Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Response to Comments, Text Changes, and Errata Sheet

Prepared for:

Donaldo Palaroan, PE
County of El Dorado
Department of Transportation
(530) 573-7920
donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

Prepared by:

NCE
Sarah Anderson
Senior Scientist
(775) 329-4955
sanderson@ncenet.com

NCE Project Number: 501.30.25

1.0 Introduction

1.1 CEQA PROCESS

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15073, the Pioneer Trail/US 50 Safety Improvement Project Draft Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration / Initial Environmental Checklist (IS/MND/IEC) was circulated for review for 30 days beginning on August 2, 2021 and ending on September 2, 2021. In response to the publication of the Draft IS/IEC/MND for public review, comments were received by the County of El Dorado (Lead Agency) via email from members of the public and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). Although CEQA does not require written responses to comments on an IS/MND/IEC, this document presents the comments received during the public circulation period and provides responses from the Lead Agency that are incorporated into the IS/MND/IEC. No new significant environmental impacts were identified during this process.

Copies of comments received are included in **Attachment 1**. Responses to comment are provided in three groupings; the first group of public comments (**Section 2.1**) are not related to specific project elements and do not address adequacy of the environmental document; therefore, these comments are documented but formal responses from the County are not provided. The second group of public comments (**Section 2.2**) address specific elements of the project and raise concerns regarding either design, alternatives, and/or analysis; therefore, formal responses have been provided. The third grouping (**Section 3.0**) presents responses to comments received from the TRPA. **Section 4** contains an Errata Sheet documenting new information that pertains to the project since public circulation of the document occurred. As none of the information provided as a response to comment or for inclusion on the errata sheet constitute significant impact or change to the project, recirculation of the IS/MND/IEC will not occur.

2.0 Public Comments on Draft IS/MND/IEC and Response

This chapter includes transcriptions of emails received during the public review period of the Draft IS/MND/IEC. Both the comments and responses are part of the Final IS/MND/IEC.

2.1 PUBLIC COMMENT – GROUP 1

The following public comments relate to providing notice of support or opposition for the project and do not request additional information, clarity, or address specific items or adequacy of the IS/MND/IEC. Some of the comments in this Section 2.1 express unsubstantiated lay opinions about roundabouts and, while not warranting a specific response, responses in Section 2.2 provide the technical and expert analyses supporting the expert conclusion that a roundabout is the ideal configuration for numerous reasons, including safety. Therefore, the County acknowledges and will consider the following comments, but formal responses will not be provided.

2.1.1 John Drum. Received August 5, 2021:

Donaldo, I am in full support of the proposed roundabout at Highway 50 and Pioneer Trail. As an avid cyclist the roundabout at 50 and 89 is a major improvement and far safer for cyclists and pedestrians than before. I also have two sons who ride with friends and both roundabouts would make the entire corridor safer. I have also witnessed countless red light runners while waiting at the existing light while both driving and riding. It has gotten so bad that I now wait and look both directions before proceeding even after the light turns green. I have also witnessed multiple cars slide into the meadow attempting to turn right on to Pioneer Trail from Highway 50 in Meyers during snow and ice conditions. The roundabout would slow these drivers down. I also feel that the current light is what slows traffic to a crawl and people instead blame the new roundabout. Please use the science and engineering to build your case and don't let the naysayers postpone another much needed project. Once this one is done they should be placed though out the entire Pioneer corridor.

2.1.2 Phil Schwartz. Received August 11, 2021:

Hello,

I wanted to send a formal comment in SUPPORT of this project to build a roundabout at the intersection of Pioneer Trail and Highway 50. As a Meyers resident and frequent traveler through this intersection, I feel this will drastically improve traffic flow, as well as safety. I bike through this intersection regularly and it is dangerous as is. In addition, as a pedestrian, the suggested improvements with multiple, clear, crosswalks will be very welcome. Thank you!

2.1.3 Elizabeth Minnix. Received August 11, 2021:

Hi Donaldo,

I am writing to you in HUGE favor of adding a roundabout at Pioneer Trail and US Highway 50. I know many people are intimidated by the idea of a roundabout, but as a part time resident of both Reno and Lake Tahoe, I have seen first hand how quickly people adapt. More than anything though, I have seen how much they have helped traffic issues in both regions when implemented in other areas. Please move forward with putting a roundabout in this location.

2.1.4 Fabian Hannemann. Received August 11, 2021:

Hello Donaldo,

I am writing this comment in favor of the proposed roundabout at the U.S. Highway 50 and Pioneer Trail intersection. Riding a bike or being a pedestrian in Meyers feel awkward, it feels difficult and dangerous to cross Highway 50 in the area. There aren't many places to cross and the ones that exist feel risky, for example when I'm on a bike I end up having to use the main turn lanes and negotiate automobile traffic unless I want to wait for a long time for the pedestrian light on two sides to connect existing bike lanes and trails.

The current intersection is part of the problem and I believe the proposed roundabout design would be a massive improvement to the area. In addition, I think we've seen that the other new roundabout has worked well so I'd love to see one added at the pioneer intersection.

In addition, I think Meyers needs another place where pedestrians can cross the highway near the Holiday Market, the current options are all too far away and most people just try to walk through the never-ending traffic if they need to cross there. It feels like as a pedestrian, you don't matter in the area and especially when the weekend traffic rolls in you can't even safely get across.

Thank you for the thoughtful designs and implementations enhancing the area.

2.1.5 Gary Mendel. Received August 11, 2021:

The circle at 50 and 89 is awesome, lived in Christmas valley since 1985, another roundabout at 50 and pioneer would also help traffic congestion in Myers too . All for it.

2.1.6 Lynn and Dick Ashby. Received August 12, 2021:

Looks great, we love roundabouts for easy traffic flow!!

2.1.7 Debbie Tranchina. Received August 13, 2021:

Hello Sir,

I am writing to you about the proposed round about at pioneer and Hwy 50 near Mont Bleu Casino. I myself travel to Tahoe at different times of the year and I have to go thru this intersection many times.

Please be assured that I am respecting your involvement as I'm not sure how involved you are with this project or what kind of influence you have with this project….but……ARE YOU OR WHOEVER IS WANTING THIS CRAZY!!!!!??????

The traffic lights stop traffic as it should… People need control at this intersection (as they do at all intersection) or they will just lose it with a round about as I have seen at other roundabouts……..an influx of bad driving habits, accidents, broken glass.

I say it would be far better to improve the intersection with more upgraded lights, walkways, crosswalks and a controlled lighting environment. As it is now, it works.

Probably all the intersections in Tahoe could use an upgrade such as this. Even a nice bridge, walkway or other access that is aesthetically appealing would be nice for access to the new convention center.

The traffic is heavy especially during summer and tourist season, ski season as well. What makes it bad, as in most intersections throughout the entire Tahoe area are the drivers. It's not the way streets are planned out, or the walking paths..yes, there are areas that can use improvement.

It's the way people drive that is dangerous. Yes, a round about keeps traffic moving but do you really think people will concede to better driving habits??

This round about will cause more accidents than ever. People out there are rude, reckless, and don't care if they hurt themselves, their cars or other people. I can see it now….they will be going thru that round about, honking at others, they won't stop for other drivers or pedestrians no matter how many yield signs are up, they will continue to speed and Road Rage for sure. If that's what who ever approves this plan wants then they better be prepared to accept the consequences of what happens out there.

Thank you for listening.

2.1.8 Nicholas Angelis. Received August 13, 2021:

Donaldo Palaroan

I would like to voice my opinion in favor of the proposed roundabout project at the intersection of Pioneer Trail. Many studies have found that roundabouts offer a far more efficient means of controlling traffic than stop lights. I hope the city of South Lake Tahoe will be wise enough to add roundabouts at more intersections after Pioneer Trail is completed.

2.2 PUBLIC COMMENT - GROUP 2

The following comments received from the public address specific elements of the project and raise concerns regarding design, alternatives, analysis, or request clarity on project description; therefore, formal responses are provided.

2.2.1 Alastair Watson. Received August 2, 2021:

I am writing to oppose the building of a roundabout at pioneer and US 50. I see the plans to allow flow to continue out of town with a channeled divider. But without a traffic signal going into town on the 50 it will be impossible to turn left from pioneer onto 50.

A lot of people use pioneer and this will become heavily backed up especially at busy times and will force traffic through elks club drive and move the problem a half mile further down the road where traffic will try and turn left from elks club onto 50 and accidents will increase through impatience as there is no signal there. We already saw an horrendous accident a few years ago with a tanker truck and an impatient driver in a Prius.

Please leave the current situation as is or keep the signal to allow left turns from pioneer.

Response 1: Before responding to this specific comment, the County would like to briefly introduce one of the technical documents in the IS/MND/IEC that will support several of the County's responses. Caltrans requires that every intersection on roads in their jurisdiction include an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE). This is a technical analysis that compares the implementation of various types of intersection control (e.g., traffic signal, roundabout, stop sign, etc.) against various criteria, with the purpose of finding the optimal intersection control for a given intersection. This project's ICE was prepared by GHD, Inc. and is attached to the IS/MND/IEC as Appendix A. The ICE was approved by Caltrans on February 11, 2020.

When motorists on westbound Pioneer Trail approach the intersection and wish to turn left onto westbound U.S. 50, they will be able to enter the roundabout without stopping if there is no other motorist in the roundabout approaching them from the left. The commenter appears to be stating that there will never be a gap inside the roundabout that will allow westbound Pioneer Trail traffic to enter the roundabout so that they may get on westbound U.S. 50. This is not the case. Traffic data contained in Figure 3.1 of Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation (GHD, 2020) shows that on Fridays during peak summer traffic conditions, 49.6% of eastbound U.S. 50 traffic will turn right onto Pioneer Trail. Figure 3.1 also shows that on Sundays during peak summer traffic conditions, 34.8% of eastbound U.S. 50 traffic will turn right onto Pioneer Trail. Each of these numerous turns from

eastbound U.S. 50 onto eastbound Pioneer Trail will create a gap inside the roundabout that will allow westbound Pioneer Trail traffic to enter the roundabout and get onto westbound U.S. 50. This will preclude the commenter's concerns that "it will be impossible to turn left from Pioneer onto 50" and that Elks Club Drive and any other ancillary roads will be overloaded with traffic.

2.2.2 Carol Nageotte. Received August 3, 2021:

I think it is a stupid idea. The light is fine. On busy weekends the roundabout will get jammed up, especially with drivers who don't know how to drive that configuration. I think it will be dangerous for bikers and pedestrians as the traffic won't let them in. The drivers from Pioneer Trail will never get to get in the roundabout. The merging traffic from Hwy. 50 going west will get jammed up and there will be more accidents with angry drivers who won't yield.

Maybe an alternating green blink like on many on-ramps would be more equitable. That way everyone gets a turn.

Response 2: The County's roundabout design consultant is GHD. GHD and their staff are experts at designing roundabouts and have designed dozens of roundabouts in California. GHD's analysis in Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation (GHD, 2020) shows that the roundabout will provide better throughput, shorter intersection delay times, and improved level of service when compared to either the no build alternative or the signal alternative. This can be best seen by comparing Tables 3.1, 4.1, and 4.2 in Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation (GHD, 2020)

Table 1.1 Design Hourly Intersection Traffic Operations
No Build Conditions – Summer Weekend

	Friday			Sunday		
	Delay	LOS	Queue	Delay	LOS	Queue
North/Eastbound US 50	62.5	E	1,118	103.6	F	1,875
South/Westbound US 50	15.1	B	279	20.1	C	950
West/Southbound Pioneer Trail	45.6	D	361	66.8	E	1,025
Overall	**47.8**	**D**	**-**	**68.0**	**E**	**-**

Note: Analysis is based on the methodology and procedures in the HCM. Average delay is reported in seconds per vehicle. For signalized intersections, LOS is based on the average control delay for all approaches. Queue is reported in feet for the 95th percentile.

Table 1.2 Design Hourly Intersection Traffic Operations Roundabout Conditions – Summer Weekend

	Friday			Sunday		
	Delay	LOS	Queue	Delay	LOS	Queue
North/Eastbound US 50	3.9	A	76	4.0	A	100
South/Westbound US 50	4.9	A	24	5.0	A	54
West/Southbound Pioneer Trail	12.0	B	43	16.6	B	152
Overall LOS	**5.4**	**A**	**-**	**7.2**	**A**	**-**

Note: Analysis is based on the methodology and procedures in the HCM. Average delay is reported in seconds per vehicle. For roundabout intersections, LOS is based on the average control delay for all approaches. Queue is reported in feet for the 95th percentile.

Table 1.3 Design Hourly Intersection Traffic Operations – Modified Traffic Signal Alternative – Summer Weekend

	Friday			Sunday		
	Delay	LOS	Queue	Delay	LOS	Queue
North/Eastbound US 50	12.4	B	208	16.5	B	491
South/Westbound US 50	12.3	B	218	17.7	B	331
West/Southbound Pioneer Trail	23.0	C	173	32.0	C	311
Overall LOS	**14.0**	**B**	**-**	**20.5**	**C**	**-**

Note: Analysis is based on the methodology and procedures in the HCM. Average delay is reported in seconds per vehicle. For signalized intersections, LOS is based on the average control delay for all approaches. Queue is reported in feet for the 95th percentile.

The roundabout is designed to handle large traffic volumes such as those that are seen on typical Fridays and Sundays during summer months. The roundabout is not designed to accommodate gridlock or near-gridlock conditions that can occur infrequently on late afternoons and early evenings Fridays and especially on Sunday afternoons between Memorial Day and Labor Day and between Christmas and March 30. When these gridlock or near-gridlock conditions occur, neither a roundabout nor a signal will make traffic flow any better or any worse because the gridlock conditions are not caused by and cannot be relieved by an individual roundabout or intersection. Generally, roadways and intersections are designed for peak traffic volumes. Designing to accommodate infrequent gridlock conditions would result in oversized infrastructure with greater environmental impacts.

Construction of the roundabout will provide improved safety, accessibility, and connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists at this intersection. The existing intersection has only one crosswalk on US 50 on the north side of the intersection as shown on Figure 3 in the Draft IS/MND/IEC. All other pedestrian movements are

prohibited. The intersection does not have sidewalks or pedestrian ramps. While the existing intersection has a bicycle lane along westbound US 50, the bicycle lanes in both directions of Pioneer Trail do not extend into the intersection. Section 4.1 of Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation (GHD, 2020) describes some of the improvements that the roundabout will provide to cyclists and pedestrians. These improvements will include the following:

- Bicycle lanes on approaches to the roundabout, including bicycle connectivity to all existing adjacent Class 1 pathways
- Removal and replacement of existing shared-use path to accommodate the new intersection
- New shared-use paths to connect to existing paths
- Removal and replacement of existing signage as needed
- Crosswalks across all three legs of the new intersection

All pedestrian facilities will comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act accessibility requirements. All crossings would be marked with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)-compliant crosswalk markings and signing.

The roundabout alternative uses roadway geometrics to force motorists to reduce speed before they reach the new pedestrian/bike crossing areas, which enhances safety for these users. Crosswalks would be provided on all three legs and tie into the proposed extension of a Class I (off-street) bike path (the intersection's existing configuration includes a crosswalk over only one of the three legs). The roundabout would be designed with a splitter island on each approach leg, which provides a refuge area for pedestrians in the crosswalk. Conflict points for pedestrians versus motorists would be significantly lower compared to a signalized intersection, since pedestrians only have to cross one direction of traffic at a time in a roundabout.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has identified modern roundabouts as a "Proven Safety Countermeasure." Roundabouts reduce fatal and injury collisions by 78% compared to signalized intersection (The Highway Safety Manual, American Association of State Highway Transportation Professionals, Washington, D.C., (2010).

Please refer to Response 1 for information related to the ability of westbound Pioneer Trail traffic to enter the roundabout and proceed to westbound U.S. 50.

2.2.3 John Poppe. Received August 11, 2021:

Hello

My comments center around snow removal and ice control. In my observations of mountain traffic circles I have come to the conclusion lesion [sic] that designers are perhaps not speaking with seasoned maintenance supervisors. Maintenance input is

essential to assist in the development of an efficient, safe and easy to care for project.

Some problems that can occur by not taking into consideration maintenance input.

1. Planting of trees that will eventually grow to shade the circle. This shade in the winter will create ice and demand more work and deicing agents to mitigate. Ice in the circle will direct inexperienced drivers to what ever is outside the circle. Keep the circles sunny all year around, this may even mean removing trees in the RW on the outside of the circle

2. Placing lighting and rigid guide markers on the outside of the circle creates a higher maintenance frequency as cars drift into these devices especially in the winter

3. Creating a circle too tight inhibits the proper and expeditious removal of snow. Additionally snow storage areas need to be considered so there is room in heavy storms to maintain a traffic flow in the circle and so blowers can easily remove the stored snow.

The inside of the circle requires a paved area that allows for long truck trailer combinations to cheat into this inner paved area. If this inner circle area is merely landscaped then maintenance has a continual problem if repairing any damage these trailers may make.

Response 3: Trees will be removed from the immediate area around the project per Tahoe Regional Planning Agency requirements to allow for construction and minimize shade on the roadway. Input on lighting, markers, maintenance and sizing of the roundabout was obtained from Caltrans maintenance staff through the Caltrans project management process wherein Caltrans circulates preliminary plans through its functional units for analysis and comment by those units. County engineering staff has consulted County maintenance staff during the environmental and preliminary design stages of this project. County engineering staff will continue to engage County and Caltrans maintenance staff as the project advances through the design stage to ensure the roundabout meets operational requirements. Caltrans maintenance staff and County maintenance staff are familiar with snow removal operations for Tahoe basin roundabouts with limited storage. Proposed lane sizes and splitter islands allow for adequate snow storage and efficient snow removal.

2.2.4 John Dillis. Received August 11, 2021:

Sir,

Please reconsider putting in a roundabout at the intersections of Highway 50 and Pioneer Trail. Signal lights help control traffic better than a "yield" sign or a

roundabout. Getting from Pioneer Trail to go West on 50 will become a nightmare - just getting into the roundabout.

Consider making the traffic lights a bit longer, timewise, so more traffic can move quickly to another area.

I am no civil engineer, but roundabouts slow everything down (which is good in some ways) but they back up traffic big time.

Response 4: Please refer to Responses 1 and 2 above for information related to safety and circulation improvements realized by constructing the roundabout alternative.

2.2.5 Richard DeVries. Received August 11, 2021:

No, No, No. Bad idea. On heavy weekends, autos entering SLT will block autos on Pioneer trail from entering round about to go west. More traffic chaos. No No No.

Response 5: Please refer to Response 1 for information related to the ability of westbound Pioneer Trail traffic to enter the roundabout and proceed to westbound U.S. 50.

2.2.6 Cody Win. Received August 11, 2021:

- Will an updated rendering be produced to reflect what is delineated in the Public Draft of the improvement project? Current rendering does not show the median at the eastern portion of the intersection where through traffic will be directed on hwy 50 heading south.

- Will there be signage at medians to direct traffic accordingly through or within roundabout? Existing roundabout at Meyers sees misdirected traffic that defeats its. efficacy.

- What other data exists to support the proposed roundabout as far as traffic flow? Will it become more difficult for cross car and bike traffic turning onto hwy 50?

Response 6: The renderings of the roundabout provided within the Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation (GHD, 2020) reflect the proposed baseline design. Updated renderings of the roundabout may be produced at a later stage of the project; however, the overall design would not change significantly from what has been provided for public review as this is the project alternative selected for implementation.

There will be new signage placed per the Caltrans Highway Design Manual standards in effect at the time of final project design to assist in navigating the approach to the roundabout and through the roundabout. Signage will also be consistent with TRPA Code Section 66.2.4B, which sets forth design standards for highway fixtures within scenic highway corridors.

Please refer to Responses 1 and 2 above for information related to safety and circulation improvements realized by constructing the roundabout alternative. Response 2 contains information related to how safety will be improved for pedestrians and cyclists once the roundabout is operational.

2.2.7 Jennifer Fortune. Received August 11, 2021:

The new round about in Meyers hasn't been tested in winter yet so not sure how effective it is/ we haven't had a big winter since it was installed. The new one at pioneer trail seems like a bad idea since the majority of traffic comes from Echo Summit. How would someone that lives off of Pioneer Trail let's say Mandan Drive ever get a chance to turn onto highway 50? Plus how would pedestrians ever get across this intersection. No round about here!!!!

Response 7: Please refer to Response 1 for information related to the ability of westbound Pioneer Trail traffic to enter the roundabout and proceed to westbound U.S. 50. Please refer to Response 2 for information related to how the proposed project will improve pedestrian safety at the intersection.

2.2.8 Anita Cota. Received August 11, 2021:

Dear Mr. Palaroan,

Our home is located in Pebble Beach Road, we have a choice of using Pioneer Trail or Highway 50 to obtain access to any area within South Lake Tahoe as well as when we take our bikes out. The roundabout does nothing but make every route more dangerous. There is currently not a bike lane on Pioneer Trail nor is there a place to cross for pedestrians or bicycles across from the Lake Tahoe Golf Course to the bicycle path. The current stop light needs to be updated and a four way cross walk added to it. If a roundabout is installed there will be constant backups on both Pioneer Trail and Highway 50, with no break in traffic on Highway 50, vehicles departing from the golf course and our neighborhood including those individuals who use Elks Club Road as a bypass from Pioneer to Highway 50 will be affected. Are you planning on putting in another signal at Elks Club Road? I do not believe this plan was completely thought out. With the current signal in place, yes traffic backs up at both Pioneer and 50 during peak times but the signal does provide a break for bikes, vehicles and pedestrians to cross or gain access to Highway 50.

Both my husband and I completely disagree with a roundabout going in between Pioneer and 50.

Response 8: Please refer to Response 2 above for information related to safety and circulation improvements realized by constructing the roundabout alternative. No traffic signal is planned for Elks Club Drive and Elks Club Drive is not a part of this project.

The project traffic design volume in Figure 3.1 of Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation (GHD, 2020) indicates a volume of 595 vehicles per hour on eastbound U.S. 50 during the Friday peak traffic period. This is equal to about 10 vehicles per minute, which is a vehicle every 6 seconds. This is an average number, so sometimes the volume will be greater (such as during infrequent gridlock conditions), and under most circumstances it will be lower given the limited duration of peak volumes, but according to Kamesh Vedula (registered Professional Engineer and registered Traffic Engineer with GHD), an average of one vehicle every 6 seconds will allow for traffic on side streets to turn left on to U.S. 50.

2.2.9 David Durst. Received August 11, 2021:

I believe a roundabout at this location given the heavy congestion at peak times will make for a mess under heavy traffic flow times in the winter and summer.

People are already taking short cuts through Meyers neighborhoods to beat this light. So I think a roundabout at this location cause huge traffic problems during peak times of the year.

During winter months, this area backs up due to traffic flow over the summit, this change will not change this, but give drivers a chance to pack the roundabout, with greater opportunity for collisions.

My vote is No.

Response 9: Please refer to Response 2 above for information related to safety and circulation improvements realized by constructing the roundabout alternative.

2.2.10 Carla Yant. Received August 11, 2021:

Dear Mr. Palaroan,

As a resident in the Meyers area next to the Lake Tahoe Golf Course between County Club Dr. and Arapaho I must access Hwy. 50 to either go into town towards the Y or down Pioneer Trail. I depend on the stop light to give me a break in traffic when going north to the Y. I purposefully bought a 6 cylinder high performance car so I could step on the accelerator and get up to speed within 5 seconds to take advantage of the already tight opportunities to enter traffic. Around about is bound to lead to no gaps as well as causing a 3-way clusterfuck during high demand exodus' out of town and highway closures. I can foresee backed up traffic to the golf course, and beyond, going south and no breaks in the traffic to get onto north bound Hwy. 50. I can see the frustrations rise as we can't get out of the neighborhood!

I understand the cost of traffic light maintenance is an issue but these "improvements" to traffic flow will only serve to frustrate the residents who are

going to have to put up with poor access and danger of trying to get out of our neighborhoods, and being neighborhood-bound as traffic backs up all around.

I hope this isn't another already predetermined project and my real-life opinion really matters. Quality of life in Tahoe is diminishing by the year, and this will be yet another contributing factor.

Thank you for giving this some thought.

Response 10: Please refer to Responses 1 and 2 above for information related to safety and circulation improvements realized by constructing the roundabout alternative.

Please refer to Response 8 above for information related to the ability of side street traffic to access U.S. 50 after the proposed roundabout has been constructed.

2.2.11 Sherie Brubaker. Received August 11, 2021:

Hello Mr. Palaroan.

I am Totally AGAINST a round about at Hwy 50 and Pioneer Trail in South Lake Tahoe.

Why? because the round about nearby at Hwy50 and Hwy 89 has slowed traffic coming into the basin.

I live off North Upper truckee Road in SLT, and the back UP of the traffic because of the new round about at Hwy 50 and Hwy 89.

It takes me longer to go to town since the round about was installed.

a 2nd round about in the same area will make the traffic even slower.

I am AGAINST the roundabout.

thank you

Response 11: Please refer to Response 2 above for information related to safety and circulation improvements realized by constructing the roundabout alternative.

2.2.12 David Petersen. Received August 12, 2021:

My wife and I favor the project.

The challenge you face is during heavy hwy 50 traffic times (either way), WB Pioneer will have few chances to break in.(This is the same problem with the 89 roundabout.) There should be ways to design for this, though. Also, a larger diameter than the 89 roundabout would be good. It's just a little tough with a trailer as it is. And some public art in the center of both would be nice.

We hope this project goes forward!

Response 12: Please refer to Response 1 for information related to the ability of westbound Pioneer Trail traffic to enter the roundabout and proceed to westbound U.S. 50. Input on sizing of the roundabout was obtained from Caltrans engineering staff and County engineering staff during the environmental stage of this project. The final geometrics of the roundabout will be determined as the design is finalized. The final design will include a mountable truck apron enabling longer vehicles to maneuver through the roundabout safely.

2.2.1 David Joyce. Received August 12, 2021:

Roundabouts are dangerous and this idea is an unnecessary expense in a time when public safety is paramount.

Please do not remove safe traffic lights and replace them with an idea commonly used in Europe because they just don't have the ability to use traffic lights.

This is a huge step backward.

Unsafe in Detroit

Newark, England

Poland

Indiana Experimental Roundabout

I hope your mind isn't made up and that you will share this with those making these decisions. My opinion, based on facts not feelings, is that roundabouts (traffic circles) are dangerous and a waste of taxpayer's money.

Response 13: Please refer to Responses 1 and 2 above for information related to safety and circulation improvements realized by constructing the roundabout alternative.

2.2.2 Jay Ngini. Received August 12, 2021:

Not a good idea... much too much traffic.. the intersection does not have four corners.. it is a "T"...need to reduce traffic on Pioneer... this had been a path for the residence of the area.. now it has become a mini 'highway'.. the speed limit is not enforced.. suggestion... put up more controlled stops; do not make it inviting to all..yes I realize that is restrictive.. but the traffic pattern for residence is more than alarming.

Response 14: Please refer to Response 2 above for information related to safety and circulation improvements realized by constructing the roundabout alternative.

2.2.3 George Wash. Received August 12, 2021:

I George Wash, a resident of Eldorado county for almost 50 years is against this round about. There will still be back up with no windows to enter traffic between

the round about and the Y , most noticeable around Golf course & Elks club. They already drive this area of 50 to fast.

Round a bouts can be good, I used plenty as I traveled England, but not in this case…

Thanks for taking our feed back.

Response 15: Please refer to Response 8 above for information related to the ability of side street traffic to access U.S. 50 after the proposed roundabout has been constructed.

2.2.4 Sarah Miller. Received August 12, 2021:

placer county created even greater bottlenecks in kings beach by placing crosswalks too close to the roundabouts. A driver doesn't have enough time to stop when pedestrians think they are safe to cross. Pls take notice!

Response 16: Please refer to Response 2 above for information related to safety and circulation improvements realized by constructing the roundabout alternative.

2.2.5 Donna Mclelland. Received August 12, 2021:

If traffic is at a stand still at the new roundabout the only thing that lets traffic get into Hwy 50 from Pioneer Trail is the light and if you have ever been at that signal on a Sunday you would see the problem !!!!!!!

Response 17: Please refer to Response 1 for information related to the ability of westbound Pioneer Trail traffic to enter the roundabout and proceed to westbound U.S. 50.

2.2.6 Chris Baker. Received August 15, 2021:

I am writing to discourage you from putting in a round-a-bout at hwy 50 and pioneer trail. The light there gives all residents living off of country club drive, meadowvale, elks club, and sawmill rd the opportunity to get out onto hwy 50. Around-a-bout will slow traffic, and there will be a never-ending stream of cars, driving at 55 mph! We will not be able to squeeze into traffic at that speed. The only other possibility would be to change the speed limit from pioneer to the airport from 55, to 40mph. That may give us a better chance of merging. Please reconsider this. The round-a-bout at hwy 50 and 89 works great, but there was never a light there which caused terrible headaches for drivers. Also, at that intersection, the speed is 40mph.

Response 18: Please refer to Response 8 above for information related to the ability of side street traffic to access U.S. 50 after the proposed roundabout has been constructed.

2.2.7 Dave Carneggie. Received August 15, 2021:

As a resident in Christmas Valley (St Nick Way) I am a strong supporter of roundabouts, especially the one at highway 50and highway 89s. However, I see some problems with the one proposed at Pioneer and highway 50, particularly on Friday afternoons and the Sunday exodus.

On Fridays, when the traffic is bumper to bumper on highway 50 east bound, it will be very difficult for traffic on Pioneer trail to make the left turn onto highway 50 westbound, because so few cars on highway 50 westbound will be making a left turn onto Pioneer to interrupt the eastbound highway 50 traffic flow. Similarly, on Sundays when the highway 50 westbound traffic is bumper to bumper, it will be difficult for westbound highway 50 traffic to flow through the roundabout because the Pioneer trail traffic entering the roundabout to head westward out of town will have priority, thus impeding the traffic flow on highway 50 westbound. This latter situation is of course an advantage for us Christmas Valley residence trying to return home via Pioneer Trail on a Sunday morning.

Why isn't the proposed design more similar to the roundabout at highway 50 and 89S? Seems like a separate outbound lane on highway 50 for westbound traffic would help???

Response 19: Please refer to Response 1 for information related to the ability of westbound Pioneer Trail traffic to enter the roundabout and proceed to westbound U.S. 50.

The proposed roundabout includes a westbound U.S. 50 bypass lane that will allow westbound U.S. 50 traffic to avoid entering the roundabout, very similar to the westbound U.S. 50 bypass lane at the roundabout at the intersection of U.S. 50 and CA 89. Please see Figure 4.1 of Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation (GHD, 2020). Thus, westbound traffic on Pioneer Trail will not conflict with westbound traffic on U.S. 50 inside the roundabout.

2.2.8 Les Wright,. Received August 16, 2021:

Aloha,

The round about at Pioneer Trail is overdue.

Thanks for planning this. One question:

Your depiction shows only one lane leaving SLT going into the circle.

Shouldn't there be another lane for traffic to go straight through like you have on the other round about heading to Hope Valley and Xmas Valley?

Keep building Round About's.

Response 20: The proposed roundabout includes a westbound U.S. 50 bypass lane that will allow westbound U.S. 50 traffic to avoid entering the roundabout, very similar to the westbound U.S. 50 bypass lane at the roundabout at the intersection of U.S. 50 and CA 89. Please see Figure 4.1 of Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation (GHD, 2020).

2.2.9 Response Applicable to All Group 1 and Group 2 Public Comments:

Overall, while some commenters express opinions about roundabouts, none of the opinions are based on technical data or expertise. In advancing this project, County engineers and consultants are relying on their expert training and analysis and find that lay opinions, including but not limited to opinions stating that a roundabout is not the ideal safety or operational configuration for this project are unsubstantiated and lack a technical and factual basis.

3.0 Group 3 - Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Comments

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The following comments to the Draft IS/MND/IEC were provided by TRPA. Some comments requested minor edits and/or inclusions to the Draft IS/MND/IEC. Edits made have been kept in 'track-changes' and will be provided as part of the Final IS/MND/IEC. New information pertaining to the project is included in Section 4.0- 'Errata Sheet'

3.1.1 TRPA, received 9/2/2021:

General: Please reference the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist. This document contains new impact assessments, data, and transportation modeling revised since the 2017 RTP.

Response 1*:* Page 143 of the Draft IS/MND/IEC references the 2020 Draft Regional Transportation Plan. The reference has been updated to reflect the final adopted 2020 Final Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

References of the 2017 RTP have been replaced throughout the document with the 2020 Final RTP (TRPA 2021). Changes can be seen in 'track-changes' in the Final IS/MND/IEC. The 2020 Final RTP was also used to update the analysis within Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation Report; none of the model inputs or outputs (results) changed as a result of this update. The updated Appendix A is included with the Final IS/MND/IEC.

3.1.2 TRPA, received 9/2/2021:

Project Description/Executive Summary:

a. *Clarify how the County determined the capacity of the roundabout and whether each leg needs a by-pass lane. We suggest it be designed and built to minimize disturbance and vegetation removal.*

Response 2a*:* The project intersection was analyzed using the procedures and methodologies in the *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)* (Transportation Research Board, 2016). The methodology for the roundabout alternative is based on the 6th edition of the HCM which draws from an FHWA report on capacity modeling for roundabouts. Traffic operations are measured through "Level of Service" (LOS), a qualitative metric for traffic conditions. LOS standards for the project are set by Caltrans, TRPA, and El Dorado County. The proposed roundabout as designed includes an eastbound bypass lane and a westbound free right turn lane and will operate at an acceptable LOS. Therefore, no additional bypass lanes are warranted.

Reference *Appendix J, Traffic Operations Analysis Report* and *Appendix A Intersection Control Evaluation Report*.

The roundabout has been designed to the minimum size possible and thereby minimize the area of disturbance and vegetation removal while accomplishing project objectives. The amount of vegetation removed will also be driven by safety concerns related to sight distance, the amount of wintertime shade that will exacerbate icy road conditions, and proximity of vegetation to the road that might inhibit vehicular evacuation during a wildfire.

b. Clarify the status of private property acquisitions and easements necessary for the project.

Response 2b*:* The project would require right-of-way (ROW) acquisition and/or easements from four parcels adjacent to the intersection. Three of the parcels are owned by the California Tahoe Conservancy (CTC). The parcel number and type, size, and purpose of easement are as follows:

- APN 034-401-025 (private owner): A temporary easement of 1,300 SF is required to construct grading and revegetation.
- APN 034-270-055 (CTC): A partial ROW take of 434 square feet (SF) is required to construct and maintain roadway, curb and gutter, landscaping, and lighting. A permanent easement of 5,202 SF is required to construct and maintain water quality treatment basin improvements. A temporary easement of 4,247 SF is required to construct grading, revegetation, and landscaping.
- APN 034-270-041 (CTC): A partial ROW take of 1,362 SF is required to construct and maintain roadway, curb and gutter, landscaping, and lighting. A temporary easement of 6,340 SF is required to construct grading, revegetation, and landscaping and to remove trees and existing shared-use path.
- APN 034-270-056 (CTC): A temporary easement of 245 SF is required to construct grading, revegetation, and landscaping and to remove trees and the existing shared-use path.

c. The project description should describe the number and size of all live and dead trees anticipated to be removed.

Response 2c: Initial tree removal estimates provided in the Project Description were developed using a combination of field survey counts and estimates using aerial imagery. Based on this initial survey effort, it was estimated approximately 160 trees would need to be removed to construct the project.

Exact tree count (and sizes) required for removal to implement the project is unknown at this time. Because final permit review and approvals have not occurred, it cannot be determined at this time if proposed tree removal would be considered substantial per TRPA Code. Under TRPA Code subparagraph 61.1.8, "substantial tree removal" is defined as "activities on project areas of three acres or more and proposing the removal of more than 100 live trees 14 inches dbh or larger, or proposing tree removal that as determined by TRPA after a joint inspection with appropriate state or federal Forestry staff does not meet the minimum acceptable stocking standards set forth in subparagraph 61.1.6.H." To prevent significant impacts from occurring, the Draft IS/MND/IEC proposes Mitigation Measure FR-1 in Section 4.2.4 to determine if the project qualifies as substantial removal once the quantity of trees to be removed is determined and ensure the project area meets the minimum stocking standards:

> **Mitigation Measure FR-1: Tree Removal Assessment**. Prior to final design development, the County shall coordinate with TRPA to determine if proposed tree removal qualifies as substantial removal. Should TRPA determine substantial removal would occur, as set forth in TRPA Code subparagraph 61.1.8, the County shall submit a harvest/tree removal plan prepared by a qualified forester and develop a conservation plan with area to be reforested/protected as required by TRPA. The plans, as approved by TRPA, shall become a part of the project and prescriptions contained in the plan shall be conditions of approval.

To further assist TRPA with project review and consistency determination with TRPA Code, an updated tree survey with removal amounts will be provided to TRPA as part of project mitigation. The following mitigation measure will be added to Sections 4.2.2 d) and 4.4.4 c):

> **Mitigation Measure FR-2: Provide Final Tree Removal Amounts with Sizes to TRPA.** As part of permit submittal, the County will conduct a tree survey to determine total number of trees to be removed, including their sizes. Results of tree survey will be provided to TRPA. Should TRPA determine substantial removal would occur, as set forth in TRPA Code subparagraph 61.1.8, the County shall submit a harvest/tree removal plan prepared by a qualified forester and develop a conservation plan with area to be reforested/protected as required by TRPA. The plans, as approved by TRPA, shall become a part of the project and prescriptions contained in the plan shall be conditions of approval.

Additionally, the following Section 4.4.4 question (e) (page 69 and 70) was rewritten for clarity of how the project would comply with TRPA Code pertaining to tree removal and tree preservation policy, integrating the additional mitigation

measure FR-2 and requirement to comply with all other TRPA tree removal and protection policies:

(e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to CEQA items (c) and (d) above in Section 4.2 – Agricultural and Forestry Resources. The County will implement Mitigation Measures FR-1 and FR-2 to ensure the project complies with TRPA Code pertaining to tree removal. These measures specify the County must provide the TRPA with final tree removal amounts (and sizes) to determine if substantial removal will occur per TRPA Code (61.1.8), and if so, follow TRPA guidelines to submit a harvest/tree removal plan and develop a conservation/reforestation plan consistent with TRPA Code.

The project is additionally required to comply with all other TRPA ordinances pertaining to tree removal and protection including Section 61.1.5. - General Tree Removal Standards, Section 61.1.6. - Minimum Standards for Tree Removal, and Chapter 61.3 – Vegetation Protection and Management. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources, including for tree preservation.

3.1.3 TRPA, received 9/2/2021:

Aesthetics:

a. *The project area is located within a transition scenic corridor and required to comply with design standards pursuant to section 66.2.4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. This includes undergrounding of new lines and aesthetics of highway fixtures. Please describe how the project will be consistent with these standards.*

Response 3a: New electrical and communication lines would be placed underground and aesthetics of highway fixtures would be in conformance with TRPA and Caltrans design standards. A 'Regulatory Setting' section (Section 4.1.1) has been added to the Draft IS/MND/IEC that outlines the design standards for scenic corridors that apply to the project. Additionally, compliance with design standards of TRPA Code Section 66.2.4 has been added to the Draft IS/MND/IEC page 37, questions a) and b).

b. *It would be helpful if the County provided visual simulations of the project so that the public can better understand the visual impact of vegetation removal.*

Response 3b: Comment noted. Additional renderings of the proposed roundabout may be developed at a later stage of project design.

c. *Please describe how lighting from the project will be screened to reduce impacts on neighboring properties. Will tree removal prevent screening from light and glare? Examples of light fixtures and measures used to prevent light impacts should be included in the IS/IEC.*

Response 3c: As presented in IS/MND/IEC Section 3.4.5 – Lighting, the project proposes to remove and replace the existing intersection and pedestrian lighting in conformance with Caltrans Highway Design Manual (Caltrans 2019) and TRPA standards. At a minimum, lighting would be provided at the vehicle-vehicle conflict points at the intersection, vehicle-pedestrian conflict points at the crosswalks, and at the nose of each splitter island. Existing lighting at the intersection is approximately 33 to 34 feet in height; new lighting to be installed would be approximately 39.5 feet in height, with a 15-foot mast arm; deviation from existing conditions would be minimal.

Tree removal will not prevent screening from light and glare as all lighting would be downcast lighting to help protect the night sky, minimize light spill-over and reduce impacts on neighboring properties. The lighting design process will evaluate the need, location, and spacing of each light pole with consideration of safety and to limit direct light on public views outside of the highway footprint.

3.1.4 TRPA, received 9/2/2021:

Air Quality: *Reference all questions in the Air Quality section of the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist template, regardless of whether any impacts are anticipated. This will ensure that the appropriate findings can be made for the project.*

Response 4: IS/MND/IEC Section 4.3.1 – TRPA Checklist Air Quality (page 58), has been revised to add TRPA checklist questions 2c) and 2d):

2c) Would the proposed project result in objectional odors?	No	Refer to discussion of CEQA item d). Dust and emission reduction BMPs as discussed in Section 3.5.1 would minimize the impact to ambient odors of the natural area during construction. Once the project is complete, it would not generate objectionable odors.
2d) Would the proposed project result in Alteration of air	No	Refer to discussion of CEQA item b). The project is a transportation project that would have no impact to air movement, moisture, or temperature. For

movement, moisture or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?		impacts to climate, operational and cumulative emissions (including MSAT) are anticipated to be reduced as a result of implementing the project.

3.1.5 TRPA, received 9/2/2021:

Biological Resources: This section includes an incorrect TRPA code citation regarding EIP exception for tree removal (Pg. 68). Please reference Code Section 61.3.7.A.6 and clarify that the 24-inch diameter at breast heigh (dbh) standard would apply as this area is designated eastside forest type. All other relevant sections in the code regarding tree removal and protection should also be referenced.

Response 5: Page 69 of the Draft IS/MND/IEC referenced Code Section 61.1.4.A.7. This section has been corrected to reference Code Section 61.3.7.A.6 – EIP Projects, which states "Trees larger than 30 inches dbh in the westside forest types and larger than 24 inches dbh in eastside forest types may be removed when it is demonstrated that the removal is necessary for the activity." Since the project is within an eastside forest type, this standard would apply.

The reference has also been corrected for IS/MND/IEC section 4.2.4 d) (page 45) to state that an approximated 15 trees 24-inches or larger dbh are required for removal to construct the roundabout.

3.1.6 TRPA, received 9/2/2021:

Transportation: Replace all references to the 2010 Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan with the more recent Active Transportation Plan.

Response 6a: References to the 2010 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan have been replaced with the following (pg. 142):

"The 2018 Active Transportation Plan (formerly Bike and Pedestrian Plan) is a technical update prepared to inform the 2020 Final RTP. The Active Transportation Plan aims at improving transportation options for bicyclists and pedestrians as one of the most effective ways to conserve and restore Lake Tahoe's environment, revitalize the economy, enhance recreation opportunities, and improve public health. The plan outlines challenges and solutions to existing mobility issues and identifies priority projects to be implemented (TRPA 2018)."

a. *Please also include reference to the Meyers Area Plan and the Safety Strategy.*

Response 6b: Reference to the Meyers Area Plan goals and policies relating to the project have been added to the IS/MND/IEC (page 143):

"The Meyers Area Plan contains goals and policies aimed at redeveloping the transportation system within Meyers to achieve complete streets, reduce reliance on the private automobile, improve circulation and provide opportunities to experience Meyers as a pedestrian or cyclist. One goal of the Meyers Area Plan calls to identify opportunities to reduce traffic speeds through Meyers without adversely affecting air quality, considering using right-of-way improvements and traffic controls to achieve the objective. Additional goals of the Area Plan include providing linkages for pedestrians and cyclists through the Area Plan by providing safe, functional pathways. Finally, the Area Plan identifies the need for intersection improvement at Pioneer Trail/US 50 intersection as a means to implement other Area Plan policies, along with need to integrate calming measures to reduce traffic spends on US 50 through Meyers, and improve pedestrian and bicycle safety (TRPA 2018)."

b. Consider whether to describe the function of the roundabout as to "slow" traffic flow. Consider replacing with "regulate" or "improve flow" (Pg. 143).

Response 6c: The description of the function of the roundabout has been revised to "improve traffic flow" now on page 145 of the IS/MND/IEC.

c. Please update Level of Service information consistent with the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan IS/IEC data -Appendix A

Response 6d: Appendix A – Intersection Control Evaluation report was updated to reflect LOS information consistent with the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. The following information is provided in Appendix A, Section 1.5 Level of Service:

While not relevant under CEQA, LOS standards for the project are set by Caltrans, TRPA, and El Dorado County and are discussed in the CEQA document for information purposes only. The applicable LOS guidelines are discussed below.

Caltrans identified standards for the project area in the *US 50 Transportation Concept Report/Corridor System Management Plan* (TCR/CSMP) in 2014. The minimum acceptable LOS for this segment of US 50 is LOS D.

TRPA identifies LOS thresholds in its *Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP) in 2020 (Policy 4.1.1) and is quoted below:

> *Level of service (LOS) criteria for the region's highway system and signalized intersections during peak periods shall be: "C" on rural recreational/scenic roads; "D" on rural developed area roads; "D" on urban developed area roads; "D" for signalized intersections. Level of Service "E" may be acceptable during peak periods in urban areas, but*

not to exceed four hours per day. These vehicle LOS standards may be exceeded when provisions for multi-modal amenities and/or services (such as transit, bicycling, and walking facilities) are adequate to provide mobility for users at a level that is proportional to the project generated traffic in relation to overall traffic conditions on affected roadways.

Based on this, the acceptable LOS for the study intersection is D, though TRPA policy notes LOS E may be acceptable during peak periods in urban areas but not to exceed four hours per day.

The modeled roundabout proposed for the project functions at LOS A.

The updated Appendix A is included with the Final IS/MND/IEC.

d. Please make sure that the most recent Caltrans traffic counts are referenced.

Response 6e: In December 2016, Caltrans prepared the Meyers Intersection Improvements at United States Highway (US) 50 and State Route (SR) 89 Initial Study with Negative Declaration (Caltrans 2016 study). The outcome of this effort led to the roundabout that is now operational at the intersection of US 50 and SR 89. As noted Caltrans 2016 study, traffic volumes at the study intersection and in the Meyers community in general are highly variable throughout the year, as the intersection serves tourist traffic to and from Lake Tahoe, the State of Nevada, and a variety of other year-round outdoor recreation activities.

Based on feedback obtained from Caltrans, the roundabout at the intersection of US 50 and SR 89 is functioning as predicted within the Caltrans 2016 study. Given the similarities shared by the U.S. 50/S.R. 89 and the U.S. 50/Pioneer Trail intersections related to intersection geometrics and traffic volumes, GHD Inc. requested that the design traffic volumes used in the design of the US 50/SR 89 intersection also be used for the design of the US 50/Pioneer Trail intersection. The County supported GHD's proposal, and Caltrans approved. This data was utilized for the project as the most complete and up-to date data available at the time of the study and represents an appropriate baseline condition and future model for project conditions.

4.0 Errata Sheet

4.1 TEXT CHANGES TO DRAFT IS/MND/IEC

All text edits and additions to the Draft IS/MND/IEC are included in 'track-changes' and included as part of the Final IS/MND/IEC.

4.2 NEW INFORMATION PERTAINING TO PROJECT

The following information has come into effect since public circulation of the Draft IS/MND/IEC and shall be included with the project record:

At the time of development and circulation of the Public Draft IS/MND/IEC, ephemeral drainages within the project area were determined to be federally 'non-jurisdictional' by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) due to the 2020 *Navigable Waters Protection Rule (Final Rule)*. Written concurrence from the USACE of the non-jurisdiction status of ephemeral features was included within Appendix D of the Draft IS/MND/IEC and discussed within Section 4.4.1 – Environmental Setting (page 62) of the Draft IS/MND/IEC. Therefore, it was concluded in the response to question Section 4.4.4 b) (page 68) that due to the NWPR ruling a federal Section 404 Clean Water Act permit would not be required.

Since public circulation of the Draft IS/MND/IEC, a more recent ruling in the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona on August 30, 2021, may result in the 'Final Rule' being overturned permanently and resulting in some ephemeral drainages returning to a federally jurisdictional status. Currently, the Environmental Protection Agency and USACE (the agencies) are in receipt of the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona's August 30, 2021 order vacating and remanding the Navigable Waters Protection Rule in the case of *Pascua Yaqui Tribe v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*. In light of this order, the agencies have halted implementation of the 2020 Navigable Waters Protection Rule and are interpreting "waters of the United States" (WOUS) consistent with the pre-2015 regulatory regime which includes ephemeral drainages as federally regulated WOUS. The agencies are continuing to review the order and consider next steps.

As such, the County acknowledges they must coordinate with the USACE to determine if federally regulated drainages exist that would be impacted by the project. If so, the County will be required to comply with the permit requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and obtain a permit from the USACE prior to construction.

The USACE permit program operates under a 'no-net loss' rule which sets forth requirements to mitigate losses to WOUS and avoid significant impact and loss of WOUS. Since the County is required to comply with federal requirements of the CWA and obtain a permit if impacting a WOUS, the determination remains that

significant impacts would not occur and additional mitigation for protection of aquatic resources and habitat is not necessary.

Attachment 1

COMMENTS RECEIVED

Lake Tahoe, NV
P.O. Box 1760
Zephyr Cove, NV 89448
(775) 588-2505

Engineering & Environmental Services

www.ncenet.com

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Pioneer and 50 roundabout

Alastair Watson <gothlampy@mac.com> Mon, Aug 2, 2021 at 10:03 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

I am writing to oppose the building of a roundabout at pioneer and US 50.
I see the plans to allow flow to continue out of town with a channeled divider. But without a traffic signal going into town on the 50 it will be impossible to turn left from pioneer onto 50.
A lot of people use pioneer and this will become heavily backed up especially at busy times and will force traffic through elks club drive and move the problem a half mile further down the road where traffic will try and turn left from elks club onto 50 and accidents will increase through impatience as there is no signal there. We already saw an horrendous accident a few years ago with a tanker truck and an impatient driver in a Prius.
Please leave the current situation as is or keep the signal to allow left turns from pioneer.

Thank you.

Alastair Watson

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

RE: roundabout at Pioneer Trail & Hwy. 50 in Meyers

tahoecarol@charter.net <tahoecarol@charter.net> Tue, Aug 3, 2021 at 9:39 AM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

I think it is a stupid idea. The light is fine. On busy weekends the roundabout will get jammed up, especially with drivers who don't know how to drive that configuration. I think it will be dangerous for bikers and pedestrians as the traffic won't let them in. The drivers from Pioneer Trail will never get to get in the roundabout. The merging traffic from Hwy. 50 going west will get jammed up and there will be more accidents with angry drivers who won't yield.

Maybe an alternating green blink like on many on-ramps would be more equitable. That way everyone gets a turn.

Carol Nageotte

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Pioneer Trail Roundabout

John Drum <tahoedrums@icloud.com> Thu, Aug 5, 2021 at 7:19 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

Donaldo, I am in full support of the proposed roundabout at Highway 50 and Pioneer Trail. As an avid cyclist the roundabout at 50 and 89 is a major improvement and far safer for cyclists and pedestrians than before. I also have two sons who ride with friends and both roundabouts would make the entire corridor safer. I have also witnessed countless red light runners while waiting at the existing light while both driving and riding. It has gotten so bad that I now wait and look both directions before proceeding even after the light turns green. I have also witnessed multiple cars slide into the meadow attempting to turn right on to Pioneer Trail from Highway 50 in Meyers during snow and ice conditions. The roundabout would slow these drivers down. I also feel that the current light is what slows traffic to a crawl and people instead blame the new roundabout. Please use the science and engineering to build your case and don't let the naysayers postpone another much needed project. Once this one is done they should be placed though out the entire Pioneer corridor.
Thanks.
John Drum
Meyers resident for the past 23 years.

Sent from my iPhone

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

IS/MND for the San Bernardino Class 1 Bike Trail Project

Gmail <jbpoppe@gmail.com> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 11:32 AM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

emailer incorrectly identified a different project;
comments below pertain to roundabout improvements

Hello
My comments center around snow removal and ice control. In my observations of mountain traffic circles I have come to the conclusion lesion that designers are perhaps not speaking with seasoned maintenance supervisors. Maintenance input is essential to assist in the development of an efficient, safe and easy to care for project.
Some problems that can occur by not taking into consideration maintenance input.
1. Planting of trees that will eventually grow to shade the circle. This shade in the winter will create ice and demand more work and deicing agents to mitigate. Ice in the circle will direct inexperienced drivers to what ever is outside the circle. Keep the circles sunny all year around, this may even mean removing trees in the RW on the outside of the circle
2. Placing lighting and rigid guide markers on the outside of the circle creates a higher maintenance frequency as cars drift into these devices especially in the winter
3. Creating a circle too tight inhibits the proper and expeditious removal of snow. Additionally snow storage areas need to be considered so there is room in heavy storms to maintain a traffic flow in the circle and so blowers can easily remove the stored snow.
The inside of the circle requires a paved area that allows for long truck trailer combinations to cheat into this inner paved area. If this inner circle area is merely landscaped then maintenance has a continual problem if repairing any damage these trailers may make.

Sincerely,

John Poppe
Caltrans Region Manager II - Retired
425-614-8702

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Roundabout

1 message

John Dillis <jddillis@att.net> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 11:58 AM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Sir,
Please reconsider putting in a roundabout at the intersections of Highway 50 and Pioneer Trail. Signal lights help control traffic better than a "yield" sign or a roundabout. Getting from Pioneer Trail to go West on 50 will become a nightmare - just getting into the roundabout.

Consider making the traffic lights a bit longer, timewise, so more traffic can move quickly to another area.

I am no civil engineer, but roundabouts slow everything down (which is good in some ways) but they back up traffic big time.
Thank you for reading my note,
John Dillis

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Pioneer Trail/Highway 50 intersection project

1 message

Phil schwartz <philipjschwartz@gmail.com> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 12:48 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

Hello,

I wanted to send a formal comment in SUPPORT of this project to build a roundabout at the intersection of Pioneer Trail and Highway 50. As a Meyers resident and frequent traveler through this intersection, I feel this will drastically improve traffic flow, as well as safety. I bike through this intersection regularly and it is dangerous as is. In addition, as a pedestrian, the suggested improvements with multiple, clear, crosswalks will be very welcome. Thank you!

Phil Schwartz

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Round about @ Pioneer Trail

1 message

Richard DeVries <rickdevries@att.net> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 12:18 PM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

No, No, No. Bad idea. On heavy weekends, autos entering SLT will block autos on Pioneer trail from entering round about to go west. More traffic chaos. No No No.

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

HWY 50 and Pioneer Trail Improvement Project | Questions.

1 message

codywin (null) <codywin@aol.com> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 1:18 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

- Will an updated rendering be produced to reflect what is delineated in the Public Draft of the improvement project? Current rendering does not show the median at the eastern portion of the intersection where through traffic will be directed on hwy 50 heading south.

- Will there be signage at medians to direct traffic accordingly through or within roundabout? Existing roundabout at Meyers sees misdirected traffic that defeats its. efficacy.

- What other data exists to support the proposed roundabout as far as traffic flow? Will it become more difficult for cross car and bike traffic turning onto hwy 50?

Thanks,
Cody

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Roundabout at Pioneer Trail and U.S. Highway 50

1 message

Elizabeth Minnix <eminnix@gmail.com> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 1:33 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

Hi Donaldo,

I am writing to you in HUGE favor of adding a roundabout at Pioneer Trail and US Highway 50. I know many people are intimidated by the idea of a roundabout, but as a part time resident of both Reno and Lake Tahoe, I have seen first hand how quickly people adapt. More than anything though, I have seen how much they have helped traffic issues in both regions when implemented in other areas. Please move forward with putting a roundabout in this location.

Thank you,
Elizabeth Minnix
--

eminnix@gmail.com
(775) 313.3553

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Hi

Jennifer Fortune <jfortune@chaseinternational.com> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 2:21 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

The new round about in Meyers hasn't been tested in winter yet so not sure how effective it is/ we haven't had a big winter since it was installed. The new one at pioneer trail seems like a bad idea since the majority of traffic comes from Echo Summit. How would someone that lives off of Pioneer Trail let's say Mandan Drive ever get a chance to turn onto highway 50? Plus how would pedestrians ever get across this intersection. No round about here!!!!

Jennifer Fortune
jfortune@chaseinternational.com
(530) 318-9286 cell
www.realestateonlaketahoe.com

Thank you for your business!

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Roundabout between Highway 50 and Pioneer Trail

1 message

Anita cota <acota1@me.com> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 2:43 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us
Cc: John Cota <jcbrews@hotmail.com>

Dear Mr. Palaroan,

Our home is located in Pebble Beach Road, we have a choice of using Pioneer Trail or Highway 50 to obtain access to any area within South Lake Tahoe as well as when we take our bikes out. The roundabout does nothing but make every route more dangerous. There is currently not a bike lane on Pioneer Trail nor is there a place to cross for pedestrians or bicycles across from the Lake Tahoe Golf Course to the bicycle path. The current stop light needs to be updated and a four way cross walk added to it. If a roundabout is installed there will be constant backups on both Pioneer Trail and Highway 50, with no break in traffic on Highway 50, vehicles departing from the golf course and our neighborhood including those individuals who use Elks Club Road as a bypass from Pioneer to Highway 50 will be affected. Are you planning on putting in another signal at Elks Club Road? I do not believe this plan was completely thought out. With the current signal in place, yes traffic backs up at both Pioneer and 50 during peak times but the signal does provide a break for bikes, vehicles and pedestrians to cross or gain access to Highway 50.

Both my husband and I completely disagree with a roundabout going in between Pioneer and 50.

Sincerely,

Anita Cota
1609 Pebble Beach Drive
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Roundabout at Hwy 50 & Pioneer Trail

1 message

David Durst <ddurst@nesglobal.net> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 5:22 PM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

I believe a roundabout at this location given the heavy congestion at peak times will make for a mess under heavy traffic flow times in the winter and summer.

People are already taking short cuts through Meyers neighborhoods to beat this light. So I think a roundabout at this location cause huge traffic problems during peak times of the year.

During winter months, this area backs up due to traffic flow over the summit, this change will not change this , but give drivers a chance to pack the roundabout, with greater opportunity for collisions.

My vote is No.

David B. Durst, CIH, CSP, CAC, CPEA
NES, Inc.
Principal Industrial Hygienist
o: 916.542.7623 / c: 916.825.6026

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

IS/MND for the San Bernardino Class 1 Bike Trail Project

1 message

Carla Yant <carlayant@aol.com> emailer incorrectly identified a different project; Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 10:00 PM
Reply-To: Carla Yant <carlayant@aol.com> comments below pertain to roundabout improvements
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>
Cc: "carlayant@aol.com" <carlayant@aol.com>

Dear Mr. Palaroan,

As a resident in the Meyers area next to the Lake Tahoe Golf Course between County Club Dr. and Arapaho I must access Hwy. 50 to either go into town towards the Y or down Pioneer Trail. I depend on the stop light to give me a break in traffic when going north to the Y. I purposefully bought a 6 cylinder high performance car so I could step on the accelerator and get up to speed within 5 seconds to take advantage of the already tight opportunities to enter traffic. A round about is bound to lead to no gaps as well as causing a 3-way clusterfuck during high demand exodus' out of town and highway closures. I can foresee backed up traffic to the golf course, and beyond, going south and no breaks in the traffic to get onto north bound Hwy. 50. I can see the frustrations rise as we can't get out of the neighborhood!

I understand the cost of traffic light maintenance is an issue but these "improvements" to traffic flow will only serve to frustrate the residents who are going to have to put up with poor access and danger of trying to get out of our neighborhoods, and being neighborhood-bound as traffic backs up all around.

I hope this isn't another already predetermined project and my real-life opinion really matters. Quality of life in Tahoe is diminishing by the year, and this will be yet another contributing factor.

Thank you for giving this some thought.

Carla Yant
48 year South Tahoe resident

Sent from the all new AOL app for Android

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Comment Re: PIONEER TRAIL/U.S. HIGHWAY 50 INTERSECTION SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Fabian Hannemann <fabian.hannemann@gmail.com> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 11:32 PM
To: Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Hello Donaldo,

I am writing this comment in favor of the proposed roundabout at the U.S. Highway 50 and Pioneer Trail intersection. Riding a bike or being a pedestrian in Meyers feel awkward, it feels difficult and dangerous to cross Highway 50 in the area. There aren't many places to cross and the ones that exist feel risky, for example when I'm on a bike I end up having to use the main turn lanes and negotiate automobile traffic unless I want to wait for a long time for the pedestrian light on two sides to connect existing bike lanes and trails.

The current intersection is part of the problem and I believe the proposed roundabout design would be a massive improvement to the area. In addition, I think we've seen that the other new roundabout has worked well so I'd love to see one added at the pioneer intersection.

In addition, I think Meyers needs another place where pedestrians can cross the highway near the Holiday Market, the current options are all too far away and most people just try to walk through the never-ending traffic if they need to cross there. It feels like as a pedestrian, you don't matter in the area and especially when the weekend traffic rolls in you can't even safely get across.

Thank you for the thoughtful designs and implementations enhancing the area.

Regards,
Fabian

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

comments on round about at Hwy 50 and Pioneer Trail.

2 messages

Sherie Brubaker <sherie_brubaker@sbcglobal.net> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 10:01 PM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Hello Mr. Palaroan.

I am Totally AGAINST a round about at Hwy 50 and Pioneer Trail in South Lake Tahoe.

Why? because the round about nearby at Hwy50 and Hwy 89 has slowed traffic coming into the basin.

I live off North Upper truckee Road in SLT, and the back UP of the traffic because of the new round about at Hwy 50 and Hwy 89.

It takes me longer to go to town since the round about was installed.

a 2nd round about in the same area will make the traffic even slower.

I am AGAINST the roundabout.

thank you

Sherie Brubaker
PO Box 551125
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96155

---

s b <srbinfo@sbcglobal.net> Wed, Aug 11, 2021 at 10:07 PM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Hello Mr. Palaroan.

I am Totally AGAINST a round about at Hwy 50 and Pioneer Trail in South Lake Tahoe.

Why? because the round about nearby at Hwy50 and Hwy 89 has slowed traffic coming into the basin.

I live off North Upper truckee Road in SLT, and the back UP of the traffic because of the new round about at Hwy 50 and Hwy 89.

It takes me longer to go to town since the round about was installed.

a 2nd round about in the same area will make the traffic even slower.

I am AGAINST the roundabout.

thank you

Randall Matthews

1843 Toppewetah Street

[Quoted text hidden]

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Pioneer roundabout comment - Peterson

David Peterson <dpeterson@pbieng.com> Thu, Aug 12, 2021 at 6:34 AM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

My wife and I favor the project.

The challenge you face is during heavy hwy 50 traffic times (either way), WB Pioneer will have few chances to break in. (This is the same problem with the 89 roundabout.) There should be ways to design for this, though. Also, a larger diameter than the 89 roundabout would be good. It's just a little tough with a trailer as it is. And some public art in the center of both would be nice.

We hope this project goes forward!
Dave and Lianne Peterson, 503 Christie Dr., SLT 96150

Sent from my iPad

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

(no subject)

Gary Mendel <gvmendel@gmail.com> Thu, Aug 12, 2021 at 10:12 AM
To: Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

The circle at 50 and 89 is awesome , lived in Christmas valley since. 1985 , another roundabout at 50 and pioneer would also help traffic congestion in Myers too . All for it ,
Gary Mendel

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Roudabout at Highway 50 and Pioneer Trail ...

jayngini@aol.com <jayngini@aol.com> Thu, Aug 12, 2021 at 10:35 AM
Reply-To: jayngini@aol.com
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

Not a good idea... much too much traffic.. the intersection does not have four corners.. it is a "T"... need to reduce traffic on Pioneer... this had been a path for the residence of the area.. now it has become a mini 'highway'.. the speed limit is not enforced.. suggestion... put up more controlled stops; do not make it inviting to all.. yes I realize that is restrictive.. but the traffic pattern for residence is more than alarming.

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

round about

1 message

phil wash <jumpmaster4u@sbcglobal.net> Thu, Aug 12, 2021 at 11:00 AM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

I George Wash, a resident of Eldorado county for almost 50 years is against this round about. There will still be back up with no windows to enter traffic between the round about and the Y , most noticeable around Golf course & Elks club. They already drive this area of 50 to fast.

Round a bouts can be good, I used plenty as I traveled England, but not in this case…

Thanks for taking our feed back.

George

Sent from Mail for Windows

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Round about

1 message

Lynn Ashby <dlatahoe@comcast.net> Thu, Aug 12, 2021 at 11:23 AM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

Looks great, we love roundabouts for easy traffic flow!!
Thank you,
Lynn and Dick Ashby

Sent from my iPhone

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

proposed roundabout

1 message

Sarah Miller <tryanything3@icloud.com> Thu, Aug 12, 2021 at 11:47 AM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

placer county created even greater bottlenecks in kings beach by placing crosswalks too close to the roundabouts. A driver doesn't have enough time to stop when pedestrians think they are safe to cross. Pls take notice!
Sarah Miller
Incline Villade

Sent from my iPhone

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Roundabout Pioneer trail

1 message

Donna K Mclelland <donnakvirg@icloud.com> Thu, Aug 12, 2021 at 12:32 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

If traffic is at a stand still at the new roundabout the only thing that lets traffic get into Hwy 50 from Pioneer Trail is the light and if you have ever been at that signal on a Sunday you would see the problem !!!!!!!!!

Sent from my iPhone

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Roundabouts are dangerous and this idea is an unnecessary expense

David Joyce <davidjoyce@d-web.com> Thu, Aug 12, 2021 at 8:40 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

Roundabouts are dangerous and this idea is an unnecessary expense in a time when public safety is paramount.

Please do not remove safe traffic lights and replace them with an idea commonly used in Europe because they just don't have the ability to use traffic lights.

This is a huge step backward.

Unsafe in Detroit

Newark, England

Poland

Indiana Experimental Roundabout

I hope your mind isn't made up and that you will share this with those making these decisions. My opinion, based on facts not feelings, is that roundabouts (traffic circles) are dangerous and a waste of taxpayer's money.

Best Regards,

David Joyce

95667

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Round About In Tahoe at Pioneer and US 50

1 message

Tranchina, Debbie <Debbie.Tranchina@hdfsi.com> Fri, Aug 13, 2021 at 8:31 AM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Hello Sir,

I am writing to you about the proposed round about at pioneer and Hwy 50 near Mont Bleu Casino. I myself travel to Tahoe at different times of the year and I have to go thru this intersection many times.

Please be assured that I am respecting your involvement as I'm not sure how involved you are with this project or what kind of influence you have with this project….but……ARE YOU OR WHOEVER IS WANTING THIS CRAZY!!!!!??????

The traffic lights stop traffic as it should… People need control at this intersection (as they do at all intersection) or they will just lose it with a round about as I have seen at other round abouts……..an influx of bad driving habits, accidents, broken glass.

I say it would be far better to improve the intersection with more upgraded lights, walkways, crosswalks and a controlled lighting environment. As it is now, it works.

Probably all the intersections in Tahoe could use an upgrade such as this. Even a nice bridge, walkway or other access that is aesthetically appealing would be nice for access to the new convention center.

The traffic is heavy especially during summer and tourist season, ski season as well. What makes it bad, as inmost intersections throughout the entire Tahoe area are the drivers. It's not the way streets are planned out, or the walking paths..yes, there are areas that can use improvement. **It's the way people drive that is dangerous. Yes, a round about keeps traffic moving but do you really think people will concede to better driving habits??**

This round about will cause more accidents than ever. People out there are rude, reckless, and don't care if they hurt themselves, their cars or other people. I can see it now….they will be going thru that round about, honking at others, they won't stop for other drivers or pedestrians no matter how many yield signs are up, they will continue to speed and Road Rage for sure.

If that's what who ever approves this plan wants then they better be prepared to accept the consequences of what happens out there.

Thank you for listening.

Deb

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Intersection of Pioneer Trail

1 message

Nick A <levendis22@aol.com> Fri, Aug 13, 2021 at 6:37 PM
Reply-To: Nick A <levendis22@aol.com>
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Dear Donaldo Palaroan,

I would like to voice my opinion in favor of the proposed roundabout project at the intersection of Pioneer Trail. Many studies have found that roundabouts offer a far more efficient means of controlling traffic than stop lights. I hope the city of South Lake Tahoe will be wise enough to add roundabouts at more intersections after Pioneer Trail is completed.

Sincerely,
Nicholas Angelis

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

roundabout

1 message

jerry baker <jbaker12@sbcglobal.net> Sun, Aug 15, 2021 at 9:55 AM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

I am writing to discourage you from putting in a round-a-bout at hwy 50 and pioneer trail. The light there gives all residents living off of country club drive, meadowvale, elks club, and sawmill rd the opportunity to get out onto hwy 50. A round-a-bout will slow traffic, and there will be a never-ending stream of cars, driving at 55 mph! We willl not be able to squeeze into traffic at that speed. The only other possibility would be to change the speed limit from pioneer to the airport from 55, to 40mph. That may give us a better chance of merging. Please reconsider this. The round-a-bout at hwy 50 and 89 works great, but there was never a light there which caused terrible headaches for drivers. Also, at that intersection, the speed is 40mph.

Thank you, Mrs. Chris Baker

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

Roundabout at Pioneer/highway 50

1 message

David Carneggie <dcarneggie@gmail.com> Mon, Aug 16, 2021 at 12:11 PM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

As a resident in Christmas Valley (St Nick Way) I am a strong supporter of roundabouts, especially the one at highway 50 and highway 89s.
However, I see some problems with the one proposed at Pioneer and highway 50, particularly on Friday afternoons and the Sunday exodus.

On Fridays, when the traffic is bumper to bumper on highway 50 east bound, it will be very difficult for traffic on Pioneer trail to make the left turn onto highway 50 westbound, because so few cars on highway 50 westbound will be making a left turn onto Pioneer to interrupt the eastbound highway 50 traffic flow.

Similarly, on Sundays when the highway 50 westbound traffic is bumper to bumper, it will be difficult for westbound highway 50 traffic to flow through the roundabout because the Pioneer trail traffic entering the roundabout to head westward out of town will have priority, thus impeding the traffic flow on highway 50 westbound. This latter situation is of course an advantage for us Christmas Valley residence trying to return home via Pioneer Trail on a Sunday morning.

Why isn't the proposed design more similar to the roundabout at highway 50 and 89S? Seems like a separate outbound lane on highway 50 for westbound traffic would help???

Dave Carneggie, 2892 St. Nick Way, SLT, Ca. 96150

Sent from my iPad

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

The Round About at Pioneer Trail

1 message

Les Wright <runmaui@gmail.com> Mon, Aug 16, 2021 at 11:01 AM
To: donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us

Aloha,

The round about at Pioneer Trail is overdue.
Thanks for planning this.

One question:
Your depiction shows only one lane leaving SLT going into the circle.
Shouldn't there be another lane for traffic to go straight through like you have on the other round about heading to Hope Valley and Xmas Valley?

Keep building Round About's.

Les Wright
South Lake Tahoe
530-559-2261

Donaldo Palaroan <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>

TRPA Comments-Pioneer Trail Roundabout

1 message

Rebecca Cremeen <rcremeen@trpa.gov> Thu, Sep 2, 2021 at 10:10 AM
To: "donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us" <donaldo.palaroan@edcgov.us>
Cc: Michelle Glickert <mglickert@trpa.gov>

Hello Donaldo,

Please see the attached comments on the Pioneer Trail/US 50 Intersection project IS/IEC.

I hope you, your family, and colleagues at the County have safely relocated out of the Basin.

Rebecca Cremeen

Associate Planner

Long Range & Transportation Planning

775-589-5214 rcremeen@trpa.gov

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449
775-588-4527
www.trpa.gov

ED County Pioneer_TRPA Comments090121.pdf
185K

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.gov

To: Donaldo Palaroan, Senior Civil Engineer
County of El Dorado

Re: Pioneer Trail/US 50 Intersection Safety Improvement Project Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist (IS/IEC)

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft IS/IEC for the Pioneer Trail/US 50 Safety Improvement Project. TRPA provides the following comments on the document:

General

Please reference the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist. This document contains new impact assessments, data, and transportation modeling revised since the 2017 RTP.

Project Description/Executive Summary

- Clarify how the County determined the capacity of the roundabout and whether each leg needs a by-pass lane. We suggest it be designed and built to minimize disturbance and vegetation removal.

- Clarify the status of private property acquisitions and easements necessary for the project.

- The project description should describe the number and size of all live and dead trees anticipated to be removed

Aesthetics

- The project area is located within a transition scenic corridor and required to comply with design standards pursuant to section 66.2.4 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances. This includes undergrounding of new lines and aesthetics of highway fixtures. Please describe how the project will be consistent with these standards.

- It would be helpful if the County provided visual simulations of the project so that the public can better understand the visual impact of vegetation removal.

- Please describe how lighting from the project will be screened to reduce impacts on neighboring properties. Will tree removal prevent screening from light and glare? Examples of light fixtures and measures used to prevent light impacts should be included in the IS/IEC.

Air Quality

- Reference all questions in the Air Quality section of the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist template, regardless of whether any impacts are anticipated. This will ensure that the appropriate findings can be made for the project.

Biological Resources

- This section includes an incorrect TRPA code citation regarding EIP exception for tree removal (Pg. 68). Please reference Code Section 61.3.7.A.6 and clarify that the 24-inch diameter at breast heigh (dbh) standard would apply as this area is designated eastside forest type. All other relevant sections in the code regarding tree removal and protection should also be referenced.

Transportation

- Replace all references to the 2010 Lake Tahoe Region Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan with the more recent Active Transportation Plan

- Please also include reference to the Meyers Area Plan and the Safety Strategy.

- Consider whether to describe the function of the roundabout as to "slow" traffic flow. Consider replacing with "regulate" or "improve flow" (Pg. 143).

- Please update Level of Service information consistent with the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan IS/IEC data -Appendix A

- Please make sure that the most recent Caltrans traffic counts are referenced.

We look forward to working with you on this project. Please let us know if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Cremeen, Associate Planner