

Question:	Answer:
Can you provide the colorful trail options in a scale large enough so we can see the streets in Rubicon and then if you can add their street names then we can more easily see just where the trail options are	Street names were added to webmap and to trail alignment segment PDFs
Please identify street names on the map at westshoretahoetrail.com	Street names were added to webmap and to trail alignment segment PDFs
1) above ground Flashing Lights, signage, marking, at Hwy 89 crossing for Segment alignment 02B; 2) agree with switchbacks on SR89 up to Lakeview Drive to provide more gentle slope.	comment noted
Where will you evaluate where people will park to access the path? While adding the criteria for public parking access/distance as deterrent is appreciated, that still doesn't address where people WILL park.	The State Route 89 Corridor Plan also identified improved transit, real time travel information, and parking management as strategies to relieve congestion. TRPA, State Parks, Caltrans, El Dorado County, and the Forest Service, and the Tahoe Transportation District are exploring a pilot parking management program and seeking funds for transit. The Trail Feasibility Study will not evaluate parking as it is being considered and planned for by other efforts in the Corridor.
Can you also provide pdfs of the routes/scores?	Information included on the website includes Evaluation Criteria & Scoring Measures, Criteria Definition and Data Sources, Quantitative Scores, Feasibility Analysis "Step by Step", trail alignment segment PDFs, and the Ranked Results webmap.
If there is no option for the black line segment then what side (lake or mountain) of Highway 89 will the trail be built on above Rubicon Drive?	Portions of the corridor presented with a black line segment are locations where the trail is envisioned to be constructed within the public right of way. The specific side of the public right of way will be determined in the future design phase of the project.
What will be done with the surveys? How will they affect decisions?	The survey results will be provided to the Steering Committee as data and information to consider in determining the trail alignment to be further evaluated as part of the Feasibility Study. The Steering Committee will be provided other information including the Fall 2021 public input, results from the feasibility analysis, survey results, and feedback obtained in Summer 2022.
You should add inverse condemnation damages to routes close to homes for privacy and related impacts of public use.	comment noted
89 is not flat around Tahoe Hills. Bay View Drive and Lake View Drive are both quite steep, it appears from the map (and we walked it) that the trail comes up to Bay View drive near the top of the hill which will help with the slope issue. But that location of the street is quite narrow and can be dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists as cars come fast around this blind corner. Lake View up to the the end of the paved route is quite steep and will be difficult for many cyclists. But as mentioned this is a challenging section for either the 89 or the neighborhood option.	comment noted
Have you addressed why BOTH sides of Highway were not evaluated for the alignment? The southern section of Rubicon is labeled as "unevaluated" and it looks like only the east side of 89 is being used.	Portions of the corridor presented with a black line segment are locations where the trail is envisioned to be constructed within the public right of way. The specific side of the public right of way will be determined in the future design phase of the project.
How do we have impact on the decision on the alignment in southern Rubicon? Actual steps we can take?	Please sign up on our mailing list, visit the website frequently, participate in public meetings and provide oral and written comment, respond to surveys, participate in future public workshops and meetings, and stay informed as implementing agencies move trail segments into the design/environmental phase.
How well defined (actual location of the trail) are each of the alignments in each segment? Have all the proposed alignments been walked in the preparation of the evaluation? It's easy to draw a line on a map, but it is often far different to get out and walk a proposed alignment. One may see things that cannot be understood from a map or a LIDAR scan. For example, in one case alignment 2B traverses an area that has a stairway up a very steep hillside. (I am not an engineer and I know engineers can solve most issues like this, but it still makes me wonder how a wide trail – 8-10' or more – will make it up or across some an area like this at reasonable gradients.)	The trail alignments are defined only to the planning scale for the purposes of the Feasibility Study. The specific or exact location, demision, and profile of the trail will be determined in the future design/environmental phase. TRPA and the consulting team have walked each of the proposed alignments multiple times. In addition, the alignments have been photographed, mapped, and evaluated with geospatial mapping tools. The team is aware of the many unique physical and spatial constraints associated with each alignment.
What standard is the trail to be built to? Paved? Width of pavement or tread? Width of shoulders? Maximum gradient? Is the trail expected to look more like the section of trail through Sugar Pine Point State Park or the section of the trail from the State Park to Meeks Bay Resort?	The trail is envisioned to be a class 1 separated path. Class 1 paths typically include a paved 10 foot trail with 2 foot unpaved shoulders on either side of the trail. However, the specific dimensions and type of trail has yet to be determined and there are likely several places within the corridor where a standard Class 1 trail may not be feasible.
For alignments along SR89, how much right-of-way exists to either side of the SR89 roadway? Is there a standard distance you expect to keep between the fog line on the roadway and the trail? Is the roadway centered in the right-of-way or does the roadway meander?	An initial review of the Caltrans ROW width suggests there is adequate area to construct a trail. The ROW location does vary across the corridor; however, for alignments envisioned to be within the public right of way, a separation between the roadway and trail is desired. None of these specifics have been determined and are not part of this feasibility study.
Related to the right-of-way question above, how is this project accounting for the storm water facilities that were recently constructed all along SR89, mostly, or perhaps, in the SR89 right-of-way? Within this segment there are storm water facilities on each side of SR89 just south of the Meeks Creek bridge/box culvert that appear to occupy the available right-of-way.	Existing facilities, including stormwater facilities, will be considered as a part of the design of any trail segment. They will be accomodated or integrated with any changes in locations where both existing facilities and the trail are proposed.
How/where will Meeks Creek be crossed in both of the proposed alignments? The current bridge/box culvert does not appear wide enough on either side to accommodate the trail. Is a separate bicycle/pedestrian bridge being proposed? Are you working with the Meeks Bay Restoration Project regarding the creek restoration both upstream and downstream from the SR89 crossing and/or a possible replacement of the existing bridge/box culvert with a bridge which is being considered? This could be an opportunity for a separated grade crossing of SR89 if that might create the possibility of a more favorable alignment of the Tahoe Trail.	The Feasibility Study is coordinating with the Meeks Bay Restoration Project. The final alignment selected for the trail will determine the location for the crossing. There is potential for inclusion with a new bridge facility on the Caltrans right of way or a seperate trail specific crossing on the meadow or lake side of the highway.
When Roadway Crossings are discussed in the evaluation of Constructability criteria is this only for SR89 or does it include other roads, driveways, entranceways (Meeks Bay Resort, Meeks Bay Campground) and the Firehouse apron?	Roadway crossings as part of the evaluation criteria only relate to crossings of Highway 89.
Will the current parking along SR89 in the vicinity of the Desolation Wilderness trailhead be impacted by either alignments 1A or 1B? In what ways? Could this project address improving the parking along SR89, particularly in making it much clearer where parking is and is not allowed?	There is potential for the trail to intersect with existing formal and informal parking near the Desolation trailhead. The Feasibility Study is coordinating with Caltrans, the USFS, and the Meeks Bay Restoration Project and parking in this area is being considered. All parties are looking for opportunities to improve safety and parking accessibility in the area.
It sounds as if this study is evaluating "corridors" rather than actual "alignment" - is this an accurate understanding?	No. Trail alignments are being evaluated. The Feasibility Study will include the Steering Committee selecting a single alignment from the existing options for further refinement and evaluation as part of the Feasibility Study. The Highway 89 Recreation Corridor Plan recommends that a trail be studied as one of the strategies to address congestion.
Why was a 1-3-5 scoring system adopted? (What happened to 2 and 4? They could provide some nuance to the process!) If only using three values, why not a 1-2-3 system? Also, is the scoring based on some standard across all segments and alignments or is it comparative to roughly "parallel" alignments (ones that start at Point A and end at Point B, such as 1A and 1B, although I am not sure the south end of those alignments are in the same location)?	The scoring system was developed based on other similar trail based evaluation efforts and the experience of the Project team. The 1, 3, 5 scoring system allows for clearer seperation between alternative alignments. The metrics applied to each alignment are defined and provided for review on the Project website. The same criteria is applied to each alignment option.
Is there supporting documentation for the evaluation scores that will be made available to the public? It helps to know why certain situations were scored in certain ways.	The scoring results and supporting criteria and metrics are provided within the webmap (click on the actual trail line in the map) and additional scoring summaries and details of the criteria are provided in pdfs on the web page.

Question:	Answer:
Your map is provided by ERSI, as is the TRPA Tahoe Open Data map shown here: <a href="https://data-trpa.opendata.arcgis.com/apps/map-maker/explore">https://data-trpa.opendata.arcgis.com/apps/map-maker/explore</a> . It seems that adding the street layer should be pretty easy. E Bikes will be a game changer and need to be part of the planning. The reality is the goal is to minimize / eliminate parking at Emerald Bay, the only way that will happen is with people using E Bikes.	Street names were added to webmap and to trail alignment segment PDFs
Can you address concerns at Emerald Bay (geotechnical analysis, landslide areas, etc.)	The agencies will evaluate the use of Ebikes on the trail. Emerald Bay is a challenging location. Readily available soils, geologic, avalanche, drainage, and other information are being used to develop the Feasibility Study. Further engineering, soils, geotechnical, and environmental analysis will be conducted in the future design/environmental phase.
Qualitatively, is there a significant difference between an alignment score of 68 v 70? When alignment scores are close, what is the judgement criteria which will be used in the next phase that has the most impact?	Scoring that results in alignment options with similar scores requires evaluation of how those scores were accumulated. Are their different scores produced by different criteria or were they the same? These results require stakeholders and the Steering Committee to consider qualitative considerations in determining which alignment option should rank higher.
It appears on the map that you are potentially planning on the path running along 89 by Cascade Properties between Cascade Rd and the creek. This portion of the land has a new drainage pond installed, for runoff. How will the path go around this?	The trail alignments are defined only to the planning scale for the purposes of the Feasibility Study. The specific or exact location, deminsion, and profile of the trail will be determined in the future design/environmental phase.
Is it likely that the Emerald Bay segment will be the last one tackled because of its unique challenges?	Emerald Bay is a challenging location. It may result in this segment moving to design/environmental and construction later then other segments.
How do construction costs figure in on a project of this size when all other factors are fairly equivalent? Let's assume everyone agrees on a certain blue alignment, but that segment costs more to build. How much more can be spent to build on the preferred blue alignment v. a different alignment? Thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions?	Construction costs are one of the evaluation criteria. Preliminary cost estimates will be developed for the alignment included in the Feasibility Study. TRPA and other agency partners will evaluate costs and potential funding sources as a part of next steps in the basin.
Who pays for NEPA on this project?	NEPA development and funding is often determined by the federal lead agency. In the case of the trail that may be the US Forest Service, Army Corps of Engineers, or other federal partner.
Where the blue alignment is proposed in front of Cascade Properties, are there any rest stops, bathroom areas proposed, etc?	The trail alignments are defined only to the planning scale for the purposes of the Feasibility Study. The specific or exact location, deminsion, and profile of the trail will be determined in the future design/environmental phase. Amenities including rest stops and restrooms will be futher evaluated for the highest ranked alignment.
Will the Steering Committee meetings be open to the public?	No, these meetings are internal. However, if the study is presented to a public agency board it would be open to the public.
The potential impacts on residential and private property areas could be considered.	Comment noted
Trail enjoyment for the landowner as well as the user is important, particularly noise impace, views, litter and trespassing.	Comment noted
I think operational alternatives (buses, boats, shuttles, timed entry) will be very helpful to try out before construction of a trail alternative.	comment noted
Options like a shuttle will be more effective in addressing the traffic concerns than a bike path many people won't use. A better use of resources in my opinion.	The State Route 89 Corridor Plan also identified improved transit, real time travel information, and parking management as strategies to relieve congestion. TRPA, State Parks, Caltrans, El Dorado County, and the Forest Service, and the Tahoe Transportation District are exploring a pilot parking management program and seeking funds for transit.
Appreciate that you've added switchbacks on #2 from 89 to Lake Drive. The switchback are important because of the grade. It would be welcome to get people up the grade in a gentle manner.	comment noted
The crossing at 02B - if it's a surface crossing will there be surface painted markings? I would highly recommend signage and flashing lights. Some of the crossings don't have them. It will be important for safety.	The details of any road crossing will be determined in the future design/environmental phase.
Please explain the "not evaluated" black line.	Portions of the corridor presented with a black line segment are locations where the trail is envisioned to be constructed within the public right of way. The specific side of the public right of way will be determined in the future design phase of the project.
I appreciate the attention to Glen Drive. Can you overlay the map with street names?	Street names were added to webmap and to trail alignment segment PDFs
Right at Rubicon Drive near the entrance, there is a power line easement. It looks from the map that the preferred option comes down to Hwy 89. Is it on the hill side or the lake side?	The trail alignments are defined only to the planning scale for the purposes of the Feasibility Study. The specific or exact location, deminsion, and profile of the trail will be determined in the future design/environmental phase.
The analysis is somewhat subjective as to the criteria evaluated, and some of the scoring. There is a difference between 14 points between 89 and Tahoe Hills. I disagree with the scoring on emergency access. Also, there are more slopes on Tahoe Hills than Hwy 89. I think the scoring should be 5 for 89 and 1 for Tahoe Hills. There are far more crossings in Tahoe Hills than Hwy 89. Maintanance is also not scored correctly. If you made those changes, then 89 would be the high score.	Comment noted
It's a steep slope along Meeks Bay Avenue. Yes Hwy 89 is flat but drops off steeply behind many of those cabins, and we will see them from our backyard and decks. There would need to be retaining walls dug into that area. Prefer the trail be on the mountain side of 89.	comment noted
Crossing Meek's Creek, would the trail be included in the discussion of the replacing of the bridge/crossing over the creek?	Yes
What is the reasoning on the scoring for slope on Tahoe Hills and 89? One seems to have quite a few slopes and the other is flat.	Please see the scoring metric definition and the scoring table.
In order to get quality input you need to provide better information than you have now. The maps are not good enough. Improve the map quality. And don't send us to the website to get the information. Send us an email directly.	comment noted
Tell people what the options are for the black line. Let people tell you whether they want the lake or mountain side on the black line.	Portions of the corridor presented with a black line segment are locations where the trail is envisioned to be constructed within the public right of way. The specific side of the public right of way will be determined in the future design phase of the project.
Where exactly will the trail go into DL Bliss at option D?	To be determined
Will public consultation be a part of the process for those who are impacted by what side of the black line is decided?	Yes
Can you break down the segments within Rubicon so we can distinguish the streets more easily?	Street names were added to webmap and to trail alignment segment PDFs
Is it as a general cheaper to build the trail into the upslope side or the downslope side?	Depends on type and size of trail and site conditions.