

Final Supplemental Initial Study/
Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial
Environmental Checklist

ASCENT

Van Sickle Bi-State Park Safety and Equitable Access Improvements Project

Prepared for:



Department of General Services

— and —



California Tahoe Conservancy

May 2026



Final Supplemental Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Environmental Checklist

Van Sickle Bi-State Park Safety and Equitable Access Improvements Project

Prepared for:



Department of General Services
Real Estate Services Division
707 3rd Street, 4th Floor
West Sacramento, CA 95605

Contact:

Stephanie Coleman
Senior Environmental Planner
916.376.1602



California Tahoe Conservancy
Resources and Public Access Program
1061 3rd Street
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Contact:

Scott Cecchi
Project Manager
530.208.8323

Prepared by:



Ascent
128 Market St, Suite 3E
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact:

Sydney Coatsworth
Principal
916.930.3185

May 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Introduction and Regulatory Guidance	1-1
1.2 Why this Document?.....	1-1
1.3 Summary of Findings	1-1
1.4 Environmental Permits.....	1-2
1.5 Document Organization	1-2
2 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS.....	2-1
2.1 Comments and Responses.....	2-1
3 REVISIONS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL IS/MND/IEC	3-1
3.1 Revisions to Section 2.2, Modified Project, Page 2-4, last 4 lines	3-1
3.2 Revisions to Figure 2-3, Page 2-5.....	3-1
3.3 Revisions to Section 2.2.1, Shared-Use Trail and Related Improvements, Page 2-8, Second Paragraph.....	3-7
3.4 Potential Permits and Approvals Required, Page 2-12, Table 2-1, last row.....	3-11
3.5 Revisions to Biological Resources, Section 3.4.1 B), Page 3-37	3-12
3.6 Revisions to Biological Resources, Section 3.4.1 H), Pages 3-39 and 3-40	3-12
3.7 Revisions to Biological Resources, Section 3.4.1 i), Page 3-40.....	3-13
3.8 Revisions to Biological Resources, Section 3.4.1 L), Page 3-41	3-13
3.9 Revisions to Geology and Soils, Section 3.7.1 g), Page 3-55.....	3-14
3.10 Revisions to Hydrology and Water Quality, Section 3.10.1 h), Page 3-69.....	3-14
3.11 Revisions to Transportation/Traffic and Circulation, Section 3.17.1 a), Page 3-88	3-15
4 REFERENCES.....	4-1
5 REPORT PREPARERS.....	5-1

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
BMP	best management practice/s
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
Conservancy	California Tahoe Conservancy
EIP	environmental improvement program
Greenway	Dennis T. Machida Memorial Greenway
IS/MND/IEC	initial study/mitigated negative declaration/initial environmental checklist
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
RTP	regional transportation plan
RWQCB	regional water quality control board
SEZ	stream environment zone/s
SWPPP	stormwater pollution prevention plan
TRPA	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
VMT	vehicle miles traveled

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

This Final Supplemental Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Environmental Checklist (Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC) has been prepared by the California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy) as lead agency, in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.). This Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC contains responses to comments received on the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC for the Van Sickle Bi-State Park Safety and Equitable Access Improvements Project (Modified Project). The Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC consists of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, all attachments and references therein, and this document (response to comments document), which includes comments on the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, responses to those comments, and revisions to the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC.

This document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.).

1.2 WHY THIS DOCUMENT?

As described in the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC “Environmental Checklist” (Chapter 3), the project would not result in any unmitigated significant environmental impacts. Therefore, an IS/MND is the appropriate document for compliance with the requirements of CEQA and an Initial Environmental Checklist (IEC) per the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Code of Ordinances and Rules of Procedure. This Supplemental IS/MND/IEC conforms to these requirements and to the content requirements of State CEQA Guidelines Section 15071.

Although CEQA does not require written responses to comments on an IS/MND, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15074, the lead agency shall consider the proposed negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration together with any comments received during the public review process. Thus, to document the Conservancy’s “consideration” of public and agency comments received, which is required by CEQA, this document has been prepared to respond to comments received on the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, which are reproduced in this document; and to present corrections, revisions, and other clarifications and amplifications to the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC made in response to these comments and as a result of ongoing planning and design efforts. The Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC will be used to support the Conservancy’s decision regarding whether to approve the project.

This Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC will also be considered by CEQA responsible agencies, in compliance with CEQA, before deciding whether and how to approve or permit project elements over which they have jurisdiction. It may also be used by other state, regional, and local agencies that may have an interest in resources that could be affected by the project or that have jurisdiction over portions of the project.

1.3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Chapter 3 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC document contains the analysis and discussion of potential environmental impacts of the Modified Project. Based on the issues evaluated in that chapter, it was determined that the project would have either no impact or a less-than-significant impact related to most of the issue areas identified in the Environmental Checklist, included as Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines and the Initial Environmental Checklist per the TRPA Code of Ordinances and Rules of Procedure.

The Conservancy has found, based on the analysis conducted in this Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC (including any comments received), that there is no substantial evidence that the project would have a significant environmental impact. Substantial evidence includes facts, reasonable assumptions predicated upon facts, and expert opinion

supported by facts. Argument, speculation, and unsubstantiated opinion or narrative do not constitute substantial evidence (CEQA Section 21080[e]; State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064[f][5]). Project features and measures identified in the Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC and to be required as conditions of approval for the proposed project would avoid or reduce all impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Potentially significant impacts were identified for biological resources, cultural resources, and tribal cultural resources; however, mitigation measures included in the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC would reduce all impacts to a less-than-significant level.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS

In addition to the Conservancy's Board of Directors approval, the Modified Project would require permits from the City of South Lake Tahoe, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, CAL FIRE, and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board—Lahontan Region. These permits are described in Chapter 2 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, "Project Description."

1.5 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

1.5.1 This Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC is organized as follows:

Chapter 1: Introduction. This chapter introduces the environmental review process. It describes the purpose and organization of this document as well as presents a summary of findings.

Chapter 2, "Responses to Comments," contains a list of all parties who submitted comments on the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC during the public review period, and responses to the comments.

Chapter 3, "Revisions to the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC," presents revisions to the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC made to correct errors that were identified by commenters subsequent to the release of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC.

Chapter 4: References. This chapter lists the references used in preparation of this Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC.

Chapter 5: List of Preparers. This chapter identifies report preparers of this Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC.

2 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

This chapter contains reproduced comments from one letter received during the public review period for the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, which concluded on April 27, 2026. In conformance with Section 15074 of the State CEQA Guidelines, to demonstrate the Conservancy has appropriately considered comments received during the public review process for the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, written responses were prepared addressing comments on environmental issues received from reviewers of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC.

2.1 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

In response to the Conservancy's Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Conservancy received one comment letter, submitted by The League to Save Lake Tahoe. The individual comments contained in the letter and the responses to those comments are provided below. The comment letter below is reproduced exactly as it was submitted.

Letter 1 The League to Save Lake Tahoe (Keep Tahoe Blue)

Gavin Feiger Policy Director
April 27, 2026

Comment 1-1

The League to Save Lake Tahoe (Keep Tahoe Blue) appreciates the opportunity to provide scoping comments on the Draft Supplemental Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Environmental Checklist (Draft Supplemental IS/MND/IEC) for the Van Sickle Bi-State Park Safety and Equitable Access Improvements Project (Project).

Keep Tahoe Blue is dedicated to protecting and restoring the environmental health, sustainability, and scenic beauty of the Lake Tahoe Basin. In connection with our mission, advocate for policies and projects that build resilience to climate change, reduce wildfire risk, and prevent fine sediment and nutrients from entering Lake Tahoe. These are outcomes that depend on strong, science-based analyses and plans.

Keep Tahoe Blue strongly supports investments that improve safe, equitable, non-motorized access to recreation while protecting Lake Tahoe's water quality, forest health, and sensitive habitats. The Van Sickle Bi-State Park Project is uniquely positioned to advance these shared goals, particularly given its proximity to the South Shore tourist core and its role in reducing vehicle trips to access recreation.

To ensure the environmental review is comprehensive, legally defensible, and aligned with Tahoe's environmental thresholds, we offer the following scoping comments for consideration in the Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC.

Response 1-1

This comment introduces The League to Save Lake Tahoe (Keep Tahoe Blue), outlining the organization's mission and goals, and introduces the comments to come.

Comment 1-2

Project Purpose, Need, and Consistency with Regional Goals

We support the Project's emphasis on:

- ▶ Environmentally friendly and accessible recreation
- ▶ Improved pedestrian and bicycle connectivity
- ▶ Enhanced safety at the park entrance and state line

The Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC should more explicitly tie Project improvements to:

- ▶ Achieving and maintaining TRPA's transportation and air quality thresholds, including Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction
- ▶ Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and active transportation goals
- ▶ Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) objectives related to water quality, recreation access, and climate resilience.

Clarifying how the Project supports car-free or car-light recreation access from the casino core would strengthen the Project's environmental benefits and its consistency with Basin-wide policy direction.

Response 1-2

This comment notes support for the project's emphasis on accessibility, improved connectivity and safety, and recommends the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC should be more explicit in regard to achieving VMT reduction, consistency with the RTP and transportation goals and EIP objectives related to water quality, recreation access, and climate resilience.

The Conservancy notes, and appreciates, Keep Tahoe Blue's support for the Modified Project. As noted in Section 1.1.1 of the Supplemental IS/MND, one of the original purposes and needs for the Park was to "provide recreation facilities close to the urban casino core of Lake Tahoe where residents and visitors can enjoy the outdoor environment without having to drive from their accommodations." As the Park is immediately adjacent to the most densely developed tourism and residential area in Lake Tahoe, the opportunities for residents and visitors to walk, ride, or roll into the Park, rather than drive to it, will be leveraged by the project.

The Modified Project will connect to the Dennis T. Machida Memorial Greenway (Greenway) shared use trail, which is a cornerstone RTP project. Eventually, via the Greenway, this project will connect to the broader shared use trail network throughout South Lake Tahoe and Meyers, thereby facilitating active transportation goals.

In addition, the Modified Project is an EIP project (03.01.02.0030, see top bullet point below), which builds upon the previous phases of the Project (see second bullet point below) and is directly connected to three other EIP projects (last three bullet points). Please see links for details:

- ▶ LT Info | 03.01.02.0030 - Van Sickle Bi-State Park - CA Phase III Improvements - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.01.02.0030>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.01.02.0012 - Van Sickle Bi-State Park: Phase 1A - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.01.02.0012>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.01.02.0123 - Van Sickle Bi-State Park Phase 3 - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.01.02.0123>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.02.02.0106 - Dennis T. Machida Memorial Greenway (Phase 3) - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.02.02.0106>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.02.02.0122 - Stateline to Van Sickle Multi-Use Path - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.02.02.0122>

In response to the recommendations made by Keep Tahoe Blue, Section 2.2 and Section 3.17.1 a) of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC is amended as follows:

Section 2.2, Modified Project, Page 2-4, last 4 lines

Original

Modified Project improvements would be consistent with the Conservancy's Accessibility Transition Plan and Self-Evaluation for Select Recreation Sites.

Figure 2-3 provides a conceptual overview of the Modified Project and Project features. The Modified Project area is approximately 15 acres.

Revised

Modified Project improvements would be consistent with the Conservancy's ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan. In addition, the Modified Project is an EIP project, which builds upon the previous phases of the Project and is directly connected to three other EIP projects. Please see links for details:

- ▶ LT Info | 03.01.02.0030 - Van Sickle Bi-State Park - CA Phase III Improvements - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.01.02.0030>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.01.02.0012 - Van Sickle Bi-State Park: Phase 1A - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.01.02.0012>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.01.02.0123 - Van Sickle Bi-State Park Phase 3 - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.01.02.0123>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.02.02.0106 - Dennis T. Machida Memorial Greenway (Phase 3) - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.02.02.0106>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.02.02.0122 - Stateline to Van Sickle Multi-Use Path - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.02.02.0122>

Figure 2-3 provides a conceptual overview of the Modified Project and Project features. The Modified Project area is approximately 15 acres.

Section 3.17.1 a), Transportation/Traffic and Circulation

Original

The 2009 IS/ND/IEC determined that the Original Project was consistent with policies, plans, and programs that support alternative modes of transportation, noting the location of the Park is within easy walking and biking distance of high density pedestrian activity and its on-site access trail support the use of alternative transportation and that no impact would occur.

Less-than-Significant Impact. Similarly, as the Original Project was consistent with policies, plans, and programs that support alternative modes of transportation, and the Modified Project is a modification to the Original Project that was foreseen through the 2005 Master Plan, 2009 IS/ND/IEC and 2019 Vision Plan, the Modified Project would also be consistent. The Modified Project is consistent with the Conservancy's ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan (2018) as it would facilitate greater pedestrian, bicycle and ADA access to the Park. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Revised

The 2009 IS/ND/IEC determined that the Original Project was consistent with policies, plans, and programs that support alternative modes of transportation, noting the location of the Park is within easy walking and biking distance of high density pedestrian activity and its on-site access trail support the use of alternative transportation and that no impact would occur.

Less-than-Significant Impact. Similarly, as the Original Project was consistent with policies, plans, and programs that support alternative modes of transportation, and the Modified Project is a modification to the Original Project that was foreseen through the 2005 Master Plan, 2009 IS/ND/IEC and 2019 Vision Plan, the Modified Project would also be consistent. The Modified Project is consistent with TRPA's Connections 2050: Regional Transportation Plan, TRPA's transportation thresholds, the Conservancy's ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan (2018), and as an EIP project, is consistent with the EIP sustainable recreation and transportation goals and action priorities. The Modified Project would facilitate greater pedestrian, bicycle and ADA access to the Park, thereby decreasing reliance on the private automobile; improve outdoor

experiences for visitors and residents; and improve and enhance public recreation facilities. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-3

Transportation, Circulation, and VMT Analysis

Because the Project is designed to shift recreation access away from short vehicle trips, the Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC should:

- ▶ Clearly explain how the Class I shared-use trail, entrance plaza, and internal circulation improvements are expected to reduce short-distance vehicle trips, particularly for visitors staying within walking or biking distance.

Response 1-3

This comment states the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC should clearly explain how the Modified Project is expected to reduce short-distance vehicle trips, particularly for visitors staying within walking or biking distance.

The proposed Class 1 shared-use trails are being designed to attract pedestrian and bicyclists to the Park by making it safer and easier to walk, bike, or roll throughout the Park. New amenities, such as the entrance plaza and picnic areas are intentionally designed to be accessible from the shared-use trail, thereby encouraging people to access them from the trail. The amenities and shared-use trail will meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, thereby making the entire Park more accessible for people of all abilities. Finally, the new amenities and shared-use trail will attract visitors staying in nearby hotels to enjoy the Park without needing to drive to the Park. The Park is connected via sidewalks from the casino core area, making a safe connection throughout the area. In addition, as outlined in Section 2.2 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, the Modified Project includes a minor (one space) increase in parking provision over existing conditions, which is not a sufficient increase to attract more vehicles to the Park.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-4

- ▶ Include a qualitative discussion of induced mode shift (walk/bike instead of drive), even if quantitative VMT modeling is infeasible.

Response 1-4

This comment recommends inclusion of a qualitative discussion of induced mode shift in the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC.

Please see the responses above for a discussion of how the Modified Project's improvements are intended to promote a modal shift from driving to walking and biking to the Park. No further discussion is required per CEQA or TRPA, or necessary to disclose the project's beneficial effects. In accordance with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section Appendix G and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, the specific consideration for evaluating a project's transportation impacts is related to conflict/inconsistency with criteria detailed in 15064.3(b). As outlined in Section 3.17.1 b) of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, the Modified Project site is within 0.5 miles of the Stateline Transit Center, thus should be presumed to have a less-than-significant impact. The Modified Project is therefore consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-5

- ▶ Evaluate potential peak-period conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists at the park entrance, and clearly describe physical or operational mitigation measures to minimize conflicts.

This analysis will help to better demonstrate consistency with achieving and maintaining TRPA transportation and air quality thresholds.

Response 1-5

This comment requests evaluation of peak-period conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists at the park entrance and description of mitigation measures to minimize conflicts

The Supplemental IS/MND/IEC evaluates potential impacts related to hazards and user conflicts in the Transportation/Traffic and Circulation Section (pages 3-88 to 3-90). In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15071 notes that mitigation measures are to be included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects. As determined in Section 3.17.1 c), the Modified Project determined less than significant impacts, and thus no mitigation measures are required.

In addition, improving conflict avoidance, safety, and orientation are the primary reasons the Conservancy is redesigning the Park entrance. The Park entrance is described in Section 2.2.1 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC (on page 2-7) as follows:

“The Modified Project would enhance the main Park entrance in several ways. A new ADA-compliant entrance plaza would be constructed near the southern corner of the Park entrance. The new entrance plaza would be focused on pedestrian safety and orientation and would be designed to encourage visitors to approach the Park from the existing sidewalk on the south side of Heavenly Village Way, and cross Montreal Road using the existing crosswalk. The entrance plaza would be accessed in three ways. A staircase and an ADA-compliant paved trail would connect the entrance plaza to the shared-use trail described below. The entrance plaza would also serve as the lower trailhead for the Barn Trail, which is also described below. Stormwater from the entrance plaza would be captured in a new adjacent basin. The existing entrance boulder, currently located on the north side of the Park entrance, would be relocated to become a central feature in the entrance plaza, providing a photo opportunity in a safer and accessible location. Several amenities would be sited in the entrance plaza such as a kiosk, benches, wayfinding signage, trash cans, interpretive features, and low-impact lighting. The Modified Project would also enhance the main Park entrance by removing the existing sidewalk paralleling the Park entrance road and converting that area into a BMP for snow storage and water runoff. The Park entrance road may be modified with asphalt swales, drains or other improvements to convey runoff to the new adjacent BMP. These improvements would both remove impervious surfaces generating runoff and provide additional capacity to improve water quality. With implementation of the Modified Project, the existing entrance sidewalk would no longer be needed because the proposed shared-use trail and barn trail described below will provide improved ways for pedestrians to enter the Park”

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-6

Water Quality, Stormwater Management, and Snow Storage

Keep Tahoe Blue strongly supports the Project’s emphasis on water quality improvements. Given the Project’s proximity to stream environment zones (SEZs), clear documentation of design assumptions and performance expectations is essential to improving water quality within the Project area.

To strengthen the analysis, the Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC should:

- ▶ Clearly document net changes in impervious coverage, including how any new coverage would be offset through best management practices (BMPs) or removal of legacy impervious areas;

Response 1-6

This comment suggests strengthening the analysis through documentation of net changes in impervious coverage, including how any new coverage would be offset through BMPs or removal of impervious areas.

In consideration of CEQA Guidelines Section 15004(b), "Choosing the precise time for CEQA compliance involves a balancing of competing factors... negative declarations should be prepared as early as feasible in the planning process to enable environmental considerations to influence project program and design and yet late enough to provide meaningful information for environmental assessment." Typically, CEQA is undertaken at the relatively early design phase of a given project, and as such, the Modified Project is currently in the process of refining impervious areas, drainage infrastructure design and determining applicability of BMPs. Non-essential impervious areas would be removed. For example, the existing sidewalk paralleling the entrance road would be converted into a pervious surface because it wouldn't be needed once the Modified Project is completed. In addition, as specified in Section 3.10.1 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, the Modified Project would comply with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations by requiring a subsequent preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which would include implementation of approved local plans, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control measures.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-7

- Provide greater detail on how stormwater and snowmelt will be treated prior to infiltration, particularly for winter operations; and

Response 1-7

This comment requests additional detail on how stormwater and snowmelt will be treated prior to infiltration.

As mentioned in Section 2.4.1 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, a number of BMPs would be included as part of the Modified Project such as relocating project improvements outside the SEZ as far as reasonably practicable and providing restoration. In addition, as specified in Section 3.10.1 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, the Modified Project would comply with the RWQCB and NPDES regulations by requiring a subsequent preparation of a SWPPP, which would include implementation of approved local plans, control of post-construction sediment and erosion control measures. In accordance with those requirements, runoff from impervious surfaces that allow vehicle use would be pre-treated wherever practical to remove sediment upstream of infiltration areas. Pre-treatment facilities could include sediment traps, basins, and forebays. BMPs would be included in the preliminary plans and refined in the final plans.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-8

- Ensure that stormwater BMPs are designed to meet or exceed current TRPA and Lahontan stormwater treatment standards, with a focus on fine sediment and pollutant capture.

Response 1-8

This comment notes the Conservancy must ensure that stormwater BMPs are designed to meet or exceed current TRPA and Lahontan stormwater treatment standards.

Section 3 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC on Page 3-8, and Section 3.10-1 discusses that the Modified Project will comply with Lahontan RWQCB and TRPA BMP requirements. The Conservancy is currently designing BMPs that will meet or exceed applicable standards.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-9**Stream Environment Zones (SEZs) and Sensitive Habitats**

We appreciate the commitment to minimize SEZ disturbance and to offset unavoidable impacts. The Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC should:

- ▶ Clearly identify temporary versus permanent SEZ disturbance to minimize short and long-term water quality impacts, including construction staging impacts;

Response 1-9

This comment suggests that the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC should clearly identify temporary versus permanent SEZ disturbance.

As mentioned in Section 2.4.1 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, a number of BMPs would be included as part of the Modified Project such as relocating project improvements outside the SEZ as far as reasonably practicable and providing restoration. As outlined in the revision to Section 3.6.1(h) of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC (see Section 3.6 of this Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, below), the TRPA threshold standard for habitats of special significance is non-degradation, and the TRPA Code of Ordinances restricts additional coverage within SEZs and SEZ buffers. However, the TRPA Code Section 30.5.2 includes an exception for public outdoor recreation facilities (Code Section 30.5.2). In addition, the Modified Project's Class 1 trail alignment would be outside of all SEZ areas, but the portion of the trail between the entrance plaza and the California day use area may encroach into the SEZ setback in some areas, if necessary, to achieve ADA compliance, but will not encroach into the SEZ itself. As direct impacts on SEZ buffers are anticipated, prior to any work in these features, the Conservancy shall acquire all applicable permits or exceptions from TRPA and, if required by TRPA, would adhere to any offset requirements for impacts on the SEZ buffer (as prescribed by TRPA Code Section 30.5.1.B.5). Furthermore, as recently confirmed in an email exchange between the Conservancy and TRPA, TRPA does not require any offsets for coverage or disturbance in SEZ/1b (or other low-land capability lands) if the trail meets the requirements of the exemption in TRPA code section 30.4.6.D.3, Non-Motorized Public Trails. Therefore, as designs are being refined, temporary versus permanent SEZ buffer disturbance numbers will be refined in the final plan set for permitting and potential SEZ buffer offset purposes. From a CEQA perspective, impacts to Water Quality and Hydrology were determined to be less than significant; thus, if any offset associated with the SEZ buffer is determined to be needed, it would specifically relate to TRPA permitting requirements and would be carried out accordingly.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-10

- ▶ Clarify how final trail alignments will be designed to avoid additional SEZ encroachment;

Response 1-10

This comment requests clarification on how final trail alignments will be designed to avoid additional SEZ encroachment.

As mentioned in Section 2.4.1 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, a number of BMPs would be included as part of the Modified Project such as relocating project improvements outside the SEZ as far as reasonably practicable and providing restoration. In addition, the Modified Project has been designed to avoid SEZs to the maximum extent feasible. In some areas grading will encroach into the ten-foot wide SEZ setback, however, as determined in the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, impacts associated would be less than significant.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-11

- ▶ Ensure that SEZ offsets and restoration credits will be secured and implemented prior to construction; and

Response 1-11

This comment notes the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC should ensure that SEZ offsets and restoration credits will be secured and implemented prior to construction.

As outlined in Section 3.8 of this Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, the Modified Project's Class 1 trail alignment would be outside of all SEZ areas, but the portion of the trail between the entrance plaza and the California day use area may encroach into the SEZ setback in some areas, if necessary, to achieve ADA compliance, but will not encroach into the SEZ itself. In accordance with TRPA Code Section 30.5, and in consideration of TRPA Code Section 30.4.6.D.3, the Conservancy would not need to mitigate for excess land coverage in land capability class 1b as the alignment crosses none. Furthermore, as recently confirmed in an email exchange between the Conservancy and TRPA, TRPA does not require any offset for coverage or disturbance in SEZ/1b (or other low-land capability lands) if the trail meets the requirements of the exemption in TRPA code section 30.4.6.D.3, Non-Motorized Public Trails. Although Lahontan RWQCB requires SEZ offsets for disturbance in Class 1 land, the trail won't be constructed in any SEZs, thus Lahontan RWQCB's requirements don't apply. Therefore, as designs are being refined, SEZ buffer disturbance will be minimized as far as possible in the final plan set for use by TRPA in its permitting authority. See also response to comment 1-9.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-12

- ▶ Include performance standards and monitoring commitments to ensure long-term SEZ function is maintained or enhanced.

Response 1-12

This comment requests inclusion of performance standards and monitoring commitments to ensure long-term SEZ function is maintained or enhanced.

As indicated in the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, SEZ function will not be altered by the Modified Project. In most areas runoff from trails will sheet flow into SEZs and forested areas rather than being concentrated by formal drainage infrastructure. Near the state line, the trail alignment is close to an SEZ, but outside the SEZ buffer. The existing drainage pipe under the road will be extended under the new trail to maintain water conveyance to this SEZ. Compliance with TRPA Code and EIP Permit requirements will ensure that SEZ function is maintained. However, as recently confirmed in an email exchange between the Conservancy and TRPA, TRPA does not require any offset for coverage or disturbance in SEZ/1b (or other low-land capability lands) if the trail meets the requirements of the exemption in TRPA code section 30.4.6.D.3, Non-Motorized Public Trails, so monitoring to ensure maintenance of long-term SEZ function may not be required. As designs are being refined, SEZ buffer disturbance will be minimized as far as possible in the final plan set for use by TRPA in its permitting authority. See also response to comments 1-9 and 1-10.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-13**Forest Health, Tree Removal, and Climate Resilience**

Keep Tahoe Blue supports forest health and safety improvements and recommends clearly distinguishing tree removal for infrastructure from forest resilience treatments. The project should clearly document how tree removal supports wildfire risk reduction to create forest and climate resilience while maintaining habitat function.

Response 1-13

This comment notes Keep Tahoe Blue's support of forest health and safety and requests the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC document how tree removal supports wildfire risk reduction to create forest and climate resilience while maintaining habitat function.

As outlined in Section 2.2.3 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, the Modified Project includes tree removal specifically for the purpose of reducing wildfire risks within the Park and the adjacent communities, as well as for the purposes of decreasing conifer densities, promoting increased health and vigor of the residual tree stand, and mitigating hazards to public health and safety. Recently acquired Park lands are overstocked with trees and will be treated to achieve forest, climate, and habitat resilience goals described in the Conservancy's Strategic Plan. In addition, Section 3.20(b) of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC notes that the inclusion of proposed tree thinning would reduce potential fuel and ignition sources. Furthermore, Section 3.4(n) of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC notes the removal of trees associated with the Modified Project would likely help achieve forest management goals to increase forest health and resilience and would not constitute a change in their natural functioning.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-14

Cumulative Impacts and Future Phases

Given ongoing and anticipated improvements in the South Shore area, the Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC should clearly describe how the Project will interact with future park phases and nearby transportation or recreation projects. The Project should address cumulative impacts from the Project by explaining how future phases will build on the water quality and access benefits of this Project.

Response 1-14

This comment suggests that the Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC detail how the Project will interact with future park phases and nearby transportation or recreation projects, and how the project's future phases will build on water quality and access benefits of the project.

As outlined in Section 3.21 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, Cumulative Impacts and Mandatory Findings of Significance, proposed projects adjacent to the Park are assessed for their potential for cumulative impacts. Any future phases beyond the Modified Project are unknown and speculative. If the Conservancy constructs additional improvements on the California side of the Park in the future, they will be designed in a manner consistent with the currently proposed improvements and would be undertaken in accordance with CEQA and TRPA requirements.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-15

Alternatives

Enhanced Car-Free Access / Reduced Parking Alternative (New Alternative)

In addition to the proposed Project and No Project Alternative, the environmental document should evaluate an alternative that prioritizes car-free and car-light access by:

- ▶ Reducing or deferring paved parking expansion at the California day-use area
- ▶ Placing greater emphasis on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit-connected access from the South Shore tourist core
- ▶ Scaling entrance and internal circulation improvements to prioritize non-motorized users during peak periods
- ▶ Phasing the project with early implementation of active transportation, safety, and ADA-access improvements (such as shared-use trails and entrance safety features), while deferring parking reconfiguration and higher-disturbance elements to a later phase, allowing monitoring and evaluation of use patterns, mode shift, operational needs, and environmental performance before committing to additional vehicle-oriented infrastructure.

This proposed alternative would meet core Project objectives related to access, safety, and equity while potentially reducing vehicle trips, impervious coverage, stormwater impacts, and construction disturbance. Analysis of this alternative would directly support regional goals related to VMT reduction, air quality, and water quality.

Response 1-15

This comment suggests the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC evaluate an alternative that prioritizes car-free and car-light access and provides a number of recommendations.

As outlined in Section 2.2 and 2.3 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, the Conservancy is proposing to retrofit the existing parking lot on the California side of the Park with BMPs to reduce environmental impacts from snow removal and snow storage. This includes paving, drainage infrastructure, and basins, which are necessary to accommodate all-seasons use. However, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15071, evaluation of alternatives is not required in an IS/MND, thus they do not need be included in the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC.

As this comment provides recommendations for improving the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC but does not raise an environmental issue regarding the adequacy of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, no further response is required.

Comment 1-16**Conclusion**

Keep Tahoe Blue supports the Van Sickle Bi-State Park Safety and Equitable Access Improvements Project and appreciates the Conservancy's leadership in advancing accessible, low-impact recreation near the South Shore tourist core. Addressing the scoping considerations outlined above will strengthen the environmental document and ensure the Project delivers long-term benefits for Lake Tahoe, park users, and surrounding communities.

Thank you for considering our comments. We look forward to continuing to work with the Conservancy and partner agencies as the Project advances.

Response 1-16

This comment expresses support for the project and appreciation for the Conservancy's leadership and consideration of the comments provided.

The Conservancy thanks Keep Tahoe Blue for their comments and appreciates its support for the project.

3 REVISIONS TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL IS/MND/IEC

This chapter presents specific text changes made to the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC since its publication and public review. The changes are presented in the order in which they appear in the original Supplemental IS/MND/IEC and are identified by the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC page number.

The information contained within this chapter clarifies and expands on information in the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC and does not constitute “significant new information” requiring recirculation, see CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5 for details regarding recirculation of a negative declaration prior to adoption.

3.1 REVISIONS TO SECTION 2.2, MODIFIED PROJECT, PAGE 2-4, LAST 4 LINES

To provide clarification, page 2-4 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC is revised as follows:

Original:

Modified Project improvements would be consistent with the Conservancy’s Accessibility Transition Plan and Self-Evaluation for Select Recreation Sites.

Figure 2-3 provides a conceptual overview of the Modified Project and Project features. The Modified Project area is approximately 15 acres.

Revised:

Modified Project improvements would be consistent with the Conservancy’s ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan. In addition, the Modified Project is an EIP project, which builds upon the previous phases of the Project and is directly connected to three other EIP projects. Please see links for details:

- ▶ LT Info | 03.01.02.0030 - Van Sickle Bi-State Park - CA Phase III Improvements - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.01.02.0030>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.01.02.0012 - Van Sickle Bi-State Park: Phase 1A - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.01.02.0012>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.01.02.0123 - Van Sickle Bi-State Park Phase 3 - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.01.02.0123>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.02.02.0106 - Dennis T. Machida Memorial Greenway (Phase 3) - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.02.02.0106>
- ▶ LT Info | 03.02.02.0122 - Stateline to Van Sickle Multi-Use Path - <https://eip.laketahoeinfo.org/Project/FactSheet/03.02.02.0122>

Figure 2-3 provides a conceptual overview of the Modified Project and Project features. The Modified Project area is approximately 15 acres.

3.2 REVISIONS TO FIGURE 2-3, PAGE 2-5

Since publication of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC, field visits were undertaken by TRPA surveyor, Mr. P. Scoles, on May 02 and May 05, 2026 to refine SEZ boundaries. As determined in the updated survey, the previously mapped SEZ at higher elevations in the project area included ditches, water tank overflow and irrigation-influenced areas. Such areas lack natural source and have many non-SEZ plants growing in the understory. As such, the areas of SEZ are smaller than previously mapped and the entirety of the trail alignment is outside the boundary of the SEZ. Therefore, Figure 2-3 is deleted and replaced by a revised Figure 2-3 showing the revised land capability verification.

This page is intentionally left blank.

Original



Revised



3.3 REVISIONS TO SECTION 2.2.1, SHARED-USE TRAIL AND RELATED IMPROVEMENTS, PAGE 2-8, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The areas of SEZ are smaller than previously mapped and the entirety of the trail alignment is outside the boundary of the SEZ. Thus, there is no requirement for the Conservancy to utilize the Conservancy's land bank to offset SEZ disturbance at a ratio of 1.5 to 1 as the Modified Project does not impact any SEZ. The Supplemental IS/MND/IEC is revised throughout to remove reference of crossing the SEZ and any offset ratios and Figure 2-4 is added to show the revised SEZ boundaries.

Original:

The proposed Class 1 trail would cross approximately 80 feet of SEZ near the state line. Consistent with the 2009 IS/ND/IEC and the TRPA Code, the Conservancy would utilize the Conservancy's land bank to offset SEZ disturbance at a ratio of 1.5 to 1 for this SEZ crossing. With a total trail footprint of up to 16 feet wide, SEZ disturbance near the state line is expected to total approximately 1,280 square feet, requiring approximately 1,920 square feet of SEZ restoration credit. The portion of the trail between the entrance plaza and the California day use area may encroach into the SEZ setback in some areas if necessary to achieve ADA compliance, but will not encroach into the SEZ itself.

Revised:

As a result of field visits undertaken by TRPA surveyor, Mr. P. Scoles, on May 02 and May 05, 2026 to refine SEZ boundaries, it was determined that the proposed Class 1 trail would not cross any SEZ in the entirety of its alignment. The portion of the trail between the entrance plaza and the California day use area may encroach into the SEZ setback in some areas if necessary to achieve ADA compliance, but will not encroach into the SEZ itself, see Figure 2-4.

This page is intentionally left blank.



Figure 2-4 Land Capability Verification

3.4 POTENTIAL PERMITS AND APPROVALS REQUIRED, PAGE 2-12, TABLE 2-1, LAST ROW

As discussed in Section 3.3 of this Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC above, no permanent disturbance in the SEZ would occur, thus there is no requirement for restoration. This row is deleted. The Supplemental IS/MND/IEC is revised as follows:

Original:

Table 2-1 Potential Permits and Approvals

Permit/Approval	Agency	Purpose/Applicability
City Encroachment Permit or Easement	City of SLT	Rights to encroach in the City right-of-way at the main Park entrance
City Major Project Review	City of SLT	City of SLT major project review
EIP Permit	TRPA	Environmental Improvement Program permit
Less Than Three Acre Conversion Exemption	CAL FIRE	Conversion of Timberland to a non-timber use only, of less than three (3) acres.
Tree Removal Permit	TRPA	Permit from TRPA to Remove Trees
General Waste Discharge Requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity in the Lake Tahoe Hydrologic Unit	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region	Regulates discharges of pollutants in storm water associated with construction activity to Waters of the U.S. in the Lake Tahoe Hydrologic Unit. Requires Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Rain Event Action Plan (REAP).
Exemption to Waste Discharge Prohibition to SEZs	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region	Permanent disturbance in SEZ. Requires restoration in an amount 1.5 times the area permanently disturbed.

Source: Compiled by Conservancy and Ascent in 2026.

Revised:

Table 2-1 Potential Permits and Approvals

Permit/Approval	Agency	Purpose/Applicability
City Encroachment Permit or Easement	City of SLT	Rights to encroach in the City right-of-way at the main Park entrance
City Major Project Review	City of SLT	City of SLT major project review
EIP Permit	TRPA	Environmental Improvement Program permit
Less Than Three Acre Conversion Exemption	CAL FIRE	Conversion of Timberland to a non-timber use only, of less than three (3) acres.
Tree Removal Permit	TRPA	Permit from TRPA to Remove Trees
General Waste Discharge Requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity in the Lake Tahoe Hydrologic Unit	California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region	Regulates discharges of pollutants in storm water associated with construction activity to Waters of the U.S. in the Lake Tahoe Hydrologic Unit. Requires Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Rain Event Action Plan (REAP).

Source: Compiled by Conservancy and Ascent in 2026.

3.5 REVISIONS TO BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, SECTION 3.4.1 B), PAGE 3-37

As a result of the revised SEZ boundary, the second paragraph under threshold b) on Page 3-37 is revised as follows:

Original:

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Modified Project has been designed to avoid the montane riparian and wet meadow habitat features located to the south of the entry road, and thus impacts would be less than significant. The Class I trail which will run parallel to the entrance road, traverses the SEZ area identified within the Original Project boundary, but is not expected to create an adverse effect on the riparian habitat.

Revised:

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Modified Project has been designed to avoid the montane riparian and wet meadow habitat features located to the south of the entry road, and thus impacts would be less than significant. The Class I trail which will run parallel to the entrance road, runs adjacent to the SEZ area identified within the Original Project boundary, but is outside of the SEZ and is not expected to create an adverse effect on the riparian habitat.

3.6 REVISIONS TO BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, SECTION 3.4.1 H), PAGES 3-39 AND 3-40

As a result of the revised SEZ boundary, the second and third paragraphs under threshold h) on Page 3-39 and Page 3-40 is revised as follows:

Original:

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Modified Project's Class 1 trail would cross the same northernmost SEZ in California, adjacent to the entrance road. This SEZ crossing is approximately 80 feet in length. Consistent with the 2009 IS/ND/IEC and the TRPA Code, the Conservancy would utilize the Conservancy's land bank to offset SEZ disturbance at a ratio of 1.5 to 1 for this SEZ crossing. With a total trail width of 16 feet, SEZ disturbance near the state line in California is expected to total approximately 1,280 square feet, requiring approximately 1,920 square feet of SEZ restoration credit.

Habitats consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows (i.e., riparian, wetland, and meadow habitats) are designated by TRPA as habitats of special significance. The TRPA threshold standard for habitats of special significance is non-degradation, and the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Code) restricts additional coverage within SEZs and SEZ buffers. However, the TRPA Code Section 30.5.2 includes an exception for public outdoor recreation facilities (Code Section 30.5.2). As direct impacts on SEZs and/or SEZ buffers are anticipated, prior to any work in these features, the Conservancy shall acquire all applicable permits from TRPA and, if required by TRPA, would adhere to any offset requirements for impacts on SEZs or SEZ buffer (as prescribed by TRPA Code Section 30.5.1.B.5). As such, impacts associated with removal of riparian vegetation would be less than significant upon acquisition of the required EIP Permit from TRPA (all TRPA authorizations would be handled under a singular EIP permit)

Revised:

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Modified Project's Class 1 trail alignment would be outside of all SEZ areas, but the portion of the trail between the entrance plaza and the California day use area may encroach into the SEZ setback in some areas, if necessary, to achieve ADA compliance, but will not encroach into the SEZ itself. Habitats consisting of deciduous trees, wetlands, and meadows (i.e., riparian, wetland, and meadow habitats) are designated by TRPA as habitats of special significance. The TRPA threshold standard for habitats of special significance is non-degradation, and the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Code) restricts additional coverage within SEZs and SEZ buffers. However, the TRPA Code Section 30.5.2 includes an exception for public outdoor recreation facilities (Code Section 30.5.2). As encroachment impacts on SEZ buffers are

anticipated, prior to any work in these features, the Conservancy shall acquire all applicable permits or an exception from TRPA and, if required by TRPA, would adhere to any offset requirements for impacts on the SEZ buffer (as prescribed by TRPA Code Section 30.5.1.B.5). As such, impacts associated with removal of riparian vegetation would be less than significant upon acquisition of the required EIP Permit from TRPA (all TRPA authorizations would be handled under a singular EIP permit).

3.7 REVISIONS TO BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, SECTION 3.4.1 I), PAGE 3-40

As a result of the revised SEZ boundary, the second paragraph under threshold i) on Page 3-40 is revised as follows:

Original:

Less-than-Significant Impact. Similarly, the only new vegetation plantings as part of the Modified Project would be to restore areas of prior disturbance such as the existing entrance trail, and potentially part of the unpaved gondola access road may see fringe plantings, if appropriate. As per the Original Project, as part of restoration activities in the northern SEZ and upland areas associated with the Class I trail, new vegetation may be planted. However, none of the species proposed for revegetation activities for the Modified Project would require long-term fertilization or irrigation after establishment. Impacts would be less than significant.

Revised:

Less-than-Significant Impact. Similarly, the only new vegetation plantings as part of the Modified Project would be to restore areas of prior disturbance such as the existing entrance trail, and potentially part of the unpaved gondola access road may see fringe plantings, if appropriate. As per the Original Project, as part of restoration activities associated with the Class I trail, new vegetation may be planted. However, none of the species proposed for revegetation activities for the Modified Project would require long-term fertilization or irrigation after establishment. Impacts would be less than significant.

3.8 REVISIONS TO BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, SECTION 3.4.1 L), PAGE 3-41

As a result of the revised SEZ boundary, the second paragraph under threshold l) on Page 3-41 is revised as follows:

Original:

Less-than-Significant Impact. As with the Original Project, the Modified Project contains no backshore vegetation. As noted in question 3.4.1 h) direct impacts on SEZs and/or SEZ buffers are anticipated, which may include removal of, or encroachment on, woody vegetation such as willows. Prior to any work in the SEZ/SEZ buffers, the Conservancy shall acquire all applicable permits from TRPA and, if required by TRPA, would adhere to any offset requirements for impacts on SEZs or SEZ buffer (as prescribed by TRPA Code Section 30.5.1.B.5). As such, impacts associated with removal of riparian vegetation would be less than significant upon acquisition of the mandated EIP Permit from TRPA (all TRPA authorizations would be handled under a singular EIP permit).

Revised:

Less-than-Significant Impact. As with the Original Project, the Modified Project contains no backshore vegetation. As noted in question 3.4.1 h), the Modified Project's Class 1 trail alignment would be outside of all SEZ areas, but the portion of the trail between the entrance plaza and the California day use area may encroach into the SEZ setback in some areas, if necessary, to achieve ADA compliance, but will not encroach into the SEZ itself. Impacts on the SEZ buffer may include removal of, or encroachment on, woody vegetation such as willows. Prior to any work in the SEZ buffers, the Conservancy shall acquire all applicable permits or exceptions from TRPA and, if required by TRPA, would adhere to any offset requirements for impacts on SEZ buffer (as prescribed by TRPA Code Section 30.5.1.B.5). As such, impacts associated with removal of riparian

vegetation would be less than significant upon acquisition of the mandated EIP Permit or an exception from TRPA (all TRPA authorizations would be handled under a singular EIP permit).

3.9 REVISIONS TO GEOLOGY AND SOILS, SECTION 3.7.1 G), PAGE 3-55

As a result of the revised SEZ boundary, the fourth paragraph under threshold g) on Page 3-55 is revised as follows:

Original:

The Conservancy would thus mitigate for excess land coverage in land capability class 1b in accordance with TRPA Code Section 30.5. The square footage would be mitigated at 1.5 times the amount of land coverage over the allowed in each of the land capability classes. With a total trail footprint of 16 feet wide, SEZ disturbance near the state line is expected to total approximately 1,280 square feet, requiring approximately 1,920 square feet of SEZ restoration credit. Therefore, similar to the Original Project, with adherence to the requirements set forth in TRPA Code Section 30.5, impacts would be less than significant. Full details of the SEZ restoration credit will be determined once detailed design has been undertaken, and in consultation with TRPA.

Revised:

However, the TRPA Code Section 30.5.2 includes an exception for public outdoor recreation facilities. In addition, the Modified Project's Class 1 trail alignment would be outside of all SEZ areas, but the portion of the trail between the entrance plaza and the California day use area may encroach into the SEZ setback in some areas, if necessary, to achieve ADA compliance, but will not encroach into the SEZ itself. Therefore, with adherence to the requirements set forth in TRPA Code Section 30.5.2, impacts would be less than significant.

3.10 REVISIONS TO HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY, SECTION 3.10.1 H), PAGE 3-69

As a result of the revised SEZ boundary, the second paragraph under threshold h) on Page 3-69 is revised as follows:

Original:

Less-than-Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Modified Project proposes up to ½ mile of new Class 1 shared-use trail, which would connect the California day-use area to the Park entrance and up to the new state line monument. From the California day-use area to the state line monument, the Class 1 trail would run parallel to the roadway alignment, which briefly crosses an SEZ area. Similarly, the Modified Project would comply with the RWQCB and NPDES regulations by requiring a subsequent preparation of a SWPPP, which would require implementation of BMPs during construction to minimize impacts through these sensitive areas. Therefore, the Modified Project would not alter the course or flow of 100-year flood waters and impacts would be less than significant.

Revised:

Less-than-Significant Impact. Similar to the Original Project, the Modified Project proposes up to ½ mile of new Class 1 shared-use trail, which would connect the California day-use area to the Park entrance and up to the new state line monument. From the California day-use area to the state line monument, the Class 1 trail would run parallel to the roadway alignment. Similarly, the Modified Project would comply with the RWQCB and NPDES regulations by requiring a subsequent preparation of a SWPPP, which would require implementation of BMPs during construction to minimize impacts through these sensitive areas. Therefore, the Modified Project would not alter the course or flow of 100-year flood waters and impacts would be less than significant.

3.11 REVISIONS TO TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION, SECTION 3.17.1 A), PAGE 3-88

To provide clarification, page 3-88 of the Supplemental IS/MND/IEC is revised as follows:

Original:

The 2009 IS/ND/IEC determined that the Original Project was consistent with policies, plans, and programs that support alternative modes of transportation, noting the location of the Park is within easy walking and biking distance of high density pedestrian activity and its on-site access trail support the use of alternative transportation and that no impact would occur.

Less-than-Significant Impact. Similarly, as the Original Project was consistent with policies, plans, and programs that support alternative modes of transportation, and the Modified Project is a modification to the Original Project that was foreseen through the 2005 Master Plan, 2009 IS/ND/IEC and 2019 Vision Plan, the Modified Project would also be consistent. The Modified Project is consistent with the Conservancy's ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan (2018) as it would facilitate greater pedestrian, bicycle and ADA access to the Park. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Revised:

The 2009 IS/ND/IEC determined that the Original Project was consistent with policies, plans, and programs that support alternative modes of transportation, noting the location of the Park is within easy walking and biking distance of high density pedestrian activity and its on-site access trail support the use of alternative transportation and that no impact would occur.

Less-than-Significant Impact. Similarly, as the Original Project was consistent with policies, plans, and programs that support alternative modes of transportation, and the Modified Project is a modification to the Original Project that was foreseen through the 2005 Master Plan, 2009 IS/ND/IEC and 2019 Vision Plan, the Modified Project would also be consistent. The Modified Project is consistent with TRPA's Connections 2050: Regional Transportation Plan, TRPA's transportation thresholds, the Conservancy's ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan (2018), and as an EIP project, is consistent with the EIP sustainable recreation and transportation goals and action priorities. The Modified Project would facilitate greater pedestrian, bicycle and ADA access to the Park, thereby decreasing reliance on the private automobile; improve outdoor experiences for visitors and residents; and improve and enhance public recreation facilities. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

This page is intentionally left blank.

4 REFERENCES

No references were used in this Final Supplemental IS/MND/IEC.

This page is intentionally left blank.

5 REPORT PREPARERS

California Department of General Services

Stephanie Coleman Senior Environmental Planner

California Tahoe Conservancy

Scott Cecchi Project Manager

Casey Strong Staff Attorney

Chris Mertens Recreation and Public Access Program Supervisor

Ascent

Sydney Coatsworth, AICP Principal

Jessica Mitchell Project Manager

Rid Hollands Assistant Project Manager

Bryn Kirk Environmental Planner

Gayiety Lane Publishing Specialist

This page is intentionally left blank.