

**SR-28 Shared Use Path, Parking, Safety, and Environmental Improvements
30-Day Comment Period Concerns and FS Response on Draft EA**

Comment Topic	Concern Statement	Forest Service Response
Analysis - EIS	Comments that request an EIS for this project	Our analysis determined there will be no significant impacts to all resources; an EA is appropriate.
Analysis - Winter Plan and EA	Comments that indicate the winter plan and EA should be considered in the same document	Winter use of the area is being considered under the Winter Recreation and Over Snow Vehicle Travel Management Project. That project will analyze the cumulative effects from this project and other projects in the area.
Parking Expansion - Non-support	Comments that do not support proposed parking lot expansion	The total number of parking spaces within the corridor is not increasing above existing levels. See the Transportation section for additional analysis
Tribal Coordination - Washoe Tribe	Comments that request tribal coordination with Executive Secretary Elvia McDonald, Washoe Tribe	The Washoe Tribe is a member of the Project Development Team and continued coordination will occur regarding project elements of concern
Parking - Lack of Access Due to Seasonal Closures	Comments concerned with parking limitations / access due to seasonal closures	Management of parking areas for winter use is being analyzed under the Winter Recreation and Over Snow Vehicle Travel Management Project. Future seasonal management would take into consideration highway parking closures to allow for winter access within the corridor
Parking - Support for Expansion/Addition	Comments that support the expansion and/or addition of parking	The existing use levels at FS beaches is approaching or exceeding the range of desired density as described in the Recreation section of the EA. Additional parking would increase use to a level outside of the desired range and would create additional resource impacts. Additional access to the site was balanced with resource concerns of existing use levels
Erosion - Resulting from Visitor Uses (general)	General comments about erosion from visitor use	The removal of user-created trails and parking on the highway shoulder will reduce erosion from these existing unimproved trails and parking areas that lack erosion control measures. The use levels in the area are not expected to increase significantly above existing levels

**SR-28 Shared Use Path, Parking, Safety, and Environmental Improvements
30-Day Comment Period Concerns and FS Response on Draft EA**

Comment Topic	Concern Statement	Forest Service Response
Erosion Control - No Funding/management	Commenters who are concerned that current erosion control is not being implemented due to funding	Project elements and design features include short- and long-term erosion control measures. Project elements such as removal of highway parking and drainage infrastructure improvements should improve erosion control management along the corridor.
Analysis - No Range of Alternatives	Comments concerning the range of alternatives	The range of alternatives was developed based on comments received during the scoping period and during engagement with the Project Development Team and other interested parties. Multiple alignments of the bike path and parking areas were considered during project development. The project record contains a feasibility report describing why this alignment was chosen over the others. EAs require only the Proposed Action, with descriptions of the existing condition. Other alternatives may be added if necessary. A No Action Alternative is required in an EIS only.
Analysis - Monitoring not Included	Comments that the analysis does not include a monitoring plan	The project is included in the annual project monitoring protocol. The project design features include monitoring protocols for the resources that were deemed necessary to monitor such as weeds
Process - General Comments (Tahoe Naturists)	General comments on process from Tahoe Naturists	The traffic studies used to inform the analysis were conducted by registered professionals using accepted methods and real time data collected at the site.
Hydrants - Wastewater for Fire Fighting	Comments regarding using treated wastewater for firefighting	The Utilities and wildland fire section of the document discusses the use of treated wastewater for firefighting. The existing effluent is allowable for use as overland broadcast such as for use on fields for irrigation and the use of the water for emergency purposes has been deemed allowable by TR.PA
Hydrants - Access by Firetrucks	Comments related to fire hydrant access by firetrucks	The bike path has been designed to allow access by vehicles for maintenance, which includes access for emergency vehicles. In addition, the fire hydrants would be located in the sections of bike path near the highway, which could be accessed by hose for larger pumper trucks.

**SR-28 Shared Use Path, Parking, Safety, and Environmental Improvements
30-Day Comment Period Concerns and FS Response on Draft EA**

Comment Topic	Concern Statement	Forest Service Response
Hydrants - Financial Upkeep	Comments concerning how financial improvements and upkeep will be assessed on the fire hydrants	IVGID is proposing replacing the current line under the bike path instead of the highway alignment for reasons that include the cost to maintain and replace the line within the highway in the existing alignment. The cost of hydrant installation was considered by IVGID to be nominal considering the significant cost savings of the overall project and was considered a mutually beneficial project element.
Transportation - Transit System and Features	Comments concerning inclusion of a public transit system and associated features	The project includes all elements for implementation of a transit system. The project goal is to reduce congestion in the corridor, which is reached by removal of highway parking and highway improvements. Transit is not part of this project. A future transit system would build upon this goal of reducing congestion.
IVGID Shared Use Pipeline - Access and Repairs	Comments concerning access and repairs of the IVGID pipeline under a shared use path	The project was designed to allow for access to IVGID facilities within the bike path. Winter access to the pathway could easily be achieved if emergency repairs are necessary through plowing of small sections of pathway if the path is not being plowed regularly. This would still be less expensive and easier to access and safer for workers than attempting to conduct repairs within the highway during periods of winter weather.
Air Quality - General	General comments concerning air quality	The transportation section was clarified to further explain that the reduction in vehicles parking on the highway shoulder and traversing across unpaved surfaces would reduce the overall particulate matter being dispelled in the air and would improve air quality in the corridor. There is not an increase in overall vehicle traffic expected from the project and no increase in VMTs or other pollutants from vehicular activity.

**SR-28 Shared Use Path, Parking, Safety, and Environmental Improvements
30-Day Comment Period Concerns and FS Response on Draft EA**

Comment Topic	Concern Statement	Forest Service Response
Evaluation of Water Quality	Comments requesting water quality evaluation	The relative effects of the proposed action on hydrology and water quality, were analyzed in the EA using relevant studies and geospatial data. The project is not expected to negatively impact water quality over the long term due to the reduction in parking off of paved surfaces, reduction in user-created trails, and improvements in drainage infrastructure. Short term water quality will be protected by use of erosion control measures during project implementation.
General – Non-Support of Project	General comments concerning non-support of the project (proposed action)	The goal of this project is to better manage the existing use of the corridor. The project elements will result in fewer resource impacts without an increase in use from project elements. Reduction of the highway parking will improve the aesthetics of the corridor, as well as safety for vehicles and pedestrians. The proposed pathway and parking lots would meet universal accessibility. The remaining east shore area would remain as-is and would not be made accessible. Alternative alignments for the pathway were analyzed and the least impactful alignment was chosen.
Analysis - Utility Vault Alternative	Comments suggesting an alternative of a utility vault	The proposed alignment of the effluent line within the bike path is based on the cost savings and improved safety of replacing the line within the bike path alignment.
IVGID Pipeline - Replace the Pipeline	Comments concerning replacing the full length of the IVGID pipeline	The full length of the pipeline is proposed for replacement either in the highway or in the shared-use path alignment. The anticipated project completion is within the timeline for pipeline failure. See the Utilities section for analysis.
Letter 44 Attachments	Attachments from Letter 44	There was an error in the EA regarding the number of miles of pipeway and the amount proposed within the alignment. The EA was clarified. The effluent pipeline timeline for failure is within the timeline anticipated for project completion. The utilities section explains that TRPA has allowed the use of the effluent for emergency firefighting use.

**SR-28 Shared Use Path, Parking, Safety, and Environmental Improvements
30-Day Comment Period Concerns and FS Response on Draft EA**

Comment Topic	Concern Statement	Forest Service Response
Release the public survey Results	Comments requesting the release of the TTD survey results without a FOIA request that are reference in the project summary.	The document was clarified to include the source of the survey results. The survey results are documented on the TRPA website.
Infrastructure - Bike Lane on Roads	Commenters requesting a bike lane be added to the roads	The primary purpose of the project is to improve safety of the highway. There was a need identified for a separated bikeway from the traffic lane. There was no need identified for additional bike lanes along the highway. Bike lanes were not considered due to the additional grading and slope cut that would be required to widen the highway along the entire length of SR 28.
General – Non-Support of East Shore Development	Comments concerned with not wanting the east shore developed	Existing use is causing significant resource damage. The goal of the project is to better manage traffic and use impacts within the corridor. Managed access will result in an improved site condition. The parking lots combined with the elimination of highway parking will reduce the use of the site during the highest use. The bike path will better manage existing uses within the corridor.
Infrastructure - Bike Bridge (Suggested)	Comments that suggest the construction of a bike bridge around Cave Rock. Photograph of a similar bike bridge in Lake Garda in Italy is submitted to illustrate the commenter's suggestion	Cave Rock is outside the project area and not within the scope of the project.
Tahoe RCD - Include in Document	Comments from Tahoe Resource Conservation District about items to include in the final document.	The AIS station needs were clarified
South Shore Transportation Management (Viewpoint)	Comments from South Shore Transportation Management Association (SS/TMA) that re-state/support items in the draft EA	Thank you for your comment

**SR-28 Shared Use Path, Parking, Safety, and Environmental Improvements
30-Day Comment Period Concerns and FS Response on Draft EA**

Comment Topic	Concern Statement	Forest Service Response
IVGID pipeline - nonsupport of project element	Commenter who makes specific references to IVGID. Detailed comments that cannot be captured in CARA, and letter requires detailed review outside of CARA	There was an error in the EA regarding the number of miles of pipeway and the amount proposed within the alignment. The EA was clarified. The effluent pipeline timeline for failure is within the timeline anticipated for project completion. The utilities section explains that TRPA has allowed the use of the effluent for emergency firefighting use.
Parking - Along SR 28	Comments regarding limiting parking on State Road 28 and requesting additional parking	The existing use levels at FS beaches is approaching or exceeding the range of desired density as described in the Recreation section of the EA. Additional parking would increase use to a level outside of the desired range and would create additional resource impacts. Additional access to the site was balanced with resource concerns of existing use levels. The parking levels proposed will accommodate the existing parking on an average peak day.
General - Funding Concerns	Comments concerning the availability and applicability of funding	Multiple sources of money have been used for similar projects in the past. Money cannot be secured until after completion of the environmental design phase
IVGID Pipeline - Design and Efficacy	Comments concerning the design and efficacy of the IVGID pipeline proposal	There was an error in the EA regarding the number of miles of pipeway and the amount proposed within the alignment. The EA was clarified. The effluent pipeline timeline for failure is within the timeline anticipated for project completion. The utilities section explains that TRPA has allowed the use of the effluent for emergency firefighting use.
IVGID - Threat to Lake	Comments concerning the possible threat to the lake from spills or breaks in the effluent pipeline	The construction of new infrastruce is expected to have a design life significantly beyond the existing design life of the deteriorated pipe in the highway. There is no additional risk of spills after construction from the pipeline being located in the bikeway versus within the highway.
Infrastructure - Storm Water Improvement	Comments requesting more information on the storm water improvement and preventing storm water from draining into the lake	This project will follow local, State, and FS stormwater regulations. The NDOT storm drain is not within the scope of this project. This project does not preclude improvements to that storm drain.

**SR-28 Shared Use Path, Parking, Safety, and Environmental Improvements
30-Day Comment Period Concerns and FS Response on Draft EA**

Comment Topic	Concern Statement	Forest Service Response
Aquatics - Kokanee Salmon Spawning Ground	Comments concerning the Kokanee Salmon spawning ground where the storm water drain empties into the creek	This project will follow local, State, and FS stormwater regulations. The NDOT storm drain is not within the scope of this project. This project does not preclude improvements to that storm drain.
Safety - SR28 between Incline Village & Crystal Bay	Comments concerning the safety of SR28 between Incline Village and Crystal Bay	This project does not preclude improving the safety of SR 28 between Incline Village and Crystal Bay. This section of SR 28 is outside the scope of this project.
Infrastructure - Inadequate Parking	Comments that express concern over the amount of parking and results of inadequate parking	The existing use levels at FS beaches is approaching or exceeding the range of desired density as described in the Recreation section of the EA. Additional parking would increase use to a level outside of the desired range and would create additional resource impacts. Additional access to the site was balanced with resource concerns of existing use levels. The parking levels proposed will accommodate the existing parking on an average peak day. The overflow parking that occurs in Incline Village is outside the scope of this project. This project does not preclude Incline Village from managing overflow parking in a different manner that does not result in parking within the neighborhoods. This project is not expected to increase the overflow traffic occurring in Incline Village (see Transportation Section)
Safety - Public Health and Safety of More Pathway	Comments expressing inclusion of information on preserving public health and safety of additional pathway	The comment is unclear about what public health and safety monitoring needs to be in place. Project construction would include a safety plan.
Analysis – In-Depth EA	Comment requesting an in-depth Environmental Assessment be conducted	Our analysis determined there will be no significant impacts to all resources; an EA is appropriate.
Infrastructure - Turnouts and Turn Lanes	Comments concerning the lack of turnouts and turn lanes	The project includes emergency turnouts and vista points. Turn lanes will be provided at parking lot intersections as required by NDOT

**SR-28 Shared Use Path, Parking, Safety, and Environmental Improvements
30-Day Comment Period Concerns and FS Response on Draft EA**

Comment Topic	Concern Statement	Forest Service Response
Water - New Path Impact to Shoreline/Water Clarity	Comments concerning the impact to shoreline and water clarity from new path	The pathway is not expected to generate use above existing levels. Water clarity will be improved through a reduction storm water runoff from highway shoulder parking and user-created trails. Short- and long-term water quality best management practices will be implemented.
Project Design Features / Recommendations	Specific comments regarding project design features / recommendations	Bike path is planned to be located on the lake side of parking lots, so it does not crossing parking lot ingress and egress