

Draft Mobility 2030 Comment Matrix

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|------------------|--|--|
| 7/8/2008 | Larry Dowdle | I'm afraid those in charge of the basin and the bike trails waited to long for a lot of us that have slipped into our senior years now and are hesitant to even buy green bananas! | Comment noted |
| 7/9/2008 | Gunnar Henriolle | In fact, this is an opportunity for the TRPA to completely re-invent itself, with a descriptive communication to the Pickens Group: "Tahoe's vision of regional access & local circulation elements, utilizing electric propulsion and renewable power source." Or, as put by the US Secretary of Transportation in Reno, July 19, 1997: "We (The Federal Government) shall assist Lake Tahoe in the construction of a clean transportation system, capable of hauling passengers and (local necessities) freight" This was repeated by VP Gore at a lakeside venue. Like, as in: "Tahoe: The Queen of Clean Transport"... | We continue to work with our Federal, State and local partners to develop a clean transportation system. A major emphasis on Mobility 2030 is towards the "construction" of this system. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|------------------------------|---|---|
| 7/9/2008 | Ron McIntyre, at APC meeting | <p>A lot of times when we combine statistics between North Shore and South Shore, we do not get a real picture. TOT in Placer County is up almost 18%. Sales taxes in the Eastern portion of Placer County are up 20% and he agrees that they have lost almost 20% of their population. But the economic reality is that they are looking at, this last fiscal year, as the largest TOT collection that they have had in North Lake Tahoe in their history. He would hope that when these things are analyzed, that we analyze them on a sub-regional basis, so we can do planning from that standpoint. The Highway 89/89 realignment in Tahoe City has been on the shelf for about 5 years because of lack of funds. When that project reached the environmental documentation stage and all the work was done, the traffic analysis clearly showed that two alternatives would completely eliminate the cueing on the West Shore. But things are back in full force and traffic is backed up to Homewood. This project is extremely critical and he would ask that this project proceed again.</p> | <p>A composite illustration that shows the economic bifurcation between the North Shore (ie North Shore Sales Tax increase) and South Shore will be included in the RTP. The stated importance of the State Route 89 Realignment in the RTP is clear and will be pursued given the availability of funding resources.</p> |
| 7/9/2008 | John Upton, at APC meeting | <p>From a South Shore perspective, he shares Mr. McIntyre's concerns. The South Shore has become a Saturday economy and he would like to know what the numbers look like in that respect. On the California side, the room nights used to be 1 million, 20 thousand per year and currently they are down around 670,000 which is a huge drop.</p> | <p>A more definitive comparison between the North Shore and South Shore economy, and resultant traffic volumes will be included.</p> |
| 7/9/2008 | Lauri Kemper, at APC meeting | <p>In terms of our own thresholds for NOx and particulates, is the Regional Transportation Plan going to show what your anticipated projections are for those components?</p> | <p>The analysis completed for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis concluded that the Region would be under the prescribed California Air Resource Board (CARB) Carbon Monoxide budgets. While not required as part of the Conformity Analysis the resultant NOx and particulate emissions also indicated lower emissions.</p> |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 7/9/2008 | Charlie Donahue, at APC meeting | There is a section on SNPLMA and how it is reported in the document. He hopes that when it is referenced, it is tied to the storm water elements, because we are hearing from the Congressional Delegation there is not funding for transportation projects. | The Financial Section Chapter 5-page 53 discusses the tenure of the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act (SNPLMA) and the funding provided for storm water elements. |
| 7/9/2008 | Jennifer Merchant, at APC meeting | She was struck by the traffic model that shows an increase in traffic, while they have had a decrease in traffic over the course of the last five to ten years. It seems inconsistent given the fact that we have had a decrease in traffic and we have unprecedented growth in the surrounding areas of the Tahoe Basin, particularly in some of the key markets where visitors come from. | Given the cumulative nature of the proposed Regional Plan Growth Assumptions and how this growth is reflected in the TransCAD Model the traffic increases (VMT) represents a little more than a half-percent per year. It should be noted that the growth assumptions of the Regional Plan did not include the significant demographic changes that have occurred in the past 5-6 years that have led to the decrease in traffic volumes. |
| 7/9/2008 | Jennifer Merchant, at APC meeting | We need to be very clear that this is just a model and may be a worst case scenario. It also doesn't take into account pedestrian and bicyclists. She thinks we have experience and that could be used to modulate the model in the South Lake Tahoe example. | All of the previous TRPA Threshold Evaluations have recommended that the VMT threshold should be closely linked to actual changes in traffic volumes and not a theoretical model. Given the recent changes in demographics the model outputs should be considered worst case. |
| 7/9/2008 | Jennifer Merchant, at APC meeting | She has huge concerns about this strategy [regional revenue], when we are trying to redevelop the communities to provide the type of development that motivates people to get out of their cars. They have a choice to stay somewhere that doesn't charge for parking or they can stay in the Basin and pay \$25 or whatever for parking. She feels strongly that Placer County is already putting a lot of money into transit. She would like the opportunity to make those decisions and not have their guests charged for parking. | Over the past year, staff has presented a variety of financing scenarios that would consider not only the lodging industry and vacation rentals but also recreation, government and commercial/retail parking components. We also framed these discussions with sunset provisions and phasing but we also understand that additional work and discussion is needed. As such we will restate the "South Shore Parking Fee " line item on page 55 to "Basin Wide Local Funding". The policy on Page 27 will also be amended to expand the coordination to include "and other potential sources of basin wide local funding." This modification will need to be closely followed by action in terms of getting a working group established representing the different sectors called out. We request your participation and assistance in bringing together the broad group of participants necessary to come to a common strategy that can be moved forward. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| 7/9/2008 | Jennifer Merchant, at APC meeting | Public comment ends on the 8th and the TTD makes a decision on the 8th. She is not sure how you take into account public comment when the TTD makes a recommendation on the same day that public comment ends. | As comments are presented they are incorporated and responded to accordingly in this matrix. |
| 7/9/2008 | Mike Riley, at APC meeting | Stated concern over the visitor's overnight occupancies and wondered if the occupancy numbers that Mr. Upton stated is a common number around the Basin, or are there any different numbers. | The changes in visitor's overnight occupancies are primarily related to the the South Shore. |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 1. Increase bicycle carrying capacity of public transit (buses, shuttles, trolley, ferry) | Modified Policy C to read "Transit facilities shall be provided that encourage transit usage, and that encourage pedestrian and bicycle use through their designs." Added new policy: "New transit vehicles shall seek to maximize bicycle carrying capacity using best available technology". |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 2. Pg. 46. Replace all storm water grates bisecting bike lanes with inlets in the curb face (type CG-3) | Added text to emphasize concurrent planning of bicycle and stormwater projects, and listing bicycle-friendly stormwater grates as a necessary improvement. Specific guidance regarding types of drop inlets is more appropriate for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Added this paragraph to page 46: "Since stormwater treatment projects often involve disturbance of the road profile, they present an important opportunity for completing bicycle and pedestrian improvements concurrently. Stormwater projects should be planned with these modes in mind, and implement, up to 20% of the full project cost, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, bicycle-friendly stormwater grates, and bicycle-activated traffic signals." |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 3. Increase safety awareness signage on all bike lanes (Share the Road signs, and bike lane stencils) | Added policy: "Safety awareness signage, road markings, and programs shall be implemented where appropriate". |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 4. Increase jurisdiction responsibility for bicycle facility maintenance – publically announcing routine schedule of sweeping and resurfacing. (Tahoe City model) | This level of detail is more appropriate for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and will be addressed in the next update of that document. |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 5. Insure there are no gaps, pavement seams or differing elevations on pavement surfaces within the bike lane | This level of detail is more appropriate for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and will be addressed in the next update of that document. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 6. Reduce number of lanes from 4 to three where possible. Its highly improbable that the existing highways will ever be widened, and yet there exists sufficient width to consider a "road diet" of lane reduction to accommodate class II bike lanes. (Hwy 50, Hwy 28 Kings Beach) | Added bullet: "Where traffic volumes are low pursue 'road-diet' lane reduction strategies to provide more opportunities for multi-modal transportation". |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 7. Reduce lane width where possible and feasible to provide for bike lanes and increase bicyclist safety by motorists speed reduction – current speeds exceed limits due to large four lane linear highways. (i.e. Hwy 50, Hwy 28 Kings Beach) | Added bullet: "Where traffic volumes are low pursue 'road-diet' lane reduction strategies to provide more opportunities for multi-modal transportation". |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 8. Page 22. Disconnect and separate out the positioning of Pedestrian Walkways/Bikeways. This is not recommended because of the inherent conflict of use. These are not Bikeways. A new term is more descriptive and may become a separate CalTrans classification – SidePaths. We want separate bicycle facilities or Class I Share Use Paths. NOT walkway/bikeways. | In second-to-last bullet under "Desired", changed slash to "and". Note, the current language says "bike lanes", not "bikeways". |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 9. Page 23 F. Stronger language than "consideration" must be applied here. Caltrans is revising their Deputy Directive 64 which also uses 'should be considered' to have more teeth and compliance. In the past, agencies have said they considered bike facilities and nothing gets built. | Changed "consideration" to "accommodation". |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 10. Pg. 34, Project Goals. Again, it is indicating walkways for cyclists. This is not acceptable. Walkways for pedestrians, bikeways for cyclists. This thinking has got to change with user conflicts in top of mind and safety a priority. | Changed "walkways" to "paths". Changed order of bullets. Note second bullet calls out the different needs of different cycling groups and need for appropriate facilities. |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 11. Pg. 35 .. Ped/Bike facilities are limited... There are no bike facilities currently present. | The TRPA currently considers many of the paths along Hwy 50 to meet the standards of shared-use facilities. Deleted "pedestrian" from "pedestrian traffic" to expand the meaning to include cyclists as well. |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 12. Pg. 39. Overview. The next chief complaint is the lack of sufficient Lake access. Bicycle facilities, water ferries can help mitigate this problem. | Added language in last sentence of Overview-- "...provides a transportation option that is environmentally friendly and efficient, provides additional lake access opportunities, and is enjoyable to the user". |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 13. Pg. 43 ... discourages pedestrian activity and bicycle use | Incorporated. |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 14. Pg. 44 ... Congress has adopted a Complete Street initiative and CA AB 1358 is California's initiative. This needs to be stronger with supportive reference, the context, about this important initiative and movement toward smarter healthy community designs. | Added language describing national Complete Streets initiatives and providing more description of Complete Streets. Changed first paragraph to read: "Many of the existing urban roadways in the Tahoe Basin are incomplete. They are designed to allow a large throughput volume of motor vehicles, but do not provide safe and convenient access to bicyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair users, or transit users. Nationwide, communities, states, and the federal government have adopted or are considering "Complete Streets" policies that require roadway designs that accommodate all users. Complete streets also support communities by providing transportation options that encourage physical activity, and reduce impacts to climate change." Second paragraph: "In Lake Tahoe, a complete street brings people, jobs, and services together and is designed to be efficient, safe, and convenient to travel on by foot, bicycle, transit, or car. Complete streets also should be developed at a scale that is appropriate to specific communities." |
| | | | Added Multi-Modal Facilities section with two bullets: - Projects will provide for the accommodation of all users of the roadway including pedestrians, bicyclists, individuals, seniors, and users of public transportation. -- Where traffic volumes are low pursue "road-diet" lane reduction strategies to open up opportunities for multi-modal transportation. |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 15. Pg. 25 C. Describe examples of ped/bike incentives | This policy language was changed--"incentives" not appropriate terminology. New language: "Transit facilities shall be provided that encourage transit usage, and that encourage pedestrian and bicycle use through their designs." |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 16. Bicycle Storage capacity must be addressed and increased. Increase bicycle racks at businesses, recreational facilities, transit centers, public agencies and businesses must provide secure bike storage for their employees and lodging properties for their residents. | Added policy: "Bicycle storage capacity shall be increased at commercial and recreational areas, transit centers, lodging properties, and government buildings". |
| 7/14/2008 | Ty Polastri, President, Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition | 17. All highway improvements/maintenance projects must submit their initial plans to TRPA/TMPO/All Stakeholders, prior to engineering, EIS and funding allocations, in order for all interested parties to have able time to review and comment on those plans in meeting Regional Transportation Plans and Community Enhancement initiatives. | p. 23, Policy F incorporates this idea in relation to TMPO jurisdictions. The RTP is a TMPO plan. When the TRPA Regional Transportation Plan is completed, it will address this concept in relation to TRPA policies. P. 44, Complete Streets Strategies, and p. 46, Environmental Stormwater Strategies also address this comment (see new language above). |
| 7/14/2008 | Karen Fink, TRPA | p. 3. For clarity, suggest changing language in last paragraph to: "This Regional Transportation Plan includes policies, project implementation plans and funding strategies to meet community goals. While the RTP functions as a stand-alone document, it is also consistent with the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan. We expect the inclusion of RTP policies into the TRPA Regional Plan update in late 2008." | Comment incorporated. |
| 7/14/2008 | Karen Fink, TRPA | p. 20. Change "Performance Measures" to "Performance Indicators", to match up with Transportation Monitoring Report terminology. | Comment incorporated. |
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | Page 15 indicates existing basin wide VMT is 1,594,400, but Page 60 says 2,079,849 Which number is considered by TRPA to be "correct"? The document should provide an explanation. | The VMT estimate shown on page 15 is the result of staff analyzing the annual percentage change in traffic volumes from the 27 Caltrans and NDOT traffic count stations. The VMT estimate shown on page 60 is a TransCAD modeling estimate that utilizes a detailed GIS based street network that previous modeling networks lacked. The TransCAD modeling estimate also incorporates a Tour-Based Modeling approach that accounts for non-homebased vehicles trips which can account for up to a third of all total trips. Previous TRPA modeling efforts lacked these refinements. Page 59 of the RTP recognizes these differences. The TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation recommends that the update to the Regional Plan recognize that the VMT Threshold be linked to actual changes in traffic volumes. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | What is the source of the 2005 population estimates in Figure 1.2? The drop in Placer County population between 2000 and 2005 seems overstated. | In order to develop a 2005 Base Year for the TransCAD modeling effort, staff utilized the TRPA Parcel Database, Security Returns on Single Family Dwelling applications, the Congressional District Second Homeownership Survey, NuStats Surveys and the RealQuest Database to identify the estimated change in residential population. To a certain degree the residential drop is also linked to the historical high percentage of second-homes in Placer County. Added source information to Figure 1.2. |
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | On page 10, it should be noted that all of the school closures have been in South Shore, not North Shore. | Comment noted; Staff will reflect that the school closures have occurred on the South Shore. |
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | The discussion regarding traffic volume trends should differentiate between South Shore and North Shore. Just providing a discussion for the basin as a whole glosses over the key distinction that South Shore traffic volumes have dropped very significantly, while North Shore volumes have been relatively steady. | Comment noted: A distinction can be made that reflects the differences between south shore and north shore traffic volumes. |
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | There is a discrepancy in the BlueGo ridership between the graph in Figure 1.14 and the table in Figure 1.15. Which number is correct? Any differences should be explained in a footnote. | Comment noted: Figure 1.14 only accounts for the BlueGo Fixed Ridership while Figure 1.15 accounts for all BlueGO Operations (ie. Trolleys, Heavenly, Bus Plus etc). Footnotes added to this effect. |
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | Figure 3-4 indicates that bike trails will be built virtually everywhere, but previous studies have indicates that some sections (like Emerald Bay) would not be separated bike "trails." Some other language like "bike facilities" would avoid misleading the public. | Changed map headings and legend to read "Facilities" instead of "Trails". |
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | Wherever light rail transit is mentioned for South Shore, I'd suggest alternative wording such as "high capacity transit" or "light rail / bus rapid transit." | Comment noted, however, we find no references to light rail except when the document quotes the TRPA Compact. References to inter-city rail were changed to include "high capacity transit". |
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | The "ped shed" map for Tahoe City infers that the commercial uses along SR 28 stop at Grove Street. In reality, the Lighthouse Center is one of the more important commercial centers in Tahoe City. | The ped shed graphic on page 49 is conceptual, however the commenter is correct in noting that the Lighthouse Center should be included in the ped shed example. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | The waterborne service map shown on p39 is consistent with the results of last year's waterborne plan, which focuses on a Tahoe City -- Ski Run cross-lake route, with shorter water taxi services to make connections within the North Shore and the South Shore. I suggest modifying the graphic on p 26 to be consistent. | A footnote will be added to the graphic on page 26 noting the updated study. |
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | I encourage TRPA to pursue reinstatement of a summer only round-the-lake transit service. The ridership data from the Lakelapper shows that this is an effective strategy if implemented only when the real need is there (summer only). | The service indicated on page 41 of the Draft RTP is intended to be operated only during the summer (June 15th- Labor Day) |
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | Why are both the US Highway 50 Realignment Project and the State Route 89 Realignment project scheduled for at least 14 years in the future? I well appreciate how long the lead time is on these types of projects. But there are substantial environmental and economic benefits that would accrue from both. I think the US Highway 50 project is the next step in making a real "place" in the Stateline area that can help stem the decline in economic activity and can also provide the opportunity for dedicated transit right-of-way. The need to speed the SR 89 Realignment project is heightened by the fact that Caltrans has indicated the existing Fanny Bridge will start to fail (increasing weight restrictions will need to be put into place) starting in roughly 2015. Unlike other issues, there is a real consequence with delay on this project. I'm concerned that an "emergency solution" will arise that will reflect Caltrans' desire to replace the existing bridge as cheaply as possible, and not reflect a long-term solution that better reflects all the noble RTP goals. | Both projects represent significant importance in terms of need from a variety of perspectives. Developing the funding for these projects will require long lead times that are contingent on federal, state and local funding resources. As funding becomes available staff will actively pursue and accelerate the development of these projects. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 7/15/2008 | Gordon Shaw, LSC Transportation Consultants | The RTP indicates a slight increase in regionwide VMT for the SR Realignment Project, but the traffic analysis conducted by LSC a few years ago indicated a decrease. This is because the travel path for SR 89 North -- SR 89 South travel would be shortened significantly, which more than offset the smaller increase in travel length for SR 28 - SR 89 South movements. Not that LSC is always right, but I'd encourage TRPA to review the route lengths assumed with this project in the VMT analysis. The RTP is silent with regards to whether the existing road across Fanny Bridge would remain open or not, but this also affects the VMT estimate. | The TransCAD modeling completed for the SR 89 Realignment was completed under the premise of the most recent Regional Plan Update Growth Assumptions for the year 2030 and was completed on a regional level. It could very well be that the residual growth associated with the assumptions of the Regional Plan are driving the VMT increases rather than the project itself. |
| 7/15/2008 | Ann Lyman, Carnelian Bay | To whom it may concern- I hope the plan to extend the bike path from Tahoe City to Kings Beach (off the road) will be started soon. Many of us would choose to ride our bikes to shop, etc and just go to town if it was safe to do so. With increased traffic, cost of gas and added pollution please get this done as soon as possible. | Timeline for the North Tahoe Bike Path will be addressed in the Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. More information on the North Tahoe Bike Path can be found at http://www.edaw.net/ntbt |
| 7/16/2008 | Hank Raymond | The plan should contain a provision for class 2 bike lanes all the way around Lake Tahoe on the main roads. At the very least, this should be in at least one direction (clockwise). The plan will be seriously flawed if this isn't included in the plan. | This idea must be evaluated through a public process before it can be placed on the RTP project list. This evaluation will take place as part of the Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan update, scheduled for August 2008-September 2009. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|---------------|--|---|
| 7/21/2008 | Mike Bradford | <p>I am disappointed in the proposal that was again brought forward and now included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). As you well recognize, I have been working to find transportation solutions for our community as have all of the Gaming Alliance members. Our continued commitment to the private funding of BlueGo is confirmation of our tangible support. When the suggestion of a \$5 per room night transportation fee was originally proposed several months ago I was clear (as was Stacy Dingman) that this was not equitable or acceptable for the gaming properties. I emphasized this by drawing the comparison to the transient occupancy tax (TOT) the Lake Tahoe Gaming Alliance had proposed of 2% for the support of the convention center. The \$5 per night charge approximates a 5% TOT. 2% TOT was a significant commitment of support for a major economic benefit like the conversion center. Transportation funding, while important, would not justify such a great cost, in my opinion then and now. \$5 per room night or approximately 5% TOT is out of the question.</p> | <p>Over the past year, staff has presented a variety of financing scenarios that would consider not only the lodging industry and vacation rentals but also recreation, government and commercial/retail parking components. We also framed these discussions with sunset provisions and phasing but we also understand that additional work and discussion is needed. As such we will restate the "South Shore Parking Fee" line item on page 55 to "Basin Wide Local Funding". The policy on Page 27 will also be amended to expand the coordination to include "and other potential sources of basin wide local funding." This modification will need to be closely followed by action in terms of getting a working group established representing the different sector called out. We request your participation and assistance in bringing together the broad group of participants necessary to come to a common strategy that can be moved forward.</p> |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 7/21/2008 | Mike Bradford (continued from above) | <p>\$5 per room night is a non-starter. Moreover, I am highly critical of a concept that was rejected being brought forward again. This raises doubt about the process. I have seen too many times how the repetition of unacceptable proposals is warped into justification for continued implementation. This is completely unacceptable. In my efforts to work with you I have looked for grounds that may be workable. I cannot make commitments for the other gaming properties, however, I have said that two conditions would likely be a prerequisite for alternative support for transportation funding. First, the fees/taxes must be equitable. This means there must be proportional and complete participation throughout the Basin including all public and private sources. I was clear that this was to include all governmental, business and individuals. The \$5 per room night proposal does not meet this standard.</p> | See above comment. |
| 7/21/2008 | Mike Bradford (continued from above) | <p>Second, the implementation timing must be relatively rapid to include all sources. Additionally, any delay in complete implementation Basin wide would result in sunseting of transportation fees/taxes on the businesses or individuals that are initially funding should there not be timely implementation of transportation funding from all other sources. I am committed to continue to seek transportation solutions. The proposal in the RTP is not acceptable. This proposal of \$5 per room night on the South Shore gaming properties must be removed. Please make this correction so we can begin to move forward on viable opportunities.</p> | See above comment. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|---------------------------|---|---|
| 7/27/2008 | Roxanne | We have all seen efficient, effective subway and rail systems most prominently in London, England. None the less we have chose the least efficient method, cars. Most people don't carpool either. Since we did not have foresight when planning our city, it's a little late to incorporate that knowledge now. Yet the Monorail system is an exception and has been observed at the Cal Expo State Fair since I was a child. Why can't that technology be incorporated? I did not get to view the draft, as I'm not interested in downloading active X controls to my computer in order to read it. | The technolgy to implement a light rail-monorail system exists, however the fiancial resources to construct and maintain this technology is limited. |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | The League submitted extensive comments which are included in the attached letter. A very brief summary of comments is in the next row. | |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | Overall, the League would like to stress that the TRPA and the TMPO need to give environmental thresholds a higher priority in the RTP, and that such thresholds as water and air quality need to be the background for all transportation projects. We would also like to stress the importance of improving existing road and bicycle/pedestrian trails over the addition of new surfaces, which will create more soil coverage. Of a high concern with the League is the continuing service and expansion of the Tahoe Valley Airport. We would recommend that the Airport be re-evaluated for both environmental and societal costs associated with the continued existence of this heavily subsidized transportation facility. | Page four of the Draft RTP establishes the historical importance and priority of the thresholds by its citation of the Compact and the environmental threshold carrying capacities. Page 50 of the RTP identifies \$127 million dollars of bicycle and pedestrain Improvements and \$712 million dollars of erosion control-stormwater improvements. The combined total of these improvements represent 43 percent of all planned improvements. Page 30 of the Draft RTP recommends that the Airport/Settlement Agreement be updated where environmental and societal costs can be more fully identified. |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | The League to Save Lake Tahoe is highly concerned that Mobility 2030 does not quantify threshold attainment within the Regional Transportation Plan. [...] concern remains that the overall plan does not address the impacts to the environmental thresholds in specific quantitative terms. | Information provided on page 15 and page 59 indicates that as a result of recent traffic volume decreases, the VMT threshold is in near attainment (6.5 percent reduction from 1981 levels). The 1991, 1997, 2001 and 2006 Threshold Evaluation Reports have all suggested that the VMT threshold standard be reevaluated for its effectiveness as a threshold for air quality. A more detailed quantification of the threshold is expected in the Regional Plan EIS. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|---------------------------|--|--|
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | <p>VMT and other statistics need to be more detailed and more representative in regards to time and location. Data needs to be displayed and compared for weekends, weeks, seasons, and years; and different regions, counties, cities, busy intersections, and thoroughfares into the Basin (Highways 267, 50, 89, etc...). Referencing Figures 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, and 1.12 are these traffic volumes figures representing the whole Basin or just one location within the Basin? Figure 1.13 needs to be a year round assessment of VMTs instead of merely presenting estimates for August, and once again for a variety of locales.</p> | <p>Figure 1.9, 1.10, represent the cumulative account of 27 traffic count locations while Figure 1.11 and Figure 1.12 represent the average of north-south shore traffic volumes. In order illustrate more specific count location data, staff will include a subregional (ie. north-south) graphic that shows these comparisons, and has more site specific information for the count locations that can forwarded upon request.</p> |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | <p>The League is also concerned with the population statistics presented in the Draft Mobility 2030 report. For instance, referring to Figures 1.1 and 1.2, the side bar claims that according to the 2000 Census Survey, the year round population of the Tahoe Basin has decreased by 7,662. However, upon closer examinations of the graphs, it is plain that from 1995 to 2005 there is a clear increase in all counties within the basin. Although there undoubtedly was a decrease in population from 2000 to 2005, the overall trend still demonstrates an obvious increase in resident population, albeit, that rate of increase may be slowing. In regards to Figure 1.3, the claim is that the year-round resident population is declining. However, the figures only show differences between primary and secondary residence for one year, and does not examine these differences over time.</p> | <p>Text was changed to more accurately represent what is shown in the figures. The information provided on Figure 1.1 and 1.2 have two sources of data. The 2000 population estimate comes directly from the Census Bureau. The 1987, 1995 and 2005 resident population estimates were developed by staff for modeling purposes. In order to develop the 2005 estimate, staff utilized the 2000 Census estimate as a calibration point and then utilized the TRPA Parcel Database, Security Returns on Single Family Dwelling applications, the Congressional District Second Homeownership Survey, NuStats Surveys and the RealQuest Database to identify the estimated change in residential population.</p> |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|---------------------------|--|---|
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | The League believes that the beneficial effects of public transit on threshold attainment will only be achieved by utilizing the best available technology and by promoting alternative modes of transportation. Furthermore, it must be demonstrated that ridership levels throughout the Basin are high enough to justify the emissions produced by the vehicles and routes served. Detailed data and graphs need to be presented regarding public transit ridership as it relates to emissions, in the form of emissions per person per mile. The types of emission that should be accounted for are CO, NOx, PM2.5, PM10, as well as greenhouse gases. | p 25 Goal H. of the Draft RTP states "transit vehicles in the Tahoe basin shall utilize alternative fuels that reduce emission to the maximum extent feasible." This statement is also consistent with the overall goal of Mass Transit by the statement "Actively pursue programs promoting the use and strategic expansion of environmentally conscious mass transit." As bus emission technology improves and cost effectiveness and functionality becomes more readily available the TMPO will strategically be in a position to achieve the stated goals. It is important to note that the Compact requires the TRPA to give "preference to providing capacity through public transportation and public programs and projects related to transportation. |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | Hybrid bus technology is recommended. | Please see above comment. |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | The League supports the use of waterborne transit only under the following conditions: 1) Only watercraft using the best available green technology will be used for transit such as boats that are powered by solar energy or wind power. If a backup carbon source needs to be utilized, the watercraft should be fitted with a catalytic converter to reduce emissions. It needs to be emphasized that traditional motorized watercraft produce emissions that are magnitudes higher than emissions from automobiles. 2) Waterborne transit will only be utilized after a full environmental assessment is performed demonstrating that there will be no negative impacts to the thresholds with particular concern to water and air quality. | Page 39 of the Draft RTP promotes the use of Waterborne Transit by stating that "Using innovative boating technology that is "clean and green" compliments the values inherent in protecting Tahoe Clarity and provides a transportation option that is environmentally friendly and efficient." |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | Improve existing road and bicycle/pedestrian trails over the addition of new surfaces, which will create more soil coverage. Use pervious surfaces for new bicycle/pedestrian trails and retrofit old trails with pervious pavement. Bike trails will not inhibit the attainment of the environmental thresholds required by the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact. | Comments will be addressed within the comment letter by Aug. 8 |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | Water quality enhancements should be at the forefront of designs and operations for parking lots and sidewalks. | The design of all parking lots and sidewalks will have to conform with the Site Development and Water Quality Provisions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|---------------------------|---|---|
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | The RTP should provide guidelines for the best way to maintain winter roadways with the least amount of impact to lake clarity which should incorporate the best possible sanding and sweeping practices including the purchase of the best available street sweepers such as the Tymco DST-6 and the use of inert sanding materials to prevent phosphorus and other nutrients from binding to the ground up sediments. | The purchase of best available street sweepers has been an eligible expense through Chapter 93 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Future efforts towards sanding and sweeping applications will be included in the TRPA Region Plan chapters for Water Quality and Air Quality. |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | It is imperative that TMPO directs the RTP to provide an overall strategy, framework, and outline for the steering of [environmental stormwater] projects. | The Environmental Stormwater strategies discussed on page 46 and identified on pages 50 and 51 represent the collective strategies, timeframes and cost amounts for the environmental stormwater strategies of Caltrans, NDOT and Local Jurisidictions. |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | The League would like to see the incorporation of water quality improvements into the document's guidelines for parking lot engineering, sidewalk and bike path design, operations and maintenance, as well as substantial charting of environmental stormwater strategies for the next twenty years. | Included language in the environmental stormwater section directing that bicycle and pedestrian and parking projects should incorporate water quality improvements appropriate to the facility. While not explicitly discussed, page 43&44 of the RTP includes the general planning principals for sidewalk and bike path design. Please see above comment for the charting of stormwater strategies. |
| 8/1/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe | Additional air service should not be encouraged in the RTP. | Page 30 of the Draft RTP recommends that the Airport Settlement Agreement be updated and limited to service levels in an updated Airport Master Plan. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Chapter 1 - Introduction and Trend Analysis. In the Overview section (page 3), we strongly encourage more recognition that the North Shore and the South Shore have unique characteristics and needs. These include differences in land use patterns, transit systems, and proximity to adjacent areas outside the Lake Tahoe Basin. We recognize that the TRPA and TMPO have Basin-wide regional responsibilities and that more can be done to coordinate transportation solutions and transit services, but a "one size fits all approach" does not adequately address the unique differences that exist among the North and South communities. One major difference is that the Tahoe portion of the North Shore is just one part of the larger "Resort Triangle." Please consider including a map that illustrates the relationship of in-Basin communities with adjacent communities. This would help the reader understand the travel patterns that must be addressed, <u>unique to each Shore</u> | A composite illustration that shows the economic bifurcation between the North Shore (i.e. North Shore Sales Tax increase) and South Shore will be included in the RTP. An additional graphic will also be added that shows the differences in traffic volumes. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | On page 5, the role of the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) in the development and implementation of transportation projects and transit services should be described more thoroughly. Reference should be made to the 1997 amendments to Article IX, based on "substantively identical enactments" adopted by the legislatures of California and Nevada (Senate Bill 815 and Senate Bill 24, respectively). The amendments established three private sector voting seats on the TTD Board and expanded the District's ability to implement and operate transit support facilities in the region. The pivotal role of the private sector in project development and implementation should be emphasized, as a partnership with the public sector. | Added: In 1997, Article IX was amended to establish three private sector voting seats on the TTD board. The private sector plays a pivotal role in project development and implementation, in partnership with the public sector. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Consultation and Cooperation: TMPO Partners (page 5). We are not aware of any private organizations that have "legal responsibility" for transportation issues in the Basin. We understand what is being said, but suggest that public agency responsibility be stated separately from the "interest" of private organizations. | Comment noted; Discussion concerning public agencies roles and responsibility and their role in transportation will be stated separately. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Transportation Partners (page 6). Under North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, please change the description to read as follows: North Lake Tahoe Resort Association (NLTRA) - The NLTRA serves as a forum for local input and recommendations on the planning and development of tourism and community related infrastructure and transportation projects, including transit services, for which the Association is a funding partner. The source of NLTRA funding is a percentage of the Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) funds generated in the North Lake Tahoe area of eastern Placer County. The Placer County Board of Supervisors grants these funds to the NLTRA on an annual basis. | Comment noted: the suggested language for the NLTRA will be amended. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Transportation Partners (page 6). South Shore TMA. The description provided is out of date. Please change, as follows: Founded in 1994, the South Shore TMA is a non-profit community forum advocating transportation and mobility solutions. | Comment noted: the suggested language for the SSTMA will be amended. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Transportation Partners (page 6). Lake Tahoe Transportation & Water Quality Coalition. Please note that the Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council is no longer an active organization at Lake Tahoe. I suggest the last sentence of the Coalition's description be revised to read as follows: Coalition members include the leaders of Tahoe's business and tourism organizations, including its gaming and ski industries and chambers of commerce, and the League to Save Lake Tahoe, the Basin's largest environmental organization. Among other activities, working with the TRPA and other partners, the Coalition coordinates the development and advocacy of Lake Tahoe's annual Federal Legislative Agenda. | Comment noted: the suggested language for the Lake Tahoe Transportation & Water Coalition will be amended. Language concerning the Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council will be deleted. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Transportation Partners (page 6). Washoe County - Please capitalize the B in Crystal Bay. | Comment noted; correction will be made. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Transportation Partners (page 6). Washoe County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). Please revise the description to ensure clarity: Within the Basin, RTC contracts with Placer County to fund Tahoe Area Regional Transit (TART) operations in Incline Village and Crystal Bay. | Language concerning the Washoe County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and its relationship with Placer County and the TART will be amended. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Transportation Partners (page 6). Tahoe Douglas Transportation District. To be consistent, please capitalize Transient Occupancy Tax. | Correction will be made. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Transportation Partners (page 6). Washoe Tribe - The correct reference is the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California. | Correction will be made. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Transportation Partners (page 6). We encourage you to include the Resort Triangle Transportation Planning Coalition in the list of Transportation Partners: Resort Triangle Transportation Planning Coalition (RTTPC) - A multi agency coalition whose function is to coordinate, plan, program, monitor and implement capital and operational projects in the North Lake Tahoe-Truckee "Resort Triangle." Members include Placer County, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, Town of Truckee, Nevada County Transportation Commission, and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. | Amendment will be made with the suggested language |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Demographic and Economic Shift at the Lake (page 8). As a member of the Board of the Tahoe Transportation District and Commission, I have consistently expressed concern about the source and reliability of data. I share the questions and comments of Gordon Shaw in his letter of July 15th. • What is the source of the 2005 population estimates in Figure 1.1 and 1.2? • The drop in Placer County population between 2000 and 2005 seems overstated. | In order to develop a 2005 Base Year for the TransCAD modeling effort, staff utilized the TRPA Parcel Database, Security Returns on Single Family Dwelling applications, the Congressional District Second Homeownership Survey, NuStats Surveys and the RealQuest Database to identify the estimated change in residential population. To a certain degree the residential drop is also linked to the historical high percentage of second-homes in Placer County and the variability with the many databases. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | On page 10, it should be noted that all of the school closures have been on the South Shore, not the North Shore. | Comment noted; Staff will reflect that the school closures have occurred on the South Shore. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | The Gaming Economy (page 11). Gaming revenue data for the South and North shores should also be displayed separately. | The source of information concerning the gaming economy comes from the Nevada Gaming Control Board. It is already broken out in Figure 1.6. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Visitor Overnight Occupancies (page 12). Why is no occupancy data presented for Placer and Washoe counties? | Data was only available for one year and does not illustrate trends, TMPO staff will research the availability of this information and include in the 2008 Transportation Monitoring Report. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Traffic Volumes (page 13). The discussion regarding traffic volume trends should differentiate between South Shore and North Shore. Just providing a discussion for the Basin as a whole glosses over the key distinction that South Shore traffic volumes have dropped very significantly, while North Shore volumes have been relatively steady. | Comment noted: Separate graphics showing the distinction between north shore and south shore traffic volumes both peak month and average annual daily traffic will be added |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | What is the source of the traffic volume data presented on page 14? | The source of this information comes from the continuous NDOT and Caltrans count station location. The count stations were averaged as a basis for a composite graphic. Source will be added to the figures. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) (page 15). The Basin-wide VMT number cited on this page is 1,594,400 (2004?), but the number (2005?) shown in Figure 5.1 on page 60 is higher. What is the TRPA's current VMT number? | The VMT estimate shown on page 15 is the result of staff analyzing the annual percentage change in traffic volumes from the 27 Caltrans and NDOT traffic count stations. The VMT estimate shown on page 60 is a TransCAD modeling estimate that utilizes a detailed GIS based street network that previous modeling networks lacked. The TransCAD modeling estimate also incorporates a Tour-Based Modeling approach that accounts for non-homebased vehicles trips which can account for up to a third of all total trips. Previous TRPA modeling efforts lacked these refinements. Page 59 of the RTP recognizes these differences. The TRPA 2006 Threshold Evaluation recommends that the update to the Regional Plan recognize that the VMT Threshold be linked to actual changes in traffic volumes. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Transit Ridership (page 16). South Shore and North Shore transit ridership should also be displayed separately, so that the reader may more clearly see the differing trends in ridership. | The Transportation Monitoring Report: 2008 will be coming out in Fall 2008 that shows this distinction. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | The information in Figure 1.15 on page 17 is out of date. More current information is available and should be used. | Comment noted: Updated information will be pursued. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | On page 18, note that TART services are not the only public transit services provided on the North Shore. It would seem appropriate to include available ridership data from the North Lake Tahoe Express, winter night service, and the Emerald Bay Shuttle service (West Shore - summer). | Footnote added that explains that this data is not inclusive. Data for NLTE, winter night service, and Emerald Bay Shuttle service will be included in the Transportation Monitoring: 2008 report. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Chapter 2 - Goals and Policies (page 19). As listed, the Primary Objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan are appropriate and commendable. Given these objectives, it is difficult to understand why the TRPA Governing Board recently struggled to determine the best alternative for the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project. As measured against the objectives stated, the correct course of action should have been more evident. It is essential that the TRPA/TMPO follow its own adopted Goals, Policies and Objectives. | Comment noted. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Pedestrian and Transit Oriented Development (PTOD) (page 21). What is the definition of "minimum development strategies" in the first bullet item under Policies? | The term "minimum development" will be deleted from the text. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | PTOD and "Incentives" (pages 21-22). We agree with the comments and concerns of Andrew Strain. In his memo of June 18th, Andrew said, "I am skeptical that we can actually accomplish significant PTOD land use changes throughout the Basin without a more clear indication of what incentives the TRPA will offer. I realize that this is as much of a Regional Plan issue as it is a RTP issue, but I do not see how it happens given the ownership pattern, lack of density and economic conditions of our business districts. The examples that are often used in public forums are not from similar resort-type communities with similar physical characteristics." Specifically, what policies and incentives will TRPA use to achieve its list of Desired Conditions? (page 22). At a minimum, a list of realistic, meaningful incentives should be included in the Plan. | TMPO staff has presented incentives to TRPA Land-Use Planners that are still being negotiated as part of the Regional Plan. Some of these include the streamlining applications noted on the bottom of page 48. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLCCC, TTD/TTC | Pedestrian & Bicycle Friendly (page 23). Why is the goal to "Design an atmosphere that encourages bicycle and pedestrian usage ...?" The goal should be more direct to the desired result of establishing and maintaining bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure so that these forms of mobility become more viable and significant modes of transportation at Lake Tahoe. | Comment noted. The goal is meant to be inclusive of not only infrastructure but also safety programs and other outreach that can encourage bicycling and walking. Policy C on page 23 to a certain degree addresses the importance of actually "constructing" rather than "designing an atmosphere". |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLCCC, TTD/TTC | Pedestrian & Bicycle Friendly (page 23). Overall, we believe the Policies listed on page 23 are appropriate. Policy C is a high priority for the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association within the Placer County portion of the Basin, along with linking residential and commercial areas (Policy G). We suggest that "TMPO funding" as referenced in Policy F be more clearly defined and that the term redevelopment be added to Policy D. The need for an appropriate level of maintenance for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including sidewalks, should be identified as a very high priority and an opportunity for local funding partnerships in support of transportation and community mobility solutions. | All of the suggested comments will be incorporated into the RTP. Please see page 45 concerning the operations and maintenance strategies for sidewalks and biketrails. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLCCC, TTD/TTC | Technology (page 24). The goal, as stated, is quite vague. This section should more clearly define what ITS technologies can best be applied at Lake Tahoe, for what specific purposes. The world of "ITS" is full of specialized terminology, jargon and acronyms. Policy C is full of terminology that most people are not familiar with. Perhaps this Technology section could include a Web site reference for those who are interested in learning more about ITS technologies and how they can be applied at Lake Tahoe to help the goals, policies and needs identified in this RTP. | Comment noted; A reference for more information has been added to the ITS section. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLCCC, TTD/TTC | Mass Transit (page 25). We suggest the goal be revised as follows: "Actively encourage the development and implementation of services and programs to expand the operation and use of public transit in the Lake Tahoe region." | Comment noted: Change will be made |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLCCC, TTD/TTC | Mass Transit (page 25). In Policy B, we suggest that the word "pursued" be changed to "encouraged and supported, as appropriate." | Comment noted: Change will be made |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Mass Transit (page 25). Policy F should be revised to read: "The expansion of private and public transit excursion services shall be encouraged in the region." | Comment noted: Change will be made |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Mass Transit (page 25). More emphasis and attention should be given to strategies and projects that help to implement Policy G, regarding dedicated rights-of-way for public transit. | On page 35, the US 50 Stateline Corridor Project calls for dedicated transit lane. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Inter-Intra Regional Transportation (page 26). This is a very important section and emphasis area for the RTP (for TRPA/TMPO, as well as the Tahoe Transportation District). We suggest the following revisions: Policy E. "Work with organizations (including the Lake Tahoe Transportation & Water Quality Coalition) that advocate and facilitate public-private partnerships, new sources of funding, and seek coordination among various transit operators and providers for the benefit of improved transportation in the Lake Tahoe region." | Comment noted: Change will be made |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Inter-Intra Regional Transportation (page 26). Policy G. Revise to: "Actively encourage the proposed extension of the Capital Corridor intercity rail service between Auburn, Truckee-North Lake Tahoe and Reno and other intercity rail or high capacity transit services, including such services along the Highway 50 corridor between Sacramento and South Lake Tahoe." | Comment noted: Change will be made. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Economic Vitality (page 27). The listed policies are vague and overly broad. Please provide more specific policies and discussion how they will support the goal of economic vitality in the region. | Policy E. Will be expanded to include language that encourages Business Improvement Districts to improve transportation facilities that in return can have an economic benefit. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | <p>Parking (page 27). To date, no one has demonstrated, in practical terms, how paid parking can generate revenues to benefit transportation and transit at Lake Tahoe. The revenues from paid parking are typically used to pay for the parking infrastructure and/or the cost of collecting parking fees. Accordingly, our view is that Policy A has no practical application. It is likely that coordinated parking management strategies are needed, such as more effective shared parking strategies and payment in-lieu strategies. This brief section fails to make the case that parking strategies are important. It fails to specify who will develop and implement parking management strategies for the Lake Tahoe region.</p> | <p>Over the past year, staff has presented a variety of financing scenarios that would consider not only the lodging industry and vacation rentals but also recreation, government and commercial/retail parking components. We also framed these discussions with sunset provisions and phasing but we also understand that additional work and discussion is needed. As such we will restate the "South Shore Parking Fee" line item on page 55 to "Basin Wide Local Funding". The policy on Page 27 will also be amended to expand the coordination to include "and other potential sources of basin wide local funding." This modification will need to be closely followed by action in terms of getting a working group established representing the different sector called out. We request your participation and assistance in bringing together the broad group of participants necessary to come to a common strategy that can be moved forward.</p> |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | <p>Transportation Demand Management (page 28). Since its adoption, the TRPA has run "hot and cold" on the implementation and "enforcement" of Chapter 97 of its Code of Ordinances. The TRPA must decide whether Chapter 97 is or is not a meaningful component of Transportation Demand Management. It is difficult for employers in the region to implement carpool or vanpool matching programs. These strategies are typically more urban-based, although there are some opportunities through third party providers or facilitators via the Internet. Tahoe area employers can and should be encouraged to provide on-site secure bicycle storage and transit passes or incentives for their employees. We suggest that the wording of Policy C be revised to be more specific to the need for traffic management plans for large special events. A policy that simply states the need to "streamline the requirements of Chapter 7" is vague and doesn't mean much to most readers.</p> | <p>Policy C will be revised as follows; TMPO working with the TRPA shall require the development of traffic management plans consistent with temporary seasonal activities. These management plans shall account for the coordination and timing of other activities that may occur simultaneously.</p> |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLCC, TTD/TTC | Regional Roadways (Page 29). This goal should be revised to provide a more comprehensive basis for regional roadway improvements, consistent with the Primary Objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan, as listed on page 19. (e.g., Fulfill the requirements of Public Law 96-551, attain and maintain Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities, establish a safe, secure, efficient and integrated transportation system, and implement the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program). This Regional Transportation Plan identifies four regional roadway improvement projects that are proposed for reasons well beyond the need to "improve traffic flow and increase safety." Accordingly, we suggest the Goal be rewritten as follows: "Upgrade regional roadways as necessary to meet environmental requirements and objectives, improve safety, address community design objectives, and provide for a more efficient, integrated transportation system." | Comment noted: Goal will be amended as follows Upgrade regional roadways as necessary to meet environmental requirements and objectives, improve safety, address community design objectives, and provide for a more efficient, integrated transportation system. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLCC, TTD/TTC | Transit Dependent Groups (page 29). We recognize that the TRPA/TMPO's recently adopted Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan (CHSTP) was Lake Tahoe's first such plan. It contains an extensive list of recommendations that could help to implement the goals and policies written in this section. While the timing was not ideal this year, we suggest that the TRPA/TMPO's next Transportation Overall Work Program incorporate work elements designed to facilitate the integration of "Transit Dependent" improvements into the Regional Transportation Plan, consistent with the goal and policies in this section. | Comment noted: Future efforts to integrate the CHSTP in the OWP and RTP will be pursued. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Regional Revenue (page 30). There has been a great deal of discussion about the need for new "Regional Revenue" to help fund the local government and private sector shares of the TRPA Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). We are surprised that there are only two sentences in this section - one goal and one policy. Somewhere in this RTP, easily accessible, additional information about the need and specific purposes of "Regional Revenue" should be provided, as they relate to transportation, transit and community mobility. TRPA/TMPO must clearly make the case for new "regional revenue." As drafted, this Regional Plan does not make the case. The term "Regional Revenue" is frequently discussed in the context of one or more new revenue sources, applied throughout the Lake Tahoe Basin, hence the term "regional." While there may be possibilities, we must acknowledge that there are a variety of legal and legislative challenges to Lake Tahoe's ability to secure a "regional" revenue source. [comment continued below] | Comment noted; The Policy on page 30 will be amended to reflect the following: B: Recognize that the success or failure of transportation systems is often linked to local/regional funding sources particularly for on-going transit operating subsidies and local match programs. C: Acknowledge that appropriate local/regional funding mechanisms are bound by legislative and legal constraints that are often solved at the jurisdictional level. |
| | comment continued from above | TRPA/TMPO should more clearly recognize that practically speaking, regional revenue made be comprised of one of more locally based revenue sources, depending on what may be achieved within each of the Basin's local government jurisdictions. As an example, Placer County benefits, and should continue to benefit from the expenditure of Transient Occupancy Tax funds, through the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, as a source of locally based regional revenue. | See above comment. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | U.S. Highway 50 Pedestrian & Bicycle Improvement Project (page 34). Under project goals, we encourage project proponents, supported by TRPA/TMPO, to be more aggressive in securing "space" for multi-use walkways, to be shared by cyclists and pedestrians. | Alternatives towards securing roadway right-of-way for pedestrians and cyclists have been developed through the U.S. 50/Stateline Area Transportation Project and will be further delineated through the on-going Caltrans Project Study Report. Through the PSR process for all projects the TMPO will continue to be aggressive in securing space for these non-automotive modes. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | U.S. Highway 50 Stateline Corridor Project (page 35). Fanny Bridge/SR 89 Realignment Road Improvement Project (page 36). As described on page 36, the Highway 89 Realignment project is much more than a road improvement project. Please change to a more appropriate project title. One suggestion would be to drop the term "road improvement" from the title. We agree with the comment and concern expressed by Gordon Shaw in this e-mail of July 15th. Why are both the U.S. Highway 50 Stateline Corridor Project and the State Route 89 Realignment Project scheduled for completion at least 14 years into the future? I well appreciate how long the lead-time is on these types of projects. But there are substantial environmental and economic benefits that would accrue from both. I think the Stateline Corridor Project is the next step in making a real "place" in the Stateline area that can help stem the decline in economic activity and can provide the opportunity for dedicated transit right-of-way. The need to speed the SR 89 Realignment Project is heightened by the fact that Caltrans has indicated the existing Fanny Bridge | The title of the Fanny Bridge / SR 89 Realignment Road Improvement Project will be changed to Fanny Bridge/SR 89 Realignment. TMPO staff agrees that these projects represent significant environmental and economic benefits. TMPO staff will continue to pursue funding as evidenced by the programming of funding from the Federal Lands Highway for these two projects. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Complete Street Strategies (ITS Strategies) (page 45). With regard to the third bullet item, there are private sector providers that broadcast to hotel and motel rooms, resorts and other venues. | Comment noted: Language will be amended that acknowledges these private providers and encourages broader participation. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Complete Street Strategies (ITS Strategies) (page 45). What incentives would be provided to lodging properties that allow guests a later checkout time when conditions for traveling are unsafe? Who would offer and provide such incentives? (4th bullet item). | It was hoped that by providing travelers information about roadway information they could make informed decisions about when and when not to travel. A possible incentive program could be incorporated through the Employer-Based Trip Reduction Program in terms of reduced requirements. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Environmental Stormwater Strategies (page 46). Why is there no mention of the Lake Tahoe TMDL in this section? | Comment noted: Discussion of the TMDL will be incorporated. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Land Use Development Strategies (pages 47-48). These are very important strategies. Successful implementation will require densities and vertical development in appropriate locations, and greater flexibility in site design and uses. As the primary land use planning and regulatory agency in the Basin, it is essential that TRPA allow and facilitate the implementation of these strategies, in terms of Regional and Community Plan goals, policies, regulations, and as part of TRPA's own project review process. | Comment noted. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Tahoe City Ped Shed Map (figure 3.5, page 49). We agree with Gordon Shaw's comment that this figure should be modified to include the Lighthouse Center as one of Tahoe City's important commercial centers; it should be within Tahoe City's primary Ped Shed. | The ped shed graphic on page 49 is conceptual, however the commenter is correct in noting that the Lighthouse Center should be included in the ped shed example. A revised ped shed example will be incorporated which includes the Lighthouse Center. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Chapter 4: Financial (Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act) (page 53). We concur with Andrew Strain's comment: The SNPLMA section should clearly identify that it is only used to fund the federal share of the EIP and that, in practice, it has limited use as a funding source for transportation projects. | Comment noted; Language will be incorporated. |
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Chapter 5: Travel Forecasts (pages 58-61). As a member of the TTD/C Board, I have consistently expressed concern about the adequacy of TRPA's modeling data, travel forecasts and growth assumptions. I again register my concerns about the data, travel forecasts, growth assumptions and model results, including intersection level of service forecasts, as summarized in this section of the RTP. | Over the past four years a variety of TMPO staff has worked with Caltrans, NDOT and local consultant firms in developing, reviewing and auditing the data that feeds the Tour-Based Travel Demand Model. As with any model the costs associated with supplemental work are great and additional work is needed to fully realize its benefit. Future efforts should also recognize the day to day traffic counts. The forecasts and growth assumptions that went into the model were based on the latest growth assumptions of the on-going regional plan. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|----------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 8/3/2008 | Steve Teshara, NLTRA, NLTCC, TTD/TTC | Energy Element (page 67). As stated, it is evident that the Lake Tahoe Region is particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change, just as it is to other environmental impacts. Our region's economy is highly dependent on the health of our environmental assets, including a substantial snowpack, a clear Lake, and a healthy watershed and forests, all of which will be negatively affected by warming temperatures. We encourage TRPA/TMPO and your many partners to focus on Goals #1 and # 2 (page 68) in terms of priority planning and project implementation to help accelerate Tahoe's ability to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. | Comment noted. |
| 8/5/2008 | Jim Nowlin | It is unrealistic to aim the majority of this proposal at the Tahoe basin residents. The majority of potential users would be commuting workforce and tourists. As a result, the system MUST be fed from Reno, Carson City, Minden/Gardnerville and Truckee. It must also be made user-friendly to these groups. It appears that all the work we put into Pathway 2007 as working groups has been largely ignored. Too many of the ideas included in this proposal predate our efforts. | TMPO staff has acknowledged the increase in commuting that has occurred and recognizes the importance of providing transit enhancements for commuters on page 26 Bullet A; Reading as follows; "Transit Service shall be expanded to cities, towns and recreational areas outside of the Tahoe Region, and be coordinated with other transportation modes". The recent development of the Kingsbury Express is primarily geared towards providing transit service to the commuting workforce. |
| 8/6/2008 | Ron Grassi, Tahoe City | Thanks for your efforts thus far. My only comment: Please insert stronger and more specific language REQUIRING the use of hybrid buses in any future purchases. We all seem to agree that we need increased public transportation to shoulder much of the burden of transporting the hundreds of thousands of visitors and even many of the locals around (ie and get them out of their polluting vehicles), but there doesn't seem to be any specific hybrid bus language set forth, nor that it's REQUIRED from now on. I don't think the revised Plan should even leave open the door to purchases, and use, of traditional relatively inefficient buses when the newer state of the art hybrid buses are now readily available and reasonably priced. | Page 25, Bullet H recognizes the importance of using alternative fueled transit vehicles to reduce emissions to the maximum extent feasible. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| 8/6/2008 | Bill Landry | A brief comment from a full time long term homeowner in Incline Village...The 72 or so pages of the Mobility 2030 draft were quite inspiring! Please note that Bev Mapps is no longer on the IVGID board. In spite of her previous public comments, many residents DO want Incline Village to be part of lake wide water taxi plans. | Comment noted: As a north-south Waterborne route develops, water taxi's are anticipated to enhance the service. |
| 8/14/2008 | Tony Pastore, P-R Design and Engineering, Inc. | The third paragraph of the first page of your report says in all: "Paramount among the desired conditions identified by those who participated (in the multi-year place-based planning process) are a future of individual communities anchored by pleasant, walkable, mixed-use town centers...reducing the reliance on the private automobiles, and facilitating and promoting other modes of transportation including public transit, bicycling and walking." New paragraph: If the Tahoe region can truly implement plans and projects that support these goals, without losing sight of long range impacts, we will create a better place than that which we have today. | The first goal of Mobility 2030 on page 21 is to "Plan for and promote land use changes and development patterns that encourage walkable, mixed-use centers and supporting transportation enhancements and improvements. page 31, second paragraph states that the TMPO intends to focus its short-term energies into bringing these projects to fruition. |
| | comment continued from above | New paragraph: However, and in contrast to TRPA's often mediocre policy direction, we can NOT please all of the people all of the time. It is simply not possible. The goals outlined and espoused in the 2030 Transportation Plan, the edict in the TRPA Charter and Compact do not direct us to make policy that "strives for compromise" or seeks "penultimate mediocrity" by finding the perfect "middle ground". How we "use" this place must be re-evaluated. We must now begin the processes of restoration and reduction. | Mobility 2030 has identified \$1.484 billion dollars of Strategies of which \$684 million dollars are erosion control-stormwater projects that will continue the process of restoration and reduction. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|------|------------------------------|---|---|
| | comment continued from above | <p>New paragraph: Transportation, whether by car, boat, or other internal combustion driven machine must be evaluated carefully for it's totality of impacts. The entirety of the infrastructure required to support the status quo (fueling stations, roads, parking lots, road sand, traffic signals, piers, fuel docks, risk to pedestrians and slower etc.) must come under great scrutiny. The environmental impacts to air and water quality associated with all of the operations and infrastructure are the leading cause of reduction of clarity of Lake Tahoe. Isn't the goal of the TRPA and it's policies to protect, restore, and enhance the environment here in Tahoe? Promoting and increasing support for infrastructure that directly supports the degradation of Lake Tahoe is directly antithetical to this mandate.</p> <p>New paragraph: Locals and visitors do not love this place because of loud fast boats or because they can drive everywhere, anytime, in any weather. This place is loved because of it's inherent natural beauty, clean air and clean water.</p> | <p>The promotion of increasing infrastrucure through redevelopment and smart growth development is intended to reverse the water quality degradation that occurred in previous years. The associated and cummlative impacts of the Regional Plan will analyzed and reviewed with great scrutiny.</p> |
| | comment continued from above | <p>New paragraph: This is not a political issue (in an ideal world) and nowhere is "serving all user groups equally" identified as a goal of the citizenry or the TRPA. The goals have been identified and validated through the public planning process. Let's not let "striving for mediocrity" get in the way of truly creating a better future for the lake, the environment and the people.</p> <p>New paragraph: Unfortunately, we can not have our cake and eat it to. Sorry 'bout that. Some people are going to be disappointed, disaffected, and may even leave the neighborhood. Leadership means making the decisions that need to be made to make a better future, not trying to please all the people all the time.</p> <p>New paragraph: The Regional Transportation Plan should be the uniting document that brings the Tahoe Basin communities together figuratively and literally. Clean, quiet, comfortable, and available mass transit . . . pedestrian and bike friendly . . . If these are the goals, then the policies MUST reflect effective means to achieve them.</p> | <p>Page 8 of Mobility 2030 suggests that over 7,000 full-time residents have left the area, Page 10 suggests that school enrollment has declined by 22 percent. Page 11 indicates that 3,123 gaming employment positions have been lost. All of the above suggests that some people have become disappointed and disaffected.</p> |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|--|---|
| 8/14/2008 | The Washoe Tribe | <p>Please add to the Policy 4 (Page 26 on the June 11th 2008 Draft) under letter B, or wherever you and your team of planners best see fit, a provision for the Washo People; specifically elders and Washo Scholarship holding students at Sierra Nevada Collage, to be provided with transit from Woodfords, CA to Incline Village (The Sierra Nevada Collage Campus). At present we have commitments into the future with the College on behalf of educating our youth and our Elders Cultural Meetings for interpretation on behalf of our people and the Lake Tahoe Coummunity. If the provision cannot be from Woodfords then we ask for a provision from The "Y" at Southshore to Incline Village (Sierra Nevada Collage.) We would also like this to be called out in the SafeT-LU funding section where 5311 funds could address this concern through planning and implementation from the TTD, TMA Blue Go or another planning agency and/or implementer provider.</p> | <p>A possible transit connection could be realized when the proposed South Shore and Incline Village Vanpool Program identified on page 26 is implemented. Another option could include the proposed Lake Lapper Service discussed on page 41 coupled with the Kingsbury Express service.</p> |
| 8/14/2008 | comment continued from above | <p>In addition, as is called out in the "Mobility" box on the same page, we would like mention of the Washo needing access/the idea for mobility as an impoetant regional planning theme. We would like the Washo having access to our homeland to be called out as it is paramount to our (the) idea of mobility.</p> | <p>An additional bullet will be added to the Mobility Box on page 25 which states; "Improved Washoe Tribe access/mobility options."</p> |
| 8/18/2008 | Joanne Auerbach: Placer County Housing Coordinator | <p>While the RTP covers vehicle miles traveled and traffic volumes within the basin, it still needs to quantify the length of the home to work commute, particularly for the Placer County portion of the Tahoe Basin. That would help to further document the extent of the jobs-housing imbalance created by the number of workers who live outside the basin and commute in for work. The RTP addresses the advantages of focused residential development within walking distance of public transit. Who will the focused residential development be for? How does air quality and traffic improve when workers live near their work, particularly within walking distance?</p> | <p>The TMPO Tour-Based Model does not explicitly spell out the home to work commute average trip-length length primarily due to the inherent nature of the model to account these trips as a series of "tours". TMPO staff however has observed actual hourly commute travel increasing at the regions' seven entry points which supports the jobs-housing imbalance. The focus of residential development located within walking distance of public transit is geared to all residential development with residual benefits in air-quality and traffic related to fewer vehicles on the roadway.</p> |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| 8/18/2008 | Joanne Auerbach: Placer County Housing Coordinator | The July 2007 Regional Vision from the TRPA Pathway Forum contains a section on "Enhancing the Social Well being of Lake Tahoe's Communities." It says "Transportation should support the needs of the Basin's low-income families.", and "investment should include housing for the Basin's working families." The benefit identified under Land Use Concept #2 is "Affordable housing solutions that allow people to live in their community and reduce the need for commuting." The RTP should lead to a new regional plan for TRPA that supports "Housing that matches the needs of employers and employees;" | Comment noted: The input and influence of the RTP will assist the direction of the Regional Plan in identifying housing needs for employers and employees. |
| 8/18/2008 | Joanne Auerbach: Placer County Housing Coordinator | The Pathway Forum reported a need for 1600 new affordable units in North Tahoe. I estimate that about half that number is to upgrade and replace existing deteriorated units, reduce overcrowding and overpayment of housing cost. The other half is needed to house workers who live outside of the basin, but work in the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer Co. Several reports produced since 2000 have documented this: | Comment noted: Please see above comment. |
| 8/18/2008 | Joanne Auerbach: Placer County Housing Coordinator | The Placer County Redevelopment Agency and Placer County have made significant commitments to increase and improve the number of affordable units in the Tahoe Basin for people who work in the Tahoe Basin. However, a significant shortage will still exist without new initiatives and the environmental documentation to demonstrate the benefit. | Comment noted: Please see above comment. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| 8/18/2008 | Alexandra Profant, Director, The Tahoe Foundation | 1-In the Waterborne Map/section, there is no inclusion for any North Eastern points to address the need for taxing or future possibilities of taxi-ing from the North Eastern shore...this as a current and potential future element in Incline Village/Crystal Bay. Nevada has historically hosted such transit privately and publicly as well as currently exists in the form of resort hosting such services. This could be broadened into the public sector especially when taking the Sand Harbor Venue into account and in lieu of the variety of parking lots/structures existing, being proposed and or even approved by you. Currently, until they are built, and if they are built, the opportunity to redress Incline or Crystal Bay or the entire Eastern Shore as a waterborne/water-taxi possibility may indeed come to pass. | As noted on page 39, the TMPO is working to analyze future operations, including inter-modal connections to desired locations through an FTA Small Starts funding program. Additional language on page 39 indicates that these connections (or terminals) need to be consistent with local plans. As Waterborne Transit becomes more fully developed the Sand Harbor, Crystal Bay locations may indeed come to pass as future locations for waterborne taxi-shuttles or point to point terminals, provided local planning efforts and infrastructure needs are acknowledged as such. |
| 8/18/2008 | Alexandra Profant, Director, The Tahoe Foundation (Continued from above) | Therefore please include the parking possibilities at the Ponderosa ranch (currently zoned for such) Sand Harbor State Park, Hermit Beach(between the Hyatt, and IVGID's Ski Beach(all four of which, currently host all waterborne modes of transit, even if only are currently private) as being a future possibility for multi-modes of transit as well as water borne taxiing--public or private. | Comment noted: Please see above comment. |
| 8/18/2008 | Alexandra Profant, Director, The Tahoe Foundation (Continued from above) | Furthermore, since much of the Nevada Shoreline is Public it is foolish not to include the future possibility and unfair not to somehow designate it as such. The need for and arcane idea of needing a fixed pier to host such things negates the reality that architectural possibilities to address temporarily hosted walkways/pathways does indeed exist. | Comment noted: Please see above comment. |
| 8/18/2008 | Alexandra Profant, Director, The Tahoe Foundation (Continued from above) | Also, there is very little mention of right of way as being the critical issue around such things as designated transit service possibilities; please include that as being paramount to effective transportation planning and the possibilities for people to donate/get paid for their right of way to provide options for implementable/ feasible solutions. | P 39, U.S. (Highway 50 Stateline Corridor Project) identifies the possibility of a dedicated transit lane and will be analyzed through the on-going Project Study Report (PSR). |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| 8/18/2008 | Alexandra Profant, Director, The Tahoe Foundation (Continued from above) | Finally, it would be nice to mention the relationship between site- planning and transportation as part of the historic nature of transportation research/multi and shared modes of transit as historical fact and legacy to the Lake Tahoe Basin; whether in the way of Thule rafts built by the Washoe, the Thunderbird Boat and its relationship to the historic Thunderbird Lodge, the Tahoe Steamer, as well as , and finally the relationship of shared goods transport/ passenger from Glenbrook and otherwise to a variety of places around the lake carrying materials/passengers at large or entertainers to the sites where these historic lodges/gaming venues were built/hosted events. | The historical context of transportation and site planning is not lost. In many ways the RTP acknowledges and builds upon the historic site planning that occurred. and the transportation infrastructure that is currently in place. A common theme throughout the RTP is that we redevelop around this legacy as transportation evolves. |
| 8/8/2008 | Andrew Strain, Vice President of Planning & Governmental Affairs | Eliminate the South Shore Parking Fee as a funding source. Heavenly does not support a parking fee. It is not an equitable proposal because parking fees are not proposed for any other location within the Tahoe Basin. It would also be applied to those businesses which today already fund a significant portion of South Shore transit service. | Over the past year, staff has presented a variety of financing scenarios that would consider not only the lodging industry and vacation rentals but also recreation, government and commercial/retail parking components. We also framed these discussions with sunset provisions and phasing but we also understand that additional work and discussion is needed. As such we will restate the "South Shore Parking Fee" line item on page 55 to "Basin Wide Local Funding". The policy on Page 27 will also be amended to expand the coordination to include "and other potential sources of basin wide local funding." This modification will need to be closely followed by action in terms of getting a working group established representing the different sector called out. We request your participation and assistance in bringing together the broad group of participants necessary to come to a common strategy that can be moved forward. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 8/8/2008 | Andrew Strain, Vice President of Planning & Governmental Affairs (Continued from above) | In previous discussions, this fee has been identified by TRPA staff as a potential source of transit operations funding. Heavenly is a significant provider and supporter of public transit. Annually, Heavenly spends close to \$1,000,000 for a free skier shuttle system that moves over 400,000 passengers. As a founding partner of the BlueGo system, Heavenly is committed to continue providing transit service. Due to the fact that BlueGo partners are the main source of transit funding and appear to be the potential main source of paid parking fees, this would result in a "double-dipping" of costs on the same group of entities which fund transit operations | Comment noted: Please see above comment. |
| 8/19/2008 | Gary Bowen | On page 4, under Background, the Compact under which we've all been operating for over 25 years describes a directed objective of the goal of transportation planning to be: (A) "to reduce dependency on the automobile by making more effective use of existing transportation modes, and of public transit to move people and goods within the region, and (B) "to reduce to the extent feasible, air pollution that is caused by motor vehicles . . ." Given the recent 'revived' interest in bike trails, it is ironic to note that the above Article 5 directives were operating as a conundrum, in that Tahoe's economy has continually relied more on auto transportation than any other to attract visitors. This conundrum has been compounded by the lack of follow through over that period of time, making some of these goals further to reach, therefore difficult | Comment noted: Much of the described conundrum is also a result of national transportation policies that provides significant funding towards private auto transportation. |
| 8/19/2008 | Gary Bowen | On page 19, under Primary Objectives, to "support the economic vitality of the region by building and maintaining an efficient system" while "minimizing adverse impacts on the environment" has, as part of the 'conundrum', an ironic effect; the reduction of automobile traffic by attrition: as the local economy suffers, automobiles are in shorter supply, with fewer visitors, and therefore less emissions. | Comment noted: As presented on pages 8-13, the effects of the local economy has had a effect on visitation, school enrollments, employment levels and the number of traveling vehicles. |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| 8/19/2008 | Gary Bowen | <p>On page 41, mention is made of 'reexamining' the Lake Lapper bus, which should be done, but not in the context mentioned: The Lake Lapper bus had a minimal draw as a "leave the driving to us" attraction – (those wanting to take a bus ride all the way around the Lake: Lapping the Lake) It is that concept that needs to be revisited, as the Lake Lapper probably had a much more profound use as a way to traverse the Lake by bicycle. There were 24 stops in 72 miles, making it an attractive thought to coordinate the bike and the bus with the idea that there was a stop averaging every three miles, and a way to continue if one was tired, or be more leisurely in wanting to dine at Sunnyside, for example. The fact that, of the 3 buses, two ran either clockwise or counterclockwise, meant that a person could either continue on, or go back the way they came, if time constrained. This also coincides with the idea that there are as many 'bike shops' along the way as there are bus stops, making economic vitality a real possibility.</p> | <p>The provision of Bicycle Racks on the proposed Lake Lapper is intended to be an important component of the transit service.</p> |
| 8/19/2008 | Gary Bowen (continued from above) | <p>This particular concept does not exist anywhere else, and holds great promise in accelerating both multi-modal and bicycle facilitation, with a distinctive Tahoe flair. A real win/win in terms of the overall goal of transportation, "It's not just sport, it's transport"</p> | <p>Please see above comment.</p> |
| 8/19/2008 | Gary Bowen | <p>On page 57, a significant discussion occurs regarding the SAFETEA-LU idea that MPO's not simply develop "wish lists", which to my untrained eye seems to be exactly what is described and itemized as a Transportation Plan. This conversation brings back to mind the idea of designated funds, as, for example, both Tahoe states (California and Nevada) have license plate funds, which have not been mentioned much in public discourse: how is that money spent or designated (?)</p> | <p>The SAFETEA-LU provisions stated on page 57 reflect the federal requirement to prioritize funding based on realistic financial assumptions. The license plate funds in California and Nevada are not part of the identified revenues.</p> |
| 8/19/2008 | Gary Bowen (continued from above) | <p>If those are not to be a direct mitigation of the effects of automobiles, (i.e., bicycle trails and facilities), then it simply ends up as just another line in "revenues and costs", with no singular advantage to correctly leverage "out of the car" experiences so vital to Tahoe's future, and 'short-circuits' the exponential aspects ever-increasing and satisfied usage.</p> | <p>Please see above comment.</p> |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|--|--|---|
| 8/19/2008 | Gary Bowen | <p>On page 67, the Energy Element addresses the major impact of our time, global warming, and of course, CO2. In noting above a renewed concentration of thought as to how exactly could bicycling contribute to reversal of emissions and still fulfill Article V of the Compact. The measured contention for the Tahoe Transportation Plan is that, given the overall health of our forests, they are not especially good at absorbing CO2, thereby releasing fresh oxygen and using the carbon in tree-building. This means that any transportation mode that reduces emission will contribute more readily to both air quality and the health of our forests, in ways not yet described, but in an ecologically sound way. Another Tahoe win/win .</p> | Comment noted |
| 8/19/2008 | League to Save Lake Tahoe (Supplemental) | <p>Comment Summarized:The League to Save Lake Tahoe is submitting these additional comments on the Draft Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan document on the basis that a mitigated negative declaration is insufficient and needs a higher level of environmental review. This conclusion is a result of the following inadequacies: 1. potential substantial environmental impacts, especially considering that transportation is the primary culprit for air quality and water quality degradation in the Basin 2. charts/diagrams that accurately depict Lake Tahoe transportation and air quality trends are either absent or misleading</p> | <p>Response Summary: Staff has reviewed the 11 pages of supplemental comments submitted and additional requested information. In order to respond accordingly, staff would like to reiterate the discussion on page one, paragraph four of the RTP reading as follows; " The policies and strategies contained in this plan do not represent TRPA land use and regulatory authority provided by the Compact, but rather provides TMPO and TRPA acting as the RTPA in California, the means to make funding allocations and other policy decisions. The policies and strategies will be utilized to inform the TRPA Regional Plan update and provide considerations for regulatory policy and potential environmental analysis related to the TRPA Regional Plan package." To this end staff is encouraged by the League to Save Lake Tahoe comments and can provide supplemental information to ameliorate their concerns.</p> |

| Date | Provided by | Comment received | How this comment was addressed |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| 8/19/2008 | Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board | <p>Comments Summarized: The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) present an excellent opportunity to improve the transportation practices and infrastructure in the Tahoe basin. It also represents an opportunity to contribute to the water quality goals of the Lahontan Region and Lake Tahoe as a whole. The first part of the Lake Tahoe TMDL is projected to be implemented in a similar 20 year planning horizon as the RTP. We urge the TMPO to have the RTP contribute to the water quality efforts of the Lake Tahoe TMDL, and to analyze the potential impacts of the RTP as it relates to achieving water quality standards.</p> | <p>Response Summary: Staff will work with Lahontan staff is identifying the air quality-water quality transportation relationships and the linkages of the TMDL towards the loadings of nitrogen, phosphorus, and fine sediment particles to the lake. It is important to note however that the RTP is intended to inform the TRPA Regional Plan and subsequent water quality environmental analysis (EIS) that will accompany it.</p> |
| 8/19/2008 | Caltrans | <p>Comments Summarized: Comments submitted include consistency measures with SAFETEA-LU and Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). including but not limited to; Environmental Mitigation, Regionally Significant Project List, Public Participation, Desired Conditions, Safety and Security, Desired Conditions, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), Action Element, Financial Element, VMT Forecast, Inter-Intra Regional Transportation Policies, Transit Dependent Groups, Model Results, Conformity, Aviation and the Regional Transportation Plan Checklist.</p> | <p>Response Summary: Staff has reviewed and acknowledged the recommendations submitted and has started the process of providing language consistent with the SAFTEA-LU and California Regional Transportation Guidelines.</p> |
| 8/19/2008 | California Tahoe Conservancy | <p>Comments Summarized: The California Tahoe Conservancy would like to thank the TRPA/TMPO for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Draft Lake Tahoe Transportation Plan (RTP). The Conservancy is pleased that so many of the projects we sponsor and fund work to achieve the RTP's important goals. We appreciate the emphasis of tying regional transportation goals to the bigger picture issues of land use planning, urban revitalization and redevelopment. We urge that policy proposals for the Regional Plan update, including those originating from the SEZ/Soils Program, be considered in light of the goals of the RTP to ensure that both restoration and transportation/recreation facility construction goals can be achieved</p> | <p>Response Summary: Staff has reviewed and acknowledged the recommendations submitted and has started the process of providing amended language consistent with the CTC concerns.</p> |