

APPENDIX H
COMMENTS ON DRAFT BPP

COMMENTS ON JUNE 11, 2010 DRAFT			
6/11/2010	E-mail	Stan Kot Kansas	Please plow the bike trail to the Y during the winter. Maybe after 3 inches of snow accumulates Plowing sidewalks would also be very good. Also get Meeks Lumber to pave their dirt parking lot next to the bike trail.
6/15/2010	Phone	McGahan	North Shore Existing and Proposed Map inset hard to see enough detail on
6/21/2010	Phone	Carol Johnson	Walkers should walk on the right. A bike path is not a road, it's like a sidewalk. With the signs on the west shore it is getting very confusing--some walkers walk on the left, some on the right. When a cyclist sees a walker coming towards them, they don't know what to do. Also, all the signs are starting to look like graffitti. It needs to be consistent basin-wide.
7/12/2010	E-mail	Maria Kiss	I AM SOOO HAPPY TO SEE CROSSWALKS ADDRESSED! I am also giving you a link to a project that the North Tahoe Truckee Leadership Program (yes, my team by the way J) did on walkability in Tahoe Truckee titled W.A.N.T.T. http://www.tahoetruckeeleadership.com/ hover over projects then choose the WANTT project
7/16/2010	E-mail	Michael LeFrancois, Gary Davis Group	Bike Lane/shoulder striping – this seems to be lag, often in July on the north shore. The winter basically obliterates any striping from the previous year. This is sometimes many months into the cycling “season” in mild weather years. Can there be a more proactive approach to striping the roads? Related, even centerline striping seems to lag past memorial day causing vehicular traffic issues and leaves cyclists out in a sea of pavement.
7/16/2010	E-mail	Michael LeFrancois, Gary Davis Group	Striping again – Caltrans recently put in 4’ bike lane “shoulders” on the North Shore. This year these are striped as little as 12” wide in the Rocky Ridge and Dollar Hill area. Can striping crews be more aware of the need for adequate shoulders and correct deficient areas? I believe all the pavement is there and this is just a striping issue.
7/16/2010	E-mail	Michael LeFrancois, Gary Davis Group	North Tahoe Bike Trail – this project is complex and requires mutual efforts by all agencies to get through the environmental hurdles. This needs to be a coordinated effort so to avoid further delay and ensure a committed effort toward construction of the trail. I believe this trail is identified by many as a critical link to an overall system of trails and the approvals process needs to be expedited accordingly.
7/19/2010	E-mail	Michael LeFrancois, Gary Davis Group	Reciprocally be sure to tell them [Caltrans] the places that are striped good are REALLY NICE!

7/17/2010	e-mail	Larry Dowdle	I had read about the bike related projects proposed, and the one I wanted to see done isn't even on the list, at least not in the near future. It's my feeling that this 2 mile stretch between Incline and crystal Bay is the one that should be number one on the list. There are over 11,000 people in Incline that are isolated from the rest of the communities around the lake. What bike trail on your project list could possibly be more needed than this. All of us bicyclist in North Lake Tahoe take our life in our hands riding to Incline to ride Mount Rose Hwy. We in Kings Beach still don't even have the bike trail from the North Tahoe Regional park to the Firestone property. The Conservancy bought the Firestone property 20 years ago for the trail head to connect Kings Beach to the Tahoe City bike trail.	Incline to Crystal Bay is shown on the High Priority Project list. Its name is "Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway."
7/18/2010	E-mail	Jacque Chandler, Sustainable Tahoe	With all the money we waste, \$213M for the porposed bike paths and improvements is cheap! that is what bothered me in the porposal - is verbs like: encourage, expand, consider...and everything accomadates the car! reducing pedestrian accidents by 10% down to 9 people a year. I say remove the cars from the road, because if we keep accomadating the car - we will stay in war forever and 9 people a yr is just too many. Why not go for it and have the road around the lake be the bike path with a monorail running overhead and move all the cars off the Lake road. the revolution will not be televised	Comment noted.
7/20/2010	Letter	Alex Finn, Lake Tahoe Secret Harbor Corporation	Letter expressing concern that the Nevada Stateline-to-Stateline Bikeway Project (NVS2S)not pass adjacent to Secret Harbor Corporation property. Expressed support for alignment B3 of the NVS2S project, immediately paralleling Highway 28 between Sand Harbor and Glenbrook. See attached letter for full text.	Comments noted.
7/21/2010	E-mail	Tom Wendell	Chapter 7 Proposed system: 0' of class I for SLT? Nothing? Nada?	Table 11 in the "Proposed Network" section shows 22 miles of proposed Class I for City of SLT.
7/21/2010	E-mail	Tom Wendell	Figure 8: No Stateline to Stateline identified, only Kahle to NV. Beach.	Figure 8 is existing facilities only. NV Stateline to Stateline path is shown on the proposed network map.
7/21/2010	E-mail	Tom Wendell	Hwy. 50 E. Shore, Hwy. 89 Luther Pass, Kingsbury Grade all identified as existing Class II. Is this a misprint? They can't be serious. None of those meet the definition of Class II.	These facilities are shown on the proposed network map, not the existing network map.

7/21/2010	E-mail	Tom Wendell	Bike accident data in table 3 says info was gathered up to 06-'01. Another section with a table 5 from LSC uses data from '02 to '07. Very confusing. In either case, this data precedes the economic downturn and there has been a significant increase in riders since 2008 and I'm sure that has increased the accident rate. Unfortunately, I see many more clueless riders riding against traffic, no lights at night, wearing headphones etc. Enforcement needs to be stepped up as these people increase the danger to responsible cyclists as well as to themselves.	Comment noted.
7/21/2010	E-mail	Tom Wendell	Goal 1, A complete bike/ped network.....Sounds good but the 5 year supportive "actions" are littered with the same old platitudes: collaborate, incorporate, update, meet with, support, etc. Not one time did I see the word 'COMPLETE'. I know that the TRPA is a Planning agency, but they sure seem to be able to REGULATE and LITIGATE when it suites their purposes. How about some real ACTION? Cal Trans and NDOT seem to be able to thumb their noses at the TRPA with impunity as witnessed by the Hwy. 50 East Shore binwall project of several years ago and the water quality project on 50 south of the SLT airport. We've been hashing some of these same things over for 20+ years. I wish I could be more optimistic, but I didn't see anything that would lead me to believe that conditions are going to improve much in the near future except for the 2011 Trout Creek to Ski Run CalTrans project that was slated to be done over 10 years ago. Did I miss something? (quite possible).	Comment noted.
7/21/2010	E-mail	Stan Hill, CSLT	Does the map show the bike paths through the Fern Basin site (corner of Pioneer Trail and U.S. 50)?	Map is not detailed enough to show path curving through Fern Basin, but I believe it is as accurate as it can be, given the scale of the map.
7/22/2010	E-mail	Ty Polastri	Page 12 - other plans What about SB 1358 Complete Streets, and SB 32 Global Warming/Climate Change?	Will add to Consistency Memo.
7/22/2010	E-mail	Ty Polastri	On page 30, accomplishments - I suggest including the following: In 2009, City of South Lake Tahoe granted \$25,000 for the purchase of bicycle racks for public and business installation. In 2010, North Shore received Honorable Mention for Bicycle Friendly Community from the League of American Bicyclists.	Added.
7/22/2010	E-mail	Ty Polastri	I understood photo credits were to be included.	Added.
7/23/2010	E-mail	Shay Navarro	I am happy to see that maintenance is covered in the funding analysis section and under appendix A guidelines – will maintenance requirements be standard in permitting new projects? Repairing cracks and ensuring drainage flows off class 1 asphalt paths as adjacent turf/vegetation grows up are common maintenance complaints that we hear from riders – especially in the South Shore.	Maintenance strategies as part of permitting of bike trails is planned as part of the Regional Plan update.

7/23/2010	E-mail	Shay Navarro	It looks like you are proposing to designate part of Oakland Ave as a class 3 bike route through the Al Tahoe neighborhood to connect bike lanes on Lakeview drive and public access to the beach to only Los Angeles. I think stenciling the entire length of Oakland Ave would provide greater cross town connectivity for this neighborhood by providing a way back to Los Angeles for riders following Lakeview all the way around to El Dorado Ave, which then terminates at Oakland.	Comment noted.
7/23/2010	E-mail	Shay Navarro	It is difficult to see exactly how the proposed shared use class 1 path will be routed along Al Tahoe to join either Rufus Allen or Johnson?? I am reading it as a path that would connect the eastern corner of the Al Tahoe intersection with Hwy 50, along Al Tahoe blvd and then through to Rufus Allen – this would be awesome and really improve cross town connectivity.	Yes, this is how the path would be routed.
7/23/2010	E-mail	Shay Navarro	As always, very happy and excited to see the proposed bike lanes on Hwy 50, including in front of the airport!!! And the bike route on Venice drive through the keys! Great way to achieve traffic calming as well.	Comment noted.
7/23/2010	E-mail	Shay Navarro	I am curious if you have received any comments on the proposed guidelines from NDOT or Caltrans? They have argued with Brian on the Hwy 50 project that the preferred grates shown on page 41 get pulled up by snow plows and that is why they do not want to use them, yet these same types currently exist on the south shore ring road without incident.	No comments were received from Caltrans or NDOT on the preferred grates.
7/23/2010	Letter	David Morrow, NDSP	1.11 Unclear as to what is meant by "shall promote pedestrian and bicycle access equal to or greater than private vehicle access"	Have changed to read: "Include pedestrian and bicycle access equal to or greater than private vehicle access as a feature of new development and re-development projects proposed in proximity to major bicycle and pedestrian routes." This is a policy statement that needs to be further refined through code.

7/23/2010	Letter	David Morrow, NDSP	1.12 Requiring the incorporation of segments of the bike and pedestrian network for all new and redeveloped public service or recreation projects consistent with the plan may not always be feasible or desirable. This requirement may place an inordinate financial burden on a given project depending on its scale and may create a maintenance issue without identifying who would be responsible for maintenance of the segment (though this may be addressed in Policy 1.25 and will add to project costs and delays). Additionally, it may not make sense to construct a segment that is not connected to other segments and will not be in the near future. Finally, including a pathway segment in a project will likely require new coverage by its very nature, which may be a significant issue depending on parcel size and location.	Comment noted. There must be a nexus between the proposed project and the required bicycle or pedestrian facility for any agency to require it to be built. Language at the end of the policy "Implementation of the facilities will be through construction, easements, or in-lieu fees as appropriate to the scale of development" is meant to address the concern that small, unconnected segments not be constructed.
7/23/2010	Letter	David Morrow, NDSP	1.13 As stated, this appears to be more of a goal than a policy	Comment noted.
7/23/2010	Letter	David Morrow, NDSP	2.5 State Parks strongly supports this policy which encourages state and local law enforcement agencies to enforce parking restrictions at recreation destinations, especially where nearby bicycle or pedestrian facilities provide a convenient alternative to driving.	Comment noted.
7/23/2010	Letter	David Morrow, NDSP	3.4 Suggest modifying language to state that facilities shall incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to filter runoff associated with the project area (versus sheet flow).	Comment noted.
7/23/2010	Letter	David Morrow, NDSP	Table 18 in Appendix B indicates that the Sand Harbor to Incline Village segment of the Nevada Stateline to Stateline Bikeway is in Washoe County ownership and is proposed as a Class 1 bike path. Although State Parks understands that the project goals indicate a preference for a separated bikeway when feasible, it is probably appropriate to reiterate here that there are several concerns our agency has regarding the proposed alignments for this section and that we will continue to work with the project working group and TRPA to address them. Please also change the ownership for this segment to primarily NV State Parks and Nevada Department of Transportation Right-of-Way instead of Washoe County.	Added NV State Parks and NDOT to project owners.
7/23/2010	E-mail	Steven J. McHugh, Attorney at Law	Letter expressing objection to the possibility of narrowing Lake Tahoe Blvd to two lanes. Full comment letter is attached.	The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan does not propose to reduce Lake Tahoe Blvd to two lanes, it only shows proposed facilities planned along different corridors.

7/25/2010	E-mail	Brendan Madigan, Alpenglow Sports	I was curious if the TRPA has any focus on the recent string of bike related accidents in front of the Tahoe House Bakery. I am a West Shore resident and a member of the TCDA. Much to my dismay, I have seen at least 3 bike accidents directly in front of the Tahoe House parking lot. My interest lies in the fact that with the increase in accidents they, as business owners, nor the County, seem to be doing anything about it. Will we need to wait until someone gets killed before they step up to the plate?	Spoke to commenter and suggested contacting TCPUD.
7/25/2010	Letter	Steve Teshara, Tahoe City Public Utility District	See attached letter	Responses sent directly to commenter.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	The California Tahoe Conservancy appreciates the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the Draft Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (BPP). We are pleased that much of the input provided prior to this public release is reflected in the draft document. Overall the document does a good job of setting the stage for more robust implementation of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. That said we encourage the TRPA/TMPO to continue to work on the obstacles, both real and perceived, to project implementation, and not be satisfied with the status quo.	Comment noted.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 29, Table 1. A few trails completed between 2003 and 2010 that were missed: 15th street class 1 path and bridge, connecting the existing USFS south shore beaches bike path and the class three trail on Eloise; 15th street class 2 lanes, from SR 89 to Venice drive; Lyons Ave class 1 path, from US 50 to Rufus Allen Blvd.	Added.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 32. The Benchmarks are great; however, the Conservancy suggests a greater connection between these benchmarks and the proposed Goals and Policies to ensure there is a strategy to achieve the benchmarks. Further, the Goals and Policies need further discussion regarding their proposed strategy for implementation and achievement. Perhaps an appendices matrix could quickly provide this cross tabulation.	Goals, Policies, and Actions to specific benchmarks. Also noted that the Goals, Policies and Actions are the strategy to achieve benchmarks. Also edited the descriptions of "Policies" and "Actions" on page 61 to better explain the tie with the benchmarks.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 46. The discussion regarding consolidating maintenance responsibility lacks recommendations or directives specifically addressing overall snow removal practices and storage. Subject should correlate to BMP compliance as well.	Added sentence to introductory paragraph on page 46 that explains that maintenance includes snow removal and maintenance of BMPs. The second paragraph provides recommendations regarding snow removal. Snow storage is handled in Appendix A, Design and Maintenance Guidelines.

7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Measure S is a property assessment (tax) not a bond measure.	Changed.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Reference to the „annual allocation distribution system“ may need further explanation; many folks will not know what this is.	Changed to "building allocation system."
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 47. Perhaps data should be compared for bike and pedestrian accidents vs. auto accidents. This may demonstrate the relative safety of cycling, compared to auto travel, which enjoys a perception of greater safety.	Agreed. Am hoping to include this information if I can find the data.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 61. Why is implementation of projects to complete/expand the network not a major goal? Implementation of projects that complete or expand the network is the best means for achieving the other goals.	Focused goal 1 reads "Construct, upgrade, and maintain a complete regional network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities that connects communities and destinations." This language implies implementation.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 62. The discussion about the eventual inclusion of the policies espoused in the BPP being incorporated into the Regional Plan and then the Code of Ordinances is confusing. Should the TRPA adopt the BPP, it becomes part of the Regional Plan package, much the same way the RTP or AQP is. As a component of the Regional Plan, its enforceable at that time, however, enforcement of policies is difficult at best. Further, the Code of Ordinances is not a set of policies, but rather, are a collection of standards that must be met. Therefore, the policies of the BPP will need to be translated into ordinance language that is actionable, reasonable and incentivizes construction of bike and pedestrian infrastructure projects.	Edited language on page 62 to explain that policies will be translated into Code language.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Likewise, the reference to Appendix A Guidelines will also present difficulties for enforcement, as guidelines are not standards. They may be followed, whereas standards must be enforced.	Almost all of the Tahoe-specific guidelines specified in Appendix A, Design and Maintenance Guidelines are just that, guidelines, not standards. Those that should be standards, such as rates of bicycle parking, are proposed to be translated into the Code of Ordinances. Caltrans, NDOT, and AASHTO standards, while covered in Appendix A, are enforceable by other documents, not the TRPA Code of Ordinances.

7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Pages 63-66. The action verbs in the policies vacillate between shall, should, may, must. Each term is specific as to its level of action required vs. encouraged. The Conservancy suggests a thorough review of these terms in each policy and a determination, which may lead to the default prioritization of the policies, of which policy is critical (it shall/must be implemented), versus those that will be helpful (should/may be implemented).	Changed policies to begin with action verbs, removing "should" and "shall" in most places.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Policy 1.3: have the unique standards been reviewed and approved by Caltrans, NDOT or FHWA? Do these unique standards comply with ADA requirements, as is also required by Policy 1.6?	All unique standards the are currently proposed are incorporated into the BPP and thus have been reviewed by Caltrans (such as the Lake Tahoe Scenic Bike Loop). All unique standards must comply with ADA.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Policy 1.4: what is the strategy to implement this policy? What is the expected outcome of declaring a high-priority?	Edited bullet #1 on page 67 to read "Collaborate with local agencies and organizations to implement the BPP, focusing on high priority projects. Facilitate workshops to highligh new BPP elements." See also bullet # 2 on this page, "Incorporate priority BPP projects into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP), the TMPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)."
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	The Conservancy suggests a policy be developed to address the permitting and mitigation obstacles to implementing projects. Without clear guidance, strategies, policies and standards, bicycle infrastructure projects will continue to be stalled, if not defeated. This is especially the case in regards to coverage and mitigation requirements due to necessary SEZ crossings.	Will carry this comment into Phase II of the Regional Plan Update.

7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	What are the strategies to implement Policies 1.13 and 1.15?	Added as bullet #4 under TRPA/TMPO Actions on page 67: "Incorporate Appendix A, Design and Maintenance Guidelines, and Goal 1 and associated policies into TRPA project review." Bullet #5 reads: Conduct annual training with TRPA permit review staff and MOU partners on how to incorporate the BPP into development project design."
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 66. Policies 1.25 and 1.26: there is a risk of discouraging infrastructure development with this type of requirement (policy 1.25). Perhaps combine the two policies as they seem incongruent as presented. What other types of public infrastructure projects does TRPA currently require a maintenance funding plan for?	Noted. Policies 1.25 and 1.25 were approved, with minor changes (changed "dedicated funding" to "a strategy for funding") by the TRPA Governing Board as part of the Regional Plan Update package.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Policy 1.29: is this consistent with or redundant to the current BMP requirements?	Consistent with, and perhaps redundant to BMP requirements, but worth noting.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 67. How will the TRPA support research on raised boardwalks? Why not TTD take the lead on this research and propose the corresponding Code amendments should the research so dictate? What is the anticipated timeline for this research?	TRPA anticipates that local jurisdictions, and perhaps the CTC will provide data on the efficacy of raised boardwalks in allowing SEZ function to continue. At that time, staff would work with local entities to develop and bring forward Code amendments.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Perhaps there should be a discussion regarding the rationale for such research. If mitigation requirements for boardwalks remain the same as for on-grade asphalt, it does not make any economic sense to continue with boardwalks, as the money saved with on-grade asphalt must be used for the mitigation. If those mitigation costs were not required, those savings can be used to construct boardwalks, or other innovative, and typically more expensive, designs.	Comment noted.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	What is the anticipated timeline to meet and develop a plan with Caltrans/NDOT for consistent bike lane striping consistent with design standards? Within five years? Perhaps these actions should be prioritized for one, two, three year implementation rather than sometime in the next five years.	Meeting with Caltrans/NDOT is a high priority action item, however specifying one, two, and three year implementation is too detailed for this document.

7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 68. Perhaps some of these actions should be carried out by Caltrans or NDOT, especially when state highway infrastructure is involved, such as the first bullet regarding pedestrian crossing improvements. This action should include State and Local activities.	Changed.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 69. Many policies on this page claim TRPA will encourage an action. Beyond a policy statement, what form of encouragement will these policies take? Without a strategy for action, these policies may have no effect on the implementation of green-infrastructure development.	Bullet 3 on page 70 is an action to convene a multi-agency group that meets with local law enforcement. Other policies that use "encourage" are supported by actions on page 70 and 71.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 71. Consistent with the proposal to meet with Caltrans/NDOT to develop consistent striping and maintenance, that plan/effort should extend to the locals as well. Numerous class 2 lanes are within the domain of local roads.	Changed action on page 67 to incorporate this suggestion.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 72. Policy 3.1: What Agency will be in charge of reviewing roadway capacity and parking for minimization? A more effective land use control would be the adoption of parking maximums, coupled with an amortization program to gain region-wide compliance. Further, the banking and transfer of the associated coverage from „extra parking" may be the best economic incentive to realize compliance, especially if the process were streamlined.	Comments noted and agreed. Most of this is being considered as part of the Regional Plan Update. (TRPA encourages the CTC to bring these issues forward again during the stakeholder process of Phase II of the Regional Plan Update.) Policy 3.1 is meant to support and encourage roadway and parking minimization, and does not contain an associated action item.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Policy 3.4: consider a revision to this policy to require sheet flow from proposed improvements to be addressed, rather than the project area. The project area may be much larger than improvements, and often given the linear nature of bike trail improvements, these projects could be saddled with mitigating water quality concerns not originating from the proposed improvements.	Changed.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 85: Property acquisition (fee title, easements, use permits, or other), are absent from the discussion of implementation. Often acquisition, which can be very difficult to finance, is a huge obstacle to implementation.	Added discussion to Intro of "Implementation" section.

7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Figure 5: consider placing a timeline on this graphic to not only show the flow of major steps, but how long it takes to move from one box to the next. May also want to consider the more realistic process that requires steps completed to be revisited due to changing environmental conditions, loss of funding, staff turn-over, etc.	Figure is not detailed enough to include this info.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Page 87. There is an intermediate step between permit issuance and project construction, actually there are many steps. However, as it relates to the TRPA Project Review Process, once a permit is issued, often referred to as a conditional approval, the permit must be acknowledged. This is when all conditions of approval must be demonstrated insofar as mitigation credits or fees are concerned and/or securities posted. Further, TRPA issues a DRAFT permit; it is not actionable until acknowledged, which also includes the review and approval of the construction plans.	Figure is not detailed enough to include this info.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Appendix A - Section 3.1.2: The discussion characterizing boardwalks is fair; however, absent is any type of incentive to use a more „environmentally friendly" design (versus at grade pavement) due to the required mitigation being the same for pavement versus boardwalks. If it is the position of TRPA/TMPO/TTD that this is the preferred application in SEZs, then permitting and mitigation requirements must be amended to incentive their installation.	Comment noted.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Section 3.1.3: The ending of the discussion section describes the elevation of the trail being built higher than the water table. I think perhaps you mean flood elevation or standing water? Water tables are typically under the ground surface.	Removed reference to water table.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Section 3.1.5: Surprising that the recommendation is for flexible bollards or none at all. The flexible bollards are not a deterrent to auto encroachment and are a maintenance burden: they do not hold up to the Tahoe climate. There are numerous other design options, including the „island" design that is recommended by AASHTO. Additionally, bollards can deter adjacent properties from storing snow on the trail. Perhaps include a greater discussion on using bollards only when auto encroachment, or other, is a real risk, even if this determination is based solely on local knowledge. They can always be put in after initial construction should monitoring indicate auto travel on the bike paths, and are not too costly to manufacture and install.	Text already explains this.

7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Section 3.1.8: TRPA Code Section 20.3.B. The Conservancy concurs with this use definition for permitting paved bike paths in the Tahoe basin. However, the Lahontan RWQCB has not always concurred with this use category determination. How can TRPA/TMPO/TTD ensure consistent permitting, project approval findings, and mitigation requirements given this discrepancy in interpreting this land use category?	TRPA can work with Lahontan on this but cannot control the state's requirements.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Section 3.2.1: The displayed Recommended Design for a typical at grade crossing at an intersection appears contradictory to the AASHTO Guidelines, see pages 48, 49. While this design may offer room for the auto to stop once turned from their main travel direction, it also offers room for the auto to accelerate after their turn movement because they do not see the cyclist/pedestrian at the corner of the intersection. A blocked roadway is safer for cyclists and pedestrians. The Conservancy encourages the TRPA/TMPO/TTD to reconsider recommending this design and request the designer provide sufficient information that ensures the design is equal or superior to the recommended AASHTO design.	Not obvious that there is a conflict--the AASHTO guide is not specific on the recommended distance of the path from the adjacent roadway. However, added this text: "Clear sight lines should take precedence in determining path proximity to adjacent roadway. "
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Section 3.2.6: the accompanying graphic is not legible.	Will fix.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Section 4.2.7: Situations wherein there is not a detour available is not addressed. Often in Tahoe there is no detour to take given limited river crossings and road networks. Suggest additional discussion and direction for traffic control signs to NOT be placed within bike lanes or road shoulders, which force cyclists into the auto travel way and is a major safety concern.	Added.

7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Appendix B: Induced by emerging federal stimulus funds, the Tahoe Conservancy in partnership with the TTD and California local jurisdictions have devised the concept of the Lake Tahoe Bikeway, which is akin to the historical bikeway effort Bikeway 2000. Simply described, the Lake Tahoe Bikeway is: "The bi-state Lake Tahoe Bikeway (a collaborative interagency project) is a centerpiece of the emerging sustainability plan for this spectacular national treasure. It will provide a safe, accessible non-motorized transportation network; connect communities around the lake; improve air and water quality; provide jobs; and support the Region's growing ecotourism-based economy." The bikeway is a combination of class 1, 2 and highway segments (class 3) that circumnavigate Lake Tahoe. Conceptually, its complete today, with only improvements	Noted.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Appendix E - Two local funding sources that were not identified: North Lake Tahoe Resort Association; California Tahoe Conservancy.	NLTRA source covered under discussion of TOT funds--will add discussion of Conservancy Funds.
7/26/2010	Letter	California Tahoe Conservancy	Appendix I - The memorandum does not make specific, useful recommendations to be carried forward in the Plan Goals and Policies. Actionable policy recommendations or goals should be considered.	Noted.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Regarding "Commercial and residential development and redevelopment shall promote pedestrian and bicycle access equal to or greater than private vehicle access. (M2030)" ·Are there specific ordinances in the works for what this means? Are there certain numbers of bike parking spaces per unit or development dollar, or can businesses pay into a general fund to help support bike hubs or similar projects at a central location? (For end-of-trip facilities) What about access through parking lots? What will be the design standards for new development, especially commercial development, for access and end of trip? Are there standards for bike parking yet in existence	The TRPA Regional Plan is currently being updated, and ordinances related to this and other policies are being developed. For now, Appendix A, Design and Maintenance Recommendations specifies rates of bicycle parking.

7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Regarding 1.16 Pedestrian and Class II bicycle facilities (bike lanes) meeting AASHTO standards must be constructed, upgraded, and maintained where feasible along major travel routes when the edge of roadway is altered or improved. Where bicycle lanes are not feasible due to environmental or land ownership constraints, provide as much shoulder area as possible. Are AASHTO standards high enough to help gain bicycle friendly community status?	Yes, we believe they are.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Regarding 1.17 The TRPA should work with other agencies to implement a "Lake Tahoe Scenic Bike Loop" with the widest possible shoulder on the Lake side of the highways circling Lake Tahoe where bicycle lanes are not feasible or have not yet been constructed. (See the Design and Maintenance Guidelines) Where shared-use paths intersect with driveways or roadways, bicyclists should have priority in accordance with Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) standards. (M2030) Will this mean that existing signage/priority will change based on MUTCD standards? I am fairly sure that some intersections on the North and West shore are not MUTCD compliant. I could certainly be wrong about this, but the priority given seems inaccurate with MUTCD standards. (See section 9B.03)	Please contact Tahoe City Public Utility District regarding this issue.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Regarding TRPA shall require a maintenance plan before issuing a permit or funding for any bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The maintenance plan shall specify dedicated long and short-term funding for the life of the project. Planning for the long-term maintenance of bike/ped facilities is a wise choice. What happens if roadway users notice a maintenance problem? Will there be a number for users to call? Will calls get logged appropriately? Who will decide what agency is responsible for alleviating the issue?	The agency that owns the facility is responsible, and it is their responsibility to publicize ways for users to contact them with issues. Usually, it is the public works department of the local jurisdiction or public utility district that is responsible for maintaining bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Regarding 1.30 The TRPA encourages jurisdictions and private property owners to minimize maintenance costs by consolidating maintenance responsibilities. (See Appendix H, Maintenance Memo) The TRPA encourages jurisdictions and roadway agencies to snow-clear, sweep, and stripe bicycle routes where needed before major cycling events. I'm concerned about the language: "major cycling events". While I believe that these events are a good time (and a popular excuse) for performing maintenance, it seems to reduce the importance of all other users. Perhaps using language such as "for seasonal use" would be more appropriate.	This concern is covered by Policy 1.23.

7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Regarding: Meet with local school officials to develop safe routes to schools programs. Help apply for funding where needed. (TRPA/TMPO/ CA & NV Safe routes to Schools Coordinators /LTBC/ Jurisdictions/Health Departments/Others) Fantastic. Who are the local SR2S coordinators? What can we do beyond Walk and Bike to School days?	Local Safe Routes to Schools coordinators can be found on the Safe Routes to Schools website. New activities can be and are currently being developed by local groups.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Include bicycle and pedestrian safety information as part of visitor packages offered through the visitor centers, hotels, resorts, and bicycle rental shops. Writing as a bike safety educator as well as someone who works at a bike shop doing rentals, I can tell you that if shops are to be included in this plan, a dedicated, specific plan needs to be in place. I see hundreds of cyclists or more every week, and there are many, many opportunities for education, but they are largely untapped.	Comment noted.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Support distribution and updating of Lake Tahoe Bike Trail Maps. (TRPA, local jurisdictions) I'm glad to see this written in, but the map is woefully inaccurate in places. Is there language about updating and improving the map included in the plan?	The Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition currently distributes and updates this map, and is responsible for fixing inaccuracies.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	"Accident Data" The word accident is a misnomer when speaking of bicycle and pedestrian crashes. I urge you to change the entire section to "Crash Data" and replace the word accident with the word "Crash". Accident implies that no one is at fault, whereas the word "crash" indicates the severity of collisions by motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians, regardless of fault. None of those modes operates without human use. If there is one overarching comment I have, it is to change this wording.	Noted. "Accidents" is used extensively throughout the document and also in supporting memos, so for consistency, did not change the word "accidents" at this time. However, in the Executive Summary we are using "collisions," and will strive to begin to shift to "collisions" or "crashes" in the future.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	"A complete bicycle and pedestrian network that provides convenient access to basin destinations and destinations outside the basin" I would advocate for adding the words "safe" and "efficient" to the phrase, so it reads "safe, efficient, and convenient access to basin destinations and destinations outside the basin" I am concerned about writing a broad phrase such as this and not including the word "safe" in it.	Did not edit this goal statement but edited the vision in the introduction to add "efficient and attractive to "bicycle and pedestrian network." We try to use "safer" or "attractive" as opposed to "safe," since no facility will ever be without the potential for unsafe situations.

7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	1.15 All roadway improvement projects shall accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians as described in the Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan project list, as well as including specialized pedestrian crossing treatments, traffic calming, and bicycle activated signals as appropriate to the scale of the project. (M2030) (See the Design and Maintenance Guidelines) The language “as appropriate to the scale of the project” seems vague enough that if specialized facilities, treatments, etc. are controversial or expensive (or both), they could easily be considered unnecessary according to scale. Is there stronger language that could be used here that would indicate that facility design would be required?	More detailed language can be incorporated into code language. Generally, where a signal or crossing is disturbed by the activity, it would need to be changed.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	1.19 Innovative shared roadway treatments (e.g. off-peak only parking/bike lanes that can be used for vehicles during peak flows) should be considered in constrained areas where roadway is limited. Could language such as “shared lane arrows (sharrows)” be included in examples?	Yes, added.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Conduct annual training with TRPA permit review staff and MOU partners on how to incorporate the BPP into development project design. This is an excellent policy statement.	Noted.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	Meet with NDOT and Caltrans to develop a plan to incorporate striping and regular maintenance of bi- cycle lanes and wide shoulders into all roadway improvement projects, including routine maintenance. This language could supercede the language in 1.31(?) that talks about major maintenance before cycling events. This is specific and supports all cyclists, not just those doing events.	Noted.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	3.1 Roadway capacity or parking facilities should be minimized where they can be effectively replaced by transit, bicycling and/or walking facilities. This is great to include, but I wonder what the definition of “effective” is? Is it feasible to suggest minimizing roadway capacity in this context?	We feel that it is, particularly in the case of excess parking capacity.
7/26/2010	e-mail	Elicia Cardenas, Olympic Bike Shop	3.6 The TRPA shall develop measures for tracking bicycling and walking impacts on local economies. (M2030)- This is an extremely worthwhile goal; see Alta Planning and Design’s Portland Economic Report. I’m partial to it as I did much of the research, writing, and analysis in my capacity at Alta. It was an incredibly effective document for persuading stakeholders who were unsure about policies and facility design.	Thank you--will check this out.

7/26/2010	E-mail	Edmund Sullivan, Placer County	1. VMT p.18 - Question: Wouldn't VMT increase due to the fact Lake Tahoe is far from population centers with adequate, not unlimited parking?	Changed text in this section to indicate that <i>Lake Tahoe</i> paths that are close to population centers are likely to reduce VMT. The reference to paths that are far from population centers with adequate, not unlimited parking, was meant to refer to certain paths within the Tahoe Region, not the Tahoe Region as a whole.
7/26/2010	E-mail	Edmund Sullivan, Placer County	2. The Safety & Outreach section (p.37) is weak. All that is concentrated on is outreach and education. Traffic calming, striping etc. need to be addressed in section 4, not just section 6.	Added additional discussion to this section.
7/26/2010	E-mail	Edmund Sullivan, Placer County	3. Maintenance. Please add to Strategies for Improving Maintenance jurisdictions pooling funds to cost share special equipment purchases.	Added.
7/26/2010	E-mail	Edmund Sullivan, Placer County	4. Question - the feasibility of implementation, given the cost to construct/finish the around-lake-trail and budget challenges facing both States, adjacent communities and the federal government?	Added discussion to Intro of "Implementation" section.
7/26/2010	E-mail	Edmund Sullivan, Placer County	5. The implementation section is rather "boiler plate". It does not address the challenges to plan implementation or offer-up creative approaches to achieving the goals/objectives/policies of the plan.	Added discussion to Intro of "Implementation" section.
7/26/2010	E-mail	Edmund Sullivan, Placer County	6. Question - Is another TAC meeting planned to discuss comments etc?	No.
7/26/2010	Letter	Caltrans District 3	Page 39, 47 - Street design for on-street parking may reduce speeds somewhat but bike and ped safety will be lessened due to reduced sight distances between cars.	Noted.
7/26/2010	Letter	Caltrans District 3	Page 39 - We recommend using a lower ADT for 3-lane roadways. 25k ADT should be reduced to a more acceptable 15k ADT.	Reduced.
7/26/2010	Letter	Caltrans District 3	page 50 - The shared use paths along State Route (SR) 89 in Placer County were not "removed." The term removed should be changed to reflect the seasonal maintenance task of remarking these pathways.	Per TCPUD, all but two of these crossings have been re-painted. Changed text to use the word "re-painted" as opposed to "removed," and reflected that only two are not currently re-painted due to safety concerns.
7/26/2010	Letter	Caltrans District 3	Page 65, Policy 1.16 - We recommend removing the use of the term "edge of" roadway or provide a clear definition of the term as it is used in this context.	Added a footnote defining "edge of" as "curbline."

RECEIVED

JUL 26 2010

TAHOE REGIONAL
PLANNING AGENCY

Lake Tahoe Secret Harbor Corporation

July 20, 2010

Karen Fink
Senior Transportation Planner
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization
128 Market Street, Suite 3F
P O Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

RE: Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Dear Ms. Fink:

I am the President of the Board of Directors of the Lake Tahoe Secret Harbor Corporation ("LTSH"). Since the early 1920's, LTSH has owned a small private campsite located on the northeast shore of Lake Tahoe between Sand Harbor and Glenbrook in Carson County.

Throughout the more than ninety years of its existence, the six families and their descendants who formed and now comprise LTSH have carefully maintained our property and limited its use to the purposes for which it was originally acquired -- camping and picnicking. There is no electricity service to the property, and water for the campground is supplied by a small natural spring located several hundred feet above the Lake.

LTSH has been addressing the issues of environmental preservation, safety and security throughout our many years as stewards of our isolated portion of the basin. We are acutely aware of the effects that increased public access has on the lake environment as the East Shore has transitioned from private ownership to public ownership over the years. With the increased use of the public beaches we have observed increased erosion, illegal campfires, trespassing, littering, bears, vandalism, and other security problems. Our on-site summer caretaker assists local and state agencies in monitoring these problems due to both the frequency with which they occur and the inability of the agencies to be in all places at all times.

Although we support the concept of more environmentally friendly access to the Lake and the reduction of automobile traffic that could be provided by the Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan in conjunction with the Nevada Stateline-to-Stateline Bikeway Project, we strongly believe that such access should not be at the expense of environmental health and stability, public and private safety and security, or the disturbance of fish and wildlife habitats. With respect to that portion of the bikeway that might be constructed on the East Shore, we believe that the best way to minimize the bikeway's negative

TRPA
July 20, 2010
Page Two

impact on the shoreline and maintain control of this sensitive environment is to site the bikeway so that it passes through the least sensitive locations.

We are very concerned that construction of any bicycle path adjacent to our property would cause substantial negative impacts affecting not only our property, but the adjoining public property, wildlife in the area, and the Lake itself. Not only would such a path draw additional people and traffic into the area, thereby threatening our spring and the privacy and solitude of the area, but would also disturb wildlife, and increase erosion, run-off and fire risks for this side of the Lake.

We have reviewed the TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Draft 2010 as well as the Nevada Stateline-to-Stateline Bikeway Project Feasibility Study. For the reasons stated above (which we are prepared to address in detail if requested) together with our nearly 90 years of experience with the area, we can only support Segment B Alternative B3 as set forth in the Bikeway Project Feasibility Study (Carson County Segment on TRPA maps). For those same reasons, we are unwilling to consider any easements across our property that would be required to proceed with Segment B Alternatives B1 or B2.

Our review of the Bikeway Project Feasibility Study indicates that based on all of the experience, environmental, cost and constructability criteria considered in that Study, Alternative B3 in fact had the highest Total score in meeting the considered criteria overall. The only category in which Alternative B3 did not score the highest was "Experience" which we believe is the least critical of the criteria considered. LTSH agrees with the evaluation.

We find the TRPA Master Plan draft more difficult to evaluate because it generally addresses the entire basin and does not specifically address in detail any of the different regions around the Lake. We are prepared to discuss our specific concerns regarding the criteria decisions in CEQA Appendix G as they apply to the Carson County segment of the basin. Our evaluation of those criteria as they apply to the Carson County segment (due to the unique nature of the area) results in "potentially significant impact" that is not addressed in the evaluation if the bikeway were to be constructed any closer to the Lake than adjacent to Highway 28.

We feel strongly that this area should be kept as natural and unimproved as possible so that future generations, as well as the native wildlife, may continue to enjoy it in its present, essentially undisturbed state. Constructing a bicycle path adjacent to our property would be completely inconsistent with that goal, and we would vigorously oppose any such plan

That said, LTSH would not oppose a proposal to construct a bicycle path that immediately parallels Highway 28 between Sand Harbor and Glenbrook. Such a path would certainly afford bicyclists a safe and spectacular route around this portion of the Lake and, because immediately adjacent to the existing highway, would presumably be simpler and less expensive to construct. More important, a path immediately adjacent to Highway 28 would preserve the unique, relatively pristine condition of this particular section of the Tahoe basin by maintaining a sufficient distance from the Lake to avoid any: (1) threats to Lake-side wildlife, (2) erosion or run-off that could negatively affect the Lake, and (3) damage to LTSH's privacy or to its spring and water system.

TRPA
July 20, 2010
Page Three

As you can conclude from this letter, Lake Tahoe Secret Harbor Corporation is vitally interested in the route of the contemplated bicycle path, if it is to be constructed. As with most development, and construction of a bicycle path along this side of the Lake must certainly be considered development, location is everything. We would be happy to meet with you, including at the LTSH property, to further discuss our concerns.

We request that we be added to any/all mailing list to ensure that we are kept fully apprised at each stage of the planning process. To date, we have only by luck become aware of the Nevada Stateline-to-Stateline Bikeway Project and the TRPA Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Draft 2010 (as our members are not full-time residents) and we strongly believe that, as private property owners who may be significantly affected by decisions regarding the proposed bikeway, we should be noticed directly and with at least thirty (30) days notice of any response deadlines in order to have the opportunity to evaluate and respond to project proposals.

Finally, we hereby put all representatives of any and all public agencies on notice that any effort to visit or walk on our property, without both a prior written request setting forth the purpose, timing and individuals to be provided access, and written consent, will be considered trespass. Due to trespass and security issues, our caretaker has standing instructions to request any non-member to vacate the property unless he or she can produce evidence of written approval from the LTSH Board. Please feel free to contact me directly regarding any such requests.

In the meantime, thank you for your time and consideration of our concerns. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,



Alex Finn
President
Lake Tahoe Secret Harbor Corporation
22065 Bonness Road
Sonoma, CA 95476
alexfinn@sbcglobal.net

cc: Tahoe Transportation District- Alfred Knotts
Carson County – Ann Bollinger
USDA Forest Service – Garrett Villanueva
Gildred Family Trust – Janice Gibbons
Thunderbird Lodge Preservation Society – Bill Watson

From: Steve McHugh
Sent: Friday, July 23, 2010 11:21 AM
To: Karen Fink
Subject: Public Comment/INPUT RE: BIKE PATH / NARROWING OF HIGHWAY near SAWMILL POND/South Tahoe High School

Dear TRPA and Ms. Karen Fink, TRPA Transportation Planner:

Please consider this a Public Comment and Input. Please give this to all appropriate persons/agencies.

We just learned that Monday, July 26, is the deadline for public comment on a proposal that you change the designation of Lake Tahoe Blvd., between the South Tahoe High School, and the Sawmill Pond area, to a "Class 1", so that it becomes mixed use bike path and highway.

We object most strenuously. We NEED all four (4) traffic lanes on this highway for motor vehicles to access our neighborhoods during times of crisis, whether it be ambulance service, fire fighting vehicles, etc., and in the winter time, as it is already, the SNOW BUILDUP ends up making this 4-lane highway effectively a 2-lane highway already. To make this highway even MORE NARROW, especially during heavy snow times, would be extremely dangerous and hazardous.

During the Angora Fire in June and July, 2007, all of us were traumatized, and almost lost our lives and homes. Over 250 of us did lose our homes and property. I personally barely got out, with my life and that of my children, in time, as the forest burned down all around us. We NEED the 4-lane highway as it exists! Don't make it a public hazard and safety risk.

Furthermore, your agency, the TRPA, and all other relevant agencies have long since been placed on notice that if you allow the narrowing of this 4-lane highway, and make it a ONE-LANE highway in each direction, so as to give recreational bike riders another bike path, you will be creating a severe, dangerous, hazardous condition on public property. This would endanger the lives and safety of not only the thousands of homeowners in the area, but also of fire-fighters, EMTs, and other emergency personnel, by foolishly changing a 4-lane highway into a much narrower, more dangerous, less-accessible, route, to and from the Tahoe Mountain Estates/North Upper Truckee/Angora Highlands neighborhoods!

Don't do it! My wife and I, and all of our neighbors, strenuously OBJECT. If anyone dies, or houses get burned down, or anyone gets injured, as a result of any stupid plan to create more recreational bike paths, at the expense of lives and safety of thousands of residents, YOUR OFFICE, the TRPA, and all others involved will be held legally responsible. You are on notice.

Furthermore, I have personally asked, in person, and in writing, several times, that you NOTIFY me by MAIL of any and all such proposed changes/meetings/deadlines. I got NO NOTICE whatsoever of this. I object to this.

Furthermore, every time I tried today to download your Plan, the BPP, OR to get on your Mailing List, your web site does not allow me to do it.

This law office does not represent the thousands of people who live in these neighborhoods, however, EVERY ONE OF THEM that we know of vehemently OBJECTS to any narrowing of that highway. We stated that at the last public meeting, at the South Tahoe Airport, on this subject, months ago.

Moreover, there is already an existing bike path in the forest, just off the road. Bike riders can use that. It should remain as it is, i.e., a "2" or a "3". Do not put the lives, property, and safety of thousands of us residents and homeowners at risk, by narrowing and reducing the usable, motor vehicle highway, and putting a BIKE PATH on the highway.

Also, doing such would be inherently dangerous to the bikers. Do you put a bike path on Highway 50, in Folsom? Do you put a bike path on Highway 80, in Sacramento? Especially during slippery, icy, snowy conditions, any such plan is insanely dangerous to all.

I respectfully demand, AGAIN, that you GIVE us proper advance NOTICE, by mail AND by email, of any and all future plans, actions, hearings, etc., as to this subject, IN ADVANCE, at all times in the future, as I have previously, already, demanded in writing that you do.

My contact information, AGAIN, is:

Steven J. McHugh, Attorney at Law
Debra A. McHugh, Attorney at Law
McHugh & McHugh, LLP
2494 Lake Tahoe Blvd., Suite B-7
South Lake Tahoe, CA. 96150
email: stevenmchugh@sbcglobal.net
TEL: (530) 544-3006
FAX: (530) 544-3517

July 25, 2010

Ms. Karen Fink
Transportation Planner
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Re: Comments on Draft 2010 Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

Dear Karen:

The comments in this letter have been prepared in coordination with Bob Bolton and Cindy Gustafson of the Tahoe City Public Utility District. I also spoke with staff at the California Tahoe Conservancy regarding the policy recommendation advocated for Section 6, page 64 (proposed new policy 1.12.1).

Section 3 - Benchmarks and Progress

Under Notable accomplishments (page 30), please update the last bullet point to indicate that the North Lake Tahoe-Truckee Resort Triangle has been recognized with an "Honorable Mention" for its efforts to be designated as a ***Bicycle Friendly Community***. This designation was announced by the League of American Bicyclists in the spring of 2010.

Section 4 - Existing Conditions

Regional Connections (pages 40-41)

We recommend that the importance of regional bicycle connections be given greater emphasis in the Plan. This emphasis will further underscore and support the Plan's own statement that "*Full connectivity between populated areas and major attractions, both inside and outside the Region, is important if the bicycle and pedestrian network is to adequately serve residents and visitors.*" This emphasis will also help facilitate and expedite the achievement of Benchmarks 1 and 2 (page 32) and Plan Goal # 1 (page 61). It will help facilitate and expedite TRPA's Compact mandate to "reduce reliance on the private automobile" by establishing important non motorized Regional Connections, allowing more people to access the Tahoe Basin without their private automobiles. Consistent with this mandate and 2010 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Benchmarks and Goals, the Plan should support the use of funds generated for bicycle trails in the Tahoe Region to be used to help support Regional Connections.

We note “for the record” that the Plan identifies Regional Connection corridors as including those on Highway 50, Nevada State Route 207 (Kingsbury Grade) and Nevada State Route 431 (Mt. Rose), connecting Carson City, Carson Valley, and Reno, respectively; also California State Highway 267 (connecting Kings Beach with Northstar, Martis Valley and Truckee) and California State Highway 89 (connecting Tahoe City and the West Shore with Alpine Meadows, Squaw Valley and Truckee).

As documented by summer field visits and observations, the highest concentration of bicyclists traveling on these Regional Connections is on the “shared use” path between Tahoe City and Truckee (page 41). As you are aware, a very popular TCPUD Class 1 trail connects Tahoe City with the entrance to Squaw Valley. Partners who have expressed interest in completing a Class 1 Trail along the remainder of the Highway 89 to the Truckee Legacy Trail network are Placer County and the Town of Truckee.

It is also important to note that the Town of Truckee is working with Caltrans on the project to construct a bicycle and pedestrian tunnel adjacent to the Highway 89 “Mousehole” (Union Pacific Railroad undercrossing). Currently, bicyclists and pedestrians are forced to use the Mousehole to make connections on either side of this short but very narrow and dangerous section of Highway 89. This project will mark an important safe passage for the Regional Connections trail on the Highway 89 corridor between Tahoe City and Truckee.

We urge the TRPA/TMPO and Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) to help support a request for federal funds to construct the Mousehole Bike and Pedestrian tunnel project as a key link in the Regional Connections Bicycle and Pedestrian network.

Section 4 - Existing Conditions Accident Data (page 50)

Paragraph two on this page states ... *“the marked shared-use path crossings have been removed along the SR 89 West Shore Path.”* Please note that recently, thanks to the advocacy of the Tahoe City Public Utility District and Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Agency, Caltrans repainted (striped) all but two of the crossings. We therefore suggest that the wording in this paragraph be changed to read: “Some of the crossings have not been repainted by Caltrans on some areas of SR 89 on the West Shore.”

It is important that the TRPA/TMPO, TTD and others, including community partners, remain vigilant with Caltrans, NDOT, and other jurisdictions with highway and road responsibilities to ensure all appropriate bicycle and pedestrian crossings are striped and signed for the safety of both trail users and the motoring public.

Section 6 - Goals, Policies and Actions

Policies (page 64)

We request that a policy be considered and added (suggestion, new Policy 1.12.1) stating that businesses that allow or participate in new bike and/or pedestrian trail construction be allowed a waiver from parking requirements, whenever possible, particularly if the trail project requires current parking area as part of the trail easement. We believe this proposed policy would be consistent with the Plan's Focused Goal: Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation (page 64) which states: *"Create and maintain bikeable, walkable communities through existing and new development."*

Based on their experiences with this issue, representatives of the Tahoe City Public Utility District and California Tahoe Conservancy would be pleased to meet with you to assist in drafting the specific wording for this new policy.

Section 6, Goals, Policies and Actions

Focus Goal: Maintenance (page 66)

Policy 1.23

Based on concerns regarding funding and liability, we cannot support use of the word "shall" in this policy. We can support use of the phrase "should consider." As referenced in this policy, we reviewed your Figure 12 Map (Shared Use Paths Requiring Winter Maintenance) and found it to be unreasonably extensive. From the Tahoe City PUD's perspective, we respectfully point out that the District does not have control over snow removed others and placed onto its trail network. While we understand and appreciate the Plan's intent, we simply do not have the resources, authority over the snow removal practices of others, nor the support of our legal advisors, to support use of the term "shall" in this policy, even with the modifier "over time."

Appendix A

Design and Maintenance Guidelines (page 17)

The Tahoe City Public Utility District currently has trail etiquette that advises users to "Walk Left/Ride Right." This is inconsistent with the recommendations in the discussion box on this page. The Plan is recommending that pedestrians walk on the right. This difference could be the subject of an extended philosophical discussion; however, TCPUD's trail etiquette is based on what the District has determined works best for its system of multi-use, overcrowded 8' wide trails. Also note that the District requires "Yield to Wheels," asking pedestrians to yield to bikes, rather than asking bikes to yield to pedestrians, as shown on the brown example sign on page 17.

Obvious Typo

If you have not already corrected this typo, please note that Master is misspelled (Mater) at the top of Appendix A, pages 50-54.

Caution - Cumulative Impacts of Regulation and Requirements

We commend you and your team of colleagues for your hard work and dedication to preparing this Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan update. From the establishment of the Plan's Technical Advisory Committee, through presentations, community meetings, and workshops, your stakeholder and community outreach has been exemplary. However, we could not read the complete plan and submit this letter without registering an overall caution and concern about the cumulative impacts of regulations, requirements, and the current project review process on the cost of planning, designing, and constructing bicycle and shared-use trails.

We paused in our reading to focus on Table 14 (page 81) which estimates the cost per mile of the various types of bike route, lane, and trail (path) construction. While public support and use of trails in the Lake Tahoe region is high, we note that the lowest estimate of "path" construction is \$1 million per mile. The total price tag for the cost of the "Proposed System" is over \$422 million (Table 15, page 82). This does not include the cost of maintenance. As noted in the fourth paragraph on page 82, *"Although some of the proposed system will be constructed as part of future development and roadway projects, a substantial portion of the total cost will rely on public funding."* (underlining added for emphasis). We believe that in the years ahead, substantial public funding will be even harder to secure. We strongly recommend that in the process of updating the Lake Tahoe Regional Plan, TRPA and its planning and regulatory partners take a hard look at the cumulative impacts of regulation, requirements, and the project review process on the cost of implementing bicycle route, lane, and trails (paths); also on the cost of implementing sidewalks and related pedestrian infrastructure. The higher the cost of planning and implementing this high priority infrastructure, the less likely it will be that the goals, recommendations, and requirements of the Plan get accomplished.

Also as an outcome of the Regional Plan Update, it is essential that TRPA approve integrated land use, transportation, and housing provisions designed to facilitate achievement of the Plans "performance benchmarks" as set forth on page 32.

Advocacy

The Tahoe City Public Utility District, Truckee North Tahoe TMA, South Shore TMA, and many other organizations and agencies are proud to be partners with TRPA/TMPO in providing leadership and advocacy in support of bicycle trails and related infrastructure. We understand that non motorized mobility is an important key to achieving the region's environmental goals, including the reduction of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG); also that our trail network and systems stimulate important economic, recreation, and public health benefits.

Specifically, as part of this letter, TCPUD, TNT/TMA, and SS/TMA want to highlight our advocacy support for the following:

- Project funding, including new sources of funding for maintenance.
- Bicycle “ferries” (water taxis equipped to carry bikes), including the proposed Bicycle ferry from Camp Richardson to Meeks Bay (page 31).
- The more effective integration of land use, transportation, and housing provisions designed to help achieve Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan goals and benchmarks.
- Increased short-term bicycle parking facilities and infrastructure in commercial, tourist, and residential centers.
- Improved trail system safety through signage, striping, design and other “best practices” as well as increased public and trail user education.
- A greater emphasis on Regional and Multi-modal connections.
- Support for the goal (policy, page 69) that all Basin communities seek recognition as a ***Bicycle Friendly Community***, as determined by the League of American Bicyclists.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of the comments, concerns, recommendations, and commitments for advocacy described in this letter.

Yours in service,

Steve Teshara, Principal
Sustainable Community Advocates

Chair, Truckee-North Tahoe TMA

Chair, South Shore TMA

Member, Board of Directors, Tahoe Transportation District/Tahoe Transportation Commission

Member, Technical Advisory Committee, 2010 Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

cc: Ms. Cindy Gustafson, General Manager, Tahoe City Public Utility District
Mr. Bob Bolton, Director of Parks and Recreation, Tahoe City PUD
Ms. Jan Colyer, Executive Director, Truckee-North Tahoe TMA
Mr. Patrick Wright, Executive Director, California Tahoe Conservancy
Mr. Ron Treabess, Interim Executive Director, North Lake Tahoe Resort Association

Public Outreach Documentation for 2010 Lake Tahoe Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan as of July 26, 2010

Held meetings:

- Jurisdiction and Stakeholder Meeting, Tahoe City, CA, October 2005
- Jurisdiction Meeting, Incline Village, NV, November, 2008
- Lake Tahoe Bicycle Coalition (LTBC) Meeting, Stateline, NV, February, 2009
- South Shore Public Open House, South Lake Tahoe, CA, October 2009
- North Shore Public Open House, Tahoe City, CA, October 2009
- Jurisdiction and Stakeholder Meeting, Stateline, NV, February 2010

Attended meetings:

- Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association/Resort Triangle Transportation Planning Coalition (TNT-TMA/RTTPC) Sept. 3, 2009
- South Shore Transportation Management Association (SSTMA) Sept. 4, 2009 plus subsequent meetings.
- Nevada Stateline to Stateline South Demo Public Scoping Meeting, Sept. 10, 2009
- Bijou School Cultural Heritage Festival Sept. 21, 2009.
- North Lake Tahoe Resort Association Transportation and Infrastructure Meeting, Sept. 28, 2009.
- Pedro Lopez announced and handed out Spanish Survey at the Latino Affairs Commission meeting October 19th, 2009.
- Washoe County Citizen's Advisory Board: Bobb Webb e-mailed the CAB in November, and is also making an announcement at the February 22nd meeting that the draft will be available in March.
- Emilio Vaca, Executive Director of North Shore Family Resource Center

Handed out or posted postcards:

- Incline Village Recreation Center
- Parasol Foundation
- Incline Village Chamber of Commerce
- Rude Brothers in SLT
- Sprouts in SLT
- Alpen Sierra in SLT
- AlpenGlow Sports in Tahoe City
- Tahoe City Farmer's Market
- Shoreline Sports in Stateline
- Tahoe Daily Tribune and Sierra Sun on-line calendars

- BlueGO buses
- Transportation front counter
- TRPA front counter
- Forest Service Front counter
- TACCD and South Tahoe Chamber
- Sports LTD

- Lake Tahoe Community College
- Tahoe Java

E-mail List:

- Mailing list from Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) list, which was originally developed from the Public Participation Plan (PPP) list.
- Bike to Work, School, Play mailing list
- Transportation mailing list
- School District contacts, for forwarding to PTAs
- Contractors Association of Truckee and Tahoe
- TRPA Governing Board, Advisory Planning Committee, Tahoe Transportation District, Tahoe Transportation Commission
- Jan Colyer forwarded to north shore neighborhood associations, fire dept., small lodging (9/15/09).

Website or Internet postings:

- Sierra Sun Blog. (9/15/09)
- Tahoe Tribune and Sierra Sun events calendar (9/15/09)
- laketahoenews.net. (10/7/09)

Radio, newspaper:

- Tahoe Daily Tribune
- Sierra Sun
- Lake Tahoe News
- 30-second spot on KTHO and KRLT commute hour.

Outreach when Draft was available:

- E-mailed mailing list from Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) list, which was originally developed from the Public Participation Plan (PPP) list 6/11/10.
- E-mailed targeted list of people who had contacted me and asked to get more info on Bike Plan 6/11/10.
- Listed Draft availability in Tahoe Tribune and Bonanza, starting 6/11/10. Ran twice in each paper.
- LTBC announced Draft availability in their Tahoe Bike News 7/12/10.
- Posted twice on Facebook page: once on 6/11/10, once on 7/12/10.
- Reminded mailing list from Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) list, which was originally developed from the Public Participation Plan (PPP) list 7/12/10.
- Reminded targeted list of people who had contacted me and asked to get more info on Bike Plan 7/12/10.