comment NGO6-11

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter NGO7—Kevin McDermott, Kings Beach Community Action Committee, June 17, 2007

Response to Comment NGO7-1

The commenter expresses merits of the public involvement process and does not address environmental impacts of the proposed action. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment NGO7-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO7-3

The commenter is in support of aesthetic improvements to the KBCC. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action. Aesthetic improvements include entry statements at the east and west ends of the KBCC; the installation of streetlights, benches, transit facilities, planters, bicycle racks, and trash receptacles; organized parking; and additional landscaping.

Response to Comment NGO7-4

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO7-5

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus and a vote by the public regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter NGO8—Dave Berry, North Tahoe Public Utilities District, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment NGO8-1

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly and safety-oriented KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of this proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach.

Response to Comment NGO8-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter NGO9—Michael Donahoe, Tahoe Area Sierra Club, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment NGO9-1

The commenter expresses an opinion on the merits of the proposed action. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input.

Response to Comment NGO9-2

The commenter expresses their support of the purpose and need of the proposed action. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment NGO9-3

The commenter expresses an opinion on the merits of the proposed action. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input.

Response to Comment NGO9-4

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO9-5

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter NGO10—David McClure (Spokesperson), The Kings Beach Business and Citizen's Alliance, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment NGO10-1

Placer County feels that the public involvement process, which included several workshops and opportunities for public input, was sufficient to obtain comments from the public. The Placer County staff attended each of these workshops.

Response to Comment NGO10-2

The commenter implies that bias was present in the public involvement process. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement. In addition, Master Comment 4 describes how a preferred alternative will be selected. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment NGO10-3

Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO10-4

The commenter implies that the literature used during the public involvement process shows bias. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement. In addition, Master Response 4 describes how a preferred alternative will be selected. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment NGO10-5

The commenter states that Alternatives 2 and 4 are not three-lane alternatives. In general, the phrase "two-lane" and "three-lane" are used interchangeably to refer to the same alternatives. Both references refer to Alternatives 2 and 4, which both have two-travel lanes and a single two-way-left turn lane of the same width as the travel lanes. Please refer to *Chapter 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS for a description of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO10-6

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment NGO10-7

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment NGO10-8

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment NGO10-9

The commenter expresses the necessity of public consensus and a vote by the public regarding the selection of a preferred alternative and does not address the adequacy of the

final EA/EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO10-10

Placer County feels that the public involvement period, which included several workshops and opportunities for public input, was sufficient to obtain comments from the public. Placer County staff attended each of these workshops. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO10-11

As stated in *Chapter 1*, the proposed action intends to address more than just aesthetic improvements. Improvements to pedestrian and bicycle safety and mobility are also a major part of the proposed action. Impacts on traffic as a result of the proposed alternatives are described in detail in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Also, please see Master Response 1. The selection of alternatives will take these factors into account, and no alternatives, including Alternative 3, have been eliminated. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO10-12

The commenter expresses opinion regarding the proposed action and does not comment specifically on the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter NGO11—Ty Polastri, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition, June 18, 2007

Response to Comment NGO11-1

The proposed action will adhere to the guidelines of the TRPA Master Bike/Pedestrian Plan.

Comment Letter NGO12—The Kings Beach Business and Citizen's Alliance, Undated

Response to Comment NGO12-1

Please see Master Response 4: Selection Process for Alternatives.

Response to Comment NGO12-2

Please see Master Response 1. There are no examples elsewhere in Placer County where a traffic-calming program has eliminated the level of traffic volumes identified in the environmental document to result from Alternatives 2 and 4. While such a program could reduce traffic speeds, traffic noise, and the potential for hazard along residential streets, the environmental analysis concludes that the diversion of traffic onto residential streets under these alternatives would be a significant and unmitigatable impact.

Response to Comment NGO12-3

The commenter asks what will be done to address cut-through traffic in the neighborhoods. Please refer to Master Response 1, which discusses Placer County's intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Response to Comment NGO12-4

Selection of Alternatives 2 or 4 would reduce the capacity of SR 28 in Kings Beach during an emergency evacuation event. Two lanes in one direction could be provided—with traffic flowing around both sides of the roundabouts in each direction—but this would still be a reduction in overall capacity from current conditions, and this option is infeasible as it would not provide a travel lane in the opposite direction to allow emergency responders to access the event. The most likely event to require rapid evacuation would be a wildfire or other event in Incline Village, which would require westbound evacuation through Kings Beach. As there is only one westbound lane

between Crystal Bay and Kings Beach, provision of an emergency egress route using Fox Street and Speckled Street (in addition to the westbound lane on SR 28) would ensure that there is more capacity through Kings Beach than is provided from Crystal Bay to Kings Beach, while maintaining an eastbound travel lane for emergency responders.

The Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District has indicated that none of the alternatives would be cause for concern with regards to emergency response (see *Chapter 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS for a copy of a comment letter from Duane L. Whitelaw, Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District). Regarding issues with evacuation from traffic congestion, although Alternatives 2 and 4 would slightly worsen traffic congestion, emergency services would take over evacuation in the event of an emergency. In addition, other routes would be available for evacuation throughout the area, as discussed in the Community Impact Assessment, which was included as Appendix F of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment NGO12-5

Currently, no sidewalks or bike lanes exist in the KBCC. Each alternative includes the addition of a sidewalk and other barriers (including planters) to separate pedestrians and traffic. In addition, please see Master Response 5 regarding snow removal.

Response to Comment NGO12-6

County Department of Public Works engineering staff has reviewed and approved the analysis and conclusions of the traffic analysis. The final EA/EIR/EIS fully evaluates the impacts associated with all of the proposed alternatives, while the public workshops was meant to present the merits and impacts associated with all alternatives and to solicit feedback from the public.

Response to Comment NGO12-7

Placer County is working to ensure that, regardless of which project alternative is selected, adequate parking with appropriate signage will be installed for all businesses.

Per Placer County policy, businesses will not be entitled to compensation or relocation assistance if they are within the public ROW.

Response to Comment NGO12-8

The commenter is correct that fewer off-street spaces would be required under Alternative 3. However, an analysis of the economic benefits or cost savings associated with project alternatives or components is beyond the scope of evaluation in the environmental document. Please refer to the Project Report for an evaluation of preliminary costs associated with project alternatives

Response to Comment NGO12-9

This is a comment on the public workshops and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment NGO12-10

The Placer County DPW will evaluate all the comments received during the public comment period before identifying a preferred alternative. Please see also Master Response 4.

Public Workshop (PW) Responses

Comment Letter PW1—Scott Frykberg, Public Workshop

Response to PW1-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW2—Joy E. Baker, Public Workshop

Response to PW2-1

Analysis conducted in preliminary stages of project development indicated that it is not feasible to implement the large-scale level of transit improvements (such as shuttle service from intercept parking) that would be required to significantly impact traffic conditions in Kings Beach. However, any improvements to transit services do provide benefits to the community, and Placer County DPW is currently implementing expanded transit services to Kings Beach, including year-round transit service to Truckee. The commenter suggests that additional parking at the airport be arranged, as well as adding more shuttles and buses in order to create a more pedestrian-friendly town. Adding more shuttles and buses is beyond the scope of the proposed action. Although a transit master plan has identified future enhancement to the transit system, they are not part of this proposed action.

Response to PW2-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW3—Billie Jo Redeno, Public Workshop

Response to PW3-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW4—Dave Gardin, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW4-1

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of Alternative 4 with modifications. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter PW5—Steven J. Baker, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW5-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW6—Rennie Barta, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW6-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW7—Matt and Alisa Wagner, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW7-1

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and emergency access.

Response to Comment PW7-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW8—Jacqui Grandfield, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW8-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter PW9—Jessica McDonald, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW9-1

The commenter compares the KBCC to Tahoe City and states that pedestrians in Tahoe City are able to cross the road safely without lights and sidewalks because the speed limit is 25 mph. The speed limit on SR 28, which is administered by Caltrans, is 30 mph. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS, and changes to the speed limit are not proposed as part of the proposed action. However, the proposed action includes traffic-calming devices; please see Master Response 2.

Response to Comment PW9-2

As stated on page 2-18 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, Caltrans and Placer County evaluated and withdrew several potential alternatives based on cost, environmental effects, operational efficiency, construction phasing, maintainability, and their ability to meet the action objectives. Having fewer traffic lights with no traffic control would not meet the action objectives, which include increasing pedestrian safety.

Response to Comment PW9-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

The commenter suggests that a demonstration of the preferred alternative be held. This suggestion is not feasible, as this would greatly delay the proposed action's water quality, pedestrian/bicyclist mobility, and aesthetic components. Furthermore, Placer County does not have the funding to undergo such a demonstration, and delaying the proposed action could result in the loss of funding available for the proposed action.

Response to Comment PW9-4

The proposed action will increase pedestrian mobility and safety, as sidewalks currently do not exist in the KBCC and pedestrians compete with bicycles and traffic. Furthermore, the proposed action will be ADA compliant, as is a federal requirement, and will not preclude, prohibit, or limit ADA compliance or accessibility. Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Comment Letter PW10—Phil Thompson, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW10-1

The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of the public involvement process for the proposed action. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response required.

Response to Comment PW10-2

The commenter suggests that more research needs to be done to find impacts on traffic flow and impacts on business owners. The traffic study, which is included as Appendix L of the final EA/EIR/EIS, contains a full analysis of the traffic impacts of each of the alternatives. The Community Impact Assessment, which is included as Appendix F of the final EA/EIR/EIS also analyzes impacts on businesses in the KBCC. Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic flow and Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses and the PBID.

Comment Letter PW11—Danny S. Daniels, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW11-1

The Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District has indicated that none of the alternatives would be cause for concern with regards to emergency response (see *Chapter 2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS for a copy of a comment letter from Duane L. Whitelaw, Fire Chief of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District). Regarding issues with evacuation from traffic congestion, although Alternatives 2 and 4 would slightly worsen traffic congestion, emergency services would take over evacuation in the event of an

emergency. In addition, other routes would be available for evacuation throughout the area, as discussed in the Community Impact Assessment, which was included as Appendix F of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment PW11-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment PW11-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW12—Susan Daniels, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW12-1

As indicated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, all five intersections within the KBCC were evaluated to determine impacts associated with the proposed action. Remaining intersections could be considered for traffic controls in the future. None of the alternatives prohibit these devices in the future. Each situation will be evaluated on its own merits, and as conditions dictate, roundabouts or signals will be built at necessary intersections. Comment noted; no changes made.

Response to Comment PW12-2

As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, the goals of the proposed action include improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, water quality, and aesthetic character of the KBCC. The proposed action will help achieve planning goals by improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety, improving water quality, and improving the scenic character of the KBCC. Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment PW12-3

The commenter expresses their opposition to a three-lane alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW12-4

The commenter offers an opinion on their support for the public involvement process for the proposed action. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response required.

Comment Letter PW13—Ken Fetternolf, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW13-1

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of Alternative 4 with modifications. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Also, please see Master Response 4.

Response to Comment PW13-2

The commenter supports sidewalks that are less than 10 feet wide, which would occur under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. The commenter also opposes bike lanes on SR 28. Bike lanes are included under all alternatives in order to meet the needs of the Kings Beach Community Plan (KBCP). There is currently a need to improve bicycle mobility and safety in Kings Beach, especially considering the fact that bicycle use is expected to increase in Kings Beach.

Response to Comment PW13-3

The commenter asks how much the assessment will be for sidewalk maintenance. It is currently unknown how much costs will be to individual business owners. Please see Master Response 3 regarding costs to commercial property owners and the PBID to address the maintenance and upkeep of the proposed sidewalk improvements.

Comment Letter PW14—Vikki J. Baker, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW14-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW14-2

The commenter expresses their support of a four-lane alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. The commenter also suggests lakeside parking so that pedestrians do not have to cross SR 28.

As indicated Figure 2-3 in the final EA/EIR/EIS, potential parking south of SR 28 has been identified as part of the proposed action. In addition, please see Master Response 2 for traffic calming and pedestrian safety.

Comment Letter PW15—Irene Ottana, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW15-1

The commenter expresses their opposition to the three-lane alternatives due to safety concerns. Please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion, diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods, and Placer County's intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Comment Letter PW16—Richard C. Leon, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW16-1

The commenter expresses their opposition to the three-lane alternatives. Please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion and emergency access.

Response to Comment PW16-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW17—Vikki J. Baker, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW17-1

The commenter expresses concerns regarding local driving conditions and safety issues when delivery trucks park in the center turn lane. The proposed action will not change deliveries or access to driveways. Parking will still be available for deliveries on side streets. Under Alternative 3, delivery trucks would deliver to businesses in the same way that they deliver currently because Alternative 3 would be similar to existing conditions. For Alternatives 2 and 3, Placer County will consider adjusting sidewalks and parking widths to allow for clearly defined truck loading zones. Planters, signs, and traffic-calming/control measures would be used to designate these zones.

Response to Comment PW17-2

The commenter expresses their support for a four-lane alternative with modifications. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW18—Nayna Patel, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW18-1

The commenter states a cost estimate of \$7,500, which is inaccurate. It is currently unknown how much costs will be to individual business owners, but the cost of sidewalk maintenance will depend on the level and frequency of maintenance needed. Placer County will not pay for sidewalk maintenance through bank interest or other means. As in Tahoe City, it is the adjacent property owners will be responsible for their fair share of maintenance, which is the sidewalk area adjacent to their property. Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses and also Master Response 6 regarding snow removal.

Response to Comment PW18-2

Placer County will not give subsidies to business owners. As in Tahoe City, business owners will pay their fair share of maintenance responsibilities, which is the sidewalk area adjacent to their property. Although Placer County will own the sidewalks once they are constructed, the business owners will pay their fair share of maintenance responsibilities. Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses and maintenance costs.

Comment Letter PW19—Van Marshall, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW19-1

Curbs and gutters are a part of all alternatives, as shown in Figure 2-1 in the final EA/EIR/EIS. Currently, Kings Beach is not meeting the guidelines set out in the KBCP, which was adopted in 1996 with the goals of enhancing the community. The proposed action will also meet needs identified in the Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Improvement Program. Solely putting in curbs and gutters would not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action, which are to improve water quality, aesthetics, and pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Comment Letter PW20—Tamara Blanco, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW20-1

The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of the public involvement process for the proposed action and does not address and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Response to Comment PW20-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion and also Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW21—Vikki J. Baker, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW21-1

The commenter suggests adding speed bumps to SR 28 and not including stoplights. Speed bumps are not allowed on the State Highway System, per Caltrans guidelines, and are particularly problematic in snow country. With regards to traffic signal warrants, please see Master Response 9.

Response to Comment PW21-2

The commenter expresses an opinion that the proposed action will drive out tourists, which would adversely affect local businesses. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. However, the analysis presented in *Chapter 3.3* of the final EA/EIR/EIS indicates that the proposed action would not result in adverse effects to local and roadside businesses.

Response to Comment PW21-3

The commenter states that access to their home will be eliminated under the proposed action. Placer County will work with property and business owners to ensure access to all commercial and retail businesses will continue to be maintained along SR 28 and that access is not denied. Changes in access would not create major problems for businesses and consequently no mitigation is required.

Comment Letter PW22—Robert Kuchenmeister, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW22-1

The commenter expresses their opposition to narrowing SR 28. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW22-2

The commenter suggests simply adding curbs and gutters to the KBCC. The addition of sidewalks is consistent with the purpose and need and also improves pedestrian safety.

Additional improvements to aesthetics are included in the project's purpose and need in

order to meet the goals of the KBCP, which include enhancing the aesthetic quality of the KBCC. Furthermore, bike lanes are necessary to improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety, especially because bicycle use in increasing in the KBCC and Tahoe area.

Response to Comment PW22-3

The commenter suggests adding a boardwalk instead of sidewalks. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter PW23—Keri Gonsalves, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW23-1

The commenter suggests a balance between making the KBCC more pedestrian friendly but also providing on-street parking to maintain the economic vitality of businesses. Alternatives 2 and 3 both provide for on-street parking and measures to improve safety. Alternative 4 eliminates on-street parking. The commenter expresses the opinion that the loss of on-street parking will adversely affect local businesses. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. However, the analysis presented in *Chapter 3.3* of the final EA/EIR/EIS indicates that the proposed action would not result in adverse effects to local and roadside businesses.

Response to Comment PW23-2

The commenter indicates the need for safer crosswalks. Alternatives 2 and 4 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267 and Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk Street intersections (with a signal at the SR 267 intersection), while Alternative 3 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267, Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk intersections (with signals at the SR 267, Bear, and Coon intersections). Please see Master Response 9 regarding traffic signal warrants. At Secline Street, Placer County will consider crosswalks at this intersection during final project design. In addition, please see Master Response 2 for traffic calming and pedestrian safety.

Comment Letter PW24—Anonymous, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW24-1

The commenter is opposed to roundabouts and expresses the need for on-street parking. Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts. On-street parking is provided under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW24-2

The commenter expresses concerns regarding local driving conditions and safety issues when delivery trucks park in the center turn lane. Under Alternative 3, delivery trucks would deliver to businesses in the same way that they deliver currently, as Alternative 3 would be similar to existing conditions. For Alternatives 2 and 3, Placer County will consider adjusting sidewalks and parking widths to allow for clearly defined truck loading zones. Planters, signs, and traffic-calming/control measures would be used to designate these zones. In addition, please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses, deliveries, and parking.

Comment Letter PW25—Anne Maria, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW25-1

The commenter is in favor of the No Project Alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW26—Stella Fernandez, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW26-1

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW26-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Comment Letter PW27—Daniel Brehanan, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW27-1

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment PW27-2

The commenter indicates that taxes fund the proposed action. Please refer to the Project Report for an evaluation of preliminary costs and funding sources associated with project alternatives. Please see Master Response 7 regarding parking costs.

Response to Comment PW27-3

Improvements to pedestrian safety, including sidewalks, are included under all alternatives. Please see Master Response 2 for traffic calming and pedestrian safety.

Comment Letter PW28—Anonymous, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW28-1

The commenter supports Alternative 1 with modifications. The commenter suggests adding speed bumps to SR 28 and not including stoplights. Speed bumps are not allowed on the State Highway System, per Caltrans guidelines, and are particularly problematic in "snow country" as they hinder snow removal and can result in potentially hazardous icy patches.

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds. In addition, please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

The commenter expresses an opinion about financing for the proposed action. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter PW29—Steven E. Griggs, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW29-1

The commenter expresses their support for Alternative 2 with modifications. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

The commenter recommends on-street parking on SR 28. On-street parking is provided under Alternatives 2 and 3. Seasonal parking was proposed to minimize traffic congestion associated with motorists searching for and maneuvering for available parking spaces. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives and Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Comment Letter PW30—Steven Griggs, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW30-1

The commenter asks for Alternatives 2 with modifications. Please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter PW31—Illegible Name, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW31-1

The proposed action proposes only to replace parking lost by construction of proposed improvements. Please see Master Response 6 regarding parking enforcement.

Comment Letter PW32—Ken Promes, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW32-1

As analyzed in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, impacts on air quality have been fully addressed. There are no adverse impacts on air quality as a result of the proposed action. In addition, although there will be slight differences in emissions between the

different alternatives, no exceedances of applicable standards or thresholds would occur. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure AIR-1 will implement all applicable PCAPCD Best Available Mitigation Measures to further reduce impacts on air quality.

Regarding the analysis of various housing projects under review in Tahoe Vista, the traffic analysis assumes full buildout of *all* Community Plan and General Plan land uses throughout North Tahoe, Incline Village, Martis Valley and Crystal Bay, including buildout of the Tahoe Vista Community Plan. It therefore includes any potential traffic impacts on Kings Beach associated with the various current Tahoe Vista proposals.

Response to Comment PW32-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW33—John Nelson, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW33-1

Please see Master Response 1 regarding congestion and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW33-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW33-3

The commenter indicates that stoplights should be synchronized at the Bear Street, Coon Street, and Fox Street intersections to optimize traffic flow. No signal light is proposed at Fox Street as part of any of the alternatives. Alternative 3, which proposes traffic signals, would not create any adverse impacts with traffic circulation at these controlled intersections. Under Alternative 3, traffic signals would be synchronized through the commercial core and would assist with speed control on SR 28.

Response to Comment PW33-4

The commenter expresses their support for Alternative 3 with modifications. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW34—Ken Arnett, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW34-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW35—Dana Ernest, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW35-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW35-2

The commenter discusses costs associated with sidewalk maintenance and its effects on businesses. It is currently unknown how much costs will be to individual business owners. Please see Master Response 3 regarding sidewalk maintenance costs to commercial property owners and the PBID to address the maintenance and upkeep of the proposed sidewalk improvement. In addition, economic effects associated with project alternatives are evaluated in the final EA/EIR/EIS, and the analysis presented in *Chapter 3.3* of the final EA/EIR/EIS indicates that the proposed action would not result in adverse effects to local and roadside businesses.

Comment Letter PW36—Naiqi and Jimmy Liu, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW36-1

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on local businesses and deliveries.

Comment Letter PW37—Cris Hennessey, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW37-1

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment PW37-2

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS; no response is required.

Comment Letter PW38—Andrew Peluso, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW38-1

Caltrans and Placer County will be responsible for all public roadway improvements, and adjacent property owners will be responsible for private sidewalk maintenance. Placer County will also be responsible for costs of drainage improvements.

In addition, the commenter asks how much the assessment will be for sidewalk maintenance. It is currently unknown how much costs will be to individual business owners. Please see Master Response 3 regarding costs to commercial property owners and the PBID to address the maintenance and upkeep of the proposed sidewalk improvements.

Comment Letter PW39—Pam Jahnke, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW39-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives and Master Response 3 regarding deliveries.

Comment Letter PW40—Judy Layton, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW40-1

The commenter is in support of left turn signals from North Lake Boulevard and Deer Street for various reasons. No signal or roundabout is proposed at this time on Deer Street. Please see Master Response 9 regarding signal warrant warrants. Various left turn lanes and pedestrian improvements are proposed under all alternatives, which would help facilitate traffic flow. Placer County used input from the school district, the Boys and Girls Club, and other stakeholders during the project design phase. As a result, the proposed action would have no impact on the school, the Boys and Girls Club, or churches in the area, and the NTMP would help to increase safety of pedestrians.

Comment Letter PW41—Judy Layton, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW41-1

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking. On-street parking on SR 28 is provided under Alternatives 2 and 3. As stated on page 2-20 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, Alternative 3a, which included a signal at Deer Street, was dropped from further consideration because this location meets warrants based upon traffic volumes but not the accident or pedestrian warrant. However, the side street traffic volumes on Deer Street are relatively low (the lowest of any of the study intersections). Drivers along Deer Street also have the convenient option of shifting to nearby Bear Street to make a left turn movement onto SR 28 at a signalized location.

Response to Comment PW41-2

The commenter indicates that enhanced pedestrian crossing elements must be put in place at all unsignalized crosswalks. Alternatives 2 and 4 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267 and Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk Street intersections (with a signal at the SR 267 intersection), while Alternative 3 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267, Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk intersections (with signals at the SR 267, Bear, and Coon

intersections). At Secline Street, Placer County will consider crosswalks at this intersection during final project design. Also, please see Master Response 9 regarding traffic signal warrants.

The commenter indicates that the final EA/EIR/EIS should address pedestrian paths from satellite parking to the business core with evaluation of pedestrian LOS. As specific parking locations have not been determined, it is not possible to specify exact pedestrian routes. Subsequent planning and permitting for individual parking facilities will need to address provision of adequate pedestrian paths to the SR 28 sidewalks and the commercial core areas. The proposed action does include pedestrian paths to satellite lots along the roadways that intersect SR 28.

Response to Comment PW41-3

Please see Master Response 3 regarding maintenance costs.

Comment Letter PW42—Forrest Philpot, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW42-1

The commenter supports sidewalks and bike lanes, which are included under all alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for their comment.

Response to Comment PW42-2

The commenter is opposed to Alternative 3. The traffic impacts associated with Alternative 3 are described in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives.

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds. The commenter indicates that a left turn lane would help to alleviate congestion from vehicles turning left. A single dual-access center turn lane is proposed under Alternatives 2 and 4 that would allow left turns.

The commenter expresses an opinion on the merits of roundabouts. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. In addition, please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

The commenter indicates that a stoplight should be installed at the Bear Street intersection. A traffic signal at the Bear Street intersection is proposed under Alternative 3. This signal is not anticipated to cause traffic problems. It would operate at LOS A or B in all seasons, and traffic queues would not back up along SR 28 to block other public street intersections. As part of a signal (or roundabout) at this location, Brook Street would be converted to one-way eastbound away from the signal, so traffic entering from Brook Street would not complicate the operation of the signal.

Response to Comment PW42-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW43—John Griffins, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW43-1

The commenter supports public safety in Kings Beach. As stated in the purpose and need section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving pedestrian safety is one of the main objectives of the proposed action, and measures to improve pedestrian and bicycle safety are included under all alternatives. Please see Master Response 2 regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety and mobility.

Response to Comment PW43-2

Comment Letter PW44—Tammy Haas, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW44-1

The commenter supports safety in Kings Beach. As stated in the purpose and need section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving pedestrian safety is one of the main objectives of the proposed action and measures to both calm traffic and improve pedestrian and bicycle safety are included under all alternatives. Please see Master Response 2 regarding pedestrian and bicycle safety and mobility.

Response to Comment PW44-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW45—Victoria Summers, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW45-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW46—Terese Salmonto, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW46-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW47—Patrick Feeley, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW47-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW48—Mike Lefrancois, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW48-1

The commenter expresses the concern that on-street parking will promote speeding, as will bus loading and turn out zones, when these areas are vacant. The commenter expresses using colored pavement in these areas. This could be considered in the final

design. When on-street parking is in use, it tends to reduce travel speeds, as drivers tend to be more cautious traveling near cars that may exit the on-street spaces at any time. However, when not in use, it is true that wider roadway cross-sections tend to encourage higher travel speeds. The use of colored pavements can reduce the perceived width of the roadway. However, this strategy would increase costs and would require Caltrans approval. It would also not be effective at night, or in snow conditions.

Response to Comment PW48-2

Breaking up on-street parking bays and bus/truck loading zones by providing curb extensions can be an effective means of reducing the perceived roadway cross section, and thus travel speeds. Opportunities to provide curb extensions will be pursued as part of detailed design.

Response to Comment PW48-3

The commenter suggests lakeside parking be coordinated with California State Parks. At peak times, the State Recreation Area parking is fully utilized and does not represent an opportunity to reduce the necessary number of replacement parking spaces. Parking options at the beach will be investigated during detail design.

Response to Comment PW48-4

The commenter suggests providing off-street parking signage. Placer County will ensure that parking lots have adequate signage and that signage will be used on SR 28 to direct traffic to off-street parking areas.

Comment Letter PW49—Allie and Ashley Hendrix, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW49-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. Additional landscaping will be provided under all alternatives, although Alternative 4 will provide for the widest sidewalks of the four alternatives.

Comment Letter PW50—Dave Wilderotter, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW50-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW51—Vincent Dovet, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW51-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW52—Harry Parker, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW52-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW53—Sally McKay, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW53-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW54—Marti and Larry Barnore, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW54-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW55—Taylor Family, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW55-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW56—Tyler LaVerde, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW56-1

Response to Comment PW56-2

Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Comment Letter PW57—Theresa May Duggan, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW57-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW58—Louise Parker, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW58-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW59—Sylvia Deering, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW59-1

The commenter expresses their support of Alternative 2. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. The commenter is also in favor of slowing traffic in Kings Beach. Traffic calming is discussed in Master Response 2, and speed enforcement is discussed in Master Response 6.

Comment Letter PW60—Phil Broadbent, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW60-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW61—Suzanne Marie (Sally) Miller, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW61-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW61-2

Comment Letter PW62—Rachel Snyder, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW62-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW62-2

The commenter is opposed to the three-lane alternative. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives and also Master Response 2 regarding safety and roundabouts. The commenter is correct that Alternatives 2 and 4 will increase traffic congestion as compared to Alternative 3. These traffic effects are described in the traffic chapter of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment PW62-3

The commenter expresses the need for year-round parking on SR-28. Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment PW62-4

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses and maintenance costs of sidewalks.

Comment Letter PW63—Charles V. Snyder, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW63-1

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking. Regarding payment for off-street parking lots, please see Master Response 7.

Response to Comment PW63-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment PW63-3

This comment focuses on funding of the proposed action rather than on the adequacy of the environmental analysis. The determination of which alternative will be selected will

be based on the decisions of the Placer County Board of Supervisors and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's (TRPA's) Governing Board.

Comment Letter PW64—Tim Snyder, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW64-1

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW64-2

The commenter offers an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Comment Letter PW65—Tim Snyder, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW65-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. As described in the *Chapter 3.6* in the final EA/EIR/EIS, the commenter is correct that compared to Alternative 3, 2, and 4 would result in increased traffic congestion at certain times of the year. The final EA/EIR/EIS has identified this as a significant and unavoidable impact.

Response to Comment PW65-2

The commenter indicates that cut-through traffic is a concern. Please refer to Master Response 1 discusses Placer County's intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The commenter indicates that as congestion gets worse, additional traffic lights, crosswalks, and CHP patrol may be required. Please see Master Response 9 regarding traffic signal warrants. Regarding CHP, increases in CHP patrol are not proposed as part

of the proposed action. However, the proposed action includes traffic-calming improvements; please see Master Response 2.

Response to Comment PW65-3

The commenter discusses concerns with impacts of maintenance fees and snow removal requirements on business owners. Please see Master Response 3 regarding costs of sidewalk maintenance and snow removal to businesses.

Response to Comment PW65-4

The commenter offers an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Response to Comment PW65-5

The commenter implies that the literature used during the public involvement process shows bias. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement. In addition, Master Response 4 describes how a preferred alternative will be selected. This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Comment Letter PW66—Larry W. Dowdle, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW66-1

Please see Responses to Comment Letter IP2.

Comment Letter PW67—Pam Lefrancois, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW67-1

The commenter expresses their opposition to Alternative 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW67-2

The commenter expresses their support for Alternative 4. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW67-3

Please see Master Response 6 regarding parking enforcement.

Comment Letter PW68—Steve Rogers, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW68-1

The commenter expresses support of Alternative 4 with the addition of limited parking, loading zones, and traffic calming. Traffic-calming devices including pedestrian crossings and roundabouts are included in this alternative. Although Alternative 4 does not include on-street parking on SR 28, Placer County has considered modifications to the preferred alternative based on community input. Also, please see Master Response 4. The commenter also states that parking and speeding enforcement is necessary for all of the alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speed and parking enforcement.

Comment Letter PW69—Don Hotaling, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW69-1

The commenter expresses their preferences in regards to a preferred alternative and also suggests that there be timed parking during the summer. Currently, parking duration has not been determined for the proposed action and will depend on which alternative is ultimately selected. The traffic study shows that motorists searching for parking spaces would exacerbate traffic congestion.

Comment Letter PW70—Jo-Ann Turner, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW70-1

The commenter suggests that a demonstration of the preferred alternative be held. This suggestion is not feasible as, closing or restriping the roadway to "simulate" project conditions would greatly delay the proposed action's water quality, pedestrian/bicyclist mobility, and aesthetic components. Furthermore, Placer County does not have the

funding to undergo such a demonstration, and delaying the proposed action could result in the loss of funding available for the proposed action.

Comment Letter PW71—Randy Williams, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW71-1

The commenter states that this action should be brought to special election of the residents of Kings Beach. Placer County had public input throughout the process of this document. The final determination of which alternative is ultimately selected will be based on a vote of the Placer County Board of Supervisors and TRPA's Governing Board. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW72—Rose Peluso, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW72-1

As stated in *Chapter 2.2* of the final EA/EIR/EIS under impact SOC-4, the proposed action is not expected to cause changes in sales tax or property tax revenue in the Kings Beach area. Placer County hopes the proposed action will be a catalyst for the economy of Kings Beach. In addition, please refer to the Project Report for an evaluation of preliminary costs and funding sources associated with project alternatives.

Comment Letter PW73—Renee Shadforth, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW73-1

The commenter expresses their support of a combined version of Alternatives 2 and 4. Placer County intends to choose a preferred alternative based on the needs and wants of the community. Please see Master Response 4. The commenter further expresses their support for roundabouts. Placer County thanks the commenter.

Comment Letter PW74—Lesley Bruening, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW74-1

The commenter supports Alternative 4 with future modifications. Please see Master Response 4.

Comment Letter PW75—Helen Foster, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW75-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW76—Anonymous, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW76-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Comment Letter PW77—Michael Morrissey, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW77-1

Costs associated with roundabouts mostly depend on whether they are installed as part of a new roadway project (relatively cheap) or a retrofit into an existing roadway (relatively expensive). Although the costs of the signal equipment and poles are avoided, roundabouts require a relatively high level of lighting, and also can require additional drainage pipes and drop inlets. Costs of the two single-lane roundabouts recently installed in Truckee have been on the order of \$1.5–1.8 million apiece.

Maintenance costs associated with roundabouts are low, as there are not signal poles and signal equipment to maintain. The roundabouts in Vail and Avon, Colorado, have been in place for almost a decade, with little maintenance required. This cost is dependent on design. For instance, a rolled or mountable curb will have less damage and maintenance costs than a vertical curb.

In addition, the commenter supports Alternative 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW78—Edee Campbell, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW78-1

The commenter expresses opposition to Alternatives 2 and 4. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. Placer County has committed to working with individual business and homeowners to ensure that access to their property is not lost. The subject parcel may lose driveway access to SR 28 (but retain access to Coon Street) unless reciprocal access can be negotiated with neighboring property.

Response to Comment PW78-2

Placer County may consider modifying or combining aspects of the alternatives based on community input. Placer County intends on maintaining property access for individual businesses and homeowners along SR 28.

The commenter expresses opposition to Alternatives 2 and 4. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. Placer County has committed to working with individual business and homeowners to ensure that access to their property is not lost. The subject parcel may lose driveway access to SR 28 (but retain access to Coon Street) unless reciprocal access can be negotiated with neighboring property.

Comment Letter PW79—C. Dominguez, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW79-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Comment Letter PW80—Peter Morris, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW80-1

The commenter expresses the merits of roundabouts. No response is required.

Response to Comment PW80-2

The commenter asks for a combination of Alternatives 2 and 4. Placer County may consider modifying or combining aspects of the alternatives based on community input. Please see also Master Response 4.

Comment Letter PW81—Anonymous, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW81-1

The commenter expresses their support of a combination of Alternatives 2 and 4. Placer County may consider modifying or combining aspects of the alternatives based on community input. Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking, delivery zones, and effects on businesses.

Comment Letter PW82—Anonymous, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW82-1

Placer County is committing to traffic-calming measures in the grid at two different times: first, prior to closing any portion of the highway for construction as an element of the TMP and second as a component of the proposed action to be completed prior to the end of construction. In addition, please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods and proposed NTMP.

Response to Comment PW82-2

It is not clear from the comment where the commenter believes right turn lanes are required. Right turn lanes (other than the westbound right turn lane from SR 28 to SR 267) were not found to be required to provide adequate LOS at any signal or stop sign controlled intersection.

Comment Letter PW83—Anonymous, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW83-1

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic flow.

Comment Letter PW84—Wayne Vieler, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW84-1

The commenter suggests that roundabouts be flat and without foliage. Typical design would include some landscaping while providing adequate visibility.

Caltrans has specific requirements regarding landscaping in roundabouts that would be followed if this alternative is chosen. Although it is important to provide adequate sight distance of a portion of a roundabout, drivers do not need to be able to see directly across the roundabout.

Comment Letter PW85—Glenn Martin, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW85-1

The commenter expresses their support for Alternatives 2 and 4. Please see Master Response 4 in regards to selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and maintenance costs.

Response to Comment PW85-2

The commenter expresses merits of the Alternatives 2 and 4. Concerns with the safety of pedestrians crossing at roundabouts are discussed in Master Response 3.

Comment Letter PW86—Kathie Chilcote, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW86-1

The commenter expresses support for Alternative 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW86-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Comment Letter PW87—Nancy Gaines, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW87-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW88—Cris Hennessy, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW88-1

The commenter suggests redirecting the grid to a one-way. Redirecting the grid to one-way is beyond the scope of the proposed action and would require its own environmental documentation. However, Placer County has committed to implementing a NTMP, which may include redirecting grid traffic, to help minimize the effects of neighborhood cut-through traffic. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Master Response 1 discusses Placer County's intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment PW88-2

The commenter expresses their opposition to additional signage. However, signage is intended to induce pedestrian safety, which is one of the goals of the proposed action. Placer County will work to minimize the number of roadway signs while still meeting the signage requirements of Placer County, TRPA, and Caltrans

Comment Letter PW89—Sandra Harrison, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW89-1

The commenter expresses their support of Alternative 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW89-2

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Comment Letter PW90—Caesar Naples, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW90-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW90-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Comment Letter PW91—Jim Steinmann, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW91-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW91-2

The commenter suggests adding trees every 60 feet on both sides of SR 28. Several proposed scenic and aesthetic improvements common to all build alternatives are discussed in *Section 2.4.3* on page 2-13 of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Those improvements include planters and additional landscaping, but do not specify adding trees every 60 feet. The public will be invited to provide input during the final design of the preferred alternative.

Comment Letter PW92—Kali Kopley, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW92-1

The commenter suggests adding medians to the crosswalks at Deer, Fox, and Chipmunk Streets. Although not proposed, Placer County may consider the inclusion of medians.

Caltrans would typically not allow raised medians in "snow country," particularly if they are short and discontinuous. Medians could preclude certain traffic movements (such as two-stage left-turn movements) and thus increase traffic congestion. They would also need to be carefully designed to avoid eliminating driveway access. However, the potential for medians can be reexamined as part of final project design.

Response to Comment PW92-2

As stated on page 2-19 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, an alternative with a roundabout located at the intersection of SR 28 and SR 267 was evaluated but withdrawn after further analysis. A two lane roundabout would be required to accommodate the anticipated traffic. This proposed roundabout would have required extensive roadway and private driveway modifications, as well as significant ROW acquisitions. Geometric difficulties made this alternative infeasible at this time.

Response to Comment PW92-3

Comment noted. No additional response is required.

Comment Letter PW93—Jack Chillemi, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW93-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW94—Lenoir DeMonie, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW94-1

The commenter expresses the merits of roundabouts. No response is required.

Response to Comment PW94-2

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment PW94-3

Placer County will propose development of a neighborhood traffic management program to address cut-through traffic, if Alternatives 2 or 4 are selected.

Speed bumps are not feasible in "snow country" as they impede snow removal and can result in buildup of icy spots. They are also not allowed on state highways per Caltrans regulations.

Comment Letter PW95—Pete Fonster Marer, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW95-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW96—James A. Fortney, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW96-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. Signage is typically provided to indicate bike lanes.

Response to Comment PW96-2

Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment PW96-3

This comment is outside of the scope of the proposed action.

Response to Comment PW96-4

This comment is outside of the scope of the proposed action.

Comment Letter PW97—Haely Kaynes, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW97-1

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Please see *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS to review the project description.

Comment Letter PW98—Tom Collin, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW98-1

As stated on page 2-19 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, an alternative with a roundabout located at the intersection of SR 28 and SR 267 was evaluated and withdrawn. However,

extensive roadway and driveway modifications, as well as ROW acquisitions would be required. Additional geometric difficulties made this alternative infeasible.

Comment Letter PW99—Priscilla Mills, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW99-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts and Master Response 4 regarding selection of preferred alternatives. The commenter supports traffic calming and roundabouts. Traffic calming is a component of all three build alternatives, while roundabouts are components of Alternatives 2 and 4.

Comment Letter PW100—Kali Kopley, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW100-1

Each of the proposed action's build alternatives will include landscaping. Placer County will evaluate feasible design options, including "green" design elements, and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Response to Comment PW100-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW101—Tom Trimble, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW101-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives and Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Comment Letter PW102—Kevin McDermott, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW102-1

Comment Letter PW103—John Shuff, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW103-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW104—Crin Connolly, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW104-1

The commenter expresses their support of Alternative 2. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. In addition, the commenter supports crosswalks and garbage cans, which are included under the alternatives, and also suggests diagonal parking if there must be street parking. There is not sufficient roadway width to allow for diagonal parking, and diagonal parking is typically not considered on high volume roadways.

Comment Letter PW105—Susie Shoberg, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW105-1

The commenter expresses concern regarding pedestrian safety. Traffic calming and other measures to enhance pedestrian safety, such as sidewalks, crossings, and curbs and gutters are components of each project build alternative.

Comment Letter PW106—Eugene Duggan, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW106-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW107—Rand and Sherie Latter, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW107-1

The commenter suggests that roundabouts are better for air quality than stoplights. The differences between these two options are relatively minor and depend on the traffic

operations at any particular time. Please refer to the *Air and Noise* chapters of the EIR document (Chapters 3.1 and 3.9, respectively).

Comment Letter PW108—Sherie Carter, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW108-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding pedestrian safety. All alternatives will provide safety improvements.

Comment Letter PW109—Rick Papeleo, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW109-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives and Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts. In addition, Placer County will evaluate feasible design options, including "green" design elements, and details of design elements will be determined during final design of the proposed action.

Comment Letter PW110—Sue Kyler, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW110-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW111—Anonymous, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW111-1

The commenter suggests redirecting the grid to a one-way. Redirecting the grid to one-way is beyond the scope of the proposed action and would require its own environmental documentation. However, Placer County has committed to implementing a NTMP, which may include redirecting grid traffic, to help minimize the effects of neighborhood cut-through traffic. The NTMP is a collaborative process with the community to develop traffic-calming measures for the residential neighborhood. However, the NTMP will not reduce diverted traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level. Please refer to Master

Response 1 discusses Placer County's intention to implement an NTMP to help minimize impacts of diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Comment Letter PW112—Illegible Name, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW112-1

This comment is unclear and therefore we are not able to respond to it.

Response to Comment PW112-2

The commenter expresses their support for Alternative 2 and also states that Alternative 3 would cost too much. Each of the alternatives has been more expensive than the others at different times, and the cost of each alternative has changed as the proposed action has developed. Funding is not tied to a specific alternative. In addition, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW112-3

The commenter states that the environmental analysis must include accurate air quality information. *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS contains the air quality analysis, which is sufficient and indicates no significant impacts. It is not clear what portion of the air quality analysis the commenter considers to be inaccurate.

Comment Letter PW113—Jim Gardiner, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW113-1

The commenter expresses concern that roundabouts should be placed at all intersections. As stated on pages 2-20 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, Alternative 2b with roundabouts at Deer and Fox Streets was initially considered but withdrawn because it would involve substantial intrusions onto private property. The commenter also suggests that businesses in the KBCC are suffering due to speeding. However speed limits are administered by Caltrans and enforced by the CHP. Enforcement of speed limits is beyond the scope of the proposed action. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW114—Stacey Woo, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW114-1

Streetlights with shields are included under all alternatives, as stated on page 2-13 of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Comment Letter PW115—Kayla and Sasha Kelly, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW115-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW116—John Foster, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW116-1

Regards the big tree in front of the Crown Motel, the tree location does conflict with either the sidewalk or curb and gutter improvements, depending which roadway alternative is being proposed. The TRPA forester was consulted and agreed that the tree poses a potential hazard because of its codominant stem on the structure side of the tree. Caltrans environmental staff agreed with the TRPA forester that this would be a markable tree and will need to be removed.

Response to Comment PW116-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW117—Bruce Kuecker, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW117-1

Comment Letter PW118—Don Hotaling, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW118-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives, and Master Response 3 regarding parking and effects on businesses. Seasonal parking was proposed in Alternative 2 to minimize traffic congestion cause by motorists searching and maneuvering for parking spaces. The commenter is incorrect that Brook Street is being proposed as a one-way street. Instead, Bear Street to Coon Street is proposed as one-way.

Comment Letter PW119—Dana Ernest, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW119-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives, and also Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses. The air quality impacts of the alternatives are described in *Chapter 3.1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Comment Letter PW120—Scott Green, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW120-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts and safety.

Comment Letter PW121—Pearl Arbeunian, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW121-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW122—Marlene J. Judd, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW122-1

The commenter suggests improvements to SR 28. However, a bridge would not be feasible, as it would conflict with the TRPA visual code. The commenter also suggests moving old box cars and set putting them on a turntable in the intersections to improve

safety for school children. This conflicts with TRPA, Caltrans, and Placer County requirements and is not considered feasible. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW123—David Hopp, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW123-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW124—Barbara Breuning, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW124-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW125—Helen Foster, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW125-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW126—Megen Chillemi, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW126-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives and also Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts. The commenter asks the opinion of other business owners in Kings Beach. This is not a comment on the adequacy of the environmental document, and therefore no response is required.

Comment Letter PW127—Carolyn Pretzer, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW127-1

The commenter supports wider sidewalks and slower traffic. All of the alternatives incorporate sidewalks, which is an improvement over existing conditions. Traffic-

calming devices such as roundabouts, stoplights, pedestrian crossings, and signage area are incorporated into some alternatives as well.

Comment Letter PW128—Suzanne Shoberg, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW128-1

The commenter suggests having 15-minute pull-out areas under Alternative 4. Placer County will consider making modifications to the preferred alternative based on community input.

Response to Comment PW128-2

The commenter suggests heating sidewalks in order to keep them clear of snow. Snow removal will be the responsibility of the adjacent property owners. Final design will most likely include an evaluation of a heater sidewalk system.

Comment Letter PW129—Candy Dowdle, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW129-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW129-2

Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds. Extension of sidewalks to Stateline, although worthy, are outside the scope of the proposed action.

Comment Letter PW130—Susan F. Smith, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW130-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW131—Carolyn Trimble, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW131-1

Comment Letter PW132—Walter Joseph, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW132-1

The commenter states that the proposed action should be brought to special election of the residents of Kings Beach. Placer County solicited public input throughout the process of this document. The final determination of which alternative is ultimately selected will be based on a vote of the Placer County Board of Supervisors and TRPA's Governing Board. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement and Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW133—Adam Going, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW133-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW134—Peggy Hine, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW134-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW135—Will Johnson, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW135-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW136—Kevin McDermott, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW136-1

Comment Letter PW137—Christopher Nolder, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW137-1

The commenter expresses merits of the public involvement process and does not address environmental impacts of the proposed action. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW137-2

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW138—Ryan Smutz, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW138-1

The goals of the proposed action are clearly outlined in the *Purpose and Need* section of *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. These goals include improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, water quality, and aesthetic character of the KBCC. Improvements to pedestrian and bicycle mobility are needed to increase pedestrian safety and accommodate for the growing amount of bicyclists in the KBCC. In addition, existing stormwater treatment facilities currently do not meet standards set by local regulatory agencies. Alternatives 2–4 of the proposed action would result in long-term benefits to the quality of surface runoff due to improved drainage, collection, conveyance, and treatment facilities. Aesthetic improvements are also needed in the KBCC in order to meet the thresholds of the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP).

Response to Comment PW138-2

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Comment Letter PW139—Ian Smith, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW139-1

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of this proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included in the project alternatives to enhance the safety of Kings Beach. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding traffic calming.

Response to Comment PW139-2

The commenter expresses the need for an aesthetically pleasing KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, the proposed action aims to improve aesthetic values of the KBCC.

Response to Comment PW139-3

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW140—Anonymous, Public Workshop

Response to Comment PW140-1

The commenter expresses concern regarding speeding in the KBCC area. This is not a comment on the environmental document. However, the proposed action does include traffic-calming device such as roundabouts and controlled intersections that are expected to slow down the flow of traffic.

Response to Comment PW140-2

Please see Master Response 2 regarding traffic-calming devices.

Response to Comment PW140-3

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Comment Letter PW141—Public Hearing Transcription, Public Workshop TRPA Governing Board Meeting, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment PW141-1

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-2

The *Purpose and Need* of the proposed action has been established by the lead agency. The *Purpose and Need* is described in detail in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment PW141-3

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses and Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion and diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment PW141-4

The commenter expresses the necessity of public input during the goal setting process, and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the need for public consensus. Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Furthermore, improvements to aesthetics are included in the project's purpose and need in order to meet the goals of the KBCP, which include enhancing the aesthetic quality of the KBCC.

Response to Comment PW141-5

A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This will result in minimized project-related traffic delay. Please see Master Response 5 regarding snow removal.

Response to Comment PW141-6

This comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental document. No response is required. However, the construction of new collection and conveyance infrastructure implemented as part of the proposed action will improve water quality in the KBCC, as stated in *Chapter 3.13* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment PW141-7

A Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented during construction as stated in Mitigation Measure TRA-2. This will result in minimized project-related traffic delay. Also, please see Master Response 5 regarding snow removal.

Response to Comment PW141-8

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment PW141-9

The commenter offers an opinion and does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County thanks the commenter. No response is required.

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-10

This comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental document. No response is required.

Response to Comment PW141-11

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-12

Response to Comment PW141-13

The commenter supports wider sidewalks and a narrower street. All of the alternatives incorporate sidewalks, which is an improvement over existing conditions. Alternatives 2 and 4 incorporate narrowing SR 28. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-14

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding traffic calming.

Response to Comment PW141-15

Please see Master Response 8 regarding public involvement.

Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-16

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses. In addition, it should be noted that Placer County will work with property and business owners regarding access to their property to ensure that access is not denied.

Response to Comment PW141-17

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment PW141-18

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment PW141-19

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-20

The commenter expresses concern regarding speed limits in the action area. Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment PW141-21

Table 2-1 has been revised to reflect changes recommended by the commenter.

Response to Comment PW141-22

Sidewalks will be provided under all alternatives, although Alternative 4 will provide for the widest sidewalks of the four alternatives. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-23

The commenter expresses merits of signage and does not address environmental impacts of the proposed action. The purpose of public comments on the final EA/EIR/EIS is to provide input on the adequacy of the environmental document, not the merits of the proposed action. However, comments on the merits of the proposed action were presented to the decision makers for their consideration during project deliberation, and a preferred alternative was chosen based partly on input from the community.

Response to Comment PW141-24

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-25

Placer County feels that the public comment period, which included several workshops and opportunities for public input, was sufficient to obtain comments from the public. Placer County staff attended each of these workshops.

Response to Comment PW141-26

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses, as well as Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment PW141-27

The commenter expresses merits of the public involvement process and does not address environmental impacts of the proposed action. Placer County thanks the commenter.

Response to Comment PW141-28

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW141-29

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-30

The commenter expresses merits of the public involvement process and does not address environmental impacts of the proposed action. Placer County thanks the commenter.

Response to Comment PW141-31

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverted traffic through residential neighborhoods. A neighborhood traffic management plan will be proposed if Alternative 2 or 4 is selected.

Response to Comment PW141-32

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW141-33

As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action includes improving the scenic quality of the KBCC. Improvements to aesthetics are included under all alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input and has considered the comments in choosing a preferred alternative.

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly and safety-oriented KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of this proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach.

Response to Comment PW141-35

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment PW141-36

The commenter is in favor of Alternative 4 and believes it will increase safety. The proposed action will increase pedestrian and bicycle safety and mobility through the KBCC under all alternatives, as the KBCC currently lacks sidewalks and pedestrian crossings. However, roundabouts are included under Alternatives 2 and 4, which are known traffic-calming devices. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-37

The commenter expresses merits of the public involvement process. Placer County thanks the commenter. In addition, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-38

The commenter is opposed to Alternative 3. Effects of Alternative 3 are discussed in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-39

Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

Response to Comment PW141-40

The commenter expresses an opinion regarding the need for a more pedestrian friendly and safety-oriented KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action addresses both of these issues. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included as part of the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach.

Response to Comment PW141-41

Please see Master Response 3 regarding the PBID.

Response to Comment PW141-42

The commenter is in favor of the three-lane alternatives and a more pedestrian-friendly KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of this proposed action addresses this issue. Pedestrian and bicycle mobility will be improved under all alternatives so that pedestrians and bicyclists will not have to compete for space on the shoulder of SR 28. Additional pedestrian crossings, sidewalks, bike lanes, and controlled intersections are included in the proposed action to enhance the safety of Kings Beach. Also, please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-43

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts and Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment PW141-44

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment PW141-45

The commenter suggests adding stoplights at Bear Street, Fox Street, and Secline Street. Please see Master Response 9 regarding traffic signal warrants.

Response to Comment PW141-46

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW141-47

The commenter indicates that enhanced pedestrian crossing elements must be put in place at additional crosswalks instead of roundabouts. Alternatives 2 and 4 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267 and Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk Street intersections (with a signal at the SR 267 intersection), while Alternative 3 would have enhanced and clearly marked pedestrian crossings at the SR 267 and Deer, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk Street intersections (with signals at the SR 267, Bear, and Coon intersections). Please see Master Response 9 regarding traffic signal warrants. Also, please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW141-48

Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-49

Please see Master Response 1 regarding traffic congestion.

Response to Comment PW141-50

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment PW141-51

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW141-52

Please see Master Response 6 regarding traffic speeds.

One of the main goals of the KBCC Improvement Project is to improve pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety through the KBCC. Dedicated bike lanes and sidewalks; enhanced pedestrian crossings; installation of controlled intersections; and traffic-calming devices, such as roundabouts, are a large part of the proposed improvements. Currently, pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles all compete for travel space along the KBCC; sidewalks and bike lanes do not exist in several areas of the KBCC.

Response to Comment PW141-54

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment PW141-55

Please see Master Response 3 regarding effects on businesses.

Response to Comment PW141-56

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment PW141-57

As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving scenic quality of the area as well as improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility, which are aspects included under all alternatives, will lead to positive economic growth.

Response to Comment PW141-58

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment PW141-59

The commenter expresses concerns regarding signage in the KBCC. As stated in *Chapter 3.15* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, design standards in the TRPA Code of Ordinances, the Design Review Guidelines, Scenic Quality Improvement Program, and Technical Appendices of the Regional Plan for the Lake Tahoe Basin, the *Draft Roadway*

Design Standards and Guidelines, Draft Guidelines for Projects Located on the California State Highways in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and the Placer County Tahoe Area Sign Ordinance will be used to develop signage along the KBCC. Placer County is responsible for the implementation of these measures into the design of signage. In order to ensure that the mitigation measures are implemented, Placer County will adopt a Mitigation Monitoring Plan and will ensure parking way-finding signage is posted.

Response to Comment PW141-60

As stated in *Chapter 1* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, improving scenic quality of the area as well as improving pedestrian and bicycle mobility will lead to positive economic growth.

Response to Comment PW141-61

The commenter supports sidewalks that are less than 17 feet wide, which would occur under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-62

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW141-63

Please see Master Response 3 regarding the PBID.

Response to Comment PW141-64

The commenter suggests that a demonstration of the preferred alternative be held. This suggestion is not feasible, as this would greatly delay the proposed action's water quality, pedestrian/bicyclist mobility, and aesthetic components. Furthermore, Placer County does not have the funding to undergo such a demonstration, and delaying the proposed action could result in the loss of funding available for the proposed action.

Synchronization of traffic signals in Kings Beach is a good idea, one that will be pursued in project design if Alternative 3 is selected. Synchronization could potentially be used as a speed control measure, by timing signals in the dominant traffic volume direction to provide a series of green lights to drivers traveling at the speed limit.

Response to Comment PW141-66

This comment does not address the adequacy of the final EA/EIR/EIS. No response is required.

Response to Comment PW141-67

The commenter is opposed to Alternative 3. Effects of Alternative 3 on traffic are described in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-68

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. The commenter also suggests using the areas within the roundabout planters as potential locations for drainage structures. Caltrans will not allow the installation of any detention ponds or infiltration vaults within the ROW.

Response to Comment PW141-69

The commenter indicates that the highway should be realigned in order for the roundabouts to fit and to minimize ROW acquisitions. The highway will not be realigned because the roundabouts have been designed to minimize any ROW acquisition.

Response to Comment PW141-70

As stated on page 2-19 of the final EA/EIR/EIS, an alternative with a roundabout located at the intersection of SR 28 and SR 267 was evaluated but withdrawn. However, extensive roadway and driveway modifications, as well as ROW acquisitions would be required. Additional geometric difficulties made this alternative infeasible.

Response to Comment PW141-71

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-72

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-73

Please see Master Response 5 regarding snow removal.

Response to Comment PW141-74

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-75

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment PW141-76

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW141-77

Please see Master Response 1 regarding diverting traffic through residential neighborhoods.

Response to Comment PW141-78

As stated in *Chapter 1*, the purpose and need of the proposed action includes improving the scenic quality of the KBCC. Improvements to aesthetics are included under all alternatives. Placer County thanks the commenter for this input and has considered the comments in choosing a preferred alternative.

Response to Comment PW141-79

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and effects on businesses. The final EA/EIR/EIS does identify some potential parking lots (see Figure 3.7-1).

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW141-81

Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Comment Letter PW142—Public Hearing Transcription (Governing Board Comments), May 24, 2007

Response to Comment PW142-1

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts and safety.

Response to Comment PW142-2

Although a transit master plan has identified future enhancement to the transit system, buses are not part of the proposed action.

Response to Comment PW142-3

At different times, each of the alternatives has been more expensive than the others, and the cost of each alternative has changed as the proposed action has developed. Funding is not tied to a specific alternative.

Response to Comment PW142-4

All alternatives include transit stops. As stated in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS, transit stops are currently provided along both sides of SR 28 near Secline, Bear, Coon, Fox, and Chipmunk Streets. In addition, there is a westbound stop near Deer Street. These locations will not change under the proposed action. Impacts on transit are discussed in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment PW142-5

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking and effects on businesses.

The commenter is correct to suggest that the four-lane alternative would be similar to existing conditions in regards to traffic. Both the no-build and the four-lane alternative would exceed future traffic criteria. However, the four-lane alternative incorporates measures to induce pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety whereas the no-build does not.

Response to Comment PW142-7

The commenter is correct to suggest that the four-lane alternative would be similar to existing conditions in regards to traffic. Both the no-build and the four-lane alternative would exceed future traffic criteria. However, the four-lane alternative incorporates measures to induce pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety whereas the no-build does not.

Response to Comment PW142-8

Under all alternatives, public parking will be made available to merchants in Kings Beach. Potential lots are identified in Figure 3.7-1 in the final EA/EIR/EIS. Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment PW142-9

Under all alternatives, public parking will be made available to merchants in Kings Beach. Potential lots are identified in Figure 3.7-1 in the final EA/EIR/EIS. Also, please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment PW142-10

Please see Master Response 3 regarding parking.

Response to Comment PW142-11

Under Alternative 2, on-street parking would be restricted during the summer peak season in order to improve traffic flow. These effects are described in *Chapter 3.6* of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Under Alternative 2, parking would be restricted using either physical barriers such as planters or enforcement.

Response to Comment PW142-13

The commenter asks if the area used for on-street parking would be used as an additional traffic lane when parking is restricted during the peak summer period. This would not occur; the restricted parking areas are too narrow for a traffic lane and will remain a buffer between pedestrians and traffic.

Response to Comment PW142-14

The commenter expresses an opinion in support of Alternative 2 due to parking flexibility. It should be noted that Caltrans will not allow year-round parking along SR 28 under Alternative 2. Please see Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives.

Response to Comment PW142-15

The commenter asks whether or not ROW acquisition is required for the alternatives. The four-lane alternative fits within the ROW, and temporary easements would be required during construction. Under the three-lane alternatives, ROW acquisitions would occur for the roundabouts.

Response to Comment PW142-16

The commenter is correct that private property will need to be acquired for ROW acquisitions. This will occur after certification of the final EA/EIR/EIS. Placer County intends to work closely with property owners to ensure that access is not denied to private property.

Response to Comment PW142-17

Please see Master Response 2 regarding roundabouts.

State Agency (S) Responses

Comment Letter S1—Robert Erlich, California Regional Water Quality Control Board Lahontan Region, May 24, 2007

Response to Comment S1-1

Language has been added page 1-3 of the final EA/EIR/EIS to address the concern about the use of abrasives and deicers that can affect water quality. The following has been added to the end of paragraph 3 of *Section 1.2:* "SR 28 is operated as a year-round highway. During winter periods with snow accumulation, abrasives and deicers are applied to the road surface, which can potentially affect water quality."

This sentence has also been added to the last paragraph of *Section ES.2*, *Project Background* on page ES-8 of the final EA/EIR/EIS.

Response to Comment S1-2

Text on pages ES-9, 1-1, and 1-9 of the final EA/EIR/EIS has been modified to address this comment regarding water quality facilities.

Response to Comment S1-3

The text in the final EA/EIR/EIS has been modified on pages 1-8 and 1-9 to remove references to the Maximum Extent Practicable and Best Available Technology Economically Achievable/Best Conventional Technology in the description of the discharge permit. References to the applicable Tahoe NPDES permits have been revised on pages 1-8, 1-9, and 3.13-8 in the final EA/EIR/EIS. In addition, the reference to sizing the facilities to the maximum extent practicable has been deleted and replaced with language indicating the stormwater treatment facilities should be designed to maximize the removal of fine sediment, nitrogen, and phosphorus to meet surface water discharge standards.

Response to Comment S1-4

Text on page 1-15 in *Section 1.6.4* of the final EA/EIR/EIS has been modified to respond to this comment regarding Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification.

Response to Comment S1-5

The proposed action will not increase stormwater runoff in the action area or surrounding areas. The coverage within the action area will stay the same or decrease, and therefore the overall runoff should be the same or less, based on this methodology. Additionally, with the development of the overall water quality project, the run-off to the commercial core area will be reduced; thus, less runoff will be seen at the outfalls to the lake. The final EA/EIR/EIS has been modified accordingly on page 1-18.

Response to Comment S1-6

The pumping of stormwater to a treatment facility was considered in the Kings Beach Watershed Improvement Project alternative formulation and evaluations. An alternative involving the pumping of stormwater runoff large distances to a treatment facility was considered but rejected by the Technical Advisory Committee in favor of more localized treatment. The media filters that are proposed for the commercial core may involve pumping for short distances (i.e., less than 20 feet horizontally and/or 5 feet vertically), but only because of space or property ownership issues/limitations. It should be noted that Placer County will continue the evaluation of the feasibility of a pump and treat options as part of final design of the Watershed Improvement Project.

Response to Comment S1-7

The water quality improvement project for the Kings Beach urban area, including the commercial core, will take into account the overall stormwater runoff flowing to and generated from the commercial core. The facilities will be designed to treat and/or infiltrate runoff in accordance with applicable NPDES requirements, and at a minimum will meet the required 20-year, 1-hour storm event. Additionally, off-street parking lots are proposed to be constructed of porous pavement, which will increase the infiltration

capacity of the existing land while providing additional storage volume (occupied by the crushed rock below the pavement section). The proposed improvements will increase the infiltration rate, and storage volume from that of the existing land.

Response to Comment S1-8

The water quality improvement project for the Kings Beach urban area, including the commercial core, will take into account the overall stormwater runoff flowing to and generated from the commercial core. The facilities will be designed to treat and/or infiltrate runoff in accordance with applicable NPDES requirements, and at a minimum will meet the required 20-year, 1-hour storm event. Additionally, off-street parking lots are proposed to be constructed of porous pavement, which will increase the infiltration capacity of the existing land while providing additional storage volume (occupied by the crushed rock below the pavement section). The proposed improvements will increase the infiltration rate and storage volume from that of the existing land.