NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, January 11, 2012 at the TRPA Offices, located at 128 Market Street, Stateline, NV. The agenda for the meeting is attached hereto and made a part of this notice.

January 4, 2012

Joanne S. Marchetta
Executive Director
All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted.

AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Any member of the public wishing to address the Advisory Planning Commission on any item listed or not listed on the agenda including items on the Consent Calendar may do so at this time. TRPA encourages public comment on items on the agenda to be presented at the time those agenda items are heard. Individuals or groups commenting on items listed on the agenda will be permitted to comment either at this time or when the matter is heard, but not both.

NOTE: THE ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION IS PROHIBITED BY LAW FROM TAKING IMMEDIATE ACTION ON, OR DISCUSSING ISSUES RAISED BY THE PUBLIC THAT ARE NOT LISTED ON THIS AGENDA.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

V. PLANNING MATTERS

A. AIS Program Report

B. Review and Discussion of Proposed 2012 Watercraft Inspection Fees

C. Regional Transportation Overview
VI. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Notice of Preparation and Determination of Scope for Route 89
   Realignment/Fanny Bridge

VII. REPORTS

   A. Executive Director
   B. General Counsel
   C. APC Members

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

IX. ADJOURNMENT
I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Advisory Planning Commission Chair Mr. Tolhurst called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

Members Present: Mr. Buelna, Mr. Donohue, Mr. Gaskin, Mr. Greene, Ms. Huggins, Mr. Jepsen, Ms. Krause, Mr. Lefevre, Mr. Maurer, Ms. McMahon, Mr. Plemel, Mr. Riley, Mr. Tolhurst, Mr. Upton

Members Absent: Ms. Feeley, Ms. Garcia, Mr. Loftis, Mr. McIntyre, Ms. Merchant, Mr. Smith

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Donohue moved approval. Motion carried unanimously.

III. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

No public comment.

IV. DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

Mr. Upton moved approval. Motion carried unanimously.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

A. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Mr. Tolhurst nominated current Vice-Chair Charlie Donohue as Chair. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Tolhurst nominated Peter Maurer as Vice-Chair.
Motion carried unanimously.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Notice of Preparation and Determination of Scope, US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Environmental Impact Statement

Staff member Nick Haven introduced the proposed scope of US 50/South Shore Community Revitalization Project Environmental Impact Statement.

Tahoe Transportation District Staff Member, Alfred Knotts presented an overview of the proposed project.

Annette Hansel, Ascent Environmental presented the proposed joint EIR/EIS/EIS specifics.

COMMISSION COMMENTS & QUESTIONS:

Mr. Tolhurst had concerns that the entire casino core is being made inaccessible to pedestrians who would like to go for a hike.

Mr. Upton agrees with the concerns that Mr. Tolhurst raised. He is also concerned with the narrowness of the alternatives. He suggested that additional round-a-bouts should be looked at. How do businesses function during temporary closures with people trying to access this corridor area? If there is an answer, to that should we be looking at either a more extensive closure and have the businesses accessed from the rear.

Ms. McMahon asked that staff check the information on Page 12, Hydrology Water Quality & Flood Plains. It says that it is outside the 200 year annual flood zone and she believes that this should be a 500 year annual flood zone.

Mr. Greene asked how much of Van Sickle State park will be affected. He also asked how many residences will be affected.

Mr. Knotts said the park will be required to put in a retaining wall around the area. It would not impact the operation of that facility. There are approximately 75 units which consist of hotel, commercial uses, residential units and multi-family dwellings. As part of the interview process with affected residents, we will obtain how many people live within the area fulltime. There are seven commercial units within the affected area.
Mr. Greene asked if any compensation for the affected residents have been determined. He also asked if consideration was given to only having access to the back of the casino corridor.

Mr. Knotts said there is a prescribed process once the environmental document is certified and accepted. Then a relocation assistance plan will be implemented which is set forth in the uniform act developed by the United States Department of Transportation. We do realize that this is a major concern within the community. The rear of the casino corridor was analyzed as part of the project study report in 2004. It was eliminated because it did not meeting the purpose and need of the project in keeping some economic activity that involves automobile local access and safety for ingress and egress in and out of the Basin in case of emergencies.

Mr. Greene said if there is an issue getting out of the Basin with an emergency, and it is not a problem during partial closure, why would it be a problem during full closure?

Mr. Knotts said just the capacity of that road and having more throughputs with the facility. A partial closure would only be signs posted and not actually closing the road itself, except for an event or seasonal closure.

Mr. Lefevre asked with respect to the right-a-way through private land, is this a candidate for some eminent domain take?

Mr. Knotts said that is a possibility, but it is not something that they are proposing.

Ms. Krause said at the Tahoe Transportation District meeting, there was discussion regarding the Pioneer intersection. The board asked that farther than the current narrow boundaries is looked at. This will affect the other property owners next door to the project.

Mr. Knotts said we expanded the project mailing far beyond the required area to accommodate this.

Ms. Krause asked why we aren’t considering a round-a-bout on both ends of each intersection.

Mr. Knotts said this was part of the 2004 study and it would have required a 3-lane round-a-bout, which doesn’t meet design criteria for Caltrans. This will be part of a more robust discussion on the alternatives considered but rejected.
Mr. Hasty, TTD said they are putting up large displays in the back of the room so the public can see the affected area more closely.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Tom & Carolyn Petersen have concerns about whether their access will be affected. She asked how this will affect the storm drainage work that the City of South Lake did. They don’t support round-a-bouts.

Angie Watson has concerns with the process of acquiring these properties and if eminent domain will be used.

Mike McKean business owner asked to be included in the project and have the project go beyond his business.

Kurt Carlsen business owner asked to be included in the project and have the project go beyond his business.

Pete McRoberts representing the Holiday Inn Express said he has concerns with the plan that shows their driveway being shut down and no entrance or exit into the main hotel. Delivery trucks will not be able to enter/exit through Carrows’ entrance to supply his property, which is currently proposed.

Joan Norman has concerns with the cost of this project and asked if it comes out of taxpayer’s pockets.

Mr. Knotts addressed the eminent domain questions.

Mr. Upton asked what would be the fund source on this project and how would the phasing of the project take place.

Mr. Knotts said there is information related to both of these topics within the project study report on their website. The funding would be a variety of local, state and federal sources. The construction would make sure it didn’t adversely affect the safety and the economic vitality of the area. Conceptually, US 50 would remain in its currently capacity and the alternative would be constructed. Then the transition would take place shifting traffic to the new area of US 50. The additional improvements would be made to the local roadway, once it is relinquished to local entities.

Mr. Donohue asked Mr. Knotts, Mr. Haven and Mr. Hasty to address some of the concerns that were raised in public comment today.

Mr. Greene asked for a cost estimate range for this project.
Mr. Knotts said this report is also on our website. At the time when they looked at right-of-way costs associated with the alternatives, the range for the entire project was between $50-$60 million dollars.

This was a no action item.

VII. REPORTS

A. Executive Director

Mr. Hester said Happy Holidays.

B. General Counsel

Mr. Lichtig said Seasons Greetings.

C. APC Members

Mr. Jepson thanked Mr. Tolhurst for a great job as Chair.

Ms. McMahon said their draft master plan is on the Douglas County website and the first public hearing is December 13 in front of the planning commission.

Mr. Greene thanked Mr. Tolhurst for a terrific job as Chair.

Mr. Upton thanked Mr. Tolhurst for a fantastic job as Chair.

Mr. Gaskin thanked Mr. Tolhurst and congratulated Mr. Donohue for his appointment. There has been some publicity regarding the TMDL. The Lahontan Board approved the permits for the California side and there was reaction to that. On the Nevada side, we are having one of our implementer meetings next Monday to discuss the TMDL implementation.

Mr. Donohue thanked Mr. Tolhurst for all of his years of service as Chair.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Teshara thanked Mr. Tolhurst for his service as Chair of the APC and his dedication to Lake Tahoe.
IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Mr. Donohue adjourned the meeting at 10:40 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Nikkel
Clerk to the Advisory Planning Commission

The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review at the TRPA Office, 128 Market Street, Stateline, Nevada.
MEMORANDUM

Date: January 4, 2012
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC)
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: 2011 Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Work Program Review – Accomplishments, Lessons Learned and Plans for the Future

Requested Action: Staff is not requesting action from the APC on this item. The purpose of the item is for Staff to brief the Commission on the accomplishments of the 2011 Lake Tahoe AIS program and lessons learned this year.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the APC provide comments to the Executive Director regarding the Lake Tahoe AIS program.

Project Description/Background: The Lake Tahoe AIS program in 2011 implemented projects related to the control, monitoring and prevention of AIS in the Tahoe Region. The presentation will cover a general review of the structure of the Lake Tahoe AIS program, a review of accomplishments and lessons learned in 2011.

The accomplishments of the program in the areas of control, monitoring and prevention will be highlighted along with specific issues that were identified during implementation. Staff will also propose organizational, policy and regulatory changes that to resolve those specific issues raised during implementation.

Contact Information: If you have any questions, please contact Ted Thayer, Aquatic Invasive Species Program Manager at tthayer@trpa.org or 755-589-5301.
MEMORANDUM

Date: January 4, 2011
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC)
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Review and Discussion of Proposed 2012 Watercraft Inspection Fees

Requested Action: APC review and comment on a revised fee structure to be presented at the January APC meeting to support the Watercraft Inspection Program. No action is requested.

Required Motion: This is an informational item only and as such no motion is required.

Project Description/Background: The Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Watercraft Inspection Program (WIP) was initiated to prevent the introduction and spread of AIS into the waters of the Lake Tahoe Region, and to facilitate compliance with TRPA Code of Ordinances Section 79.3. This Code Section was amended in March 2009 and again in April 2011 to allow the collection of fees to contribute to a long term funding source for the AIS inspection program. The present fee structure was approved in April 2011, to be effective from May 1, 2011 through April 30, 2012. The WIP involves two types of stickers – one for boats that are exclusively used on Lake Tahoe (“Tahoe Only”) and the other for boats that go to other bodies of water as well as Tahoe (“Tahoe In and Out”). In addition it also allows for a seven day pass and a reduced rate.

In response to input from the year round boating community the fee structure is proposed to be amended early in 2012 to change future effective dates to match the calendar year in order to simplify the annual fee periods.

The proposed fee structure will provide partial funding for the implementation of watercraft inspections while being effective, equitable and more understandable to the public. The staff proposed fees for 2012 and the 2011 fees are shown below. There is a decrease in the budget for 2012; from $1.9 million in 2011 to $1.5 million in 2012 due mainly to the capital costs that were incurred in 2011 for additional decontamination equipment that will not be required in 2012.

Alternative fee schedules will be presented and discussed at the APC meeting on January 11, 2012. The alternatives considered range from no changes to the current fee structure to a large increase in fees in all categories and additional decontamination fees. The proposed fee schedule, should it be approved, would be implemented for the calendar year 2012 and will be reviewed again at the end of 2012 for the 2013 season. Staff is proposing a grace period with the change in effective dates of the fees such that boaters with current 2011 stickers will be able to launch without purchasing a 2012 sticker until April 30, 2012.
As in previous years, the program utilizes two types of stickers for boaters that are essentially yearly passes, plus the Seven Day Pass. Staff is not proposing that this basic structure be changed in 2012, as data collected during the 2011 season has verified that the current two sticker (and Seven Day Pass) system and current length based structure for inspections is both effective and equitable.

Staff is proposing two changes for the 2012 watercraft inspection fees. The first change is an increase of approximately 10% in the basic inspection fee for all boats not currently sealed as last launching in Lake Tahoe and therefore requiring an AIS inspection and a Tahoe In & Out sticker. Personal watercraft, e.g. jet skis, are the exception to this increase and will see a decrease of 26%. The second change proposed by staff is to charge a $20 fee for each decontamination performed. Personal watercraft were charged a higher fee in 2011 due to the nature of their systems, which are more complicated to decontaminate, although not more difficult to inspect. Assuming the proposed fee structure is approved, it is not necessary to have a fee for a complicated decontamination as the decontamination fee would be separate. Since the inspection of personal watercraft is no more difficult than that of a boat of similar size, staff thought it only fair to reduce the cost of the inspection to make it equivalent to the smallest boat category.

In 2011 the WIP performed approximately 4,800 decontaminations, or approximately 62% of all boats inspected, the vast majority of these decontaminations were included as part of the basic yearly sticker fee. This level of effort is not sustainable under the current fee amounts and a separate decontamination charge is recommended to support this effort. In addition it is likely that a decontamination charge will encourage boaters to come to the inspection station “Clean Drained and Dry” therefore reducing the number of decontaminations required and program costs.

Issues/Concerns: Staff vetted the project description and fee table for the proposed fee changes with private and public launch facilities and the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Coordination Committee. While this was not an exhaustive list of stakeholders and partners, communication regarding the proposed fees will continue through the date of the January APC meeting.
While fee increases are not generally looked upon favorably by stakeholders, in this case there was unanimous understanding by those that staff has contacted of the need to increase revenue due to the pending decrease in federal funding (SNPLMA). Two specific issues with the proposed fees were raised. Those issues and responses are shown below:

- The Tahoe In and Out fees should not be increased, but rather the additional revenue should be generated from those boaters that do not come to the ramps/inspection stations clean, drained and dry.
  - Staff acknowledges that the largest cost to the program is the number of decontaminations performed. The charging of a separate decontamination fee reflects this reality. However, staff has determined that to reach the current projected revenue by decontamination fees alone would increase those fees to a point that they could adversely affect the number of boats coming to Tahoe. This proposed change to the fee structure will be presented as an alternative during the presentation to the APC.

- Ongoing costs of decontamination equipment maintenance replacement should be considered, and reflected in the increased fees for decontamination.
  - Staff includes in the yearly budget projection maintenance costs for all decontamination units, and will add a line item to the budget for anticipated replacement costs. It is not likely that the addition of replacement costs will influence the proposed fees for 2012, but will influence the long term funding of the program.

Contact Information: If you have any questions, please contact Dennis Zabaglo, Watercraft Program Manager at dzabaglo@trpa.org or 775-589-5255.
# Staff Proposed Fees for 2012 Boating Season (effective February 1, 2012 through January 30, 2013)

**Tahoe Only Stickers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Fee Amount</th>
<th>2011 Fee Amount</th>
<th>Total Anticipated Funding (2012):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Sealed Vessels</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$208,560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tahoe In & Out Stickers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Fee Amount</th>
<th>2011 Fee Amount</th>
<th>Total Anticipated Funding (2012):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Watercraft (PWC)</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 0.1 ft. - 17.0 ft.</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 17.1 ft. - 21.0 ft.</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 21.1 ft. - 26.0 ft.</td>
<td>$83.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 26.1 ft. - 39.0 ft.</td>
<td>$94.00</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 39.1 ft. and Greater</td>
<td>$116.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Tahoe In & Out Stickers include unlimited inspections $318,749

*** Additional decontamination fees may apply see below (2011 included unlimited decontaminations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Fee Amount</th>
<th>2011 Fee Amount</th>
<th>Total Anticipated Funding (2012):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven Day Passes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Watercraft (PWC)</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 0.1 ft. - 17.0 ft.</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 17.1 ft. - 21.0 ft.</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 21.1 ft. - 26.0 ft.</td>
<td>$61.00</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 26.1 ft. - 39.0 ft.</td>
<td>$72.00</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 39.1 ft. and Greater</td>
<td>$94.00</td>
<td>$85.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Seven Day Passes include one inspection and seven days of launches. $120,003

*** Additional decontamination fees may apply see below (2011 included one decontamination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Fee Amount</th>
<th>2011 Fee Amount</th>
<th>Total Anticipated Funding (2012):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrades from Tahoe Only to Tahoe In &amp; Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Watercraft (PWC)</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 0.1 ft. - 17.0 ft.</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 17.1 ft. - 21.0 ft.</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 21.1 ft. - 26.0 ft.</td>
<td>$53.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 26.1 ft. - 39.0 ft.</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels 39.1 ft. and Greater</td>
<td>$86.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$3,767

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Fee Amount</th>
<th>2011 Fee Amount</th>
<th>Total Anticipated Funding (2012):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decontamination Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All vessels requiring decontamination</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessels with bladders, ballast tanks</td>
<td>Additional $10.00</td>
<td>Additional $30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL - ALL FEES 2012**

$740,212

**TOTAL PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 2012 WATERCRAFT INSPECTION PROGRAM**

$1,517,965
MEMORANDUM

Date: January 4, 2012
To: TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC)
From: TRPA Staff
Subject: Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Determination of Scope, State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EIS/EA) in Placer County

Proposed Action: No formal action is proposed for this item at this time. The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) and TRPA staff are requesting comments from the members of the APC and the public on the scope and content of a proposed joint EIR/EIS/EA for the project referenced above. Once the public scoping period of the EIR/EIS/EA has been completed, the final scope for the document will be prepared to reflect comments received. In addition, certain components of the proposed project may be changed to address comments and/or concerns raised during the scoping process.

Project Location/Existing Conditions: The proposed State Route (SR) 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project study area is located in Placer County within the vicinity of Truckee River Bridge #19-0033 (Fanny Bridge) in Tahoe City, California. In the Tahoe City area, SR 89 is primarily a two-lane roadway built to rural design standards. At the southwest end of the Tahoe City commercial area, SR 89 intersects with SR 28 at a signalized intersection locally referred to as the North Tahoe “Wye.”

The purpose of this project is to reduce congestion and improve the safety and operation of the SR 89/28 intersection in Tahoe City, by addressing present and future automobile travel demand, pedestrian and bicycle mobility, public transit needs, the structural integrity of Fanny Bridge, and emergency access to the Lake Tahoe West Shore communities in the Fanny Bridge vicinity. The TTD is proposing improvements around the existing Fanny Bridge to relieve traffic congestion, improve bicycle and pedestrian circulation, and address the structural deficiencies of the bridge. The project would involve the repair or replacement of Fanny Bridge, construction of a new bridge across the Truckee River to the south, and construction on SR 89 north of Granlibakken Road to northwest of Fairway Drive and on SR 28 from just to the east of the SR 89/28 intersection to the SR 89/28 intersection, and possible construction in an open wooded area south and west of SR 89 known as the 64-Acre Tract.

Project Description: Fanny Bridge serves as the main artery for vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians to enter and exit Lake Tahoe’s West Shore to Tahoe City and/or Truckee. Fanny Bridge is currently the only vehicular bridge crossing the Truckee River that provides access to the west shore from the north. This bridge provides one 12-foot lane in each direction, with a five-foot wide shoulder on the west side and three-foot wide shoulder and a five-foot sidewalk on the east side. During peak summer months, there is an average of 22,300 vehicles per day and approximately 400 cyclists and pedestrians per hour. Fanny Bridge congestion continues to deteriorate due, in part, to high (and growing) traffic during peak
vacation times. Pedestrian, cyclists and drivers are also affected by the extreme congestion heading into Tahoe City along the West Shore (SR 89) and at the southwest end of town. In addition, vehicle, bicycle, and foot traffic disturbs topsoil, which can erode and enter the lake; and emissions from idling vehicles also affect air and water quality.

The project site is bounded by commercial and industrial facilities, but much of the site lies within a public open space with native vegetation (64-Acre Tract owned by the U.S. Forest Service). The land uses in the vicinity of the project site include single-family residential, visitor accommodations (hotel/motel), public utilities, commercial uses, and industrial uses. A Caltrans maintenance yard is located at the western end of the project site. The Truckee River Bike Trail is adjacent to the maintenance yard, parallel to SR 89. The project area is nearly level, but includes scattered depressions, as well as the incised channel of the Truckee River. The project site is located at an elevation of approximately 6,300 feet above mean sea level. Much of the project area is on land that was, in part, previously developed but that has been restored to native vegetation and is used as a park. Vegetation in the project area consists primarily of open Jeffrey pine forest and montane riparian scrub. Non-vegetated areas include the channel of the Truckee River and developed areas.

Alternatives: The EIR/EIS/EA will evaluate five potentially feasible alternatives, including the no action/no build alternative, each at an equal level of detail. The alternatives are described in detail in the attached Notice of Preparation (NOP).

Scope of Environmental Document and Notice of Preparation: The proposed scope and official NOP of the EIR/EIS/EA is included as Attachment A.

The TTD and TRPA have retained Ascent Environmental to prepare the EIR/EIS/EA through a three party agreement, with the expenses to be paid by the applicant (TTD). TRPA and the TTD will direct the preparation of the EIR/EIS/EA. Four action alternatives and a no-action alternative will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR. TRPA and TTD are initiating preparation of an EIS/EIR for the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project. This document is an EIS prepared by TRPA pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure and an EIR prepared by TTD pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.). It is anticipated that an Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) (under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) delegation authority from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)) pursuant to NEPA (42 U.S. Code 4321 – 4347), the Council on Environmental Quality’s Regulations Implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500 – 1508), FHWA Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (23 CFR 771), and the Caltrans Standard Environmental Reference. This notice meets the TRPA and CEQA noticing requirements for a Notice of Preparation (NOP). Public notice of scoping is not required for an EA.

The purpose of the public scoping is to solicit views of interested persons, organizations, and agencies as they relate to the scope and content of the information to be included and analyzed in the EIR/EIS/EA. Agencies should comment on the elements of the environmental information that are relevant to their legal authority and statutory responsibilities in connection with the project. The designated public scoping period began on December 2, 2011 and will extend for 60 calendar days, concluding on January 30, 2012. Comments would be most helpful if received within the designated scoping period.
Please send your comments and contact information to Alfred Knotts, TTD Project Manager by any of the following:

**Via Mail:** Alfred Knotts
P.O. Box 499
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448

**Via Phone:** (775) 589-5503
**Via Fax:** (775) 588-0917
**Via Email:** aknotts@tahoetransportation.org

Please see Attachment A for the full Notice of Preparation and complete Project Description, including proposed alignments.

**Contact Information:** If you have any questions, please contact Nick Haven at nhaven@trpa.org or 775-589-5256.

**Attachment:**
A. Notice of Preparation
This notice is being issued jointly by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) and the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) in preparation of a joint TRPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To: California State Clearinghouse
    Responsible Agencies
    Trustee Agencies
    Other Interested Public Agencies
    Interested Parties and Organizations
    Affected Property Owners (within 300 feet of the project boundary)

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a TRPA Draft EIS and CEQA Draft EIR for the State Route (SR) 89 /Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project

Lead Agencies:
TTD
P.O. Box 499
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
Contact: Alfred Knotts
Transportation Project Manager
Phone: (775) 589-5503
Fax: (775) 588-0917
Email: aknotts@tahoetransportation.org

TRPA
P.O. Box 5310
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449-5310
Contact: Brian Judge
Principal Environmental Specialist
Phone: (775) 589-5262
Fax: (775) 588-4527
Email: bjudge@trpa.org

Project Title: State Route (SR) 89 /Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project

Project Location: The project site is located within the immediate vicinity of Truckee River Bridge # 19-0033 (locally known as the “Fanny Bridge”) in Tahoe City, Placer County, California.

Project Overview: The SR 89 /Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project would include construction of a new bridge over the Truckee River, repair or replacement of Fanny Bridge, and various other improvements to address the following project objectives:

▶ Improve connectivity, reliability, travel times and operations of public transportation modal concepts, including increased mobility and safety of bicycles and pedestrians;

▶ Relieve existing congestion on SR 89 and improve vehicle mobility for commerce needs and a better resident and visitor experience;

▶ Improve traffic safety, traffic operations, and emergency access on SR 89 and SR 28, which includes the river crossing (Fanny Bridge) and associated intersections;
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- Improve highway freight mobility and commerce needs;
- Improve the river crossing’s structural integrity (Fanny Bridge) and resolve safety and community concerns about the cultural values related to the historic Fanny Bridge;
- Make public transportation more effective with better connectivity, reliability, and travel times;
- Provide two viable emergency evacuation routes from the Lake Tahoe West Shore communities; and
- Reduce vehicle emissions and improve stormwater treatment.

Four action alternatives and a no-action alternative will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR. TRPA and TTD are initiating preparation of an EIS/EIR for the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project. This document is an EIS prepared by TRPA pursuant to the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure and an EIR prepared by TTD pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.). It is anticipated that an Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) (under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) delegation authority from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)) pursuant to NEPA (42 U.S. Code 4321 – 4347), the Council on Environmental Quality’s Regulations Implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500 – 1508), FHWA Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (23 CFR 771), and the Caltrans Standard Environmental Reference. This notice meets the TRPA and CEQA noticing requirements for a Notice of Preparation (NOP). Public notice of scoping is not required for an EA.

A brief description of the alternatives likely to be evaluated in the EIS/EIR and a summary of the probable environmental effects of the proposed project are available for review on the TRPA website at: www.trpa.org, and on the TTD website at: www.tahoetransportation.org.

Public Scoping: The purpose of this NOP is to solicit views of interested persons, organizations, and agencies as they relate to the scope and content of the information to be included and analyzed in the EIS/EIR. Agencies should comment on the elements of the environmental information that are relevant to their legal authority and statutory responsibilities in connection with the project.

The designated public scoping period will extend for 60 calendar days beginning on December 2, 2011 and concluding on January 30, 2012. Comments would be most helpful if received within this 60-day scoping period. Please send your comments and contact information to Alfred Knotts, TTD Project Manager, by mail, fax, or email to the address shown above. Comment letters should include the name of a contact person at your agency or organization. Additional information on the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project may be obtained at www.tahoetransportation.org.

Three public scoping meetings will be held to provide the opportunity to learn more about the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project and to receive comments from the public and other interested parties and agencies regarding the issues that should be addressed in the EIS/EIR. The scoping meetings will be held as follows:
Thursday, December 8, 2011
Beginning at 6:00 p.m.
North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council (NTRAC)
Tahoe City Public Utility District - Board Room
221 Fairway Drive
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Friday, December 9, 2011
Beginning at 9:30 a.m.
Tahoe Transportation District
Granlibakken Conference Center
725 Granlibakken Rd.
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Wednesday, January 11, 2012
Beginning at 9:30 a.m.
TRPA Advisory Planning Commission (APC)
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency - Board Room
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

The TRPA APC and TTD meetings will begin at 9:30 a.m. while the NTRAC meeting will begin at 6:00 p.m.; however, the scoping agenda item for the proposed project is not time certain. Please refer to the agendas posted at www.trpa.org, www.tahoetransportation.org, and www.placer.ca.gov within one week of the meetings for updated information.

If you have further questions or require additional information, please contact Alfred Knotts at TTD by mail, fax, or email at the address shown above.
STATE ROUTE 89/FANNY BRIDGE
COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION PROJECT

PROJECT OVERVIEW AND LOCATION

The proposed State Route (SR) 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project study area is located within the vicinity of Truckee River Bridge #19-0033 (Fanny Bridge) in Tahoe City, Placer County, California. In the Tahoe City area, SR 89 is primarily a two-lane roadway built to rural design standards. At the southwest end of the Tahoe City commercial area, SR 89 intersects with SR 28 at a signalized intersection locally referred to as the North Tahoe “Wye” (see Exhibit 1).

The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) is proposing improvements around the existing Fanny Bridge to relieve traffic congestion, improve bicycle and pedestrian circulation, and address the structural deficiencies of the bridge. The project would involve the repair or replacement of Fanny Bridge, construction of a new bridge across the Truckee River to the south, and construction on SR 89 north of Granlibakken Road to northwest of Fairway Drive and on SR 28 from just to the east of the SR 89/28 intersection to the SR 89/28 intersection, and possible construction in an open wooded area south and west of SR 89 known as the 64-acre Tract.

PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of this project is to reduce congestion and improve the safety and operations of the SR 89/28 intersection in Tahoe City by addressing present and future automobile travel demand, pedestrian and bicycle mobility, public transit needs, the structural integrity of Fanny Bridge, and emergency access to the Lake Tahoe West Shore communities in the Fanny Bridge vicinity. The project will fulfill the following specific needs:

A. Degraded traffic operation along SR 89 within the project area during summer peak periods is currently at an unacceptable Level of Service (LOS) “F” for northbound traffic. It should be noted that some or all concepts developed may not improve LOS to levels normally considered acceptable to one or more agencies’ criteria. The project has physical and environmental constraints that limit the opportunity for substantial LOS improvement; i.e., roadway lane additions on SR 28 or 89 would not be feasible or advisable because the existing roadway system around the North and West Shores of Lake Tahoe is predominately a two-lane highway and agency plans do not envision adding vehicular lanes.

B. Bike/pedestrian/transit facility connectivity is lacking within the project area and across the Truckee River. Currently, bike/pedestrian/vehicle conflicts occur at Fanny Bridge due to the proximity of bicycles and pedestrians to traffic lanes and pedestrians crossing the highway. This impacts pedestrian and bicycle safety and causes vehicle operations to operate at an unacceptable LOS during peak summer hours. SR 89 bisects U.S. Forest Service land that prevents the public from having a reasonable level of access to public land that fronts the lake adjacent to the project area.

C. Intermodal connectivity is lacking between vehicles, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. Currently there is insufficient parking and access for recreational activities and transit. The new bus Transit Center will accommodate existing bicycle and pedestrian paths, but those paths have limited connections east across SR 89 to access Lake Tahoe and Tahoe City. Those path connections are limited by the existing SR 89, because it supports the primary vehicular roadway circling the lake and does not provide adequate width for pathways additional to the vehicle travel lanes.

D. Structural condition of Fanny Bridge (Truckee River Bridge, Bridge No. 19-0033) structure has degraded. The existing structure has a bridge sufficiency rating of 52.7 and is classified as
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"structurally deficient.” The existing structure also does not meet current seismic design standards and is potentially vulnerable to failure in an earthquake. Design considerations address present and future automobile travel demand, pedestrian and bicycle mobility, public transit needs, the structural integrity of Fanny Bridge, and emergency access to the West Shore communities within the Fanny Bridge area.

**PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The project is intended to achieve the following objectives:

- Relieve existing congestion on SR 89 and improve vehicle mobility for commerce needs and a better resident and visitor experience;
- Improve traffic safety, traffic operations, and emergency access on SR 89 and SR 28, which includes the river crossing (Fanny Bridge) and associated intersections;
- Improve connectivity, reliability, travel times and operations of public transportation modal concepts, including increased mobility and safety of bicycles and pedestrians;
- Improve highway freight mobility and commerce needs;
- Improve the river crossing’s structural integrity (Fanny Bridge) and resolve safety and community concerns about the cultural values related to the historic Fanny Bridge;
- Make public transportation more effective with better connectivity, reliability, and travel times;
- Provide two viable emergency evacuation routes from the Lake Tahoe West Shore communities; and
- Reduce vehicle emissions and improve stormwater treatment.

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Fanny Bridge serves as the main artery for vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians to enter and exit Lake Tahoe’s West Shore to Tahoe City and/or Truckee. Fanny Bridge is currently the only vehicular bridge crossing the Truckee River that provides access to the west shore from the north. This bridge provides one 12-foot lane in each direction with a five-foot wide shoulder on the west side and three-foot wide shoulder and a five-foot sidewalk on the east side. During peak summer months, there is an average of 22,300 vehicles per day and approximately 400 cyclists and pedestrians per hour. Fanny Bridge congestion continues to deteriorate due, in part, to high (and growing) traffic during peak vacation times. Pedestrian, cyclists and drivers are also affected by the extreme congestion heading into Tahoe City along the West Shore (SR 89) and at the southwest end of town. In addition, vehicle, bicycle and foot traffic disturbs topsoil, which can erode and enter the lake; and, emissions from idling vehicles also affect air and water quality.

The project site is bounded by commercial and industrial facilities, but much of the site lies within a public open space with native vegetation (64-Acre Tract owned by the U.S. Forest Service). The land uses in the vicinity of the project site include single-family residential, visitor accommodations (hotel/motel), public utilities, commercials uses, and industrial uses. A Caltrans maintenance yard is located at the western end of the project site. The Truckee River Bike Trail is adjacent to the maintenance yard, parallel to SR 89. The project area is nearly level but includes scattered depressions as well as the incised channel of the Truckee River. The project site is located at an elevation of approximately 6,300 feet above mean sea level. Much of the project area is on land that was, in part, previously developed but that has been restored to native vegetation and is used as a
park. Vegetation in the project area consists primarily of open Jeffrey pine forest and montane riparian scrub. Non-vegetated areas include the channel of the Truckee River and developed areas.

**ALTERNATIVES**

There are five alternatives considered for implementation of the project, including four action alternatives and a no-action alternative. Exhibits 2 through 5 illustrate each action alternative. A brief description of these alternatives follows below.

**ALTERNATIVE 1 – PROPOSED ACTION**

Under Alternative 1, Fanny Bridge would be repaired or replaced, and a new bridge would be constructed over the Truckee River near the east end of the Caltrans Maintenance Station. The new alignment would consist of a two-lane roundabout at the new SR 89/SR 28 connection, a four-lane bridge over the Truckee River, and a single-lane roundabout to complete the new intersection. The existing SR 89 and Fanny Bridge would become a local street and there would be no change in access to existing recreational parking areas from the existing SR 89. In addition, there is an option to modify striping at the old Wye intersection to create a parking area, or town square, between SR 89 and north end of Fanny Bridge (see Exhibit 2).

**ALTERNATIVE 2**

Under Alternative 2, Fanny Bridge would be repaired or replaced, and a new bridge would be constructed over the Truckee River near the east end of the Caltrans Maintenance Station. The new alignment would consist of a two-lane roundabout at the new SR 89/SR 28 connection, a four-lane bridge over the Truckee River, and a single-lane roundabout to complete the new intersection. The existing SR 89 and Fanny Bridge would be used for pedestrians, bicycle, and emergency access, and would be closed to all other traffic. There would be no change in access to existing recreational parking areas from the existing SR 89. In addition, there is an option to modify striping at the old Wye intersection to create a parking area, or town square, between SR 89 and north end of Fanny Bridge (see Exhibit 3).

**ALTERNATIVE 3**

Under Alternative 3, Fanny Bridge would be repaired or replaced, and a new bridge would be constructed over the Truckee River near the east end of the Caltrans Maintenance Station. The new alignment would consist of a two-lane roundabout at the new SR 89/SR 28 connection, a four-lane bridge over the Truckee River, and a single-lane roundabout to complete the new intersection. The existing SR 89 would be turned into a cul-de-sac on the southern side of the bridge and only provide for local access. SR 89 would be closed to vehicle traffic between the existing recreational parking access and the Tavern Shores driveway. In addition, there is an option to modify striping at the old Wye intersection to create a parking area, or town square, between SR 89 and north end of Fanny Bridge (see Exhibit 4).

**ALTERNATIVE 4**

Under Alternative 4, Fanny Bridge would be repaired or replaced, and a new bridge would be constructed over the Truckee River near the east end of the Caltrans Maintenance Station. The new alignment would consist of a signalized intersection at the new SR 89/SR 28 connection, a four-lane bridge over the Truckee River, and a sweeping curve at the southern end of the new SR 89 alignment. The existing SR 89 would be turned into a cul-de-sac on the southern side of Fanny Bridge. SR 89 would be closed to vehicle traffic between the existing
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recreational parking access and the Tavern Shores driveway. In addition, there is an option to modify striping at the old Wye intersection to create a parking area, or town square, between SR 89 and north end of Fanny Bridge (see Exhibit 5).

**ALTERNATIVE 5 (NO PROJECT/NO ACTION)**

Alternative 5 is the No Project/No Action Alternative. The project would not be constructed, and existing conditions on the project site would remain.

**ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER EVALUATION**

An additional alternative was considered during the initial planning for the SR 89/Fanny Bridge project. This alternative is described below.

*Replace and Widen Existing Bridge, Provide Pedestrian Undercrossing.* This alternative would replace the existing Fanny Bridge with a new three span structure widened by approximately 23 feet in the downstream direction. Widened sidewalks on both sides would be separated from traffic lanes with reinforced concrete barrier rails. A pedestrian/bicycle underpass would be provided on the south side of the bridge, with stairs and ramps connecting existing trails. Reinforced concrete barrier rails would be constructed on each side of SR 89 to discourage at-grade pedestrian/bicycle crossing. This alternative did not meet the purpose and need of the project because the pedestrian undercrossing would be closed during high river flows in early summer when there is corresponding heavy pedestrian activity, thereby reducing any benefit to the level of service at the intersection. This alternative would have resulted in substantial impacts to property owners because of the large footprint needed to meet Caltrans standards for design and level of service.

**POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

The following subject areas include potential environmental effects that will be analyzed in the EIS/EIR/EA.

**Land Use.** Land use impacts to be addressed in the EIS/EIR/EA include changes to onsite uses, community character, compatibility with adjacent land uses, and development outside the urban boundary. The EIS/EIR/EA will also address consistency with the Tahoe City Community Plan, and TRPA Code of Ordinances, and Goals and Policies.

**Hydrology and Water Quality.** The alternatives being considered would cross the Truckee River. Project construction could create short-term increases in sediment loads at locations adjacent to Lake Tahoe during the construction period. Both pre- and post-construction impacts will be identified and analyzed in the environmental document. This will include non-point pollution sources from the project, potential contaminants, proposed source control methods, and proposed temporary and permanent best management practices (BMPs) to address potential impacts on water quality. The EIS/EIR/EA will also address potential hazardous material issues, evaluate potential short-term and long-term changes in sediment rate and transport as it relates to altered landscapes, total maximum daily load (TMDL) effects, source water protection (wells and intake lines), and address long-term water quality monitoring needs. Mitigation measures will be proposed, if needed.
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Biological Resources: Fisheries and Aquatic Resources, Vegetation, and Wildlife. Construction and use of the action alternatives could affect the distribution, extent, and quality of sensitive and common biological resources that may be located within the project site and vicinity. Habitat that may be suitable for sensitive plant species could occur in the project area. The relationship of the TRPA vegetation and wildlife threshold carrying capacities will be discussed along with tree removal related to construction of the action alternatives. Impacts on native vegetation, fisheries and aquatic resources, and wildlife will be described based on the alternative infrastructure improvements. The potential for the project to result in the spread of noxious weeds (e.g., cheatgrass) will also be discussed. Mitigation measures will be proposed where needed.

Geology and Soils, and Land Capability and Coverage. The project would involve substantial excavation and placement of fill material and new coverage for shared-use path construction, bridges, and roadways. The EIS/EIR/EA will describe the potential adverse environmental effects related to coverage, land capability, soils, and geology. Potential environmental effects related to land capability and coverage, soils and geology, topographic alteration, seismic hazards, slope stability, and erosion will be described. If soil export outside of the study area is necessary, potential disposal sites will be identified and evaluated. Mitigation measures will be proposed, if needed.

Scenic Resources. Roadway, bridge, and trail construction would result in changes to natural elements that contribute to the scenic quality of the study area (e.g., tree removal, grading, vegetation disturbance), as well as changes related to the installation of recreation-related structures (e.g., paved path and structure-supported path). The project would introduce manmade features that could be visible from SR 28, SR 89, and Lake Tahoe. The EIS/EIR/EA will evaluate the project’s potential effects to scenic resources through the use of ground-level site photographs from sensitive viewpoints on or near the project site and photorealistic visual simulations. Scenic effects will be evaluated in terms of visibility of the alternatives, alteration of the visual setting, sensitivity of viewpoints, as well as the effect of the project on TRPA scenic thresholds. Mitigation measures will be proposed, if needed.

Public Access and Recreation. Construction and operation of the path would result in changes in existing public access to and recreational uses of the study area. Existing recreation resources and opportunities at the project site and vicinity will be described and mapped. Changes in public access and recreational opportunities will be described and mitigation measures will be recommended for significant impacts, if necessary.

Archeological and Historical Resources. The potential for cultural resources to be located on or near the project site and the potential for disturbance of known and/or undiscovered cultural resources due to implementation of the project will be analyzed. The evaluation methodology will include field reconnaissance and evaluation of potentially significant resources in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Mitigation measures will be proposed, if needed.

Transportation, Parking, and Circulation. Transportation, parking, and circulation will be evaluated by calculating the level of service (LOS) for all intersection control types using methods documented in the Transportation Research Board’s Publication Highway Capacity Manual, Fourth Edition, 2000. Key traffic issues that will be evaluated in the EIS/EIR/EA are increased traffic volumes, LOS at area intersections, changes to vehicle miles traveled (VMT), effects on bicycle and pedestrian travel, public transit and shuttle access, and the adequacy of parking. Both short-term construction-related traffic and long-term traffic generated by the project will be analyzed. Mitigation measures will be recommended for significant impacts.

Air Quality and Conformity. The project would involve temporary construction emissions and generation of fugitive dust, as well as generate construction traffic in the area, contributing pollutants to the air basin. The EIS/EIR/EA will include an assessment of ambient air quality conditions as well as short-term (i.e., construction)
air quality impacts and long-term (i.e., operational) regional air pollutant emissions, including mobile and area source emissions. The potential for long-term air quality benefits will also be evaluated from improved traffic operations. The analysis will identify sensitive receptors within and in the vicinity of the project area, discuss potential emissions of odors and/or hazardous air pollutants generated by stationary and area sources in the area, General Conformity and Transportation Conformity, and determine the significance of air quality impacts in comparison with applicable local, state, and federal standards and significance thresholds. Mitigation measures will be recommended for significant impacts, if necessary.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change.** The EIS/EIR/EA will include an analysis of potential project impacts relative to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate change. This analysis will include a quantitative estimate of construction and operational carbon dioxide emissions from mobile sources. Carbon dioxide will be used as a proxy for all GHGs potentially emitted as a result of project operation. GHG emissions from project construction will also be discussed qualitatively. Mitigation measures will be recommended for significant impacts, if necessary.

**Noise.** The EIS/EIR/EA will assess potential short-term (i.e., construction) noise impacts relative to sensitive receptors and their potential exposure, as well as stringent noise standards that apply to PASs. Noise levels of specific construction equipment will be determined and resultant noise levels at nearby receptors (at given distances from the source) will be calculated. Long-term (i.e., operational) noise impacts will be assessed. Mitigation measures will be proposed, if needed.

**Public Services and Utilities.** The public services and utilities section of the EIS/EIR/EA will evaluate impacts on power, solid waste collection and disposal, police services, fire protection services, fire fuel management, water treatment and distribution and wastewater collection – including any impacts associated with disturbance or relocation of the treated effluent pipeline at identified locations. Mitigation measures will be proposed, if needed.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials.** The EIS/EIR/EA will map and address potential hazardous materials located on the project site such as petroleum products (including aerially deposited lead), fertilizers, and pesticides. The EIS/EIR/EA will also address hazardous materials issues related to adjoining properties. Mitigation measures will be proposed, if needed.

**Agricultural and Mineral Resources.** The proposed alternatives are not expected to affect agricultural or mineral resources in the study area. Existing resources will be verified and discussed.

**Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice.** The EIS/EIR/EA will address socioeconomic concerns including: 1) community character and cohesion; 2) potential business relocation; and 3) potential environmental justice issues, including potentially disproportionate impacts to these populations as a result of the proposed project and/or alternatives. Mitigation measures will be proposed, if needed.

**Growth-Inducing Impacts.** The proposed project and action alternatives would increase the number of jobs available in the region on a temporary basis during construction. Given the growth restrictions that exist in the Lake Tahoe Basin (limited commodities and restrictions on development), project implementation is not anticipated to result in long-term growth-inducing impacts.

**Cumulative Effects.** The EIS/EIR/EA will identify and describe recently approved and reasonably anticipated projects and planning efforts in the vicinity of the project, including the TRPA Regional Plan Update, the Regional Transportation Plan, and other applicable projects. The EIR/EIS/EIS will evaluate the project’s direct and indirect contribution to the combined effects of these activities.
**TRPA Threshold Carrying Capacities**: The EIS/EIR/EA will include assessment of the project alternatives’ compliance with and contribution to the attainment and maintenance of threshold carrying capacities adopted by TRPA.

**Intended Uses of the EIS/EIR/EA**

The TTD, FHWA, Caltrans, and TRPA will use this EIS/EIR/EA to consider the potential environmental effects, design features, mitigation measures, and alternatives when reviewing the SR 89/Fanny Bridge project for approval. The EIS/EIR/EA will serve as FHWA’s NEPA compliance document, TTD’s CEQA compliance document, and as TRPA’s compliance document with respect to its Compact and implementing regulations. Agencies with permitting authority over the project may also use the EIS/EIR/EA, as needed, for subsequent discretionary actions. Permits may include but are not limited to, TRPA and Placer County construction permits, Caltrans encroachment permits, and a California State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Permit.