

FINAL



Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist/Environmental Assessment

Meyers Permanent Watercraft Inspection Station Meyers, California

July 2026



Meyers Watercraft Inspection Station

Meyers, California

Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist/Environmental Assessment

Prepared for:

El Dorado County
924 B Emerald Bay Road
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Contact:

Thea Graybill
El Dorado County
Planning and Building Department
(530) 573-7908
Thea.Graybill@edcgov.us

Prepared by:



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

NCE Project No. 501.53.25

Table of Contents

1	Summary and Findings.....	1
1.1	Findings	2
1.2	Questions and/or Comments.....	4
2	Adoption of the IS/MND	5
3	Approval of the IEC/FONSE	6
4	Comments Received on the Draft IS/IEC/EA and Responses	7
4.1	Introduction	7
4.2	Comments and Responses.....	7
5	Text Revisions to Draft IS/IEC/EA	45

List of Appendices

Appendix A

Draft IS/IEC/EA As Amended Through Responses to Comments

1 Summary and Findings

Project: Meyers Watercraft Inspection Station

Lead Agency: California Environmental Quality Act: El Dorado County
Tahoe Regional Planning Compact: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
National Environmental Policy Act: US Fish and Wildlife Service

El Dorado County (County), in cooperation with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy), and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), is proposing the construction and operation of the Meyers Watercraft Inspection Station Project (Project or Proposed Action under the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]). The Project would relocate the existing watercraft inspection station in Meyers, currently located at 2175 Keetak Street in South Lake Tahoe, California, to a more suitable, permanent location on Pomo Street near the junction of State Route (SR) 89 and U.S. Highway (US) 50.

An Initial Study/Initial Environmental Checklist/Environmental Assessment (IS/IEC/EA) was prepared to address the potential environmental effects of the Project. An IS is a preliminary environmental analysis that is used by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) lead agency as a basis for determining whether an Environmental Impact Report, a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), or a Negative Declaration is required for a project under CEQA guidelines. An IEC is a preliminary environmental analysis that is used for determining whether an Environmental Impact Statement, a Mitigated Finding of No Significant Effect, or a Finding of No Significant Effect (FONSE) is required for a project under TRPA Rules of Procedure. An Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) are prepared for federal actions when it is expected there are no significant effects and the project does not fit into a Categorical Exclusion. A separately prepared Decision Notice/FONSI will be issued by the USFWS to document their decision on the Project and supporting rationale.

In 2021, the TRPA-administered Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Program received funding through the federal Bipartisan Infrastructure Law for the provision of permanent AIS inspection locations. In addition, the Conservancy through its Asset Land Program has appropriate land available that is developable, meets the needs of the AIS program, and is proximate to the existing temporary station. The Project would consist of construction and operation of a watercraft inspection station, decontamination area, and workforce housing to replace the existing temporary inspection station, which is constrained and does not provide enough safe area for work on large event days. Consequently, inspections occur in public roadways, which is unsafe for staff. In addition and due to site constraints, winterization of the facility requires additional attention each year.

The new location would provide a more efficient way of inspecting vehicles and adequate safe space for inspections to occur, while minimizing impacts of vehicular traffic on neighborhood streets. In addition to providing improved vehicle entrance and exit along Pomo Street with truck/boat trailer queuing lanes, the Project would include the following improvements:

- Decontamination unit and other associated stormwater treatment facilities
- Mechanical and storage buildings
- Office building
- Public restroom

- Bicycle station
- Workforce housing and associated parking
- On-site parking for employees
- Open space/public access area
- Connection to nearby bike trails
- AIS interpretive area

Upon completion of construction, the existing facilities at the current watercraft inspection station would be removed.

1.1 Findings

Based on the IS/IEC/EA, it has been determined that the Project would not have significant effects on the natural environment after implementation of mitigation measures. This conclusion is supported by the following findings:

- The Project would have no effects, no impact, or less-than-significant impacts related to Aesthetics, Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Utilities, Service Systems, and Wildfire.
- Mitigation is required to avoid or reduce potentially significant impacts/effects related to Biological Resources, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources.

The following mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project by the County, TRPA, and USFWS to avoid or minimize environmental impacts/effects. Each of these measures are included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Public Review Draft IS/IEC/EA Section 8, as amended in Section 5 of this document).

BIO-1: All Sierra juniper trees located outside the immediate footprint or essential work area of Project components will be protected and avoided regardless of diameter at breast height. Sierra junipers that occur within the immediate footprint or essential work area of Project components (e.g., buildings, decontamination area, or other permanent infrastructure) may be removed where avoidance is infeasible. Any such removal will occur in compliance with the Meyers Area Plan and TRPA Code of Ordinances and will require all applicable permits and approvals prior to removal. Temporary construction uses, such as staging areas, shall not qualify as essential work area requiring tree removal.

At a minimum and prior to construction, orange construction limit fencing will be installed around the entire dripline of each on-site tree within 20 feet of the limits of construction. No ground disturbance, soil compaction, construction of structures, or staging or storage of construction materials will occur within the fenced protection area. Existing grade around each juniper will be maintained to at least the edge of the tree's dripline.

BIO-2: To prevent the spread of invasive species, the Project proponent will treat and/or remove invasive plants in the Project area prior to construction. Any construction equipment and materials that enter

the Project area will be cleaned, free of dirt, vegetation material, and other organic/inorganic debris. All equipment and materials will be cleaned prior to entering the Project area, and the construction manager or other qualified personnel shall inspect all equipment to ensure this requirement is met. Disturbed soil areas and stockpiles will be covered when inactive and will be monitored/treated for invasive plant species establishment. All disturbed soil areas will be landscaped or otherwise revegetated with native species. All imported fill, mulch, straw, seed, or other revegetation materials used during construction shall be certified free of noxious weeds.

BIO-3: At least 14 days prior to removal or modification of trees or other features that may provide roosting habitat for bats, a qualified biologist will conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of roosting bats. Results of the survey will be provided to the Project proponent. If bats or signs indicating past or present roosting are found, the Project proponent will report the bat observation or roost to California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and will delay removal until the roost can be confirmed unoccupied. The Project proponent will coordinate with CDFW to determine an appropriate activity-free buffer area around occupied roosts in the Project area, if found.

NOI-1: TRPA shall establish the following as conditions of approval for any permit that results in the use of construction equipment:

- Construction shall be limited to 8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.
- All construction equipment powered by internal combustion engines shall be properly muffled and maintained.
- Quiet construction equipment, particularly air compressors, are to be selected whenever possible.
- All stationary noise-generating construction equipment such as generators or air compressors is to be located as far as is practical from existing residences. In addition, the Project contractor shall place such stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the Project site.
- Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines is prohibited.
- The construction contractor shall, to the maximum extent practical, locate on-site equipment staging areas to maximize the distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the Project site during all Project construction.

TCR-1: The County will enact the following measures related to tribal cultural resources:

1. Construction Monitoring. The Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada has requested, and the County has agreed, to tribal cultural resources monitoring during ground disturbing construction activities. The County will prepare a monitoring plan and provide it to the Tribe prior to commencing construction, and shall continue coordination with the Tribe up to and during ground disturbing activities of the Project concerning the avoidance and protection of Tribal Cultural Resources that may be impacted.
2. Inadvertent Discoveries. The following measure is intended to address the evaluation and treatment of inadvertent/unanticipated discoveries of potential tribal cultural resources during the Project's ground disturbing activities. An inadvertent discovery plan will be included in the monitoring plan:

- a. If any suspected tribal cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing construction activities, all work shall cease within 100 feet of the discovery, or an agreed upon distance based on the Project area and nature of the find. A qualified professional archaeologist and a Tribal Representative from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with a geographic area shall be immediately notified and shall determine if the find is a tribal cultural resources (PRC § 21074). The Tribal Representative or qualified archaeologist will make recommendations for further evaluation and treatment as necessary.
 - b. The contractor shall implement any measures deemed by the County to be necessary and feasible to preserve in place, avoid, or minimize impacts to the resource, including, but not limited to, facilitating the appropriate tribal treatment of the find, as necessary.
 - c. Work at the discovery location shall not resume until all necessary investigation and evaluation of the discovery have been satisfied.
3. Human Remains. In the event human remains are discovered, all work shall cease immediately, and the County, TRPA, and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California shall be informed. All measures shall be made to secure and protect areas in which human remains and funeral objects are discovered. Construction workers and/or contractors or subcontractors on the job site will not be permitted to take photographs of human remains, or funeral objects. Resources are not to be moved or taken from the Project area and work should not resume until authorized.

The County Coroner and local law enforcement will be notified according to Section 5097.98 of the State PRC and Section 7050.5 of California's Health and Safety Code to conduct proper evaluation and treatment of remains. The coroner and the law enforcement agency will evaluate the discovery to determine whether it is a crime scene or a burial. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, and the procedures outlined in CEQA Section 15064.5(d) and (e) shall be followed.

If human remains are determined to be associated with a burial, the County will notify the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and will work with SHPO to determine measures to take. That office will contact the appropriate tribal representatives and consult on the disposition of the remains and any associated artifacts.

1.2 Questions and/or Comments

Questions or comments regarding this environmental document may be addressed to:

El Dorado County, Planning and Building Department
Tahoe Planning and Building Division
Attn: Thea Graybill, Planning Manager
924 B Emerald Bay Road
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
(530) 573-7908
meyersais@trpa.gov

2 Adoption of the IS/MND

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors will consider adoption of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan pursuant to CEQA. Refer to the Board Agenda Packet and resolution regarding the Project for more detailed information on the County's adoption.

3 Approval of the IEC/FONSE

TRPA Certification. I hereby certify that the statements furnished above and in the attached exhibits present the data and information required for this initial evaluation to the best of my ability, and that the facts, statements, and information presented are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dennis Zabaglo, AIS Program Manager
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Date

Approval of the Project by the Lead Agency. Pursuant to Tahoe Regional Planning Compact, as amended and Article 6 of the TRPA Rules of Procedures, the TRPA Governing Board has independently reviewed and analyzed the IEC and FONSE for the Project and finds that the IEC and FONSE for the Project reflect the independent judgment of TRPA. The lead agency finds that the Project's regulatory compliance measures/mitigation measures will be implemented as stated in the IEC.

I hereby approve this project.

Name
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Date

4 Comments Received on the Draft IS/IEC/EA and Responses

4.1 Introduction

The Draft IS/IEC/EA was circulated for public review and comment between April 16, 2026, and May 15, 2026. A Notice of Intent to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration was sent to reviewing agencies and persons and organizations expressing interest in the Project. Copies of the Draft IS/IEC/EA were available online on the lead agency websites (El Dorado County and TRPA). Several comment letters were received from agencies, organizations, and interested members of the public.

This section includes transcriptions of the comments received during the public review period on the Draft IS/IEC/EA and responses to those comments. Changes to the Draft IS/IEC/EA based on El Dorado County's consideration of public comments address substantive issues. The comments and responses plus the Public Review Draft IS/MND (as amended and inclusive of the MMRP) comprise the Final IS/IEC/EA. The comment letters are transcribed in the responses and numbered in order of receipt by El Dorado County as listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Commenter Information

Letter Number	Agency/Organization	Commenter	Date (2026)
State			
S1	California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 3	Satwinder Dhatt	May 15
Organization			
O1	Why Trash Earth	Alec Flores	May 14
Individual			
I1	NA	Kelly Bergstedt	May 1
I2	NA	Kenny Curtzwiler	May 4
I3	NA	Kelly Bergstedt	May 4
I4	NA	Jennifer Bridgewater Miller	May 10
I5	NA	Tim Taylor	May 15
I6	NA	Meghan Dunn	May 15
I7	NA	Jenna Rainey	May 15
I8	NA	(No first name) Bergstedt	May 15
I9	NA	Amanda Bergstedt	May 15
Public Meeting			
PM1	NA	Kenny Curtzwiler	May 4
PM2	NA	Allen Graybill	May 4

4.2 Comments and Responses

Each unique comment is copied below, followed by a response to the comment. Each comment is identified by commenter and assigned a number corresponding to the order the comment was received.

Comment Letter S1: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), May 15, 2026**Comment S1-1**

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the review process of Meyers Watercraft Inspection Station. Caltrans has reviewed and provided comments in the attachment. We have also included Right of Way record maps for your reference.

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this project as we would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on any changes related to this project.

Should you have questions regarding these comments or require additional information, please contact Satwinder Dhatt, Local Development Review, Equity and System Planning Coordinator, by phone (530) 821-8261 or via email at D3.local.development@dot.ca.gov.

Response to Comment S1-1

The comment provides introductory information related to the transmittal of comments and mapping from Caltrans. The comment also requests copies of further actions and documentation related to the project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the County of El Dorado Board of Supervisors (Board) as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment S1-2

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the review process for the project referenced above. We reviewed this local development for impacts to the State Highway System (SHS) in keeping with our mission, vision, and goals, some of which includes addressing equity, climate change, and safety, as outlined in our statewide plans such as the California Transportation Plan, Caltrans Strategic Plan, and Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure.

The Meyers Watercraft Inspection Station (Project) proposes to construct a watercraft inspection station, decontamination area, workforce housing, and vehicle entrance and exit lanes on Pomo Street with truck/boat trailer queuing lanes. The Project also includes associated mechanical and stormwater treatment facilities, mechanical, storage, and office buildings, public restrooms, a public service bicycle station, on-site parking for employees, an open space/public access area, connection to nearby bike trails, and an aquatic invasive species (AIS) interpretive area. The existing inspection station is constrained and results in inspections occurring in public roadways. This existing facility would be removed after construction of the Project. The Project is located within the southwestern quadrant of the US 50/State Route (SR) 89 interchange in the unincorporated community of Meyers within the Lake Tahoe Basin in El Dorado County. Based on the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) received, we provide the following comments.

Response to Comment S1-2

The comment provides introductory information related to Caltrans and the agency's understanding of the Project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment S1-3**Highway Operations**

The Appendix D traffic study from LSC incorrectly shows the proposed circulation on Pomo Street; there is path overlap of vehicles exiting the proposed site and turning left on Pomo Street and vehicles coming to the site on Pomo Street. However, this conflict in a low-speed environment is preferred to the left turn conflict that may arise by turning left from US 50 into Cirugu Street/Pomo Street towards the west end of the site. There should be signage on SR 89 and US 50 directing visitors to the new inspection station; please note that these will require permits to install in the future.

Response to Comment S1-3

The comment suggests a modification to Figure 1 of Appendix D of the draft environmental document and expresses a preference for signage along SR 89 and US 50 that would require encroachment permits from Caltrans. The commenter's suggestion regarding Figure 1 of Appendix D is noted, however the access routes shown on Figure 1 for the existing and proposed inspection stations are not intended to show the exact paths by which vehicles would travel (including on which side of the street). The figure is intended to show the similarities between the 2 sites, albeit on opposite sides of SR 89. The analysis provided on pages 3 and 4 of Appendix D does not require modification as a result.

The County does intend to maintain and/or provide new signage for the proposed inspection station as part of the Project. This may include signage for travelers along SR 89 northbound toward Pomo Street, SR 89 southbound toward Pomo Street, US 50 northbound toward SR 89, and US 50 southbound toward SR 89. Should any new or modified signage be deemed appropriate and within Caltrans Right of Way (ROW), the County will coordinate with Caltrans regarding necessary permitting prior to installation of the signage.

Comment S1-4**Right of Way**

Future-Plans will need to show and label Caltrans Right of Way (ROW), Centerline, and widths along with bearings and distances. The applicant or their representatives may also need to identify any possible vulnerable survey monuments in the development area that will need to be preserved and/or perpetuated, as required by PE Act 6731.2 and PLS Act 8771. ROW record maps have been attached, if further mapping is needed, please contact District 3 ROW Front Map Counter by contacting: d3rwmaprequest@dot.ca.gov.

Response to Comment S1-4

The comment requests coordination and identification of Caltrans ROW on future plans. As appropriate, the County and/or TRPA shall coordinate with Caltrans regarding identification of Caltrans ROW in future design drawings for the Project and the need to consider additional regulatory requirements related to Caltrans ROW.

Comment S1-5**Encroachment Permit**

Any project or work, including access modification and drainage work, that takes place along or within the State's ROW requires an encroachment permit issued by Caltrans. To apply, a completed encroachment permit

application, environmental documentation, and five sets of plans clearly indicating State ROW must be submitted to Encroachment Permits Offices as indicated below:

California Department of Transportation
District 3, Office of Permits
703 B Street
Marysville, CA 95901
D3encpermit@dot.ca.gov

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this proposal. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on any changes related to this development.

Response to Comment S1-5

The comment identifies the potential need for encroachment permits during construction of the Project. As noted on page 7 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, the County anticipates that the Project may require an encroachment permit should work within Caltrans ROW be required. Consistent with this comment, the County would coordinate with appropriate Caltrans staff regarding an encroachment permit prior to initiation of work within Caltrans ROW.

Comment Letter O1: Why Trash Earth, May 14, 2026

Comment O1-1

I appreciate the continued efforts by El Dorado County, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to strengthen aquatic invasive species prevention in the Lake Tahoe Basin through the proposed Meyers Watercraft Inspection Station Project.

Having previously visited the Meyers inspection station, I understand some of the spatial and operational constraints that can arise during high-demand periods. The proposed improvements related to safety, traffic flow, inspection capacity, and long-term facility reliability appear consistent with the stated safety, queuing, and operational needs identified for the existing station.

In addition to these physical infrastructure improvements, I respectfully suggest consideration of complementary upstream approaches that may further support operational efficiency over time. For example, pre-arrival verification, appointment coordination, or clearance-support mechanisms for certain users, where consistent with AIS program requirements, may help reduce peak congestion, improve arrival flow, and support smoother inspection operations during high-demand periods.

Such approaches should not reduce AIS inspection requirements or replace on-site inspection authority. Rather, they could complement the proposed facility improvements by reducing the volume of unprocessed arrivals reaching inspection points at the same time.

Thank you for your continued work protecting Lake Tahoe and for the opportunity to provide public input on this important project.

Response to Comment O1-1

The comment expresses opinions regarding potential efficiencies and operational considerations that could be employed as part of the AIS program. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental

analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment Letter I1: Kelly Bergstedt, May 1, 2026

Comment I1-1

Dear Members of the TRPA Board of Directors and Planning Commission,

Please find attached my formal written opposition to the proposed permanent boat inspection station on TRPA-owned land adjacent to Pomo Street in South Lake Tahoe.

As a neighboring property owner, I have serious concerns about the impacts this facility would impose on the surrounding residential community — including noise from air drying equipment, significantly increased heavy vehicle traffic on residential streets, environmental harm from tree removal and stormwater runoff, and the lack of meaningful community engagement in this process.

I respectfully request written acknowledgment of this letter and a formal response addressing each concern raised. I am also copying the offices of Assemblymember Heather Hadwick and Senator Marie Alvarado-Gil on this correspondence.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Response to Comment I1-1

The comment is introductory in nature and provides an overview of the more detailed comments that follow. The specific comments raised following this introduction are listed separately, along with the County's individual responses. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I1-2

I am writing as a concerned resident and neighboring property owner to formally register my strong opposition to the proposed permanent boat inspection station on TRPA-owned land adjacent to [Street Name / Neighborhood Name] in South Lake Tahoe. While I fully support the TRPA's broader mission to protect the ecological integrity of Lake Tahoe, I am deeply troubled by both the process through which this proposal is being advanced and the significant, wide-ranging impacts it would impose on the surrounding residential community.

I respectfully urge the TRPA Board to halt, reassess, and engage in genuine community consultation before moving forward with this project.

Response to Comment I1-2

The comment is introductory in nature and expresses concern regarding the process and potential impacts of the Project. Specific comments are raised following this introduction and are provided with individual responses by the County. The environmental review process was conducted in accordance with CEQA, TRPA, and NEPA requirements. No further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I1-3**I. Failure to Meaningfully Engage Affected Residents**

The TRPA's own governing documents and stated values emphasize transparency, community engagement, and balancing environmental goals with the needs of residents and local communities. This proposal falls far short of that standard. Neighboring property owners — those most directly and daily impacted by a permanent commercial-style operation adjacent to their homes — have not been given a meaningful opportunity to provide input, raise concerns, or participate in the decision-making process.

The placement of a permanent, high-traffic inspection facility in a residential neighborhood is not a minor administrative matter. It is a land use decision with profound, lasting consequences for those who live nearby. We ask that the TRPA:

- Conduct formal, well-publicized community meetings with affected residents before any further planning steps are taken.
- Provide a transparent environmental and land use review process, including independent assessments of noise, traffic, and ecological impact.
- Genuinely incorporate resident feedback into site selection and design decisions — not merely acknowledge it after the fact.

Response to Comment I1-3

The comment raises concerns regarding the level of public involvement and meetings that were conducted for the project. As noted above in Response to Comment I1-2, the environmental review process was conducted in accordance with CEQA, TRPA, and NEPA requirements. More specifically, notice of the release of the draft environmental document was posted in the Tahoe Daily Tribune on April 14, 2026. In addition, the County and TRPA provided additional and advanced notice for the two community meetings (October 14, 2024, and May 4, 2026) that were conducted for the Project. Contrary to statements made in this comment, the County and TRPA have engaged with the community with respect to the environmental analysis and design considerations of the Project at several points, as described in Section 6.1.2 (beginning on page 161) of the Draft IS/IEC/EA. These include public meetings to discuss the status of Project design and to receive public comments in October 2024 and May 2026. Notice of each public meeting were provided using a variety of media, including flyers, posting in the Tahoe Daily Tribue, and on the website for this project. The Project website contains actively managed FAQs, an email address for submitting additional comments, and a link to the prior public information meetings (slides and recordings). The website can be found here: <https://tahoeboatinspections.com/meyers/>. There will be additional opportunities for interested members of the public to engage and provide feedback on the Project as further planning, design, and implementation occurs, all of which will be provided via the Project website and prior noticing methods. The commenter's opinion regarding the currently proposed Project is acknowledged.

Comment I1-4**II. Noise Pollution**

I have personally observed the operations at the current boat inspection station, and the noise generated by the high-powered air drying equipment is substantial. This is not ambient background noise — it is a persistent,

penetrating industrial sound that would fundamentally alter the character and livability of the surrounding residential neighborhood if a permanent station were established here.

Residents in this area live here because of Tahoe's natural quiet, its connection to the outdoors, and its residential character. A permanent station operating during peak boating season — which can span many hours per day, seven days a week — would subject neighboring homes to ongoing industrial-level noise that is wholly incompatible with residential use. Specific concerns include:

- High-decibel air blowers used to dry boat hulls, bilges, and compartments during every inspection.
- Engine noise from the estimated 2,000 or more boats and towing vehicles passing through the area annually, including large trucks pulling heavy trailered watercraft.
- Noise from vehicles idling in queue, staff operations, and any associated public address or signaling systems.

I respectfully request that any further review include a professional acoustic study measuring projected noise levels at residential property lines under peak operating conditions, benchmarked against applicable noise ordinances and residential quality-of-life standards.

Response to Comment I1-4

The commenter raises concerns regarding potential noise impacts associated with the proposed inspection station. The commenter refers to high-powered, high-decibel air drying equipment at the existing station, however, no such equipment is used at the existing station, and no such equipment is proposed at the proposed station. No air blowers/dryers would be used. The Project also does not include a public address or other sound amplification system.

A professional acoustic study was conducted by Saxelby Acoustics for the Project. This was provided as Appendix C to the Draft IS/IEC/EA and circulated for public review. The acoustic study included ambient noise measurements at and near the existing station, including during boat inspections. These measurements captured operational noise associated with watercraft inspection, including inspection activities (including staff operations), vehicle movement, and idling vehicles. These measurements were conducted for a 24-hour period on August 31, 2024, at 4 separate locations, including 2 adjacent to the existing station, one along Pomo Street between Blitzen Road and Cirugu Street, and one at the single-family home along Blitzen Road that would be closest to the proposed inspection station building. For the 2 locations adjacent to the existing station, the maximum noise level measured during the hours of the existing inspection activities was 81 A-weighted decibels (dBA). Most maximum noise levels within each hour did not exceed 75 dBA. Average noise levels between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. generally ranged between 50 and 56 dBA. Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) measurements for these 2 locations were both 53 dBA CNEL. For the 2 locations south of SR 89 and closer to the proposed inspection station, the maximum noise level was 80 dBA. The measured CNELs for these 2 locations were 54 and 55 dBA CNEL, slightly higher than those of the 2 locations near the existing inspection station.

With respect to idling vehicles, the California Code of Regulations includes specific requirements for large vehicles to limit idling to no more than 5 minutes. In addition, ambient noise associated with idling passenger vehicles would not be substantial and is considered part of the ambient noise level measurements conducted at the existing inspection station on August 31, 2024.

Based on the analysis presented in the acoustic study and as stated on pages 113 and 114 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, a substantial increase in ambient noise would not occur as a result of the Project. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

Comment I1-5

III. Road Traffic, Safety, and Infrastructure Impacts

Routing an estimated 2,000 or more boats — many towed by large trucks — through a residential neighborhood raises serious concerns about public safety, road degradation, and the fundamental character of the streets that families use daily for walking, cycling, and accessing their homes. These streets were not designed or maintained for heavy commercial vehicle traffic at this volume.

Specific traffic concerns include:

- Significant increase in large vehicles (trucks with boat trailers) on narrow residential streets not engineered for commercial traffic loads.
- Elevated risk of pedestrian and cyclist accidents, particularly during peak summer months when foot traffic is high.
- Increased road wear and associated maintenance costs that would be borne by the public and local taxpayers.
- Traffic congestion and queuing that could block residential driveways, restrict emergency vehicle access, and create hazardous conditions.
- Noise and exhaust emissions from vehicles idling in line, degrading air quality and quality of life for adjacent residents.

A full traffic impact analysis conducted by a qualified, independent traffic engineer should be required before this project advances any further.

Response to Comment I1-5

The comment expresses concern regarding potential transportation impacts that could occur with implementation of the Project and requests a full traffic impact analysis. As part of the environmental review process, LSC Transportation Consultants conducted a transportation analysis consistent with CEQA, TRPA, and NEPA requirements. This included an assessment of Project-related trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), as well as likely travel routes to and from the Project area. This report is included as Appendix D to the Draft IS/IEC/EA and summarized in the environmental document. As noted on page 5 of Appendix D, 28 round trips (56 one-way trips) is the peak number anticipated on a given day during the summer. This would correspond to just under 3 vehicles entering and exiting the site per hour. As noted in Appendix D and the Draft IS/IEC/EA, this is not considered a significant increase in the number of vehicles in the vicinity of the Project area, and due to the existing appointment system used for AIS inspection, the trips would be spread throughout the day. This would be similar to conditions associated with the existing inspection station, albeit future queuing would be contained entirely within the Project area rather than on public roadways.

With respect to transportation safety, the Draft IS/IEC/EA evaluates potential conflicts with vehicle turning movements and bicycle/pedestrian movement through the area. As noted on page 133 of the environmental

document, the Project would provide additional on-site connections to existing bicycle and pedestrian trails in the area, providing a direct connection between Pomo Street and the bike path along US 50. This is anticipated to increase pedestrian/bicycle safety in the area by providing a separated path by which pedestrians and bicyclists could travel through the Project area.

With respect to traffic congestion, Level of Service (LOS) analysis is no longer conducted as part of environmental analysis, following the passage of Senate Bill 743 and the California Natural Resources Agency's subsequent amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines. The Project was specifically designed to remove queuing vehicles from local roadways. The queuing capacity within the Project area (i.e., on-site) would accommodate the number of vehicles (and boats) awaiting inspection such that no queuing is anticipated within Pomo Street or the surrounding neighborhood. As a result, no impacts to emergency vehicle access or hazardous conditions would occur. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

As noted in response I1-4, the idling of vehicles would be limited in accordance with applicable regulations and potential noise associated with them was incorporated into the analysis of the Draft IS/IEC/EA.

Comment I1-6

IV. Environmental and Ecological Concerns

The TRPA was created specifically to protect the Lake Tahoe Basin's fragile and irreplaceable environment. It is particularly incongruous, then, that a project undertaken in the name of environmental protection could itself cause significant ecological harm. The establishment of a permanent station on this site raises the following environmental concerns:

- Tree removal and vegetation loss: Construction of a permanent facility, associated infrastructure, and a high-volume traffic corridor would require the clearing of trees and native vegetation. Loss of mature trees reduces carbon sequestration, degrades wildlife habitat, increases stormwater runoff, and diminishes the natural beauty that defines the Tahoe experience.
- Stormwater and runoff risks: High vehicle and boat traffic, along with impervious surface expansion from paving and structures, increases the risk of polluted stormwater runoff — the very problem the TRPA's aquatic invasive species program is meant to combat.
- Soil compaction and grading: Repeated heavy vehicle use will compact soils, damaging root systems of remaining trees and reducing the land's capacity to absorb precipitation naturally.
- Habitat fragmentation: Increased vehicle traffic and site disturbance can displace or harm wildlife that currently uses or moves through this area.
- Noise and light pollution impacts on wildlife: Ongoing operational noise and any required lighting could disturb local wildlife during sensitive periods.

A comprehensive environmental impact assessment — including arborist review, wildlife assessment, hydrology study, and analysis of impervious surface impacts — should be a prerequisite to any further site planning.

Response to Comment I1-6

The comment expresses concern regarding the potential loss of vegetation, wildlife impacts, and potential stormwater runoff impacts. With respect to the Project area, the Project (as evaluated in the IS/IEC/EA) is

located within parcels that are considered “asset lands,” as detailed in Section 3.2 (beginning on page 8 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA.) Asset lands are typically non-sensitive parcels that can support sustainable development. In addition, the Project area is already disturbed due to a utility easement, informal dirt road, and user-created trails. Further, as stated in Section 3.4 (beginning on page 10) of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, the Project area is designated for development with land uses that support outdoor activity and recreation-oriented facilities. Therefore, within local planning documents, the Project area is not considered to be sensitive.

Furthermore and with respect to vegetation and wildlife impacts, the Draft IS/IEC/EA includes an evaluation of potential impacts to biological resources within Section 5.4, beginning on page 51. As noted on page 57, removal of some vegetation would be necessary as part of the Project, however Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would be implemented to protect on-site vegetation to the extent feasible, and any removal would be conducted in accordance with the Meyers Area Plan and TRPA Code of Ordinances. Further, nesting bird and bat surveys would be conducted prior to initiation of construction to ensure that the Project does not result in the disturbance of active nests or roosts, respectively. Further, as noted on page 54 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, the Project area does not provide habitat for special status species, beyond the aforementioned potential for nesting birds and roosting bats.

With respect to stormwater and as stated on page 96 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, the Project would create new impervious areas within the Project area and would also involve decontamination of watercraft which would generate runoff (considered hereafter as an additional source of stormwater). The Project is designed to capture and treat all stormwater on-site to reduce risk of contamination of Lake Tahoe with invasive species which are intended to be removed from watercraft at the site. The Project includes on-site stormwater conveyance infrastructure and a stormwater retention area. All stormwater would be treated and/or stored on-site. Through project design and regulatory compliance, significant off-site impacts with respect to stormwater quality would not occur. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

Comment I1-7

V. Aesthetic and Community Character Impacts

The residential neighborhoods surrounding Lake Tahoe derive their character — and much of their property value — from the natural setting, mature trees, and the quiet, small-community atmosphere that residents chose when purchasing their homes. Introducing a permanent inspection station into this environment would be a drastic and irreversible intrusion on that character.

Aesthetic and community character concerns include:

- Permanent commercial infrastructure (inspection bays, equipment, signage, lighting, fencing, and associated facilities) would be visually incompatible with a residential neighborhood.
- Property values for immediately adjacent and neighboring homeowners could be materially and negatively affected.
- The removal of trees and natural vegetation would permanently diminish the scenic quality of the area for residents and visitors alike.
- Increased foot traffic, litter, and activity associated with a commercial-style operation would alter the peaceful nature of the neighborhood.

Any project of this scale — which would permanently alter the look, feel, and function of a residential area — should be subject to a full aesthetic and community character review, including input from neighboring property owners.

Response to Comment I1-7

The comment expresses concern regarding the potential aesthetic and visual resources impacts of the Project. The Draft IS/IEC/EA evaluated the potential aesthetic impacts of the project, beginning on page 29 (See Section 5.1.4 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA). As noted in this section of the environmental document, the Project would be partially visible from US 50, SR 89 and along Pomo Street but would be largely obscured by existing and proposed landscaping within the Project area. The Project would be visible from its proposed ingress and egress points, however the change in visual conditions is not anticipated to be substantially adverse. In addition, visual renderings along Pomo Street and the Project's points of ingress and egress were provided as part of Community Meeting #2 conducted on May 4, 2026, consistent with the requests made in this comment. With respect to foot traffic and litter, operation of the Project would include maintenance of the Project area, including litter. Further, the Project area would be maintained in a manner similar to the existing inspection station which provides on-site trash receptacles and storage containers so as to minimize changes in aesthetic conditions associated with its operation. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

Comment I1-8

VI. Alternative Sites Should Be Evaluated

Given the breadth and severity of the concerns outlined above, I strongly urge the TRPA to conduct a rigorous evaluation of alternative locations for a permanent boat inspection station — sites that are better suited to commercial and high-traffic operations and that do not impose these burdens on a residential community. Suitable alternatives might include:

- Existing commercial or industrial-zoned parcels near established boat launch facilities.
- Locations adjacent to major highway corridors where traffic volumes and existing infrastructure are better suited to this use.
- Collaboration with neighboring jurisdictions (El Dorado County, Douglas County, etc.) to establish inspection stations at regional entry points before boats enter the Basin.

The TRPA has a responsibility to pursue solutions that achieve its environmental mission without displacing those harms onto the residents it also serves.

Response to Comment I1-8

The comment provides suggestions regarding alternative locations/options to the Project, as proposed, and requests that TRPA conduct an evaluation of alternative locations. With respect to the need to evaluate alternatives, evaluation of alternative is not required as part of an IS or an IEC. The environmental document does present an evaluation of alternatives consistent with NEPA requirements for the EA. The comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required.

However, it should be noted that, consistent with the commenter's request, TRPA conducted an evaluation of feasible alternatives to the Project, as currently proposed, when conducting initial siting analysis for the

inspection station. As part of this initial siting analysis, TRPA evaluated potential locations for development of a more permanent site inspection station, taking into consideration a variety of criteria to identify the most optimal location for their project. The factors that TRPA considered for this Project included land ownership, accessibility, proximity to major roadways, land required for development (including the ability to provide adequate queuing space on-site), and the availability of land for development of an inspection station. Based on the evaluation conducted, the Project area was deemed the most suitable location for the Project. Other sites that were considered included the Welcome Center (located on USFS property), the existing transportation yard (located on El Dorado County property), and other asset lands owned by California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy).

The USFS property would not be able to accommodate on-site queuing. In addition, vehicle movement through the site was an identified constraint, and its use as an inspection station would conflict with potential future plans USFS has for that property. The El Dorado County transportation yard had conflicting use issues associated with operation of the existing transportation yard, as well as on-site drainage concerns and the inability to isolate disinfectant from aquatic invasive species inspection activities. Lastly, the Conservancy lands were constrained in terms of size and would not be able to provide enough space for on-site queuing and vehicle movements. In addition, direct ingress/egress to US 50 was identified as a concern due to vehicle speeds and turning movements. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

Comment I1-9

VII. Conclusion and Requested Actions

Lake Tahoe's protection is a goal I share and support. However, the manner in which this proposal is being advanced — without adequate community engagement, without independent impact assessments, and in a location that will cause significant and lasting harm to a residential neighborhood — is not consistent with the TRPA's own standards or its obligation to the communities within the Basin.

I formally request that the TRPA:

- Immediately pause any further planning or permitting actions related to this site pending full community consultation.
- Commission independent assessments covering noise, traffic, environmental, and aesthetic impacts.
- Conduct properly noticed public hearings in the affected neighborhood, with adequate time for residents to review and respond to project materials.
- Evaluate alternative sites that are appropriate for a commercial-scale, high-traffic operation.
- Commit to genuinely incorporating resident input — not just acknowledging it — before any final decision is made.

I am happy to discuss these concerns further and would welcome the opportunity to participate in any formal review process. I request written acknowledgment of this letter and a response addressing each of the concerns raised herein.

Response to Comment I1-9

The comment requests further analysis of impacts and alternatives, as well as additional public outreach, prior to consideration of the Project for approval. However, as noted above in Responses to Comments I1-2 through I1-8, no substantive issues were raised in the provided comments that would trigger further environmental analysis. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment Letter I2: Kenny Curtzwiler, May 4, 2026**Comment I2-1**

1. Who will own the land because TRPA can't own property?

Response to Comment I2-1

The comment requests further information regarding ownership of the Project area. As noted on page 15 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, the County would own the Project area following completion of a land exchange as part of the Project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I2-2

2. If it is the county, did they pay for it. Will they pay property taxes?

Response to Comment I2-2

The comment requests further information regarding how the County will own the Project area and whether they would pay taxes. As noted on page 15 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, the County would own the Project area following completion of a land exchange as part of the Project. To the extent property taxes are applicable to the Project area, they would be paid by the appropriate entity. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I2-3

3. If 6 months of the year it is being used by ELDCO. Doesn't that change the zoning?

Response to Comment I2-3

The comment requests further information regarding the zoning of the site. The Project (and its components) were evaluated for consistency with applicable land use and zoning designations. Based on the allowable uses for the existing zoning of the Project area, consideration of a zone change is not required as part of the Project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I2-4

4. If it apartments on a second level and underground parking. Will they have to put in an elevator per Ca Code access for disabled?

Response to Comment I2-4

The comment requests further information regarding accessibility of the workforce housing units proposed as part of the Project. The proposed residential units are anticipated to be townhomes versus apartments, and installation of elevators is not currently anticipated. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I2-5

5. Have they done a VMT for the area in and around Pomo Street. There are approx. 75 vehicles a day using Pomo and Blitzen to get into the neighborhood. The public roadway that you are concerned about has almost zero traffic compared to Pomo Street. It is located in a commercial area. There are no Neighborhood Streets where it is currently located.

Response to Comment I2-5

The comment asks if a VMT analysis was conducted for the area. A VMT analysis was conducted for the Project and is reflected in the Draft IS/IEC/EA in Section 3.17, Transportation and Appendix D. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I2-6

6. There are also hundreds of walkers, bikes, kids, dogs in the area that use Blitzen to Pomo for walks.

Response to Comment I2-6

The comment notes the use of Blitzen and Pomo by pedestrians. As noted in Response to Comment I1-5, the Project would provide additional pedestrian/bicyclist facilities along the Project area's northeastern boundary. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I2-7

7. During the summer that is also the entrance to the Forestry Cabins off Blitzen.

Response to Comment I2-7

The comment notes the use of Pomo Street and Blitzen for residential purposes. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I2-8

8. The TRPA Watercraft site will be located on Pomo Street. Coming down Hiway 50 into Meyers there is a street sign showing Pomo and a right-hand turn before Hiway 88. That turn off is onto Cirugu Street and then you turn right onto Pomo.

Response to Comment I2-8

The comment notes that the street sign located along US 50 at Cirugu Street states Pomo Street. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I2-9

9. You have stated previously that with the reservation system you no longer have a back up. How many 'Large event days' do you anticipate?

Response to Comment I2-9

The comment requests additional info regarding the number of peak days anticipated at the inspection station. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, the transportation analysis conducted for the Project determined that on peak summer days 28 vehicles would visit the site per day. This comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I2-10

10. You are building a public space area and an AIS Interpretive Area. Where will those that want to visit park?

Response to Comment I2-10

The comment requests consideration of parking demand for the interpretive center. The existing inspection station has a similar interpretive station that is used by visitors awaiting inspection but does not generate vehicle trips on a daily basis in and of itself. With implementation of the Project, visitation to the interpretive station is anticipated to be similar to existing conditions, and no parking is required for the interpretive station. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment Letter I3: Kelly Bergstedt, May 4, 2026**Comment I3-1**

I am writing to supplement my formal opposition letter dated May 1, 2026 regarding the proposed permanent Meyers Watercraft Inspection Station. Having reviewed the draft environmental document released April 15, 2026, including Section 5.13 (Noise), Appendix C, Section 5.1 (Aesthetics), the Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by Saxelby Acoustics (2025), and the project site plan, and having received written correspondence

from the project coordinator confirming the scope of noise measurements conducted, I submit the following material concerns for the official record before the May 15, 2026 public comment deadline.

I am a resident of Cirugu Street, immediately adjacent to the proposed project site. As confirmed by Google Maps measurement, my home is approximately 300 feet from the proposed facility, not 430 feet as stated in the environmental document. I respectfully request that this supplemental comment be entered into the official record alongside my prior submission and that all concerns receive a formal written response.

Response to Comment I3-1

The comment requests consideration of the commenter's residence at a distance of 300 feet from the Project area, not 430 feet. The comment is referring to the statement on page 113 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA that states "[t]he nearest residences, located approximately 430 feet away, would experience maximum noise levels of approximately 71 dBA...." As noted on page 19 of Appendix C of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, construction noise is evaluated as occurring at the center of the site to represent average noise levels generated over the duration of construction across the project area. As a result, the distance reflected in the Draft IS/IEC/EA is correct for the purposes of analysis. However, for clarity, the first paragraph on page 113 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA has been amended as follows:

Original:

Construction activities would temporarily increase noise levels in the Project area, with maximum noise levels ranging from 76 to 90 dBA Lmax at 50 feet. These activities would occur primarily during daytime hours (8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.), consistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, which exempts daytime construction noise from noise limits. The nearest residences, located approximately 430 feet away, would experience maximum noise levels of approximately 71 dBA, representing an increase of up to 11 dBA over existing ambient conditions (60-80 dBA), although likely less due to the presence of nearby highway road noise.

Revised:

Construction activities would temporarily increase noise levels in the Project area, with maximum noise levels ranging from 76 to 90 dBA Lmax at 50 feet. These activities would occur primarily during daytime hours (8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.), consistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, which exempts daytime construction noise from noise limits. Construction noise is evaluated as occurring at the center of a given site to represent average noise levels generated over the duration of construction across the site. The nearest residences, located approximately 430 feet away as measured from the center of the Project area, would experience maximum noise levels of approximately 71 dBA, representing an increase of up to 11 dBA over existing ambient conditions (60 – 80 dBA), although likely less due to the presence of nearby highway road noise.

The above-listed change does not constitute substantial new information, as defined by the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5 as it does not result in a new or substantially more significant impact. As such, recirculation of the environmental document is not required prior to consideration by the County for adoption.

Comment I3-2

I. The Noise Model Omits the Facility's Primary Noise-Generating Equipment

Section 5.13.4 of the environmental document states that noise modeling was conducted using the SoundPLAN prediction model, and that the following noise generators were analyzed: vacuums, decontamination pumps, pressure washing equipment, on-site circulation, HVAC, and jet ski engines.

Industrial air dryers, the equipment used to dry every boat hull, bilge, and compartment at every inspection station, on every boat processed, throughout every operating day, are entirely absent from this list. Air drying is not a peripheral activity. It is the primary mechanical function of the facility and its most continuous source of operational noise. Industrial air dryers of the type used at watercraft inspection stations typically operate at 85 to 100 dBA at the source. The proposed facility includes 14 simultaneous drying stations.

The document concludes that the facility would increase ambient noise levels by only 1.0 dBA, an increase essentially imperceptible to the human ear, and far below the 5.0 dBA FICON significance threshold the document adopts. That conclusion is a direct product of a noise model that excludes the loudest equipment on site. A finding of 1.0 dBA increase has no credibility as a representation of this facility's operational noise impact, and cannot be relied upon as a basis for a significance determination under CEQA or any other standard.

I respectfully request that:

- The noise model be revised to explicitly include industrial air drying equipment operating at all 14 stations simultaneously under peak conditions, using manufacturer-provided decibel specifications or field measurements from a comparable operating facility.
- Revised projected noise levels be calculated at the nearest residential property lines, including properties on both Pomo Street and Cirugu Street.
- The revised significance determination be compared against the Meyers Area Plan's 55 dBA CNEL residential standard, the applicable local threshold for neighboring residential land uses, in addition to the FICON aviation noise criteria.
- If revised noise levels exceed applicable residential standards, enforceable mitigation measures be identified and incorporated as binding conditions of any project approval.
- The revised noise analysis be recirculated for public comment, as the corrected findings may materially alter the significance determination.

Response to Comment I3-2

The comment expresses concern regarding potential air drying equipment and the noise standards by which the project's impacts were determined. Regarding the comment's statements related to air drying equipment, refer to Response to Comment I1-4. With respect to thresholds used as part of the environmental document's noise analysis as presented on pages 113 and 114 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, FICON standards are considered the industry standard for assessing whether increases in ambient noise levels would be perceivable by nearby receptors. As such, they are considered appropriate for the purposes of evaluating whether a potential increase in noise levels as a result of a proposed development would be substantial. The requested information regarding whether the Project would result in an exceedance of the CNEL standards in the Meyers Area Plan is provided in Table 7 on page 19 of Appendix C of the Draft IS/IEC/EA. As shown in this table, Project noise levels (dBA CNEL) would be in compliance with applicable noise level standards. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

Comment I3-3**II. The Noise Significance Threshold Used Is Inappropriate for a Residential Context**

In the absence of a TRPA-specific threshold for stationary source noise increases, the environmental document applies FICON criteria, a standard developed by the Federal Interagency Committee on Aviation Noise to evaluate aircraft noise around airports. This is not an appropriate benchmark for assessing the impact of an industrial inspection facility operating in a residential neighborhood.

The applicable local standard is the Meyers Area Plan's maximum noise level of 55 dBA CNEL for the Upper Truckee Residential/Tourist District, the designation that governs the residential uses immediately surrounding this project. The environmental document never directly tests the facility's operational noise against this residential standard. Adopting a permissive aviation noise threshold while ignoring the applicable local residential standard is not a legally adequate basis for a CEQA significance determination. The analysis must demonstrate compliance with the 55 dBA CNEL residential standard at neighboring property lines, not merely satisfy a threshold designed for flight paths over airports.

Response to Comment I3-3

The comment requests consideration of a different threshold for noise. Refer to Response to Comment I3-2.

Comment I3-4**III. The Noise Analysis Uses an Incorrect Distance to the Nearest Residence**

Section 5.13.4(a) of the environmental document states that the nearest residences are located approximately 430 feet from the project area, and uses this figure to calculate that construction noise at the nearest residence would reach approximately 71 dBA, just under the Caltrans 12 dB significance threshold the document adopts for construction noise assessment.

This distance is factually incorrect. Using Google Maps measurement tools, my residence on Cirugu Street is approximately 300 feet from the proposed project site, a 33 percent error in the foundational measurement upon which the noise significance determination rests.

Using standard acoustical principles, at 300 feet rather than 430 feet, projected construction noise at the nearest residence would be approximately 74 to 75 dBA, roughly 3 to 4 dB louder than calculated. Applied to the document's own ambient baseline and its own adopted Caltrans significance threshold of 12 dB, this correction likely pushes the construction noise impact from "less than significant" into significant territory by the document's own standard. I respectfully request that:

- The project team verify and publicly disclose the methodology used to determine the 430-foot distance and reconcile it against Google Maps and any available survey data.
- The acoustical analysis be recalculated using the correct distance to the nearest residence, and the significance determination revised accordingly.
- If the corrected calculation produces a significant impact finding, full mitigation measures be identified and evaluated before any project approval.

Response to Comment I3-4

The comment expresses a need to amend the noise analysis to reflect a distance from source to receptor of 300 feet instead of 430 feet. Refer to Response to Comment I3-1.

Comment I3-5**IV. The Nearest Residential Receptor — A Cirugu Street Resident — Was Not Measured in the Noise Assessment**

In written correspondence from the project coordinator, I was informed that the noise assessment included long-term measurements at the existing station, along Pomo Street, and at "the nearest receptor to the proposed new site."

My residence on Cirugu Street is, by distance measurement, among the nearest residential properties to the proposed facility, approximately 300 feet away. However, Cirugu Street was not identified as a measurement location in the coordinator's response. This means the property closest to the project site may not have been assessed as a sensitive receptor in the noise study at all.

This is a significant gap. A noise assessment that measures along Pomo Street but omits the nearest adjacent residential street, where one of the closest neighbors live, cannot be considered a complete evaluation of impacts on sensitive receptors. CEQA requires that the analysis address the most impacted receivers. I respectfully request that:

- The project team confirm in writing whether any Cirugu Street residential property was measured or modeled as a sensitive receptor in the Saxelby Acoustics noise assessment.
- If no Cirugu Street property was assessed, the noise analysis be supplemented with measurements and modeling at the nearest Cirugu Street residential receptor under both construction and operational conditions.

Response to Comment I3-5

The comment requests noise measurements be taken at the nearest residence along Cirugu Street and reflected in the environmental analysis. As noted by the comment, noise measurements were taken in several locations at and around the Project area. The noise measurement taken along Pomo Street as part of the environmental analysis is considered representative of ambient noise in the area. This is further supported by the consistency of noise level measurements across the 4 measurements taken and reflected in Appendix C of the Draft IS/IEC/EA. As noted in Response to Comment I3-1, the residence referred to in this comment was considered as part of the environmental analysis and identified as the closest noise-sensitive receptor to the Project, contrary to statements made in this comment. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

Comment I3-6**V. The Aesthetics Analysis Is Facially Inadequate With Respect to Neighboring Residents**

Section 5.1 of the environmental document contains several material flaws in its analysis of aesthetic and visual impacts on neighboring residential properties.

First, the analysis relies heavily on existing mature vegetation to screen the project from view, while simultaneously acknowledging in Section 5.1.4(b) that trees will be removed from the central portion of the project area to construct the facility. The screening argument is internally contradictory: the vegetation relied upon to justify a "less than significant" visual impact finding is the same vegetation that will be cleared to build the project.

Second, the document's visual impact analysis is almost entirely oriented toward highway travelers along US 50 and SR 89, with only a passing reference to Pomo Street and no analysis whatsoever of impacts on Cirugu Street residents, who are one of the closest neighbors to the facility. I am attaching as Exhibit A a photograph taken from my window on Cirugu Street showing the proposed site clearly visible at approximately 300 feet. CEQA requires analysis of impacts on adjacent sensitive land uses. Residents who will view this facility from their homes every day are the primary sensitive receptors for visual impacts, not highway travelers passing at speed.

Third, the document cites compliance with TRPA's "Mountain Contemporary" architectural standards as the basis for its aesthetic conclusions. These design standards govern building appearance. They do not address the visual character of industrial air drying equipment, vehicle queuing lanes, inspection bays, security fencing, a 1,300-square-foot decontamination unit, a 1,200-square-foot storage building, an 80-by-120-foot bypass area, and continuous heavy vehicle traffic, none of which are evaluated for visual compatibility with the surrounding residential neighborhood.

Fourth, the lighting analysis dismisses nighttime impacts on the basis that inspections occur during daylight hours. This ignores the permanent workforce housing component, which will be occupied and generating light, vehicle activity, and noise year-round including evenings and overnight hours in all seasons.

I respectfully request that the aesthetics analysis be revised to:

- Resolve the internal contradiction between the screening argument and the tree removal the project requires.
- Specifically assess visual impacts on Cirugu Street residential properties as the nearest sensitive receptors, including photo-simulation of the completed facility as viewed from neighboring homes.
- Evaluate the visual character of operational equipment, vehicles, queuing areas, and industrial structures, not merely the architectural design of buildings.
- Address year-round lighting impacts from workforce housing occupancy, not only daytime inspection operations.

Response to Comment I3-6

The comment expresses concern that the visual analysis did not appropriately consider the removal of on-site vegetation, private views, visual compatibility, and lighting associated with the proposed workforce housing. With respect to screening, the Draft IS/IEC/EA did appropriately consider the extent to which proposed buildings would be screened from view. The screening of on-site development that was referred to on page 29 in the Draft IS/IEC/EA is the existing vegetation (including trees) located along the perimeter of the site along Pomo Street, US 50, and SR 89. The proposed workforce housing, which would adhere to TRPA's Mountain Contemporary architectural standards, would further prevent views of vehicle queuing from Cirugu Street. Based on a review of line-of-sight as provided in Exhibit A to the comment, the inspection station building and canopy would be located approximately 200 – 250 feet to the east of the Project area frontage shown in Exhibit

A and would not be visible. This is supported by the absence of the existing power lines from either photo provided in support of this comment. The ingress and egress points would be visible, including from nearby residences. This is acknowledged on page 29 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, and was shown in visual renderings that were provided as part of Community Meeting #2 on May 4, 2026. The analysis provided in the environmental document is considered accurate and appropriate with respect to views from nearby residences.

With respect to the proposed workforce housing, access and the primary entrances to the proposed residential units would be located internal to the site and away from Pomo Street and nearby residential uses. Existing vegetation and the residential units themselves would prevent excessive light spillover toward adjacent uses. Further and as noted on pages 30 and 31 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, all on-site lighting (including that associated with the workforce housing units) would be designed to eliminate excess light pollution (i.e., angled down and toward on-site development) and installed in accordance with TRPA guidelines, including appropriate directional placement. Therefore, the analysis of potential lighting impacts associated with the workforce housing units is considered accurate and appropriate. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

Comment I3-7

VI. The Site Plan Reveals an Industrial-Scale Complex Incompatible With the Document's Characterization

Review of the project site plan reveals a scope and scale not adequately reflected in the environmental document's characterization of the facility. The proposed complex includes: a queue area for 12 boats measuring 55 by 225 feet; a decontamination unit of 1,300 square feet; a storage building of 1,200 square feet; an office and public restroom of 600 square feet; a bypass area of 80 by 120 feet; parking for off-site employees; and a workforce housing building of 4,608 square feet with tuck-under parking. This is not a modest inspection station. It is a permanent, multi-structure, industrial-scale complex with year-round residential occupancy, sited within a residential neighborhood.

Additionally, the queue area is designed to hold 12 boats while the facility operates 14 drying stations simultaneously. On any peak summer day when demand exceeds 12 queued boats, overflow will extend onto Pomo Street, the same pattern of on-street queuing the document acknowledges has already failed at the existing Keetak Street site. The environmental document must include a specific queuing overflow analysis demonstrating how Pomo Street will be protected from becoming a de facto queue extension, and what enforceable operational conditions will prevent this. A video posted to Facebook by the TRPA on July 1, 2020 shows significantly more than 14 boats lined up along Pomo and Cirugu Streets, demonstrating that similar traffic patterns will continue to occur despite the large inspection station site: <https://fb.watch/GUXu8AjzmV/>

Response to Comment I3-7

The comment expresses concern regarding the scale of the facility and the potential for queuing of vehicles onto Pomo Street. The commenter's opinion regarding the size and capacity of the facility is noted. With respect to the potential for drying stations to be provided as part of the Project, refer to Response to Comment I1-4. As it pertains to queuing of vehicles, the video to which the comment refers was taken on July 1, 2020. TRPA had initiated a reservation system 5 days prior, on June 26, 2020, and suspended the system between July 1 and July 5 of that year, resulting in the conditions shown. The reservation system has now been in place for the past 6 years, and approximately 7 to 8 vehicles queue at one time. As a result, queuing of vehicles for inspection is not

anticipated to exceed the queuing capacity of the Project for up to 17 vehicles. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

Comment I3-8

VII. The Project Is a Year-Round Facility and Must Be Evaluated as Such

The proposed facility includes permanent onsite workforce housing for inspection staff during the boating season and snow removal staff during winter months. The facility will be occupied, lit, and generating vehicle traffic and noise in all seasons. The environmental document must fully assess year-round operational impacts, including:

- Off-season vehicle traffic for snow removal operations and staff housing occupancy.
- Year-round lighting from the residential building during evening and overnight hours.
- Noise from year-round staff activity, vehicles, and equipment associated with housing occupancy.
- Land use compatibility of a permanently staffed, inhabited commercial facility within a residential neighborhood in all seasons.

Response to Comment I3-8

The comment requests evaluation of the Project as a year-round facility. The Draft IS/IEC/EA did evaluate the Project as having two distinct components, a watercraft inspection station that would be open during boating season and workforce housing units. The workforce housing units were assumed to be occupied year-round, as the residents of the units could assist with snow removal during the winter months. No supplemental analysis is considered to be required as a result of this comment.

Comment I3-9

VIII. Traffic Management Has Already Failed at the Existing Site

The project description acknowledges that at the existing Meyers inspection station on Keetak Street, staff are routinely forced to conduct inspections on the public roadway because the current site lacks adequate queuing space. The agency has demonstrated that it cannot prevent on-street spillover at the existing facility. Commitments to manage traffic at the new site should not be accepted without independent verification. The environmental document must include an independent traffic impact analysis conducted by a licensed traffic engineer, a specific queuing overflow analysis for Pomo Street under peak conditions, and enforceable operational conditions with defined consequences that prohibit on-street queue spillover.

Response to Comment I3-9

The comment requests an independent traffic impact analysis. Refer to Response to Comment I1-5.

Comment I3-10

IX. Summary of Requested Actions

I respectfully request that the TRPA and El Dorado County:

- Extend the public comment period beyond May 15, 2026, given the volume and materiality of errors and omissions identified in the environmental document.

- Revise the noise model to include industrial air drying equipment at all 14 stations under peak simultaneous operating conditions, and recalculate projected noise levels at the nearest Cirugu Street and Pomo Street residential property lines.
- Compare revised operational noise levels against the Meyers Area Plan's 55 dBA CNEL residential standard, not only FICON aviation noise criteria.
- Correct the foundational distance error in the construction noise analysis (300 feet, not 430 feet) and revise the significance determination accordingly.
- Confirm in writing whether any Cirugu Street residential property was assessed as a sensitive receptor, and supplement the analysis if it was not.
- Revise the aesthetics analysis to address visual impacts on Cirugu Street and Pomo Street residents specifically, including photo-simulation from neighboring properties, and assess the visual character of operational equipment and industrial structures.
- Revise the environmental document to fully assess year-round operational impacts from workforce housing occupancy.
- Commission an independent traffic impact analysis and queuing overflow study by a licensed traffic engineer.
- Recirculate the revised environmental document for public comment if significance determinations change as a result of these corrections.
- Provide a formal written response to each concern raised in this letter and in my prior submission dated May 1, 2026.

The noise analysis in this environmental document omits the facility's primary noise source, uses an incorrect distance to the nearest residence, applies an airport noise standard to a residential neighborhood, and fails to assess the closest residential street as a sensitive receptor. The aesthetics analysis focuses on highway travelers while ignoring the neighbors who will live with this facility every day. These are not minor technical issues — they are foundational failures that undermine the environmental document's conclusions across multiple impact categories. I urge the TRPA to conduct a genuine, complete, and corrected analysis before this project advances any further.

Response to Comment I3-10

The comment summarizes the recommendations and requests made in preceding comments of Comment Letter I3. Refer to Responses to Comments I3-1 through I3-9. As demonstrated in those responses, the analysis provided in the Draft IS/IEC/EA is considered accurate and in compliance with CEQA, TRPA, and NEPA requirements related to environmental impact analysis. None of the concerns raised in this comment letter constitute substantial new information, as defined by the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5, as they do not identify new or substantially more significant impacts beyond those presented in the Draft IS/IEC/EA. As such, recirculation of the environmental document is not required prior to consideration by the County for adoption. Extending the public comment period is not necessary or required under State CEQA Guidelines. Moreover, there will be additional opportunities for members of the Public to provide feedback on the Project, such as the forthcoming El Dorado County Board of Supervisors meetings and the TRPA meetings.

Comment Letter I4: Jennifer Miller, May 10, 2026**Comment I4-1**

I attended the community meeting for the AIS station on Pomo.

I would like more information on Cal Trans not allowing the entrance and exit to be on the highway.

Response to Comment I4-1

The comment requests additional information regarding the infeasibility of direct access to and from US 50. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment Letter I5: Tim Taylor, May 15, 2026**Comment I5-1**

I am writing as a resident of the Meyers neighborhood to express serious concerns about the proposed permanent watercraft inspection station and the impacts it will have on nearby homes and families if approved in its current form.

After reviewing the environmental documents released on April 15, 2026, including the noise study, site plans, and related materials, I do not believe the project analysis reflects the actual day-to-day impacts this facility would create for the surrounding residential area. The scale and intensity of the proposed operation are far greater than what this neighborhood was designed to absorb.

The project includes 14 boat-drying stations, a decontamination building, overflow queuing areas, and permanent workforce housing operating year-round. Together, these elements would introduce ongoing industrial activity into the middle of a quiet residential community. The environmental review significantly understates the likely impacts from noise, traffic, and lighting.

Response to Comment I5-1

The comment is introductory in nature and provides an overview of the more detailed comments that follow. The specific comments raised following this introduction are listed separately, along with the County's individual responses. As noted in Response to Comment I1-4, the Project does not include 14 boat-drying stations. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I5-2**Noise Impacts**

The conclusion that the project would increase neighborhood noise levels by only 1 dBA does not appear realistic. Most concerning is that the analysis does not fully account for the industrial air dryers planned for all

14 drying stations. These dryers are expected to operate continuously during busy periods and are widely known to generate substantial noise levels.

The report also appears to rely on an incorrect distance measurement to nearby homes. Several residences on Cirugu Street are much closer to the site than the 430-foot distance referenced in the study. Based on actual measurements, some homes are closer to 300 feet away. That difference matters because it directly affects projected noise levels.

For residents living nearby, this would not be a minor or occasional disturbance. Continuous equipment noise, vehicle activity, and operational sounds would affect sleep, outdoor use of property, conversations, and the overall quiet character of the neighborhood. The analysis should be revised using accurate distances and the applicable residential noise standards under the Meyers Area Plan.

Response to Comment I5-2

The comment expresses concern regarding potential industrial air dryers and regarding the distance between the Project area and nearby residences. Refer to Responses to Comments I1-4 and I3-1, respectively. As noted on pages 113 through 118 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA, the Project is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Further, refer to Response to Comment I3-2 regarding the degree to which the Project would be consistent with Meyers Area Plan noise standards.

Comment I5-3

Traffic and Queuing Concerns

The proposed queuing capacity also appears inadequate for the scale of the operation. The site plan provides space for approximately 12 boats even though the facility is designed to process up to 14 boats simultaneously. During peak summer weekends, overflow onto nearby streets seems inevitable.

Residents have already seen similar congestion problems at the current Keetak Street inspection location, where boats reportedly spill into public roadways during busy periods. It is difficult to understand how this new facility would avoid the same outcome without a detailed independent traffic analysis and enforceable operational controls.

Pomo Street and Cirugu Street are narrow residential roads used daily by local families, pedestrians, and children. Increased congestion, trailer maneuvering, and roadside queuing would create ongoing safety concerns and significantly change the character of the area.

The addition of permanent workforce housing would also increase year-round vehicle traffic related to employees, maintenance crews, and snow-removal operations.

Response to Comment I5-3

The comment expresses concern regarding roadway congestion and the potential for queuing of vehicles with boats awaiting inspection on local roadways. Refer to Response to Comment I1-5.

Comment I5-4

Lighting and Neighborhood Character

The project documents also downplay the effect of lighting on nearby homes. While inspections may occur primarily during daytime hours, the workforce housing and year-round operations mean lighting impacts will not be limited to the summer boating season.

Security lighting, parking area illumination, vehicle headlights, and lighting from occupied residential units will permanently alter nighttime conditions in the surrounding area. Dark skies are an important part of the Tahoe environment and a major reason many residents choose to live here. Increased glare and nighttime light intrusion would directly affect neighboring homes and reduce the rural residential character of the Upper Truckee area.

The current review does not appear to include realistic visual simulations from nearby residences or require meaningful dark-sky protections such as shielding, fixture limitations, or stricter operational lighting controls.

Response to Comment I5-4

The comment expresses concern regarding potential lighting impacts on nearby homes, including from the proposed workforce housing units, vehicle headlights, and security lighting. Refer to Response to Comment I3-6.

Comment I5-5

Before moving forward with any approval, I respectfully ask TRPA and El Dorado County to:

- Revise the noise analysis to fully evaluate all industrial drying equipment operating simultaneously, use accurate residential setback distances, and apply the proper residential noise standards.
- Require enforceable mitigation measures, including sound barriers, equipment enclosures, and operational hour restrictions.
- Commission an independent traffic study prepared by a licensed traffic engineer and adopt strict prohibitions against any on-street boat queuing or spillover onto nearby residential roads.
- Update the lighting and aesthetics analysis to evaluate year-round lighting impacts from workforce housing and facility operations, including dark-sky-compliant requirements.
- Evaluate the project based on its true long-term operational intensity as a permanent industrial-style facility operating year-round.
- Recirculate the environmental document if revised analysis changes any significance findings.
- Provide written responses to the concerns raised by residents and neighboring property owners.

These are not minor issues for the people who live here. They affect daily quality of life, neighborhood safety, sleep, property enjoyment, and the long-term character of the Meyers community. I respectfully urge the Board to require a more complete and accurate analysis before considering approval of this project in its current form.

Response to Comment I5-5

The comment summarizes the recommendations and requests made in preceding comments of Comment Letter I5. Refer to Responses to Comments I5-1 through I5-4. As demonstrated in those responses, the analysis provided in the Draft IS/IEC/EA is considered accurate and in compliance with CEQA, TRPA, and NEPA requirements related to environmental impact analysis. None of the concerns raised in this comment letter constitute substantial new information, as defined by the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5, as they do not

identify new or substantially more significant impacts beyond those presented in the Draft IS/IEC/EA. As such, recirculation of the environmental document is not required prior to consideration by the County for adoption.

Comment Letter I6: Meghan Dunn, May 15, 2026

Comment I6-1

As a resident of Cirugu Street, I want to submit my concerns regarding the proposed watercraft inspection station planned near the Highway 50/89 intersection.

I understand and support the need to protect Lake Tahoe from invasive species. That effort is important to all of us who live here. My concern is that this particular location is too close to an established residential neighborhood for a project of this scale and intensity.

Response to Comment I6-1

The comment is introductory in nature and expresses general concern regarding the Project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I6-2

The biggest issue is traffic. During busy weekends and summer months, traffic in the area is already difficult, especially around the Highway 50/89 intersection. Adding an inspection and decontamination facility with long boat and trailer lines will only worsen congestion. We in the community will deal with more delays, more oversized vehicles, and more safety concerns on roads never designed for this kind of constant commercial activity.

Response to Comment I6-2

The comment states that adding an inspection facility at the Project area will worsen congestion. As noted in Response to Comment I1-5, the analysis of LOS or congestion is no longer considered as part of environmental documentation, following the passage of SB 743. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I6-3

Noise is another major concern. An inspection station means ongoing vehicle movement, idling engines, industrial air dryers, trailers, pressure washers, continuous equipment noise, backup alarms, and staff activity throughout the day. What currently feels like a quiet residential area will start to feel more like a highway service yard during peak seasons.

Response to Comment I6-3

The comment expresses concern regarding potential noise impacts associated with the Project. Refer to Response to Comment I1-4.

Comment I6-4

I'm also very concerned about lighting. Facilities such as this proposed station, that include workforce housing and year-round operations, require continuous lighting for parking areas, security, and residential units. Excessive lighting may not seem like a big issue on paper, but for people living nearby it absolutely changes the character of the neighborhood. Meyers is a residential community surrounded by forest, and new artificial lighting will intrude on our dark skies, disturb wildlife, and shine directly into our neighboring homes. The project's claim that it will "limit visual impacts" does not address the real world light pollution that residents like me will experience every night.

Response to Comment I6-4

The comment expresses concern regarding potential lighting impacts associated with the Project. Refer to Response to Comment I3-6.

Comment I6-5

Another concern is the inclusion of employee housing as part of the proposal. Workforce housing is an important issue in Tahoe, but it feels unrelated to the original purpose of this project and adds another layer of impact for nearby residents. Housing onsite means additional vehicles, parking, lighting, and 24-hour activity in an area that is already being asked to absorb a large regional facility.

Response to Comment I6-5

The comment expresses a general concern for workforce housing as part of the Project. The potential impacts associated with workforce housing as part of the Project are evaluated throughout the Draft IS/IEC/EA. This comment does not identify specific concerns or issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA for the workforce housing component, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I6-6

Overall, this project feels too large and too intensive for this location. I appreciate the opportunity to comment and ask that TRPA carefully consider the long-term effects this project could have on the surrounding neighborhood and the people who already live here.

Protecting Lake Tahoe should not come at the expense of the people who call Meyers home.

Response to Comment I6-6

The comment provides opinion that the Project is too large and too intensive for the Project area. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment Letter 17: Jenna Rainey, May 15, 2026**Comment 17-1**

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed permanent aquatic invasive species boat inspection station planned for TRPA-owned land on Pomo Street in Meyers. While the protection of Lake Tahoe from invasive species is unquestionably important and broadly supported by the community, the proposed location is fundamentally incompatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood, inconsistent with the Meyers Area Plan, and likely to result in significant environmental, traffic, noise, aesthetic, and quality-of-life impacts.

The current proposal raises serious concerns regarding land use compatibility, environmental review, public process, and compliance with both CEQA and TRPA environmental standards. Equally concerning is the apparent lack of meaningful engagement with the residents who would be most directly affected by the project. Thus far, despite multiple community meetings, there is no evidence that community input has been considered.

This proposal deserves far greater scrutiny before any further planning or approvals move forward.

Response to Comment 17-1

The comment expresses opposition to the Project and expresses concern regarding the level of public engagement. Regarding the degree of public engagement conducted for the project, refer to Response to Comment 11-3. Public noticing related to the IS/IEC/EA was conducted in accordance with CEQA, TRPA, and NEPA requirements. This comment does not identify specific concerns or issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is possible. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment 17-2**Inconsistency with the Meyers Area Plan**

The Meyers Area Plan clearly establishes a vision for Meyers as:

“An ideally situated, spacious, historic, and walkable mountain community that values sustainability, health, wellbeing, the natural environment, and the preservation of natural open spaces.”

The proposed project conflicts directly with these stated goals.

The Pomo Street parcel is currently a largely undeveloped, forested area that contributes to the scenic and residential character of Meyers. Replacing that natural landscape with a permanent commercial-style inspection facility, paved parking areas, boat queuing lanes, equipment storage, lighting infrastructure, employee housing, maintenance facilities, and high-volume traffic circulation would permanently urbanize a sensitive residential gateway area.

The Meyers Area Plan also emphasizes preservation of open space, scenic quality, pedestrian safety, and neighborhood compatibility. Importantly, the Plan specifically recognizes that higher-noise commercial and industrial uses should remain separated from residential and recreation districts in order to avoid land use conflicts. The proposed inspection station would do the exact opposite.

A high-noise, high-traffic industrial operation would be inserted directly adjacent to residential homes, recreational corridors, bike routes, and pedestrian areas, fundamentally undermining the planning principles established for Meyers.

The Meyers Area Plan further identifies relocation of the existing agricultural inspection station outside the Meyers area as a community goal intended to improve scenic quality, traffic flow, community character, and pedestrian and bicycle safety. It is difficult to reconcile that policy objective with the simultaneous proposal to introduce another intensive inspection facility into the center of town that would create many of the same impacts residents have already identified as problematic.

Response to Comment I7-2

The comment expresses 4 areas of concern and potential conflicts with the Meyers Area Plan. With respect to the urbanization of the area, the Project area is identified as Recreational within the Meyers Area Plan, and allows for development of certain uses, including employee housing and amusement and recreation services. The Project would provide both a recreation service related to boating on Lake Tahoe and employee housing. As such, no conflict with the Meyers Area Plan would occur.

With respect to prevention of land use conflicts, the Project would internalize vehicle queuing and reduce vehicle trips associated with the operation of the existing inspection station. The Project would also maintain existing vegetation and open space to the extent feasible along the periphery of the site to maintain the existing condition. It would also provide a dedicated connection for pedestrians and bicyclists along the southern edge of SR 89. As such, no conflict with the Meyers Area Plan would occur.

With respect to noise, no significant noise impacts were identified in the Draft IS/IEC/EA, and as noted in Response to Comment I3-2 and Appendix C of the environmental document, the Project would be consistent with Meyers Area Plan noise standards. As such, no conflict with the Meyers Area Plan would occur.

With respect to the agricultural inspection station goal of the Meyers Area Plan, TRPA began the AIS watercraft inspection program in 2008, prior to development of the Meyers Area Plan in 2018. Consideration of a goal/policy that is specific to a different facility that was in existence at the time of plan development is not appropriate or reasonable. As such, no conflict with the Meyers Area Plan would occur.

Comment I7-3

Noise Impacts and Potential Legal Concerns

The proposed facility would introduce substantial and ongoing noise impacts into an otherwise quiet residential neighborhood.

Residents who have observed operations at existing boat inspection stations are aware that the air-drying equipment used during decontamination procedures generates loud, industrial-style noise. In addition, the site would create continuous vehicle noise from trucks towing boats, idling traffic, reversing trailers, boat engines being started or tested, employee operations, and congestion associated with long wait times during peak boating periods.

The Meyers Area Plan specifically states that land use conflicts associated with noise should be prevented through careful district separation and compatible land use planning. This proposal disregards that guidance.

The project may also trigger significant concerns under CEQA and TRPA environmental thresholds relating to:

- Substantial permanent increases in ambient noise levels
- Exposure of residents to excessive noise levels exceeding residential standards
- Placement of incompatible noise-generating uses adjacent to residential properties
- Cumulative noise impacts during peak tourism and boating periods

There are legitimate concerns that operational noise levels, particularly during active decontamination and heavy traffic periods, could exceed acceptable residential thresholds, including the commonly recognized 55 dBA exterior residential standard referenced in many environmental and land use analyses.

An independent acoustical study should be required before any approvals are considered. Noise measurements should be conducted under realistic peak operating conditions and evaluated at nearby residential property lines, recreational corridors, and pedestrian areas.

Residents should not be expected to absorb industrial-scale operational noise in their homes, yards, and neighborhoods for the entirety of boating season.

Response to Comment I7-3

The comment raises concerns regarding potential operational noise considerations associated with the Project. Refer to Response to Comment I1-4.

Comment I7-4

Traffic, Congestion, and Public Safety Concerns

The proposed site appears poorly suited for the volume and type of traffic it would generate.

Boat inspection demand during summer weekends and holidays can be extremely high, with hundreds of boats entering the Basin during peak periods such as Memorial Day, Fourth of July, and Labor Day weekends. The Pomo Street location lacks the roadway capacity and circulation infrastructure necessary to safely accommodate this level of use.

The likely result would include:

- Long queues of trucks and trailers extending through residential streets
- Traffic backups onto Highway 50 and Highway 89
- Spillover congestion onto nearby neighborhood streets such as Cirugu Street and Blitzen Road
- Blocked driveways and impaired neighborhood access
- Delayed emergency vehicle access
- Increased accident risks involving pedestrians and cyclists
- Road degradation from heavy trailer traffic
- Increased exhaust emissions and idling pollution

The surrounding neighborhood currently functions as a low-traffic residential area used daily by families, children, dog walkers, cyclists, and pedestrians. Many streets lack sidewalks, increasing the safety risks associated with a dramatic influx of boat and trailer traffic.

Residents should not lose safe access to their neighborhood because of a commercial-scale regional facility placed in an unsuitable location.

A full independent traffic impact study should be required, including peak holiday modeling, emergency access evaluation, trailer circulation analysis, and cumulative impacts on surrounding intersections and highways.

Response to Comment I7-4

The comment expresses concern related to transportation impacts that may occur with implementation of the Project. Refer to Response to Comment I1-5.

Comment I7-5

Environmental and Scenic Impacts

It is particularly troubling that a project intended to protect Lake Tahoe's environment may itself cause significant environmental degradation.

The proposal would likely require tree removal, grading, increased impervious coverage, expanded lighting, drainage infrastructure, utility installation, and continuous vehicle activity on a currently natural parcel. These impacts could substantially alter the visual and ecological character of the site and surrounding area.

Potential environmental impacts include:

- Removal of mature trees and native vegetation
- Degradation of scenic corridor views from Highway 50 and Highway 89
- Visual impacts visible from TRPA-designated bike routes
- Increased stormwater runoff and soil compaction
- Habitat disruption and wildlife displacement
- Increased light pollution affecting residents and wildlife
- Degradation of nighttime scenic quality
- Industrialization of a prominent gateway area into Meyers

The project may also trigger significant impacts under CEQA and TRPA environmental checklist criteria relating to scenic resources, visual character, light and glare, noise, traffic, and land use compatibility.

The introduction of permanent lighting, equipment yards, inspection bays, fencing, employee housing, storage structures, and large-scale paved circulation areas would permanently alter the character of this currently forested and residential area.

A full environmental review should be required, including visual simulations, lighting analysis, hydrology review, biological assessment, and cumulative impact analysis.

Response to Comment I7-5

The comment raises general concerns related to potential environmental impacts associated with aesthetics, lighting, hydrology and water quality, biological resources, and cumulative impacts. All of the issue areas identified in this comment were evaluated as part of the Draft IS/IEC/EA. Refer to Sections 5.1 (Aesthetics), 5.4

(Biological Resources), 5.10 (Hydrology and Water Quality), and 5.21 (Mandatory Findings of Significance) of the Draft IS/IEC/EA. This comment does not identify specific concerns or issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is possible. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I7-6

Community Character and Property Impacts

Meyers is valued precisely because it retains a quieter, small-community atmosphere that distinguishes it from more heavily commercialized areas of the Basin. The proposed project would move the community in the opposite direction.

A permanent inspection station operating daily during boating season would effectively function as a regional industrial checkpoint embedded within a residential neighborhood. The associated traffic, lighting, noise, visual intrusion, and operational intensity would inevitably affect nearby residents' quality of life and potentially impact property values.

The fact that homes exist within only a few hundred feet of the proposed site makes these impacts impossible to dismiss as insignificant.

It is reasonable to ask decision-makers to consider this proposal from a personal perspective:

Would TRPA staff, board members, or project proponents consider this an appropriate project next to their own homes?

Would they accept industrial air blowers, traffic congestion, floodlighting, storage yards, employee housing, idling trucks, and noise exceeding residential standards operating daily in their own neighborhood?

Communities should not be expected to absorb impacts that decision-makers themselves would likely reject in their own backyards.

Response to Comment I7-6

The comment raises concerns regarding potential effects of the Project on community character and property values. Of note, air blowers or dryers are not a component of the Project; refer to Response to Comment I1-4 for further clarification. This comment does not identify specific concerns or issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is possible. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I7-7

Alternative Locations Should Be Evaluated

Before advancing a proposal with such significant neighborhood impacts, TRPA should conduct a serious evaluation of alternative sites better suited for this type of operation.

More appropriate locations may include:

- Existing commercial or industrial parcels

- Previously disturbed or developed sites
- Locations adjacent to major transportation corridors
- Regional entry points before boats enter residential portions of the Basin
- Partnerships with neighboring jurisdictions for distributed inspection infrastructure

The environmental goals of aquatic invasive species prevention can and should be pursued without placing disproportionate burdens on residential communities.

Response to Comment I7-7

The comment requests that TRPA evaluate alternative sites for the Project. Refer to Response to Comment I1-8.

Comment I7-8

Requested Actions

Given the substantial concerns outlined above, I respectfully request that the TRPA:

1. Pause all advancement of the proposed Pomo Street site.
2. Require independent environmental, acoustical, traffic, scenic, and land use compatibility studies prior to any approvals.
3. Fully evaluate alternative locations that are more compatible with the operational scale and intensity of a permanent boat inspection facility.

Protecting Lake Tahoe is a shared community value. However, environmental protection efforts must also respect established residential neighborhoods, community planning principles, and the quality of life of Basin residents.

This proposal, as currently conceived and located, fails to achieve that balance.

Response to Comment I7-8

The comment summarizes the recommendations and requests made in preceding comments of Comment Letter I7. Refer to Responses to Comments I7-1 through I7-7. As demonstrated in those responses, the analysis provided in the Draft IS/IEC/EA is considered accurate and in compliance with CEQA, TRPA, and NEPA requirements related to environmental impact analysis. None of the concerns raised in this comment letter constitute substantial new information, as defined by the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15073.5, as they do not identify new or substantially more significant impacts beyond those presented in the Draft IS/IEC/EA. As such, recirculation of the environmental document is not required prior to consideration by the County for adoption.

Comment Letter I8: Bergstedt, May 15, 2026

Comment I8-1

HI, I want to express my concerns about the new location for the inspection station on Pomo street. First and foremost, we need to consider the effectiveness of the location. We are doing this to STOP the possibility of mussels contaminating our beautiful lake! This post takes that as the most important issue! My concern is, what will keep people from driving right by the new inspection station???? Boaters for the most part do not want to

stop and have their boats inspected. It's a hassle etc.. All it takes is one contaminated boat. Think about that! We are destined to fail UNLESS you cannot launch your boat without an effective inspection! Even then, sooner or later it's going to happen. Lake Tahoe will be contaminated. I wish we could concentrate on a cure, instead of a temporary postponement like this inspection station. Regardless, the new proposed location will not be effective and will be another waste of the taxpayer's money. People who live in the proximity have reported loud noises coming from the location. This will be a problem. There is not enough parking in the location. Cars towing boats will be lined up along Pomo, Cirugu etc. causing traffic hazards, road rage, etc.. There are many launch ramps in Lake Tahoe, you can't expect this location to be effective! Think!!

Response to Comment I8-1

The comment expresses concerns related to signage and parking associated with the Project. Refer to Responses to Comments S1-3 and I1-5.

Comment Letter I9: Amanda Bergstedt, May 15, 2026

Comment I9-1

I am writing to formally submit a comprehensive protest against the proposed establishment of a permanent watercraft inspection station on TRPA-owned land at Pomo Street. While the necessity of preventing Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) is undisputed, the selection of this specific residential parcel is fundamentally flawed. The project, as currently envisioned, represents a direct violation of the Meyers Area Plan, an abandonment of established land-use principles, and a significant threat to the environmental and socio-economic health of the Meyers community.

Response to Comment I9-1

The comment expresses opposition to the Project and expresses concern regarding potential conflicts with the Meyers Area Plan and impacts to the Meyers community. This comment does not identify specific concerns or issues related to the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is possible. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment I9-2

I. Conflict with the Meyers Area Plan (MAP)

The proposed facility is irreconcilable with the mandates set forth in the Meyers Area Plan, which characterizes Meyers as a "walkable mountain community" that prioritizes the "preservation of natural open spaces."

- **Destruction of Pristine Land:** The MAP explicitly seeks to preserve open space. Converting a currently undeveloped, forested parcel into an industrial-style transit hub contradicts the town's goal of maintaining its natural environment.

Response to Comment I9-2

The comment expresses concern that the Project would conflict with the Meyers Area Plan. As noted in Response to Comment I7-2, the Project is considered to be consistent with the Meyers Area Plan. It would enhance the walkability of the area by providing a direct connection to the existing trail along US 50 and an on-site interpretive station while preserving (to the extent feasible) vegetation and open space along the Project

area perimeter. The Project area was not designated for preservation in perpetuity but rather for development consistent with the Recreational land use designation.

Comment I9-3

II. Significant Environmental and Aesthetic Degradation

This project triggers several "significant impact" thresholds under both CEQA and TRPA environmental checklists:

- **Scenic Resources:** The site is visible from Highway 50, Highway 89, and a TRPA-designated bike trail. Developing parking lots, storage sheds, a transit station, and housing will substantially damage scenic resources and nighttime views through new light pollution. The evaluation on aesthetics included in the environmental checklist failed to account for the visual impact the inspection station would have on neighborhood residents.

Response to Comment I9-3

The comment expresses general concern that the environmental document did not evaluate potential impacts on neighborhood residents. However, the Draft IS/IEC/EA does evaluate potential impacts to the surrounding neighborhood as evidenced by the discussion of views of the Project area from Pomo Street and from south of the Project on page 29. In addition, the environmental document presents an evaluation of lighting impacts of the Project to the south on pages 30 and 31 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA. No further response is necessary.

Comment I9-4

III. Incompatible Noise and Acoustic Impacts

The MAP states that high-noise districts (Industrial/Community Center) should be separated from sensitive districts (Residential/Recreation) by major highways. The Pomo Street proposal ignores this buffer.

- **Industrial Soundscape:** High-powered air dryers and boat engines frequently exceed 55 decibels. Placing this 300 feet from residences (such as those on Cirugu Street and Blitzen Road) introduces a permanent, incompatible noise source into a quiet neighborhood.
- **Operational Burden:** The noise is not limited to inspections; it includes heavy trucks idling in queue and the constant mechanical activity inherent in a commercial-scale operation.

Response to Comment I9-4

The comment raises concerns regarding potential noise impacts associated with potential air dryers and boat engines, as well as vehicle idling. Refer to Response to Comment I1-4.

Comment I9-5**IV. Public Safety and Infrastructure Concerns**

The neighborhood infrastructure, specifically narrow residential streets, was never engineered to accommodate the volume or weight of 2,000+ boat trailers annually.

Traffic Congestion: During peak periods (e.g., July 4th), the site lacks the capacity to handle the influx. This will inevitably lead to "spillover" queuing on Cirugu Street and Highway 50, blocking residential driveways and obstructing emergency vehicle access.

Pedestrian Safety: Meyers is a family-oriented community where residents, children, and cyclists use the streets due to a lack of sidewalks. Introducing heavy commercial-scale tow traffic into these "shared-use" residential zones creates an unacceptable safety risk.

Response to Comment I9-5

The comment raises concerns related to congestion and transportation safety. Refer to Response to Comment I1-5.

Comment I9-6**V. Additional Arguments Against the Proposed Site**

In addition to the points above, the Board should consider the following legal and social implications:

1. **Inverse Condemnation and Property Value:** Placing a high-impact industrial facility adjacent to residential properties likely constitutes a "taking" by significantly diminishing property values and the quiet enjoyment of the land and neighborhood community.
2. **Opportunity Cost:** This land represents a rare opportunity for projects that actually foster community, such as a downtown gathering space or recreational park. Using it for a boat station permanently deprives Meyers of a heart.
3. **Inadequate Alternatives Analysis:** The TRPA has failed to demonstrate a rigorous review of alternative sites, such as existing industrially-zoned parcels or regional entry points outside the Basin, which would achieve the environmental goal without sacrificing a neighborhood.

Response to Comment I9-6

The comment expresses concerns related to diminished property values and opportunities for other community benefits, as well as the need for further evaluation of alternatives. With respect to property values and other community benefits, the evaluation of property values is considered outside the scope of environmental analysis as required by CEQA, the TRPA Code of Ordinances, and NEPA. However, the concerns identified are noted and have been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

With respect to the need for further evaluation of alternatives, refer to Response to Comment I1-8.

Comment I9-7

The TRPA's mission is to balance environmental protection with the needs of the community. This proposal fails that balance. It places an undue burden on a small residential pocket to solve a Basin-wide problem. I

respectfully request that the TRPA immediately halt all planning actions for the Pomo Street site and engage in a transparent, independent assessment of more appropriate, non-residential locations.

Response to Comment I9-7

The comment expresses opinion regarding the potential approval of the Project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. Further, noticing of the environmental document was done in accordance with applicable requirements under CEQA, TRPA Code, and NEPA, as noted in Section 2 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA (beginning on page 3). This comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment Letter PM1: Kenny Curtzwiler, May 4, 2026

Comment PM1-1

Remove the street sign on hiway 50 saying 'Pomo.' That is actually Cirugu Street coming down 50 from Echo Summit. The people will see Pomo and turn.

Response to Comment PM1-1

The comment requests removal of the street sign located along US 50 at Cirugu Street that states Pomo Street. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

Comment Letter PM2: Allen Graybill, May 4, 2026

Comment PM2-1

Blitzen and Pomo both need repaving and have needed this for years. It's even more imperative that this is done now, before the inspection station is complete.

Response to Comment PM2-1

The comment expresses opinion that repaving of Blitzen Road and Pomo Street should be completed prior to initiation of operation of the Project. The comment does not address the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the IS/IEC/EA, and no further response is required. However, this comment is noted and has been included in the record for consideration by the Board as part of its consideration of the Project.

5 Text Revisions to Draft IS/IEC/EA

This section contains changes to the text of the Draft IS/IEC/EA in response to certain comments identified in Section 4, Comments Received on the Draft IS/IEC/EA and Responses. The changes are presented in the order in which they appear in the Draft IS/IEC/EA and are identified by Draft IS/IEC/EA page number. The changes identified below do not alter the conclusions of the environmental document with respect to any of the significant impacts of the Project and do not necessitate recirculation of the Draft IS/IEC/EA.

Section 5.13, Noise

The first paragraph on page 113 of the Draft IS/IEC/EA has been amended as follows:

Original:

Construction activities would temporarily increase noise levels in the Project area, with maximum noise levels ranging from 76 to 90 dBA Lmax at 50 feet. These activities would occur primarily during daytime hours (8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.), consistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, which exempts daytime construction noise from noise limits. The nearest residences, located approximately 430 feet away, would experience maximum noise levels of approximately 71 dBA, representing an increase of up to 11 dBA over existing ambient conditions (60-80 dBA), although likely less due to the presence of nearby highway road noise. Because there is no established TRPA threshold for construction noise, the Caltrans standard of noise impact significance (12 dBA) was used. The predicted increase is below the Caltrans significance threshold, indicating that typical daytime construction would not cause a significant noise impact.

Revised:

Construction activities would temporarily increase noise levels in the Project area, with maximum noise levels ranging from 76 to 90 dBA Lmax at 50 feet. These activities would occur primarily during daytime hours (8:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.), consistent with the TRPA Code of Ordinances, which exempts daytime construction noise from noise limits. Construction noise is evaluated as occurring at the center of a given site to represent average noise levels generated over the duration of construction across the site. The nearest residences, located approximately 430 feet away as measured from the center of the Project area, would experience maximum noise levels of approximately 71 dBA, representing an increase of up to 11 dBA over existing ambient conditions (60-80 dBA), although likely less due to the presence of nearby highway road noise. Because there is no established TRPA threshold for construction noise, the Caltrans standard of noise impact significance (12 dBA) was used. The predicted increase is below the Caltrans significance threshold, indicating that typical daytime construction would not cause a significant noise impact.

Appendix A

Public Review Draft IS/IEC/EA as Amended Through Responses to Comments