TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD)

BUDGET FINANCE COMMITTEE
Meeting Agenda

Granlibakken Resort and Conference Center **April 10, 2015**
Bay Room **9:00 a.m.**
725 Granlibakken Road
Tahoe City, CA 96145

All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order. The Board may combine two or more items for consideration. The Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

I. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

All comments are to be limited to no more than five minutes per person. Comments made cannot be acted upon or discussed at this meeting, but may be placed on a future agenda for consideration.

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Item		Action Requested	Page
A.	Renewal of Contract for Professional Services to Represent the District on Federal Transportation Matters, Including the Reauthorization of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act	**Recommend Approval**	**1**
B.	(Item V.A.)		
C.	Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway Phase 3 Project Update; Authorize District Manager to Execute an Agreement with the United States Forest Service to Complete the Environmental Analysis for the Project; Adoption of a Resolution Approving a Federal Lands Access Program Application for Project Funding (Item VI.B.)	**Recommend Approval and Adoption**	**96**

III. ADJOURNMENT

TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD)

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Meeting Agenda

Granlibakken Resort and Conference Center **April 10, 2015**
Bay Room **9:30 a.m.**
725 Granlibakken Road
Tahoe City, CA 96145

All items on this agenda are action items unless otherwise noted. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order. The Board may combine two or more items for consideration. The Board may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND GENERAL MATTERS

A. Roll Call and Determination of Quorum of TTD
B. Approval of Agenda for April 10, 2015

II. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

At this time, members of the public shall have the opportunity to directly address the Board. All comments are to be limited to no more than five minutes per person. The Board is prohibited by law from taking immediate action on or discussing issues raised by the public that are not listed on this agenda. In addition, members of the public shall have the opportunity to directly address the Board after each item on which action may be taken is discussed by the public body, but before the public body takes action on the item.

III. BUDGET FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

IV. TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION APPOINTEE REPORT

V. TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD) CONSENT ITEMS

Item	Action Requested	Page
A. Renewal of Contract for Professional Services to Represent the District on Federal Transportation Matters, Including the Reauthorization of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act	**Approval**	**1**

VI. TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (TTD) BUSINESS ITEMS

COMPLIANCE WITH PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

This notice and agenda has been posted at the TTD office and the following post offices: Stateline, Nevada and Tahoe Valley, California. The notice and agenda has also been posted at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach, the Incline Village GID office and the North Tahoe Chamber of Commerce and on the TTD website: www.tahoetransportation.org.

For those individuals with a disability who require a modification or accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting, please contact Judi White at (775) 589-5502.

California Open Meeting Law Compliance
Written notice of this special meeting was delivered to each member of the Board and to each local newspaper of general circulation and radio or television station who has previously requested such notice in writing. Such notice was received at least 24 hours before the time of this special meeting.

Notice of this special meeting was posted at least 24 hours prior to the meeting in a location that is freely accessible to members of the public.

In addition, the Board has caused this agenda and all documents constituting the agenda packet to be mailed to all persons requesting such materials, and such mailing occurred at the time the agenda was posted or upon distribution to all, or a majority of all, of the members of the Board, which occurred first.

Nevada Open Meeting Law Compliance
Written notice of this meeting has been given by posting a copy of this agenda at the principal office of the Board and at three other separate, prominent places within the jurisdiction of the Board not later than 9 a.m. of the third working day before the meeting.

Written notice of this meeting has been given by providing a copy of this agenda to any person who has requested notice of the meetings of the Board. Such notice was delivered to the postal service used by the Board not later than 9 a.m. of the third working day before the meeting for transmittal to the requester by regular mail, or if feasible for the Board and the requester has agreed to receive the public notice by electronic mail, transmitted to the requester by electronic mail sent not later than 9 a.m. of the third working day before the meeting.

Supporting materials were provided to any person requesting such materials and were made available to the requester at the time the material was provided to the members of the Board or, if provided to the members of the Board at the meeting, were made available to the requester at the meeting.

This agenda has been posted on the TTD website - www.tahoetransportation.org.

Tahoe Transportation DISTRICT

Connecting our communities

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 6, 2015

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Renewal of Contract for Professional Services to Represent the District on Federal Transportation Matters, Including the Reauthorization of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act

---

Action Requested:
It is requested the Board renew the contract for professional services to Kathy Ruffalo and Associates to represent the District on federal transportation matters, including the reauthorization of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21).

Background:
At the Board meeting of 2013, Staff reported on the District Manager's trip to Washington, DC and the likelihood of reauthorization consideration with the start of the new Congress. The Tahoe Region needs to continue to be engaged to ensure its interests are addressed. With a tight schedule due to the holiday season, Staff issued a request for proposal for professional consulting services to represent Lake Tahoe transportation interests. The request included addressing the incomplete designation status of the MPO, which is recognized as urban for planning, but rural for any implementation funding. The request was sent to seven firms.

Staff received five proposals from the solicited seven firms. After reviewing the proposals and discussing them with the District Chairman, Staff recommended the award of a contract to Kathy Ruffalo and Associates, LLC as the successful bidder, which the Board approved for a period of twelve months.

The primary task of the contract was to address a potential technical amendment to bring full parity to the MPO as an urbanized area consistent with past federal statutes, including past transportation legislation and the bi-state compact. This discrepancy is attributed to the Census Bureau tool kit, utilized by USDOT as required by law, which cannot accommodate a lake at the center of its region's population and density. Other strategies and needs may exist and be determined as part of the consultant's work with Staff.

Discussion:
Language for the technical amendment has been successfully drafted and vetted by the USDOT staff. It has been included in the Senate version of the proposed Lake Tahoe Restoration Act reauthorization and will likely shift to the reauthorization of the federal transportation bill when Congress takes it up. The Congressional situation remains fluid, however and Staff recommends renewal of Ruffalo and Associates' contract for twelve months, not to exceed forty-eight thousand dollars.

CH/jw AGENDA ITEM: V.A.

Fiscal Analysis:
The source of funds for this contract is through the general fund. Staff will continue to seek general fund revenues to offset these expenses, maintain the balance, and support the District's work in each jurisdiction for transit service and capital projects. This expense will be for up to twelve months over two fiscal years.

Work Program Analysis:
All work associated with this effort will be captured under respective elements of the existing Work Program and corresponding allotted staff time.

Additional Information:
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Carl Hasty at chasty@tahoetransportation.org or (775) 589-5501.

CH/jw AGENDA ITEM: V.A.

Tahoe Transportation DISTRICT

Connecting our communities

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 6, 2015

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Consideration of the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project and its Final Environmental Impact Report; Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report; Approval of the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as Described in the Final Environmental Impact Report as Alternative 1 (New Alignment–Existing SR 89 Open to Local Traffic) with Option 2 (Roundabout); Adoption of Findings of Fact and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act

---

Action Requested:
Staff requests the Board consider the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project and its Final Environmental Impact Report and take the following actions:

Action 1: Adopt "Resolution 2015-003" certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Attachment A).

Action 2: Adopt "Resolution 2015-004" approving the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as described in the Final Environmental Impact Report as Alternative 1 (New Alignment–Existing SR 89 open to local traffic) with Option 2 (Roundabout) and adopting Findings of Fact and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Attachment B).

Background:
In 2000, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), in coordination with California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and Placer County, initiated project development activities for the Project (formerly known as the SR 89 Realignment/Fanny Bridge Rehabilitation Project). The initial focus of the project development activities was related to the development of a Project Study Report (PSR) as required by Caltrans for projects on the state highway system. This PSR was submitted and approved by Caltrans District 3 in 2002. Following approval of the PSR, TRPA initiated the next phase of the Project consistent with Caltrans Project Delivery Procedures, which is the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase, which also includes the preparation of a Caltrans required Project Report (PR). Due to contractual and budget issues, this phase of the Project was never completed and project development activities ceased around 2005 without the completion of PA/ED Phase deliverables, including the PR. This Project is identified in the Lake Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan, the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program, the Tahoe City

Community Plan, Caltrans' "State Route 89 Transportation Corridor Concept Report," and the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association's "North Lake Tahoe Tourism and Community Investment Master Plan."

In February of 2009, TTD assumed project management duties for the Project and entered into a professional services agreement with Wood Rodgers to complete the above-referenced PR for the Project. Additionally, TTD sought and obtained concurrence from Caltrans that the PSR was still valid and did not require additional updates and/or modifications, as this phase of the Project was complete. However, as part of this consultation, Caltrans did determine that most of the design and natural environmental studies were "stale" and required the preparation of new studies to accurately reflect existing conditions and modifications to law, standards, and regulations. Prior to re-initiation of project development activities, TTD obtained California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) delegation authority from Caltrans to be the lead CEQA agency.

Following re-initiation of project development activities, additional resources were allocated to the project for the collection of design and environmental information necessary to develop preliminary engineering studies and drawings, as well as perform environmental analysis to adequately analyze the potential human and natural environmental impacts associated with the project. Ascent Environmental Inc. was selected to develop the environmental documentation as required by the CEQA, TRPA, and NEPA, with AECOM providing support to complete the support environmental and technical studies. Formal environmental scoping for the Project was initiated in December 2011, with formal scoping meetings held on December 11, 2011, December 12, 2011, and January 11, 2012 at the North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council, the District's Board meeting held on the North Shore, and TRPA's Advisory Planning Commission meeting, respectively. The scoping and Notice of Preparation (NOP) described the four action alternatives, as well as the required "No Project/No Action." TTD also completed a Value Analysis/Value Engineering study as recommended by Caltrans Project Delivery Procedures for all projects estimated to be equal or greater than $15 million. This study was initiated in June 2011 and finalized in January 2012.

Concurrent with the development of preliminary engineering and environmental analysis, TTD embarked on a robust and proactive public outreach effort to engage the public, seek input on the project, and provide up-to-date information on Project Development activities. This effort included the hiring of an "on the ground" Community Outreach Specialist and has involved over 30 public meetings/workshops with the following groups, agencies, and/or organizations:

- North Tahoe Historical Society
- Tahoe City Public Utility District
- Tahoe City Downtown Association
- Tahoe League for Charity
- Tahoe City Hospitality Group
- Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association
- Tahoe City Rotary Club
- Tahoe Very Important Parents Group
- Tahoe Tavern/Tahoe Shores Homeowners Association
- Placer County Board of Supervisors
- North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council
- Tahoe Transportation District
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Advisory Planning Commission

- Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency

In addition to the project development activities described above, business owner interviews were conducted and an Economic Analysis was developed to further support the Community Impact Assessment and associated environmental document. TTD staff also established a Community Review Committee (CRC) to further engage area stakeholders, including the members of the business community in and around the Project Area. The CRC's initial orientation meeting was held September 2013, with four subsequent meetings which concluded February 2014. The Economic Analysis was finalized in May 2014.

Lastly, in October 2013, the Federal Highway Administration-Central Federal Lands Highway Division (FHWA-CFLHD) awarded Federal Land Access Program (FLAP) funding for the Project alternatives, including the Meeks Bay to Sugar Pine Point Bike Trail and Dollar Creek Shared Use Path Project for additional project development activities related to all three projects and associated range of alternatives for SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project. As a result of this award, TTD, FHWA-CFLHD, Placer County and other state, local and federal agencies entered into a formal Project Agreement specifying the roles and responsibilities for the development, construction and maintenance of the projects and associated milestones for project delivery. Award of these funds and execution of this Project Agreement transitioned the NEPA lead from Caltrans to FHWA-CFLHD, given their role as Co-Project lead on the Project.

As described above, TTD and Project Development Team partners have worked diligently, assuming the lead role in project development activities necessary to prepare the environmental documentation as required under CEQA, TRPA, and NEPA and resulting in the completion of the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Public Draft Joint Environmental Document. Consistent with public circulation and review processes, a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Joint Environmental Document was issued to the California State Clearinghouse on December 19, 2014, initiating the 60-day public comment period. During the 60-day public comment period, three public hearings were held on January 14, 2015, January 23, 2015, and January 28, 2015 before the TRPA Advisory Planning Commission, TTD Board of Directors, and TRPA Governing Board, respectively. The public comment period was scheduled to conclude on February 17, 2015; however, at their January 28 meeting, TRPA offered an extension of public comment until March 9, 2015. While TTD did not extend the comment period as it relates to CEQA, all comments received during the extension period have been considered, given this is a joint environmental document. During the public comment period, approximately 100 individuals, agencies, and organizations provided comments on the Project which have been considered, responded to, and/or incorporated as necessary. It should also be noted that TTD, FHWA-CFLHD, and other partner agencies hosted a public workshop on January 29, 2015 where additional comment and input was received and considered as part of the public comment period.

Description:

Since the conclusion of the public comment period, TTD, partner agency staff, and consultant teams representing disciplines in engineering, planning, and regulatory/environmental compliance have completed the final joint environmental document for consideration by the TTD Board of Directors. (Due to the document's size, it has not been attached to this staff summary, but can be viewed at http://tahoetransportation.org/fanny-new-1.) In preparing the final joint environmental document, the lead agencies convened with other partner agencies to determine the identification and recommendation of a Preferred Alternative. The agencies include TRPA, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Caltrans, Placer County, and the Tahoe City Public Utility District.

In recommending the preferred alternative, the Staff considered the following planning and guidance documents:

- Project's Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives
- United States Forest Service Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment
    - "A Plan for the 64 Acres Environmental Assessment/Finding of No Significant Effect" (1986)
- TRPA Regional Planning Objectives, including but not limited to the 2012 Regional Plan Update and associated elements:
    - TRPA Code of Ordinances
    - TRPA Goals and Policies
    - TRPA Tahoe City Community Plan (1994)
    - TRPA/TMPO Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies
    - TRPA Environmental Improvement Program
- Caltrans Project Study Report (2002)
- North Lake Tahoe Resort Association Master Plan (2004)

In addition to evaluating the project alternatives with the above documents, the Staff received considerable public input collected from the following venues and constituency groups:

- General Community/Public
- General Agency
- Community Review Committee
- Affected Property Owners
- TRPA Governing Board
- TRPA Advisory Planning Commission
- Placer County Board of Supervisors
- North Tahoe Regional Advisory Council
- TTD Board of Directors
- Tahoe City Public Utility District Board of Directors
- Tahoe Truckee Sanitation District Board of Directors
- USFS Forest Leadership Team
- Tahoe City Downtown Association
- Truckee-North Tahoe Transportation Management Association

Staff has reviewed the project alternatives for consistency with the TRPA Regional Plan and has found that the recommended preferred project alternative is consistent with and will not adversely affect implementation of the TRPA Regional Plan, including all applicable Goals and Policies, Plan Area Statements and maps, the Code and other TRPA plans and programs, including:

a. Land Use Element: Based on the environmental document analysis and review of the element goals and policies, Staff finds the Project consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan, and best achieves the goals and objectives related to Land Use, and sub-elements of the Regional Plan including Community Design, Noise, Natural Hazards, Air Quality, and Water Quality.
b. Transportation Element: Based on review of the goals and policies, Staff finds the Project consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan, and best achieves the goals and objectives of the Transportation Element, specifically those related to T-1, T-2, T-4, T-6, T-10, and T-14.
c. Implementation Element - Environmental Improvement Program (EIP): Based on review of the goals and policies, Staff finds the Project consistent with the TRPA

Regional Plan, and best achieves the goals and objectives of the Implementation Element, including the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program, specifically those related to IAP-1, DP-3, DP-4, Fin-1, Fin-2, Fin-3, and Fin-4.

d. Conservation Element: Based on the environmental document analysis and review of the element goals and policies, Staff finds the Project consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan, and best achieves the goals and objectives related to the Conservation Element.
e. Regional Transportation Plan: Based on review of the Goals and Policies, Staff finds the Project consistent with, and best meets the goals and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan, including the Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the Federal Livability Principles.
f. Sustainable Communities Strategy: Based on the environmental document analysis and review of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, Staff finds the Project consistent with, and best meets the goals and objectives of the Sustainable Communities Strategy, including the Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.
g. Tahoe City Community Plan: Based on review of the plan, Staff finds the Project consistent with, and best meets the goals and objectives of the adopted Tahoe City Community Plan adopted in 1994.

After the release of the final joint environmental document, the TTD Board of Directors held a special public meeting on March 27, 2015, but took no action. The Board heard the project and received public comments on the final joint environmental document and the preferred alternative for the project. The comments expressed did not add significant new information to the final joint environmental document. The comments and responses are summarized as Attachment C.

In consideration of all of the information contained above, including information in the environmental analysis, Staff recommends the Board approve **Alternative 1,** defined as a realignment of SR 89; construction of new Truckee River Bridge and single lane eastern and western roundabouts; conversion of existing SR 89 into a local "Complete Street" open to traffic; and inclusion of the roundabout option at the wye, as the alternative that best meets the Purpose and Need and the TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies; and approve the two attached resolutions, the first of which certifies the environmental document under CEQA (Attachment A), and the second of which approves the project alternative and adopts Findings of Fact and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program pursuant to CEQA (Attachment B).

Additional Information:
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Alfred Knotts at aknotts@tahoetransportation.org or (775) 589-5503.

Attachments:
A. Resolution 2015-003
B. Resolution 2015-004
C. Summary of Public Comments and Responses to Comments, Tahoe Transportation District Board Meeting, March 27, 2015

The final environmental document has not been attached to this staff summary due to its size. It can be viewed at http://tahoetransportation.org/fanny-new-1.

AK/jw AGENDA ITEM: VI.A.

TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-003

A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE STATE ROUTE 89/FANNY BRIDGE COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION PROJECT PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), the Tahoe Transportation Planning Agency (TRPA), and Federal Highways Administration–Central Federal Lands Highway Division (FHWA-CFLHD) have prepared a joint environmental document for the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project (Project) in Tahoe City, California; and

WHEREAS, the joint environmental document is intended to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the TRPA Compact, Code of Ordinances and Rules of Procedure; and

WHEREAS, TTD is the lead agency for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) required by CEQA; and

WHEREAS, a Notice of Preparation of the EIR was released on December 2, 2011, initiating a 30-day public scoping period to gather comments from public agencies and the general public regarding desired contents of the environmental analysis; and

WHEREAS, a draft joint environmental document and accompanying appendices were prepared and TTD circulated it as the draft EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 2011122013) for public comment from December 19, 2014, to February 17, 2015, duly noticed in accordance with CEQA; and

WHEREAS, the final joint environmental document has been prepared, which includes the draft joint environmental document, appendices, public comments on the draft joint environmental document, and responses to comments; and

WHEREAS, the final joint environmental document constitutes the final EIR for the Project (Final EIR);

WHEREAS, CEQA requires TTD, as the lead agency for the EIR, to certify the Final EIR prior to approving the Project; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors has reviewed and considered the Final EIR in light of public comments and testimony, the information in the Final EIR, the administrative record, and staff reports.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors certifies as follows:

1. The recitals above are true and accurate and reflect the independent judgment of the Board of Directors.

2. Notice of the Board of Directors meetings on the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project environmental review documents including the opportunity for public comment was given as required by law and the actions were conducted in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

3. All individuals, groups and agencies desiring to comment were given adequate opportunity to submit oral and written comments on the environmental review documents. These opportunities for comment meet or exceed the requirements of CEQA.

4. All comments submitted during the public review and comment period on the Draft EIR were responded to adequately.

5. The Board of Directors was presented with all of the information described in the recitals and has considered this information in adopting this resolution.

6. The Final EIR: (a) has been completed in compliance with the intent and requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; (b) reflects the independent judgment and analysis by the Board of Directors; and (c) has been presented to and reviewed and considered in its deliberations regarding approval of the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Tahoe Transportation District at its regular board meeting held on April 10, 2015, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

_____
Steve Teshara, Chair
Tahoe Transportation District

TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-004

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE STATE ROUTE 89/FANNY BRIDGE COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION PROJECT AND ADOPTING FINDINGS OF FACT AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) and Federal Highway Administration–Central Federal Lands Highway Division (CFLHD) are the project proponents for the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project (Project) in Tahoe City, California; and

WHEREAS, TTD, CFLHD, and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) have prepared a joint environmental document for the Project, which is intended to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the TRPA Compact, Code of Ordinances and Rules of Procedure; and

WHEREAS, TTD is the lead agency for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) required by CEQA and has adopted a resolution certifying the Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, after public comment, review and consideration, staff for TTD and CFLHD have identified Alternative 1 (New Alignment – Existing SR 89 Open to Local Traffic) with Option 2 (Roundabout), as described in the Final EIR, as the preferred alternative for the Project; and

WHEREAS, Alternative 1 (New Alignment – Existing SRR 89 Open to Local Traffic) with Option 2 (Roundabout) best meets the "Purpose and Need" of the Project, as well as the basic project objectives, and is consistent with the goals and objectives of the TRPA Regional Plan; and

WHEREAS, the staff of the project development team for the Project, which includes the U.S. Forest Service, Placer County, and the Tahoe City Public Utility District, has endorsed Alternative 1 (New Alignment – Existing SR 89 Open to Local Traffic) with Option 2 (Roundabout) as the preferred alternative for the Project; and

WHEREAS, TTD staff recommends that the Board approve the Project, as described in the Final EIR as Alternative 1 (New Alignment – Existing SRR 89 Open to Local Traffic) with Option 2 (Roundabout); and

WHEREAS, the Board has reviewed and considered the following: (1) Final EIR documents and record; (2) information, data and technical reports provided regarding the Project; (3) the proposed CEQA Findings of Fact; (4) the proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; (5) all oral and written public testimony received; and (5) the administrative record;

WHEREAS, the Board has also considered input from the public, staff and other agencies on the Project and its alternatives, and evaluated the merits of the identified preferred alternative in achieving the "Purpose and Need" of the Project and basic project objectives; and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with approving the Project, CEQA requires the Board to adopt the findings attached hereto as Exhibit A (Findings of Fact) and Exhibit B (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors as follows:

1. The Board hereby approves the Project, as described in the Final EIR as Alternative 1 (New Alignment – Existing SR 89 Open to Local Traffic) with Option 2 (Roundabout), for purposes of CEQA.

2. The Board hereby adopts Exhibit A (Findings of Fact) pursuant to CEQA.

3. The Board hereby adopts Exhibit B (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program) pursuant to CEQA.

4. The Board hereby specifies that TTD's Capital Improvement Program Transportation Projects Manager, Alfred Knotts, shall be the custodian of TTD's record of proceedings for purposes of CEQA and the record is located at 128 Market Street, Suite 3F, Stateline, NV 89449.

5. The Board hereby directs TTD staff to file a notice of determination and pay California Department of Fish and Wildlife filing fees as required by CEQA.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors at its regular board meeting held on April 10, 2015, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

_____
Steve Teshara, Chair
Tahoe Transportation District

State Route 89 / Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Environmental Impact Report

Findings of Fact

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act

California SCH# 2011122013

Tahoe Transportation District
PO Box 499
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
128 Market Street, Suite 3F
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact: Alfred Knotts

March 23, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) and Federal Highway Administration-Central Federal Lands Highway Division (FHWA-CFLHD) are proposing improvements to resolve the existing and future traffic congestion at the wye intersection of State Route (SR) 28 and SR 89, enhance multi-modal options, improve safety and access, address the long-term structural integrity of the Truckee River Bridge #19-0033 (locally known as "Fanny Bridge"), and support community revitalization. TTD is the Lead Agency that is approving the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These CEQA Findings of Fact (these Findings) are prepared for use by TTD in taking its actions related to the project.

The SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project is located in Tahoe City, Placer County, California. The project site includes approximately 0.7 mile of SR 28 and 0.6 mile of SR 89. The proposed improvements are designed to enhance motorized and non-motorized mobility, reduce traffic congestion, accommodate anticipated future increases in traffic, increase access across the Truckee River, address existing pedestrian and traffic safety concerns, and encourage revitalization of the local Tahoe City community.

Addressing seasonal traffic congestion problems around the wye and Fanny Bridge has long been a concern of TTD, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and Placer County, as well as residents, business owners, and visitors. Although traffic management strategies have been implemented, congestion has remained at a level that can only be addressed through physical improvements that enhance traffic flow, better accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists, and facilitate on-time performance of transit service. Specifically, an approach is needed to separate vehicular traffic from the heaviest areas of tourist pedestrian activity and address vehicular conflicts. Realignment of SR 89 in the area is identified as part of the TRPA Regional Plan, Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization (TMPO) Regional Transportation Plan, TRPA Environmental Improvement Program, the Caltrans State Route 89 Transportation Corridor Concept Report, and Tahoe City Community Plan adopted by both TRPA and Placer County.

TTD, TRPA, and the FHWA -CFLHD prepared a joint environmental document. TTD is the Lead Agency for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), pursuant to CEQA (Public Resource Code Section 21000 et. seq. and California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq. [CEQA Guidelines].). TRPA is the Lead Agency for the TRPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under the Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, Code of Ordinances, and Rules of Procedure. FHWA-CFLHD is the Lead Agency for the Environmental Assessment (EA) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations Implementing NEPA.

This project is included in the TMPO 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) list. It is also considered to be a fiscally constrained project of the Tahoe Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), adopted in December 2012. "Fiscally constrained" means that the costs of the proposed projects, over the 23-year plan horizon of the RTP, are within the reasonably foreseeable revenues of that period and, therefore, the project is prioritized for implementation. The RTP includes a baseline forecast of federal, state, and local funding, which is intended to reflect what has historically been available from these sources, with inflation factors from zero to 2.5 percent, depending on the revenue source (TMPO and TRPA 2012). In 2013, the project was selected and programmed for construction funding through the Federal Lands Access Program in Fiscal Year 2016, if a preferred alternative is approved by the lead agencies following the environmental review process. The environmental analysis contained in the EIR/EIS/EA provides a thorough evaluation of significant and potentially significant effects on the environment that would occur as a result of implementing the project.

When approving a project, CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines provide that:

> No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:
>
> (a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:
>
> (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
>
> (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
>
> (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.
>
> (b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment. (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines, Section 15091.)

Because the EIR/EIS/EA identified significant effects that would occur as a result of the project and in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, TTD hereby adopts these Findings as part of the approval of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project.

TTD will make the following motions to certify the Final EIR/EIS/EA and approve the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project, based on the EIR/EIS/EA, the TTD staff summary, and the complete administrative record:

I. EIR Certification: TTD adopts a motion to certify the final EIR/EIS/EA for the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as being adequate, in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

II. SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Approval: TTD adopts a resolution approving the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project, as described below.

III. CEQA Findings of Fact and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program Adoption: TTD adopts these Findings and adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

2 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For all purposes of CEQA compliance, including these Findings of Fact, the administrative record of all TTD and relevant TRPA and FHWA-CFLHD proceedings and decisions regarding the environmental analysis of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Alternatives consists of those items listed in Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e), including but not limited to the following documents, which are incorporated by reference and made part of the record supporting these Findings:

- The SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Draft and Final EIR/EIS/EA, together with all appendices and technical reports referred to therein, whether separately bound or not;
- The NOP and all other public notices issued by TTD, TRPA and/or FHWA-CFLHD in conjunction with the project;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR/EIS/EA;
- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) for the project;
- All resolutions adopted by TTD, TRPA and/or FHWA-CFLHD regarding the project;
- All applicable general or regional plans and all updates and related environmental analyses;
- The rules, codes and/or regulations of TTD, TRPA and FHWA-CFLHD;
- The RTP/SCS Draft and Final EIR/EIS, and the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan Update and EIS, as any is incorporated into or relied upon by the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project EIR/EIS/EA, together with all appendices and technical reports referred to therein, whether separately bound or not;
- All reports, letters, applications, memoranda, maps or other planning documents relevant to the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project prepared by TTD, TRPA, FHWA-CFLHD, their environmental consultant, or others and presented to or before the decision-makers or staff;
- All minutes or notes of any public workshops, meetings or hearings regarding the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project, and any recorded or verbatim transcripts or videotapes thereof;
- Any letters, reports, illustrations or other documents or evidence regarding the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project submitted into the record at any public workshops, meetings or hearings; and
- Matters of common general knowledge to TTD, TRPA, and CFLHD relevant to the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project that TTD may consider, including applicable state or local laws, ordinances, and policies.
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

Documents or other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which these Findings of Fact are made are maintained by the custodian of the record, TTD's Capital Improvement Program Transportation Projects Manager, Alfred Knotts, and are located at the following location:

Tahoe Transportation District
128 Market Street, Suite 3F
Stateline, NV 89449

3 FINDINGS ARE DETERMINATIVE

TTD recognizes that there may be differences in and among the various sources of information and opinions offered in the documents and testimony that make up the EIR/EIS/EA and the administrative record; that experts can disagree; and that TTD must base its decisions and these Findings on the substantial evidence in the record that it finds most compelling. In adopting these Findings, TTD ratifies, clarifies and/or makes insignificant modifications to the EIR/EIS/EA and resolves that these Findings and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall control and are determinative of the significant impacts of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project and requirements imposed on the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project in response to those impacts.

4 MITIGATION MEASURES AND MMRP

The TTD has defined the approach to implementing mitigation measures for the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project by the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The Mitigation Measures avoid or mitigate to a less-than-significant level all of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project's significant and potentially significant environmental impacts, and attempt to otherwise consider, address, and resolve all of the environmental concerns raised during the public review of the EIR/EIS/EA. The discussion that follows under the captions "Finding" for each significant impact recites some of the background environmental impact information related to the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project from the EIR/EIS/EA; the finding made by TTD is set forth under the caption "Facts in Support of Finding;" and the discussion under this caption contains substantiating information about what mitigation is provided and how it reduces the significant impact. TTD finds that the specific references to Mitigation Measures provided herein are intended to indicate where the particular measure or condition can be found in the administrative record.

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires that when a public agency is making the findings directed by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) and Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code, the public agency shall adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the changes that it has either required of the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. TTD hereby adopts the mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP), and commits itself and its agents, contractors, and partner agencies to full and complete implementation of the Mitigation Measures set forth therein. These Mitigation Measures are binding and enforceable obligations with which TTD, its agents, contractors, and partner agencies must comply.

To the extent these Findings omit any Mitigation Measures set forth in the MMRP, the omission was inadvertent. TTD therefore incorporates the MMRP herein by reference and finds that compliance with the MMRP shall be required, even if a Mitigation Measure is not referenced in these Findings.

To the extent the Mitigation Measures in these Findings and in the MMRP differ from one another, any such difference was inadvertent. In that event, the more stringent Mitigation Measure shall be required.

5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE EIR/EIS/EA

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly attain the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project was addressed in the EIR/EIS/EA.

Each SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project alternative, except Alternative 5 (No Action Alternative), includes different approaches to achieving the project objectives and purpose and need (Draft EIR/EIS/EA, pp. 1-4 to 1-5). Each alternative also presents different environmental advantages and disadvantages. From the standpoint of minimizing environmental effects related to physical disturbances, Alternative 5 (No Action Alternative) would be the environmentally preferable/environmentally superior alternative. Under Alternative 5, no construction would take place and operations and maintenance would continue under existing programs, and there would not be substantial changes to the existing environment. However, Alternative 5 would not meet any of the basic project objectives described in Section 1.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EA, "Purpose and Need." Implementing Alternative 5 would also preclude gaining the environmental and economic revitalization benefits of the action alternatives. CEQA also specifies that if the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Sections 4.1 through 4.15 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EA identify a number of significant, potentially significant, less-than-significant, and beneficial impacts identified under each action alternative for each environmental issue area evaluated in the EIR/EIS/EA. The significance of impacts after mitigation is also identified. As shown in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA in Table 6-3, based solely on impact significance conclusions after implementation of mitigation measures, Alternatives 1 and 4 would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts; Alternatives 2 and 3 would result in two long-term, significant and unavoidable traffic impacts, and Alternatives 6 and 6a would result in one temporary significant and unavoidable impact related to construction traffic congestion. All action alternatives would provide beneficial effects.

The SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project is intended to support community revitalization. It is included in the 2035 Lake Tahoe 2035 RTP and TRPA's Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). Consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan Goals and Policies, the EIP is designed to attain, maintain, or surpass multiple environmental thresholds through an integrated approach. Each action alternative was designed with these considerations in mind, and would contribute to various environmental improvements as described throughout the EIR/EIS/EA

As stated above, there would be no significant and unavoidable impacts related to implementation of Alternative 1 or 4. Alternative 2 or 3 would result in long-term, significant and unavoidable impacts to segment and intersection levels of service (LOS). While mitigation is available to reduce these LOS impacts through construction of an expanded western roundabout, implementation of these additional traffic improvements is not feasible because of a lack of identified funding sources and project proponent.

Significant and unavoidable impacts associated with Alternatives 6 and 6a would be temporary, construction-related traffic congestion impacts. Construction-period traffic impacts would be less than significant under Alternatives 1 through 4 (because of the ability to stage the construction timing of a new bridge and the Fanny Bridge improvements). Alternatives 6 and 6a would not be able to avoid congested traffic flow in peak summer travel periods during construction of the Fanny Bridge improvements.

Alternatives 1, 4, 6, and 6a would meet all of the project objectives and not cause long-term significant and unavoidable impacts; and Alternatives 2 and 3 would not meet all of the project objectives in the long-term (i.e., 2038), as they relate to traffic operations, and would result in long-term, traffic-related significant and unavoidable impacts. The environmental differences between Alternatives 1, 4, 6, and 6a are related to project design. Each of these alternatives would provide benefits to the study area associated with traffic operations, mobility, and emergency services.

The environmental effects of Alternatives 1 and 4 are similar, with some variations in amount of coverage and land disturbance, but not to the extent that significance conclusions are substantially different. Alternatives 6 and 6a would maintain the current roadway alignment in the study area and provide beneficial effects related to groundwater, stormwater runoff, and drainage, in comparison to Alternatives 1 and 4. Alternatives 6 and 6a would result in no impacts to the public lands known as the "64-Acre Tract." However, the benefits related to the realigned portion of SR 89 would not be realized, including those involving greater emergency access and improved traffic operations. Alternative 6a would result in construction of a

roundabout at the wye, which would provide greater traffic benefits than the modifications to the existing T intersection proposed under Alternative 6. Otherwise, the environmental consequences of Alternatives 6 and 6a are similar.

As described in section 6.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS/EA, the environmentally superior alternative would be one of Alternatives 1, 4, 6, and 6a, depending on decisions about the priority of types of environmental benefits and adverse effects by the Lead Agencies. Each of these four alternatives would not result in long-term, significant and unavoidable environmental impacts and would provide substantial benefits to the study area.

Staff of TTD and FHWA-CFLHD identified Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative, based on consideration of the analysis in the EIR/EIS/EA , public comments, and responses to public comments. The lead agencies convened the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project, Project Development Team (PDT) on Wednesday, March 11, 2015 to seek the PDT's endorsement of the staff's identified preferred alternative. The PDT agencies include TRPA, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), Caltrans, Placer County, and the Tahoe City Public Utility District. After careful review of the information in the record, including but not limited to the analysis in the EIR/EIS/EA and the comments and testimony received on the project, the PDT endorsed the staff's identification of Alternative 1 (New Alignment – Existing SR 89 Open to Local Traffic) with Option 2 (roundabout), as the preferred alternative based on its ability to achieve the identified project objectives, purpose, and need; and its lack of long-term significant and unavoidable impacts. Alternative 1 is defined as a realignment of SR 89, construction of a new Truckee River Bridge and single lane eastern and western roundabouts, conversion of existing SR 89 into a local "Complete Street" open to through traffic, and inclusion of the roundabout "option" at the wye. Recognizing the TTD and FHWA-CFLHD staff identification and PDT endorsement of Alternative 1, Option 2, this alternative has been brought for consideration of approval by the TTD Board.

5.1 SR 89/FANNY BRIDGE COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Seven project alternatives, consisting of six action alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 6a) and one no-action alternative (Alternative 5), were evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA. Four action alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 4) would result in the construction of a new bridge over the Truckee River and realignment of SR 89 through the 64-Acre Tract, rehabilitation or replacement of Fanny Bridge, bike path realignments, and modifications to the Caltrans maintenance yard. Two action alternatives (Alternatives 6 and 6a) would focus on rehabilitating or replacing the existing Fanny Bridge on the current SR 89 alignment and improve the SR 89/SR 28 intersection at its current location. All action alternatives propose improvements to the wye.

As noted previously, on March 11, 2015, the PDT endorsed the staff's identification of Alternative 1 (New Alignment – Existing SR 89 Open to Local Traffic) with Option 2 as the preferred alternative.

CEQA requires that the lead agency adopt mitigation measures or alternatives, where feasible, to substantially lessen or avoid significant environmental impacts that would otherwise occur. Project modification or alternatives are not required, however, where significant environmental impacts will not occur.

As is evident from the EIR/EIS/EA, all significant effects of the project would be mitigated to less than significant levels by the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. There are no impacts that remain as significant and unavoidable and which cannot be substantially lessened. The EIR/EIS/EA evaluates the following alternatives to the proposed project:

5.1.1 Alternative 1 – New Alignment – Existing SR 89 Open to Local Traffic

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

WYE INTERSECTION MODIFICATIONS

Alternative 1 (as well as Alternatives 2 through 4) would include options for addressing the existing free-right-turn lanes at the existing SR 89/SR 28 wye intersection.

Option 1 – Parking Spaces, Landscaping, or Minor Modifications

Under Option 1, the existing free-right-turn lanes would either be replaced with 55 parking spaces, restored with expanded landscaping, or retained with minor modifications, as described below:

- Parking Spaces: If the area is developed for parking, the existing free-right-turn lanes would be replaced with approximately 55 parking spaces. The landscaped median at the southeast corner of the intersection would be removed and replaced with a parking lot, and the existing free-right turn lanes would be restriped with parking spaces. The free-right turns would be closed to through traffic, and all right turns would be directed through the signalized intersection.

- Landscaping: If the area is restored with landscaping, the landscaped medians at the southeast and southwest corners of the intersection would be expanded to include the existing free-right turns. All right turns would be directed through the signalized intersection.

- Minor modifications: If the lanes are retained, they would be reduced to 13 feet to make room for landscape and pedestrian improvements. The existing landscaped medians would be expanded and pedestrian facilities in the area would be enhanced. Free-right turns would continue to be provided.

Option 2 – Wye Roundabout

Under Option 2, a roundabout would be constructed at the existing wye intersection with expanded landscaping and gateway features. Business access would require minor modifications associated with consolidation and/or reconfiguration of ingress/egress driveways.

OTHER PROJECT COMPONENTS

Alternative 1 would include way-finding signage to indicate to drivers the direction to Truckee, Tahoe City, and South Lake Tahoe. Signs would be placed near all entry points to the roundabouts. Signs for gas, food, lodging, public transportation, hiking trails, and other tourist amenities would direct travelers toward Tahoe City attractions and businesses. In addition, the entrance into the Tahoe City Transit Center (Transit Center) would be realigned to allow for bus and vehicle access approximately 240 feet north of the eastern roundabout.

Under Alternative 1, the primary ingress and egress to the Caltrans maintenance yard (i.e., Caltrans Tahoe City Maintenance Station) would be relocated from the northeastern end of the maintenance yard to a modified entrance at the western end. The profile of the new western entrance would be raised approximately 10 feet higher than the existing conditions, and a wall may be constructed at the existing entrance to prohibit access. Fuel tanks, pumping facilities, and a pole barn would be demolished and relocated within the maintenance yard. In addition, the entire area between the new driveway and SR 89 would be used as storage for snow or other materials.

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

Portions of the existing Class I bike paths on the project site would be realigned as part of implementation of the project, including any of the new bridge alternatives.

5.1.2 Alternative 2 – New Alignment – Close Existing SR 89 to Vehicle Traffic

Under Alternative 2, the SR 89 realignment and signage would be the same as described above under Alternative 1, except that the western roundabout would be proposed as a single-lane hybrid configuration (i.e., a single-lane around the circle with two free-right-turn lanes). Fanny Bridge would be rehabilitated or replaced to address the long term structural integrity and resolve safety issues. The existing segment of SR 89 between Fanny Bridge and the eastern roundabout would be relinquished to Placer County and become a local street. Under Alternative 2, the western roundabout would contain a new bridge, which would serve as the primary river crossing constructed over the Truckee River near the east end of the Caltrans maintenance yard. Bollards would be placed to the north and south of Fanny Bridge to prohibit vehicular traffic. Access across Fanny Bridge would be provided only for pedestrians, bicyclists, and emergency vehicles.

Entry into the Transit Center would be allowed from the south only, at an access point approximately 240 feet north of the eastern roundabout. Transit routes to the north would be provided across the new bridge. Traffic calming improvements similar to those described for Alternative 1 would be constructed on the street south of Fanny Bridge. The realigned portion of SR 89 would be elevated through the 64- Acre Tract in the same manner as Alternative 1.

Wye intersection options, signage, and modifications to the Caltrans maintenance yard, realignment and replacement of the TRI and NSEL, and realignments to the Class I bike paths would be the same under Alternative 2 as described above under Alternative 1.

5.1.3 Alternative 3 – Existing SR 89 Becomes a Cul-de-Sac on the South Side of the Bridge

Under Alternative 3, the SR 89 realignment, new bridge, and signage would be the same as described above under Alternative 1, except that the western roundabout is proposed as a single-lane hybrid configuration (same as Alternative 2). Fanny Bridge would be rehabilitated or replaced to address the long term structural integrity and resolve safety issues. The existing section of SR 89 between Fanny Bridge and the eastern roundabout would be relinquished to Placer County and become a local street. A new bridge, which would serve as the primary river crossing, would be constructed over the Truckee River near the east end of the Caltrans maintenance yard. Access to Fanny Bridge would only be available from the north via SR 28. A cul-

de-sac would be constructed south of Fanny Bridge near the Transit Center. The existing SR 89 approaching from the south would no longer allow vehicular access to Fanny Bridge, but it would provide emergency access across the cul de sac to the bridge, when needed. Buses would be allowed to enter the Transit Center from the north via the cul-de-sac or from the south via the eastern roundabout; automobile entry to the Transit Center would be limited to access from the south at the eastern roundabout. The realigned portion of SR 89 would be elevated through the 64-Acre Tract in the same manner as Alternative 1.

Wye intersection options, signage, and modifications to the Caltrans maintenance yard, realignment and replacement of the TRI and NSEL, and realignments to the Class I bike paths would be the same under Alternative 3 as described above under Alternative 1.

5.1.4 Alternative 4 – New Alignment, No Roundabouts – Existing SR 89 Becomes a Cul-de-Sac on the South Side of the Bridge

Under Alternative 4, the SR 89 realignment would follow a similar path across the 64-Acre Tract, as described above under Alternative 1. However, the western roundabout at the new SR 89/SR 28 junction would be replaced with a traditional, signalized intersection, and the eastern roundabout would be replaced by a sweeping curve directing vehicles from the existing SR 89 alignment to the south onto the realigned SR 89 across the 64-Acre Tract. A new bridge, which would serve as the primary river crossing, would be constructed over the Truckee River near the east end of the Caltrans maintenance yard. Fanny Bridge would be rehabilitated or replaced to improve the long term structural integrity and resolve safety issues. A cul-de-sac would be constructed south of Fanny Bridge near the Transit Center. The realigned portion of SR 89 would be elevated through the 64-Acre Tract in the same manner as Alternative 1.

The SR 89/SR 28 intersection modifications and signage would be the same under Alternative 4 as described above under Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. Buses would be allowed to enter the Transit Center from the north via the cul-de-sac or from the south via a new entrance driveway from the sweeping curve; automobile entry to the Transit Center would be limited to an approach from the south via the new entrance driveway.

Under Alternative 4, modification options to the wye intersection would consist of parking spaces, landscaping, or minor modifications. A roundabout would not be constructed at the wye under this alternative. Modifications to the Caltrans maintenance yard, realignment and replacement of the TRI and NSEL, and realignments to the Class I bike paths would be the same under Alternative 4 as described above under Alternative 1.

5.1.5 Alternative 5 (No Action)

Alternative 5 is the No Action Alternative. Under this alternative, there would be no improvements to SR 89, the SR 89/SR 28 intersection, or to Fanny Bridge. Any actions required to address the bridge's service life and structural integrity would not be completed by the Tahoe Transportation District. Another agency (such as Caltrans or Placer County) could pursue a separate bridge rehabilitation or replacement project at another time, or gradual upgrades could be implemented through routine maintenance by Caltrans. Alternatively, Caltrans could declare a more stringent vehicle weight restriction. At this time, no specific improvements to the bridge are planned by Caltrans or any other agency.

5.1.6 Alternative 6 – Rehabilitate or Replace and Widen Existing Bridge, Modify Lane Geometrics at Existing Wye Intersection

Alternative 6 would rehabilitate or replace the existing Fanny Bridge with a wider structure with three northbound and two southbound travel lanes. SR 89 would remain on its existing alignment. The widened

portion of the bridge would be constructed downstream of the existing structure, to comply with Bureau of Reclamation's distance restrictions related to the dam. As a result, the new bridge would be 60 feet wider, and the centerline would be 28 feet downstream, as compared to the existing structure. The new Fanny Bridge would have 12-foot travel lanes, 8-foot shoulders, and 10-foot sidewalks on both sides. Under this alternative, the wye would remain in its existing location and configuration; however, the free-right-turn lanes at the wye would be removed and replaced with right-turn lanes that would direct vehicles through the signalized intersection.

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

5.1.7 Alternative 6a – Rehabilitate or Replace and Widen Existing Bridge, Install Roundabout at Existing Wye Intersection

Under Alternative 6a, the existing Fanny Bridge would be rehabilitated or replaced at its current location with a new, wider four-lane structure built to current Caltrans design and safety standards. The increase in width would be approximately 49 feet. Similar to Alternative 6, the additional width would be downstream of the existing structure. The centerline of the new bridge would be 22 feet downstream from the centerline of the existing bridge. The new Fanny Bridge would have 12-foot travel lanes, 8-foot shoulders, and 10-foot sidewalks on both sides. The existing signalized wye intersection would be replaced with a roundabout.

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

6 CEQA SECTION 21091 FINDINGS

TTD has independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR/EIS/EA for the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project, consisting of the Draft EIR/EIS/EA, public comments on the Draft EIR/EIS/EA, the Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR/EIS/EA and revised sections of the draft EIR/EIS/EA. TTD has also reviewed the Monitoring Mitigation and Reporting Program and considered the administrative record on the project as well as the references provided in Chapter 8, "References," in the draft EIR/EIS/EA.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081, for each significant effect identified in the draft EIR/EIS/EA, TTD must make one or more of the findings specified in that Section. TTD hereby makes the following findings regarding the significant effects of the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project (Alternative 1, Option 2), pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CCR Section 15091.

No Significant or Potentially Significant Impacts of Alternative 1 were identified for Air Quality; Geology, Soils, Land Capability and Coverage; Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Population, Employment, and Housing; and Public Services and Utilities.

6.1 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

6.1.1 Significant Effect: Tree Removal (Impact 4.1-1)

FINDING

Regardless of the magnitude of biological effects of tree removal, native trees are protected in the Tahoe Basin. Because the preferred alternative would result in removal of more than 100 trees greater than 14 inches diameter at breast height (dbh), it would result in substantial tree removal, which would be a potentially significant impact for Alternative 1. While the preferred alternative would also require removal of trees greater than 30 inches dbh, which is generally prohibited by TRPA, the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Project is exempted because it is on the TRPA EIP 5-Year Priority Project List. (TRPA Code Section 61.1.4.A.7.)

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 can and will be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts from tree removal by ensuring adherence to the TRPA requirements associated with tree removal. Implementation of the measure is the responsibility of TTD, TRPA, and construction contractors, with monitoring by TTD and TRPA.

MITIGATION MEASURE 4.1-1: PREPARE TREE REMOVAL, PROTECTION, AND REPLANTING PLAN

A Tree Removal, Protection, and Replanting Plan shall be prepared by the applicant to provide tree protection measures to comply with the performance criteria and other requirements of TRPA Code Section 61, prevent damage to trees that are proposed to remain, and determine appropriate tree replanting locations and approaches to occur in the project area. The Plan will include marking and inventorying the specific trees to be removed, after detailed design is completed. A qualified forester will make a determination regarding the project's consistency with Chapter 61 of the TRPA Code. The plan shall set forth prescriptions for tree removal, water quality protection, root zone and vegetation protection, residual stocking levels, replanting, slash disposal, fire protection, and other appropriate considerations.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementing Mitigation Measure 4.1-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts associated with tree removal, because a qualified forester will be retained to develop a tree removal plan that would comply with TRPA Code Section 61. Compliance with TRPA Code section 61 will ensure that the project's impacts maintain species and structural diversity. (TRPA Code 60.1.1.) This performance standard will be achieved through the preparation and enforcement of a compliant Tree Removal, Protection, and Replanting Plan, subject to approval and monitoring by TTD and TRPA.

6.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

6.2.1 Significant Effect: Disturbance or Loss of Sensitive Habitats (Jurisdictional Wetlands, Riparian Vegetation, and SEZ) (Impact 4.3-2)

FINDING

Implementing the preferred alternative would result in direct removal and disturbance of sensitive habitats, including waters of the United States, waters of the state, riparian habitat, and SEZs. This impact would be significant for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measures 4.3-2 a, b, c, and d can and will be implemented by TTD, and these mitigations would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts from disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats. Implementation of the measures is the responsibility of TTD and construction contractors, with monitoring by TTD and TRPA.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-2a: Implement Vegetation Protection Measures and Revegetate Disturbed Areas

Vegetation will not be disturbed, injured or removed, except in accordance with the TRPA Code or conditions of project approval. Consistent with the TRPA Code, all trees, major roots, and other vegetation, not specifically designated and approved for removal in connection with a project will be protected according to methods approved by TRPA. All vegetation outside the construction site boundary, as well as other vegetation designated on the approved plans, will be protected by installing temporary fencing pursuant to subsections 33.6.9 and 33.6.10. Areas outside the construction site boundary that sustain vegetation damage during construction will be revegetated according to a revegetation plan in accordance with Section 61.4.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b: Conduct Delineation of Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization for Fill and Required Permits

Two delineations of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. within the project site have been completed (Nichols Consulting Engineers [NCE] 2012, 2013). The first delineation (NCE 2012), which was verified by USACE, covered most but not all the current project site, because the project site configuration changed after the delineation was completed and submitted to USACE. The second delineation (NCE 2013) covered the current, expanded project site. The following would apply, as applicable, to any potentially affected jurisdictional resources that have not been delineated or verified by USACE prior to project implementation.

Prior to the start of on-site construction activities on any potentially affected jurisdictional resource that has not been previously delineated or verified by the USACE, a qualified biologist will survey the project site for sensitive natural communities. Sensitive natural communities or habitats are those of special concern to resource agencies or those that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA and other applicable regulations. If sensitive natural communities or habitats that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA are determined to be present, a delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, will be prepared by a qualified biologist through the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process. The delineation will be submitted to and verified by USACE. If, based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United

States would result from implementation of the project, authorization for such fill will be secured from USACE through the Section 404 permitting process. The acreage of riparian habitat (deciduous riparian vegetation) that would be removed or disturbed during project implementation will be quantified and replaced or restored/enhanced in accordance with USACE and TRPA regulations. Habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement will be at a location and by methods agreeable to USACE as determined during the permitting processes for CWA Section 404 and by TRPA during the permitting process for SEZ.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c: Obtain and Comply with a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement; Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of Stream and Riparian Habitat

The following measures would be implemented to avoid or compensate for the loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat, ensure consistency with Fish and Game Code Section 1602, and further reduce potential adverse effects on riparian habitats:

- The project proponent (e.g., TTD, Placer County, or Caltrans) will notify the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) before commencing any activity within the bed, bank, or riparian corridor of any waterway. If activities trigger the need for a Streambed Alteration Agreement, the proponent will obtain an agreement from CDFW. The project proponent will conduct construction activities in accordance with the agreement, including implementing reasonable measures in the agreement necessary to protect the fish and wildlife resources, when working within the bed or bank of waterways that function as a fish or wildlife resource or in riparian habitats associated with those waterways.

- The project proponent shall compensate for permanent riparian habitat impacts at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio through contributions to a CDFW approved wetland mitigation bank or through the development and implementation of a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan aimed at creating or restoring in-kind habitat in the surrounding area. If mitigation credits are not available, stream and riparian habitat compensation shall include establishment of riparian vegetation on currently unvegetated bank portions of streams affected by the project and enhancement of existing riparian habitat through removal of nonnative species, where appropriate, and planting additional native riparian plants to increase cover, continuity, and width of the existing riparian corridor along streams in the project site and surrounding areas. Construction activities and compensatory mitigation shall be conducted in accordance with the terms of a streambed alteration agreement as required under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code.

- The Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall include the following:

  - identification of compensatory mitigation sites and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites;

  - in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory riparian habitats (using performance and success criteria) to document success;

  - monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (Compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer.);

  - ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native riparian plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80% survival of planted riparian trees and shrubs by the end of the five-year maintenance and monitoring period or dead and dying trees shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80 percent survivorship is achieved;

  - corrective measures if performance standards are not met;

- responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and
- responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-2d: Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of SEZ.

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

- SEZ lands within the project area shall be delineated, mapped, and TRPA-verified. All reasonable alternatives/options shall be implemented to avoid or reduce the extent of encroachment into SEZs.
- In instances where there is no feasible alternative to avoid an SEZ, the project proponent shall mitigate all impacts within the boundaries of SEZs by restoring SEZ habitat (land capability district 1b) in the surrounding area, or other appropriate area as determined by TRPA, at a minimum ratio of 1.5:1, consistent with TRPA Code.
- The project proponent shall retain a qualified restoration ecologist to prepare a restoration plan that will address final clean-up, stabilization, and revegetation procedures for areas disturbed by the project. The restoration plan for SEZs shall include the following:
  - identification of compensatory mitigation sites, with emphasis on sites within the Truckee River watershed, and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites;
  - complete assessment of the existing biological resources in the restoration areas;
  - in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory SEZs (using performance and success criteria) to document success;
  - monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (Compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer.);
  - ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80 percent survival of planted vegetation by the end of the five-year maintenance and monitoring period or dead and dying plants shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80% survivorship is achieved;
  - corrective measures if performance standards are not met;
  - responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and
  - responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

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

6.2.2 Significant Effect: Introduction and Spread of Invasive Plants (Impact 4.3-3)

FINDING

Implementation of the preferred alternative has the potential to introduce and spread terrestrial and aquatic invasive plants during construction and revegetation periods. Noxious weeds and other invasive plants could inadvertently be introduced or spread in the project area during grading and construction activities, if nearby source populations passively colonize disturbed ground, or if construction and personnel equipment is transported to the site from an infested area. Soil, vegetation, and other materials transported to the study area from off-site sources for best management practices (BMPs), revegetation, or fill for project construction could contain invasive plant seeds or plant material that could become established in the study area. Additionally, terrestrial and aquatic invasive species currently present in or near the study area have the potential to be spread by construction disturbances. The introduction and spread of terrestrial or aquatic invasive species would degrade terrestrial plant, wildlife, and aquatic habitats, including habitats of special significance (riparian) within the study area. The potential introduction and spread of terrestrial or aquatic invasive species would be a potentially significant impact for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measures 4.3-3a and b will be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts from the introduction and spread of invasive plants. Implementation of the measures is the responsibility of TTD.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3A: Implement Invasive Plant Management Practices During Project Construction

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

- For project activities on USFS land, a Noxious Weed Risk Assessment will be prepared for all areas to be temporarily impacted. Applicable LTBMU Invasive Plant Management Measures will be implemented under the direction of the Forest Botanist.

- Before construction activities begin, invasive plant infestations will be treated where feasible. Treatments will be selected based on each species ecology and phenology. All treatment methods-including the use of herbicides-will be conducted in accordance with the law, regulations, and policies governing the land owner (e.g., TRPA and/or LTBMU). Land owners will be notified prior to the use of herbicides for invasive treatment. In areas where treatment is not feasible, noxious weed areas will be clearly flagged or fenced in order to clearly delineate work exclusion.

- To ensure that fill material and seeds imported to the project site are free of invasive plants/noxious weeds, the project will use on-site sources of fill and seeds whenever available. Fill and seed materials that need to be imported to the project site will be certified weed-free. In addition, only certified weed-free imported materials (or rice straw in upland areas) will be used for erosion control.

- Vehicles and equipment will arrive at the study area clean and weed-free. All equipment entering the project site from weed-infested areas or areas of unknown weed status will be cleaned of all attached soil or plant parts before being allowed into the project site. Vehicles and equipment will be cleaned using high-pressure water or air at designated weed-cleaning stations after exiting a weed-infested area. Cleaning stations will be designated by a botanist or noxious weed specialist and located away from aquatic resources. Equipment will be inspected by the on-site environmental monitor for mud or other signs that weed seeds or propagules could be present prior to use in the study area. If the equipment is not clean, the monitor will deny entry into work areas.

- If designated weed-infested areas are unavoidable, the plants will be cut, if feasible, and disposed of in a landfill in sealed bags or disposed of or destroyed in another manner acceptable to the USFS, TRPA, or other agency as appropriate. If cutting weeds is not feasible, layers of mulch, degradable geotextiles, or similar materials will be placed over the infestation area to minimize the spread of seeds and plant materials by equipment and vehicles during construction. These materials will be secured so they are not blown or washed away.

- Locally collected native seed sources for revegetation shall be used when possible. Plant and seed material will be collected from or near the study area, from within the same watershed, and at a similar elevation when possible and with approval of the appropriate authority (e.g., USFS botanist for collection on USFS land). Persistent nonnatives such as cultivated timothy (*Phleum pretense*), orchard grass (*Dactylis glomerata*), or ryegrass (*Lolium* spp.) shall not be used.

- After the project is completed, the USFS noxious weed coordinator shall be notified so that the USFS portion of the project site can be monitored by the USFS if desired. Monitoring could be for up to three years (as feasible) subsequent to project implementation to ensure additional nonnative invasive species do not become established in the areas affected by the project and to ensure that known nonnative invasive species do not spread.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-3b: Implement Aquatic Invasive Species Management Practices During Project Construction

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

- All equipment, including individual equipment such as waders, wading boots, etc., entering the study area that will be used in or around the Truckee River or Lake Tahoe shall be decontaminated using methods recommended in the Lake Tahoe Region Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan (USACE 2009) before being allowed into the study area.

- If applicable, all equipment, including individual equipment such as waders, wading boots, etc., used in known infested areas within the study area shall be decontaminated using the above mentioned methods before entering any other areas of the study area not known to contain aquatic invasive species.

- Aquatic invasive species encountered during fish removal and relocation efforts will be euthanized and/or removed from the watershed.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementing Mitigation Measures 4.3-3a and 4.3-3b would reduce potentially significant impacts from the spread of invasive species to a less-than-significant level because invasive plant and aquatic invasive species management practices would be implemented and would prevent the inadvertent introduction and spread of invasive plants or aquatic invasive species during project construction. The management practices would be consistent with existing, proven protocols developed and overseen by TRPA, USFS and the Lake Tahoe Aquatic Invasive Species Management coordination group and will be effective in mitigating any potential impacts.

6.2.3 Significant Effect: Disturbance or Loss of Special-Status Wildlife Species and Habitats (Impact 4.3-4)

FINDING

Under the preferred alternative, constructing or expanding roadway alignments, roadway features (e.g., curbs, gutters, retaining walls), bike path realignment, and other project elements could result in disturbances to two special-status wildlife species (waterfowl and olive-sided flycatcher). Disturbances resulting in loss of individuals or nests, or disruptions to nesting attempts by special-status species would be a potentially significant impact for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measure 4.3-4 can and should be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts from the disturbance or loss of special-status wildlife species and habitats. Implementation of the measure is the responsibility of TTD and the construction contractor, with monitoring by TTD and TRPA.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-4: Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys for Nesting Special-Status Birds, and Implement a Limited Operating Period if Necessary

For construction activities that would occur in suitable habitat during the nesting season (generally April 1–August 31, depending on snowpack and other seasonal conditions), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct focused surveys for waterfowl and olive-sided flycatcher nests no more than 14 days before construction activities are initiated each construction season. If an active nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, the biologist shall notify TRPA and/or CDFW. If necessary, modifications to the project design to avoid removal of occupied habitat while still achieving project objectives shall be evaluated, and implemented to the extent feasible. If avoidance is not feasible or conflicts with project objectives, appropriate buffers around nests and limited operating periods will be established through consultation with TRPA and/or CDFW to avoid disturbances during the sensitive nesting season.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Because implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-4 would avoid the loss of individuals and nests of special-status wildlife species (olive-sided flycatcher and waterfowl), potential impacts to special-status wildlife species would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

6.2.4 Significant Effect: Short-Term Effects on Aquatic Resources Resulting from Construction (Impact 4.3-5)

FINDING

Under the preferred alternative, project construction and staging near aquatic habitats could temporarily result in adverse impacts to aquatic resources in the Truckee River. Additionally, the preferred alternative would require construction and/or rehabilitation of bridge foundations and footings below the ordinary high water mark and within the river channel, dewatering, and water diversion. Because TRPA, State and Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Placer County regulations are in place to minimize erosion and transport of sediment and other pollutants during construction, and appropriate project-specific measures would be defined to secure necessary permits and approvals, construction-related impacts to aquatic resources would be minimized and would not result in substantial adverse effects on water quality or aquatic habitat quality and functions in the Truckee River. However, even with incorporation of these measures and requirements into the project, project construction could result in loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat protected under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. Additionally, construction would include dewatering activities that would result in the temporary loss of aquatic habitat. Any disturbance to the bed and bank of a waterway that provides habitat functions and requiring a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFW, and potential injury or mortality to native fish during dewatering activities, would be considered a potentially significant impact to aquatic resources under Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measures 4.3-5a, b, and c can and should be implemented by TTD, and these mitigations would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts from the short-term effects on aquatic resources resulting from construction. Implementation of the measures is the responsibility of TTD, with monitoring by TTD and TRPA and USACE.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-5a: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b

Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b (reprinted immediately below).

Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b: Conduct Delineation of Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization for Fill and Required Permits

Two delineations of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. within the project site have been completed (NCE 2012, 2013). The first delineation (NCE 2012), which was verified by USACE, covered most but not all the current project site, because the project site configuration changed after the delineation was completed and submitted to USACE. The second delineation (NCE 2013) covered the current, expanded project site. The following would apply, as applicable, to any potentially affected jurisdictional resources that have not been delineated or verified by USACE prior to project implementation.

Prior to the start of on-site construction activities on any potentially affected jurisdictional resource that has not been previously delineated or verified by the USACE, a qualified biologist will survey the project site for sensitive natural communities. Sensitive natural communities or habitats are those of special concern to resource agencies or those that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA and other applicable regulations. If sensitive natural communities or habitats that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA are determined to be present, a delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, will be prepared by a qualified biologist through the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process. The delineation will be submitted to

and verified by USACE. If, based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United States would result from implementation of the project, authorization for such fill will be secured from USACE through the Section 404 permitting process. The acreage of riparian habitat (deciduous riparian vegetation) that would be removed or disturbed during project implementation will be quantified and replaced or restored/enhanced in accordance with USACE and TRPA regulations. Habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement will be at a location and by methods agreeable to USACE as determined during the permitting processes for CWA Section 404 and by TRPA during the permitting process for SEZ.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-5b: Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c

Implemented Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c (reprinted immediately below).

Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c: Obtain and Comply with a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement; Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of Stream and Riparian Habitat

The following measures would be implemented to avoid or compensate for the loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat, ensure consistency with Fish and Game Code Section 1602, and further reduce potential adverse effects on riparian habitats:

- The project proponent will notify CDFW before commencing any activity within the bed, bank, or riparian corridor of any waterway. If activities trigger the need for a Streambed Alteration Agreement, the proponent will obtain an agreement from CDFW. The project proponent will conduct construction activities in accordance with the agreement, including implementing reasonable measures in the agreement necessary to protect the fish and wildlife resources, when working within the bed or bank of waterways that function as a fish or wildlife resource or in riparian habitats associated with those waterways.

- The project proponent shall compensate for permanent riparian habitat impacts at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio through contributions to a CDFW approved wetland mitigation bank or through the development and implementation of a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan aimed at creating or restoring in-kind habitat in the surrounding area. If mitigation credits are not available, stream and riparian habitat compensation shall include establishment of riparian vegetation on currently unvegetated bank portions of streams affected by the project and enhancement of existing riparian habitat through removal of nonnative species, where appropriate, and planting additional native riparian plants to increase cover, continuity, and width of the existing riparian corridor along streams in the project site and surrounding areas. Construction activities and compensatory mitigation shall be conducted in accordance with the terms of a streambed alteration agreement as required under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code.

- The Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall include the following:

  - identification of compensatory mitigation sites and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites;

  - in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory riparian habitats (using performance and success criteria) to document success;

  - monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (Compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer.);

  - ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native riparian plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80% survival of planted riparian trees and shrubs by the end of the five-year maintenance and

monitoring period or dead and dying trees shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80 percent survivorship is achieved;

- corrective measures if performance standards are not met;
- responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and
- responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.

Mitigation Measure 4.3-5c: Conduct Preconstruction Surveys and Develop and Implement Native-Fish Capture and Translocation Plan

The project proponent shall develop and implement measures to prevent the construction-related loss of native fish occupying habitat within the study area. In accordance with existing regulations, before any construction activities that require dewatering commence, a qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys and implement native-fish relocation activities (if native fish are present) within the construction dewatering area. All captured native fish species shall be immediately released to a suitable habitat near the study area. The qualified biologist shall place nets with 1/8-inch mesh at the upstream and downstream extents of the area to be dewatered to keep fish out of the area during fish removal activities. After completion of removal activities, the work area will be cleared for dewatering. Fish rescue and relocation will continue until the area is completely dewatered or until it is determined that no fish remain in the dewatering area. This fish translocation plan will apply only to native fish species. Nonnative species captured during the pre-dewatering effort will be humanely killed and disposed of. These activities shall take place in consultation with TRPA and CDFW.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.3-5a, 4.3-5b, and 4.3-c would reduce potentially significant impacts to aquatic resources (Impact 4.3-5) to a less-than-significant level because it would require that: 1) aquatic habitat is avoided to the extent feasible; 2) aquatic habitats that cannot be avoided are restored following construction; 3) any unavoidable losses would be compensated for in a manner that results in no net loss of aquatic habitat; and 4) project implementation is consistent with the aquatic and riparian habitat protection provisions of Fish and Game Code Section 1602.

6.3 CULTURAL RESOURCES

6.3.1 Significant Effect: Historical Resources (Impact 4.4-1)

FINDING

The preferred alternative has the potential to affect the National Register of Historic Places-listed Lake Tahoe Dam and associated Outlet Gates through the rehabilitation or replacement of the adjacent Fanny Bridge. The preferred alternative would not physically alter the dam or gates; however, construction would occur immediately adjacent to the resources. Overall, the replacement or rehabilitation of Fanny Bridge would result in a bridge that would be similar in size and scale to the existing bridge and the new elements would be of comparable visual relationship to that of the existing bridge. Therefore, while there would be no change in the significance of the resource, because of the risk of construction damage to the resource this impact would be potentially significant for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 can and

should be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted Mitigation Measure 4.4-1, below, that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts from the short-term effects to historic resources. Implementation of the measure is the responsibility of TTD, the design engineer, and the construction contractor, with monitoring by TTD.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-1: Ensure Historic Integrity During Construction

During design development, engineering design and specifications will be prepared to account for the proximity of construction activities associated with rehabilitation or replacement of Fanny Bridge to the Lake Tahoe Dam, Outlet Gates, and stilling basin and define separation distances, construction techniques, and other protective design details to avoid damage to the dam-related structures. This measure will include attention to the construction activity related to the bridge's pile support structures. Where project construction activities will take place in the vicinity of the Lake Tahoe Dam, Outlet Gates, and stilling basin, those facilities shall be clearly identified in the field to facilitate maintenance of a physical separation from construction activities and other protection actions to adequately protect historically important features of the dam structure.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 would reduce potentially significant impacts to historic resources because it would ensure the historic integrity of the Lake Tahoe Dam and Gates will be protected and maintained throughout the construction period, thereby avoiding a significant impact on the historic property. By ensuring adherence to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

6.3.2 Significant Effect: Archaeological Resources (Impact 4.4-2)

FINDING

Construction and excavation activities associated with the preferred alternative could result in sediment disturbance and removal, which can adversely affect archaeological resources. Because the preferred alternative would include excavation and other ground-disturbing activities, the preferred alternative could result in adverse physical effects to known and unknown archaeological resources. This impact is potentially significant for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measures 4.4-2a and b can and should be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted Mitigation Measures 4.4-2a and 4.4-2b, below, that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts from the short-term effects on archaeological resources. Implementation of the measures is the responsibility of TTD, the construction contractor, and a qualified archaeologist.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a: Conduct Archaeological Monitoring

In accordance with existing regulations, for ground-disturbing activities that have the potential to impact archaeological remains and that will occur in an area that has been determined by a qualified archaeologist

to be an area that is sensitive for the presence of buried archaeological remains, the project proponent (e.g., TTD, Placer County, Caltrans) will require the construction contractor to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor those activities. Archaeological monitoring will be conducted in areas where there is likelihood that archaeological remains may be discovered but where those remains are not visible on the surface. Monitoring will not be considered a substitute for efforts to identify and evaluate cultural resources prior to the project initiation. Where necessary, the project proponent will seek Native American input and consultation.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b: Stop Work in the Event of an Archaeological Discovery

If potentially significant cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with individual project preparation, construction, or completion, the project proponent will require the construction contractor to stop work in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find, and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with TRPA and other appropriate agencies and interested parties. A qualified archaeologist will follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the California Historical Resources Information Center office (North Central Information Center) for California projects. The consulting archaeologist will also evaluate such resources for significance per California Register of Historical Resources eligibility criteria (PRC Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR Section 4852). If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the TRPA standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the lead agency will be notified and a data recovery plan will be prepared.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-2a and 4.4.-2b would reduce potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources because mitigation would be developed in coordination with the appropriate federal, state, and/or local agency(ies) to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid disturbance, disruption, or destruction of archaeological resources, this impact (Impact 4.2-2) would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

6.3.3 Significant Effect: Accidental Discovery of Human Remains (Impact 4.4-3)

FINDING

Construction and excavation activities associated with development activities result in sediment disturbance and removal, which can unearth human remains if they are present. Because the preferred alternative would allow excavation and other ground-disturbing activities, this impact would be potentially significant for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 can and should be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted Mitigation Measure 4.4-3, below, that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts on accidental discovery of human remains. Implementation and monitoring of the measure is the responsibility of TTD.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: Stop Work if Human Remains are Discovered

In accordance with existing regulations, if any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location on an individual project site, the project proponent will ensure that there will be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:

a) The applicable County Coroner/Sheriff has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and

b) If the remains are of Native American origin,

   1. The descendants of the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or

   2. The Native American Heritage Commission was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.

   3. The site shall be flagged and avoided during construction.

c) If human remains, grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony (as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [NAGPRA]) are discovered during ground disturbing activities on Federal Property, work will cease until the provisions of NAGPRA are met.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 would reduce potentially significant impacts to human remains because mitigation would be developed in coordination with the appropriate federal, state, and/or local agency(ies) to avoid, move, record, or otherwise treat the resource appropriately, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations. By providing an opportunity to avoid disturbance, disruption, or destruction of archaeological resources, this impact (Impact 4.4-3) would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

6.3.4 Significant Effect: Ethnic and Cultural Values (Impact 4.4-5)

FINDING

Because the preferred alternative could result in physical changes to historic and prehistoric sites, unique ethnic cultural values could be affected, and historic or prehistoric religious or sacred uses within the area of potential effects could be restricted. Consultation with the Washoe tribe is required by federal, state and TRPA regulations, however, project activities could still uncover or destroy historic or archaeological resources as identified in Impacts 4.4-1 (historic) and 4.4-2 (archaeological). Additionally, as described in Impact 4.4-3 (human remains), project activities could result in accidental discovery of remains during grading and excavation. Accidentally discovered remains could be of Native American origin. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measures 4.4-5 can and should be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted Mitigation Measure 4.4-5, below, that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the preferred alternative's impacts on ethnic and cultural values. Implementation of the measure is the responsibility of TTD, the construction contractor, and a qualified archaeologist, with monitoring by TTD.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-5: Implement Other Cultural Resources Mitigation Measures

Implement mitigation measures 4.4-2a, 4.4-2b, and 4.4-3 (reprinted immediately below)

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a: Conduct Archaeological Monitoring

In accordance with existing regulations, for ground-disturbing activities that have the potential to impact archaeological remains and that will occur in an area that has been determined by a qualified archaeologist to be an area that is sensitive for the presence of buried archaeological remains, the project proponent (e.g., TTD, local county, Caltrans, NDOT) will require the construction contractor to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor those activities. Archaeological monitoring will be conducted in areas where there is likelihood that archaeological remains may be discovered but where those remains are not visible on the surface. Monitoring will not be considered a substitute for efforts to identify and evaluate cultural resources prior to the project initiation. Where necessary, the project proponent will seek Native American input and consultation.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b: Stop Work in the Event of an Archaeological Discovery

If potentially significant cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with individual project preparation, construction, or completion, the project proponent will require the construction contractor to stop work in that area until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find, and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with TRPA and other appropriate agencies and interested parties. A qualified archaeologist will follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the California Historical Resources Information Center office (North Central Information Center) for California projects. The consulting archaeologist will also evaluate such resources for significance per California Register of Historical Resources eligibility criteria (PRC Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR Section 4852).

If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the TRPA standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the lead agency will be notified and a data recovery plan will be prepared.

Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: Stop Work if Human Remains are Discovered

In accordance with existing regulations, if any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location on an individual project site, the project proponent will ensure that there will be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:

a) The applicable County Coroner/Sheriff has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and

b) If the remains are of Native American origin,

   1. The descendants of the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or

   2. The Native American Heritage Commission was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.

3. The site shall be flagged and avoided during construction.

c) If human remains, grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony (as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [NAGPRA]) are discovered during ground disturbing activities on Federal Property, work will cease until the provisions of NAGPRA are met.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4-5 would reduce this impact because it would require 1) consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission and the Washoe Tribe; 2) require avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, and/or data recovery of historical and archaeological resources; and 3) require assessment of and adherence to a formal recommendation for any discovered human remains.

6.4 HAZARDS, HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, AND RISK OF UPSET

6.4.1 Significant Effect: Hazardous Materials Sites (Impact 4.8-2)

FINDING

Roadway improvements associated with the preferred alternative could affect properties that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Therefore, the possibility of encountering hazardous materials exists and impacts related to exposure of the public or the environment to hazardous materials would be potentially significant for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD, and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measures 4.8-2a and b can and should be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted Mitigation Measures 4.8-2a and 4.8-2b, below, that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the preferred alternative's impacts from existing hazardous materials sites. Implementation and monitoring of the measures is the responsibility of TTD.

Mitigation Measure 4.8-2a: Conduct Surveys for Asbestos-Containing Materials, Aerially Deposited Lead, and Lead-Based Paints and Coatings

a. Demolition of buildings and roadways containing asbestos and lead-based materials will require specialized procedures and equipment, and appropriately certified personnel, as detailed in the applicable regulations. Buildings and roadways intended for demolition that were constructed before 1980 will be surveyed for asbestos, while those constructed before 1971 will be surveyed for lead.

   Prior to construction, all existing road right-of-ways in the project site shall be surveyed for lead contamination due to aerially deposited lead (ADL) and use of paint and coatings containing lead. All sampling would be conducted consistent with applicable Caltrans requirements.

b. A demolition plan shall be prepared for any location with positive results for asbestos or lead. The plan will specify how to appropriately contain, remove, and dispose of the asbestos and lead-containing material while meeting all requirements and BMPs to protect human health and the environment. A lead compliance plan shall be prepared by a Certified Industrial Hygienist (consistent with the requirements of Caltrans' SSP 14- 11.07).

Prior to demolition, the project applicant shall submit the written plan to the Placer County Environmental Health Department describing the methods to be used to: (1) identify locations that could contain hazardous residues; (2) remove plumbing fixtures known to contain, or potentially containing, hazardous materials; (3) determine the waste classification of the debris; (4) package contaminated items and wastes; and (5) identify disposal site(s) permitted to accept such wastes. Demolition shall not occur until the plan has been accepted by the Placer County Environmental Health Department and all potentially hazardous components have been removed to the satisfaction of Placer County Environmental Health Department staff. The project applicant shall also provide written documentation to Placer County that lead-based paint and asbestos testing and abatement, as appropriate, have been completed in accordance with applicable state and local laws and regulations. Lead abatement will include the removal of lead contaminated soil (considered soil with lead concentrations greater than 400 parts per million in areas where children are likely to be present).

Mitigation Measure 4.8-2b: Prepare a Construction Hazard Management Plan

A construction hazardous materials management plan shall be developed to address potentially impacted soil, impacted groundwater, lead-based paint, and asbestos-containing materials that may be encountered during project construction activities. The construction hazardous materials management plan shall include provisions for agency notification, managing impacted materials, sampling and analytical requirements, and disposal procedures. The plan would include identification of construction site BMPs to minimize the potential for water quality impacts.

The construction hazardous materials management plan shall cover the following:

- petroleum hydrocarbon-impacted soils and/or groundwater that may be encountered during project construction activities in areas where construction depths exceed 2 feet bgs in the vicinity of the recognized environmental conditions (RECs) described above;
- soils identified by the ADL surveys as being impacted by ADL within survey area right of ways;
- materials identified by the lead-based paint and asbestos-containing materials surveys as impacted by lead based paint and asbestos containing materials within bridge, pipe, and building materials;
- impacted soil or groundwater related to TRI pipe relocation; and
- guidance for relocating, removal, or repair of hazardous materials storage facilities (underground storage tanks or aboveground storage tanks) that are impacted by project construction. The plan shall include information on assessment and potential handing of contaminated soils found during relocation.

The plan will include procedures to stop work if evidence of potential hazardous materials or contamination of soils or groundwater is encountered during construction, including the applicable requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and CCR Title 22 regarding the disposal of wastes.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8-2a and 4.8-2b would reduce this impact because they require that asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, and other hazardous substances in building components are identified, removed, packaged, and disposed of in accordance with applicable state laws and regulations and would establish a procedure to address potentially impacted soil, impacted groundwater, lead-based paint, and asbestos-containing materials that may be unexpectedly encountered during project construction activities. This would minimize the risk of an accidental release of hazardous substances that could adversely affect human health or the environment. Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce this potential impact to a less-than-significant level.

6.5 NOISE

6.5.1 Significant Effect: Short-Term Construction Noise Impacts (Impact 4.10-1)

FINDING

Existing noise-sensitive receptors are located within 50 feet of construction areas. Most heavy-duty construction equipment use and activity would occur during the daytime. However, some minor roadwork would occur at night. Nighttime activities would not result in substantial increases in noise above existing ambient noise levels and would not exceed applicable standards at the nearest sensitive receptors. Daytime construction could occur outside of the exempt daytime hours by Placer County or TRPA; therefore, could potentially exceed applicable standards and result in excessive noise at nearby sensitive receptors. This would be a significant impact for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measures 4.10-1a and b can and should be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted Mitigation Measures 4.10-1a and 4.10-1b, below, that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts on short-term construction noise. Implementation of the measures is the responsibility of TTD and the construction contractor, with monitoring by TTD.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-1a: Limit Construction Hours

To reduce noise exposure during the sensitive times of the day, construction activities will comply with the following limitations.

For daily construction activities (e.g., heavy duty equipment, pile driving, paving, cement removal), with the exception of minor night time activities as described under Impact 4.10-1, construction will begin no earlier than 8:00 a.m. and continue no later than 6:30 p.m. daily.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-1b: Noise Controls for Construction Equipment

To reduce noise levels from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment the construction contractor will comply with the following measures.

- All construction equipment shall be equipped with properly operating mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications.
- Inactive construction equipment shall not be left idling for prolonged periods of time (i.e., more than 5 minutes).
- Stationary equipment (e.g., power generators) and staging area for other equipment shall be located at the maximum distance feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors (i.e., receptors defined in Draft EIR/EIS/EA, Exhibit 4.10-1 and Tables 4.10-13a and -13b).
- Trucks hauling materials and goods to and from the construction site shall only do so during construction seasons (i.e., May 1 through October 15).
- As directed by FHWA, the contractor will implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures, including changing the location of stationary construction equipment, turning off idling equipment,

rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, and installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise source.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.10-1a and 4.10-1b would reduce potentially significant impacts related to short-term construction noise because they would ensure that the primary noise-generating construction activities would occur during the daytime hours when people are less likely to be at home and, therefore, would not be disturbed by loud noise. This time restriction would comply with TRPA noise exemptions for construction activities taking place during the day. Further, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-1b would ensure that all heavy-duty construction equipment is properly equipped with mufflers that provide additional noise reduction. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures all construction-related noise-generating activity would be limited to the less sensitive times of the day and heavy-duty equipment would be properly maintained and equipped to reduce noise to the greatest extent possible. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

6.5.2 Significant Effect: Ground Vibration Impacts (Impact 4.10-2)

FINDING

Existing noise-sensitive receptors and structures are located within 50 feet of potential pile driving locations. Thus, receptors could be exposed to excessive levels of ground vibration and vibration noise such that structural damage and human disturbance could occur. This would be a significant impact for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measures 4.10-2a and b can and should be implemented by TTD, and these mitigations would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted Mitigation Measures 4.10-2a and 4.10-2b that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the preferred alternative's impacts from construction-related ground vibration by reducing exposure times and including basic best practices. Implementation of the measures is the responsibility of TTD, with monitoring by TTD and TRPA.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-2a: Implement 4.10-1a

Implement mitigation measure 4.10-1a.(reprinted immediately below).

Mitigation Measure 4.10-1a:

Limit construction hours to reduce noise exposure during the sensitive times of the day, construction activities will comply with the following limitations.

For daily construction activities (e.g., heavy duty equipment, pile driving, paving, cement removal), with the exception of minor night time activities as described under Impact 4.10-1, construction will begin no earlier than 8:00 a.m. and continue no later than 6:30 p.m. daily.

Mitigation Measure 4.10-2b: Reduce Exposure to Construction-Generated Ground Vibration

To reduce exposure to construction-generated ground vibration, measures will be developed to address vibration generated during construction and demolition activity. TRPA's Best Construction Practices Policy may include required setback distances for various types of construction equipment that generate ground

vibration, as well as criteria for conducting site-specific studies where these setback distances cannot be maintained. Measures required by the policy to minimize exposure to ground vibration may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Holes shall be predrilled to the maximum feasible depth to reduce the number of blows required to seat the pile.
- All construction equipment on construction sites shall be operated as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as reasonably possible.
- Earthmoving and ground-impacting operations shall be phased so as not to occur simultaneously in areas close to offsite sensitive receptors, to the extent feasible. The total vibration level produced could be significantly less when each vibration source is operated at separate times.
- No construction or demolition activity shall be performed that would expose an existing structure to levels of ground vibration that exceeds 0.20 in/sec Peak Particle Velocity (PPV).
- The vibration control program shall include minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving, blasting) for the purpose of preventing damage to nearby structures.
- Established setback requirements can be breached if a project-specific, site specific analysis is conducted by a qualified geotechnical engineer or ground vibration specialist that indicates that no structural damage would occur at nearby buildings or structures.
- No construction or demolition activity shall be performed that would expose human activity in an existing building to levels of ground vibration that exceed Federal Transit Administration's 80 Vibration Decibel (VdB) standard. The vibration control program shall also include minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration producing activities (e.g., pile driving, blasting) for the purpose of preventing negative human response. Established setback requirements can be breached only if a project-specific, site-specific, technically adequate ground vibration study indicates that the buildings would not be exposed to ground vibration levels in excess of 80 VdB, and ground vibration measurements performed during the construction activity confirm that the buildings are not being exposed to levels in excess of 80 VdB; or at least two weeks' advanced notice is provided to owners and renters of residential buildings that would be exposed to ground vibration levels within the applicable setback distance; and hotel accommodations are offered to inhabitants of residences within the applicable setback distance at the expense of the project applicant.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-2a would ensure that the vibration-generating, construction activities would occur during the daytime hours when people are less likely to be at home. Further, Mitigation Measure 4.10-2b requires implementation of best practices to prevent construction-generated ground vibration, thereby reducing the risk of damage to buildings and structures. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

6.5.3 Significant Effect: Long-Term Noise Impacts (Impact 4.10-3)

FINDING

The preferred alternative would result in changes to existing traffic noise levels. Under the preferred alternative, the noise effect in the study area would be significant for CEQA and TRPA environmental compliance, because portions of the 64-Acre Tract would be exposed to traffic noise increases greater than

3 db CNEL where the TRPA standard of 55 dBA CNEL is already exceeded. This would be a significant impact for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measures 4.10-3a can and should be implemented by TTD, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted Mitigation Measure 4.10-3a that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the preferred alternative's impacts from long-term traffic noise. Implementation of the measures is the responsibility of TTD, the design engineer, and the construction contractor, with monitoring by TTD, TRPA and Central Federal Lands Highway Division (CFLHD).

Mitigation Measure 4.10-3a: Include Traffic Noise Reduction Features in the Realigned Section of SR 89

To reduce noise impacts associated with realignment of SR 89, to the extent feasible, TTD, TRPA, and CFLHD will coordinate with Placer County, Caltrans, and USFS to identify and include feasible and effective design features that would reduce noise generation on the realigned section of the highway to ensure that the traffic noise level does not exceed 55 CNEL at a distance of 300 feet from the highway edge. Feasible and effective design features will be incorporated into the final design of the realigned highway. Features considered during design development may include, but are not limited to:

- reduced vehicle speeds to 30 mph or lower through posted limits, advisory signs, and/or design features, such as traffic calming elements (e.g., median barrier, center islands, and raised crosswalks),
- vegetative screening that includes trees to aid in noise attenuation over distance,
- noise-attenuating pavement, if determined to be feasible and effective in this location,
- limiting access by heavy duty trucks to daylight hours,
- construction of vegetated earth berms for noise attenuation.

The performance standard of these noise-reducing features will be to achieve a traffic noise level that does not exceed 55 CNEL at a distance of 300 feet from the highway edge.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-3a would reduce this impact through reducing the travel speed on the realigned SR 89. Modeling of traffic noise contours along the realigned segment of SR 89 indicates that reducing the travel speed to 30 mph for the preferred alternative would result in a 55 CNEL noise contour that is less than 300 feet from the highway edge (Ascent Environmental 2014). This shows that the performance standard required by Mitigation Measure 4.10-3a is feasible and implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10-3a would reduce the impact along the realigned segment of SR 89 to a less-than-significant level for purposes of CEQA and TRPA environmental compliance.

6.6 RECREATION

6.6.1 Significant Effect: Temporary Disruption of Public Access to the Truckee River, Recreational Trails, 64-Acre Tract, or Fanny Bridge Area (Impact 4.13-1)

FINDING

During the construction period, the preferred alternative would have a short-term effect on existing public access to recreation trails, a public river rafting launch site, and public lands, because of temporary trail closures, construction staging areas, and limitations on parking that supports access to public lands and river recreation. Also, brief closures of Fanny Bridge could occur during its rehabilitation or reconstruction. Cyclists would be directed to "share the road" and/or to temporary detour routes when trails are not available. This short-term decrease in access would be a significant impact.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD, and have been adopted by TTD. TTD can and should ensure the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.10-1 through its project review, and this mitigation would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted the following mitigation measure that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the project's impacts related to temporary disruption of public access to recreation resources. Implementation of the measure is the responsibility of TTD and the construction contractor, with monitoring by TTD, TRPA, CFLHD, United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), Placer County, USFS, and Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD).

Mitigation Measure 4.13-1: Provide Detours and Trail Access Management for the Tahoe Rim Trail and Truckee River Trail Through or Around Construction Areas

The Traffic Management Plan shall address all modes of transportation used to access recreation areas, including trail access, public transit, pedestrian and bicycle modes. In order to mitigate short-term decreases in access to recreation resources, trail detour plans shall be included in the Traffic Management Plan, which will meet, at minimum, the following specifications.

1. During construction of the new bridge, SR 89 near the bridge, and the Caltrans maintenance yard entrance, the Truckee River Trail will be temporarily closed and all bicycle and pedestrian travel will be required to "share-the-road" and/or be detoured to a temporary trail/path on the highway consisting of a physical barrier such as "K-Rail." The temporary separated path shall be established from the western end of the construction zone on SR 89 to the existing bicycle/pedestrian bridge to the east. It is anticipated that construction in this area will be completed in one season, thus the temporary trail will be used from May through October during one year. Signage will be provided at parking lots and approaching the construction zone to alert trail users about the timing, duration, and nature of construction-related impacts.

2. The contractor shall submit a plan to create detours for trail users on the Tahoe Rim Trail, West Shore Trail, Lakeside Trail, and the Truckee River Trail.

3. Signage shall be provided at trail heads and parking lots for all trails directly affected by construction and for connecting trails to alert trail users about the timing, duration, and nature of construction-related impacts, detours and closures.

a. Sign locations shall include, but are not limited to parking lots and trail entrances at Tahoe City, Alpine Meadows, Squaw Valley, and Tahoma for the Truckee River Trail and the Lakeside Trail, and Barker Pass and Brockway Summit trailheads for the TRT.

4. The Traffic Management Plan shall include trail access management and require extensive public information via a variety of media outlets in the region to inform the public regarding the construction-related detours and closures that affect access to recreational facilities, including parking, and trail closures.

5. The Traffic Management Plan shall provide a "recreation hotline" and or website link that is frequently updated to provide current information on construction related detours and closures.

The Traffic Management Plan shall be subject to the review and approval of TTD, TRPA, CFLHD, Reclamation, Placer County, USFS, and TCPUD. Measures will be taken to keep the public informed of the project construction activities. When closures and/or detours are required by the contractor(s), warning signs and signs regarding restricted access, trail closures, and detours will be posted before and during construction to ensure adequate public safety. Postings, including public notices, will be posted no less than 5 working days in advance of the closures and/or detours. Detour routes will be clearly marked, and construction limit fencing or physical barriers will be installed in order to prevent access to the project site and to clearly delineate the detour route. Full trail closure by the contractor(s) will be prohibited from July 1 through September 9 without an approved detour. All bicycle and pedestrian detours will be included in the Traffic Control Plan to be reviewed and approved prior to construction.

Approval must be granted before the start of earth-moving activities. No trail shall be closed without an approved detour plan.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 will minimize the adverse effects associated with Impact 4.13-1 because it will allow continued recreational use of the Tahoe Rim Trail and Truckee River Trail, when feasible, and will allow the public to make informed decisions regarding recreation destinations prior to arriving in the study area. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.13-1, Impact 4.13-1 would be less than significant.

6.7 SCENIC RESOURCES

6.7.1 Significant Effect: Change the Existing Visual Character or Quality of the Project Site after Completion (Impact 4.14-2)

FINDING

The preferred alternative would increase built environment features within the 64-Acre Tract and across the Truckee River. Views from the Tahoe Rim Trail in the 64-Acre Tract near the new bridge approach and from the river, itself, would experience visual change; however, the area is already altered by the presence of urban features. Due to the visibility of the new, realigned highway and bridge approach within the forest of the 64-Acre Tract, changes to visual character of the forest landscape would be a significant impact

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measure 4.14-2 can and should be implemented by TTD, which would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the preferred alternative's long-term impacts on the existing visual character or quality of the project site. Implementation of the measures is the responsibility of TTD, the design engineer/landscape architect, and the construction contractor, with monitoring by TTD and USFS.

Mitigation Measure 4.14-2: Minimize Visual Change and Visually Screen Infrastructure with Replanted Forest Vegetation

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

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

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.14-2 would reduce potentially significant impacts associated with changes to the existing visual character or quality of the project site because, while the preferred alternative would alter views from some portions of the Tahoe Rim Trail and the 64-Acre Tract near the new bridge approach and highway embankment, implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the visual effects from the addition of urban features by restoring disturbed forest vegetation and increasing native trees and understory vegetation. The forest vegetation plans will be approved by TRPA and the USFS before construction of the preferred alternative begins. Thus, by restoring the forest with replanted trees and understory vegetation, as well as incorporating appearance-enhancing design elements, the visibility and adverse scenic impact of the realigned highway and bridge approach would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

6.8 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

6.8.1 Significant Effect: Intersection Operations (Impact 4.15-2)

FINDING

The preferred alternative would not generate additional vehicle trips that could affect intersection operations; rather, it would implement improvements to existing transportation infrastructure. Under the preferred alternative, SR 89 would be realigned through the 64-Acre Tract and the existing SR 90/SR 28 wye intersection would be modified. Additional delay is projected to occur at the Granlibakken Road intersection with SR 89 for both 2018 and 2038. Thus, intersection impacts would be significant for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency. Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a can and should be implemented by Placer County. Placer County has already identified the SR 89 and Granlibakken Road intersection as a future Capital Improvement Program project.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the preferred alternative's impact on intersection operations. Implementation of the measure is the responsibility of TTD and Placer County, with monitoring by TTD, TRPA, Placer County and Caltrans.

Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a: Implement Improvements for the Side-Street Movements at the Granlibakken Road Intersection with SR 89

The proposed project would create a site-specific impact on the local transportation system when analyzed against the projected operations for the No Action condition. Article 15.28.010 of the Placer County Code establishes a road network Capital Improvement Program. The payment of traffic impact fees funds the Capital Improvement Program for area roadway improvements. Placer County has already identified the SR 89 and Granlibakken Road intersection as a future Capital Improvement Program project. The project is not defined at this time; however, the improvements will modify the type of control at this location to reduce the delay for the side street movements on Granlibakken Road. Placer County is the agency responsible for this mitigation measure.

Before initiating construction of the improvements to the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection, an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans will need to be approved. In addition, implementation of this mitigation measure will include sufficient design improvements to achieve acceptable delay and LOS levels to the satisfaction of Placer County, Caltrans, TRPA, and TTD.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a will reduce delay and maintain the LOS at the SR 89/Granlibakken Road intersection at acceptable levels, because its implementation will contribute to improvements to this intersection and will include acceptance by Placer County, TRPA, and TTD. The Placer County Capital Improvement Program has been resulting in transportation improvements with a record of reducing environmental impact throughout Placer County for many years. Implementation of Placer County improvements will maintain LOS at acceptable levels. The impact will be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

6.8.2 Significant Effect: Construction-Related Traffic Impacts (Impact 4.15-4)

FINDING

Construction of the preferred alternative would result in temporary construction traffic and temporary disruption to traffic circulation in the area of construction. The project could be constructed over a total of up to three construction seasons. The project applicant would be required to prepare a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) for review and approval by CFLHD-FHWA prior to construction activities. Access to the river crossing and existing intersections would be maintained during construction, however the potential disruption would be potentially significant for Alternative 1.

Changes or alterations that would mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of TTD and have been adopted by TTD. Mitigation Measure 4.15-4 should be implemented by TTD, which would reduce the significant effects of the project to a less-than-significant level.

FACTS IN SUPPORT OF FINDING

TTD adopted the following mitigation measures that would reduce to less-than-significant levels the preferred alternative's impact on intersection operations. Implementation of the measure is the responsibility of TTD, FHWA-CFLHD, and the construction contractor, with monitoring by TTD and CFLHD-FHWA.

Mitigation Measure 4.15-4: Maintain Efficient Traffic Flow and Provide Safe Work Zones During Each Construction Season

Prior to construction, the contractor will be required to submit a Traffic Control Plan to CFLHD-FHWA. CFHLD-FHWA will coordinate review and approval of the plan with TRPA, Placer County, Caltrans, and other agencies as appropriate. The Traffic Control Plan will regulate maintenance of traffic during each construction season and comply with agency standards and regulations to promote safe and efficient travel for the public and construction workers through the work zones. The plan will include provisions for regular inspections to assess contractor compliance with the plan, signage to direct traffic, and public noticing, as appropriate.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING IMPACT REDUCTION BY MITIGATION

Implementation of Mitigation 4.15-4 will minimize traffic flow disruption and, when needed, will provide detours that will maintain construction period traffic flow in a manner that is acceptable to Placer County and Caltrans. In the construction work zones, this mitigation measure will also enhance the safety of the work zones for the traveling public and workers. Because implementation of this mitigation measure will minimize possible transportation disruptions during the construction seasons, and ensure safe and efficient travel, impacts will be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

7 CONCLUSION

The mitigation measures listed in conjunction with each of these Findings, as implemented through the MMRP, have eliminated or reduced, or will eliminate or reduce to a level of insignificance, all adverse environmental impacts.

The MMRP, as adopted by TTD at the time of project approval, is attached to these Findings.

8 REFERENCES

For complete lists of references used in preparing the Draft EIR/EIS, see Chapter 8, "References," in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA. For a complete list of references used in preparing the Final EIR/EIS/EA, see Chapter 5 "References," in the Final EIR/EIS/EA.

State Route 89 / Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Environmental Impact Report

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

California SCH# 2011122013

Tahoe Transportation District
PO Box 499
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
128 Market Street, Suite 3F
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact: Alfred Knotts

March 23, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines to provide for the monitoring and reporting of mitigation measures required of the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as set forth in the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Assessment (FEIR/EIS/EA) prepared for the project.

Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15091(d) and 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines require public agencies "to adopt a reporting or monitoring program for changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment." A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is required for the proposed project because the EIR/EIS/EA for the project identified potentially significant and significant adverse impacts related to construction and implementation activities, and mitigation measures have been identified to reduce all of those impacts to a less-than-significant level.

This MMRP is being adopted by the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) as part of CEQA compliance for the State Route 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project approval of Alternative 1

This MMRP will be kept on file at TTD, 128 Market Street, Suite 3F, Stateline, Nevada, 89449.

PURPOSE OF THE MMRP

This MMRP has been prepared to ensure that all required mitigation measures are implemented and completed according to schedule and maintained in a satisfactory manner during the construction and operation of the State Route 89 / Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project, as required. The MMRP may be modified by TTD during project implementation, as necessary, in response to changing conditions or other refinements. A summary table (attached) has been prepared to assist the responsible parties in implementing and monitoring compliance with the MMRP. The table identifies individual mitigation measures, monitoring/mitigation timing, responsible person/agency for implementing the measure, monitoring procedures, and a record of implementation of the mitigation measures. The numbering of mitigation measures follows the numbering sequence found in the EIR/EIS/EA.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Some mitigation measures involve additional or modified design features, while others require specific construction practices, or pre or post-construction activities. Mitigation measures will be implemented by TTD, the contractor selected to construct the project, the design engineer, and other individuals or entities with required technical expertise. As the primary agency implementing the project and the lead agency under CEQA, TTD has overall responsibility for monitoring compliance with required mitigation measures. In cases where another agency has statutory authority over a specific element of a mitigation measure, that agency is also responsible for monitoring compliance with the mitigation measure. Additional details on the responsibilities for implementation and monitoring of each mitigation measure is provided in the MMRP summary table.

MMRP SUMMARY TABLE

The MMRP Summary Table that follows should guide TTD in its evaluation and records of the implementation of mitigation measures.

The column categories identified in the MMRP Summary Table are described below:

Impacts – describes the impacts requiring mitigation.

Mitigation Measure – provides the text of the mitigation measures identified in the EIR.

Monitoring Action – identifies the elements of the mitigation that will be monitored for compliance with the MMRP.

Responsibility – identifies the entity responsible for implementing the requirements of the mitigation measure, and the entity responsible for monitoring compliance with the mitigation measure.

Timing/Schedule – lists the time frame in which the mitigation will take place.

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
4.1. Agricultural and Forestry Resources				
Impact 4.1-1: Tree removal. Regardless of the magnitude of biological effects of tree removal, native trees are protected in the Tahoe Basin. Because Alternative 1 would result in removal of more than 100 trees greater than 14 inches dbh, it would result in substantial tree removal, which would be a potentially significant impact. While Alternative 1 would also require removal of trees greater than 30 inches dbh, which is generally prohibited by TRPA, the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Project is exempted because it is on the EIP list of projects.	**Mitigation Measure 4.1-1: Prepare tree removal, protection, and replanting plan.** A Tree Removal, Protection, and Replanting Plan shall be prepared by the applicant to provide tree protection measures to comply with the performance criteria and other requirements of TRPA Code Section 61, prevent damage to trees that are proposed to remain, and determine appropriate tree replanting locations and approaches to occur in the project area. The Plan will include marking and inventorying the specific trees to be removed, after detailed design is completed. A qualified forester will make a determination regarding the project's consistency with Chapter 61 of the TRPA Code. The plan shall set forth prescriptions for tree removal, water quality protection, root zone and vegetation protection, residual stocking levels, replanting, slash disposal, fire protection, and other appropriate considerations.	1. Prepare a Tree Removal, Protection, and Replanting Plan and hire a qualified forester to review the Plan to determine consistency with Chapter 61 of the TRPA Code.	1.Implementation: TTD Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	1. Prior to construction
		2. Monitor implementation of the Tree Removal, Protection, and Replanting Plan	2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	2. Throughout project construction
4.3. Biological Resources				
Impact 4.3-2. Disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats (jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, and SEZ). Implementing Alternative 1 would result in direct removal and disturbance of sensitive habitats, including waters of the United States, waters of the state, riparian habitat, and SEZs. This impact would be significant.	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-2a: Implement vegetation protection measures and revegetate disturbed areas.** Vegetation will not be disturbed, injured or removed, except in accordance with the Code or conditions of Project approval. All trees, major roots, and other vegetation, not specifically designated and approved for removal in connection with a project will be protected according to methods approved by TRPA. All vegetation outside the construction site boundary, as well as other vegetation designated on the approved plans, will be protected by installing temporary fencing pursuant to subsections 33.6.9 and 33.6.10. Areas outside the construction site boundary that sustain vegetation damage during construction will be revegetated according to a revegetation plan in accordance with Section 61.4.	1. Include measures to protect vegetation and revegetate disturbed area, per Mitigation Measure 4.3-21, in project-specific environmental review for inclusion in construction contracts	1. Implementation: TTD Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	1. Prior to construction
		2. Monitor installation and maintenance of vegetation protection features and adherence to other vegetation protection measures.	2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	2. Throughout project construction
		3. Monitor revegetation activities to ensure they are consistent with the revegetation plan.	3. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	3. During or immediately following construction activities
Impact 4.3-2. Disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats (jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, and SEZ). Alternative 1 would result in direct removal and disturbance of sensitive habitats, including waters of the United States,	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b: Conduct delineation of waters of the United States and obtain authorization for fill and required permits.** Two delineations of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. within the project site have been completed (NCE 2012, 2013). The first delineation (NCE 2012),	1. Monitor project design to determine if the final design would potentially affect any wetlands or waters of the US,	1. Implementation and Monitoring: TTD	1. During project design

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
waters of the state, riparian habitat, and SEZs. This impact would be significant.	which was verified by USACE, covered most but not all the current project site, because the project site configuration changed after the delineation was completed and submitted to USACE. The second delineation (NCE 2013) covered the current, expanded project site. The following would apply, as applicable, to any potentially affected jurisdictional resources that have not been delineated or verified by USACE prior to project implementation. Prior to the start of on-site construction activities on any potentially affected jurisdictional resource that has not been previously delineated or verified by the USACE, a qualified biologist will survey the project site for sensitive natural communities. Sensitive natural communities or habitats are those of special concern to resource agencies or those that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA and other applicable regulations. If sensitive natural communities or habitats that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA are determined to be present, a delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, will be prepared by a qualified biologist through the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process. The delineation will be submitted to and verified by USACE. If, based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United States would result from implementation of the project, authorization for such fill will be secured from USACE through the Section 404 permitting process. The acreage of riparian habitat (deciduous riparian vegetation) that would be removed or disturbed during project implementation will be quantified and replaced or restored/enhanced in accordance with USACE and TRPA regulations. Habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement will be at a location and by methods agreeable to USACE as determined during the permitting processes for CWA Section 404 and by TRPA during the permitting process for SEZ.	which have not been delineated or verified by the USACE.		
		2. If the final project design would potentially affect any wetlands or waters of the US, which have not been delineated or verified by the USACE; then monitor to ensure that a delineation of waters of the US is performed and submitted to USACE for verification.	2. Implementation: TTD and qualified biologist Monitoring: TTD	2. Prior to construction
		3. Monitor to determine if fill of waters of the US would occur through project implementation, and if so, secure authorization through the 404 permitting process.	3. Implementation: TTD and qualified biologist Monitoring: TTD and USACE	3. Prior to construction
		4. Monitor construction activities to ensure that habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement is consistent with USACE and TRPA permit conditions.	4. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	4. During project construction
Impact 4.3-2. Disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats (jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, and SEZ). Implementing Alternative 1 would result in direct removal and disturbance of sensitive habitats, including waters of the United States, waters of the state, riparian habitat, and SEZs. This impact would be significant.	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c: Obtain and comply with a lake and streambed alteration agreement; compensate for unavoidable loss of stream and riparian habitat.** The following measures would be implemented to avoid or compensate for the loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat, ensure consistency with Fish and Game Code Section 1602, and further reduce potential adverse effects on riparian habitats:	1. Notify CDFW prior to conducting activity within the bed, bank, or riparian corridor of any waterway. Prepare Streambed Alteration Agreement, per Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c.	1. Implementation and monitoring: TTD	1. Prior to construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	The project proponent will notify CDFW before commencing any activity within the bed, bank, or riparian corridor of any waterway. If activities trigger the need for a Streambed Alteration Agreement, the proponent will obtain an agreement from CDFW. The project proponent will conduct construction activities in accordance with the agreement, including implementing reasonable measures in the agreement necessary to protect the fish and wildlife resources, when working within the bed or bank of waterways that function as a fish or wildlife resource or in riparian habitats associated with those waterways. The project proponent shall compensate for permanent riparian habitat impacts at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio through contributions to a CDFW approved wetland mitigation bank or through the development and implementation of a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan aimed at creating or restoring in-kind habitat in the surrounding area. If mitigation credits are not available, stream and riparian habitat compensation shall include establishment of riparian vegetation on currently unvegetated bank portions of streams affected by the project and enhancement of existing riparian habitat through removal of nonnative species, where appropriate, and planting additional native riparian plants to increase cover, continuity, and width of the existing riparian corridor along streams in the project site and surrounding areas. Construction activities and compensatory mitigation shall be conducted in accordance with the terms of a streambed alteration agreement as required under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. The Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall include the following: ◢ identification of compensatory mitigation sites and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites; ◢ in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory riparian habitats (using performance and success criteria) to document success; ◢ monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (Compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the success	2. Prepare a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, per Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c.	2. Implementation and monitoring: TTD	2. Prior to construction
		3. Monitor implementation of construction activities and compensatory mitigation in accordance with the lake and streambed alteration agreement.	3. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	3. Throughout project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer.); ◢ ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native riparian plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80% survival of planted riparian trees and shrubs by the end of the five-year maintenance and monitoring period or dead and dying trees shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80 percent survivorship is achieved; ◢ corrective measures if performance standards are not met; ◢ responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and ◢ responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.			
Impact 4.3-2. Disturbance or loss of sensitive habitats (jurisdictional wetlands, riparian vegetation, and SEZ). Implementing Alternative 1 would result in direct removal and disturbance of sensitive habitats, including waters of the United States, waters of the state, riparian habitat, and SEZs. This impact would be significant.	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-2d: Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of SEZ.** The following measures would be implemented to ensure consistency with TRPA Code Section 61.3 and Fish and Game Code Section 1602 and further reduce potential adverse effects on SEZs, streams, and riparian habitat. Because SEZ boundaries may generally correspond with wetlands and riparian zones regulated under Section 404 of the CWA or Fish and Game Code Section 1602, implementation of these measures shall be planned in conjunction with Mitigation Measures 4.3-2b (Conduct Delineation of Waters of the United States and Obtain Authorization for Fill and Required Permits) and 4.3-2c (Obtain and Comply with a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement; Compensate for Unavoidable Loss of Stream and Riparian Habitat). ◢ SEZ lands within the project area shall be delineated, mapped, and TRPA-verified. All reasonable alternatives/options shall be implemented to avoid or reduce the extent of encroachment into SEZs. ◢ In instances where there is no feasible alternative to avoid an SEZ, the project proponent shall mitigate all impacts within the boundaries of SEZs by restoring SEZ habitat (land capability district 1b) in the surrounding area, or other appropriate area as determined	1. Delineate, map, and obtain TRPA verification for SEZ lands within the project area. 2. Hire a qualified restoration ecologist to prepare a restoration plan, per Mitigation Measure 4.3-2d	1. Implementation: TTD Monitoring: TTD and TRPA 2. Implementation: TTD Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	1. Prior to project construction 2. Prior to project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	by TRPA, at a minimum ratio of 1.5:1, consistent with TRPA Code. ◢ The project proponent shall retain a qualified restoration ecologist to prepare a restoration plan that will address final clean-up, stabilization, and revegetation procedures for areas disturbed by the project. The restoration plan for SEZs shall include the following: ◤ identification of compensatory mitigation sites, with emphasis on sites within the Truckee River watershed, and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites; ◤ complete assessment of the existing biological resources in the restoration areas; ◤ in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory SEZs (using performance and success criteria) to document success; ◤ monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (Compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer.); ◤ ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80 percent survival of planted vegetation by the end of the five-year maintenance and monitoring period or dead and dying plants shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80% survivorship is achieved; ◤ corrective measures if performance standards are not met; ◤ responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and ◤ responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.			
Impact 4.3-3. Introduction and spread of invasive plants. Under Alternative 1, project implementation has the potential to introduce and spread terrestrial and aquatic invasive plants during construction and revegetation periods. Noxious weeds and other invasive plants could inadvertently	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-3a: Implement invasive plant management practices during project construction.** In consultation with TRPA and USFS, the project proponent shall implement appropriate invasive plant management practices during project construction. Recommended practices generally include the following:	1. Monitor the completion of a Noxious Weed Risk Assessment for USFS lands, and the treatment of invasive plant infestations	1. Implementation: TTD staff and/or qualified contractor Monitoring: TTD, USFS	1. Prior to construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
be introduced or spread in the project area during grading and construction activities, if nearby source populations passively colonize disturbed ground, or if construction and personnel equipment is transported to the site from an infested area. Soil, vegetation, and other materials transported to the study area from off-site sources for best management practices (BMPs), revegetation, or fill for project construction could contain invasive plant seeds or plant material that could become established in the study area. Additionally, terrestrial and aquatic invasive species currently present in or near the study area have the potential to be spread by construction disturbances. The introduction and spread of terrestrial or aquatic invasive species would degrade terrestrial plant, wildlife, and aquatic habitats, including habitats of special significance (riparian) within the study area. The potential introduction and spread of terrestrial or aquatic invasive species under Alternative 1 would be a potentially significant impact.	◢ For project activities on USFS land, a Noxious Weed Risk Assessment will be prepared for all areas to be temporarily impacted. Applicable LTBMU Invasive Plant Management Measures will be implemented under the direction of the Forest Botanist. ◢ Before construction activities begin, invasive plant infestations will be treated where feasible. Treatments will be selected based on each species ecology and phenology. All treatment methods-including the use of herbicides-will be conducted in accordance with the law, regulations, and policies governing the land owner (e.g., TRPA and/or LTBMU). Land owners will be notified prior to the use of herbicides for invasive treatment. In areas where treatment is not feasible, noxious weed areas will be clearly flagged or fenced in order to clearly delineate work exclusion. ◢ To ensure that fill material and seeds imported to the project site are free of invasive plants/noxious weeds, the project will use on-site sources of fill and seeds whenever available. Fill and seed materials that need to be imported to the project site will be certified weed-free. In addition, only certified weed-free imported materials (or rice straw in upland areas) will be used for erosion control. ◢ Vehicles and equipment will arrive at the study area clean and weed-free. All equipment entering the project site from weed-infested areas or areas of unknown weed status will be cleaned of all attached soil or plant parts before being allowed into the project site. Vehicles and equipment will be cleaned using high-pressure water or air at designated weed-cleaning stations after exiting a weed-infested area. Cleaning stations will be designated by a botanist or noxious weed specialist and located away from aquatic resources. Equipment will be inspected by the on-site environmental monitor for mud or other signs that weed seeds or propagules could be present prior to use in the study area. If the equipment is not clean, the monitor will deny entry into work areas. ◢ If designated weed-infested areas are unavoidable, the plants will be cut, if feasible, and disposed of in a landfill in sealed bags or disposed of or destroyed in another manner acceptable to the USFS, TRPA, or other agency as appropriate. If cutting weeds is not feasible, layers of mulch, degradable geotextiles, or similar materials will be placed over the infestation area to minimize the spread of seeds and plant materials by	2. Monitor the identification of on-site or weed-free fill sources; and weed-free, local seed and vegetation sources.	2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	2. Prior to construction
		3. Monitor construction practices to ensure vehicles and equipment entering the site are weed-free; and that any infested areas that cannot be avoided are managed to avoid the spread of weeds during construction.	3. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	3. Throughout project construction
		4. Monitor notifying the USFS noxious weed coordinator	4. Implementation and monitoring: TTD	4. After completion of construction activities

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	equipment and vehicles during construction. These materials will be secured so they are not blown or washed away. ◢ Locally collected native seed sources for revegetation shall be used when possible. Plant and seed material will be collected from or near the study area, from within the same watershed, and at a similar elevation when possible and with approval of the appropriate authority (e.g., USFS botanist for collection on USFS land). Persistent nonnatives such as cultivated timothy (Phleum pretense), orchard grass (Dactylis glomerata), or ryegrass (Lolium spp.) shall not be used. ◢ After the project is completed, the USFS noxious weed coordinator shall be notified so that the USFS portion of the project site can be monitored by the USFS if desired. Monitoring could be for up to three years (as feasible) subsequent to project implementation to ensure additional nonnative invasive species do not become established in the areas affected by the project and to ensure that known nonnative invasive species do not spread.			
Impact 4.3-3. Introduction and spread of invasive plants. Under Alternative 1, project implementation has the potential to introduce and spread terrestrial and aquatic invasive plants during construction and revegetation periods. Noxious weeds and other invasive plants could inadvertently be introduced or spread in the project area during grading and construction activities, if nearby source populations passively colonize disturbed ground, or if construction and personnel equipment is transported to the site from an infested area. Soil, vegetation, and other materials transported to the study area from off-site sources for best management practices (BMPs), revegetation, or fill for project construction could contain invasive plant seeds or plant material that could become established in the study area. Additionally, terrestrial and aquatic invasive species currently present in or near the study area have the potential to be spread by construction disturbances. The introduction and spread of terrestrial or aquatic invasive species would degrade terrestrial plant, wildlife, and aquatic habitats, including habitats of special significance (riparian) within the	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-3b: Implement aquatic invasive species management practices during project construction.** In consultation with TRPA and consistent with USFSWS Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) planning guidance, the project proponent shall develop and implement a plan that includes appropriate aquatic invasive species management practices during project construction. Recommended practices include the following: ◢ All equipment, including individual equipment such as waders, wading boots, etc., entering the study area that will be used in or around the Truckee River or Lake Tahoe shall be decontaminated using methods recommended in the Lake Tahoe Region Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan (USACE 2009) before being allowed into the study area. ◢ If applicable, all equipment, including individual equipment such as waders, wading boots, etc., used in known infested areas within the study area shall be decontaminated using the above mentioned methods before entering any other areas of the study area not known to contain aquatic invasive species. ◢ Aquatic invasive species encountered during fish removal and relocation efforts will be euthanized and/or removed from the	1. Monitor the development of a plan that includes specific aquatic invasive species management practices	1.Implementation: TTD Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	1. Prior to construction
		2. Monitor implementation of aquatic invasive species control management practices	2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	2. Throughout project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
study area. The potential introduction and spread of terrestrial or aquatic invasive species under Alternative 1 would be a potentially significant impact.	watershed.			
Impact 4.3-4. Disturbance or loss of special-status wildlife species and habitats. Under Alternative 1, constructing or expanding roadway alignments, roadway features (e.g., curbs, gutters, retaining walls), bike path realignment, and other project elements could result in disturbances to two special-status wildlife species (waterfowl and olive-sided flycatcher). Disturbances resulting in loss of individuals or nests, or disruptions to nesting attempts by special-status species would be a potentially significant impact.	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-4: Conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting special-status birds, and implement a limited operating period if necessary.** For construction activities that would occur in suitable habitat during the nesting season (generally April 1–August 31, depending on snowpack and other seasonal conditions), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct focused surveys for waterfowl and olive-sided flycatcher nests no more than 14 days before construction activities are initiated each construction season. If an active nest is located during the preconstruction surveys, the biologist shall notify TRPA and/or CDFW. If necessary, modifications to the project design to avoid removal of occupied habitat while still achieving project objectives shall be evaluated, and implemented to the extent feasible. If avoidance is not feasible or conflicts with project objectives, appropriate buffers around nests and limited operating periods will be established through consultation with TRPA and/or CDFW to avoid disturbances during the sensitive nesting season.	1. Monitor the completion of pre-construction surveys for waterfowl and olive-sided flycatchers	1. Implementation: Construction contractor, qualified biologist Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	1. No more than 14 days prior to initiating construction activities for each construction season.
		2. If active waterfowl or olive-sided flycatchers nests are identified then monitor notifying TRPA and/or CDFW, incorporating design modifications to avoid nests, or institute buffers and limited operating periods.	2. Implementation: TTD and qualified biologist Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	2. Prior to each construction season
Impact 4.3-5. Short-term effects on aquatic resources resulting from construction. Under Alternative 1, project construction and staging near aquatic habitats could temporarily result in adverse impacts to aquatic resources in the Truckee River. Additionally, Alternative 1 would require construction and/or rehabilitation of bridge foundations and footings below the ordinary high water mark and within the river channel, dewatering, and water diversion. Because TRPA, State and Regional WQCB, and Placer County regulations are in place to minimize erosion and transport of sediment and other pollutants during construction, and appropriate project-specific measures would be defined to secure necessary permits and approvals, construction-related impacts to aquatic resources would be minimized and would not result in substantial adverse effects on water quality or aquatic habitat quality and functions in the Truckee River. However, even with incorporation of these measures	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-5a:** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b. **Mitigation Measure 4.3-2b: Conduct delineation of waters of the United States and obtain authorization for fill and required permits.** Two delineations of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. within the project site have been completed (NCE 2012, 2013). The first delineation (NCE 2012), which was verified by USACE, covered most but not all the current project site, because the project site configuration changed after the delineation was completed and submitted to USACE. The second delineation (NCE 2013) covered the current, expanded project site. The following would apply, as applicable, to any potentially affected jurisdictional resources that have not been delineated or verified by USACE prior to project implementation. Prior to the start of on-site construction activities on any potentially affected jurisdictional resource that has not been previously delineated or verified by the USACE, a qualified biologist will survey the project site for sensitive natural communities. Sensitive natural communities or habitats are those of special concern to resource agencies or those that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA and other applicable	1. Monitor project design to determine if the final design would potentially affect any wetlands or waters of the US, which have not been delineated or verified by the USACE.	1. Implementation and Monitoring: TTD	1. During project design
		2. If the final project design would potentially affect any wetlands or waters of the US, which have not been delineated or verified by the USACE; then monitor to ensure that a delineation of waters of the US is performed and submitted to USACE for verification.	2. Implementation: TTD and qualified biologist Monitoring: TTD	2. Prior to construction
		3. Monitor to determine if fill of waters of the US would occur	3. Implementation: TTD and qualified biologist	3. Prior to construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project
Tahoe Transportation District
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Monitoring Action	Responsibility	Timing
and requirements into the project, project construction could result in loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat protected under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. Additionally, construction would include dewatering activities that would result in the temporary loss of aquatic habitat. Any disturbance to the bed and bank of a waterway that provides habitat functions and requiring a Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW, and potential injury or mortality to native fish during dewatering activities, would be considered a potentially significant impact to aquatic resources.	regulations. If sensitive natural communities or habitats that are afforded specific consideration, based on Section 404 of the CWA are determined to be present, a delineation of waters of the United States, including wetlands that would be affected by the project, will be prepared by a qualified biologist through the formal Section 404 wetland delineation process. The delineation will be submitted to and verified by USACE. If, based on the verified delineation, it is determined that fill of waters of the United States would result from implementation of the project, authorization for such fill will be secured from USACE through the Section 404 permitting process. The acreage of riparian habitat (deciduous riparian vegetation) that would be removed or disturbed during project implementation will be quantified and replaced or restored/enhanced in accordance with USACE and TRPA regulations. Habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement will be at a location and by methods agreeable to USACE as determined during the permitting processes for CWA Section 404 and by TRPA during the permitting process for SEZ. **Mitigation Measure 4.3-5b:** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c. **Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c: Obtain and comply with a lake and streambed alteration agreement; compensate for unavoidable loss of stream and riparian habitat.** The following measures would be implemented to avoid or compensate for the loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat, ensure consistency with Fish and Game Code Section 1602, and further reduce potential adverse effects on riparian habitats: The project proponent will notify CDFW before commencing any activity within the bed, bank, or riparian corridor of any waterway. If activities trigger the need for a Streambed Alteration Agreement, the proponent will obtain an agreement from CDFW. The project proponent will conduct construction activities in accordance with the agreement, including implementing reasonable measures in the agreement necessary to protect the fish and wildlife resources, when working within the bed or bank of waterways that function as a fish or wildlife resource or in riparian habitats associated with those waterways. The project proponent shall compensate for permanent riparian habitat impacts at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio through contributions to a CDFW approved wetland mitigation bank or through the development and	through project implementation, and if so, secure authorization through the 404 permitting process. 4. Monitor construction activities to ensure that habitat restoration, enhancement, and/or replacement is consistent with USACE and TRPA permit conditions.	Monitoring: TTD and USACE 4. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	 4. During project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	implementation of a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan aimed at creating or restoring in-kind habitat in the surrounding area. If mitigation credits are not available, stream and riparian habitat compensation shall include establishment of riparian vegetation on currently unvegetated bank portions of streams affected by the project and enhancement of existing riparian habitat through removal of nonnative species, where appropriate, and planting additional native riparian plants to increase cover, continuity, and width of the existing riparian corridor along streams in the project site and surrounding areas. Construction activities and compensatory mitigation shall be conducted in accordance with the terms of a streambed alteration agreement as required under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. The Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall include the following: ◢ identification of compensatory mitigation sites and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites; ◢ in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory riparian habitats (using performance and success criteria) to document success; ◢ monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (Compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer.); ◢ ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native riparian plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80% survival of planted riparian trees and shrubs by the end of the five-year maintenance and monitoring period or dead and dying trees shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80 percent survivorship is achieved; ◢ corrective measures if performance standards are not met;			

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	◢ responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and ◢ responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.			
Impact 4.3-5. Short-term effects on aquatic resources resulting from construction. Under Alternative 1, project construction and staging near aquatic habitats could temporarily result in adverse impacts to aquatic resources in the Truckee River. Additionally, Alternative 1 would require construction and/or rehabilitation of bridge foundations and footings below the ordinary high water mark and within the river channel, dewatering, and water diversion. Because TRPA, State and Regional WQCB, and Placer County regulations are in place to minimize erosion and transport of sediment and other pollutants during construction, and appropriate project-specific measures would be defined to secure necessary permits and approvals, construction-related impacts to aquatic resources would be minimized and would not result in substantial adverse effects on water quality or aquatic habitat quality and functions in the Truckee River. However, even with incorporation of these measures and requirements into the project, project construction could result in loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat protected under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. Additionally, construction would include dewatering activities that would result in the temporary loss of aquatic habitat. Any disturbance to the bed and bank of a waterway that provides habitat functions and requiring a Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW, and potential injury or mortality to native fish during dewatering activities, would be considered a potentially significant impact to aquatic resources.	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-5b:** Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c. **Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c: Obtain and comply with a lake and streambed alteration agreement; compensate for unavoidable loss of stream and riparian habitat.** The following measures would be implemented to avoid or compensate for the loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat, ensure consistency with Fish and Game Code Section 1602, and further reduce potential adverse effects on riparian habitats: The project proponent will notify CDFW before commencing any activity within the bed, bank, or riparian corridor of any waterway. If activities trigger the need for a Streambed Alteration Agreement, the proponent will obtain an agreement from CDFW. The project proponent will conduct construction activities in accordance with the agreement, including implementing reasonable measures in the agreement necessary to protect the fish and wildlife resources, when working within the bed or bank of waterways that function as a fish or wildlife resource or in riparian habitats associated with those waterways. The project proponent shall compensate for permanent riparian habitat impacts at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio through contributions to a CDFW approved wetland mitigation bank or through the development and implementation of a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan aimed at creating or restoring in-kind habitat in the surrounding area. If mitigation credits are not available, stream and riparian habitat compensation shall include establishment of riparian vegetation on currently unvegetated bank portions of streams affected by the project and enhancement of existing riparian habitat through removal of nonnative species, where appropriate, and planting additional native riparian plants to increase cover, continuity, and width of the existing riparian corridor along streams in the project site and surrounding areas. Construction activities and compensatory mitigation shall be conducted in accordance with the terms of a streambed alteration agreement as required under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code.	1. Notify CDFW prior to conducting activity within the bed, bank, or riparian corridor of any waterway. Prepare Streambed Alteration Agreement, per Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c. 2. Prepare a Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, per Mitigation Measure 4.3-2c. 3. Monitor implementation of construction activities and compensatory mitigation in accordance with the lake and streambed alteration agreement.	1. Implementation and monitoring: TTD 2. Implementation and monitoring: TTD 3. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	1. Prior to construction 2. Prior to construction 3. Throughout project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	The Compensatory Stream and Riparian Mitigation and Monitoring Plan shall include the following: ◢ identification of compensatory mitigation sites and criteria for selecting these mitigation sites; ◢ in kind reference habitats for comparison with compensatory riparian habitats (using performance and success criteria) to document success; ◢ monitoring protocol, including schedule and annual report requirements (Compensatory habitat shall be monitored for a minimum of 5 years from completion of mitigation, or human intervention (including recontouring and grading), or until the success criteria identified in the approved mitigation plan have been met, whichever is longer.); ◢ ecological performance standards, based on the best available science and including specifications for native riparian plant densities, species composition, amount of dead woody vegetation gaps and bare ground, and survivorship; at a minimum, compensatory mitigation planting sites must achieve 80% survival of planted riparian trees and shrubs by the end of the five-year maintenance and monitoring period or dead and dying trees shall be replaced and monitoring continued until 80 percent survivorship is achieved; ◢ corrective measures if performance standards are not met; ◢ responsible parties for monitoring and preparing reports; and ◢ responsible parties for receiving and reviewing reports and for verifying success or prescribing implementation or corrective actions.			
Impact 4.3-5. Short-term effects on aquatic resources resulting from construction. Under Alternative 1, project construction and staging near aquatic habitats could temporarily result in adverse impacts to aquatic resources in the Truckee River. Additionally, Alternative 1 would require construction and/or rehabilitation of bridge foundations and footings below the ordinary high water mark and within the river channel, dewatering, and water diversion. Because TRPA, State and Regional WQCB, and Placer County	**Mitigation Measure 4.3-5c: Conduct preconstruction surveys and develop and implement native-fish capture and translocation plan.** The project proponent shall develop and implement measures to prevent the construction-related loss of native fish occupying habitat within the study area. In accordance with existing regulations, before any construction activities that require dewatering commence, a qualified biologist shall conduct preconstruction surveys and implement native-fish relocation activities (if native fish are present) within the construction dewatering area. All captured native fish species shall be immediately released to a suitable	1. Develop and implement measures to prevent the construction-related loss of native fish, per Mitigation Measure 4.3-5c.	1. Implementation: Qualified biologist and TTD Monitoring: TTD	1. Prior to dewatering activities
		2. Monitor the implementation of preconstruction surveys; and development and implementation of a native-fish	2. Implementation: Qualified biologist and TTD Monitoring: TTD	2. During project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
regulations are in place to minimize erosion and transport of sediment and other pollutants during construction, and appropriate project-specific measures would be defined to secure necessary permits and approvals, construction-related impacts to aquatic resources would be minimized and would not result in substantial adverse effects on water quality or aquatic habitat quality and functions in the Truckee River. However, even with incorporation of these measures and requirements into the project, project construction could result in loss or degradation of stream or riparian habitat protected under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code. Additionally, construction would include dewatering activities that would result in the temporary loss of aquatic habitat. Any disturbance to the bed and bank of a waterway that provides habitat functions and requiring a Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW, and potential injury or mortality to native fish during dewatering activities, would be considered a potentially significant impact to aquatic resources.	habitat near the study area. The qualified biologist shall place nets with 1/8-inch mesh at the upstream and downstream extents of the area to be dewatered to keep fish out of the area during fish removal activities. After completion of removal activities, the work area will be cleared for dewatering. Fish rescue and relocation will continue until the area is completely dewatered or until it is determined that no fish remain in the dewatering area. This fish translocation plan will apply only to native fish species. Nonnative species captured during the pre-dewatering effort will be humanely killed and disposed of. These activities shall take place in consultation with TRPA and CDFW.	capture and translocation plan.		
4.4. Cultural Resources				
Impact 4.4-1. Historical resources. Alternative 1 has the potential to affect the NRHP-listed Lake Tahoe Dam and associated Outlet Gates through the rehabilitation or replacement of the adjacent Fanny Bridge. Alternative 1 would not physically alter the dam or gates; however, construction would occur immediately adjacent to the resources. Overall, the replacement or rehabilitation of Fanny Bridge would result in a bridge that would be similar in size and scale to the existing bridge and the new elements would be of comparable visual relationship to that of the existing bridge. Therefore, while there would be no change in the significance of the resource, because of the risk of construction damage to the resource this impact would be potentially significant for Alternative 1.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-1: Ensure historic integrity during construction.** During design development, engineering design and specifications will be prepared to account for the proximity of construction activities associated with rehabilitation or replacement of Fanny Bridge to the Lake Tahoe Dam, Outlet Gates, and stilling basin and define separation distances, construction techniques, and other protective design details to avoid damage to the dam-related structures. This measure will include attention to the construction activity related to the bridge's pile support structures. Where project construction activities will take place in the vicinity of the Lake Tahoe Dam, Outlet Gates, and stilling basin, those facilities shall be clearly identified in the field to facilitate maintenance of a physical separation from construction activities and other protection actions to adequately protect historically important features of the dam structure.	1. Monitor the development of design elements and specifications to ensure historic integrity	1. Implementation: Design engineer/TTD Monitoring TTD	1. During project design
		2. Monitor construction activities to ensure they comply with design elements and specifications intended to ensure historic integrity.	2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	2. Throughout project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
Impact 4.4-2. Archaeological resources. Construction and excavation activities associated with the action alternatives could result in sediment disturbance and removal, which can adversely affect archaeological resources. Because Alternative 1 would include excavation and other ground-disturbing activities, these alternatives could result in adverse physical effects to known and unknown archaeological resources. This impact is potentially significant.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a: Conduct archaeological monitoring.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. In accordance with existing regulations, for ground-disturbing activities that have the potential to impact archaeological remains and that will occur in an area that has been determined by a qualified archaeologist to be an area that is sensitive for the presence of buried archaeological remains, the project proponent (e.g., TTD, local county, Caltrans, NDOT) will require the construction contractor to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor those activities. Archaeological monitoring will be conducted in areas where there is likelihood that archaeological remains may be discovered but where those remains are not visible on the surface. Monitoring will not be considered a substitute for efforts to identify and evaluate cultural resources prior to the project initiation. Where necessary, the project proponent will seek Native American input and consultation.	1. Hire a qualified archaeologist to monitor construction activities, per Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a.	1. Implementation: Qualified archeologist Monitoring: TTD	1. Prior to ground disturbing construction activities
		2. Monitor ground-disturbing activities where buried archeological remains are likely to occur, per Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a.	2. Implementation: Qualified archeologist Monitoring: TTD	2. During ground disturbing construction activities
Impact 4.4-2. Archaeological resources. Construction and excavation activities associated with the action alternatives could result in sediment disturbance and removal, which can adversely affect archaeological resources. Because Alternative 1 would include excavation and other ground-disturbing activities, this alternative could result in adverse physical effects to known and unknown archaeological resources. This impact is potentially significant.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b: Stop work in the event of an archaeological discovery.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. If potentially significant cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with individual project preparation, construction, or completion, the project proponent will require the construction contractor to stop work in that area until a qualified archaeologist can access the significance of the find, and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with TRPA and other appropriate agencies and interested parties. A qualified archaeologist will follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the California Historical Resources Information Center office (North Central Information Center) for California projects. The consulting archaeologist will also evaluate such resources for significance per California Register of Historical Resources eligibility criteria (PRC Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR Section 4852). Consultation with the Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer will be undertaken for Nevada projects.	1. Monitor to ensure construction activities in the vicinity stop and a qualified archeologist evaluates archeological resources if potentially significant archeological resources are discovered	1. Implementation: Construction contractor and qualified archeologist Monitoring: TTD	1. During ground disturbing construction activities
		2. If a qualified archeologist determines that potentially significant resources have been discovered, then monitor to ensure that appropriate treatment measures are implemented in coordination with TRPA and appropriate parties	2. Implementation: Qualified archeologist Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	1. Upon discovering potentially significant archeological resources

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the TRPA standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the lead agency will be notified and a data recovery plan will be prepared.			
Impact 4.4-3. Accidental discovery of human remains. Construction and excavation activities associated with development activities result in sediment disturbance and removal, which can unearth human remains if they are present. Because the project would allow excavation and other ground-disturbing activities, this impact is potentially significant for Alternative 1.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: Stop work if human remains are discovered.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. In accordance with existing regulations, if any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location on an individual project site, the project proponent will ensure that there will be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: a) The applicable County Coroner/Sheriff has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and b) If the remains are of Native American origin, 1. The descendants of the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or 2. The Native American Heritage Commission was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission. 3. The site shall be flagged and avoided during construction. c) If human remains, grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony (as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [NAGPRA]) are discovered during ground disturbing activities on Federal Property, work will cease until the provisions of NAGPRA are met.	1. Monitor to ensure construction activities in the vicinity stop and steps outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 are followed, if human remains are discovered during construction.	1. Implementation: Construction Contractor and TTD Monitoring: TTD	1. During ground disturbing construction activities

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
Impact 4.4-5. Ethnic and cultural values. Because the project could result in physical changes to historic and prehistoric sites, unique ethnic cultural values could be affected, and historic or prehistoric religious or sacred uses within the APE could be restricted. Consultation with the Washoe tribe is required by federal, state and TRPA regulations, however, project activities could still uncover or destroy historic or archaeological resources as identified in Impacts 4.4-1 (historic) and 4.4-2 (archaeological). Additionally, as described in Impact 4.4-3 (human remains), project activities could result in accidental discovery of remains during grading and excavation. Accidentally discovered remains could be of Native American origin. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-5: Implement other cultural resources mitigation measures.** Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-2a, 4.4-2b, and 4.4-3. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a: Conduct archaeological monitoring.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. In accordance with existing regulations, for ground-disturbing activities that have the potential to impact archaeological remains and that will occur in an area that has been determined by a qualified archaeologist to be an area that is sensitive for the presence of buried archaeological remains, the project proponent (e.g., TTD, local county, Caltrans, NDOT) will require the construction contractor to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor those activities. Archaeological monitoring will be conducted in areas where there is likelihood that archaeological remains may be discovered but where those remains are not visible on the surface. Monitoring will not be considered a substitute for efforts to identify and evaluate cultural resources prior to the project initiation. Where necessary, the project proponent will seek Native American input and consultation. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b: Stop work in the event of an archaeological discovery.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. If potentially significant cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with individual project preparation, construction, or completion, the project proponent will require the construction contractor to stop work in that area until a qualified archaeologist can access the significance of the find, and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with TRPA and other appropriate agencies and interested parties. A qualified archaeologist will follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the California Historical Resources Information Center office (North Central Information Center) for California projects. The consulting archaeologist will also evaluate such resources for significance per California Register of Historical Resources eligibility criteria (PRC Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR	1. Hire a qualified archaeologist to monitor construction activities, per Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a. 2. Monitor ground-disturbing activities where buried archeological remains are likely to occur, per Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a.	1. Implementation: Qualified archeologist Monitoring: TTD 2. Implementation: Qualified archeologist Monitoring: TTD	1. Prior to ground disturbing construction activities 2. During ground disturbing construction activities

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	Section 4852). Consultation with the Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer will be undertaken for Nevada projects. If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the TRPA standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the lead agency will be notified and a data recovery plan will be prepared. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: Stop work if human remains are discovered.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. In accordance with existing regulations, if any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location on an individual project site, the project proponent will ensure that there will be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: a) The applicable County Coroner/Sheriff has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and b) If the remains are of Native American origin, 1. The descendants of the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or 2. The Native American Heritage Commission was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission. 3. The site shall be flagged and avoided during construction. c) If human remains, grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony (as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [NAGPRA]) are discovered during ground disturbing activities on Federal Property, work will cease until the provisions of NAGPRA are met.			

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
Impact 4.4-5. Ethnic and cultural values. Because the project could result in physical changes to historic and prehistoric sites, unique ethnic cultural values could be affected, and historic or prehistoric religious or sacred uses within the APE could be restricted. Consultation with the Washoe tribe is required by federal, state and TRPA regulations, however, project activities could still uncover or destroy historic or archaeological resources as identified in Impacts 4.4-1 (historic) and 4.4-2 (archaeological). Additionally, as described in Impact 4.4-3 (human remains), project activities could result in accidental discovery of remains during grading and excavation. Accidentally discovered remains could be of Native American origin. Therefore, this impact is potentially significant.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-5: Implement other cultural resources mitigation measures.** Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-2a, 4.4-2b, and 4.4-3. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2a: Conduct archaeological monitoring.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. In accordance with existing regulations, for ground-disturbing activities that have the potential to impact archaeological remains and that will occur in an area that has been determined by a qualified archaeologist to be an area that is sensitive for the presence of buried archaeological remains, the project proponent (e.g., TTD, local county, Caltrans, NDOT) will require the construction contractor to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor those activities. Archaeological monitoring will be conducted in areas where there is likelihood that archaeological remains may be discovered but where those remains are not visible on the surface. Monitoring will not be considered a substitute for efforts to identify and evaluate cultural resources prior to the project initiation. Where necessary, the project proponent will seek Native American input and consultation. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-2b: Stop work in the event of an archaeological discovery.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. If potentially significant cultural resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with individual project preparation, construction, or completion, the project proponent will require the construction contractor to stop work in that area until a qualified archaeologist can access the significance of the find, and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures in consultation with TRPA and other appropriate agencies and interested parties. A qualified archaeologist will follow accepted professional standards in recording any find including submittal of the standard Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Primary Record forms (Form DPR 523) and location information to the California Historical Resources Information Center office (North Central Information Center) for California projects. The consulting archaeologist will also evaluate such resources for significance per California Register of Historical Resources eligibility criteria (PRC Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR	1. Monitor to ensure construction activities in the vicinity stop and a qualified archeologist evaluates archeological resources if potentially significant archeological resources are discovered	1. Implementation: Construction contractor and qualified archeologist Monitoring: TTD	1. During ground disturbing construction activities

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	Section 4852). Consultation with the Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer will be undertaken for Nevada projects. If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet the TRPA standards of significance for cultural resources, construction may proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the lead agency will be notified and a data recovery plan will be prepared. **Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: Stop work if human remains are discovered.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. In accordance with existing regulations, if any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location on an individual project site, the project proponent will ensure that there will be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: a) The applicable County Coroner/Sheriff has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and b) If the remains are of Native American origin, 1. The descendants of the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or 2. The Native American Heritage Commission was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission. 3. The site shall be flagged and avoided during construction. c) If human remains, grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony (as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [NAGPRA]) are discovered during ground disturbing activities on Federal Property, work will cease until the provisions of NAGPRA are			

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	met.			
		2. If a qualified archeologist determines that potentially significant resources have been discovered, then monitor to ensure that appropriate treatment measures are implemented in coordination with TRPA and appropriate parties	2. Implementation: Qualified archeologist Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	1. Upon discovering potentially significant archeological resources
Impact 4.4-3. Accidental discovery of human remains. Construction and excavation activities associated with development activities result in sediment disturbance and removal, which can unearth human remains if they are present. Because the project would allow excavation and other ground-disturbing activities, this impact is potentially significant for Alternative 1.	**Mitigation Measure 4.4-3: Stop work if human remains are discovered.** The following mitigation was included in the RTP/SCS EIR/EIS, which included the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project as one of the TTD Capital Improvement Program projects in the RTP. In accordance with existing regulations, if any human remains are discovered or recognized in any location on an individual project site, the project proponent will ensure that there will be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: a) The applicable County Coroner/Sheriff has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and b) If the remains are of Native American origin, 1. The descendants of the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or 2. The Native American Heritage Commission was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission. 3. The site shall be flagged and avoided during construction. c) If human remains, grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony (as	1. Monitor to ensure construction activities in the vicinity stop and steps outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.4-3 are followed, if human remains are discovered during construction.	1. Implementation: Construction Contractor and TTD Monitoring: TTD	1. During ground disturbing construction activities

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [NAGPRA]) are discovered during ground disturbing activities on Federal Property, work will cease until the provisions of NAGPRA are met.			
4.8. Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Risk of Upset				
Impact 4.8-2. Hazardous materials sites. Roadway improvements could affect properties that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Therefore, the possibility of encountering hazardous materials exists and impacts related to exposure of the public or the environment to hazardous materials would be potentially significant for Alternative 1.	**Mitigation Measure 4.8-2a: Conduct surveys for asbestos-containing materials, aerially deposited lead, and lead-based paints and coatings.** a. Demolition of buildings and roadways containing asbestos and lead-based materials will require specialized procedures and equipment, and appropriately certified personnel, as detailed in the applicable regulations. Buildings and roadways intended for demolition that were constructed before 1980 will be surveyed for asbestos, while those constructed before 1971 will be surveyed for lead. Prior to construction, all existing road right-of-ways in the project site shall be surveyed for lead contamination due to ADL and use of paint and coatings containing lead. All sampling would be conducted consistent with applicable Caltrans requirements.	1. Monitor to ensure all buildings and roadways to be demolished that were constructed before 1980 are surveyed for asbestos; and all road right-of-ways and buildings to be demolished that were constructed prior to 1971 are surveyed for lead; and that documentation is submitted to Placer Co. Dept. of Environmental Health.	1. Implementation: qualified hazardous materials contractor Monitoring: TTD	1. Prior to construction
	b. A demolition plan shall be prepared for any location with positive results for asbestos or lead. The plan will specify how to appropriately contain, remove, and dispose of the asbestos and lead-containing material while meeting all requirements and BMPs to protect human health and the environment. A lead compliance plan shall be prepared by a Certified Industrial Hygienist (consistent with the requirements of Caltrans' SSP 14-11.07). Prior to demolition, the project applicant shall submit the written plan to the Placer County Environmental Health Department describing the methods to be used to: (1) identify locations that could contain hazardous residues; (2) remove plumbing fixtures known to contain, or potentially containing, hazardous materials; (3) determine the waste classification of the debris; (4) package contaminated items and wastes; and (5) identify disposal site(s) permitted to accept such wastes. Demolition shall not occur until the plan has been accepted by the Placer County Environmental Health Department and all potentially hazardous components have been removed to the satisfaction of Placer County Environmental Health Department staff. The project applicant shall also provide written documentation to the County that lead-based	2. If surveys identify lead or asbestos, monitor to ensure that a compliance plan is prepared and accepted by the Placer County Environmental Health Department, and that potentially hazardous components or contaminated soil has been removed consistent with the compliance plan.	2. Implementation: Qualified hazardous materials contractor, including a Certified Industrial Hygienist, if needed Monitoring: TTD and Placer County Environmental Health Department	2. Prior to demolition or ground disturbing activities.

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	paint and asbestos testing and abatement, as appropriate, have been completed in accordance with applicable state and local laws and regulations. Lead abatement will include the removal of lead contaminated soil (considered soil with lead concentrations greater than 400 parts per million in areas where children are likely to be present).			
Impact 4.8-2. Hazardous materials sites. Roadway improvements could affect properties that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites. Therefore, the possibility of encountering hazardous materials exists and impacts related to exposure of the public or the environment to hazardous materials would be potentially significant for Alternative 1.	Mitigation Measure 4.8-2b: Prepare a construction hazard management plan. A construction hazardous materials management plan shall be developed to address potentially impacted soil, impacted groundwater, lead-based paint, and asbestos-containing materials that may be encountered during project construction activities. The construction hazardous materials management plan shall include provisions for agency notification, managing impacted materials, sampling and analytical requirements, and disposal procedures. The plan would include identification of construction site BMPs to minimize the potential for water quality impacts. The construction hazardous materials management plan shall cover the following: petroleum hydrocarbon-impacted soils and/or groundwater that may be encountered during project construction activities in areas where construction depths exceed 2 feet bgs in the vicinity of the RECs described above; soils identified by the ADL surveys as being impacted by ADL within survey area right of ways; materials identified by the lead-based paint and asbestos-containing materials surveys as impacted by lead based paint and asbestos containing materials within bridge, pipe, and building materials; impacted soil or groundwater related to TRI pipe relocation; and guidance for relocating, removal, or repair of hazardous materials storage facilities (USTs or ASTs) that are impacted by project construction. The plan shall include information on assessment and potential handing of contaminated soils found during relocation. The plan will include procedures to stop work if evidence of potential hazardous materials or contamination of soils or groundwater is encountered during construction, including the applicable requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act and CCR Title 22 regarding the disposal of wastes.	Hire a qualified hazardous materials contractor to prepare an implement a construction hazard management plan, per Mitigation Measure 4.8-2b	Implementation: TTD and Qualified hazardous materials contractor Monitoring: TTD	Prior to construction
		Monitor construction activities to ensure that all elements of the construction hazard management plan are followed.	Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring : TTD	Throughout project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
4.10. Noise				
Impact 4.10-1. Short-term construction noise impacts. Existing noise-sensitive receptors are located within 50 feet of construction areas. Most heavy-duty construction equipment use and activity would occur during the daytime. However, some minor roadwork would occur at night. Nighttime activities would not result in substantial increases in noise above existing ambient noise levels and would not exceed applicable standards at the nearest sensitive receptors. Daytime construction could occur outside of the exempt daytime hours by Placer County or TRPA; therefore, could potentially exceed applicable standards and result in excessive noise at nearby sensitive receptors. This would be a significant impact for Alternative 1.	**Mitigation Measure 4.10-1a: Limit construction hours.** To reduce noise exposure during the sensitive times of the day, construction activities will comply with the following limitations. For daily construction activities (e.g., heavy duty equipment, pile driving, paving, cement removal), with the exception of minor night time activities as described under Impact 4.10-1, construction will begin no earlier than 8:00 a.m. and continue no later than 6:30 p.m. daily.	Monitor construction activities to ensure compliance with limits on construction hours	Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	Throughout project construction
Impact 4.10-1. Short-term construction noise impacts. Existing noise-sensitive receptors are located within 50 feet of construction areas. Most heavy-duty construction equipment use and activity would occur during the daytime. However, some minor roadwork would occur at night. Nighttime activities would not result in substantial increases in noise above existing ambient noise levels and would not exceed applicable standards at the nearest sensitive receptors. Daytime construction could occur outside of the exempt daytime hours by Placer County or TRPA; therefore, could potentially exceed applicable standards and result in excessive noise at nearby sensitive receptors. This would be a significant impact for Alternative 1.	**Mitigation Measure 4.10-1b: Noise controls for construction equipment.** To reduce noise levels from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment the construction contractor will comply with the following measures. ◢ All construction equipment shall be equipped with properly operating mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. ◢ Inactive construction equipment shall not be left idling for prolonged periods of time (i.e., more than 5 minutes). ◢ Stationary equipment (e.g., power generators) and staging area for other equipment shall be located at the maximum distance feasible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors (i.e., receptors defined in Exhibit 4.10-1 and Tables 4.10-13a and -13b). ◢ Trucks hauling materials and goods to and from the construction site shall only do so during construction seasons (i.e., May 1 through October 15). ◢ As directed by FHWA, the contractor will implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures, including changing the location of stationary construction equipment, turning off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, and installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise source.	Monitor construction activities to ensure that best practices for construction generated noise are followed	Implementation: Construction Contractor Monitoring: TTD	Throughout project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
Impact 4.10-2. Ground vibration impacts. Existing noise-sensitive receptors and structures are located within 50 feet of potential pile driving locations. Thus, receptors could be exposed to excessive levels of ground vibration and vibration noise such that structural damage and human disturbance could occur. This would be a significant impact for Alternative 1.	**Mitigation Measure 4.10-2a:** Implement 4.10-1a	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1a	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1a	See Mitigation Measure 4.10-1a
Impact 4.10-2. Ground vibration impacts. Existing noise-sensitive receptors and structures are located within 50 feet of potential pile driving locations. Thus, receptors could be exposed to excessive levels of ground vibration and vibration noise such that structural damage and human disturbance could occur. This would be a significant impact for Alternative 1.	**Mitigation Measure 4.10-2b: Reduce exposure to construction-generated ground vibration.** To reduce exposure to construction-generated ground vibration, measures will be developed to address vibration generated during construction and demolition activity. TRPA's Best Construction Practices Policy may include required setback distances for various types of construction equipment that generate ground vibration, as well as criteria for conducting site-specific studies where these setback distances cannot be maintained. Measures required by the policy to minimize exposure to ground vibration may include, but are not limited to, the following: ◢ Holes shall be predrilled to the maximum feasible depth to reduce the number of blows required to seat the pile. ◢ All construction equipment on construction sites shall be operated as far away from vibration-sensitive sites as reasonably possible. ◢ Earthmoving and ground-impacting operations shall be phased so as not to occur simultaneously in areas close to offsite sensitive receptors, to the extent feasible. The total vibration level produced could be significantly less when each vibration source is operated at separate times. ◢ No construction or demolition activity shall be performed that would expose an existing structure to levels of ground vibration that exceeds 0.20 in/sec PPV. The vibration control program shall include minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration-producing activities (e.g., pile driving, blasting) for the purpose of preventing damage to nearby structures. Established setback requirements can be breached if a project-specific, site specific analysis is conducted by a qualified geotechnical engineer or ground vibration specialist that indicates that no structural damage would occur at nearby buildings or structures. ◢ No construction or demolition activity shall be performed that would	1. Monitor compliance with TRPA's best construction practices for ground vibration as outlined in the standard conditions of approval for grading projects.	1.Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	1. Throughout project construction
		2. Monitor earthmoving and ground-impacting construction activities to ensure that operations a phased to avoid simultaneous vibration generating activities.	2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	2. Throughout project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	expose human activity in an existing building to levels of ground vibration that exceed FTA's 80 VdB standard. The vibration control program shall also include minimum setback requirements for different types of ground vibration producing activities (e.g., pile driving, blasting) for the purpose of preventing negative human response. Established setback requirements can be breached only if a project-specific, site-specific, technically adequate ground vibration study indicates that the buildings would not be exposed to ground vibration levels in excess of 80 VdB, and ground vibration measurements performed during the construction activity confirm that the buildings are not being exposed to levels in excess of 80 VdB; or at least two weeks' advanced notice is provided to owners and renters of residential buildings that would be exposed to ground vibration levels within the applicable setback distance; and hotel accommodations are offered to inhabitants of residences within the applicable setback distance at the expense of the project applicant.			
Impact 4.10-3. Long-term noise impacts. Traffic noise levels would change in specific locations for all alternatives. For all the alternatives, the noise increase would be less than significant for NEPA compliance, because they would be less than applicable the FHWA-established NAC standards and they would not result in a traffic noise level increases during the worst-case hour greater than 12 db Leq(h). For Alternative 1, the noise effect in the study area would be significant for CEQA and TRPA environmental compliance, because portions of the 64-Acre Tract would be exposed to traffic noise increases greater than 3 db CNEL where the TRPA standard of 55 dBA CNEL is already exceeded.	**Mitigation Measure 4.10-3a: Include Traffic Noise Reduction Features in the Realigned Section of SR 89.** To reduce noise impacts associated with realignment of SR 89, to the extent feasible, TTD, TRPA, and CFLHD will coordinate with Placer County, Caltrans, and USFS to identify and include feasible and effective design features that would reduce noise generation on the realigned section of the highway to ensure that the traffic noise level does not exceed 55 CNEL at a distance of 300 feet from the highway edge. Feasible and effective design features will be incorporated into the final design of the realigned highway. Features considered during design development may include, but are not limited to: ◢ reduced vehicle speeds to 30 mph or lower through posted limits, advisory signs, and/or design features, such as traffic calming elements (e.g., median barrier, center islands, and raised crosswalks), ◢ vegetative screening that includes trees to aid in noise attenuation over distance, ◢ noise-attenuating pavement, if determined to be feasible and effective in this location, ◢ limiting access by heavy duty trucks to daylight hours,	1. Monitor the development and incorporation of design features that are projected to maintain a 55 CNEL level at 300 feet from the highway edge under future traffic conditions. 2. Monitor project construction to ensure noise-reducing features are constructed as designed.	1. Implementation: Design engineer/TTD Monitoring: TTD, TRPA, CFLHD 2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD and TRPA	1. During project design 2. Throughout project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	◢ construction of vegetated earth berms for noise attenuation. The performance goal of these noise-reducing features will be to achieve a traffic noise level that does not exceed 55 CNEL at a distance of 300 feet from the highway edge.			
4.13. Recreation				
Impact 4.13-1. Temporary disruption of public access to the Truckee River, recreational trails, 64-Acre Tract, or Fanny Bridge area. During the construction period, the Alternative 1 would have a short-term effect on existing public access to recreation trails, a public river rafting launch site, and public lands, because of temporary trail closures, construction staging areas, and limitations on parking that supports access to public lands and river recreation. Also, brief closures of Fanny Bridge could occur during its rehabilitation or reconstruction. Cyclists would be directed to "share the road" and/or to temporary detour routes when trails are not available. This short-term decrease in access would be a significant impact for Alternative 1.	**Mitigation Measure 4.13-1: Provide detours and trail access management for the Tahoe Rim Trail and Truckee River Trail through or around construction areas.** The Traffic Management Plan shall address all modes of transportation used to access recreation areas, including trail access, public transit, pedestrian and bicycle modes. In order to mitigate short-term decreases in access to recreation resources, trail detour plans shall be included in the Traffic Management Plan, which will meet, at minimum, the following specifications. 1. For Alternative 1, during construction of the new bridge, SR 89 near the bridge, and the Caltrans maintenance yard entrance, the Truckee River Trail will be temporarily closed and all bicycle and pedestrian travel will be required to "share-the-road" and/or detoured to a temporary trail/path on the highway consisting of a physical barrier such as "K-Rail." The temporary separated path shall be established from the western end of the construction zone on SR 89 to the existing bicycle/pedestrian bridge to the east. It is anticipated that construction in this area will be completed in one season, thus the temporary trail will be used from May through October during one year. Signage will be provided at parking lots and approaching the construction zone to alert trail users about the timing, duration, and nature of construction-related impacts. 2. The contractor shall submit a plan to create detours for trail users on the Tahoe Rim Trail, West Shore Trail, Lakeside Trail, and the Truckee River Trail. 3. Signage shall be provided at trail heads and parking lots for all trails directly affected by construction and for connecting trails to alert trail users about the timing, duration, and nature of construction-related impacts, detours and closures. a. Sign locations shall include, but are not limited to parking lots and trail entrances at Tahoe City, Alpine Meadows, Squaw Valley, and	1. Prepare a Traffic Management Plan, per Mitigation Measure 4.13-1 to addresses all modes of transportation accessing recreation sites, includes trail detour plans, and identifies public outreach practices. 2. Monitor construction activities to ensure approved trail detour plans, signage, public information, and other elements of the Traffic Management Plan are implemented	1. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD, TRPA, CFLHD, BOR, Placer County, USFS, and TCPUD 2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	1. Prior to construction 2. Throughout project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
	Tahoma for the Truckee River Trail and the Lakeside Trail, and Barker Pass and Brockway Summit trailheads for the TRT. 4. The Traffic Management Plan shall include trail access management and require extensive public information via a variety of media outlets in the region to inform the public regarding the construction-related detours and closures that affect access to recreational facilities, including parking, and trail closures. 5. The Traffic Management Plan shall provide a "recreation hotline" and or website link that is frequently updated to provide current information on construction related detours and closures. The Traffic Management Plan shall be subject to the review and approval of TTD, TRPA, CFLHD, BOR, Placer County, USFS, and TCPUD. Measures will be taken to keep the public informed of the project construction activities. When closures and/or detours are required by the contractor(s), warning signs and signs regarding restricted access, trail closures, and detours will be posted before and during construction to ensure adequate public safety. Postings, including public notices, will be posted no less than 5 working days in advance of the closures and/or detours. Detour routes will be clearly marked, and construction limit fencing or physical barriers will be installed in order to prevent access to the project site and to clearly delineate the detour route. Full trail closure by the contractor(s) will be prohibited from July 1 through September 9 without an approved detour. All bicycle and pedestrian detours will be included in the Traffic Control Plan to be reviewed and approved prior to construction. Approval must be granted before the start of earth-moving activities. No trail shall be closed without an approved detour plan.			
4.14. Scenic Resources				
Impact 4.14-2. Change the existing visual character or quality of the project site after completion. Alternative 1 would increase built environment features within the 64-Acre Tract and across the Truckee River. Views from the Tahoe Rim Trail in the 64-Acre Tract near the new bridge approach and from the river, itself, would experience visual change; however, the area is already altered by the presence of urban features. Due to the visibility of the new, realigned	**Mitigation Measure 4.14-2. Minimize visual change and visually screen infrastructure with replanted forest vegetation.** To decrease the visual effects caused by the realigned highway and bridge approach built with an elevated profile on an earthen embankment, the following design and construction actions will be implemented. These actions will soften the visual intrusion of the new bridge approach and realigned highway within the 64-Acre Tract and blend them into the forest landscape. ◢ Minimize tree removal and retain existing rock outcroppings to the	1. Monitor the preparation of project specifications and plans to ensure that they comply with Mitigation Measure 4.14-2. 2. Prepare a replanting plan, per Mitigation Measure 4.14-2, and monitor the plan's implementation.	1. Implementation: TTD, construction contractor Monitoring: TTD 2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	1. During project design 2. Prior to project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
highway and bridge approach within the forest of the 64-Acre Tract, changes to visual character of the forest landscape would be a significant impact.	extent feasible. ◢ Restore forest vegetation, including trees, within the disturbed areas of the realigned highway following construction. As a supplement to standard revegetation for erosion control, trees and understory vegetation will be planted on the earthen slopes of the elevated embankment supporting the realigned highway. Forest restoration will be conducted in accordance with a replanting plan approved by the USFS, the public agency landowner of the 64-Acre Tract, and by TRPA. ◢ Select forest-appropriate species and design plant spacing for a natural appearance and for achieving scenic and fire fuel objectives of the USFS and TRPA. ◢ Save, stockpile, and reapply duff and topsoil on disturbed slopes to reduce the newly constructed look and to promote natural revegetation. ◢ The forest restoration plantings will be designed by a Landscape Architect or similar qualified specialist. All vegetation planting on USFS lands shall be approved by USFS botanist for areas on National Forest System lands. ◢ During the design development process, reduce the length and/or height of the embankment supporting the realigned SR 89 highway through the 64-Acre Tract will be reduced to the maximum extent feasible. ◢ Implement embankment slope design options to reduce the visible mass and enhance the appearance of the slope, including rockery walls, stepped design with planting areas, and bridge abutment concrete staining/stamping with natural colors to soften the visual intrusion.	3. Hire a landscape architect or similar qualified specialist to design the forest restoration replantings.	3. Implementation: Construction contractor, landscape architect Monitoring: TTD, USFS botanist	3. Prior to project construction
4.15. Traffic and Transportation				
Impact 4.15-2. Intersection operations. The project would not generate additional vehicle trips that could affect intersection operations; rather, it would implement improvements to existing transportation infrastructure. For Alternative 1, SR 89 would be realigned through the 64-Acre Tract and the wye would be modified. An additional delay is	**Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a: Implement improvements for the side-street movements at the Granlibakken Road intersection with SR 89.** Four of the proposed build alternatives would create a site-specific impact on the local transportation system when analyzed against the projected operations for the No Action condition. Article 15.28.010 of the Placer County Code establishes a road network Capital Improvement Program. The	1. Develop a Capital Improvement Project under the Placer County Capital Improvement Program to improve side-street movements at the Granlibakken Rd. and SR	1. Implementation: Placer County Monitoring: Placer County, TTD, TRPA, and Caltrans	1. Following SR 89/Fanny Bridge project construction

SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Tahoe Transportation District Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program				
Impacts	**Mitigation Measures**	**Monitoring Action**	**Responsibility**	**Timing**
projected for the Granlibakken Road intersection with SR 89 for both 2018 and 2038. Thus, intersection impacts would be significant under Alternative 4.	payment of traffic impact fees funds the Capital Improvement Program for area roadway improvements. Placer County has already identified the SR 89 and Granlibakken Road intersection as a future Capital Improvement Program project. The project is not defined at this time; however, the improvements will modify the type of control at this location to reduce the delay for the side street movements on Granlibakken Road. Placer County is the agency responsible for this mitigation measure.	89 intersection, per Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a. Ensure the Plan includes sufficient design improvements to achieve acceptable delay and LOS levels to the satisfaction of Placer County, Caltrans, TRPA, and TTD.		
	Before initiating construction of the improvements to the SR 89/ Granlibakken Road intersection, an Encroachment Permit from Caltrans will need to be approved. In addition, implementation of this mitigation measure will include sufficient design improvements to achieve acceptable delay and LOS levels to the satisfaction of Placer County, Caltrans, TRPA, and TTD.	2. Obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans for the Capital Improvement Project developed under Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a.	2. Implementation: Placer County Monitoring: Placer County, TTD, TRPA, and Caltrans	2. Prior to Capital Improvement Project construction
Impact 4.15-4. Construction-related traffic impacts. Construction of Alternative 1 would result in temporary construction traffic and temporary disruption to traffic circulation in the area of construction. The project could be constructed over a total of up to three construction seasons. The project applicant would be required to prepare a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) for review and approval by CFLHD-FHWA prior to construction activities. Access to the river crossing and existing intersections would be maintained during construction, however the potential disruption would be potentially significant.	**Mitigation Measure 4.15-4: Maintain efficient traffic flow and provide safe work zones during each construction season.** Prior to construction, the contractor will be required to submit a Traffic Control Plan to CFLHD-FHWA. CFHLD-FHWA will coordinate review and approval of the plan with TRPA, Placer County, Caltrans, and other agencies as appropriate. The Traffic Control Plan will regulate maintenance of traffic during each construction season and comply with agency standards and regulations to promote safe and efficient travel for the public and construction workers through the work zones. The plan will include provisions for regular inspections to assess contractor compliance with the plan, signage to direct traffic, and public noticing, as appropriate.	1. Require the construction contractor to prepare a Traffic Control Plan, per Mitigation Measure 4.15-4	1. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD, CFLHD-FHWA	1. Prior to construction
		2. Monitor construction activities to ensure they are consistent with the approved Traffic Control Plan	2. Implementation: Construction contractor Monitoring: TTD	2. Throughout project construction

State Route 89 / Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project

Environmental Impact Report

Summary of Public Comments and Responses

Tahoe Transportation District Board Meeting

March 27, 2015

California SCH# 2011122013

PREPARED FOR:

Tahoe Transportation District
PO Box 499
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
128 Market Street, Suite 3F
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact: Alfred Knotts

PREPARED BY:

Ascent Environmental, Inc.
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

128 Market Street, Suite 3E
Stateline, NV 89449

Contacts: Curtis E. Alling, AICP
Francisca Ruger

April 3, 2015

SR 89/FANNY BRIDGE COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION PROJECT FINAL EIR/EIS/EA

Summary of Public Comments and Responses to Comments
Tahoe Transportation District Board Meeting
March 27, 2015

The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors held a special public meeting on March 27, 2015 at which it received public comments on the SR 89/Fanny Bridge Community Revitalization Project Final EIR/EIS/EA and the preferred alternative for the project. Public comments expressed at the meeting have been summarized and responses are provided below. The comments and responses do not add significant new information to the environmental document.

#	Commenter	Summary of Comment	Response
TTD 1	Ron McIntyre	The commenter is a West Shore resident. He expressed support for the realigned highway. He suggested phasing the construction to retain the "T" intersection at the wye, until people are used to the realigned highway. Later, the roundabout could be considered. A roundabout may not be needed, if fewer people need to drive through the wye.	The comments supporting the realigned highway and staging of the project improvements are noted.
TTD 2	Chief Michael Schwartz, NTFD	The commenter, Chief of the North Tahoe Fire District and other fire districts, indicated that the districts provide ambulatory and fire service to the project area. The commenter stated his comments are related to fire response, and he believes Alternative 1 is the best choice for public safety.	The comment is consistent with the project description for Alternative 1, which would include construction of a new bridge over the Truckee River providing a second point of emergency access to and from the West Shore.
TTD 3	Zach Hymanson	The commenter is a Granlibakken Road area resident. He stated that the intersection of Granlibakken Road and Tahoe Taverns is outside the project area, but the document identifies it as a significant impact. He is concerned that Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a (Granlibakken Road intersection) is undefined as to the nature or timing of the effect.	Please see Response to Comment O4-6 and I79-2 in the Final EIR/EIS/EA. As stated in Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a, Placer County has identified the SR 89 and Granlibakken Road intersection as a future Capital Improvement Program project, and the Lead Agencies have confirmed that Placer County plans to improve operations at this intersection. Placer County is a CEQA Responsible Agency based on its funding commitment to the project and the potential that the preferred alternative would transfer facilities to the County for operation and maintenance.

#	Commenter	Summary of Comment	Response
TTD 4	Jim Sajdak	The commenter submitted a packet of information to the Board today. The commenter opposes Alternative 1 and supports a modified Alternative 6A. The EIR identified Alternatives 1, 4, 6, and 6a as environmental superior, but the environmental differences do not show a great deal of difference and are not enough to demonstrate a definitively superior alternative. The commenter believes that Alternative 6A is clearly environmentally superior to Alternative 1, citing tree loss and coverage comparisons. He believes a modified Alternative 6A would be superior and Alternative 1 would have a major impact from the elevated roadway.	The submitted packet is the same as the commenter's March 6, 2015 comment letter. Comments in this packet were addressed in the Final EIR/EIS/EA under Letter EX4. Project effects on the 64-Acre Tract, including the elevated roadway, are discussed in Master Response 4, Scenic Effects. The commenter's preference for a modified Alternative 6a is noted.
TTD 6	Glen Campbell	The commenter is the owner of the Dam Café, Tahoe City. The commenter stated that FHWA acknowledged that there would be no improvement to congestion, if the project built. Is the No Action Alternative a serious consideration? Improvements have occurred with other things, such as the pedestrian signal and the transit center. The commenter stated that impacts and cost of the project are not worth it. He cited $400,000 as the repair cost to Fanny Bridge, so he supports the repair approach, and the denial of the project. The commenter stated that roundabouts slow traffic when there is no congestion and that roundabouts are not consistent with the culture of Tahoe City.	Please see Master Response 1 in the Final EIR/EIS/EEA regarding existing congestion and the need for the project. As stated in Master Response 1, the cited repair cost of $400,000 is out of date. The current estimated repair costs for Fanny Bridge would be approximately $1.5 million. These costs do not include seismic retrofit of the bridge to meet the current design standards. Including improvements to seismically retrofit the bridge along with the cost of maintenance, the total costs would be estimated to approach $2.0 million. Regarding improvements to traffic congestion, Table 4.15-6 in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA shows that Alternative 1 is projected to reduce traffic congestion and improve the LOS at the SR 89/SR28 intersection. Also, as described in Response to Comment EX5-30 in the Final EIR/EIS/EA, under Alternative 1 conditions in 2018 and 2038, the majority of intersections would experience decreased delays, many of which would result in better level of service (LOS). The exceptions would be at SR 28/Grove Street, which would remain the same; and at the SR

#	Commenter	Summary of Comment	Response
			89/Granlibakken Road intersection, which would experience increased delays. Issues associated with the SR 89/Granlibakken Road are disclosed in the document, and would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a. Thus, Alternative 1 would achieve the project purpose of reducing delay at intersections associated with the project. The Draft EIR/EIS/EA analyzed a No Action Alternative as Alternative 5; however, it would not meet the purpose and need of the project. The commenter's preference is noted.
TTD 7	Roger Kahn	The commenter is a Tahoe City resident. The commenter stated that the draft EIR/EIS/EA did not address a roundabout at the wye. He believes it was not presented in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA or at the public meetings. The commenter owns property near the wye and stated that the roundabout will affect his property and business access to several properties. While he is a proponent of the realigned highway in Alternative 1, he opposes the roundabout at the wye. He asked for a meeting with property owners right away to resolve business access.	The Draft EIR/EIS/EA included a roundabout at the wye under several alternatives. The description of the Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 include Option 2, which proposes a roundabout at the existing wye intersection. This option is also shown in Exhibits 3-2, 3-3, and 3-4 in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA. Alternative 6a also includes a roundabout at the wye an is described as "Rehabilitate or Replace and Widen Existing Bridge, Install Roundabout at Existing Wye Intersection." As stated in Response to Comment I5-1 in the Final EIR/EIS/EA, potential access effects of the project alternatives are discussed in Impact 4.11-2, Displacement of Businesses. Additional discussion of effects to property access and parking was included in the economic analysis prepared for the project. Design refinement will be coordinated with regard to property access and circulation movements. Regarding property access around the wye intersection on roadways that provide business

#	Commenter	Summary of Comment	Response
			access, design would be coordinated to maintain existing business access in a manner similar to the existing conditions to the extent feasible.
TTD 8	Marten Daniels	The commenter stated that the Penny Pines Plantation was planted as a memorial for families and fire fighters, and the EIR does not address it adequately. He also states that the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) was not notified properly regarding the need for access to its property. The EIR does not address loss of public facilities owned by TCPUD. It does not address a sewage spill risk, saying it would be the contractor's responsibility.	A discussion of the Penny Pines Program is included in Response to Comment EX4-4 in the Final EIR/EIS/EA. Please see Responses to Comments 010-1 and 010-2 in the Final EIR/EIS/EA regarding comments from the Truckee Meadows Water Authority and responses to comment letter A5 from the Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency regarding effects on the existing sewer line.
TTD 9	Sue Rossi	The commenter is a Tahoe City resident. The commenter stated that the Penny Pines Plantation trees are a memorial of 121 people who have passed, including firefighters in New York City on 9/11. The commenter reported that Matt Pank at the U.S. Forest Service said the program started in 1989 and ran through 2003/2004. Seedlings were planted, so the trees could be well grown. It is a memorial park that would be damaged by the realignment, not just a forest restoration. The commenter stated that an estimated 135 trees would be lost for the realignment, and this is a major issue. Garden Clubs are expressing concern.	A discussion of the Penny Pines Program is included in Response to Comment EX4-4 in the Final EIR/EIS/EA. The physical impacts associated with the removal of trees, including possible Penny Pines program trees, are addressed in Impact 4.1-1: Tree Removal in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA. In response to community concerns about the plantation, TTD will coordinate with the U.S. Forest Service to encourage them to seek another location for planting a memorial grove, if desired by the affected families.
TTD 10	Susan Gearhart	The commenter is a Homewood resident and President of Friends of the West Shore. The commenter stated that Alternative 1 was pre-selected as the proposed action a long time ago. This is a biased outcome that negates public input. The commenter stated that a modified Alternative 6A should be approved, and she is opposed to Alternative 1. The commenter cited a number of concerns about project impacts and that the impact analysis needs to be improved. West Shore residents are concerned about taking forest and wetland areas and causing deep disturbance of the soil,	As stated in Response to Comment 05-5 n the Final EIR/EIS/EA, identification of an alternative as a proposed action does not equate to identification of the preferred alternative. Alternative 1 was noted as "proposed," because it was the "starting point" concept based on previous adopted land use and regional transportation plans. All the action alternatives and the No Action Alternative have been evaluated in comparable detail and are available for approval by

#	Commenter	Summary of Comment	Response
		including SEZ and floodplains. The commenter stated that wildlife will be affected and greenhouse gas emissions will increase. The commenter also cited concerns related to water quality impacts and sediment loss, impervious surfaces, noise and utility impacts, and a reduction of public forest lands. The commenter stated there are significant gaps in the EIR data. The commenter stated that Fanny Bridge should be widened, rather than building the highway realignment.	the Lead Agencies. The commenter's preference for a modified Alternative 6a over Alternative 1 is noted. The issue items addressed in the comment are included and analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA in Section 4.2 through 4.16. The commenter does not provide specific examples of data gaps. The information presented in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA provides credible and substantial evidence in a good faith effort at full disclosure to understand the significant effects of the project alternatives, in compliance with CEQA, NEPA, and TRPA requirements.
TTD 11	LeAnn Cullen	The commenter supports leaving the project area alone (No Action Alternative). The commenter stated that Placer County will not help as much as desired. The commenter stated that, if an action alternative must be chosen, Alternative 1, Option 2 is best, but only with resolution of business access concerns.	The commenter's alternative preference is noted. Please see Comment TTD 3 and TTD 15 regarding Placer County's role in the project.
TTD 12	Mike Willet	The commenter identified himself as a Tahoe City resident and real estate broker. The commenter stated the opinion that the Transit Center is a failure, so he believes the highway project would be a failure, too. The commenter is opposed to the project.	The commenter's position opposing the project is noted. Issues related to the project goals, cost, and operation of the Tahoe City Transit Center are not within the scope of the project. As noted in the Final EIR/EIS/EA, the Tahoe City Transit Center is a regionally important transportation project intended to achieve goals associated with TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity, the Environmental Improvement Program, the Tahoe City Community Plan, and other TRPA Regional Plan objectives aimed at improving inter-regional and intra-regional access and mobility. The comments regarding the Transit Center are noted.
TTD 13	Donna Caravelli	The commenter is a Granlibakken area resident and supports retrofit of Fanny	The comments in support of the retrofit of Fanny Bridge and in

#	Commenter	Summary of Comment	Response
		Bridge, but stated it is the only part where consensus exists. Tahoe City will be a ghost town during construction. The commenter opposes a bypass. Roundabouts were said to speed up traffic, but she believes they really slows down traffic. The charm and environmental quality of Tahoe City will be lost.	opposition against the realigned highway are noted. Construction effects are addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS/EA.
TTD 14	Cindy Gustufson, TCPUD	The commenter represents the Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) and states that the TCPUD Board has unanimously supported Alternative 1, but did not look specifically at Option 1 or 2. Public safety and emergency response are their key reasons for support, including having a secondary access over the river. The 64-Acre Tract is a key point of recreation access to the river, trails, or at the park on the trails. The trail improvements are sufficient in Alternative 1. The TCPUD welcomes new sewer infrastructure.	The commenter's report of the TCPUD preference for Alternative 1 is noted. Discussions and a description of the project effects on the 64-Acre Tract and recreation use on and around the 64-Acre tract are included in Master Response 3, Recreation Effects, and in Section 2.3.1, Recreation Use Features of the Action Alternatives, of the Final EIR/EIS/EA.
TTD 15	Peter Kraatz, Placer County	Regarding Granlibakken Road, Placer County has identified the intersection as needing improvements for some time, so it is already listed as part of the County's Capital Improvement Program. It will be implemented, but funding needs to be identified to define the timing. The Tahoe City Mobility Study will address off-site congestion in downtown Tahoe City. Placer County is a CEQA responsible agency, because the County must accept the former SR 89 and Fanny Bridge for operations and maintenance, and because $3.1 million of County funds are committed to construction. The commenter supports Alternative 1 as County staff, but the Placer County Board of Supervisors must take action on whether to approve that alternative or another.	Please see Response to Comment O4-6 and I79-2 in the Final EIR/EIS/EA. As stated in Mitigation Measure 4.15-2a, Placer County has identified the SR 89 and Granlibakken Road intersection as a future Capital Improvement Program project, and the Lead Agencies have confirmed that Placer County plans to improve operations at this intersection. Placer County is a CEQA Responsible Agency based on its funding commitment to the project and the potential that the preferred alternative would transfer facilities to the County for operation and maintenance.
TTD 16	Sandy Evans Hall	The commenter is from the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association. The Association does not have an official position on the project. The Association (NLTRA) has authorized allocation of some transient lodging fees to help fund construction. Past surveys by NLTRA indicate the congestion is a detriment to Tahoe City visitation and economic health. It needs to be solved.	The comments are noted.

#	Commenter	Summary of Comment	Response
Public Meeting Concludes			
TTD 17	TTD Board	Board Chair, Steve Teshara, noted that the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) must be adopted to ensure implementation of mitigation measures. It is available for public for review. He concluded by indicating that the TTD Board will continue this item to April 10, 2015 for consideration of Board action on the alternatives.	The MMRP is available for review at TTD's website on the Fanny Bridge Project page. [see http://www.tahoetransportation.org/fanny-new-1]

Tahoe Transportation DISTRICT

Connecting our communities

MEMORANDUM

Date: April 6, 2015

To: Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) Board of Directors

From: TTD Staff

Subject: Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway Phase 3 Project Update; Authorize District Manager to Execute an Agreement with the United States Forest Service to Complete the Environmental Analysis for the Project; Adoption of a Resolution Approving a Federal Lands Access Program Application for Project Funding

---

Action Requested:
Staff will provide an update to the Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway Phase 3 Project to the Board. Following the Project update, Staff recommends and requests the Board to:

1) Authorize the District Manager to execute an agreement with the United States Forest Service to complete the Environmental Analysis for the Project; and
2) Adopt Resolution 2015-005 approving a Federal Lands Access Program application for Project funding

Fiscal Analysis:
All expenditures associated with this item are accounted for in the approved 2014/15 budget.

The agreement with the United States Forest Service (USFS) includes the District providing funding in the amount of $340,000 to the USFS Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit (LTBMU) to complete the environmental analysis and all necessary field work. Funding to reimburse the LTBMU is secured and will be provided through Nevada State Question 1 funding and funding provided by the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID).

Work Program Analysis:
All work associated with this effort is captured under respective elements of the approved FY 2015 Work Program and corresponding allotted staff time.

Background:
At the October 10, 2014 TTD Board meeting, Staff presented the results of a fatal flaw analysis for the Project, prepared by Lumos and Associates (Lumos) for TTD and IVGID, which showed that co-location of the Phase 3 Bikeway Project and IVGID's sewer effluent export line is feasible. At that meeting, the Board approved a new interlocal agreement with IVGID, which included IVGID providing up to $300,000 for the Project, allowing TTD to move forward with the environmental review process, including the required 30% design for that review; and a new Task Order for Lumos to develop the 30% design. Lumos is currently working on the 30% design, which is scheduled for completion in May in preparation for the environmental analysis (EA) to begin.

DK/jw AGENDA ITEM: VI.B.

Discussion:
Over the past few months, Staff has met with the LTBMU to discuss the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process for the Project. A determination was made by the LTBMU that they will be the Lead Agency for NEPA as the Project is entirely on USFS lands, with the exception of a small segment on State lands. It was anticipated that Ascent Environmental would develop the EA for the Project under contract with TTD. However, after discussions with LTBMU regarding their experience in developing joint NEPA/TRPA EAs for their projects on USFS lands within the Tahoe Basin, TTD and LTBMU Staff agreed to a new approach for the project. As the project is on USFS lands, LTBMU will complete the environmental process for the project, including the field work and special studies, which will help streamline the overall process, keeping the Project on schedule and helping reduce Project costs. The most recent draft of the agreement between TTD and LTBMU is attached (Attachment A) but is subject to change.

As the primary design and environmental process is underway, Staff continues to work with IVGID and LTBMU to fund construction of the Project. TTD originally included the NV Bikeway Phase 3 and co-location Project in the FLAP application submitted for the overall SR 28 Corridor in 2013. Due to the amount of FLAP funds available at the time and the fact the environmental process had not yet begun, the NV Bikeway Phase 3 co-location portion was removed from the awarded FLAP project. The northern portion of the corridor, including the NV Bikeway Phase 2 (Incline to Sand Harbor); USFS parking lot expansions; NDOT water quality project; and various safety improvements were approved as the NV FLAP SR 28 Phase 1 Project. The fiscal year 2015 Nevada FLAP Call for Projects is now open with applications due May 8, 2015. Staff is proposing to submit an application for a NV FLAP SR 28 Phase 2 Project which includes the eight miles of NV Bikeway Phase 3 (Sand Harbor to US 50) project; the co-location of IVGID's export line; and two new parking areas in the southern portion of the corridor to provide access to the proposed bike path. IVGID has agreed to provide at least $15 million in matching funds for the project, which are funds they have set aside for replacement of the export line. In order to submit an application, the Board is required to adopt a resolution (Attachment B) approving the application.

Additional Information:
If you have any questions or comments regarding this item, please contact Alfred Knotts at (775) 589-5503 or aknotts@tahoetransportation.org.

Attachments:
A. Draft Agreement between TTD and USFS-LTBMU
B. Resolution No. 2015-005

DK/jw AGENDA ITEM: VI.B.

USDA, Forest Service

OMB 0596-0217
FS-1500-11

FS Agreement No. _____

Cooperator Agreement No. _____

COLLECTION AGREEMENT
Between The
TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
And The
USDA, FOREST SERVICE
LAKE TAHOE BASIN MANAGEMENT UNIT

This COLLECTION AGREEMENT is hereby entered into by and between the Tahoe Transportation District, hereinafter referred to as "TTD", and the USDA, Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, hereinafter referred to as the "U.S. Forest Service," under the provisions of the Cooperative Funds Act of June 30, 1914 (16 U.S.C. 498 as amended by Pub. L. 104-127 ????.

Background: Improvements to the Highway 28 including Phase 2 of the Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway from Incline to Sand Harbor have undergone planning and environmental analysis and will begin implementation in 2015. Phase 3 of the Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway project will include approximately 8 miles of bikeway from Sand Harbor to Spooner Summit, associated parking areas, and utility co-location. This agreement funds the U.S. Forest Service to complete NEPA and TRPA analysis for the above mentioned Phase 3 project.

Title: Stateline to Stateline Bikeway, Phase 3-Environmental Analysis

I. PURPOSE: The purpose of this agreement, and incorporated Financial Plan, is to document the voluntary contribution of funds from the "TTD" to the U.S. Forest Service to complete environmental analysis of the Phase 3 bikeway, including wildlife, amphibous, botanical, and archaeological surveys and reports, and scenic analysis, for the bike path corridor and associated Incline Village General Improvement District ("IVGID") effluent export line and other utility co-location. The surveys and reportinig will be coordinated with Nevada Division of State Parks ("NDSP") for the approximatley 2 miles of trail that would be located across park property. Subsequent environmental analysis will include preparation of the environmental analysis to comply with both TRPA and Forest Service NEPA requirements.

The following is a detailled description of what will be accomplished by the Forest Service under this agreement:

TASK 1: USFS Project Management

The Forest Service will coordinate and manage the field surveys, specialist reports, public comments and document development.

Deliverables: USFS will provide monthly progress reports and invoices to TTD for work completed. USFS will coordinate with TTD and TTD's consultants for the overall EA.

TASK 2: Biological Resources Data Review, Field Surveys, and Mapping

A wildlife biologist and botanist with expertise in Tahoe Basin natural resources and USFS sensitive species will review existing data, conduct field surveys, and prepare maps to document sensitive and common biological resources in and adjacent to NFS lands in the project area, and to support preparation of USFS specialist reports (Tasks 3.1 to 3.6, below). Biologists will first review most current data to preliminarily identify special-status species and other sensitive resources known or with potential to occur in the project area. The data review will include: review of TRPA and USFS survey and GIS data; a records search of U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) database of Federal Endangered and Threatened Species that Occur in or May be Affected by Projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin (USFWS 2010); consultation with resource agency staff; and review of relevant literature and previous analyses conducted for the project.
Following the initial data review, biologists will conduct field surveys to verify information collected during the data review, and supplement that information with current project-specific survey results required to complete the USFS specialist reports. Field studies conducted by the Consultant team under this Scope of Work will include supplemental protocol surveys for special-status plants and noxious weeds on NFS lands in the project area (Note: this is supplemental to the reconnaissance survey and habitat assessment field work being conducted under the environmental document scope of work.) Additional focused or protocol surveys are not expected to be required. During the reconnaissance field survey and habitat assessment for wildlife and aquatic resources, information about land cover type, hydrology, vegetation stand composition and structure, and habitat suitability for USFS sensitive and other special-status species will be recorded. The special-status plant and noxious weed surveys will be conducted simultaneously, during the appropriate summer blooming period.
Additional biological survey work for the NV Bikeway Phase 3 Project to support the environmental document (EA/EA), including vegetation community mapping of the entire Project area and reconnaissance-level special-status plant, noxious weed, wildlife, and aquatic surveys.
A set of biological resources maps to support the USFS specialist reports will be prepared based on the data review and results of field surveys. Resource maps will display vegetation communities, special-status plant and animal occurrences and suitable habitat, sensitive natural communities, and noxious weed locations. Elements of these maps will be incorporated into the USFS specialist reports, as appropriate.

Deliverables: LTBMU staff shall share survey results with Integrated Solutions for report preparation. Draft and Final reports, mapping, and survey information shall be provided to TTD in electronic format.

TASK 3: USFS Specialist Reports

Task 3.1: Biological Assessment (BA)/Biological Evaluation (BE) for Aquatic and Terrestrial Animal Species (USFS BA/BE)
Integrated Resources will prepare a joint biological assessment/biological evaluation (BA/BE) for the Project. The BA provides a process through which species listed as endangered or threatened, or proposed for listing, under the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (as amended) receive full consideration during a federal agency's planning and consultation process. The BE provides a process through which potential effects of project alternatives on species designated as sensitive by the Regional Forester are evaluated and considered during the planning and review process. The BA/BE will address aquatic and terrestrial animal species. The BA/BE will include descriptions of the following: agency consultation to date; current management direction for affected species; the action area and project alternatives; affected species and critical habitat; direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the project alternatives; and effects determinations for each species. Preparation of this document will involve ongoing coordination with USFS staff.

Deliverables:
- Integrated Resources shall submit one (1) pdf and one (1) Word electronic version of the Draft BA/BE (Aquatic and Terrestrial Animal Species) for concurrent review by USFS and TTD.
- Integrated Resources will submit two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic version of the Final BA/BE (Aquatic and Terrestrial Animal Species).

Task 3.2: Biological Evaluation (BE) for Plant and Fungi Species
Integrated Resources will prepare a biological evaluation (BE) for sensitive plant and fungi species. The USFS requires preparation of a biological evaluation (BE) for plant and fungi species designated as sensitive by the Regional Forester; it presently does not require a biological assessment (BA) because no plant or fungi species listed or proposed for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) occur on NFS lands in the project area. Tahoe yellow cress (Rorippa subumbellata) is a candidate for listing under the ESA and occurs on beaches near the project area. This species is also designated as sensitive by the Regional Forester and, therefore, will be addressed in the BE as such. Elements of the BE for plant and fungi species will be similar to those described for the BA/BE for Aquatic and Terrestrial Animal Species (see Task 3.1). Preparation of this document will involve ongoing coordination with USFS staff.

Deliverables:
- Integrated shall submit one (1) PDF and one (1) Word electronic version of the Draft BE for Plant and Fungi Species for concurrent review by USFS and TTD.
- Consultant will submit two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic version of the Final BE for Plant and Fungi Species.

Task 3. 3: Management Indicator Species (MIS) Report
Integrated Resources will prepare a project-level Management Indicator Species (MIS) Report for the Project. The MIS report will evaluate and describe the anticipated direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the project alternatives on the habitat of 10 MIS identified in the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forests

Management Indicator Species Amendment (SNF MIS Amendment) Record of Decision. The report will also discuss how effects on MIS habitat relate to bioregional population or habitat trends. The format and content of this document will follow the guidance provided in "Overview of the Sierra Nevada Project-Level MIS Report Template Outline and Key Points for Its Use." Preparation of this document will involve ongoing coordination with USFS staff.
Deliverables:

- Integrated Resources shall submit one (1) PDF and one (1) Word electronic version of the Draft MIS Report for concurrent review by USFS and TTD.
- Integrated Resources will submit two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic version of the Final MIS Report.

Task 3. 4: Aquatic and Terrestrial Species Impact Analysis Report for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Integrated Resources will prepare an Aquatic and Terrestrial Species Impact Report for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA Report) on USFS's behalf. The TRPA Report will evaluate potential effects of project implementation with respect to TRPA threshold standards for fisheries and wildlife. For fisheries, TRPA maintains threshold standards and attainment-status indicators for lake habitat (F-1), stream habitat (F-2), in-stream flow (F-3), and Lahontan cutthroat trout (Oncorhynchus clarki henshawi) (F-4). For wildlife resources, threshold standards and indicators are established for eight TRPA Special Interest Species (W-1) and habitats of special significance (W-2). Preparation of this document will involve ongoing coordination with USFS staff.

Deliverables:

- Integrated Resources shall submit one (1) PDF and one (1) Word electronic version of the Draft TRPA Report for concurrent review by USFS and TTD.
- Integrated Resources will submit two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic version of the Final TRPA Report.

Task 3.5: Noxious Weed Risk Assessment

Integrated Resources will prepare a Noxious Weed Risk Assessment (NWRA) Report for the Project. The report will include: project description, project location, risk assessment (field assessment, habitat vulnerability, vectors, expected habitat alteration, mitigation), and a summary. The NWRA will also include a glossary of terminology used, references, maps, and tables, as required by the NWRA template. Preparation of the NWRA will involve ongoing coordination with USFS staff.
The NWRA will focus on NFS lands in the project area and be based primarily on protocol-level weed surveys on NFS lands. However, the NWRA will also address weed risk to NFS land from project construction on adjacent non-NFS lands, based on reconnaissance-level weed surveys and risk assessment of those areas.

Deliverables:

- Integrated Resources shall submit one (1) PDF and one (1) Word electronic version of the Draft NWRA Report for concurrent review by USFS and TTD.
- Integrated Resources will submit two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic version of the Final NWRA Report.

Task 3.6: Migratory Bird Report
Integrated Resources will prepare a letter report on USFS's behalf that documents project effects on migratory birds, as well as design considerations to minimize adverse effects on migratory birds (Migratory Bird Report). USFS prepares a Migratory Bird Report to formalize and document its consideration of migratory bird conservation during project planning, as established in the 2008 "Memorandum of Understanding between the USDA Forest Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to Promote the Conservation of Migratory Birds." The report will follow the USFS template "Migratory Landbird Conservation on the Proposed [Project Name], Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit." The report will describe how project design has been developed or modified to minimize impacts to landbirds, with emphasis on birds of conservation or management concern; it will also summarize expected impacts to habitats and select migratory bird populations as a result of project implementation. Preparation of this document will involve ongoing coordination with USFS staff.

Deliverables:
- Integrated Resources shall submit one (1) PDF and one (1) Word electronic version of the Draft Migratory Bird Report for concurrent review by USFS and TTD.
- Integrated Resources will submit two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic version of the Final Migratory Bird Report.

Task 3.7: Heritage Resources Report
Integrated Resources will prepare a Heritage Resources Report that will focus on the NFS lands and NV State Park lands (approximately 42,340 linear feet) in the project area. The report will be prepared following the template provided by the USFS. Work performed under this Scope of Work is for services supplementary to and not already included in the environmental document (EA/EA) scope of work. The project area within NFS lands is thought to have been previously surveyed and the State Parks lands needs archaeological surveys. The level of effort to conduct the remaining archaeological reconnaissance and the report is included in this agreement for the environmental document (EA/EA). This Scope of Work includes the level of effort to prepare a standalone Heritage Resource Report for the segment of trail that crosses NFS land, "NDSP" land and independent Native American consultation for this stretch. Preparation of the Heritage Resources Report will involve ongoing coordination with USFS heritage resources staff.

Deliverables:
- Integrated Resources shall submit one (1) PDF and one (1) Word electronic version of the Draft Heritage Resources Report for concurrent review by USFS and TTD.
- Integrated will submit two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic version of the Heritage Resources Report.

TASK 3.8: Hydrology
Integraded Resources shall develop a groundwater and surface water hydrology report that identifies design measures and impacts from both the bike path and the export pipeline.

Deliverables:

- Integrated Resources shall submit one (1) PDF and one (1) Word electronic version of the Draft Hydrolgy Report for concurrent review by USFS and TTD.
- Integrated will submit two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic version of the Hydrology Report.

TASK 4: Visual/Scenic Analysis

TTD will utilize consultant services to develop visual simulations for the USFS to use in their visual analysis.
Deliverables: USFS to provide visual analysis for EA. TTD to provide visual simulations.

TASK 5: PUBLIC SCOPING/HEARING

The Forest Service will coordinate with TTD and attend Public Scoping meetings and Hearings scheduled by the TTD.

Deliverables: Coordinate and attend public meetings for project scoping. TTD to coordinate with USFS on public outreach for this task. TTD Board for hearing.

TASK 6: Draft the Environmental Analysis for NEPA and TRPA

The Forest Service with Integrated Resources will prepare the Draft Environmental Analysis for TRPA, Forest Service, NDSL/NDSP, IVGID, Douglas County, and TTD review.

Deliverables: USFS to provide admin draft for PDT review (TTD, NDSL/NDSP, IVGID, Douglas County, USFS)

TASK 7: Final Environmental Analysis for NEPA and TRPA

The Forest Service with Integrated Resoures will prepare the Final Environmental Analysis for public review.

Deliverables: EA for public review. Address public comments. Includes TTD and TRPA Board meetings as applicable.

TASK 8: Final Environmental Analysis Decision for NEPA and TRPA

The Forest Service will prepare the FONSI/FONSE for final decision.

Deliverables: NEPA - FONSI, TRPA - FONSE

TASK 9: Public Outreach

TTD will be responsible for leading the Public Outreach efforts for the Project similar to the Incline to Sand Harbor segment of the Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway. TTD will coordinate these efforts with the USFS.

Deliverables: TTD to use consultant services for Public Outreach and coordinate with USFS Public Outreach Team.

II. THE TTD SHALL:

A. LEGAL AUTHORITY. TTD shall have the legal authority to enter into this agreement, and the institutional, managerial, and financial capability to ensure proper planning, management, and completion of the project, which includes funds sufficient to pay the nonfederal share of project costs, when applicable.

B. Perform in accordance with the Financial Plan.

C. Upon presentation of a Bill for Collection, deposit with the U.S. Forest Service the amount agreed to in the Financial Plan.

D. PAYMENT BOND. TTD shall furnish and maintain a payment bond acceptable to the U.S. Forest Service in the amount of **$0-government agency**- before any work commences under this agreement.

E. The TTD will provide resource surveys that have been completed and 30% design documents for the bike path and parking areas. The TTD will provide collaboration and project coordination between partners in order for the U.S. Forest Service to complete the NEPA analysis on both National Forest System Lands and Nevada State Lands.

III. THE U.S. FOREST SERVICE SHALL:

A. ADVANCE BILLING. The U.S. Forest Service shall bill the "TTD" prior to commencement of work for deposits sufficient to cover the estimated costs (including overhead) for the specific payment period. Overhead is assessed at the rate of 8percent.

Billing Method: A single lump sum advance bill.

B. REIMBURSABLE BILLING. The U.S. Forest Service shall bill the "TTD" annually as of September 30 for funds sufficient to cover the costs for the specific payment period. All reimbursement billings must be completed within the same fiscal year as U.S. Forest Service expenditures. Overhead is assessed at the rate of 6 percent.

Billings must be sent to:

The U.S. Forest Service is required to issue bills for expenditures incurred under reimbursable agreements at the end of or prior to the end of each fiscal year. Therefore, an out-of-cycle bill may be received by the "TTD" .

If payment is not received to the satisfaction of the U.S. Forest Service by the date specified on the Bill for Collection (Form FS-6500-89), the U.S. Forest Service shall exercise its rights regarding the collection of debts owed to the United States. Conditions specified in an associated payment bond guaranteeing payment must also be met.

C. SPECIAL BILLING REQUIREMENTS – FINANCIAL DOCUMENTATION. Reimbursable billings shall be issued at the prescribed frequency based on expenditures recorded in the U.S. Forest Service accounting system for work performed. Bills for Collection reflect an aggregate amount for the billing period. U.S. Forest Service Transaction Register listing itemized expenses will be provided upon request at the end of a project or annually for long-term agreements. Provision of the Transaction Register or other supporting documentation accompanying individual bills will be limited to agreements over $2,500, and only when cooperator requirements are clearly defined within this clause.

The special billing requirements are:

D. SPECIAL BILLING REQUIREMENTS – PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION. The U.S. Forest Service Program Manager shall provide the "TTD" with a written report that meets the "TTD" 's specific documentation requirements.

E. Perform in accordance with the attached Financial Plan.

F. The U.S. Forest Service will prepare the NEPA documentation which is anticipated to be an Environmental Analysis and Finding of No Significant Impact.
Completion of resource surveys, writing of the document, and management of the NEPA process will be performed by the U.S. Forest Service.

IV. IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED AND UNDERSTOOD BY AND BETWEEN THE PARTIES THAT:

A. PRINCIPAL CONTACTS. Individuals listed below are authorized to act in their respective areas for matters related to this agreement.

Principal Cooperator Contacts:

Cooperator Program Contact	Cooperator Administrative Contact

Name: Alfred Knotts Address: PO Box 499 City, State, Zip: Zephyr Cove, NV 89448 Telephone:775-589-5503 FAX: 775-588-0917 Email: aknotts@tahoetransportation.org	Name: Derek Kirkland Address: PO Box 499 City, State, Zip: Zephyr Cove, NV 89448 Telephone: 775-589-5504 FAX: 775-588-0917 Email: dkirkland@tahoetransportation.org

Principal U.S. Forest Service Contacts:

U.S. Forest Service Program Manager Contact	U.S. Forest Service Administrative Contact
Name: Garrett Villanueva Address: 35 College Drive City, State, Zip: South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 Telephone: 530-543-2762 FAX: Email: gvillanueva@fs.fed.us	Name: John Hefner Address: 35 College Drive City, State, Zip: South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 Telephone: 530-543-2692 FAX: Email: jhefner@fs.fed.us

B. FOREST SERVICE LIABILITY TO THE COOPERATOR. The United States shall not be liable to the "TTD" for any costs, damages, claims, liabilities, and judgments that arise in connection with the performance of work by the U.S. Forest Service or its contractors under this collection agreement, including but not limited to fire suppression costs and damage to any property owned by the "TTD" or any third party.

C. REFUNDS. Funds collected in advance by the U.S. Forest Service, which are not spent or obligated for the project(s) approved under this agreement, may be refunded to the "TTD" , authorized for use for a new agreement by the "TTD" , or waived by the "TTD" . A DUNS number and registration in the System for Award Management (SAM.gov) by the "TTD" may be necessary to process a refund. Due to processing costs, any balance less than $25 shall not be refunded to the "TTD" .

D. PUBLIC NOTICES. It is the U.S. Forest Service's policy to inform the public as fully as possible of its programs and activities. TTD is/are encouraged to give public notice of the receipt of this agreement and, from time to time, to announce progress and accomplishments. Press releases or other public notices should include a statement substantially as follows:

" U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit."

TTD may call on the U.S. Forest Service's Office of Communication for advice regarding public notices. TTD is/are requested to provide copies of notices or announcements to the U.S. Forest Service Program Manager and to the U.S. Forest Service's Office of Communications as far in advance of release as possible.

E. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA). Public access to agreement records must not be limited, except when such records must be kept confidential and would have been exempted from disclosure pursuant to Freedom of Information regulations (5 U.S.C. 552).

F. PARTICIPATION IN SIMILAR ACTIVITIES. This agreement in no way restricts the U.S. Forest Service or the "TTD" from participating in similar activities with other public or private agencies, organizations, and individuals.

G. ENDORSEMENT. Any of the "TTD" 's contributions made under this agreement do not by direct reference or implication convey U.S. Forest Service endorsement of the "TTD" 's products or activities.

H. NOTICES. Any communication affecting the operations covered by this agreement by the U.S. Forest Service or the "TTD" will be sufficient only if in writing and delivered in person, mailed, or transmitted electronically by e-mail or fax, as follows:

To the U.S. Forest Service Program Manager, at the address specified in the agreement.

To the "TTD" , at the "TTD" 's address shown in the agreement or such other address designated within the agreement.

Notices are effective when delivered in accordance with this provision, or on the effective date of the notice, whichever is later.

I. COLLABORATION. The U.S. Forest Service and the "TTD" may mutually agree to collaborate in the review of draft publications, interpretive signs, manuscripts, and other printed material and audiovisuals prior to completion. This agreement, in and of itself, does not authorize the "TTD" 's participation in the project.

J. USE OF U.S. FOREST SERVICE INSIGNIA. In order for the "TTD" to use the U.S. Forest Service insignia on any published media, such as a Web page, printed publication, or audiovisual production, permission must be granted from the U.S. Forest Service's Office of Communications. A written request must be submitted and approval granted in writing by the Office of Communications (Washington Office) prior to use of the insignia.

K. BUILDING AND COMPUTER ACCESS BY NON-FOREST SERVICE PERSONNEL. TTD may be granted access to Forest Service facilities and/or computer systems to accomplish work described in the Operating Plan or Statement of Work. All non-government employees with unescorted access to Forest Service facilities and computer systems must have background checks following the procedures established by USDA Directives 3505 and Departmental Manual 4620-02. Those granted computer access must fulfill all Forest Service requirements for mandatory security awareness and role-

based advance security training, and sign all applicable Forest Service statements of responsibilities.

L. U.S. FOREST SERVICE ACKNOWLEDGED IN PUBLICATIONS, AUDIOVISUALS, AND ELECTRONIC MEDIA. TTD shall acknowledge U.S. Forest Service support in any publications, audiovisuals, and electronic media developed as a result of this agreement.

M. PROPERTY IMPROVEMENTS. Improvements placed on National Forest System land at the direction or with the approval of the U.S. Forest Service becomes property of the United States. These improvements are subject to the same regulations and administration of the U.S. Forest Service as would other National Forest improvements. No part of this agreement entitles the "TTD" to any interest in the improvements, other than the right to use them under applicable U.S. Forest Service Regulations.

N. PURCHASE OF ASSETS. Any assets (such as equipment, property, or improvements) purchased by the U.S. Forest Service with the "TTD" 's contributions shall become the property of the U.S. Forest Service.

O. OFFSETS, CLAIMS AND RIGHTS. Any and all activities entered into or approved by this agreement will create and support afforestation/ reforestation efforts within the National Forest System without generating carbon credits. The U.S. Forest Service does not make claims of permanence or any guarantees of carbon sequestration on lands reforested or afforested through partner assistance. The U.S. Forest Service will provide for long-term management of reforested and afforested lands, according to applicable Federal statute regulations and forest plans.

P. NONDISCRIMINATION STATEMENT – PRINTED, ELECTRONIC, OR AUDIOVISUAL MATERIAL. TTD shall include the following statement, in full, in any printed, audiovisual material, or electronic media for public distribution developed or printed with any Federal funding.

> ***In accordance with Federal law and U.S. Department of Agriculture policy, this institution is prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.)***
>
> **To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice and TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.**

If the material is too small to permit the full statement to be included, the material must, at minimum, include the following statement, in print size no smaller than the text:

> ***"This institution is an equal opportunity provider."***

Q. TERMINATION FOR COLLECTION AGREEMENTS. Either party, in writing, may terminate this agreement in whole, or in part, at any time before the date of expiration. The U.S. Forest Service shall not incur any new obligations for the terminated portion of this agreement after the effective date of termination and shall cancel as many obligations as possible. Full credit must be allowed for U.S. Forest Service expenses and all non-cancelable obligations properly incurred up to the effective date of termination.

R. DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION. TTD shall immediately inform the U.S. Forest Service if they or any of their principals are presently excluded, debarred, or suspended from entering into covered transactions with the Federal Government according to the terms of 2 CFR Part 180. Additionally, should the "TTD" or any of their principals receive a transmittal letter or other official Federal notice of debarment or suspension, then they shall notify the U.S. Forest Service without undue delay. This applies whether the exclusion, debarment, or suspension is voluntary or involuntary.

S. MODIFICATIONS. Modifications within the scope of this agreement must be made by mutual consent of the parties, by the issuance of a written modification signed and dated by all properly authorized, signatory officials, prior to any changes being performed. Requests for modification should be made, in writing, at least 30 days prior to implementation of the requested change.

T. COMMENCEMENT/EXPIRATION DATE. This agreement is executed as of the date of the last signature, and has an expiration date of 10/31/2016. The expiration date is the final date for completion of all work activities under this agreement.

U. AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVES. By signature below, each party certifies that the individuals listed in this document as representatives of the individual parties are authorized to act in their respective areas for matters related to this agreement. In witness whereof, the parties hereto have executed this agreement as of the last date written below.

Carl Hasty, Date

Jeff Marsolais, Forest Supervisor Date
U.S. Forest Service, Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit

The authority and format of this agreement have been reviewed and approved for signature.

JOHN HEFNER Date
U.S. Forest Service Grants Management Specialist

Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0596-0217. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 4 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at 202-720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20250-9410 or call toll free (866) 632-9992 (voice). TDD users can contact USDA through local relay or the Federal relay at (800) 877-8339 (TDD) or (866) 377-8642 (relay voice). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

TAHOE TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-005

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A FEDERAL LANDS ACCESS PROGRAM APPLICATION FOR THE STATE ROUTE 28 CORRIDOR REVITALIZATION PROJECT - PHASE 2

WHEREAS, The Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) presents an opportunity for state, county and local entities to obtain federal funding for a variety of transportation projects that improve access to federal lands; and

WHEREAS, FLAP is administered by the Federal Highway Administration through the Central Federal Lands Highway Division; and

WHEREAS, the Nevada Programming Decisions Committee solicits, reviews and ranks project applications for the FLAP funding; and

WHEREAS, the Tahoe Transportation District (TTD), in partnership with the Nevada Department of Transportation, applied for FLAP funding in response to a call for projects issued in 2013 and $12,500,000 in FLAP funding was awarded for the State Route 28 Corridor Revitalization Project – Phase 1; and

WHEREAS, a new call for projects was issued on February 9, 2015, which is anticipated to program up to approximately $28 million from 2017-2020 depending on program needs and future congressional actions; and

WHEREAS, applications must be received by May 8, 2015 to be considered; and

WHEREAS, TTD intends to submit an application for FLAP funding for the State Route 28 Corridor Revitalization Project – Phase 2; and

WHEREAS, TTD, Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID), and Federal Highway Administration–Central Federal Lands Highway Division (CFLHD) will serve as co-leads for the Project; and

WHEREAS, TTD is a signatory to the Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway Interlocal Agreement dated May 11, 2007, the State Route 28 Corridor Management Plan Project Charter dated June 1, 2012, and the NV SR 28 Phase 1 FLAP Project Memorandum of Agreement dated December 19, 2014, which document key agreements between participating federal, state and local entities and authorize and commit TTD to securing funding for implementation of the Project; and

WHEREAS, TTD and IVGID have entered into a separate Interlocal Agreement for implementation of the Project; and

WHEREAS, the FLAP funding requires a minimum non-federal match of 5% which will be provided by IVGID.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors supports the Project and directs staff to submit the FLAP application and endorsement form for the Project along with all necessary supporting materials.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors at its regular board meeting held on April 10, 2015, by the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Abstain:

Absent:

_____
Steve Teshara, Chair
Tahoe Transportation District