BURTON CREEK STATE PARK
GENERAL PLAN
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
Reponses to Comments

Volume 2 of 2

State Clearinghouse # 2005052059

Approved by the State Park and Recreation Commission
November 18, 2005

California Department of Parks and Recreation
Sierra District
2005

Volume 2
This is Volume 2 of 2 of the Final General Plan for Burton Creek State Park. It contains the Comments and Responses (comments received during the public comment period review of the General Plan and California State Parks (CSP) response to those comments); and the Notice of Determination (as filed with the State Office of Planning and Research), documenting the completion of the CEQA compliance requirements for this project. **Volume 1** of the Final General Plan for Burton Creek State Park contains the Executive Summary; the Summary of Existing Conditions; Goals and Guidelines for park development and use; Environmental Analysis (in compliance with Article 9 and Article 11 Section 15166 of the California Environmental Quality Act); Maps and Appendices relating to the General Plan. Together, these two volumes constitute the Final General Plan for Burton Creek State Park.

This document is also available as an electronic file at
www.parks.ca.gov/generalplans

Copyright

This publication, including all of the text and photographs, unless otherwise noted, is the intellectual property of the Department of Parks and Recreation and is protected by copyright.

Table of Contents

Introduction……4

List of Commenters……6

Comments and Responses……9

Recommended Changes to General Plan……77

INTRODUCTION

On June 15, 2005, the California Department of Parks and Recreation (Department) released to the general public and public agencies the Preliminary General Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Report for Burton Creek State Park. The proposed General Plan will guide future management direction at the park. It contains a comprehensive and integrated set of park-wide goals and guidelines for the long-term management of the Park that focus on protection of environmental resources, enhancements to visitor use and opportunities, and improvements to administration and operations of the park. In addition, the General Plan includes proposed plan elements, park development and operations, and designates appropriate land uses.

The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that is included in the Preliminary General Plan contains the environmental analysis of potentially significant effects of the proposed project. Together, the Draft EIR and this response to comments document constitute the Final Environmental Report for the project.

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21091 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15087, a 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR was provided. The public was advised of the availability of the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR through public notices, a mailing notice to over two hundred and fifty individuals, and notification on the Department's web site. The Public Notice (Notice of Availability) was posted with the Placer County Clerk. Copies of the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR were also available for review at the following locations: Tahoe City Public Library, Sierra District Office at Sugar Pine Point State Park, Tahoma, CA, the Northern Service Center in Sacramento, and on the Department web site. Copies of the documents were also available upon request to the Sierra District Office in hard copy and CD format.

The public review period ended July 31, 2005. During the public review period, comments on the Plan and environmental analysis were received from one public agency (California Department of Transportation), one Native American Tribe (Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California), private groups, and individuals. The vast majority of individual comments were submitted via email. The Department also received a petition signed by approximately 300 individuals and submitted anonymously. The exact number of signatories is unknown due to some individuals signing several times. Also included as comments, are the comments received during the public meeting convened on July 7, 2005, specifically for the purpose of letting the public comment on the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR.

The majority of comments were objections to the proposed development of a campground in the park.

All comments on the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR and the responses thereto, are presented in this document, which is organized as follows:

The Introduction provides a brief overview of the proposed project, describes the requirements under CEQA for responding to public comments received on the Draft EIR, and describes the organization of the Final EIR.

The next section is a List of Commenters which is a list of all people and entities that submitted comments.

The next section provides the Responses to Comments including a copy of the comment letter and the responses to it, for every comment received during the public comment period on the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR.

The final section provides a reproduction of portions of the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR with revisions to text and graphics made in response to comments.

LIST OF COMMENTERS

This chapter provides a list of all public comments received on the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR during the public review period, which ended on July 31, 2005, Listed first are agency and/or organizations who submitted comments, followed by individuals who submitted comments.

Agencies and Organizations

Jeffrey Pulverman, Chief, Office of Transportation Planning and Mass Transportation – Caltrans

Marie Barry, Environmental Director, Environmental Protection Department, Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California

Ron Treabess, Director, Community Partnerships and Planning, North Tahoe Resort Association

Duane L. Whitelaw, Fire Chief, North Tahoe Fire Protection District

Individuals

Jeffrey D. Harris
Richard Van Fossen
Julia Kingery
Lynne Larson
Juli Anderson
Arthur Penniman
Marylyn and Peter Siewert
Jon Weedn
Robin Machette
Mike Niles
Ingrid Backstrom
Jeffrey Rieger
Alain and Stacy Bordes
Paul Vatistas
Kris Kingery
Carol Pollock
Michael Ramicone
Elizabeth Dugan
Sue and Gregg Henrikson
Mike Schwartz
Doug Greenwood
Dewey and Lynda Paul
Laurie Gregory
Nancy Wells
Mr. and Mrs. Charles Banfield
Mr. and Mrs. Richard Banfield
Nurpu

Dave Shelton
Jim Zellers
Greg and Mary Rankin
Anne Greenwood
John Hearst
Ray Garland
Hugo Kenyon
Joann Russell
Emily Headley
Roger Huff
Mike Hawkins
Tom Carter and Carol Mazerall
Benita Luke

Also received and recorded as part of the public comment are those comments received at the July 7th public meeting held at the North Lake Tahoe High School

Finally, a petition was anonymously submitted during the comment period.

A note to the commenters - We wish to sincerely thank every individual that commented on the Preliminary Plan. Really! Each one of you took the time to become involved and active in a planning process with direct and indirect effects to an area you care for. For that you are to be commended. Despite differences in opinion with some commenters, the Department has listened to you, making several changes to the three draft renditions of the general plan along the way. We believe the current Preliminary General Plan strikes a balance between the needs of the local community and the mandates governing the Department in providing statewide outdoor recreation.

For brevity, throughout the responses to comments, we refer to the Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Report as the Preliminary Plan. The California Department of Parks and Recreation is referred to as the Department. Burton Creek State Park is sometimes referred to as BCSP.

Also for brevity, readers will note that we refer commenters to responses in earlier letters received for similar issues. We apologize if this appears somewhat impersonal. However, where the issue or concern was the same, there was no reason (or way) to create a unique response to each person bringing up the same concern.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING AGENCY ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 3, SACRAMENTO AREA OFFICE
Venture Oaks -MS 15
P.O. BOX 942874
SACRAMENTO, CA 94274-0001
PHONE (916) 274-0614
FAX (916) 274-0648
TTY (530) 741-4509

Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

July 27, 2005

05TAH0015/05TAH0012
SCH# 2005052059
Burton Creek State Park
Preliminary Plan and DEIR
05PLA028 PM 1.50/1.75

Mr. Ken Anderson
California Department of Parks and Recreation
P.O. Box 266
Tahoma, CA 96142

Dear Mr. Anderson:

1.10 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Burton Creek State Park Preliminary Plan and DEIR. We acknowledge your response on June 24, 2005 to our NOP comments. We look forward to working with you to assess future traffic impacts, and offer the following comments and points of clarification below:

COMMENTS

1.11
- Although the Preliminary General Plan is a part of a tiered environmental assessment process, it would be more efficient to conduct a comprehensive traffic study at this juncture to identify significant traffic impacts and necessary mitigation measures. This would allow for the identification of effective mitigation strategies and for the timely pursuit of resources for project development and construction activities, which often take many years. Furthermore, a comprehensive traffic study avoids the pitfalls of separate traffic analyses, including, for example, the efficient sequencing and planning of Park improvements and cumulative impacts. Caltrans staff is available to assist you with developing the scope of the needed traffic study.

1.12
- The Plan cites the undetermined amount of traffic as an unavoidable significant environmental effect. Such a finding is premature, given the absence of an objective traffic study and consultation with Caltrans regarding strategies to reduce impacts to State Route 28, particularly with regard to the access points to the Highway.

1.13
- On pages 7 and 29 of the DEIR, Caltrans Level of Service (LOS) goals are discussed. It is stated that Caltrans goal for LOS on State Route (SR) 28 is a LOS D. This is incorrect. The current LOS is E and the future concept for SR 28 is LOS F. Even though the concept LOS is "F", significant impacts

to the Highway must be mitigated and appropriate facilities developed. For example, the access points to the Park will have to be constructed to State Highway standards.

1.14 • The Preliminary General Plan states that the preferred access point from SR 28 into the park would be near the Tamarack Lodge across from Star Harbor Court. Depending on the volume of traffic expected to use this access, a left-turn pocket may be required on SR 28. Subsequent environmental and traffic analyses will be needed to address park access issues.

1.15 • On page 68, the initial phase includes the development of four trailheads. Two are located at the Tahoe State Recreation Area Campground (TSRA) and one at Tamarack Lodge would require access directly to SR 28. The safest locations for access must be determined for each of these sites, and Caltrans should review any preliminary plans. The demand for parking at these trailheads should be estimated carefully, and adequate parking provided, so that overflow parking does not impact the highway. Subsequent environmental and traffic analyses will be needed to determine if highway improvements will be required concurrently with the construction of the access for these trailheads.

1.16 • Caltrans expects to begin construction of a major water quality treatment project on this segment of SR 28 within the next couple of years. If the Department of Parks and Recreation is able to identify and fund needed improvements to SR 28 and/or Burton Creek State Park in a similar time frame, we would encourage coordination between, and consideration of, project scheduling between our departments as feasible.

1.17 • The proposed park site is located immediately adjacent to and up gradient of SR 28. The existing 2000 acre site is undeveloped but has been logged out. Several non-paved (dirt) logging roads traverse the site. These roads have been greatly incised and currently serve as drainage pathways during significant rainfall and snow melt events. With high runoff flows, the site and the system of dirt roads continue to erode and contribute significant quantities of depositional material to the Burton Creek meadow and to Lake Tahoe. Efforts should be made in this project to restore natural vegetation within the park area and to establish more natural waterways within the park area to carry surface water to the various creeks within the park. The park entrance and exit road off of SR 28 should include improvements to insure that runoff being carried along the shoulder of the park access road is conveyed to the west to Burton Creek. Caltrans currently has no plan to increase Burton Creek flows beneath SR 28 at the current creek crossing (PM 1.66). Park improvements should not result in adverse hydrologic or hydraulic impacts to the State's highway Right of Way. Any cumulative impacts to Caltrans' drainage facilities arising from effects of development on surface water runoff discharge from the peak (100-year) storm event should be minimized through project drainage mitigation measures. All grading and/or drainage improvements must perpetuate, maintain or improve existing drainage pathways and may not result in adverse hydrologic or hydraulic conditions within the State's highway Right of Way or to Caltrans' drainage facilities. Means of accomplishing this, if necessary, shall be identified and backup calculations supporting this conclusion provided to our office. Please identify proposed outfall and runoff pattern in future documents.

1.18 • On page 51, the goal of having more signs on the highways to guide visitors to this park is discussed. While some directional signage to the park may be permitted along state highways, it is unlikely extensive signage will be permitted along multiple highways given the size of the park.

POINTS OF CLARIFICATION

1.19 • It should be noted that Caltrans did not create LOS standards. The "LOS" metric was established through the Transportation Research Board, and the Levels of Service are defined in the Highway Capacity Manual. (Page 28)

1.20 • On page 29, it states that Caltrans is leading a taskforce to address traffic congestion in Tahoe City, and that improvement projects are planned for implementation in the next 5 years. While Caltrans is involved with other agencies is examining various alternatives for State Route 28 near Tahoe City, it is a significant challenge, given funding and environmental constraints, to implement major projects to reduce traffic congestion during the next several years.

1.21 • On page 29, it states that passing is difficult on SR 28. It would be more accurate to say that passing is illegal on SR 28 between Tahoe City and Tahoe Vista.

1.22 Please provide our office with a copy of the future reports and documents, including the hydrology report and conditions of approval. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Marlo Tinney at (916) 274-0618.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY PULVERMAN, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning and Mass Transportation

Cc: State Clearinghouse

Response to Letter 1 from the California Department of Transportation

1.10 The Department thanks you for the Department of Transportation's participation and comments on the Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR.

1.11 The Department does not believe conducting a traffic analysis at this time is a prudent use of resources. A traffic analysis should be conducted at the time of the proposed development. At that time that current conditions can be analyzed and critiqued against the exact facility development proposed.

1.12 We concur. The text on page 81 referring to the unavoidable significant impact has been revised to read as follows:

Impact
Potentially significant unless mitigated

~~1.12~~1.13 Thank you for the correction. From other interactions between our respective departments, we were under the impression Caltrans had a specific goal to improve traffic flows in Tahoe City. Regardless of Caltrans future traffic flow goals in Tahoe City, the Department will integrate all possible mitigation actions, such as constructing the park access points to State Highway standards, to attempt to mitigate traffic impacts below a significant level. The following paragraph, located on page 7, will be revised to read as follows:

Second, the proposed campground development will take into consideration traffic on Highway 28, by referencing the Caltrans traffic index of Levels of Service (LOS) for Tahoe City. The index, that rates traffic flow on a scale of A-F, currently rates Tahoe City traffic near the bottom of the scale as an E, due to traffic congestion at times. Caltrans, has determined that due to regulatory restrictions defined by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), they are unable to implement potential measures to improve the index and that it will eventually be downgraded to an F. The Department is committed to work with Caltrans, TRPA and other agencies to implement reasonable and feasible mitigation for the proposed development in this plan to lessen impacts to traffic as much as possible.

Page 28 – 29 will be changed as follows:

Another impact on facility development in BCSP, is ~~the ongoing problem of~~ traffic congestion in Tahoe City and in the Lake Tahoe area in general. During most of July and August, holidays, and winter weekends, traffic backs up on Highways 28 and 89 leading into Tahoe City. Delays can

range from minutes to an hour, with the back up sometimes measured in miles.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) ~~has an established~~ utilizes a system describing traffic quantities on two-lane highways. Called "Levels of Service for Two-Lane Highways", the system rates highway traffic ~~alphanumeric system~~ based on quantity of traffic and speed limit (see below).

Traffic on Two-Lane Highways: Level of Service Definitions

LOS A – Free Flowing Conditions.

LOS B – Speeds at or near free-flow speed, but presence of other users begins to be noticeable.

LOS C – Speeds at or near free-flow speed, but freedom to maneuver is noticeably restricted.

LOS D – Conditions where speeds begin to decline slightly with increasing flow;

LOS E – Operating conditions at or near roadway capacity. Even minor Freedom to maneuver more restricted.
disruptions to the traffic stream can cause delay.

LOS F – Breakdown in vehicle flow. Queues form quickly behind point in the roadway where the arrival flow rate temporarily exceeds the departure rate.

Highway traffic around Tahoe City is currently ranked as an ~~F – heavily congested traffic~~ E by Caltrans- Operating conditions at or near roadway capacity. ~~Demand exceeds capacity and speeds vary greatly – considerable delays. The~~ Caltrans projects the future LOS for Highway 28 in the Tahoe City area to downgrade to an F. (Draft State Route 28 Transportation Concept Report).

"The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is the responsible agency within the Tahoe Basin for transportation issues, and takes the lead role in identifying transportation strategies and projects. As a result, in order to preserve the unique character of the Basin, typically, TRPA does not pursue additional roadway capacity. Since Caltrans is not the responsible agency for programming capacity increasing projects in the Basin, they cannot guarantee that the overall facility will operate at any level of service better than LOS F. Therefore, the future concept for SR 28 will remain LOS F."~~goal for highway traffic around Tahoe City is to achieve a ranking of D. This would allow for a speed of about 40 miles per hour (except right in town), with some traffic flow becoming unstable. Speeds are subject to sudden change and passing is difficult.~~

~~In order to meet this goal, Tahoe City traffic issues are currently being addressed through a new taskforce headed by Caltrans. Several alternatives to alleviate or lessen the traffic are being explored including construction of another bridge across the Truckee River, and bypasses around the town. Implementation is planned in the next five years.~~

Many of the recreation facilities proposed in this general plan are viewed by local residents as potential negative contributors to the existing traffic flow in Tahoe City. The Department's intent is to ~~plan for facilities that will allow for a Level of Service ranking D or better.~~ work closely with Caltrans and other state, federal and local agencies to implement reasonable and feasible measures to mitigate or reduce ~~significant~~ traffic impacts.

This may be achieved by implementing the improvements developed through the Caltrans Tahoe City traffic working group combined with other mitigations such as retiring of an existing campground in Lake Forest currently managed by the Department of Fish and Game, designing the facilities to encourage walking and biking, and working with other agencies to evaluate opportunities for a trolley service from the campground to nearby points of interest. Also, the size of the proposed campground has been reduced from 300 sites and two large group sites, to a campground of a range of ~~1~~ 25 - 200 sites, and one group site for 50 people.

Page 32, paragraph 6 will be changed to read as follows:

There are two traffic issues related to the proposed campground development in the Preliminary Plan. One is where the primary access road into the park is located and connects with Highway 28. The other issue is in regards to increased traffic from the proposed facilities and traffic flow.

The original focus of much opposition regarding the access road location was its location near Dollar Hill. The Department listened to the community and moved the proposed access road location from the Dollar Hill area to the currently proposed location at Tamarack Road. The Department will still need to work closely with Caltrans to incorporate properly designed ingress/egress engineered features on Highway 28 where the access road will connect. In order to develop this access, the current natural preserve boundary will require adjustment. This will require a separate resolution for the Park and Recreation Commission to approve.

In regards to increased traffic and traffic flows California State Parks is committed to work with Caltrans, TRPA and other agencies to implement all feasible and reasonable mitigation measures to reduce the traffic impacts of the proposed development in the Preliminary Plan.

~~A primary caveat to campground development will be traffic flows along Highway 28. Development of a campground at Burton Creek State Park will be considered with engineering measures taken in Tahoe City to improve the current traffic Level of Service, from a ranking of F to a level of D, as described in the Caltrans Level of Service traffic Ranking System. This may be achieved by expanding existing roads, adding new roads, building a bypass around Tahoe City or developing a second bridge down river from Fanny Bridge. The Department's intent is to plan for facilities that will allow for a level of service D or better.~~

Page 68, bullet 5 will be changed as follows:

- Plan for development of a campground in this planning zone. The actual size of the campground would be determined through analysis of use data and environmental analysis and constraints. Start the planning process by considering a facility to accommodate ~~1~~ 25 - 200 campsites, a small number of cabins and yurts, and one group camp area for 50 people. Campground development would take into consideration traffic on Highway 28, with the intent of implementing feasible and reasonable measures to mitigate impacts of traffic flow and access on Highway 28.

Page 81, Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects, Traffic, will be changed as follows:

Traffic

Threshold

Caltrans uses the Concept Level of Service (LOS) as the CEQA level of significance threshold when evaluating the impacts of local development plans and projects. A significant impact is identified if a specific local development plan or project results in a level of service on the highway segment or intersection that is below the Concept LOS, and must be mitigated.

Impact

Potentially significant unless mitigated

Discussion

Traffic in the Tahoe City area is sometimes congested during daylight hours during the summer and winter weekends. Caltrans currently ranks traffic flow as an ~~F~~ E – ~~Considerable Delays~~ Operating Conditions at or

near roadway capacity - on Highway 28, ~~the worst rating in its Level of Service traffic flow rating system.~~ In their Concept Transportation Report for Highway 28 (TCR, 2004) Caltrans has projected the LOS for Tahoe City will be downgraded in the future to a LOS of F - heavily congested traffic - in the future.

The report goes on to state:

"The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is the responsible agency within the Tahoe Basin for transportation issues, and takes the lead role in identifying transportation strategies and projects. As a result, in order to preserve the unique character of the Basin, typically, TRPA does not pursue additional roadway capacity. Since Caltrans is not the responsible agency for programming capacity increasing projects in the Basin, we cannot guarantee that the overall facility will operate at any level of service better than LOS F. Therefore, our concept for SR 28 will remain LOS F."

Proposed campground development and day use facilities in the General Plan may contribute to the traffic congestion. ~~It is the intent of the Department to meet the goal of Caltrans to achieve and maintain a traffic flow Level of Service D, with only minor delays in traffic. However, this goal may not be attained.~~

Mitigation

California State Parks is committed to work with Caltrans, TRPA and other state, federal and local agencies to implement all feasible and reasonable mitigation measures to reduce the traffic impacts of the proposed development in the Preliminary Plan.

~~Although some of the expected i~~Increases in traffic from the campground development may be mitigated through various measures such as project design encouraging hike and bike trips to town, developing public transportation options, closing of the Forest Lake Campground (DFG operated), developing a trolley service from the campground to local points of interest, and limiting the size of the new campground.~~, not all of the additional traffic may be mitigated to a level below significant.~~ The proposed campground size will be analyzed to determine the size of campground that will maximize camping opportunity while addressing traffic impacts.

The impact ~~That~~ determination for the campground will be made when a traffic analysis is conducted as part of a facility development project specific CEQA document. ~~Therefore, an increase in traffic of a yet undetermined amount, must be considered at this time an unavoidable significant environmental effect.~~

Responsibility:	The Department of Parks and Recreation Staff Planners
Monitoring/Reporting	Completion of Traffic Analysis as part of a project specific CEQA analysis.

Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects

Evaluation of the specificity of this first tier review indicates that all the ~~other~~ potential effects from projects proposed in this General Plan can be reduced to a less than significant level with appropriate facility location, the implementation of resource management programs, and the development of other specific mitigation measures.

Until the uses, locations, and scope of facilities or management plans are specified, the actual level of impact, whether individual or cumulative, cannot be determined. However, all future plans and projects are required to be in compliance with local, state, and federal permitting and regulatory requirements and subject to subsequent tier CEQA review and project specific mitigation.

1.14 The Department concurs subsequent environmental and traffic analyses will be needed to address park access issues when future development is proposed.

1.15 The Department concurs with Caltrans that subsequent environmental and traffic analyses will be needed when specific trailhead development is proposed.

1.16 The Department currently has no funding or timeframe for the proposed facility development discussed in the Preliminary Plan. Upon approval of the Preliminary Plan, when the Department is able to move forward with any of the facility development proposed in the plan, we will coordinate immediately with the SR 28 Project.

1.17 The Department concurs. The current Preliminary Plan recommends the development of a Vegetation Management Plan to develop a healthy forest, and a Road and Trail Plan to address erosion of current roads and trails. Drainage, storm water runoff discharge, erosion, and all other impacts associated with the proposed development will be analyzed through subsequent environmental documents when specific development is proposed.

1.18 We concur that excessive signage is not necessary to indicate the park's location to the public. Currently, no signs are found along the highway indicating the location of the park. We will work closely with Caltrans to

determine the appropriate number of signs that will be allowed along the highway.

1.19 See response to comment 1.13. We have modified references to the LOS.

1.20 The Department recognizes the uphill battle all involved parties will have in implementing solutions to improve traffic congestion in the Tahoe City area. However, we remain optimistic solutions exist and can be implemented to improve traffic flow in the town.

1.21 References to passing have been deleted.

1.22 We will keep Caltrans informed of all new reports and documents pertinent to Burton Creek State Park and Highway 28.

Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California

Environmental Protection Department

July 31, 2005

California State Parks and Recreation
Sierra District
Mr. Ken Anderson
P.O. Box 266
Tahoma, CA 96142

Dear California State Parks and Recreation:

Subject: Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report

2.10 Thank you for providing an opportunity to comment on the Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. The Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California's Environmental Protection Department has the following comments to offer on the Plan.

2.11 The Washoe people have occupied over 1.5 million acres surrounding the Lake Tahoe Basin area for over 10 thousand years and Lake Tahoe is the center of their aboriginal territory and is to this day considered a sacred place. The Burton Creek area and meadow complex was utilized and managed by the Washoe for thousands of years prior to European contact the area was known for its rich natural resources which supplied food for the Washoe throughout the year. There is a Washoe name for every tributary that enters into Lake Tahoe and different families occupied areas surrounding the Lake. The focus of these comments are mainly related to natural resources, but keep in mind that natural and cultural resources to Washoe are one in the same. The Washoe Archival Coordinator, William Dancing Feather or the Cultural Committee should be consulted regarding cultural resources.

919 Highway 395 South, Gardnerville, Nevada 89410
(775) 265-4191 • (775) 883-1446 • (530) 694-2339 • FAX (775) 265-3211

1. The California Code of Regulations §4332. Preparation of General Plan. States:

2.12 "After classification or reclassification of a unit, the Department shall obtain public comment and prepare a general plan. The general plan shall consist of a resource element, a land use element, a facilities element, and an operations element. In order that it shall act as a guide and constraint, the resource element will be prepared, made available for public comment, and approved by the Director before substantial work is done on the other elements of the plan."

Where is the signed Resource Element for Burton Creek State Park?

2.13 2. Pg 6. Why should a local high school need access through a State Park? The State Department of Education requires access prior to the establishment of a school.

2.14 3. Pg 7. Does California State Parks and Recreation really mean that they may only have one site in a campground? 50 to 200 are more realistic than 1-200! How was carrying capacity and attendance limits established over such a wide range? California Public Resources Code Sec. 5001.96. states: "Attendance at state park system units shall be held within limits established by carrying capacity determined in accordance with Section 5019.5." Section 5019.5 states: Before any park or recreational area developmental plan is made, the department shall cause to be made a land carrying capacity survey of the proposed park or recreational area, including in such survey such factors as soil, moisture, and natural cover. Where is this survey? It is not referred to in the literature sited section. Neither is the original "Burton Creek Inventory of Features" that was required for classification.

2.15

2.16 4. Pg 8. Boundary adjustment - Why is a portion of the Burton Creek Natural Preserve being eliminated for roads and facilities? Has this area lost its "natural value" or is this for convince of the developments? The Alternative campground site would not compromise the natural preserve. "Technically, natural preserves should not have roads in them" - is not correct. Legally natural preserves shall not have roads in them. Please refer to California Public Resources Code Sec. 5001.8. (a)" The use of motor vehicles in units of the state park system is subject to the following limitations: (1) In state wildernesses, natural preserves, and cultural preserves, use is prohibited." That includes park vehicles.

2.17 5. Pg. 31. As described in the Plan the majority of the park visitors are residents who would like to see the area maintained as undisturbed as possible. Additional facilities, trails, and roads will impact the scenic and natural value of the area. There will be unavoidable negative impacts to wetlands including the meadows and riparian corridors if the area is

developed. The potential impact to the water quality of Lake Tahoe by non point sources from the proposed Plan is great. Shouldn't the Department be protecting the area not impacting the area?

2.18 6. Pg 40. Development of a forest management plan - Stack and burn causes destructive alteration of soil structure and destroys native seed reserves found naturally in the soil; it also leaves the perimeter of these intense burns susceptible to alien weedy taxa invasions. This is not a recommended practice! Scattering of downed fuels in forest openings would be more appropriate.

2.19 "Broadcast burning" should be replaced with "prescribed burning". Chipping has two known problems - it decreases the pH of the soil and it smolder burns during wild or prescribed fire.

2.20 No mention of a meadow management plan? Frequent fire is essential to perpetuation of meadows. Seeds of native grasses and other forbs were harvested by the Washoe; meadows were burned after harvest. This practice probably occurred for thousands of years. Meadows were thus not encroached upon by surrounding forest ecosystems.

2.21 7. Pg.46. Fire Management Goals - this should be based on more than "historic information" Fire chronologies have been worked out for the Tahoe Basin - i.e. Scott Stephens (UCB) work. See: Stephens, S.L., Meixner, T., Poth, M., McGurk, B, Payne, D. 2004. Prescribed fire, soils, and stream water chemistry in a watershed in the Lake Tahoe Basin. International Journal of Wildland Fire 13: 27-35.

2.22 8. Wildlife surveys have identified Northern Goshawk nests within and adjacent to the Park boundaries.

2.23 9. The potential administrative building site is located within the Burton Creek Reserve area and is in the middle of two riparian corridors and would impact the integrity of the SEZ. It is recommended that development be outside of riparian and meadow areas. The potential location would impact the tributaries, meadows, riparian corridors, and the Lake.

2.24 10. There are a few unique forest stands in the Park that have only recently started to make a comeback since the logging era. It is recommended that these stands be protected to the fullest extent possible for future generations to enjoy.

2.25 11. It is recommended if this plan is implemented that any ground disturbance should have a Washoe monitor on site along with the department's archeologist in order to protect cultural and historical resources that will be disturbed.

2.26 Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report. If you have any questions or need clarification on the comments provided please feel free to contact me at your convenience at (775) 265-8682 or via email at marie.barry@washoetribe.us. William Dancing Feather, Archival Coordinator can be reached at (775) 888-0936 and can also set up a meeting with the Cultural Committee if needed.

Sincerely,

Marie Barry
Environmental Director
cc: A. Brian Wallace, Chairman
Tim Seward, General Counsel
William Dancing Feather, Cultural Archives Coordinator
Lynda Shoshone, Cultural Committee
WEPD file

Response to Letter 2 from the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California

2.10 The Department thanks the Washoe Tribe for taking the time to comment on our Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR.

2.11 The Department has met with tribal leaders to discuss the proposed plan, as required by the Department's Native American Consultation Policy and Senate Bill 18, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004, and will continue to consult with appropriate members, such as the Washoe Archival Coordinator, when any proposed development comes to fruition or whenever the Washoe Tribe proposes we meet. For this project we met personally with Lynda Shoshone of the Cultural Committee, and sent letters to William Dancing Feather, Cultural Resources Coordinator, and Brian Wallace, Chairperson, advising them of the project.

2.12 The Department completed a Resource Inventory for Burton Creek State Park (BCSP1978 – 1994). We are sending you a copy.

2.13 A secondary access route through the state park had been requested by some members of the community in the past to lessen traffic in their neighborhoods and to provide secondary emergency evacuation routes out of the neighborhoods in the event of a forest fire in the area. The Department's position on the access route through the park was the proposed road was not compatible with the State Park mission, and other routes (exiting north of the Highlands Subdivision) and safe zones (high school ball fields) are available in the event of a fire.

2.14 The Preliminary Plan discusses a range of campground sizes. We plan to analyze the impacts of a campground incrementally until the maximum 200 site campground and 50 person group camp is analyzed. We particularly want to analyze the impacts additional traffic will have on Highway 28. In this way we can propose and construct a campground that addresses impacts while maximizes camping opportunity.

2.15 We concur. Once a General Plan is approved for the park, specific development plans and proposals are made. The Department then conducts timely surveys for resources utilizing the existing Resource Inventory and other available resource information, to determine the impacts the proposed development will have on the natural and cultural resources. This will occur when any type of development generally described in the Preliminary Plan is proposed for implementation. For additional information, please see the discussion under "Carrying Capacity and Park-Wide Goals and Guidelines for Managing Visitor Impacts" in the Preliminary Plan.

2.16 The road proposed for access into the park currently exists through the preserve. However, the Department is recommending an adjustment to the preserve boundary for several reasons. In order to improve the road for public access, it should be realigned slightly, widened and paved. Paving the road, and putting in proper drainage structures, will also eliminate the erosion currently taking place on the road. Realignment of the road will also allow the Department to move it away from adjacent landowners to lessen visitor/ private property interactions. Finally, the proposed boundary adjustment will allow for administrative buildings to be constructed on high capability lands adjacent to the highway.

In considering this boundary adjustment, the Department has placed protection of the resources at the forefront. The preserve was established to protect Burton Creek and the surrounding riparian area. The area being proposed for removal from the preserve is not in the riparian area nor is it near the creek. It is an upland forest area similar to the rest of the park. It actually slopes away from the creek so any runoff from the area does not enter Burton Creek. We encourage a field trip inspection of the area proposed for removal from the preserve to verify these findings.

2.17 The Department respects the position taken by many of the local residents who do not want to see any changes made in the park, especially the development of overnight camping facilities, because they believe it will impact the scenic and natural values of the area and caused negative impacts to wetlands, meadows and riparian areas.

The Department strongly endorses the plan because it will, in many ways, improve environmental conditions in the park. As described in the Preliminary Plan, a Road and Trail Management Plan will be developed and implemented. This plan, when implemented, will restore some eroding roads trails to natural landscape while re-engineering others to eliminate current erosion problems. Some roads and trails, currently located in meadows and riparian areas will be removed. No new roads or trails will be proposed in meadows or riparian areas. The plan will also address the needs of the various user groups to construct or improve existing connector trails to surrounding U.S. Forest Service lands.

The Department's mission is to protect resources and provide recreation. We believe the plan provides a greater level of protection of resources than currently exists in the park, and will provide a larger spectrum of recreational opportunities to all Californians, including the local residents.

No facilities are proposed in or near riparian areas, meadows or stream courses so there would not be additional impacts to these resources. The proposed campground is approximately .5 miles from the any residential area.

In terms of degrading scenic and natural resources the total build out of all the facilities will affect less than 10 percent of the park or two hundred acres. If the Tahoe Conservancy parcel (Dollar parcel) is added in then the park will be about 3,000 acres, meaning only 7 percent of the total land base will be impacted in any way from the proposed development.

In response to the comment that the proposed developments would affect Lake Tahoe's water quality, the proposed Preliminary Plan will lead to improvements to roads and trails in the park, decreasing sediment sources to the lake. In particular, the entrance road currently accessing the park has serious design flaws leading to sediment eroding directly into Burton Creek (then Lake Tahoe). The road would be improved under the plan eliminating this erosion. Also, redundant roads and trails in the park would be eliminated, also decreasing erosion of sediment from the park. Finally, all the proposed developments would be designed in high capability areas, with all required Best Management Practices (BMPs) to capture all project produced sediments. The proposed location for the campground is far from all stream courses and wetlands, on flat ground, on a very large flat bench.

In addition to a greater level of resource protection described above for controlling sediment and erosion, development of the park will result in greater State Park ranger presence in the park. The park will not be developed unless it is staffed with appropriate levels of rangers, ecologists and maintenance workers. Local residents are concerned about illegal activities taking place in the park, such as motorcycle riding. Such activities can cause erosion and are a fire hazard. In parks where there is a ranger presence, these activities are quickly stopped. Development of the park will be coupled with an increase in staffing, allowing the Department to hire rangers to patrol and protect the park's resources and stop illegal activities.

Finally, concerns have been expressed by some about a campground increasing fire danger. Campground development will bring fire hydrants to the middle of the park where water is currently not available for fire suppression, increasing fire suppression capabilities. Regular patrols will be in the park to spot fires sooner. DPR is not aware a wildfire has ever been attributed to a state park campground.

Also, more fuels reduction work has taken place in Burton Creek State Park in the last five years than any other Tahoe Basin state park. Shaded fuel breaks have been constructed next to most of the adjacent subdivisions, and extensive forest thinning and fuel reduction has occurred in the area of the proposed campground. For these reasons the Department does not believe fire hazard will be an issue with the proposed development in the Preliminary Plan.

2.18 The Department recognizes that pile burning can cause alteration of soil structure and mortality of the natural seed bank. It can also lead to alien weed invasion. However, we view it as a necessary step in the overall program of restoring health to forest stands. We strongly disagree that we could scatter slash on the forest floor as an alternative.

We have completed many forest management projects in BCSP over the last twenty years. Our forester characterizes the stands as overgrown, decadent, and heavily overburdened with fuels. Our current prescription for treatment is to thin the stands, removing dead trees and live trees to reduce the stocking. Then we pile the slash and down dead material and burn it during the winter. Finally, only after the fuel loads have been greatly reduced, do we broadcast burn. If we eliminated the pile burn phase, fuel loads would be so great that the entire stand would burn up when we broadcast prescribe burned. In addition, local and regional regulatory agencies such as the North Tahoe Fire District and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency do not permit scattering of slash as an alternative to pile burning.

2.19 We use the terms broadcast burning and prescribed burning interchangeably. We concur that chipping has problems including decreasing the pH of the soil and smoldering when burned. We only chip in areas where we do not plan to burn, where we haul the chips away, or where we wish to inhibit future understory growth.

2.20 Our most recent experience with burning in meadows is that it promotes the invasion of exotic species. The burning of the meadows in the past took place at a time when few exotic species were present to invade meadows following burning. Our current method of treating conifer encroachment in meadows is removal of the trees when they are seedlings and saplings using hand crews.

2.21 Thank you for the references on fire chronologies. Page 46, under Goal will be changed as follows:

Maintain a fire management program based on vegetation management priorities, scientific fire chronology studies, historical information, monitoring data, and other park management goals.

2.22 The Department has monitored the Northern Goshawk activity in BCSP for many years. The species is mentioned in page 42 under Special Animals.

2.23 We agree all development should be outside of riparian and meadow areas. The area proposed for administration buildings is on a flat, dry, mixed conifer site at least 500 feet from a riparian or meadow area.

2.24 We agree the forest stands in BCSP should be protected. We have an active program to treat stands in the park to promote healthy forests for future generations.

2.25 The Department will work with the Washoe Tribe to have a monitor on site during any construction of the proposed facility development.

2.26 The Department looks forward to working with the Washoe Tribe as we move forward in this planning effort.

North Lake Tahoe
RESORT ASSOCIATION
Serving our members • Serving our community

July 29, 2005

Ken Anderson
Sierra District
California Department of Parks and Recreation
P.O. Box 266
Tahoma, CA 96142-0266

Re: Burton Creek State Park Draft General Plan

Dear Ken,

The North Lake Tahoe Resort Association would like to express our support for the approach that has been taken to draft a successful General Plan for Burton Creek State Park. The Park-Wide Goals and Guidelines appear to be well thought-out and have provided a solid basis on which to develop the preferred alternative.

3.10

3.1

As you know, the Resort Association has recently completed a broad based effort to develop the *North Lake Tahoe Tourism and Community Investment Master Plan* as a guiding document for the cooperative efforts necessary to achieve economic and environmental sustainability and community improvement. Our goal, much as is yours, is to ensure the long-term enhancement of our natural and human environment, and historical and cultural heritage. The results will provide an improved visitor experience and quality of life for residents in the North Lake Tahoe area. We believe the goals of the BCSP General Plan and our Master Plan do compliment each other and allow for working together to achieve them.

3.11

3.11

Specific proposals that we would like to see expanded or further referenced in the General Plan, and have you consider working with the Resort Association to accomplish are parking, transit, visitor information, and signage. Parking and convenient transit opportunities have always been in short supply in the Tahoe City area. While we are continuing to improve parking and transit, it is very important that this need be strongly stated as a part of all new visitor serving proposals. Information is also a very important part of the visitor experience, and all of us providing such should do so in concert, enabling the visitors to receive what they need to know about the area at any one of our information facilities.

3.12

3.12

We would like to suggest you incorporate more language in your description of the opportunities at the trailhead to be located across Highway 28 from the Tahoe State Recreation Area Campground where BCSP touches the eastern edge of Tahoe City. We agree that this area will be the most popular trailhead allowing access into BCSP, and could provide multi-benefits to visitors and residents utilizing the State Park, Tahoe State Recreation Area, and Tahoe City. There is the opportunity in this location to provide a major parking area which will serve this trailhead without taxing surrounding

limited parking, and will serve Tahoe City. It will allow an easy interface with the Tahoe City Trolley and other transit vehicles that could provide access to other trailheads and, perhaps, to the proposed campground. There might be the opportunity to consider "trolley access" camping and reduced auto camping. Regardless, a free trolley to and from the campground, other trailheads and Tahoe City would reduce auto trips, having a positive impact on the traffic congestion along Highway 28. Additionally, a visitor information center located here would be key to allowing visitors to learn of the opportunities of BCSP, other State Parks, and Tahoe City/North Shore. As this proposal is consistent with many findings and recommendations in our Master Plan, the Resort Association could consider a request to help fund the planning and environmental analysis, as well as solicit funding partners for bringing the proposal to fruition.

3.13

3.13

The Resort Association and other local entities are beginning to do planning for a wayfinding signage program to improve and coordinate directional signage along the Northshore of Lake Tahoe. The purpose of this program is to accomplish the type of needs you are calling for under Park Wide Goals for Circulation. A stronger reference in the General Plan to this on-going program and the need to coordinate with it, would ensure that States Parks is working with the local community and could lead to BCSP being able to share in some of the funding this program might receive.

3.14

3.14

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this Draft General Plan, and have done so to the extent that our two missions relate to one another. We look forward to the approval of this Plan which will allow certain needs of BCSP to start being met. We realize that Burton Creek State Park is very important not just to North Lake Tahoe, but to the entire California State Parks system. With that in mind, we thank you for carefully considering the effect BCSP will have on the surrounding area.

Sincerely,

Ron Treabess

Ron Treabess
Director, Community Partnerships and Planning
(530)581-8735; (530)581-8780 (fax)
ron@puretahoenorth.com

Response to Letter 3 from the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association

3.10 Locally, the Sierra District of California State Parks has enjoyed a long and cooperative relationship with the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association. Statewide, the Department has worked with resort associations and the business communities in efforts to promote and protect parks while creating a successful business climate for nearby businesses. The economic benefits of State Parks to local communities have been clearly demonstrated in many studies.

3.11 When we develop and submit plans and environmental documents for a trailhead development across from the Tahoe State Recreation Area (TSRA), we will consider facilities to accommodate dissemination of visitor information for the Tahoe Basin and local businesses.

3.12 As we move forward with the development of a trailhead across from the TSRA campground, we will consider the needs of parking for businesses in Tahoe City in so far as it fits with the mission of California State Parks.

3.13 The Department strongly agrees with the concept of a trolley service from the proposed campground and trailheads to other central locations. On page 29, Constraints on Facility Development, the paragraph has been amended to read as follows:

This may be achieved by implementing the improvements developed through the Caltrans Tahoe City traffic working group combined with other mitigations such as retiring of an existing campground in Lake Forest currently managed by the Department of Fish and Game, designing the facilities to encourage walking and biking, and working with other agencies to implement a trolley service from the campground to nearby points of interest. Also, the size of the proposed campground has been reduced from 300 sites and two large group sites, to a campground of a range of ~~1~~ 25 - 200 sites, and one group site for 50 people.

On page 51, Park Wide Goals and Guidelines for Circulation, a bullet has been added to read as follows:

- The concept of a trolley service can be explored with other local entities to shuttle people from the proposed campground and trailheads to central locations such as Tahoe City.

Also, see Response 1.13 for more information on traffic.

3.14 The Department looks forward to reviewing the way finding signage program once it is developed and exploring the possibility of integrating it with the Department's signing standards for State Parks.

July 26, 2005

To: Ken Anderson

Re: Burton Creek/Dollar properties

I appreciate that our state park system is inviting input, and hope this leads to trying new approaches in combining recreation with natural environment. A unique opportunity opens up if goals of the Forest Service, the State Park, and Firestone properties unite in certain projects. The Firestone is the only remaining sizeable undeveloped property that fronts the highway for a 30-mile stretch of the lake's north shore. And the Burton Creek/Dollar properties are the only areas that can link the Firestone's adjacent black-top civilization with the upper-basin's forested wilderness. To err in decision-making regarding this park's highly-desirable position will be viewed by succeeding generations as an irreparable loss.

My credentials: I have tent-camped for months...or overnight as a city-escape. I have been a mountaineer, rock-climber, back-packer, and day-trip hiker. I view the outdoors as another home, know my limits, and find that non-structured recreation balances the structure civilization places us in. While teaching in the public schools I introduced inner-city kids to the out-of-doors, and while teaching skiing for 35 years I helped adult "couch-potato" beginners overcome their fear of inadequacy and of an alien environment. (Many have later become staunch supporters of our state and national parks, and of protecting the environment.)

My viewpoint: To experience is the key. We gain re-creation by going back to our native heritage. The problem is that we don't know what we have missed until we experience it. An uneducated consensus of what recreation is cannot mend this. Rather than pandering to human misconceptions, public agencies must help educate the public—and that includes setting certain limits.

My suggestions: Ski areas don't encourage beginners to hop on the highest lift. Newcomers to the sport are helped in choosing proper clothing and equipment. They are encouraged to take lessons that start on the "civilized" flats and gradually reach "native" heights. Burton Creek State Park is located in an ideal situation for creating a summer school for "beginning" and "intermediate" hikers and bikers and tent-campers, encouraging increasingly high explorations, and luring persons onto trails that branch out above the park—far from their cars and civilization. (To avoid overcrowding our parks we must spread more of our growing population into these "outer" areas.) Since the current proposed plan for Burton Creek awaits traffic mitigation, this is an ideal time to experiment with new (and less expensive) recreational uses. As starters:

4.10

Help solve the traffic problem. If possible, eliminate all the proposed trailheads. (To provide on-site parking only increases our car-enslaved populace.) The Tahoe Trolley/TART bus system provides speedy access to both Tamarack and Dollar Hill.

And people will use it if it's the only vehicle that can take them where they want to go. (The only exception would be for ADA parking.) The short bus trip would introduce visitors to a means of travel around the lake that aids relaxation and lessens traffic. A "guided hike" might start in the bus—which would also advertise the park's services to other bus occupants.

4.11 Hold a variety of talks and guided short hikes—including speakers who may be local businessmen or knowledgeable in specific fields…eg: How to survive without a car nearby: What day-pack to choose, and what to supply it with—covering needs of various ages and family situations. What clothes to choose (especially footwear.) Join a park naturalist or an artist or musician or experienced hiker, etc. as the teacher/guide who makes the hike an "experience" rather than a lecture. (Each contributes a different viewpoint—important since we differ in how we learn.)

Expand the length of hikes to all-day, or evening/night experiences, which can tune the participants into handling changes in temperature and use of their senses in varying environmental situations. Lessons can include how to put out a minor fire in forested land, first aid, and how to protect oneself or one's family from various dangers (human, animal, or environmental.) Discussions encourage participants to compare this new environment with that of their usual one.

4.12 Establish area(s) for tent-campers only—NO vehicles, thus the campers pack in their gear (or hire a service-employee to do this.) Camping can include lessons that focus on the information needed by potential back-packers. Ideally, a variety of tents and equipment would not only be displayed, but could be rented for a short stay. Classes would cover all aspects—from camp-cooking to sleeping bag comfort to which pack fits which person and purpose. Over-night campers would have star-gazing sessions—or follow paths without a flashlight, etc. Naturalists can teach the campers about native animals and the night-environment's sounds. (That persons can experience the quiet and solitude of isolated areas, yet be close to town, is a learning experience that most campgrounds cannot provide.)

4.13 Set up pre-registered programs for special interest groups (which would include limited-group camping—and NO vehicles)…eg: Mountain–biking for novices, painting outdoors under an artist's guidance, classes for dancers, students in scientific fields, teen-age challenges, gourmet camp-cookery, family-camping for those with pre-school children, for seniors, for the disabled, etc. Specialized concessions may offer the designated courses.

Other insights: Tahoe City locals expected that the state would honor keeping this property only for day use. Many persons aren't yet aware of what changes might ensue—if only because no worker can keep up with the multiple meetings of the 25 or so agencies and groups that govern our area. That "not in my back yard" is a common complaint does not make it invalid. This undeveloped area lies between 3 large subdivisions—the most compacted area near Tahoe City—and the necessity of preserving nearby green-belt areas like Burton/Dollar is also being

4.14 recognized by land planners throughout the country. Locals fear having vehicle-campers (let alone RV's) near homes and the high school—since they increase the danger of fire, of robbery and sex-crimes, and endanger the nearby bears and other wild animals. There is no way that the state park can ensure safety for any of us settlers. (However, persons who tent-camp are usually a breed that reveres the environment, and would probably be accepted by their neighbors.)

4.15 The Tahoe Basin is too valuable to remain a one-day trip for the masses that view the scene without developing a kinship with it. I spent several years in attending meetings held by many agencies (plus local and county special-interest groups.) ALL of them mentioned the need for visitor education, yet little originality in planning this has emerged. The state park administration can lead the way for other locales, and also contribute to this community's welfare. To have the Burton Creek State Park initiate an educational program for its visitors provides a focal point that sparks cooperation—and aids the local economy. (Those attending classes will purchase clothes and equipment from locals whose expertise they now trust.) To stimulate non-structured recreation is unique, and can build business during skiing's off-season. And, like ski-areas, a summer school can start small.

A Firestone and Dollar property coalition is important. The Firestone provides an easily-reached panoramic view—ideal for families with babies, the elderly, and for meeting ADA needs. Parts of both properties have been damaged, yet may bridge the gap between what visitors can and can't "touch"—as outlined in a recently-published book, "Last Child in the Woods" (by Richard Louv). This book is receiving nation-wide attention. It details ideas for children's parks and greenbelt areas, and creates insights in planning recreation for everyone.

Thank you for your attention. I have been thinking about—and testing—environmental education possibilities for many years, and will be happy to discuss these points if you or any member of the planning board wishes.

Julia Kingery

Julia Kingery
530-583-3273 (message machine)
julking@earthlink.net
fax: 530-581-2864
PO Box 679 Tahoe City CA 96145

Response to Letter 4 from Julia Kingery

4.10 The Department appreciates the concern you express regarding traffic. However, we do not believe the development of relatively minor trailhead amenities such as parking for 8-12 vehicles, directional interpretive panels, trash cans and restroom will add significantly to the traffic in the area. We concur with your recommendation to include the trolley and bus system in our planning and have added language to the document in several sections supporting the concept of integrating our campground and trailhead proposals with bus stops and a trolley service where appropriate (see Response 3.13). A shuttle between the campground and Tahoe City would reduce traffic impacts from the proposed facility.

4.11 Staffing permitting, California State Parks supports all types of interpretive opportunities including guided hikes and talks covering a range of topics including forest and fire management, first aid, and the hazards of animals (and people).

4.12 Language has been added to page 54 of the Preliminary Plan under Park Wide Goals and Guidelines for Recreation discussing alternative forms of camping including walk-in tent sites. The added language states; "Explore alternative camping facilities such as walk-in tent sites to provide different camping experiences, and as a new potential source of revenue generation".

4.13 The Department is open to concession proposals for education and the other topics you mention such as painting outdoors and other concession opportunities that may be presented.

4.14 Please see Response 2.17 regarding impacts from campground development. Also, the Preliminary Plan allows for overnight facility development while preserving a green belt between all the subdivisions surrounding the park. The proposed location of the campground is roughly in the middle of the park, placing it nearly a mile away from any subdivision and school. There will be no loss of privacy for local residents. In regards to public safety, the park, if developed, will have a greater ranger patrol presence leading to less, not more violations, such as the motorcycle trespass currently taking place in the park.

In addition, less than 10 percent of the 2000 acre park is proposed for development. That would leave 1800 acres undeveloped, providing more than ample open green space for all the surrounding subdivisions and local residents.

The Department disagrees that the proximity of a campground to a subdivision or town translates into higher crime and other problems. A local example of this is at Sugar Pine Point State Park where a 175 unit

campground is within 100 feet of Tahoma, a long established west shore community. The campground and community have existed side by side for over thirty years. Since State Park rangers are peace officers that occasionally assist in back up for county sheriff units, law enforcement presence has actually increased in Tahoma since the campground was built. We are not aware of any studies or statistics indicating crime increases in adjacent neighborhoods when a campground is built. If such information is available, we would appreciate a copy be sent to the Department.

In regards to the observation that development of the park will lead to increased fire danger, although more people may be present in the park, so will park personnel. Ranger patrols with fire pump capabilities will be available for fire response. Fire hydrants will be installed making year round water available for fire fighting (currently not available). Currently there are no ranger patrols in the park. A campground will only be developed if more staffing is available to serve the public and protect resources.

Also, in the last five years the Department has spent considerable funds and crew time conducting fuel reduction work in Burton Creek State Park (more than any other California State Park in the Tahoe Basin). Nearly the entire east and south sides of the park have had shaded fuel breaks constructed along the boundaries, and many acres of forest stands in the interior of the park have been treated by mechanical and prescribe fire methods.

Additionally, a visit to any of the campgrounds in the Tahoe Basin will illustrate how little forest litter and wood is actually available for burning in the campgrounds and immediate surroundings. People collect the wood to burn in there contained camp fires leaving little to nothing on the ground to start a fire.

Finally, the Sierra District operates three other parks in the Tahoe Basin that have campgrounds – Sugar Pine Point, DL Bliss and Emerald Bay State Parks. There is no record of a fire starting in these parks that ever left the park, nor are we aware of any statistics supporting the premise fire occurrence is higher in developed state parks than any other areas in the Tahoe Basin.

In regards to endangering bears and other wildlife, State Parks has a strong program educating the public about bears, other wildlife, and camp food. We encourage people to go to Sugar Pine Point State Park and observe our program that includes bear proof food storage lockers, a diverse public education program, and enforcement program that occasionally results in citations for food left out. Tahoma's only complaint regarding the program, is that State Parks has done such a good job

public education and enforcement that the bears now spend their time in Tahoma, because some residents are not as disciplined as our campers in storing food and disposing of garbage.

4.15 We agree that visitor environmental education is critical to protecting resources and stimulating thought. We will continue to provide (and expand) these services as funding and staffing permits.

ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.

CHRISTOPHER T. ELLISON
ANNE J. SCHNEIDER
JEFFERY D. HARRIS
DOUGLAS K. KERNER
ROBERT E. DONLAN
ANDREW B. BROWN
MARGARET G. LEAVITT, OF COUNSEL

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
2015 H STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814-3109
TELEPHONE (916) 447-2166 FAX (916) 447-3512

LYNN M. HAUG
PETER J. KIEL
CHRISTOPHER M. SANDERS
JONATHAN R. SCHUTZ
GREGGORY L. WHEATLAND

July 27, 2005

Ken Anderson, Sierra District
California State Parks
P.O. Box 266
Tahoma, CA 96142
Telephone (530) 525-9535
Email kande@parks.ca.gov

Re: Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR

Dear Mr. Anderson:

5.10 I am writing as a resident of Tahoe City to express my deep concern that the *Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR* (the "Draft EIR") published by State Parks is legally defective. Specifically, the Draft EIR fails to adequately consider direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed Burton Creek Project, as required by CEQA. Fortunately, there is still time for State Parks to cure these defects.

5.11 First, and foremost, the Draft EIR fails to properly consider the appropriate CEQA baseline with regard to traffic. As you know, the current level of service ("LOS") for traffic on State Highway 28 is LOS F. The LOS F condition can easily be documented if State Parks uses the period between the draft EIS and the final EIS to conduct legally sufficient traffic studies. I respectfully request that State Parks conduct the appropriate traffic studies -- studies that reflect the existing baseline conditions. State Parks should not rely on outdated traffic studies. Failure to do so would be a fatal flaw in the project.

Second, State Parks cannot simply dismiss traffic impacts based on the current LOS F for Highway 28. It is well-settled law in California that CEQA lead agencies may not apply the rejected "ratio theory." Specifically, State Parks may not simply conclude that since the LOS for Highway 28 is currently LOS F that no additional mitigation is required. CEQA precedent clearly dictates that such rationalizations are impermissible. The project must provide mitigation for its contributions to an already significant impact.

5.12 Third, State Parks must properly consider other projects and mitigate the Burton Creek Project's cumulative impacts. Specifically, Placer County recently approved the HIGHLANDS VILLAGE MIXED-USE PROJECT (EIAQ-3785; the "Highlands Project"). The Highlands Project is a mix of senior housing (78 residential units and underground parking garage), commercial buildings (4,791 sq. ft), and 25-three story townhouse buildings (50 residential units) that use Highway 28 for access and egress. The addition of one hundred twenty-eight (128)

housing units, underground parking and nearly 4,800 square feet of commercial space will exacerbate traffic problems on Highway 28. Accordingly, State Park must consider the Highlands Project in its examination of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with the Burton Creek Project.

Fourth, in addition to the traffic issues discussed above, State Parks should revise the draft EIR to take into consider the potential cumulative impacts of the Burton Creek Project, the Highlands Project, and other reasonably foreseeable projects. That cumulative impacts analysis should specifically address the potential cumulative effects of the projects, including, but not limited to the potential cumulative effects on Air Quality, Public Health, Biological Resources, Noise and Vibration, Soil and Water Resources, Visual Resources, and Waste Management.

It is critically important that State Parks take into consideration the potential effects of the Burton Creek Project in combination with other recently approved and reasonably foreseeable projects. I hope that State Parks will address these issues.

5.13 The problems I raise are real and here today. Last Saturday, a weekend that was not a Holiday weekend, it took our family more than twenty-five minutes to travel from Highway 28 and Old Mill Road to the intersection of Highway 28 and Highway 89. It should not take twenty-five minutes to travel less than three (3) miles, but it does in Tahoe City.

Tahoe's residents, business and visitors should be able to enjoy the beauty of Tahoe without the frustration of inadequate roads. The local economy also deserves the opportunity to thrive and grown too.

State Parks and the Burton Creek Project may not be responsible for all of the problems that we face as a community, but State Parks has both the obligation and the opportunity to be part of the solution. State Parks, in consultation with CalTrans and local officials, should first perform a more detailed examination of the current problems and propose real solutions to the traffic problems.

Thank you for your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

Jeffery D. Harris

Jeffery D. Harris

Response to Letter 5 from Jeffery D. Harris

5.10 The Department believes the Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR (Preliminary Plan) adequately addresses the impacts of the proposed project as required by CEQA for a first-tier Environmental Impact Report as defined in Section 15166 of the CEQA Guidelines.

5.11 Please refer to responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.13, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues. . In summary it is our intent to implement all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures for traffic. Since it may not be possible for all the proposed developments, we have included a recommendation that a Statement of Overriding Consideration be included in the final general plan document. Also, since development of the park may be many years away, the Department has determined that it will be more productive, accurate, and economical to conduct a baseline traffic analysis at the time the development is actually proposed for implementation.

5.12 Please refer to the discussion in the Environmental Analysis Section – Tiered CEQA Analysis. Based on our interpretation of CEQA, the Preliminary Plan and Draft EIR contain the level of specificity necessary for analysis of a general plan. Subsequent project specific proposals will require more detailed environmental analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts. This detailed analysis will include current and potential projects and the potential impacts to Air Quality, Public Health, Biological Resources, Noise and Vibration, Soil and Water Resources, Visual Resources and Waste Management.

5.13 We sympathize with your observations regarding traffic. Our intent is to mitigate the significant impacts of our proposed development on traffic. The Department will continue to work with Caltrans and other agencies to explore solutions to improving traffic flow in the Tahoe City area.

Lynne R. Larson
P.O. Box 8126
Truckee, CA 96162
11155 Rancho View Court
Truckee, Ca 96161

July 26, 2005

Ruth Coleman, Director
California State Parks
Department of Parks and Recreation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

RE: Burton Creek State Park; Preliminary General Plan Draft EIR

Dear Director Coleman,

After careful examination of the Burton Creek State Park, Preliminary General Plan Draft EIR I would make the following comments.

There are nearly 35 million people living in California today so I can appreciate the need for recreational facilities for the citizens of California. However, the "Preferred Alternative " is seriously flawed and is fraught with "Unavoidable Significant Environment Impacts" such as:

6.10 1. Increased traffic to an already impacted area where the major transportation corridor to access the Burton Creek area is classified as F by Cal-Trans.

6.11 2. The "Plan" says there are no irreversible changes to the physical environment if the site is developed under the "preferred plan" with mitigation. With the development of numerous campsites, roads and a management and housing facility, there can only be a negative impact on the environment. The increased traffic, noise, air pollution from numerous campfires, autos and dust from roads within the Plan area will only contribute to degradation of the region and ultimately effect the water quality of Lake Tahoe.

6.12 3. The loss of privacy for the local residents, increased noise levels, increased fire risk and the opportunity for increased criminal activities.

Realizing the need for recreational facilities I urge you to consider another alternative. Consider Minimum Recreation/Maximum Resource Protection and Management (Alternative 2) but include the following:

6.13 1. Limited "walk in" only campsites. This would allow visitors the opportunity for a semi-wilderness experience without the disturbances from mechanical sources. The campsites would be by reservation and scattered within the plan area. Sanitation facilities would be included.

6.14 2. Develop hiking trails that would be used by both visitors and local residents.

6.15 3. Repair or abandon those current trails and roads that contribute to the degradation of the region and design a trail system that provides access to campsites but also hiking away from the campsites.

6.16 4. Use resources to develop a visitor center in a centralized location that would serve all of the State parks in the North Tahoe area. The visitor center would manage the reservations for campsites, provide an education program and serve as an information center for State supported activities in the region.

6.17 5. Provide limited parking at Trailheads into the Burton area. Urge campers and hikers to use the local transit system. A current proposal for a Transit Center in Tahoe is being discussed and is in the EIR stage. One of the purposes of the Transit Center is to get visitors out of their cars and reduce the traffic on roads that are rated F in the Tahoe City area. The Transit Center Plan calls for parking that could encourage those wanting to visit Burton Creek to use the bus. Consider whether it would be feasible to work with the Placer County Department of Public Works and any other necessary agencies to develop the visitor center near the proposed Transit Center. A good example where a bus system for hikers and campers works is Yosemite National Park.

6.18 6. Prohibit motorized vehicles in the Burton Creek area. Not only does this enhance the peaceful experience of the area but reduces the impact on surrounding neighborhoods.

6.19 7. Allow NO concessions in the Burton Creek area or at the Trailheads. This will negatively impact an already declining economy for local merchants by taking the business out of the downtown area.

6.20 I would also mention at this point that the local citizens were lead to believe that a Burton Creek proposal developed and presented in 2002,which resembled Alternative 2, had been approved. The citizens were recently informed that this was not the case. This raises in my mind serious questions about the current document and what really happened in 2002.

Please keep your Mission in mind.

6.21 To provide for the health, inspiration and education of the people of California by helping to preserve the State's extraordinary biological diversity, protecting its most

valued natural and cultural resources and creating opportunities for high quality outdoor recreation.

I believe very little health and inspiration occur when visitors leave their congested home areas for vacations and then end up in another congested area.

I appreciate your consideration to the notion that there may be another alternative to Burton Creek State Park.

Sincerely,

Lynne R. Larson

Cc: Ken Anderson

Response to Letter 6 from Lynne R. Larson

6.10 The Department's intent is to implement all possible mitigation measures to reduce significant traffic impacts. However, we recognize that some of the traffic impacts may still not be below a level of significance. Consequently, the Department will prepare a statement of overriding considerations regarding traffic impacts. This statement will discuss the benefits of providing public services such as affordable overnight facilities and quality outdoor recreation that outweigh the impacts of additional traffic in the Tahoe City area. Also, see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 for more responses to the traffic issues.

6.11 The Department's interpretation regarding irreversible changes is that any of the proposed facility development may be removed and the area restored to its previous condition over time.

6.12 Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding issues about the proposed development including loss of privacy, increased noise levels, increased fire risk and the perception that criminal activities will increase.

6.13 The Preliminary Plan proposes a variety of camping experiences from a walk-in tent campground to a traditional campground.

6.14 Developed trails will be available for use by visitors and residents of the local community.

6.15 The Sierra District is currently repairing and restoring some trails in the park. In addition, the Preliminary Plan proposes the development of a Road and Trail Plan. That plan will lead to the development a trail system throughout the park that includes connectors to surrounding U.S. Forest Service lands and closure of some roads and trails that may be causing environmental degradation.

6.16 The suggestion of a visitor center for the north shore is a great idea that the Department supports. We will gladly participate with other agencies in its development as staffing and funding permit.

6.17 We concur with this recommendation. The parking areas for the trailheads are currently planned to be relatively small, and we have added language to the Preliminary Plan to tie the bus and trolley system into the proposed campground and trailhead locations (see Response 3.13).

6.18 The Department firmly believes the park is big enough for many forms of recreation including car access to trailheads and a campground. Less than 10 percent of the park is proposed for development. Only the roads to the trailheads and campground would be open to motorized vehicles. About 1800 acres would be left undeveloped and would be accessible

only by foot, bike or horse. The main access road will be upgraded with sediment capture structures and paved, leading to a substantial reduction in current erosion levels on the road. There will still be plenty of room in the park for people to find and enjoy peace and quiet. Approximately 90 percent of the park will remain undeveloped. None of the current trails will be closed due to the proposed campground development.

6.19 Local businesses would have the opportunity to present concession ideas and compete for concession offerings. Often, local businesses approach State Parks about concession opportunities. Also, there may be some concession opportunities, such as teaching outdoor skills, mountain biking or outdoor painting, that are not appropriate for downtown. The Department supports exploration of concession opportunities in California State Parks. Concession opportunities will only be proposed for visitor needs not currently addressed in the adjacent business community. The intent of the Department's Concession program is not to directly compete with local business.

6.20 The draft plan was presented to the public in 2002. After public comment, the plan was submitted to the State Park Executive Staff in Sacramento for comment and review. The Executive Staff strongly objected to a State Park General Plan for a 2000 acre park, such as BCSP, that did not include an overnight camping facility. The draft plan failed to respond to the statewide demand for camping in a park clearly large enough to accommodate a variety of recreation experiences, from day use to over night camping. Members of the State Park and Recreation Commission, the commission responsible for adopting the plan, expressed similar views. The planning process was then delayed for a year and a half due to a lack of planning staff. We have just recently been able to resume the planning process with the submittal to the public of a new Preliminary Plan. The State Park and Recreation Commission did not adopt a previous version of the Preliminary Plan.

The current Preliminary Plan has been developed in clear response to the public comments we have received, balanced with the mission of the Department. The Preliminary Plan will explore the possibility of a campground ranging in size from 25-200 sites and a group camp for 50 people. This is a substantial reduction in the size of the originally proposed campground of 300 sites. The entrance and access road has been moved 1.5 miles to the west of the Highlands, in a direct response to opposition expressed over the previously proposed access road location.

6.21 The Department believes the proposed Preliminary Plan provides a good balance between protecting natural and cultural resources and providing opportunities for high quality outdoor recreation.

From: "Juli Anderson" <andersonjuli@hotmail.com>
To: "Ken Anderson" <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/29/2005 5:15:05 PM
Subject: Burton Creek Public Comment

July 29, 2005

Ken Anderson

PO Box 266

Tahoma, CA 96142

To California State Parks People:

A few years ago I was riding my mountain bike from the TXC Nordic Center to Watson Peak when I came across the crew chip-sealing the fire road. When I asked the contractor why they were paving the road he replied, "Because of you guys [mountain bikers]. You kick up dirt that gets in the streams and pollutes the lake". No sooner had he finished his sentence when a Ford Explorer came to a skidding fishtail stop as it raced around the corner and nearly into the paving crew.

Paving because of the pollution factor of bicycles? I don't think so.

7.10 Increased access to Burton Creek State Park and the surrounding areas has increased use as well as abuse. It is not unusual to find beer cans and other signs of consumption at viewpoints within and outside Park boundaries. By permitting hundreds of RVs and additional vehicles I feel the Park Service is allowing a disservice to its land. As residents we pay attention to our impact however I cannot say the same for careless campers. Allowing campfires or any type of heat source in the dry Sierra forest seems absolutely ludicrous. In the heat of summer there is not abundant water available and everyday we live with potential threat of wildfires. Let's not bait that trap.

7.11 Speaking of water, has the Park Service considered effects to Anton Meadows wetlands or the tributary that feeds trout to Star Harbor? Human impact will destroy this and other fragile ecosystems. Just a couple years ago the Park Service made a big deal of obliterating trails in order to consolidate use of specific trails. Development of a campsite seems contradictory to these previous actions.

7.12 The greater Lake Tahoe/Truckee area has seen unprecedented growth over the last ten years. With this in mind, I feel there has not been an increase of year round population. Point being there are currently accommodations available without adding an unnecessary campground.

7.13 As an outdoor enthusiast I wanted to see the benefits of a campground. Maybe the campers will spend money in Tahoe City? Well, maybe at the supermarket. We offer motels that need occupants, restaurants that need diners and shops that need patrons. Let's keep people in Tahoe City. In addition to the traffic debacle, I feel it is negligent to add hundreds of RVs driving through town. We are struggling to implement a mass transit system here and this seems completely inconsistent to these efforts. Visitors should get out of their vehicles to see the beauty of Anton Meadows or the trails near the Nordic Center. As an overweight nation we should encourage use with human strength, not fuel.

7.14 At a time when everything seems to be changing, it's nice to escape to the trails behind town to remind ourselves and enjoy why we live here. This sanctuary of flora and fauna has maintained its peace and I feel it is in our as well as future generation's best interest to maintain Burton Creek State Park in its current state.

Juli Anderson
P.O. Box 3305
Olympic Valley, CA 96146
530.583.9898
andersonjuli@hotmail.com<mailto:andersonjuli@hotmail.com>

Response to letter 7 from Juli Anderson

7.10 Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 in response to fire danger at Burton Creek State Park and other issues regarding campground development. In regards to adding campers and additional vehicles into the park please see Response 6.18.

7.11 Water for domestic use associated with the proposed development would come from municipal wells and other water sources operated by the Tahoe City Public Utility District. It would not come from surface waters in the park. None of the proposed development would be near riparian, stream or meadow habitat areas. The proposed location for the campground is approximately 1.5 miles from Antone Meadows wetlands and would be located lower in the watershed. The campground will have no impact on the meadow complex or to tributaries that feed into Star Harbor.

7.12 Accommodations are at a premium in the Tahoe Basin during the summer months. State park facilities are filled months in advance. The average cost of hotel rooms or cabins on the north shore for a family exceed one hundred dollars nightly. Camping provides an affordable overnight stay alternative to the high priced accommodations currently available in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The same discussion could be applied to the area restaurants. For a percentage of California's population, camping is an affordable way to enjoy the beautiful Lake Tahoe Area. As economic studies have demonstrated, these same campers will greatly contribute to local businesses in Tahoe City, stimulating what is currently a stagnant economic climate with some businesses actually closing down in town.

7.13 In regards to the traffic issues please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 9.11, and 17.0. In addition, when the proposed campground development is ready to move forward, there will be an extensive traffic analysis conducted. This analysis will incrementally measure the impact of constructing a very small 25 unit traditional campground, on up to the maximum size campground (200 sites) described in the Preliminary Plan. This will allow planners to assess the impacts of the proposed facilities at various sizes allowing the decision makers to select the campground that provides the most camping opportunities with the least amount of traffic impacts.

Some proposed mitigation measures for traffic impacts include; designing facilities that link with existing mass transit systems like TART, working with other agencies to close the existing campground at Star Harbor and restoring that area to wetlands, working with other entities to provide a trolley service between the park and Tahoe City, and designing the park's facilities to link with road and trail systems in the park connecting with the

regional systems to encourage people to travel by foot and bike to local destinations.

7.14 Please see Response 6.18 regarding seeking peace and quiet in the park.

RECEIVED JUN 8 - 2005

Arthur B. Penniman
Post Office Box 25
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Phone (530) 583-2019
Fax (530) 583-1357
penniman@north-tahoe.net

June 28, 2005

California State Parks
Ken Anderson
Tahoma, CA

Regarding the public comment period for the plans for development of Burton Creek State Park, may I offer these comments?

The park is now used intensively by both locals and visitors for a great number of different activities. We use the Park for what it now is, and we would hope that development can be kept to a minimum so that we will be able to enjoy the Park in these many ways that have attracted so many users. The below list is of the activities I have witnessed, and I am sure there are many more that have not come to my attention.

Bicycling
Horseback
Fishing
Orienteering
Geo Caching
Running races
Athletic training activities for school kids
Nature Walks
Birding
Skiing
Hiking

8.10 If we were to do a cost/benefit study for development of the Park, I imagine that it would point in the direction of minimal development.

Sincerely,

Art

Response to Letter 8 from Arthur B. Penniman

8.10 All of the activities listed in your letter will continue to be available to you and other user groups. Only 10 percent of the park would be affected by the proposed development. The benefit of providing affordable overnight camping in the Tahoe Basin should not be discounted. In statewide surveys the public demand for camping has been steadily increasing supporting the notion the public supports the cost of constructing recreation facilities in California State Parks such as those proposed in the Preliminary Plan.

July 25, 2005

To: Hayden Sohm
Ken Anderson

Re: Burton Creek State Park

Faxed to: hsohm@parks.ca.gov

From: Marylyn and Peter Siewert
146 Hacienda Drive, Tiburon, Ca 94920

9.10 First we would like to say that we live in Tiburon, California, and Squaw Valley (not in the Highlands). We have owned and enjoyed property for over thirty years in the Tahoe area. During this time, we have utilized the open spaces of the Burton Creek area habitually – in the winter cross-country skiing and in the summer bicycling (yesterday, as a matter of fact). We do not understand why all areas have to be organized. It is wonderful to be able to explore the open spaces in natural settings. This is one place where we can. Further, we know many non-Highlands' residents who also utilize this prized piece of open space year round. It is a misnomer to say that it is used exclusively by the Highlands' residents. Please leave this area in its natural state.

9.11 Second is the problem of traffic. It is totally inappropriate for a camp ground to be accessed through a small, local neighborhood (the Highlands). These people live there to be in a non-commercial, low-trafficated area where their children feel free to play and be safe and where they can walk dogs, ride bicycles, etc., without a lot of cars going by that are not neighbors. The school is bad enough, but at least it is a need for the local population. There must be areas in the Tahoe basin where "locals" can exist on their own.

9.12 Third is the problem of the intersection of the Highway and Fabian. What a joke it is turning left onto Fabian when traveling north from Tahoe City. Coming at you are southbound speeders, people turning out of Dollar Point, people turning out of the 7-11, not to mention the increased traffic caused by the new development going in across from Dollar Point. The access to any development in the Burton Creek Park should be well away from this area and away from any neighborhoods. Consider some place near the Tamarak Lodge.

9.13 Fourth perhaps this is the wrong location for a giant trailer park. If the Park Department insists that it is a necessity, it should be located near the highway and not destroying the beautiful open space that exists to the north. Also "everything in moderation." There is a lot of leeway between zero and two hundred camping spots. Why not consider something closer to zero.

Thank you for your consideration of our thoughts.

Marylyn & Peter Siewert

Response to Letter 9 from Marylyn and Peter Siewert

9.10 Please see Response 6.18 regarding the proposed development of the park.

9.11 The park and campground will not be accessed through the Highlands or any other neighborhood. The currently proposed main access into the park is about 1.5 miles west of the Highlands adjacent to the Tamarack Lodge.

9.12 See Response 9.11 regarding the access route.

9.13 Please see Response 6.18 regarding open space. In reference to the "giant trailer park", the Preliminary Plan proposes to analyze a campground ranging in size from 25-200 sites. The Department will analyze the possibilities of constructing a small traditional car campground, and incrementally investigate the impacts of building a larger facility until the maximum 200 site facility is analyzed. This will allow us to explore the concept of "everything in moderation" as mentioned in your comments.

From: "Whitelaw, Duane" <whitelaw@ntfire.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/25/2005 2:49:56 PM
Subject: Burton Creek Planning Process

Hi Ken,

I had an opportunity to do a cursory review of the plans in the works for Burton Creek. Your agency seems to be doing a comprehensive job which should result in a fine product when finished.

10.0 This Fire District will be called for medical emergencies and to assist with fire suppression in the Park. While it is not in our purview to make recommendations whether the Park should move forward or not, I am interested in ensuring that when called, we are able to gain access to wherever the need arises. This can mean anything from emergency access roads wide enough for fire engines to helicopter landing sites for seriously injured patients. Please consider this in your long-term planning. The Public Resources Code can be particularly instructive in these areas. We would be willing to discuss strategies for these kinds of amenities when the time presents itself.

10.1 We have also been hopeful that your project could provide a secondary means of ingress/egress to the Highlands Subdivision in the event of wildfire or other emergency blocking the main access road. This includes a need for both homeowners and the students/employees at the High School and Middle School. I recognize this is outside of your area of responsibility but it could be a huge collateral benefit to that area.

If you have any questions or think the Fire District can be of any assistance in the planning process, feel free to contact me.

Duane L. Whitelaw

Fire Chief

North Tahoe Fire Protection District

PO Box 5879

Tahoe City, CA 96145-5879

530-583-6913

--
No virus found in this outgoing message.
Checked by AVG Anti-Virus
Version: 7.0.338 / Virus Database: 267.9.4/57 - Release Date: 7/22/2005

Response to Letter 10, submitted by email by Fire Chief Duane Whitelaw, of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District

10.0 The Department agrees with the North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD) of the importance of maintaining appropriate access roads, helicopter landing sites etc. within the park for emergency responses. As part of the development of the Road and Trail Plan the Sierra District will work closely with the NTFPD to ensure emergency access is designed into the road and trail system.

10.1 Within the scope of the Department's mission the Sierra District will work with the NTFPD and other entities to explore development of a secondary access route to the Highlands. Currently, such a route may be possible exiting north of the North Tahoe High School, traversing east across the Dollar property, then south through the Firestone property along the eastern boundary of the Highlands. We also believe an adequate fire safe zone currently exists at the high school ball fields.

From: Jon Weedn <jonweedn@yahoo.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/31/2005 11:02:03 AM

11.0

As a home owner in the highlands and user of burton crk. state park for over 20 years I would like to register my opposition to the proposed development. I realize the high demand for campgrounds in the area most particularly in july and august when traffic into Tahoe City already backs up in every direction on most days and always on weekends. The greatest impact would be felt when overcrowding in the area already exists.The proposed area is also one of the most used areas by local residents and vistors for biking and walking trails. I guess my idea of a walk in the woods is a little spoiled as campsites and crowds start to fill areas already being heavily used. Were the campgrouinds a year round asset and if they would be used during the times when it is not already very crowded I might feel differently...even though I would still view it as an encoachment to an already active recreational area. As a local and home owner I am hoping these plans will not come to fruition ..!
.most
particulary more roads and new campgrounds . Sincerely Jon L Weedn

---

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
http://mail.yahoo.com

Response to Letter 11, submitted via email by Jon Weedn

11.0 Please see Responses 2.17, 4.14 and 6.18 regarding the proposed park development. See Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues.

From: <RobinM3534@aol.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/29/2005 12:50:17 PM
Subject: Burton Creek

To: Ken Anderson

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I am a frequent Tahoe visitor and Lahontan homeowner and would also like to reiterate my friend Carol Pollock's comments on the proposed Burton Creek Park development.

"We are deeply concerned and opposed to the Individual Campsites and any large Group sites. 12.0
*The fire risk and air pollution issue from even 50 campsites is enormous.
*The traffic consequences for travel on Highway 28 are huge. Putting a significant number of additional cars on that road is hard to imagine during busy summer days. 12.1
*Access on existing roads into Burton Creek would have an extremely negative impact on nearby residents. Right now the streets are dangerous to anyone walking on the road, children and animals. 12.2
*Finally, on a quality of life issue, you may not have any idea how sound travels throughout the area. Please come join me on the deck of our Tahoe cabin anytime there are baseball games at night at the new high school fields--you would be astonished by the sound, which is actually a long way away. 12.3

Improving the park for limited day use is a great idea--what about signs on trailheads, maybe restroom facilities? A small trailhead parking lot. 12.4
That's all it needs. Also, I would appreciate learning the Parks' policy on dogs in a developed Burton Creek Park. 12.5

Finally, as California State Parks contributor, I am deeply disappointed and dismayed by the Parks process and high handed attitude toward developing this property. There is significant local opposition for serious valid reasons. 12.6

Several years ago there was a huge effort by local residents to shape the park development in an appropriate way. And, it appeared that the Parks agreed. I am astonished that in face of this the Parks now propose to ignore that input and go ahead and frankly, I am offended by the characterization of local comment, and negative opinion, as just a bunch of local neighborhood people who want the park for their own. That's just insulting.

I and many others who spend time at Tahoe have introduced people to the beauty of the property and tried to encourage its use. Our objections to the development have a serious objective basis in fact. The current proposals are totally inappropriate for development in a sensitive, populated area with serious fire, environmental and traffic issues.

Sincerely,
Robin Machette
106 Requa Road

Response to Letter 12, submitted via email by Robin Machette

12.0 Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding campground development issues including fire hazards.

12.1 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic impacts.

12.2 Please see Response 9.11 regarding park access.

12.3 Please see Responses 4.14 and 6.18 regarding proximity of the proposed development to adjacent communities.

12.4 The proposed plan calls for signage and the development of at least four trailheads with limited facilities, such as proposed in your letter.

12.5 The current regulations for dogs in Burton Creek State Park would remain the same whether or not the park is developed. Dogs are only allowed in the park on leash, and only on paved roads and trails. When the park is developed, there will be a greater ranger presence in the park leading to more strict enforcement of current regulations.

12.6 Please see Response 6.20 regarding the overall planning process for the Burton Creek State Park General Plan.

From: "mniles" <mniles@cwnet.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/31/2005 3:39:47 PM
Subject: Burton Creek

Dear Sir,
I wish to offer my my comments regarding the development of Burton Creek. These comments will be in opposition, but I hope you will read and consider them anyways. I understand there has been "no upwelling of public comment". We have a fairly laid back community so that is not surprising. I would though, venture to guess that there has not been a tremendous upwelling of 'pro' Burton Creek feedback either. My personal concerns are these: Campgrounds, trail plans, traffic, Conservancy land, housing and concessions. Campgrounds - I see open sites at all of our local campgrounds year round, how about filling those first. When that's done, how about Lake Forest, I understand there were some Forest Service offices planned there. I think it has great Lake access and, after all, belongs to the People of California. Trail plans - OK, a network of well marked trails would be nice. I encounter many People of California using the area, some ask for directions to a specific location. On the other hand, I must say that I have never heard of a Search and Rescue in Burton Creek. The reports of You getting lost there must have been a mistake since i'm sure you had peers to orient you on the area. Traffic - Please, No More Traffic for Dollar Hill. Be aware of your impact on nieghborhoods. There is a large development of residential homes coming and the likelyhood of a recreation center (open to the People of California) in this area. Please, No Access Through Dollar Hill. Conservancy Land - OK, maybe I am cynical here, but I thought this was supposed to be preserved as Open Space. How and why do you get your hands on it?? I may be uninformed on this matter, but it does not seem right. Housing - Other campgrounds have people who live in trailers etc.., I think that should be fine, Otherwise, let employees rent locally just like anyone else. Working in the Parks is a great job already, employees don't need special housing treatment. Concessions - Don't take away from the community. Let people stop and shop in local stores or give back an even split of profits from any concessions.
In conclusion, I wish that you all would consider a master plan for other parts of State Land in the area istead of Burton Creek.
Regards,
Mike Niles
Tahoe City

13.0
13.1
13.2
13.3
13.4
13.5

Response to Letter 13 submitted via email from Mike Niles

13.0 Many of the California State Park campgrounds in the Lake Tahoe area are filled to capacity during most of the camping season. Campgrounds are closed during the winter except a few sites at Sugar Pine Point State Park. The proposed campground for Burton Creek State Park would be closed during the winter. California State Parks does not manage property in Lake Forest large enough to accommodate a campground,

13.1 The Preliminary Plan calls for signing the trail system to provide visitor information and orientation.

13.2 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic impacts from the proposed campground development.

13.3 The only development proposed in the Preliminary Plan on the Conservancy property is a trailhead. Almost the entire parcel will be kept as open space and preserved as is or restored and improved when eroding roads and trails are rehabilitated. The California Tahoe Conservancy and California State Parks view the Dollar Property as a logical extension of Burton Creek State Park with the road and trail system already closely linked. It will streamline management in the area to have only one agency manage both parcels.

13.4 The Department often provides housing for employees, especially in areas where housing is cost prohibitive for state employees. We do have camp hosts who stay in travel trailers in the campgrounds, but permanent resident employees are not housed in the campgrounds. Housing employees within park boundaries allows for a quick response from rangers and maintenance employees during emergencies and provides 24 hour staff presence in the park.

13.5 Please see Response 6.19 regarding concessions.

From: Ingrid Backstrom <ibackstrom@yahoo.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/30/2005 9:32:44 AM
Subject: Burton Creek campground

Hi, Ken,

14.0

I wanted to write to express my dismay at the proposed Burton Creek Campground plans. Having moved to Tahoe and made my life here for two reasons--mountains and trails--it saddens me deeply to think that one or both of these might be compromised in exchange for camp spots.

I, along with many, many friends (both local and from around California and Nevada), use the trails in the proposed campground area (and in the network to which they connect) on a daily basis, from April through November, and many use them during the winter to snowshoe and cross-country ski, as well. As I'm sure you know, there's nothing like being able to enjoy the beauty of unspoiled wilderness on foot or on a bike for hours at a time--the trails in the Burton Creek area are vital to that Tahoe experience.

14.1

My knowledge of the camping infrastructure in Tahoe is limited; however, it does seem that a campground such as the one proposed in Burton Creek would only be full to capacity for the weekends of perhaps two months of the year. This seems like a very small benefit to a small number of users, at a huge cost to the majority of users who take advantage of this area on a very regular basis. Perhaps these folks could be accomodated at one of the many other campgrounds in the area, at a fraction of the price and land use implications? Again, I don't have experience with this, but it doesn't look like an equitable or efficient use of rich, beautiful land, to pave and section it off rather than keeping and improving the uninhibited trails in the area.

Thank you so much for your time and patience in reading our concerns--and thanks in addition for all the work you do to keep this area beautiful. From one user who values these trails as much as the snow in the wintertime, I'm asking that my and my friends thoughts be considered in this matter.

Sincerely,
Ingrid Backstrom
(530) 583-2839

Start your day with Yahoo! - make it your home page

Response to Letter 14 submitted via email from Ingrid Backstrom

14.0 Please see Response 6.18 regarding hiking trails.

14.1 Please see Responses 7.12 and 8.10 regarding the cost benefits of the proposed campground.

From: Jeffrey Rieger <jhrieger@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/29/2005 4:25:42 PM
Subject: Burton Creek Project

15.0

Dear Mr. Anderson, I am a 25 year resident of North Lake Tahoe. I am an active hiker, mountain biker, back country skier and general forest enthusiast. I have reviewed the plan for Burton Creek and am opposed to your campground plans. I would suggest that a good mapping project of the area and the reopening of camping in the area of the fiberboard freeway and across the street from the Tahoe City campground would better serve the public. Also, you might try counting the users in the Anton meadows burton Creek environs I have it on good authority that the trails in the area are experiencing eight visits per hour during daylight hours in the non snow season, and more in the winter in and around the nordic center. If you wanted a tour of the area, as a member of the TNSAR and frequent user of the area with degrees in both planning and biology, I feel more than qualified to show you what is actually going on in our woods. Sincerely, Jeff Rieger

15.1

Response to Letter 15 submitted via email by Jeffrey Rieger

15.0 The lands around the Fiberboard Freeway are managed by the U.S. Forest Service. The campground across the street from the Tahoe State Recreation Area was closed because the Department is over coverage requirements as defined by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency for that park.

15.1 The Department is aware of the high level of use on the trails in Burton Creek State Park during all times of the year. That is why it is important to implement the proposed general plan for the area. The plan proposes trail improvements, signage, and environmental projects to decrease erosion on the roads and trails in the park.

From: "Alain and Stacy Bordes" <stacyalain@earthlink.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/31/2005 3:50:02 PM
Subject: Burton Creek State Park

Hello Ken,

16.0 Our family wanted to forward our thoughts about the potential Burton Creek Park plan for campsites and access roads. We live in the Highlands and have small children. The potenial for more vehicle traffic through our neighborhood, on Hwy 28, and in the park area concern us. We also would be very UNhappy to deal with increased noise and pollution from the park, not to mention the affect of up to 200 campsites will have on the wildlife behind us and the increase threat of fire danger placed on our neighborhood.

16.1 What would be wonderful to see would be a passive use park with increased trail signage so that more people (locals and tourists alike) could enjoy the trails and wildlife either on foot or bike. Campers and hundreds of people back there day and night would defeat the peaceful and serene place that Burton Creek Park currently is today.

16.2 Also, we found it very interesting that when another Cal. State Park located near Hearst's Castle was recently acquired, Nick Franco, a California State Park District Superintendent, stated his desire for the park area to have trails phased in, but that he hopes that the park remains "pristine" 50 years from now. (VIA magazine, AAA Traveler's Companion, Issue July/August 2005; page 9) That should be exactly what our district superintendent could, and should, be saying about Burton Creek! Please feel free to contact us for further comment or questions at our email address or home phone (530)583-9334. Thank you for your time, Stacy and Alain Bordes

16.3

16.4

Response to Letter 16, submitted via email by Alain and Stacy Bordes

16.0 Please see Response 9.11 regarding the proposed access route to the park.

16.1 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic impacts from the proposed project.

16.2 Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding issues about the proposed campground development.

16.3 The Preliminary Plan proposes improvements in the signage in the park to assist visitors in directions. Also, please see Response 6.18 regarding passive recreation in the park.

16.4 Every State Park offers different opportunities for recreation and resource protection. The proposed plan addresses these sometimes competing goals by providing recreation facilities on less than 10 percent of the park land, leaving the remainder for those who desire little or change in the park.

To: **Ken Anderson** **Date: July 30, 2005**
California State Parks

From: Paul Vatistas, PO Box 1926, Tahoe City, CA 96145

Re: Burton Creek State Park (BCSP) General Plan Draft EIR of June 15, 2005

There are a number of concerns with the Draft General Plan and EIR for Burton Creek. Most of these were raised and recorded at the public meeting held in the High School in Tahoe City earlier in July.

First of all, my thanks to Ken Anderson and Hayden Sohm from State Parks for leading the debate on this plan and for offering solutions that reflect the realities of this part of California, particularly around new paved roads and unacceptable levels of increase in traffic in this already congested area.

The key points that I wish to make in my comments on the draft EIR are:

- The proposed improvements to the health of the forest are needed and should be implemented soon after the adoption of the plan
- The plan's proposed improvements for trails and to trailheads, so as to make the park more accessible, are also desirable
- 17.0 The proposed camp site should not exceed 200 sites, and no sites should be built until the traffic on 28 improves considerably (as stated in the current Draft EIR).
- Zero drive-in camp sites should remain a serious option because of the current high levels of traffic (as laid out by staff as an option in the public meeting).
- 17.1 Any new paved road to a camp site should come directly off highway 28 so as to minimize the impact on residential areas and reduce the level of development needed in the park – I strongly support the preferred alternative in the Draft EIR that goes in near Tamarack Lodge, and any decisions needed to make this access alternative possible.
- 17.2 I do not believe that an access road from Dollar Point is feasible.
- New maintenance facilities should be kept to a minimum, located close to existing facilities along highway 28, and not deep inside the park.
- I support the proposal to adjust the status of the small section of preserve close to highway 28 to facilitate the Preferred Alternative access road (near Tamarack Lodge).
- I support the proposal that some of the land around Dollar Creek on the adjacent Tahoe Conservancy property be designated as a Preserve.

Note that increasing traffic levels will have significant negative effects on the special environment that is Lake Tahoe through pollution and other measures, and that the State of California has already stated that it wishes to preserve this special area.

I hope that California State Parks will adopt a new plan taking into account the comments

above. Additional specific comments on the June 15 draft EIR for BCSP follow.

Specific Comments on the June 15 Draft EIR for BSCP

With specific reference to the Burton Creek State Park (BCSP) Draft EIR:

17.3 Executive Summary page 3: No campground or access roads should be built until the section of highway 28 between Burton Creek State Park and the entrance to Tahoe City close to the Tahoe State Recreation Area (TSRA, also a CA State Parks facility) reaches the Caltrans designated level of service D. This stretch of road is recognized by TRPA as one of the worst traffic areas, if not the worst, within the Tahoe Basin.

Executive Summary page 4: It is correct that, "Adding traffic of any amount to the Tahoe City area may be considered a significant impact." The traffic impact is itself reason to delay any camp site development (other than a walk-in camp site).

Main Document, bottom of page 7: No camp site should be built until the Caltrans level of service between the campsite entrance and Tahoe City is better than level D. No campsite should be built until any such proposed development can be built without forcing the Caltrans level of service (LOS) between the campsite entrance and Tahoe City to fall below LOS D.

Main Document, page 8: The local staff have correctly identified that the access from the area near the Tamarack Lodge is the correct point of access, and that this will require an adjustment to the current natural preserve boundary. This access alternative is widely supported by the people of California who live in this region.

17.4 Main Document, page 12: The statement that the park is used by only a few visitors is not correct. The park is widely used by many visitors year round for hiking, biking, and cross-country skiing, and the majority of the ones that I speak to come from California. I frequently hear comments that this group enjoy the wild nature of the BCSP and that they would like improved signage to allow for greater access.

Main document, page 26: Improved trail maintenance and signage is desirable and should be a priority following adoption of the plan. Signage should be in harmony with the natural feel of the park.

17.5 Main document, page 28: The TRPA thresholds for air quality have specific thresholds for traffic (VMT) and these are currently out of compliance.

Main document, page 29: Facilities should not be built until they can be done so while maintaining Level of Service D along highway 28.

17.6 Main document, page 31: The majority of visitors are not local residents but visitors from around California. Surveys undertaken by State Parks in 2001/2 of visitors to their facilities in this area clearly showed that the vast majority from around the State of California did not wish to see widespread development of BCSP.

Main document, page 32: A route into the park from Dollar Hill is not feasible and should be dropped as a possibility.

Main document, page 49: There is no additional 'carrying capacity' in and around the BCSP when it comes to traffic in summer.

17.7 Main Document, page 66: The NOP failed to identify as an option the position promoted by CA State Parks in its newsletter number 6 in 2002.

Main document, page 67: A campsite and associated building and development are not necessary to make this a shining example of the State Parks' system.

17.8 Main document, pages 68-72: I would support the Preferred Alternative, with an access road near Tamarack Lodge, over the other Alternatives presented in this Plan. However the draft EIR fails to identify and expand on the no campsite plan, previously identified by CA State Parks in newsletter number 6, as one of its Alternatives.

Main document, page 81: Increased traffic is not an unavoidable consequence of the plan. There will be no increase in traffic resulting from either no campsite or a walk-in only campsite.

17.9 Main document, page 83: No Alternative was presented that improves the management of BCSP, contains no campsite, and maintains use of the groomed cross-country ski trails. This is a failing under CEQA.

17.10 Main document, page 87: Wood smoke and traffic pollution will cause further deterioration in the Air Quality in the Tahoe Basin. State Parks is aware that air quality is already out of compliance as measure by the TRPA.

Response to Letter 17, submitted via email from Paul Vatistas

17.0 A letter submitted as part of this planning process by Jeffrey Pulverman, Chief, Office of Transportation Planning and Mass Transportation, California Department of Transportation, indicated that State Parks was mistaken in reporting the Level of Service (LOS) traffic goals. He states the current LOS is an E in the Tahoe City area on Highway 28, and its future projection is an F. We had incorrectly reported from information we had received that the current LOS was an F and the goal was to improve traffic flows to a Level D. Caltrans states in their Transportation Concept Report for Highway 28 that TRPA is responsible for addressing traffic capacity issues in the Tahoe Basin and therefore there future projection for the traffic LOS on Highway 28 will remain an F.

However, it is our intent to implement all feasible and reasonable mitigation measures for traffic impacts. Please see Responses .12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, and 9.11 for additional responses to traffic impacts. Also, should Caltrans revise its goal to improve traffic flows in Tahoe City; the Department will actively participate to help achieve those goals.

17.1 The proposed access road will come directly off Highway 28 near the Tamarack Lodge.

17.2 Operation facilities are proposed near the highway next to the proposed access road.

17.3 See Response 17.0

17.4 The vast majority of current use in BCSP is from adjacent neighborhoods. Many visitors also use the park. Proportionally, their numbers are few. The Preliminary Plan calls for improved signage for all users.

17.5 It is stated on the second paragraph on page 27of the Preliminary General Plan that the majority of indicators for all of the TRPA thresholds are out of compliance.

17.6 The Department is unaware of a survey taken in 2001/2 that verifies the observation made by the commenter that the majority of users at the park are visitors from around the state rather than home owners (or renters) in subdivisions adjacent to Burton Creek State Park. It is possible the commenter is referring to comments received at a public workshop held during the first planning process for the first draft of the general plan. At that workshop, people listed their primary residence addresses since that is where they would be sent information about the general plan planning process in the future. The Department would classify these people, who

have a primary residence outside of the basin, and a secondary home in the basin as local users of the park, not as visitors.

The distinction between these people and visitors is that visitors come to the area and camp in parks, stay in hotels, or simply come for the day. It is logical to assume that the vast majority of these visitors would not attend a public meeting during their vacation regardless of how they felt about the proposed plan. It is the perception of the State Park personnel at the meeting that the majority of people at the meeting have primary or secondary residences (or rent homes) in the Lake Tahoe area. Therefore, the difference between whether local residents or visitors use the park more may simply be a matter of semantics and definitions.

A formal survey was conducted during the Memorial Day Weekend of 2005 at various park units around the Tahoe Basin. Additional surveys were conducted at specific locations in California and Nevada during the following two weeks. Visitors and stakeholders were surveyed at Tahoe State Recreation Area, Sugar Pine Point SP, and Emerald Bay SP. Park visitors were also surveyed at Leo Carillo State Park in Malibu. Stakeholders were surveyed in Reno and Las Vegas, Nevada. They were also surveyed in Bakersfield, California.

The data revealed that the most important priority for individuals who responded to the survey was; "I would like to see family campsites included in this park". The least important priority was; "I do not want any development of park facilities on this land".

It should be noted that the second most important priority was the need to establish recreational trails in the park.

17.7 Please see Response 6.20 regarding the overall planning process for the Burton Creek State Park General Plan.

17.8 Alternatives 1 and 2 discussed in the draft EIR beginning on page 83 of the Preliminary General Plan discuss alternatives for development with no campgrounds.

17.9 Increased traffic may be an unavoidable impact of the proposed plan.

17.10 See Response 17.8 regarding a discussion of other alternatives.

From: "Kris Kingery" <mountainkat@earthlink.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/29/2005 11:33:54 PM
Subject: Park at Burton Creek etc.

Dear Mr. Anderson,
After reviewing the proposed park development plans including motorhome access and 200+ campsites that is being considered for the Burton creek/dollar hill State park I have many concerns, and hopefully some alternative ideas.
First, over the course of 35+ years that I have lived here, I have always been interested in why "city-dwellers" were drawn to this area. Simple, Lake Tahoe offers them the ability to relax, be away from cement air pollution, and car alarms, slow down the hectic pace of their lives, and remember simpler days when their parents took them camping. Yet, time and again I have been hearing over the last 10 years how much Tahoe has grown and how much it resembles their city life just with "more trees". The last comment from a couple that visited 3 years ago saddened me because I have felt it too. In the rush to make Tahoe "The New Aspen" we have lost the overall reason people come to enjoy it's beauty. If this proposed park development comes to pass, not only will further traffic tie-ups occur on the famously horrible traffic jam corridor of dollar hill, but with the
18.0 potential of a rec center, the Nahas property development, and various county buildings all in the same area on a daily basis I would be surprised if traffic would move at all...especially during the busy summer season where it backs up to dollar hill on a daily basis.:-(
Also, even as a young child, I witnessed the first hand devastation and near evacuation of this area due to forest fires. Most city dwellers assume the
18.1 "firepit" at the campsite will contain whatever fire they build and usually bigger is better. Also, the prevailing winds head upslope and if any burning embers catch fire, the possibility of a tree-top to tree-top fire in an area just ripe for a big burn could be devastating!
Also, in this day and age, the camp area is close to a major school which hosts summer kid programs and trainings for various sports activities. Often predators are drawn to these areas, and now we have made their access even easier, not to mention often campsites will be used for the summer as a means for cheap lodging for summer workers. In other areas of the country burglaries increase around these areas. Also, the possibility of people wandering off regular trails into close by residential backyards is a high likelihood and is currently already occurring in that area along with squatters pitching tents in the woods of the park. Also, several studies have shown the high risk to current wildlife and stream/riparian environments that will be affected. Sadly people just DO NOT stick to beaten paths; they want to explore! and in the process destroy habitats and scare wildlife. This is especially the case with motor bikes which have been in that area for over 25 yrs. despite signs that deny access.
18.2 Motorhomer's love to bring off-road vehicles, and jeeps and bikes for easy exploration from their campsite home base.
SOOOO, how to mitigate and possibly change all the negatives to positives Easy, develop park run campsites where the campers have guided experiences in the back country, all the while leaving their vehicles and "motorhomes of convenience" outside of the Tahoe basin. Basically, the businesses of Tahoe city and beyond can join by offering the camp discovery guest the full natural Tahoe experience. Not only does this promote more jobs for locals, but it promotes the local businesses in a quasi-concession type experience. Most importantly it creates a full natural experience for the guest all the

while giving them the ability to have as much comfort as they want.
For instance, a family of four leaves their motorhome with full kitchen, TV and comforts outside the basin. They are bussed or taxied in to the main headquarters near the "Lake of the Skye" inn (across from Lighthouse shopping). The main headquarters/trailhead starts there. They can either backpack in (all supplies exc clothes/personal items are rented from local outdoors stores), or go on fourwheelers (allows access for disabled or poorly fit/unconditioned etc.) to a camping area. Here many other families have their own campsites, but a main firepit, kitchen, restrooms, and other facilities are already set to share and monitored by a camp director.
From here guided excursions of discovery can occur with even "kids-camps", adult walk-a-bouts and theme based nature walks can occur using local residents/workers and guides etc. etc. Imagination leads onto other ideas from here how to not only engage visitors in the whole experience of the outdoors, but also teaches new generations about preserving and coexisting with the environment. It become basically a guided discovery and even adults can learn to forget the pressures of job and home while learning and enjoying the outdoors like they did when a child. I really believe they can, especially if all the "little details" like where and what they will eat today is already taken care of by catered meals from local restaurants. What a great way to promote local restaurants! and promote more or return business than if campers recall that awesome meal in the middle of the wilderness they had.
The possibilities just keep growing beyond the scope of this letter, but I really wanted you to get a mental picture of what could happen and how it could increase /benefit both the environment, and the community without causing many of the negatives currently apparent including those which were apparent in 2002. It also may provide a much better income source than just "renting" campsites especially during this tough time finacially for the state park system.
I have even more ideas which would tie in the state park issues listed here, with an alternative idea for the rec center, and more efficient use of the current bus system that I think would really benefit this community and also continue to "Keep Tahoe Blue" for generations to come.
If you are interested, please contact me at the E-mail listed below. My schedule precludes my ability to come to most meetings, but I try to attend when I can.
Thank you for your valuable time in reviewing my comments above.
Sincerely,
Kris
mountainkat@earthlink.net

Response to Letter 18 submitted via email by Kris Kingery

18.0 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues.

18.1 Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding the potential impacts from the proposed campground.

18.2 The Department appreciates the vision of the commenter. You are well ahead of the norms, laws and regulations governing use and enjoyment of the beauty that is Lake Tahoe. Perhaps some day the only way to access the basin will be through guided tours.

From: "Carol Pollock (SBC)" <carol_pollock@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/29/2005 11:29:44 AM
Subject: Regarding the proposed Burton Creek additions

To: Ken Anderson

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I am a frequent Tahoe visitor and Tahoe City homeowner and would like to comment on the proposed Burton Creek Park development.

We are deeply concerned and opposed to the Individual Campsites and any large Group sites.
*The fire risk and air pollution issue from even 50 campsites is enormous.
*The traffic consequences for travel on Highway 28 are huge. Putting a significant number of additional cars on that road is hard to imagine during busy summer days.
*Access on existing roads into Burton Creek would have an extremely negative impact on nearby residents. Right now the streets are dangerous to anyone walking on the road, children and animals.
*Finally, on a quality of life issue, you may not have any idea how sound travels throughout the area. Please come join me on the deck of our Tahoe cabin anytime there are baseball games at night at the new highschool fields--you would be astonished by the sound, which is actually a long way away.

19.0

Improving the park for limited day use is a great idea--what about signs on trailheads, maybe restroom facilities? A small trailhead parking lot. That's all it needs. Also, I would appreciate learning the Parks' policy on dogs in a developed Burton Creek Park.

Finally, as California State Parks contributor, I am deeply disappointed and dismayed by the Parks process and high handed attitude toward developing this property. There is significant local opposition for serious valid reasons.

Several years ago there was a huge effort by local residents to shape the park development in an appropriate way. And, it appeared that the Parks agreed. I am astonished that in face of this the Parks now propose to ignore that input and go ahead and frankly, I am offended by the characterization of local comment, and negative opinion, as just a bunch of local neighborhood people who want the park for their own. That's just insulting.

I and many others who spend time at Tahoe have introduced people to the beauty of the property and tried to encourage its use. Our objections to the development have a serious objective basis in fact. The current proposals are totally inappropriate for development in a sensitive, populated area with serious fire, environmental and traffic issues.

Sincerely,

Carol G. Pollock
25 King Avenue

Response to Letter 19 submitted via email by Carol Pollock

19.0 Please see the responses to letter 12.

From: Michael Ramicone <mistermr@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/28/2005 4:23:14 PM
Subject: Proposed Burton Creek State Park

Ken,Ive taken my time sending you these notes because I wanted to do a little home work first.I have spent the last three weeks visiting and in some cases camping at all the State parks in the Tahoe Basin and those in the surrounding National Forests.Included are camp grounds at Frenchman's Lake,Davis Lake,Bucks Lake,Almonor Lake,Sardine and Gold Lakes and the Robinson Creek campgrounds up above the Bridgeport Area..In addition I stomped around in the Burton and Conservancy lands behind my house.These are the areas I have just now visited. There are many more that I and my wife have used throughout CA. during the years and still use such as the Coastal Parks and down in the Mammoth and Bishop areas.

My observations are that all are over used and abused.Erosion is in evidence with the expected runoff into existing water sources (not all into water supplies),some have restroom facilities that are of the outhouse vault type where others have flush toilets,most have potable water stations with or without proper drainage receptacles under the faucets,most do not have adequate BEAR proff food storage units,most have paved roads with paved campsites for autos etc.I could go on but you must be aware of most of this,but I want to apply these notes to the proposed Burton Creek Campground.

First let me tell you that I was adamantly opposed the the Campground as first proposed.I no longer am and thank you for the informative presentation at the High school.You might note ,however,contrary to our local papers Editor a check of the names on the many petitions would disclose that the existing trails were not made exclusively by us locals.Those lists have folks from all over the USA,CA,and Europe.Those folks found out about these lands from us locals who are willing to share with all.

The entrance to the proposed park should be in the area of the Timberland Lodge.The Lodge is at the end of the present commercial corridor and close to the town.
The roads and campsites should be paved and drained in a manner to avoid erosion from runoff.
I would suggest no more than 100 campsites placed in two separated clusters of 50 each.
20.0 Potable water with proper drainage stations and flush toilets tied into the existing sewer system if possible.
A shower facility,either portable or fixed,along the lines of those found in some of the existing Parks.I suggest this be a pay as you use facility to defray any costs involved in care and upkeep.
A convenient facility for the disposal of the campers grey water and waste dump.These could be built into the toilet facilities as a possibility.
Forget the traffic requirement.Don't take this wrong but that is stupid.All one has to do is look at the developments around the Basin,Truckee,and the efforts of the Tahoe Resort Assoc.to bring more people into the town,to realize that your 100 campsites are not significant in the overall traffic problem and its solution.
I would suggest you contact Amy Green at the County of Placer Dept. of Public Works Truckee Office to coordinate water runoff problems with their present effort.She and a crew were out in our area today working on that very problem.The office phone # is 530-581-6234,and her e-mail is agreen@placer.ca.gov.

I hope this contributes to your efforts to establish a campground in Burton Creek.

Michael Ramicone
3042 Highlands Dr.
Tahoe City,CA.

From: Michael Ramicone <mistermr@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/28/2005 7:08:20 PM
Subject: Proposed Burton Creek State Park

20.1 Whoops Ken,must have had a senior moment.The entrance to the proposed park should be in the area of Tamarack Lodge not Timberland.Timberland is even in another state.

20.2 Also my wife had some druthers as well.She said to place all campsites away from any homes no matter where you are placing them. Not in anyones backyard,here or anywhere in the state.She also recommends that the CTC Dollar Property be preserved in its natural habitat with hiking and biking with day use facilities only.
Reference the Messenger Newsletter #6 February 2002.

Thanks Michael Ramicone
Phone 530-583-1209

Response to Letter 20 submitted via email by Michael Ramicone

20.0 Thank you for your observations and support for the proposed project. The suggestions you make for improving the proposed facilities will be considered in any future development plans including sediment capture structures, installing proper drainage, showers and flush toilets (if there is enough water), bear proof food lockers, a waste dump facility etc. When we actually propose development of the facilities we will work closely with all agencies including the county.

20.1 The entrance to the park is proposed to be at the Tamarack Lodge location.

20.2 Please see Responses 2.17, 4.14 and 13.3 regarding potential impacts of the campground and the proposed location.

From: Elizabeth Dugan <elizabethdugan@yahoo.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/27/2005 12:40:11 PM
Subject: Burton Creek Drive Plan

21.0

Mr. Anderson-
I oppose the plan to develop Burton Creek Drive area.
As a home owner off Old County Road, I feel strongly
that the additional traffic and "campers" will destroy
the delicate balance of people to nature we currently
experience in the woods off the Burton Creek area.
There is also a huge fire danger in that area.
Please reconsider. There are plenty of camp grounds
between Truckee and Lake Tahoe.
Sincerely
Elizabeth Dugan
POB 5992
3705 La Crosse
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
http://mail.yahoo.com

Response to Letter 21 submitted via email by Elizabeth Dugan

21.0 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic impacts. Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding issues surrounding the campground development.

July14, 2005

This is a response comment to the Burton Creek State Park General Plan and draft EIR. Please include the following comments in the next revision, or alter the plan accordingly.

1. We believe the potential Admin. Building Site shown or proposed on the CTC Dollar Property should be removed. It seems obvious that if the State Parks is in need of such facilities they can construct them on the TSRA in Tahoe City. That land is on both sides of Highway 28 and is clearly accessible and already substantially impacted and man modified by previous and current State Park activities. It makes no sense to plan to do rehabilitation work on a very accessible location in Tahoe City and then destroy a fairly remote and natural location that is on the border of your proposed Reserve, which you may some day need rehabilitate that site as well.

22.0

2. We request that you remove the alternate access road on CTC Dollar Property. To encircle a substantial amount of the Park with all the traffic the Park would generate seems to substantially degrade the reasons for the Park in the first place. We would hate to hike for hours just to cross a major paved road full of cars possibly more than once. It is also much longer than the proposed access road or many other routes that could be the alternate access road. Your current alternate access cuts through your proposed Dollar Reserve more than once, then crosses through one or both the Antone and the Burton Creek Reserves. It also looks like the proposed campground is just as good or better if moved 1 mile to the south on the largest flat area in the Park. This would make the alternate access road even longer and the proposed even shorter. If you must show an alternate access road, choose one out of Tahoe City or Rocky Ridge. They appear to have their own problems, but we don't believe as many as the current proposed alternate access road. This alternate access road should not be identified at all not even as the fall back plan.

3. We oppose campgrounds all together but if they can not be eliminated from the plan entirely, the proposed location or a location 1 mile to the south of the proposed location appears to be the least objectionable. Please remove the alternate campground location from the CTC Dollar Property. It is clear that they are there to justify the alternate access road and should be removed along with the alternate access road. If an alternate campsite is necessary, a location approximately 1 mile to the south of the proposed campsite should evaluated.

Sue and Gregg Henrikson

Response to Letter 22 submitted via email by Sue and Gregg Henrikson

22.0 The Department concurs with your three recommendations to remove the potential administrative building site, alternate road location, and alternate campground location from the CTC property shown on the maps in the Preliminary Plan. The final plan will show these changes on the maps.

Comments for Burton Creek Master Plan
By Mike Schwartz – owner of The Back Country
The Back Country has 2 stores, in Tahoe City and Truckee. We specialize in cycling, Backpacking/Hiking, Backcountry Skiing, and Snowshoeing.

You mentioned that these comments would remain public record, and actually be shown to others in some way. I hope this is true.

Burton Creek State Park has mostly been used by cyclists for decades. Some folks walk the trails from the Highlands and Nordic Center, including me. I live on Polaris Rd. But even over there it's at least 50% bikers. Other than the trails close to the Nordic Center Parking Lot, I've never seen a single person walking anywhere else in Burton Creek State Park. I've never run into one person walking on the Rim Trail within the Burton Creek State Park Boundaries. I have been on HUNDREDS of bike rides through this area, usually covering every single trail in each ride. Don't read me wrong; I want hikers to start enjoying it back there. My point is more just "for the record". Please write down somewhere in the history books this absolute FACT. Although the trails and roads aren't that fun to ride, Burton Creek State Park has been primarily a place to ride your mountain bike. Anyone who ever chooses to debate this, and claim bikers are in appropriate, or problematic in this area, has never stepped foot in the area. This is an important point to make in the new Burton Creek Master Plan.

23.0 Burton Creek State Park is the perfect place for mountain biking. You can't ride your bike inside a Wilderness Area, and this land designation is likely to continue growing over time. This Park has the perfect topography for bike trails, and no erosion or trail damage has ever been created in the area from bikes.

RV Campgrounds issue

23.1 Ken says NO Master Plan will be accepted without a 0-200 potential RV campground. He says a draft was strongly denied recently, that showed no RV campground facility. The park isn't much of a "park". It is a sad waste of prime recreational land, immediately adjacent to one of the most beautiful places in the world. I want to see the trails, signs, and trailhead work finally go in. Ken says no trail work will EVER happen at all unless a

23.2 master plan is accepted. I am left to believe this as the truth, so I will strongly support a campground element of Burton Creek State Park. But if millions of dollars are spent on RV Campgrounds **before** the trail system goes in, you guys will go down in the history books as the guys with some horrible names I can't type in this letter.

23.3 Adding a new RV Campground in Tahoe City has absolutely nothing to do with the needs of Locals or Tourists, nor is it healthy for Lake Tahoe or Burton Creek State Park. I'm not against RV people. I want an RV myself. But you know as well as I do….an additional campground out on I-80 or Hwy 89 is all you need to throw together. It would be just as filled up for the season and help satisfy this "demand" you keep talking about. Like people don't have enough places to drive there RV's to…you guys are telling me they MUST drive right to the edge of sensitive lake Tahoe, and turn left into the local trail

system we all use. Umm….I doubt it.

I have ridden every trail and fire road in the Burton Creek and surrounding area for 12 years. I have ridden every trail 100 times, in every possible direction. I have also directed my customers on mountain bike rides daily in my business for 12 years. Our store is located right in the middle of Tahoe City. I've personally drawn maps on paper 1000 times, and handed out another 1000 home-made maps to Tahoe city locals and tourists. Every time is the same 20 minute struggle to explain how to get through the Burton Creek area to get to the only trail that's longer than a few hundred yards, which is the Tahoe rim Trail. The only trail in the Tahoe Basin that gets any maintenance at all! People want to go to from Tahoe City to Watson Lake and Watson Peak by trail. Sorry to repeat myself, but creating a real trail system is 100 times more important than adding campgrounds.

23.4 If you build a campground, you cannot create more traffic. Read the lengthy documents created for the NLTRA, by private party researchers. Traffic is the NUMBER ONE complaint of both tourists and locals.

23.5 Another issue your potential campground plan must include is NATURAL SCREENING BY LOCATION SELECTION. This thing better remain very hidden. You will destroy the backcountry experience of Burton Creek State Park forever, if hikers and bikers have to look at RV's, pavement and buildings along the trails. It's not easy to hide 50-200 RV's and the yard sales associated with each one.

In order of what you need to do with this property is:

1. make a trailhead in downtown Tahoe City, and sign a trail all the way to Mt. Watson Peak. This is the most important function of Burton Creek State Park. Get you up the hill to a place where there is a view. No one needs to drive up this hill. Make them park that thing and walk or ride a bike for crying out loud. This trail must contour with minimal switchbacks, and be designed for mountain bikers as well as hikers.
2. 23.6 Sign a trailhead at the other locations I saw on your map, and sign a route on existing trails that circles the terrain through the Nordic center and Antone Meadows. This will be the easier of the 2 trails. These are not new routes; this is what has been going on for decades. Just turn some fire roads back into trails, and put up a few signs.
3. Influence USFS to help you accomplish this, as some of the necessary trails are on their property.
4. 23.7 If you do build a campground, you must build a paved road up through Star Harbor, which facilitates bike riding as well as RV traffic. It needs to have a BIKE LANE. The bike paths are way too crowded, almost dangerous. And campers will all have bikes as well. If you must have a campground, I like the proposed location I saw on the most recent map. It would be great to extend a PAVED BIKE PATH fork to the left, just before you reach the actual campground, which joins the Fibreboard Freeway. Now we have a paved bike ride from Tahoe City to

Brockway Summit. NO CARS ON THIS.

5. DO NOT DESIGN A CONNECTION FOR AUTOS OR I WILL KILL ALL OF YOU. If Campers start driving on the fibreboard freeway towards Watson Lake, you have just successfully ruined this entire area…and given the land to the campers for the summer. Okay, I'm just kidding about killing you. I think. But I can't promise you any protection from the thousands of Tahoe backcountry lovers who will agree with me. It would be totally dangerous, in appropriate, and just plain DUMB. Nevertheless, it's exactly what the campground manager is going to want the second you pave him a little home next to this paved backcountry route. I have seen many bikers dodge speeding cars back there, as tourists race around the fibreboard freeway, gaining access from Brockway Summit. There is nothing to see except trails between Watson Lake and Tahoe City. I'm okay with cars going from Brockway Summit to Watson Lake, because trails don't intersect other than in one spot near the start. The stretch from Watson Lake to Tahoe City needs to be protected.

23.8

Please NEVER consider **concessions** in this state park. The business community is the only group of locals who are allowing you to go through with this project. We do NOT need more competition. Bike rental income keeps the bike stores in business, as they lose money for the other 9 months each year. Tahoe City needs improved food options, no one makes enough money to be competing with State Parks on this level either. Concessions should only be allowed in any state park when they are necessary, due to driving distance to such needs. This is not the case here. If you're going to mow down trees, and create more traffic, and collect RV Campground revenue, you need to have some respect for the communities businesses.

23.9

Thanks for all your hard work. Please improve this area. It is long overdue. Good luck!

Sincerely,

Mike Schwartz
The Back Country
Po box 6706 Tahoe City
530-362-0020
mike@thebackcountry.net

Response to Letter 23 submitted via email by Mike Schwartz

23.0 The Department supports mountain bike use in areas where it is appropriate and we can effectively manage this activity to minimize soil erosion and environmental impacts. Trail problems often originate from poor trail design and overuse.

23.1 Please see Response 6.20 in regards to the overall planning process for the park that has taken place so far.

23.2 The Department would like to clarify that extensive road and trail work has occurred in the past to rehabilitate some eroding sections. Also, roads and trails have been relocated outside of riparian and meadow areas to protect resources. Road and trail projects such as these can still take place in the future. The Preliminary Plan recommends the completion of a Road and Trail Plan. This plan would look at the entire area in terms of trail use, trail signage, trail connectivity, resource problems associated with trail use etc. However, minor trail work to fix resource damage may still occur regardless of whether a general plan is approved for the park or a campground is built.

23.3 Please see Response 7.12 regarding camping demand in the Tahoe Basin and Response 6.18 regarding how the proposed campground will impact the existing trail system in the park.

23.4 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues.

23.5 The proposed location for the campground is approximately .5 to 1.5 miles from any surrounding neighborhood or school.

23.6 Suggestions 1-3 may be considered in the Road and Trail Plan proposed to be developed in the future. Traditionally, general plans do not provide this level of detail.

23.7 Please see Response 6.18 regarding upgrades to the proposed access road. Also, see Response 23.6 regarding level of detail in general plans.

23.8 Motorized traffic is proposed to be prohibited on all roads except on the access road to the campground and the trailhead access roads, similar to Sugar Pine Point State Park.

23.9 Please see Response 6.19 regarding concessions in State Parks.

From: "Doug Greenwood" <doug@alpensoftware.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/26/2005 7:35:12 AM
Subject: Preliminary General Plan: Burton Creek, Public Comment

Ken,

I'm a resident of Tahoe City, Dollar Hill area.

I've reviewed the General Plan for Burton Creek, reviewed the maps and approve of your "Proposed" General Plan for the State Park.

24.0 I overwhelmingly support the "Proposed (preferred) Access Road", but strongly oppose the "Alternative Access Road". Too much wilderness is at stake, plus it appears to encroach upon the Dollar Reservoir and Nordic Ski areas.

24.1 I strongly support both the Antone Meadows Preserve and the Burton Creek Preserve, however I do not want the Tahoe XC Nordic Center trail system compromised either.

24.2 I strongly support all trailheads and trail systems, hopefully the "logging roads" will be converted to single track.

24.3 I strongly support the Proposed (preferred) campground location, but strongly oppose the alternate campground locations. Reviewing the maps, it would appear that you would use the alternate access road for the 2 other alternate campground locations, and I very strongly oppose that.

Thank you,

Doug Greenwood

Alpen Software, Inc.

530-583-5822

530-320-9001 (cell)

Response to Letter 24 submitted via email by Doug Greenwood

24.0 The alternative access road will be removed from the maps in the Final Plan.

24.1 Under the proposed Preliminary Plan the preserves will remain intact as well as the Tahoe XC Nordic Center Trail System.

24.2 The proposed Preliminary Plan calls for the development of a Road and Trail Plan. That plan will identify those roads to be converted to single track. We encourage your participation in that planning process.

24.3 The alternative campground locations identified on the maps in the Preliminary Plan will be removed from the maps.

From: "Dewey/Lynda Paul" <dewlyn@digitalpath.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/25/2005 4:53:25 PM
Subject: Burton Creek/Dollar Properties

25.0

PLEASE do not change the Burton Creek State Park to overnight camping or annex the Dollar (conservancy) Property. Tahoe is so overwhelmed with people as it is. We can hardly get from one place to the next because of traffic congestion (which causes air pollution) as it is. There are already enough places for people to camp overnight - we do NOT need anymore! The area you are talking about is pristine, peaceful, remote and already has a high use without any development. Why would anyone want to bring more people, dogs, bikes, garbage, cars, or noise into there? We beg you not to do this - Let's save what undeveloped land we have. The millionaires are ruining Tahoe with their big mansions and docks into the lake - let's not be like them. Keep it for the ones that are willing to walk to find tranquility and therefore appreciate where they are and take care of it!

Thank you,
Dewey and Lynda Paul

Response to Letter 25 submitted via email by Dewey and Lynda Paul

25.0 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues and the Preliminary Plan. Please see Response 7.12 regarding camping demand in the Tahoe Basin. Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding issues surrounding the proposed campground development, and Response 6.18 regarding how much open space will remain following development of the park.

From: "Laurie Gregory" <lauriegregory@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/20/2005 7:42:34 AM
Subject: Burton Creek Park

26.0

26.1

I was upset to read the plan being proposed for the park. I thought they had looked at this last year or so and had decided to keep it small with a few parking places and that was it. Now it seems the state parks wants to ruin all the untouched space around Tahoe if they can. This area is a wonderful wilderness feeling space, but close to town and housing so locals and tourists alike can get a "woods experience" without having to drive or hike/bike long distances. I can see putting in a parking area, small though, and maybe some signage but all the campground ideas and roads into this area would basically ruin its charm and use as a great escape from roads, traffic and too many people. I thought the parks would want to conserve as much space as possible, keeping it "back to nature" so people have a different experience from city life, rather than making everything into parking lots. It is so disappointing to read this plan as I thought it had been resolved a while back and now looks like everything else in Tahoe with overbuilding and overuse. This area is used extensively as it is for hiking, biking and XC skiing and snowshoeing in the winter by locals and tourists alike. I was able to take my 85 year old mother on a small "wildflower hike" because this area is so accessible and if it were to be ruined with roads and campgrounds that would not have been possible. I hope you reconsider these extensive, overbuilding of the wilderness area plans and preserve this area as it is. Not everything has to be remodeled to be better. Mother nature knew what she was doing and man cannot always improve on that. Please allow some natural areas to remain just that, natural. They are still available to all who want to find them. I would hope the parks service's first job is too conserve the parks, not develop them and ruin what little natural space is left. Please keep me informed of what is happening and who else to email or contact to try to preserve this space.
Thank you for considering the opinions of those who love and use this area on a regular basis.
Laurie Gregory

Response to Letter 26 submitted via email by Laurie Gregory

26.0 Please see Response 6.20 regarding the overall planning process that has taken place so far for the Burton Creek State Park General Plan.

26.1 Please see Response 6.18 regarding how much open space will remain following development of the park and how the development will be compatible with the parks existing recreation resources.

From: "Nancy Wells" <kemana@earthlink.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/21/2005 9:58:26 PM
Subject: Burton Creek proposal

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our very important feelings about the proposed Burton Creek campground. My family and I use the Nordic center almost daily in the winter and ride our mountain bicycles or hike in the summer frequently in the same area. We are adamently against the proposed campground for the following reasons:

27.0 Safety: Who will monitor the campground when the budget for rangers has been cut drastically and DL Bliss Campground is down to one ranger. Has the location of a campground adjancent to schools and summer camps been fully evaluated? I would not want my children near a unsupervised campground.

27.1 Paving: Do not add more pavement to the wilderness; we live in Tahoe to enjoy wilderness, not have more asphalt and less trees.

27.2 Traffic: Probably the biggest concern: Highway 28 cannot handle the traffic right now. For example, I sat in traffic from the Tamarack Lodge to Tahoe City for over 30 minutes and that is without the added traffic of RVs and a minimum of 300 more people.

Planning: People will not walk to town for their groceries and walk back up the mtn to their campsite; this is California and the US,not Europe. Your idea of people walking to town, not driving and adding to the pollution and traffic, is not realistic.

27.3 Short Season: Our summer this year started in late June and could be over by Labor Day; that is less than 3 mos when the campgrounds would be open. You should not pave and ruin our paradise for 10 weeks of camping; We have to pay with the pollution, traffic, danger to our families, and ruination of a wonderful spot for people that will not respect our neighborhood, our children. Do not, repeat, not, build this campground. Thank You. Nancy Wells

Nancy Wells
kemana@earthlink.net
EarthLink Revolves Around You.

Response to Letter 27 submitted via email by Nancy Wells

27.0 Please see Responses 2.17, 4.14 and 23.5 regarding issues about the proposed campground development.

27.1 Only one road is proposed for paving - the proposed access road into the park. This road currently erodes sediment directly into Burton Creek. By redesigning the road, paving, and installing sediment traps we will greatly reduce the sediment currently generated. The area is not a designated wilderness. It is classified as a State Park. The proposed facility development in the Preliminary Plan is permitted under such a classification. Also, see response 6.18 regarding open space and the proposed development.

27.2 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic and the Preliminary Plan.

27.3 The Department appreciates your concern for "our paradise" as you refer to it in the comment letter. However, Burton Creek State Park belongs to all of the people of California. The park is large enough to accommodate local resident as well as visitors that come to enjoy this wonderful spot. Please see Response 6.18

From: Charlie Banfield <charliebanfield@yahoo.com>
To: <kande@parks.gov>
Date: 7/19/2005 12:29:54 PM
Subject: Burton Creek

The idea of a park in that forest is a bad one.

28.0

In addition to destroying a beautiful natural area it will increase traffic in an already congested area.

The past has proven that campers are a major cause of fires.

Mr.& Mrs. Charles Banfield
Mr. & Mrs. Richard Banfield

Start your day with Yahoo! - make it your home page
http://www.yahoo.com/r/hs

Response to Letter 28, submitted via email by the Banfields

28.0 Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding issues about campground development and fires, and Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic impacts from the proposed development.

From: "nurpu" <nurpumike@hotmail.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/18/2005 6:21:26 PM

29.0

As a resident of N Tahoe for 15 years I am absolutly disgusted with the plans for BCSP. Leave it as it is.

Response to Letter 29, submitted via email by "nurpu"

29.0 Comment noted.

From: "Dave Shelton" <ds@tahoedesigns.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/14/2005 6:46:32 PM
Subject: Burton Creek

30.0

Ken,
I attended the public hearing last week at NTHS. I believe my only comment would be a request that any improvements proposed include a buffer from any existing development. I envision both a physical buffer, perhaps 100 feet or so, and a visual buffer. I think that should apply to any improvement including parking lots, defined trails and roadways, and buildings. I own adjoining property and I believe most of the adjoining property owners never anticipated any development of the state lands. I understand the right to develop and I hope not to be a nimby, but hopefully increased public access to this area can be accomplished with minimal impact on the neighbors.
Dave Shelton
1225 North Lake Blvd.

Response to Letter 30, submitted via email by Dave Shelton

30.0 The Department concurs with your recommendation to provide appropriate screening between any of the proposed development in the Preliminary Plan and existing development. The proposed campground is at least half a mile from any existing development and all the trailheads can be located in areas where screening can be achieved, except the proposed Tahoe City trailhead, which is already in a developed area.

From: "Jim Zellers" <jim_zellers@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/12/2005 7:11:03 PM
Subject: Public comment

Ken,

I don't really have the time to do a research project on the proposed Burton Creek state park expansion but I do have a few comments on what I have read.

31.0 1. The purpose of this proposal is to, "...provide high quality recreation..." "...with splendid views..." "...clear streams...". Well, we already have that. I can bike, ski, and hike there anytime I wish and I drink out of those streams constantly (against State Park's advice), because the water is so clean and clear already. Why do I need the state park to spend my money which they don't have enough of, being in constant deficit spending and all, to provide me with something I already have?

Ken, I really want a specific answer to that question.

31.1 2. What happens when the state park is overrun with visitors in peak months and the state parks decides it needs another bathroom and closes the park for the season to build one with an outside contractor, while is loses revenues. You guys have a bad track record here looking at the Donner State Park model and I am not confident state parks will be any more efficient with Burton Creek. Sure you can provide all kinds of stipulations and mitigations, but once the park is approved, history has shown us over and over State Parks runs the show and the local community bears the inconvenience of an approved money pit.

31.2 3. The general plan states how they will manage the area in much detail. Is the USFS currently falling behind in their management practices? Can't we just all help them to keep it in its natural state and save several million dollars which we don't have anyway.

31.3 4. Traffic impacts seem to be a large component of the proposal. Wouldn't the money set for this proposed park be better spent on a transit system like that in Mammoth, CA., Aspen, CO., Steamboat, CO., Vail, CO., etc. A free system with stops every 15 to 20 minutes so cars are less of an issue at the Lake.

31.4 5. I just don't get the benefit for us locals.

Thanks-

Jim Zellers
Truckee, CA
25 year resident
530.587.2081

Response to Letter 31 submitted via email by Jim Zellers

31.0 Burton Creek State Park belongs to all of the people of California. In regards to funding, the people of California have passed many bonds in support of the Department's efforts to provide the finest state park system in the country to include providing parks with visitor use facilities. We believe the proposed development in the Preliminary Plan will make the park more accessible to all of the people of California including those who may possess disabilities.

31.1 Comment noted. The Department follows contract procedures according to state regulations.

31.2 The Department suggests you contact the U.S. Forest Service regarding their management of national forest lands.

31.3 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues. See Response 3.13 regarding the idea of a trolley system developed in cooperation with other agencies.

31.4 The Preliminary Plan proposes improvements to the park that will benefit a wide variety of park visitors including the local residents. Development of the park will provide staff on site to enforce public safety and resource protection regulations. There will be infrastructure improvements to the road and trail system, resulting in better circulation (trail connectors to USFS trails and Tahoe City) and less erosion of the road and trail surfaces. There will be nearby camping for visiting friends and relatives for those living in the Tahoe City area. There will be an economic boost to Tahoe City businesses. There will be reduced fire hazard because fire hydrants and year round water will be available to certain locations around the park. Also the response time to emergencies will be quicker with park staff living and working in the park. These are just a few of the many benefits that could occur with implementation of the proposed plan.

From: "Rankin" <rankin@sierra.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/11/2005 10:13:13 PM
Subject: Burton Creek Park-Tahoe City

Dear Mr. Andersen.

32.0 We are year round residents of the Highlands subdivision in Tahoe City, adjacent to the proposed campground that is being considered in Burton Creek State Park. The notification of a public hearing came to us too late to be there in person to tell you of our dissatisfaction with this plan.

32.1 We feel that it is imperative that all action be stopped so that you can get the true picture of what is at stake. Traffic congestion is a huge problem already and adding more cars to this area is unconscionable!

32.2 What happened to the resolution made by supervisor Mr. John Knott (Calif. State Parks newsletter #6, 2002) in support of a passive recreation facility?

32.3 The number of proposed campsites, cars and RV's coming through the one and only artery into this subdivision, will hugely impact this neighborhood as well as Highway 28 that feeds into it. Any traffic control specialist will tell you how truly bad this traffic problem is for this area, especially in the summer season. A developer is building a new subdivision at the entrance to this neighborhood which will add a large number of more cars, plus there is a plan for a recreation center building that may come in the future, and this will also add to the traffic. Increased traffic also adds to the danger in case of a forest fire. The people in the proposed campground would be at great risk.

32.4 In addition to the traffic issue there is also another issue that should be considered. Burton Creek State Park is presently a very nice, pristine area that is easily accessible to both locals and vacationing visitors. This is an area that should be preserved not disturbed. The plan that is currently being considered would ruin this area. It would add to pollution, it would be detrimental to the wildlife, and it would take away one of the main attractions that is a reason people come to vacation in this area!

Please revisit this subject and scale down this plan to a passive recreation facility or move it elsewhere!

Frustrated and angry,

Greg and Mary Margaret Rankin

3185 Fabian Way

Tahoe City, Ca. 96145

530-581-2030

From: "Rankin" <rankin@sierra.net>
To: "'Ken Anderson'" <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/12/2005 9:22:36 AM
Subject: RE: Burton Creek Park-Tahoe City

Mr. Anderson,

32.5

Thank you for your reply. Please add this response to the official record of the final document.
If the access road is by the Tamarack Lodge, the issues we brought up still apply. If that is the only way in or out then the danger in a fire situation would be very great. It would cause a lot of traffic congestion with RV's as well as cars trying to flee a fire. That would also create a dangerous intersection. On busy summer days the back up now often extends to Tamarack Lodge or to Lake Forest Road, and with the additional cars that a campground will add, the backup could easily extend to the top of Dollar Hill! Imagine this with a forest fire happening and emergency vehicles trying to get to the fire. Also, a campground in that area would our opinion add to the possibility of a fire. From just a safety point of view, the current plan is a bad idea and should revert back to the passive recreation facility plan that was formally agreed upon!

Greg R.Rankin & Mary Margaret Rankin
3185 Fabian Way
P O Box 5803
Tahoe City, Ca 96145
email: rankin@sierra.net

-----Original Message-----
From: Ken Anderson [mailto:kande@parks.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2005 6:41 AM
To: rankin@sierra.net
Subject: Re: Burton Creek Park-Tahoe City

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Rankin,
Your letter will become part of the official record of the final document along with the department's response. I can tell you if you read the current draft plan you will see that the proposed access route does not go anywhere near the Highlands now. Also, notices went out about the public meeting three weeks in advance of the meeting. I am sorry you were unable to attend. Please review the final draft when it comes out for responses to the rest of your comments. Thank you for your letter. Ken Anderson

>>> "Rankin" <rankin@sierra.net> 7/11/2005 10:12:33 PM >>>
Dear Mr. Andersen,

We are year round residents of the Highlands subdivision in
Tahoe City, adjacent to the proposed campground that is being considered
in Burton Creek State Park. The notification of a public hearing came to us too late to be there in person to tell you of our dissatisfaction
with this plan.

Response to Letter 32 submitted via email by Greg and Mary Margaret Rankin

32 The proposed campground in the Preliminary Plan is not located adjacent to the Highlands subdivision. It is located approximately 1.5 miles to the west of the subdivision. Also, see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding impact issues with the proposed campground development.

32.1 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues.

32.2 Please see Response 6.20 regarding the overall planning process that has taken place to date.

32.3 The proposed entrance to the park is approximately 1.5 miles west of the Highlands subdivision.

32.4 Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding issues about the park and campground development.

32.5 Please see Responses 2.17 and 4.14 regarding issues about fire.

From: <annegreenwood@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/18/2005 7:32:56 AM
Subject: Burton Creek development

Good morning,

We live in Dollar Point and use the proposed area on a daily basis year round. We run, hike, and cycle in the spring, summer, and fall, and we nordic ski in the winter. We love the access to this lovely area, but also realize the benefits of a managed area.
I view the development as a positive one given several factors are addressed:

33.0 1.) We love the nordic center for our own personal benefit, but also for what it provides the community; a strong center for children, adults, and tourists to develop the skills and passion for the nordic sport. They are really a stellar local business. We are most fearful that their business would be jeopardized by the development of the park.

33.1 2.) The traffic is unbearable at this point. Further usage seems unmanageable.

33.2 There is quite a strong local sentiment against this development. I've heard several people express fears that access will be severely restricted for mtn. biking etc.. Is this true or hysteria? I, for one, envision more people using the area in an orderly fashion and exploring this natural treasure in a respectful way. I think we need more camping resources, especially in North Tahoe.

Thnks for your time.
Anne Greenwood

Response to Letter 33 submitted via email by Anne Greenwood

33.0 The Department strongly supports the recreation provided by the Nordic Ski Center and enjoys a good working relationship with them. The Preliminary Plan does not propose any curtailment of their activities. In fact, the plan proposes more warming huts and the possibility of over night cabin stays.

33.1 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues.

33.2 The proposed development in the Preliminary Plan will not close any trails and roads currently in use in the park. Access will remain as it is today. In the future, some roads and trails may be closed if they represent a threat to resources through excessive erosion etc. Also, see Response 6.18 for additional information on how the proposed development will be compatible with existing park resources.

From: "John E. Hearst" <jehearst@berkeley.edu>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/11/2005 10:50:21 AM

Sir:

34.0 I oppose the State Park plan to put 170 camp sites in the Burton Creek State Park area. The traffic trough Tahoe City in the summertime is
34.1 rapidly destroying it as a productive target for vacationers and home owners, with development moving to the Truckee Area. The original plan
34.2 to build a by-pass road distant from the lake-front must be the first step in any plans for increase land utilization in the Tahoe City area.

John Hearst
3020 Polaris Road
Tahoe City

John E. Hearst, PhD. DSc
Professor Emeritus
Department of Chemistry
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-1460

office: (510) 642-3556
mobile: (510) 407-4555

jehearst@berkeley.edu
jehearst@lbl.gov

Response to Letter 34 submitted via email by John Hearst

34.0 The Preliminary Plan proposes to investigate the construction of a campground ranging in size from 25 to 200 sites, not a set 170 site campground.

34.1 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues.

34.2 The Department recommends you contact Caltrans regarding a by-pass road around Tahoe City.

From: "Ray Garland" <ray.garland@mail.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/11/2005 10:36:03 AM
Subject: Burton Creek Draft General Plan

35.0 As a homeowner at 3165 Cedarwood Drive, I strongly urge that the State Park Department adhere to its earlier position that met with the approval of area residents; i.e., that it be for passive recreation only. The revised plan presented July 7 will be a traffic disaster for an already crowded region.

Ray Garland

Response to Letter 35 submitted via email by Ray Garland

35.0 Please see Response 6.20 regarding earlier versions of the Preliminary Plan and Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues.

From: "H W Kenyon" <hwkenyon@pacbell.net>
To: "Ken Anderson" <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/10/2005 9:17:59 PM
Subject: Burton Creek State Park Plan

Ken Anderson

Dear Sir,

36.0 When did the plan for Burton Creek change from passive recreation to transient campsites, complete with new roads, support facilities and overnight winter camping?

36.1 Where is the traffic study that justifies adding another turnout for slow moving campers at the already dangerous Dollar Hill summit intersection. Vehicles enter Highway 28 just below the crest of Dollar Hill from both North and South and accelerate from the top of the hill westbound, making this a tricky intersection even for locals.

36.2 Has the state considered that the Firestone property is slated for development with a proposed senior housing and a recreation center adding to the traffic?

The chart of your proposal indicates that Dollar Hill property may be co-opted into Burton creek and that a proposed Admin Building may be constructed 400 yards from Dollar Reservoir, with proposed access through a residential area backing the Nordic center.

I question if this if this is the best use of resources. Dollar reservoir is a quiet place used by locals, the closest pond to residential housing in that area. Residents should not be treated to transients in their back yard and campers deserve more of a wilderness experience.

The alternate entrance should be closer to town and the campsites if there are to be some, located in western Burton Creek only. The speed limits are slower for town making crossing Highway 28 safer for cars and pedestrians. Supplies and shopping are within walking distance. Parking, emergency medical facilities and law enforcement are close at hand. Burton pond and creek are a short hike in.

Some people have said that the camping industry will be good for business in town.

36.3 I doubt is any number of campers will give Tahoe City the economic shot it needs. Sugar Pine Point is a great park but it hasn't done much for Tahoma.

Sincerely,

Hugo Kenyon
Tahoe City

CC: "virginia graham" <v-graham@sbcglobal.net>

Response to Letter 36 submitted via email by Hugo Kenyon

36.0 Please see Response 6.20 regarding earlier versions of the Preliminary Plan

36.1 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 5.13, 7.13, and 9.11 regarding traffic issues. Also, the proposed entrance road to the park is no longer at Dollar Hill; it is near the Tamarack Lodge, about 1.5 miles west of Dollar Hill.

36.2 The proposed administrative buildings shown on the Dollar Property maps will be removed in the Final Plan.

36.3 We believe a substantial portion of the business transacted in summer in Tahoma at the market, restaurants and launder mat comes from campers at Sugar Pine Point State Park. Businesses in Tahoe City may be able to branch out and take advantage of concession opportunities in the park. Burton Creek State Park visitors will no doubt conduct a portion of their shopping in Tahoe City. Development of the park has the potential to benefit business in Tahoe City.

From: "Joann Russell" <joann.r@earthlink.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/10/2005 4:05:23 PM
Subject: Burton Creek S.P. General Plan meeting comments July 7 2005

My comments regarding the Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan:

37.0 If your traffic survey indicates that traffic from your planned 200 campsites and large group campsite will not improve to an LOS D after CalTrans improvements, what happens to the BCSP plan? If traffic from BCSP will cause the traffic to remain at or revert to LOS F, does the gridlock justify invoking the "unavoidable significant environmental effect"?

37.1 Your statement that 50 to 80% pf homes are second homes does not appear to take into account rentals which raise the total occupancy rate. In the Highlands - the closest housing development to the Dollar Property, the local owner/occupancy is 62%. The 2000 Census showed the total occupancy at 85 %.

37.2 On p.33, you state: "The Department believes the proposed day use facilities will lead to improving some of the indicators for the TRPA thresholds and help solve transportation problems in the area." I find it hard to believe that creating up to 200 campsites and a large group campsite, with all the traffic those would generate could possibly help solve transportation problems.

37.3 On p.36, you intimate that campers will have "splendid views" of mountains and the Lake Tahoe Basin from the areas of "active and passive...recreation".
This might be a serious overstatement. Perhaps it could be worded more reasistically.

37.4 The residents of the Highlands are not likely to launch a coordinated effort to oppose the campground development - providing the access to the campgrounds is located at Tamarack Rd. However, there is sure to be strong opposition to any location of the access road from the top of Dollar Hill with the road traversing the Dollar Property north of the Highlands. I would hope that State Parks will not wait another 3 years before we hear of progress toward the culmination of the BCSP plan.

Joann Russell
jayjo@thegrid.net

Response to Letter 37 submitted via email by Joann Russell

37.0 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic impacts and issues. Also, the original concept advanced in the Preliminary Plan was to work with Caltrans to improve the LOS from an F to a D. Caltrans corrected the Department in this assertion in their comment letter to the Preliminary Plan. The current LOS is an E, with the future projected LOS being an F for SR 28. Therefore, we have changed our position based on the new information. Our current position is to implement all reasonable and feasible measures to mitigate or reduce impacts to traffic.

37.1 Thank you for the information. The percentage of year round, second home owners, renters, or visitors living in the Highlands does not influence or change any of the proposals in the Preliminary Plan.

37.2 The statement regarding thresholds and traffic apply to the trailhead day use facilities where people may park and then travel by bike to surrounding destinations. The campground is not a day use facility. The Preliminary Plan proposes to explore development of a range of campground sizes from 25 to 200 sites, to see how the campground may affect traffic incrementally. In that way, the Department will be able to recommend an appropriate campground size that maximizes the opportunities for overnight camping while addressing the impacts to traffic.

37.3 There are many locations in the park that offer views of Lake Tahoe, Mt. Watson and other mountains in the area.

37.4 The proposed location for the access road into the park is at Tamarack Road. We sincerely hope to complete this planning process for BCSP within a year from now.

From: "Emily Headley" <eheadley@inreach.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/9/2005 9:44:00 AM
Subject: Burton Creek State Park

Dear Mr. Anderson:

38.0 I am writing to express my support for improving Burton Creek State Park for passive recreation without bringing unacceptable levels of new traffic to the Tahoe City area. The current proposal under consideration, for the development of approximately 170 camp sites, would significantly detract

38.1 from the wilderness experience that is now enjoyed by both residents and visitors to the area. Additionally, the impact of another 300+ vehicles, as a result of developed campsites, would make our current traffic problem even worse.

Please do not pursue the general plan for creating the campsites. Please stick with the passive recreation plan for Burton Creek.

Thank you,

Emily Headley

Emily Headley R.D.

P.O. Box 7272

Tahoe City, CA 96145

530/581-5640

530/581-0240 fax

Response to Letter 38 submitted via email by Emily Headley

38.0 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic. Also, see Response 37.2 regarding the size of the campground that will be explored for development.

38.1 Please see Response 6.18 regarding how the proposed facility development will still allow for many forms of passive recreation.

DRAFT **DRAFT** **DRAFT**

July 15, 2005

Comments on the Burton Creek State Park Gneal Plan and Draft EIR

Myron B "Mike" Hawkins

Generally speaking, I feel that the Park concept presented in the General Plan is a misguided attempt to "make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." My bases for this opinion are given in the following paragraphs.

First, I believe that a majority of campers that visit the Tahoe Basin come here to experience the wonders presented by this unique National treasure and to enjoy the scenic and recreational resources of Lake Tahoe, whether this be tanning and picnicking on the beach, swimming, fishing or boating. The General Plan does not discuss these aspects of the visitor experience, probable because the Tahoe City Recreational Area is so small and inadequate for additional water front users. Consequently, the Burton Creek campers who seek the Lake Tahoe experience will be forced to drive considerable distances to avail themselves of other public and private facilities many of which are already used to capacity. These sorties will contribute, of course, to existing traffic and parking problems. I feel that it is mandatory that any development of the Burton Creek State Park must include contiguous waterfront facilities for the use of the Park's campers.

39.0

39.1

The proposed park, by the nature of not having waterfront access, with or without camping, will be, as the General Plan suggests, primarily a hiking, backpacking, bicycling, ORVing and horseback riding facility. I have no reason to believe that a park with these recreational amenities, with or without camping, will be a popular destination when so many other State and Federal parks offer more interesting and attractive venues throughout California and the West. Without a doubt, however, such a park would be an attraction for many local residents.

39.2

Unfortunately, I for see the possibility that a park developed as indicated in the previous paragraph being a recreational facility primarily for locals and an "over flow" facility for more popular State Parks in the area.

Note: In order to evaluate my opinions, I suggest that State Parks conduct a survey of campers at other Parks around Lake Tahoe to determine the primary reasons that campers select Lake Tahoe as the destination for their vacations.

Phone: 530/581-2812
FAX: 530/581-2586
E-mail: mbh1@inreach.com

Response to Letter 39 submitted via email by Mike Hawkins

39.0 Please see Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues.

39.1 There are many water front access locations (beaches) open to the public close by Burton Creek State Park. These include Star Harbor, Bristlecone Parcel, Skylandia Beach, Klausen property, Commons Beach, Carnelian Bay Beach, Tahoe Vista Beaches, the Dunes, and Kings Beach. All of these public beaches are close to BCSP.

39.2 The Department shares a different opinion of BCSP than the commenter. We do not believe it will be an overflow facility to the other state parks. First, some people prefer the north side of the lake. Also, no other state park in the Tahoe Basin offers nearly as much hiking and biking opportunity as Burton Creek State Park, particularly for beginner and intermediate hikers and bikers. It has more miles of moderate trails than any other park in the Lake Tahoe area. We believe Burton Creek State Park will become a premier destination for hikers and bikers.

From: Tom Carter <tfcarter@cwo.com>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/25/2005 2:16:07 PM
Subject: burton creek

Hello -

I live in Cedar Flat near the proposed expansion. I am troubled daily by the access to the USFS on motorized vehicles.

40.0 I realise this is legal on designated roads and trails. However, there is much negligence and no enforcement. Wouldn't increasing the access exacerbate this problem?

Every hiking trail becomes a bike trail which eventually turns into a motorbike trail in this area.

When additional activities and increased use is introduced how is it going to be controlled? Is there a budget for enforcement?

40.1 What happened to the Goshawk closures? We don't get a bike trail for 15 years because of the sensitivity of the area and now we are faced with planned increased traffic?

I understand that we need to provide areas for visitors and families around the lake.

I also understand why those living nearby a proposed development would be questioning this additional development.

I hope you consider my questions concerning this project.

I will be monitoring the "progress".

Sincerely,

Tom Carter and Carol Mazerall

Response to Letter 40 submitted via email by Tom Carter and Carol Mazerall

40.0 The proposed development of Burton Creek State Park should greatly curtail illegal motorcycle activity in the park because ranger staff will have a round-the-clock presence similar to Sugar Pine Point State Park where no illegal motorized activities take place in the park. Part of the proposal for park development includes additional staff to properly manage the park's resources and enforce its regulations. The only roads open to motorized vehicles in the park would be the access road to the campground and any roads leading to the trailheads. Only non-motorized vehicles are allowed on trails and dirt roads in Burton Creek State Park. The only exception is official State Park vehicles.

40.1 The proposed development will comply with all current regulations for Goshawk protection.

From: "Benita Luke" <benitaluke@sbcglobal.net>
To: <kande@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 7/25/2005 1:55:16 PM
Subject: comments

Of course any people that live in the area of this purposed development are not excited about this. Bringing campers in to our backyards is a security, noise, and traffic issue as well as increased chance of fire.

41.0

I do not understand why we are talking about increasing our growing problem of traffic opposed to finding ways to mitigate it. This area is already being enjoyed by anyone that wants to hike or bike and parking has never been a problem. I'm all for keeping the forest preserved in it's natural state as much as possible opposed to making our beautifully unique area look more and more like the areas that the tourist are coming from. Why not first at least pay attention to the traffic problem and the cleaning up of all the dead trees in the forest to help with the fire situation. It sounds to me like we would be spending tax payers money that could be more appropriately used in other areas. There are already biking roads around the lake and river if people need that kind of format. Many people come here to bike and hike that do not wish to see signs, buildings, fences etc. Perhaps you will be increasing the number of one type of person coming here for enjoyment but decreasing the other.
This proposed campground is just too close to residential homes!
I am all for cleaning up the forest and addressing any erosion problems etc. and leaving everything else as it it.
Thank you,
Benita

Response to Letter 41 submitted via email by Benita Luke

41.0 Please see Response 2.17 and 4.14 regarding impacts from the proposed development and Responses 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 5.11, 5.13, 6.10, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues. Also, the proposed campground is approximately 1.5 miles from the Highlands residential area.

July 24, 2005

Ken Anderson, Sierra District
Post Office Box 266
Tahoma, CA 96142

Dear Ken:

You did a good job of introducing yourself at our July 7th meeting so let me try to do the same. As a former program manager both in and for the Government for over 20 years, I appreciate your challenges in writing a General Plan like this. As a trained biologist I understand your focus, and as an owner of properties on both the south and north shores of Lake Tahoe for more than 30 years I have seen its evolution first hand. I am a practical moderate, and I have serious problems with agenda-biased pseudo-scientists and petty bureaucrats on any side of an issue. I am tenacious, and not easily discouraged if I feel something is worth pursuing.

Thank you for the chance to submit comments on this Draft, and I sincerely hope they will be afforded serious consideration in the same constructive atmosphere as they are offered. At first glance some may seem to be minutiae, but decades of lessons learned have clearly proven proper structure and wording often make the difference between failed and successful plans. While many of the following comments are keyed to sections in the Executive Summary, they also apply to all related portions of the: Main Body, Attachments, Figures, etc. Copies of these comments have also been provided to other interested parties requesting them.

42.0

1. Comment: I strongly recommend inserting a clear and concise statement of the "official mission of the California State Parks" at the very beginning of all major components of this Draft document, including the Executive Summary. Inserting this absolutely critical element provides a cornerstone for all goals and arguments presented in this Draft, and ensures that they are consistent with the officially stated mission of California State Parks (CSP).

42.1

2. Comment: It is strongly recommended that objective historical synopses of all previous Drafts be included in the introductory sections of both the Main Body and Executive Summary. These synopses must openly discuss the pros and cons of controversial issues including: numerous campgrounds, a secondary access road to NTHS for public (fire) safety, etc. and CSP's rationale for not proceeding with prior Draft Plans. Including such background information up front can help de-fuse legitimate legal arguments by opponents that CSP is attempting any "end-run" now by laying the cards on the table.

42.2 3. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 1, Introduction, Line 13 – The current statement that, "The property is surrounded by undeveloped Forest Service land…" is misleading and incorrect. It gives the false impression this is in the midst of a wilderness, instead of adjacent to municipal and residential areas.

42.3 4. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 2, Purpose of the General Plan, First Bullet – This currently ambiguous statement about "providing the foundation for future facility development in the park." raises a big red flag for opponents because it is too open-ended. A more respected approach would be to spell out what CSP's specific intentions are regarding "future facility development."

42.4 5. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 2, Purpose of the General Plan, Second Bullet – This statement currently refers to some "immediate need," but does not offer any legitimate explanation for any such "need" or why CSP thinks it to be "immediate." Such words will damage the Plan's credibility.

42.5 6. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 2, Purpose of the General Plan, Fourth Bullet – Tying the CTC Dollar Point property in any way to the Burton Creek State Park may spell the failure of this Plan, because doing so is vehemently opposed by many interests with legal clout. Any "alternative flexibility" it may offer is negated by putting the entire project in jeopardy. Delete this bullet!

42.6 7. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 3, Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects, Paragraph Title – The current wording of this paragraph title is invalid, since none of the items mentioned are truly "unavoidable." Deleting the word "Unavoidable" from this paragraph title would be an excellent first step.

42.7 8. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 3, Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects, Line 6 – Honesty is the best policy. If analysis shows that proposed campground development "will" contribute to traffic congestion use that word, not "may" as currently worded. "May" contradicts inclusion as "unavoidable."

42.8 9. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 3, Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects, First Bullet, Last Sentence – Delete this sentence, because it detracts and adds little if any tangible value. "Intent" is a nebulous word in this case.

42.9 10. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 3, Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects, Third Bullet – The current statement is incorrect and misleading. The proposed access route(s) are not located in "an undeveloped area with no current traffic congestion." Delete this bullet.

42.10 11. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 4, Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects, Last Subparagraph – To be meaningful, replace all uses of the verb "may" with the verb "will" throughout this subparagraph. Also, delete the word "unavoidable" from the last sentence in this subparagraph since it clearly isn't.

42.11 12. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 4, Potential Environment Impacts and Mitigation, Third Subparagraph – Expand upon the statement made here to describe what process CSP used to arrive at this determination. Also, in its last sentence, replace the words "may be" with the word "is." It's definite.

42.12 13. Comment: Executive Summary, Pgs 4 & 5, Aesthetic Resources, Second Subparagraph – In the first sentence of this subparagraph, replace the word "can" with the word "will" to indicate a commitment. Also, in the last sentence of this subparagraph, replace the words "a campground" with the words "all facilities, roads, etc."

42.13 14. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 5, Biological Resources, Second Subparagraph -.Replace the current last sentence in this subparagraph with the following one, "Construction of new roads, trails, facilities, or structures in previously undisturbed areas will impact wildlife." This is a true statement.

42.14 15. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 5, Biological Resources, Fourth Subparagraph – The sentence beginning of the 8th line of this subparagraph currently says that "State and federal resource agencies will be consulted..." It should also discuss the matter of compliance with regulations of these, as well as other (e.g., local, county, bi-state) relevant agencies at Tahoe.

42.15 16. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 6, Biological Resources, Fourth Subparagraph – In the third line on this page, delete the words "whenever possible."

42.16 17. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 6, Cultural Resources, Third Subparagraph – The first sentence must clarify whom will "review" potential cultural resources. Is it CSP? Native Americans? Others? Be careful here.

42.17 18. Comment: Executive Summary, Pg 6, Water Quality Resources – The issues of wildfire prevention and protection from proposed source within the park are of major concern from the standpoints of both water quality and public safety. Unless CSP is pro-active in this area now and throughout the process, they are setting themselves up for extremely serious and lengthy litigation.

42.18 19. Comment: Existing and Proposed Classifications Map – Remove all mention of the CTC Dollar Property from this map and elsewhere in the Draft Plan for Burton Creek. Including this controversial issue is a very serious mistake.

42.19 20. Comment: Preferred Alternative Proposed and Alternative Access Roads Map – First, delete the word "Preferred" from the title of this map. It's clearly not preferred by local residents, and inflames powerful opponents. Secondly, remove all mention of the CTC Dollar Property from this map and elsewhere in the Draft Plan for Burton Creek. Including such a controversial issue is a

very serious mistake. Thirdly, re-word the listed "objectives" to be less "blue sky" and nebulous, and more measurable and consistent with the main Plan.

42.20

21. Comment: Management Planning Zones Map – I cannot overemphasize the importance of removing all mention of the CTC Dollar Property from this map and elsewhere in the Draft Plan for Burton Creek. Continuing to include this "alternative" could very well lead to the failure of yet another Draft plan.

42.21

22. Comment: Preferred Alternative Proposed Facilities Map – First, delete the word "Preferred" from the title of this map, since it's clearly not preferred by many local residents, and inflames powerful opponents. Second, remove all mention of the CTC Dollar Property from this map and elsewhere in the Draft Plan for Burton Creek. Including such a controversial issue is a very serious mistake. Third, re-word the "objectives" listed here to be less nebulous, more objectively measurable and consistent with the main Plan. Other people have expressed major concerns about the proposed facility locations, and I will let them address those to you directly.

42.22

23. Comment: Management Planning Zones Map – Having been there and done that myself, I very strongly recommend deleting all mention of the CTC Dollar Property again here and elsewhere in the Plan for Burton Creek State Park. This contentious "alternative" isn't worth the risk to your project as a whole.

I will stop here, because I expect you will have plenty of other inputs to review. Please contact me if you have any questions about these comments. Once again, thanks for the opportunity, and I wish you good luck from here on.

Yours truly,

Roger Huff

Response to Letter 42 submitted via email by Roger Huff

42.0 Thank you for the recommendation. We believe stating the mission of California State Parks in the Plan Section of the document is adequate.

42.1 See Response 6.20 regarding the planning process for the general plan. Also, a brief history is provided on page 13, first paragraph.

42.2 We concur. The first page of the Executive Summary, paragraph 3 will be changed as follows:

The property is partially surrounded by undeveloped U.S. Forest Service land with connecting roads and trails and serves as part of an unobstructed habitat corridor to within a few hundred yards of the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. The rest of the property is bordered by residential and commercial properties.

42.3 Future facility development is defined on the next page, page 7, fourth paragraph, and in other places throughout the document.

42.4 We concur. The first paragraph on page 7 will be changed as follows:

A plan will also describe and address the immediate need to develop day use and access facilities, and to implement a Road and Trail Plan for the park. These facilities are needed because the park is currently not readily accessible to the general public, and is not developed to accommodate the visiting public with basic amenities such as signs, directional panels, restrooms and refuse containers. The Road and Trail Plan is needed to address current resource and recreation issues related to road and trail use in the park. Several roads and trails in the park are experiencing erosion.

42.5 The CTC Dollar Property is a logical extension of BCSP and should be integrated with the current park. Due to similar resources and recreational activities the land can be more efficiently managed by one agency rather than two. Also, the CTC and the Department agree in concept on the transfer and do not view it as controversial.

42.6 There is currently no reference to unavoidable significant effects in the Executive Summary of the Preliminary Plan.

42.7 See Response 42.6 regarding the word unavoidable.

42.8 See Response 42.6 regarding the word unavoidable.

42.9 See Response 42.6 regarding this reference.

42.10 See Response 42.6 regarding this reference.

42.11 There is no such term, sentence or section in the Executive Summary of the current Preliminary Plan (June 15, 2005).

42.12 See Response 42.11 regarding Aesthetic Resources.

42.13 See Response 42.11 regarding Biological Resources.

42.14 See Response 42.11 regarding Biological Resources.

42.15 See Response 42.11 regarding Biological Resources.

42.16 See Response 42.11 regarding Cultural Resources

42.17 See Response 42.11 regarding Water Quality Resources

42.18 See Response 42.5 regarding Existing and Proposed Classification Maps

42.19 The preferred alternative refers to the preference of the Department. The Department is charged with managing the land for all the people of California and the preferred alternative represents what the Department believes is the best use of BCSP for potential visitors. Also, see Response 42.5. The Objectives section will be deleted on the maps in the final plan.

42.20 See Response 42.5 regarding maps.

42.21 See Responses 42.5, 42.19 and 42.20 regarding maps.

42.22 See Response 42.21 regarding maps.

Comments and review of Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report

Submitted by Richard Van Fossen
on
7-21-05

submitted to
Curtis Gray

at
TSRA
Tahoe State Rec. Area

Comments and review of Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Page 6 paragraph 1. In the executive summary it states that the Burton Creek State Park was acquired for the purpose of providing a large area of resource protection and outdoor recreation opportunities on the north side of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The
43.0 purpose of BCSP was not for overnight camping or year round overnight temporary lodging. The purpose of BCSP is not to build Park facilities or exceedingly large campgrounds. This proposal deviates from the purpose the BCSP was acquired. BCSP has and is continuing to provide the essential services it was acquired for in its current state. To develop BCSP into a 24hr year round camping facility and residences goes against the purpose that BCSP was acquired for. Overnight camping and construction of access roads is not resource protection. It is in fact the exact opposite. This proposal is just another opportunity to develop open space and make more money at the expense of natural resources.

Page 6 pp2. Paragraph 2 starts out saying that the park is nothing special - just typical
43.1 forest on the north shore of Lake Tahoe. There is nothing typical about this area, in fact it is very special. BCSP and the CTC Dollar property combined equal approximately 4.7 Square miles of land and according to my count there is approximately 34 square miles of land total on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe in California. This makes the BCSP equal to approximately 14% of the total land on the North shore of Lake Tahoe. This is undeveloped land ideal for low impact recreation and intense natural resource protection. Large areas of BCSP have had very high
43.2 mixed conifer die off due to drought, too many trees per acre, the removal of fire from the ecosystem, heavy logging in the past, and the outbreak of beetles and forest disease. This has been a failure of the State Park system because the number one purpose of the acquisition of the park was resource protection. There was significant damage to the park at the Burton creek road crossing at the upper end of Antone meadows where a culvert washed out and wasn't repaired for at least 15 years. Blame was placed on vehicles and roads in signs along the restoration area. Many of the old cabin sites with little remaining were in fact some of the first communities in the Lake Tahoe area and can be located on some of the very old maps of the region. These communities sprang up around range allotments and Timber harvesting. Some of the old barb wire fence can still be located.

Page 6 pp3. States that the property is surrounded by undeveloped U.S.Forest
43.3 service land. This is absolutely untrue and should be removed from the Executive Summary. BCSP is sandwiched between residential communities on the south (Lake forest), west (Tahoe City) and east (Dollar Hill and Old County Road Subdivisions) with undeveloped National Forest Land on the north side of BCSP.

Page 7pp2. States that the dollar parcel was acquired by the California Tahoe
43.4 Conservancy for the protection of the property's natural resources and make the land open to the public. The main reason the CTC purchases open space property is to prevent it from being developed. This means No Facilities and no paved roads.

Comment on BCSP General plan and draft environmental impact report. (cont.)

43.5 Page 7pp5. The plan states that to better accommodate local traffic and environmental conditions the proposed campground is for 1- 200 sites, instead of a much larger facility. My experience is that a campground with 100 sites or so is quite large and has significant environmental consequences and traffic issues.(see Fallen Leaf Campground and associated mass trampling and traffic issues). Would prefer a lower maximum in the proposal say 0-100 campsites - 500 to 1,000 persons a day would be added to this area exceeding the carrying capacity of the land and its natural resources.

43.6 Page 7pp6. Traffic along highway 28 should be allowed to reach a LOS of D or better before additional development and traffic is added. A large development (condominiums) has been approved for the Nahas property that is adjacent to the CTC Dollar parcel. This will add significant congestion and traffic problems to the Dollar Hill area of highway 28. The new condo development will also add a significant number of recreationists to the CTC Dollar property and BCSP.

43.7 Page 8pp1. I support designing the facilities, roads, and trails to accommodate travel by foot, bike and ski, but I feel the location of proposed campgrounds are too far from Tahoe City to have this happen. There are several other locations that would be close enough to Tahoe City. The new Campground and facilities could be built around current facilities at The State Recreation Area near Tahoe City. Another location would be north west of the SRA (39 degrees 11',25" North longitude by 120 degrees 08', 20") This area is close enough to Tahoe City for significant foot traffic. May have Lake views as well. No Lake views with current proposed locations for campgrounds. These new proposed campground locations would also better protect sensitive natural resource areas in other parts of the park and would centralize park operations requiring a much shorter access road with less mechanical disturbance and would not impact natural preserve areas.

43.8 Page 8pp6. Natural Resources: I don't understand how a new 2 lane road, 100-200 campsites plus additional year round cabins or yurts meets the criteria for this paragraph. I feel that the surveys of plant and animal populations are general and not detailed enough to show the species that are rare and listed for special protection. I feel that developing large paved roads (camp ground access) and an additional 1,000 people per day during the summer cannot " protect and ensure the perpetuation of native wildlife species populations at Burton Creek State Park." I also feel that with the proposed recreational facility development that the State Park cannot "Provide special protection for listed species, as well as for other exceptional natural resources."

43.9 Page 9pp7 " The activities proposed herein **generally** do not pose long term significant impacts on the environment." This is not supported by facts. There are current significant environmental impacts occurring under current use! The bears are learning we are a source of food and then they must be killed. The roads cause

barriers for reptiles and amphibians to cross. Disposal of waste poses the threat of leaks and spills. Heavy use of the area reduces the quality of experience e.g. instead of walking on a trail you are dodging mountain bikes and taking other routes to avoid other hikers on the trails. I currently do most of my walking in this area away from roads or trails in order to have any quality experience due to current over use in this area. My estimates of traffic on most trails in the BCSP & CTC Dollar Parcel is 8 hikers or mountain bikers an hour with higher use during summer peak times. I feel that more accurate public use figures need to be developed and counters need to be placed in high use areas to get more accurate numbers on current use!! The guided commercial mountain bike tours have disappeared for now, but will probably return.

43.10 Page10 pp2. Local residents created most of the existing trails. This is not exactly what has happened. Local residents created trails by repetitively walking or riding their mountain bikes over the same route. They did not use machinery, hand tools or imported dirt to make trails. The State Park has used machinery, hand tools and imported dirt to make trails. This poses some environmental risks to the existing natural resources. Local residents pose less risk of biological contamination and unwanted species introduction than visitors from throughout the U.S. and have less impact than machinery or hand tools.

43.11 Page 11pp3. This is not a very clear statement. I believe that the CTC has these purposes but not to develop facilities and paved two lane roads that the State Park proposes.

43.12 Page 12pp1. "The quiet of the park is contrasted by the bustle of people recreating." This is a description of the current situation in BCSP and hints that it is about at or over its carrying capacity for recreationists. Last year I filed a complaint with the orienteering event using the park because they placed one of their course markers next to my neighbors house in the stream bed. Participants ran through my yard down the street and all over my neighbors yard trying to locate the marker. The orienteering group must have run out of area to have there event in the BCSP and had to run a portion of it in and through the residential area.

43.13 Page 13pp2. Primary reason for the general plan is for the development of campgrounds. Not to determine the baseline or thresholds of recreational use or for the protection of natural resources. The CTC acquired the Dollar parcel to prevent development, protect natural resources and provide public access. The Dollar parcel was not acquired for construction of State facilities and development of recreation for profit!!

43.14 Page15. Continued inaccuracy and statement of fact that is untrue. The highlands subdivision is nearly 80% home owner occupied. Almost all second homes in the subdivision that are not occupied by their owner are rented by full time residents.

43.15 Page 16. Why isn't the Ward unit listed for General plan Development for campgrounds?? It appears to be a good site!!

43.16 Page 19 and 20. The statement that the Dollar Creek dam serves no purpose should be discussed with TRPA and Lahontan Water Quality. Counties in the Lake Tahoe Basin have had to make water runoff holding ponds to allow sediment to settle before running into Lake Tahoe. Dollar reservoir is an excellent settling pond for the so called erosion from trails and roads on the CTC Dollar parcel!! Beavers inhabit the pond as well as fish frogs and salamanders. There is also unusual (for this area) plant communities associated with the north side of the reservoir.

43.17 Page21pp1 The plant community has a number of spring annuals that have yet to be described. These plants are not yet identified yet in pp 4 it states that no rare or endangered species have yet been identified. I know of an anenome plant that is found only in the BCSP and 2-3 acres of National Forest Land near Old County Road. I'm sure that plant surveys are incomplete at best. Most focused on meadows with short time frames. Plants that appear early in the season are quite often missed due to poor access. Dodecatheon alba has been found in the Park but it is not recorded in any surveys that I've seen.

43.18 Page 22 pp1 Plan states that recent surveys for goshawk and spotted owl are complete. But what is absent in this statement is that they are found within the BCSP or the CTC Dollar Parcel and must be protected under State Law. I see no mention of how the Park is protecting these animals at this time, or how development of the park with campgrounds and increased recreation is going to protect or enhance their habitat.

43.19 Page 26pp1. BCSP has made "improvements" to the trails in the park. One problem I have with the improved condition of many of the trails is that the recreationist cannot obey trail etiquette and let others pass because the trail sides are lined with big logs or rocks that prevent you from pulling to the side of the trail to let others pass!! I believe this improved trail situation poses a liability due to potential accidents that will occur with increased use on these trails.

43.20 Page 27pp2. Current use figures are w.a.g. estimates and need to be known more accurately before statements about NO significant Environmental impacts can be stated. It is difficult to make sweeping statements about projects with so much unknown even at present time. My estimate on current use puts 42,350 people a year visit the BCSP & Dollar Parcel. Hikers walk approximately 2.5 miles per visit and mountain bikers ride approximately 8.5 miles per visit. There is very little horse back recreation in BCSP or CTC Dollar Parcel.

43.21 Page 28 pp1&2 Thresholds that indicate that the carrying capacity of the land has been exceeded and natural resources are being degraded not protected. The current 36 indicators had a majority that were not in compliance and were in a negative fashion. Although the TRPA is tending to change these indicators in a manner that might favor development. What price Tahoe??

43.22 Page 28pp5. Traffic and congestion - currently as bad as can be rated by Caltrans.

Additional developments that are already approved for the area are going to add more traffic to an already bad situation. I would recommend not allowing campground development until rating improves to the level Caltrans says its shooting for which is D or better.

43.23 Page 30 pp6. There is allot of demand for recreation opportunities in the Lake Tahoe area, but is it OK to make more campgrounds because of demand at the expense of natural resources. I've seen full campsites that were mere parking lots of asphalt. Does that mean there was a natural resource people were recreating in? No it just meant that there was demand for parking space. Did people in there RV's come outside? NO!! They sat inside and watched TV on their satellite dish. Have they added more land to California? There seems to be more demand!!

The U.S. Forest Service in the Basin has reduced available campsites to a small handful due to NEPA and Lahontan regulations and the need to protect natural resources.

43.24 Page 31pp2. Currently there are 500 campsites in 4 State Parks. 200 campsites would increase total campsites in Tahoe Basin State Parks by one third. Not bad for a small campground. In fact it would be the largest in the system!!

43.25 Page 33pp2. Placing the campground on the middle of the 2,000 acre park prevents most people from walking or biking into town. Placement of the campground closer to Tahoe City would make foot and or bike traffic more likely to occur. Current proposed campground locations will have most campers driving their RV's into town increasing congestion and decreasing air quality.

43.26 Page 39 Guidelines. Develop programs and policies as needed to protect and manage special status species consistent with natural resource management policies and priorities in the natural resource section of the DOM. What does this mean? where is the natural resource section? and who or what is the DOM??? Needs a great deal of clarification. Does the CTC Dollar parcel contain these special status species?? Should the entire CTC Dollar parcel be made into a natural preserve?? I believe it meets the criteria!!

43.27 Page 40 Vegetation Management. Preservation and perpetuation of representative examples of natural plant communities are statewide mandates for the department. Yet we will adjust threshold indicators to allow development of CTC Dollar parcel and BCSP. I don't feel the BCSP did a very good job of educating the public on past or current management activities in the park. What was with the 8 foot road relocation in Antone Meadows and why was that so critical?? Was there a need to disturb?? It will be many years before this area looks natural again !!!

43.28 Page 41 Include all species that are locally important (including endemic species), whether or not they appear on any endangerment list, as well as those protected by

state or federal law. It is important to recognize that this means environment and habitat associated with this animal as well a migratory access if necessary. The main problem is finding rare things!! Rare means it is hard to find and may not be found just because you looked once or allot, but just because you don't find it right away doesn't mean its not there!!

43.29 Page 44 Guidelines. Attempts should be made to reduce the net area of hardened surfaces (foundations, paving etc.) Making the Campground access road as short as possible will dramatically reduce hardened surface as well as reduce construction cost. Put employee housing and facilities in places where they won't have to drive for services.

43.30 Page 44 Water Quality. The plan says " New projects or new/increased visitor use within the park must be evaluated to insure that they do not contribute to degradation of surface and ground water quality, and I assume quantity as far as surface water is concerned. The new well in the highlands is of questionable supply. When the well was drilled it had to be doubled in order to give an adequate flow. The amount of water underground and available for this well will soon be tested when the new tank is built. In the spring when the pumps are turned on the surface water quickly diminishes until the pumps are turned off, then the flow slowly increases until the pump is turned on again. Installing a campground will require a water system and it will be likely that it to will take water away from the surface. The problem is that the geology of this area is mostly volcanic vesicular basalt. This kind of geology is known for its lack of underground water and dependence on surface water. We must not forget that the north shore was once used as a sewage processing plant by pumping raw sewage up from Tahoe City to the Cinder Cone west of Mt. Watson. If we disturb the underground water too much we might find out what happened to that sewage!! Also the Park will have to provide flush toilets at their 200 site campground this will cause increased load on the local sewage treatment plant on the Truckee River and will increase the chance of a leak or spill into the park or eventually Lake Tahoe. Highlands Creek has already been contaminated by sewage leak as well as a diesel spill from the high school.

43.31 Page 49 Carrying Capacity. PRC 5001.96 and 5019.5 provide basic direction that carrying capacities are considered as part of any park facility development. Carrying capacity is important but not defined in PRC. It is feared that the carrying capacity for BCSP and the CTC Dollar parcel may have already been exceeded and that additional visitors will increasingly degrade the recreation experience and environmental integrity of the park.

43.32 Page 50 Impacts on carrying capacity can be reduced or avoided by taking management actions and initiating proper mitigation measures. I don't believe this to be true but usually management believes it can work. If you have too many people using an area that is 14% of the land area on the north shore in California this will have a cumulative degrading effect on 100 % of the open space available. I find the phrase "regional coverage requirements and TRPA threshold standards will be

evaluated" discouraging. Why wouldn't they be followed? Or complied with?? Everyone else must obey them!!

43.33 Page 51. Roads and trails "Increase visitor safety and enjoyment when exploring the park." Several of the "new and Improved " trails have decreased visitor safety by lining the trails with large rocks and logs which make it extremely dangerous to pull off the trail to allow others to pass. The horse I met on my mountain bike did not appreciate it even though I bailed off the side. If the horse had tried to leave the trail it and the rider could have been injured on the large sharp rocks lining the trail. These trails need to be modified before making trail heads and parking areas.

43.34 Page 53. Evaluate the current capacities of the road and trail system to provide a quality visitor experience, while implementing facility upgrades to make current and future programs accessible to the general public. I haven't seen a park employee on the new trails since they have been completed. Complete appropriate studies to provide a greater understanding of planning issues for development projects in the park, including campgrounds and trails. They should take into account potential impacts of facilities and visitation increases on the resource base, the relationship of the new facilities to those already existing, access and traffic loads on feeder roads, as well as those within the park. Please take time to do this because if you overload this area with people you will cause many more problems that cannot be reversed.

43.35 Page 61 I recommend lowering the number of campsites to be between 1-50. Anything over 100 campsites will be an environmental and social disaster. How many campsites per restroom? How many restrooms in a 50 campsite campground?? How many water spigots and restrooms in a 100 campsite campground??

43.36 Planning Zone #3- The Dollar parcel. I feel that the intent of CTC acquisition of the Dollar Parcel was to protect it from development. The alternative road access and alternative campground locations placed within the Dollar parcel would go against the direction and purpose of the CTC acquisition. The Dollar parcel should be considered for Natural Preserve Zone status especially when it comes to proposed new development. The CTC acquires land to protect it from development , this includes two lane paved roads and campgrounds with restrooms and dumpsters every 50 feet. My impression of campgrounds has been a beautiful site for my tent close to my car with a beautiful view of a lake, but what happens is that someone thinks they reserved that site last Christmas and wants you to move. You search around and fortunately locate a Park Ranger. He tells the other camper that he has reserved a campsite but its the one next to your campsite. At approximately 2:10 AM people camped on the other side of you arrive from drinking at the casinos. They immediately start chopping firewood and turn on their radio -- loud. Camping can have such magical moments!! I feel that this is not what the CTC has in mind for the Dollar parcel.

Page 62 I would recommend the Dollar Parcel for classification as a natural preserve, considering it contains Goshawk, pine marten, olive sided flycatcher, willow flycatcher, and California spotted owl. These are animals that I have observed or heard

personally in the Dollar parcel. Other rare and animals that would be endangered by paved roads and increased vehicle traffic would be reptiles such as the rubber boa and terrestrial garter snake. These snakes need there habitats intact (not traversed by paved roads and numerous campground loops) in order to maintain viable breeding populations.

43.38 Page 64 pp3. Environmental Analysis. This is supposed to be a key statement about what is critically important and I believe it does not make sense without the word "prevent" put in between the words might and them in the sentence and changing the word "implementation" to implementing and the sentence makes sense!! I feel that the report should not contain incomplete sentence structure when trying to explain what is critically important in the EIR!! Is this govspeak??

43.39 Page 66pp2. I don't see a building or facility management plan!! What will that be under? Another plan or combined management plan from the four focused management plans?? "Some of the provisions of these focused management plans as well as development, maintenance, facility use, and recreational activities allowed by the General Plan have the potential to impact the environment. Prior to taking any action, CSP must evaluate whether that action constitutes a "project" under CEQA, whether it is categorically exempt (for example routine maintenance), whether it may have a significant impact on the environment and if so, whether a negative declaration or an EIR needs to be prepared." This appears to be an important point but I wasn't able to determine who is the "CSP" ? They are not listed in the ACRONYMS section! This must be clarified since CSP decides whether any of this is even a "project" and whether there will be "significant" environmental impacts. There may be the appearance of a conflict of interest if the State Parks determines whether there is need for EIR or not, or even if there activities are even projects in need of review.

43.40 Page 67pp3. " Potential significant environmental impacts are those commonly associated with facility development and visitor use." Isn't this what the General Plan proposes?? Campgrounds and roads are facilities that will increase visitor use in a major way. "Potential adverse impacts identified in this plan include disturbance to or loss of natural and cultural resources" The BCSP's mission is to protect and perpetuate natural and cultural resources. This plan proposes to go against the "Mission Statement" of the reason BCSP was acquired and determined that the implementation of this plan would have " Effects found insignificant"!! How can this be true? How many protected and sensitive species are known within BCSP and CTC Dollar parcel ?? How many Miles of Paved 2 lane road and Campground loops will be constructed for a campground of 50 sites? 100 sites? 200 sites? How many restrooms per campgrounds of different sizes? How many campfires adding smoke to the air every evening and morning when the diurnal winds are down hill and down canyon towards Lake Tahoe and surrounding subdivisions. Air quality in Tahoma has always suffered from the smoke from campfires in General Creek Campground. The smoke tends to slide down the hillsides from evening till mid morning and can be trapped by inversion in the atmosphere and accumulate at the lower elevations near Lake Tahoe? Air quality was one of the key thresholds that was mentioned but not

addressed except by vehicles and housing facilities!! I don't believe air quality can be mitigated except to severely limit overnight camping, cabins and yurts. Will Campground toilets be flush type? Will the toilets be connected by pipeline to PUD's sewer system?? What are the environmental consequences of pipeline rupture or pump failure? Do State Park Campgrounds pay into TOT funds?? The only water quality issue brought up under the plan is erosion. Use of water for campgrounds and facilities could deplete surface water and could endanger the creeks and sensitive habitat as underground water tables are depleted.

43.41

43.42

43.43

Page78 Water Quality Resources. Non-point sources of water quality that are not addressed are leaks and emissions from automobiles and heavy equipment. Many RV's have self contained toilets and waste holding tanks. These tanks can be accidentally emptied or damaged during parking operations. The tanks on RV's probably contain chemicals and some human waste that will have a cumulative effect on water quality over time because shit happens!! " Development and maintenance of the following facilities could create significant adverse impacts." "New campground with yurts and cabins- New developed trialheads- Entrance, visitor, and maintenance roads- Trails, including trail connections and associated support facilities (trailheads-parking areas and rest rooms) - Interpretive exhibits/facilities-- Rehabilitation of areas where the landscape has been disturbed --Administrative buildings. Leaking or broken sewer lines are point source but must be recognized and located. This has already happened on Polaris Road in the Highlands subdivision when a large sewer pipe broke under road fill and had run down Highlands Creek toward Lake Tahoe for several years before my kids found it and said something smells down there and you need to look at it. When I reported it to the TCPUD they took prompt action. The sewer line that broke was the one that serves North Tahoe High School so I'm sure the volume was large and not just residential. A few years later the high schools diesel tanks failed and dumped their contents over the road and into the same drainage towards the Lake.

43.44

Page 80 pp5. Mitigation measures -- " To avoid potential impacts to water quality, park visitors will be restricted from entering sensitive habitat areas, including wetlands, riparian areas, and stream beds, by use of fencing and signage" This amount of fencing and signage would spoil the anesthetics and the nature of these special places with fence and sign pollution!! Installation of the fences could alter or damage these sensitive areas. U.S. Forest Service used log fencing to protect the endangered Tahoe Cress on its beaches from visitors, but the log fence changed wind flow and shade and modified the microclimate in these areas nearly eliminating them from inside the log barriers. Now some very unesthetic steel post and wire fence protects the areas where they used to be and hopefully they will come back. This is an example of how mitigation measures may not have the effect that was predicted.

43.45

Page 81. Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects. Traffic. First of all traffic on highway 28 near Tahoe city is at the lowest traffic flow rating Caltrans has. Any worse and we would have gridlock and road rage. Yet we must develop and add more traffic to a highway whose carrying capacity of vehicles has been exceeded. OK we mitigate by eliminating an existing campground (already disturbed and over developed area)

43.46

and build a new campground farther away requiring new disturbance and new construction to an area that contains many protected and sensitive species and we will fix it by mitigating. Tahoe will suffer again at the hands of those willing to develop and make money from its beauty and rationalize that there is No Significant Environmental impact. Again in the plan there is no recognition of cumulative impacts. As you add more vehicles the probability of breakdown or collision increases and on a LOS F road this can have serious consequences. Parking is already overrun at rim trail trailheads in the Basin and the need for restroom facilities is emerging at these trailheads.

43.47 82 Growth- inducing impacts- If a sign was placed on or near one of the closed gates providing information on access park visitation would increase. Let alone have a road with a parking area near one of those closed gates. Complete development of all proposals will exceed the carrying capacity of BCSP and will have a cumulative

43.48 environmental impact that will threaten to eliminate at least ten sensitive or protected animals from the park by altering their habitat. These animals have been pushed into smaller and smaller areas as increased development gobbles up useless open space in the race to make more money from a rapidly expanding human population.

43.49 Page 83 Alternative 1 - No Project -- Can a no project alternative be passed as part of the 20 year general plan?? Can trailheads be developed without 200 campsites and who's knows how many dumpsters. Current "unmanaged, resource destructive recreation would continue to occur on the Dollar Parcel." I feel that full development of the preferred alternative will cause much more cumulative resource destruction just in the construction of the Dollar parcel than what is currently occurring by local residents riding their bikes and walking on existing trails. I think the author of this paragraph wants to vilify the locals for using the public land in a manner that has minimal impact and will occur regardless of what plan alternative is selected. Approximately 25 years ago the Tahoe World newspaper did a story about the recreational activity at the end of Old County Road. In the interview with those recreating near the area of the Dollar Parcel it was brought out that most of the recreation there at the time was related to uncontrolled motocross riding in the area and showed a motocross bike and rider in mid air. It is interesting how recreation has changed in a short time. After the story about the motocross riders there was no letter to the editor saying that this could have a negative effect on the natural environment. These past practices have left trails that are not acceptable today. Hopefully development of BCSP and CTC Dollar parcel will not fall into the same dilemma. If only we knew then what we know now could come back to haunt developers of BCSP.

43.50 Page 85 Alternative 2-- Minimum Recreation/Maximum Resource Protection and Management -- I support the development of this alternative except the removal of the cross country ski area. Agencies such as the U.S. Forest service have determined that over the snow vehicles cause little enviromntal disturbance. Winter recreation events and activities are tolerated by wildlife. The orienteering event has caused significant environmental degradation and litter. There are many orienteering markers made out of plywood that were never remove and left as litter and when the event ended there

was no attempt to remove or pick up any litter. This alternative allows the BCSP to acquire the CTC Dollar parcel and to mitigate current environmental problems on the Dollar parcel. Although the California State Parks system will not contribute to badly needed campsites in California and the Lake Tahoe Basin it appears that camping shortage just like traffic will increase and by developing campsites in this area would not significantly reduce the over demand for California or Tahoe resources. Alternative 2 will also keep protected species and their habitats intact and will serve the mission of the California Tahoe Conservancy to open land to the public but to protect its natural resources. Many would like to make a quick buck off of the development of this area but, in the long run preservation of this areas unique environmental qualities can reap rewards in the soul and spirit in perpetuity. I also agree that the General plan states that "facility construction and visitor use are those most likely to cause Significant Environmental Effects." The general plan would significantly increase visitor use and involves major facility construction. This goes against what the general plan says will happen and the finding of "Effects found not to be significant" in the environmental analysis.

43.51 Page 85 Cumulative Impacts. "The facility development proposed in the General Plan may result in impacts to cultural resources,sensitive species, wildlife habitat,water quality, and visual resources. This would have a significant environmental impact due to the cumulative effect this would have on all resources in BCSP.

43.52 Page 86 Growth has been slow due to environmental concerns and restrictions imposed by TRPA and Lahanton Regional Water quality Control Board. So this means that BCSP should go against the purpose of the growth and environmental restrictions as long as we can meet the letter of the law and mitigate various irreversible consequences of development. " To the extent that water Quality degradation and the loss of biological, cultural and visual resources is occurring in the region (especially in Nevada and Placer counties) any loss, disturbance, or degradation of these resources would contribute to cumulative impacts to these resources. I see no guarantee that any mitigation has or will restore lost sensitive species habitat or contaminated ground and surface water or restore air quality due to a hundred of campfires every morning and evening. Mitigation looks to me to be a bait and switch scheme. A way of rationalizing resource damage. What are the 36 TRPA environmental indicators that are not currently in compliance and decline and will mitigation bring them back into compliance?? Probably not!! So we will find new indicators and levels and lower the bar of environmental quality until we have mitigated it all and rationalized its commercialization justifying it by increased demand and mission statements.

43.53 Page 87 Air Quality. I think you missed it on this one!! One thing camping in campgrounds involves is a campfire!! Campfires in the evening help prevent bites from mosquitoes and allow for campfire cooking and light and warmth. Unfortunately the times when campfires are burned the atmosphereic stability is the greatest and the smoke is not mixed into the free air of the upper atmosphere but stays low to the ground and is transported downhill by diurnal winds. (see Pascals atmospheric stability chart) The mitigation of putting new burning units with secondary burners that

reduce particulate matter would have little effect on the campfire at every campsite. The smoke from campfires is transported down slope and down canyon towards Lake Tahoe and surrounding subdivisions where it can be trapped by an inversion layer in the atmosphere holding the smoke in the area until the inversion breaks around 11:00 AM. This campfire smoke has effected air quality in the Tahoma area and can be seen early in the morning when driving highway 89 through Tahoma. Other land management actions proposed in the General Plan will have a cumulative effect on air quality such as fuels reduction projects, broadcast burning, pile burning, and RV's going to and from campgrounds.

43.54 Page 88 Hazards-- " The project would not release hazardous substances,create a health hazard, expose people to any existing sources of health hazards, or increase a fire hazard." There are a few more hazards out there that you realize!! Currently there are thousands of dead trees. These dead trees are called snags. Snags are dead and do not have healthy roots or solid structure. Increased visitor use especially from other parts of the country will not recognize snags as a hazard. More forest workers are killed every year by snags than all other causes. I did not see an evaluation of how many snags per acre exist in the park but I'm sure its quite high in certain areas. The project will not increase the fire hazard but increased visitor use will increase the probability of ignition to a fire hazard. BCSP and the Dollar parcel are located on the north shore of Lake Tahoe, the mountains rise up towards Watson Peak. This gives slopes in BCSP a south aspect. In the Northern hemisphere south aspects receive the most direct sunlight and solar heating. A raise in temperature of 10 degrees Fahrenheit doubles the reaction intensity of forest fuels to fire. Predominant daytime wind flow in the area is from the southwest. This wind flow would assist fire in its preheating and rate of spread and intensity. The combination of topography, forest fuels, and wind are called the fire behavior triangle. The problem with BCSP and the Dollar parcel is that all of the parts of the fire behavior triangle are in alignment. This is a cumulative effect on fire behavior and resistance to containment and control (see Campbell Fire Prediction system). What about Hanta virus and bubonic plague?? Aren't these potential health hazards??

43.55 Utilities and Service systems. "The project recommends new facility development (including campground development, trailhead parking and restroom facilities) that will require additional utilities and service systems." The increase required will be provided by local utility services. Sierra Pacific will have to install underground power lines as is required by TRPA for new development. TCPUD will have to increase capacity to its sewer treatment plant as it currently is approaching maximum capacity. New water tanks will have to be installed above the campground because pumping water uphill against pressure is expensive.

Response to Letter 43 submitted in person by Richard Van Fossen

42.0 The term "outdoor recreation opportunities" includes overnight camping. BCSP is classified as a State Park. This classification allows for facilities such as campgrounds.

43.1 The term "nothing special" is not used in referenced paragraph. The term typical is used to characterize the west side conifer forest type found in the park.

43.2 The Department is proud of the progress it has made in the park actively removing dead and dying trees and completing forest health projects. More acres have been treated in BCSP than any other park in the Tahoe Basin.

43.3 Regarding surrounding properties, the paragraph has been changed. Please see Response 42.2.

43.4 The Preliminary Plan shows alternative facility locations on the CTC property. Assuming the preferred facility locations are utilized, the proposed alternate facility locations will be dropped in the final plan.

43.5 Please see responses 4.14 regarding issues about campground development and Responses 5.13, 7.13, and 9.11 regarding traffic issues.

43.6 Please see Response 17.0 regarding the Level of Service goals.

43.7 The proposed location for the campground is in a flat area, on high capability land, away from all water courses and meadows, the shortest distance to the highway, and actually would have a view of the lake on its southern edge. We believe it is the best proposed location for a campground in the park.

43.8 The road you refer to already exists but will be realigned, widened and paved to decrease erosion and accommodate vehicles. The campground would be built in a area of low diversity. No special interest species are known to exist there. Less than 10 percent of the 2000 acre park would be developed leaving more than adequate space for species protection and management. Additional site specific surveys would b conducted for special interest species prior to development as part of the required environmental document process. Any special interest species found will be protected in accordance with all existing laws and regulations.

43.9 We concur there are environmental impacts taking place in the park due to current use. Implementation of the proposed plan will bring additional funds and staffing to the park to help address these impacts. Development of the proposed Road and Trail Plan will lead to a general

decrease in the number of roads and trails in the park which will benefit species that are challenged in crossing them. The remaining roads and trails will be improved to decrease erosion and enhance the riding experience. Accurate use counts of roads and trails would take place as part of the Road and Trail Plan development.

Please see Response 4.14 regarding impacts of campground development.

43.10 The reference to local residents will be deleted. The trails were not properly designed, engineered or constructed to manage the current use. The trails were established with no consideration given to basic trail construction guidelines for topography, stability, erosion etc.

43.11 We concur. The text on page 11, paragraph 3 has been changed as follows:

The Dollar Parcel was acquired by the California Tahoe Conservancy in 1990. The purposes of the acquisition were to protect the property's natural and cultural resources, and make the land available to the public. ~~consistent with the park designation.~~ Also, see Response 43.4.

43.12 Comment noted. Recent orienteering events going off trail have been denied permits by the Department.

43.13 Paragraph 2 on page 13 supports your observation. Also, see Response 43.4 regarding permitted facilities on the CTC property.

43.14 See Response 37.1 regarding home ownership in the Highlands.

43.15 The Ward Unit is only 173 acres, a large percentage of which is designated as riparian or wetlands. The proposed development for BCSP will cover about 200 acres.

43.16 Settling ponds are often required by the agencies you mention for development projects. The Dollar Reservoir, located above the Highlands subdivision was not originally built for the purpose of capturing sediment from a development. We agree that the area provides habitat for aquatic and riparian species. The area would be afforded additional protection under the Preliminary Plan because it would be proposed for preserve status after it is transferred to the Department.

43.17 Additional site specific surveys would be conducted for special interest species prior to any proposed development as part of the required environmental document process. Any special interest species found will be protected in accordance with all existing laws and regulations. Any data or survey information the commenter has regarding resources in the

park should be forwarded to the Senior Ecologist for the Sierra District for validation.

43.18 In its present management of the park the Department is in compliance with current laws and regulations pertaining to special status species in its management in BCSP. We annually conduct surveys for the species according to established protocols. We do not allow permitted events to occur during nesting season if proposed near the nests. Also see Response 43.17

43.19 These comments will be forwarded to the Sierra District's Maintenance Chief.

43.20 Thank you for your observations regarding use. See Response 43.9 regarding accurate numbers. We appreciate the submission of any data to the Sierra District which we will try to validate.

43.21 Comment noted. The Department will comply with all TRPA regulations for any proposed development.

43.22 Please see Response 17.0 regarding the Level of Service Caltrans goals.

43.23 Comment noted. We will design and construct a campground that protects much of the natural resources. Please visit Sugar Pine Point Campground to see a campground that is well integrated into the forest setting.

43.24 Comment noted.

43.25 Please see Responses 5.13, 7.13, and 9.11 regarding traffic issues. The proposed campground location was chosen because it is high capability ground, level terrain, is far from meadows and riparian areas, and does not impact any local subdivisions.

43.26 Thank you for pointing out the document failed to define DOM. DOM refers to the Department Operations Manual which includes a Natural Resources Section. The manual is first mentioned on page 29, Planning influences but is not defined by the acronym DOM. The paragraph will be changed to read as follows in the final plan:

Planning for state parks often deals with issues that extend beyond park and regional boundaries. Often, federal, county, or other state agencies are responsible for providing oversight for various planning related policies and laws such as the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Clean Water Act, Section 404, and Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Additionally, numerous Department resource management policies found in the

Department's Operation Manual (DOM) help guide the planning processes.

You may review or obtain a copy of the DOM by contacting the Sierra District Office at Sugar Pine Point State Park.

Some special interest species such as the Northern Goshawk do exist on the CTC Dollar Property. Also, see Response 43.17. Portions of the CTC property around Dollar Creek may eventually be recommended for preserve status.

43.27 The Department does not have the authority to adjust threshold indicators. That authority belongs to TRPA. The 8 foot road mentioned by the commenter was moved because it was in the meadow destroying meadow habitat. It was moved onto less sensitive forest habitat.

43.28 We concur - The Preliminary Plan states your recommendation. See Bullet one under Animal Life Management on page 41 of the Preliminary General Plan.

43.29 We concur. When the proposed development is designed we will attempt to limit hardened surfaces and locate housing and facilities near the main road.

43.30 The Department will work with the Tahoe City Public Utility District in securing water and sewage disposal facilities for the proposed development (that could be 25-200 camp sites) that meet all current state and federal regulations.

43.31 When a specific development plan and proposal is made, the Department will conduct an analysis, utilizing existing Resource Inventory data and new survey data, to determine the impacts the proposed development will have on the natural and cultural resources. This will occur for any type of development project described in the Preliminary Plan.

43.32 We concur. The choice of the word "evaluated" is misleading. The second paragraph on page 50 of the Preliminary General Plan has been changed to read as follows:

Establishing land-based carrying capacities, quantified in terms of visitor attendance levels, will be addressed through inventorying and monitoring in subsequent management planning efforts. When site-specific proposals for land uses or facilities are to be prepared, various resource maps of the proposed project location will be checked for resource constraints and sensitivities during the project's preliminary planning phases. Site-specific investigations may also be necessary. Regional

coverage requirements and TRPA threshold standards will be evaluated. Any proposed development will comply with all TRPA regulations.

43.33 Please see Response 43.27 regarding trail construction techniques.

43.34 The Preliminary Plan addresses the potential impacts from the facility development on the resource base in the Plan Section and in the Draft EIR. Also, see Responses 43.9 and 43.31 regarding future development and studies needed.

43.35 The Preliminary Plan proposes to analyze a campground ranging in size from 25-200 sites. The Department will analyze the possibilities of constructing a small (25 site) traditional car campground, and incrementally investigate the impacts of building a larger and larger facility until the maximum 200 site facility is analyzed.

43.36 The alternate road and facilities shown on the maps for the CTC property will be removed in the Final Plan. A portion of the Dollar property surrounding Dollar Creek may be considered for preserve status when the Department acquires the property. Also see Response 43.4 regarding defined uses of the CTC property.

43.37 Please see Response 43.36 regarding preserve status for the CTC parcel.

43.38 Thank you for pointing out an unclear sentence. The third paragraph on page 64 of the Preliminary General Plan has been changed to read as follows:

The level of detail addressed in the Environmental Analysis section is comparable to the level of detail provided in the land use proposals of the Plan. What is critical, and what is set forth in the Plan, is the formulation and eventual adoption of a set of policies designed to minimize and mitigate impacts.~~them from further implementation projects~~.

43.39 A building and facility management plan is not required by any current regulation or law prior to construction of such facilities. When specific actions discussed in the Preliminary Plan are ready for implementation, the level of CEQA analysis will be determined.

Also, thank you for pointing out the lack of definition for the acronym CSP. It means California State Parks, also referred to as the California Department of Parks and Recreation throughout the document. In these responses we refer to it as the Department. The sentence where CSP first appears in the paragraph on page 66 will be changed to read as follows:

Prior to taking any further action, California State Parks (CSP) must evaluate whether that action constitutes a "project" under CEQA, whether it is categorically exempt (for example routine operational), whether it may have a significant impact on the environment and if so, whether a negative declaration or an EIR needs to be prepared.

43.40 The mission of the Department, paraphrased, is to protect resources and provide recreation. The Preliminary Plan strikes that balance. Also, see Response 43.17 regarding protected species and surveys, Response 4.14 regarding general impacts and campground development, and Response 43.31 regarding future development and the analysis process.

43.41 Please see Response 43.31 regarding future development and the analysis process.

43.42 State Parks does not pay into transient occupancy tax (TOT).

43.43 Please see Response 43.30 regarding water supplies for the proposed facility development.

43.44 Impact analysis of broken holding tanks on RVs is beyond the scope of a general plan. Such analysis would be more appropriate for the environmental documents and analysis that will be required before any specific facility development proposal is implemented.

43.45 Comment noted. When installing fencing to protect resources we will endeavor to use materials appropriate to the site that blend in with the surroundings. Also, please see the Park Wide Goals and Guidelines for Aesthetics in the Preliminary Plan.

43.46 Please see Responses 5.13, 7.13, 9.11, and 17.0 regarding traffic issues.

43.47 Growth inducing impacts generally refers to permanent changes in economic, population, or housing growth.

43.48 It would be helpful If the commenter has substantive evidence to the opinion provided regarding the carrying capacity and the elimination of species, to receive copies of the information for analysis and comment.

43.49 A No Project Alternative can be the identified preferred alternative in a general plan. A trailhead can be developed without a campground. Your comment is noted.

43.50 Comment noted.

43.51 Comment noted. Implementation of the Park Wide Goals and Guidelines along with specific mitigation measures for specific facility development projects will mitigate impacts below a significant level.

43.52 Comment noted. Also, we recommend the commenter contact TRPA regarding the threshold standards and revisions.

43.53 It is within the regulatory authority of the Department to prohibit campfires in a State Park should it be necessary to comply with current regulations and laws. Specific analysis of air quality impacts from campfires and other sources would be more appropriately conducted as part of the environmental analysis required before any specific facility development proposal is implemented.

43.54 The Department has a rigorous Tree Safety Inspection Program that is implemented in all developed visitor use facilities. See Response 4.14 regarding fire dangers and the proposed facility development. Specific analysis of Hanta virus and bubonic plague would be more appropriately conducted as part of the environmental analysis required before any specific facility development proposal is implemented.

43.55 Comment noted. Specific analysis of utility infrastructure would be more appropriately conducted as part of the environmental analysis required before any specific facility development proposal is implemented.

BURTON CREEK STATE PARK GENERAL PLAN MEETING
JULY 7, 2005 – NORTH TAHOE HIGH SCHOOL

PURPOSE
The purpose of the meeting was to accept public comment on the Burton Creek State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR. The plan was released for public comment on June 15, 2005. The public meeting was held three weeks later. Approximately 25 people attended the meeting.

Below is a summary of the comments. Similar comments were grouped together to facilitate the development of responses.

1 1. The business community of Tahoe City requested the department to explore the possibility of a parking lot across from Tahoe State Recreation Area to be used by business patrons, transit users and park users.

2 2. Proposed access at Tamarack Lodge may violate the preserve designation.

3 3. Remove the proposed alternative administrative site on the Dollar property as it would be against the Tahoe Conservancy goals of resource protection.

4 4. Are there other preserves proposed?

5 5. You should favor improvements to the environment over development.

6 6. What about accessing the park through the Fiberboard Freeway

7 7. Define "Overriding Considerations" in the document.

8 8. The document talks about keeping traffic at level d. What is it never gets to a level d in the first place? Will you still build a campground.

see # to right 9. Need to define DOM, fix bird and plant lists, discuss carrying capacity

10. Where will the water come from for the campground?

11. How will the trailhead on the east side of the property be integrated with the recreation center?

12. Is there a bypass road proposed in Tahoe City?

13. Check your language in the executive summary – contradicts the document in some places.

14. Winter access and winter camping what do you plan there?

15. Why can't the Dollar property stay in the hands of the Tahoe Conservancy?

16. Your stats on second homeowners is misleading – clarify that many permanent renters live in those homes.

17. Explain how a campground will improve traffic. It will actually make it worse.

18. You will have to deal with the conflict of casual winter users and the ski groom concession.

19. Road removal could effect cultural resources (of roads).

20. Consider lower flat for campground.

21. Address fire issues from fuels and people stand point

22. What about those alternative campground locations? Are you going to build there too? And what about the alternative road? Will you use it if the other road falls through?

23. What assurances to we have you won't throw the plan out some day and do what ever you want?

24. Why don't you pursue the water rights on Burton Creek from the golf course?

25. Make all the Dollar property a preserve.

26. Where and when will the commission meeting be.

Responses to Comments noted at the Public Meeting held July 7th, 2005 at the North Tahoe High School

1 See Response 3.12 regarding a parking lot across from TSRA

2 See Response 2.16 regarding the proposed preserve boundary adjustment.

3 The proposed alternative administrative site will be removed from the maps.

4 No other preserves are proposed for BCSP. However, when the CTC Parcel is transferred to the Department, it is likely a natural preserve sub-classification will be recommended for the Dollar Creek corridor.

5 The Preliminary Plan strikes a fair balance between improvements to the environment and development particularly in light of the fact less than 10 percent of the 2000 acres would be developed.

6 Accessing the park through the Fiberboard Freeway would require going through a neighborhood. The currently proposed access route does not disturb any neighborhood.

7 We concur the Statement of Overriding Considerations should be defined. The last paragraph on page 9 where the Statement of Overriding Considerations is mentioned has been changed to read as follows:

The EIR is being prepared to provide full public disclosure of the Department's proposed actions. The Department's purposes in moving forward with the BCSP General Plan are the protection of natural and cultural features balanced with the development of recreation facilities. The activities proposed herein generally do not pose long-term significant impacts on the environment. However, implementation of elements of the General Plan may cause an increase in traffic in an area already congested with tourist traffic. Therefore a Statement of Overriding Considerations ~~will need~~ is recommended to be adopted for this impact.

A Statement of Overriding Considerations is a written statement made by the decision-making body when it approves an environmentally damaging project. In making the decision to approve or deny a project, the decision makers must balance the benefits of the project against unavoidable environmental impacts. The Statement of Overriding Considerations is generally an explanation of this balancing. Specifically, it must explain why the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable significant environmental impacts. This Statement will be prepared as part of the Notice of Determination, for signature by the Director of the California Department of Parks and Recreation and approval by the Park and Recreation Commission as part of the adoption of this General Plan.

8 Please see Response 17.0 regarding the Level D and the Level of Service goals.

9 Please see Response 43.26 regarding DOM - the Department Operations Manual. Please see Response 43.31 regarding species lists, and Response 43.32 regarding Carrying Capacity.

10 Please see Response 43.30 regarding where the water will come from.

11 If the Recreation Center is constructed on or near the Firestone property the Department would work with pertinent agencies to build a trailhead facility adjacent to the center.

12 The Department is not aware of a detailed proposal for a bypass road around Tahoe City that is ready for implementation by any agency.

13 Thank you for the observation. We have reviewed the text in the Executive Summary with the Preliminary Plan for contradictions.

14 Most all facilities in the park would be closed during the winter with the exception of the existing cross country ski facilities. If a trailhead facility were constructed across from the TSRA campground, it may remain open during the winter.

15 Please see Response 42.5 regarding the CTC property.

16 Please see Response 37.1 regarding second homeowners.

17 The Preliminary Plan does not state that a campground will improve traffic. Also, see Responses 5.13, 7.13, and 9.11 regarding traffic issues.

18 We concur. Management of the Nordic facility already must deal with casual users getting on the groomed trails.

19 We concur. Some roads may be classified as cultural resources. In those cases specialists will be consulted to determine the best measures to take to protect the resource.

20 We concur. We will consider the lower flat for a campground.

21 Please see Response 4.14 regarding campground development and fire issues.

22 The alternative campground and road locations were put on the maps for planning analysis. At this time, they are expected to be removed from the plan maps in the final plan.

23 A general plan is adopted by the State Park and Recreation Commission. It becomes the overall guiding document for a park in terms of management direction and facility development. It provides long term assurances to the public of expected development over the next twenty to thirty years. If a decision is made to deviate from the plan, it would require a public process and development of a general plan amendment similar to the development of a general plan.

24 The Department challenged the water rights on Burton Creek in the 1990s. The outcome was a decision by the State Water Resources Control Board that the company that owns the golf course has a legitimate water right to extract water from Burton Creek.

25 A natural preserve classification is based on unique and sensitive natural resources. The majority of the Dollar property does not fit that definition. However, every water course in the Tahoe Basin may be considered a sensitive resource. Consequently, if the Department acquires the Dollar property from the CTC, it may recommend the Dollar Creek corridor be classified as a natural preserve by the State Park and Recreation Commission.

26 The Park and Recreation Commission is currently scheduled to meet in November of 2005 in the Lake Tahoe area to review and adopt the Preliminary Plan.

Ken Anderson, Sierra District
P.O. Box 266
Tahoma, CA 96142
Kande@parks.ca.gov

Dear Mr. Anderson,

P 1

P 2

I am opposed to the plans for a campground in Burton Creek State Park. I feel that the Park best serves the public of the State of California and all of the tourists enjoying the Lake Tahoe area by remaining in its current "unimproved" state. After considering the impact on year round recreation in the park, environmental concerns, fire danger, and state budget issues, I oppose all of the alternatives proposed in the Burton Creek General Plan and would suggest enlargement of existing campgrounds to serve any perceived shortfall in State Park sites. Thanks for your Attention,

Name	Signed	Address	Date
JASON BOYD	Jason Boyd	PO BOX 521 Tahoe City	7.21.05
Kim Melody	[illegible]	PO BOX 521 Tahoe City	7.21.05

Response to the Petition Anonymously Submitted during the Public Comment Period

P1 Please see Response 2.17 regarding the proposed development in the plan and associated impacts. Also, the "current unimproved state" of Burton Creek State Park makes it unavailable to most visitors to the area. The park is not signed so many visitors to the area do not know it is there. The Department does not have any developed access points so it is inaccessible to most people. As described in Response 2.17, leaving the park in it current condition will not improve the degraded conditions present on some of the roads and trails. Leaving the park as it is would not provide additional recreation opportunities for the public such as camping. It would not provide an affordable alternative to the current expensive overnight lodging. Also, see Response 4.14 for additional information regarding the proposed facility development and impact analysis.

P2 The Department could expand camping at other state parks in the Tahoe basin rather than develop BCSP. However, the proposed development of Burton Creek State Park in the Preliminary Plan will provide much more to the people of California then simply expanding the campgrounds in the other parks on the west side of the basin. The proposed development will provide camping on the north shore of Lake Tahoe where few camping opportunities are located. It will make accessible the largest area of intermediate hiking and biking trails in the state parks in the basin. It will make available to the people of California a 2,000 acre park currently unknown to most.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE GENERAL PLAN

This chapter contains recommended changes and modifications to the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR for Burton Creek State Park, made subsequent to its public release and the public review process. All changes are a result of responses to comments detailed in Chapter 3 and Department recommended editorial changes.

Page 6, Executive Summary, the 3rd paragraph will be revised to read:

The property is partially surrounded by undeveloped U.S. Forest Service land with connecting roads and trails and serves as part of an unobstructed habitat corridor to within a few hundred yards of the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. The rest of the property is bordered by residential and commercial properties.

Page 7, Executive Summary, the 1st paragraph will be revised to read:

foundation for possible future facility development in the park. A plan will also describe and address the immediate need to develop day use and access facilities, and to implement a Road and Trail Plan for the park. These facilities are needed because the park is currently not readily accessible to the general public, and is not developed to accommodate the visiting public with basic amenities such as signs, directional panels, restrooms and refuge containers. The Road and Trail Plan is needed to address current resource and recreation issues related to road and trail use in the park. Several roads and trails in the park are experiencing erosion.

Page 7, Executive Summary, 4th paragraph, a sentence will be added to the end of it to read:

The trailhead proposed across from the Tahoe State Recreation Area (TSRA) will require a boundary adjustment to Burton Creek State Park, as the property is currently part of the TSRA.

Page 7, Executive Summary, paragraph 5, 1st sentence, the word draft has been deleted.

Page 7, Executive Summary, paragraph 6, will be revised to read:

To better accommodate local traffic and environmental conditions the proposed campground is for ~~1~~25-200 sites, plus a 50 person group site, instead of a much larger facility.

Page 7, Executive Summary, last paragraph, will be revised to read:

Second, the proposed campground development will take into consideration traffic on Highway 28, by referencing the Caltrans traffic index of Levels of

Service (LOS) for Tahoe City. The index, that rates traffic flow on a scale of A-F, currently rates Tahoe City traffic ~~at~~ near the bottom of the scale as an ~~F~~ E, due to ~~extreme~~ traffic congestion at times. Caltrans, ~~through traffic and road planning efforts now underway, has a goal to improve the traffic index to Level D,~~ has determined that due to regulatory restrictions defined by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), they are unable to implement potential measures to improve the index and that it will eventually be downgraded to an F.~~representing only minor delays in traffic flow~~. The Department~~'s intent is to plan for campground facilities that will still allow Caltrans to meet this goal~~ is committed to work with Caltrans, TRPA and other agencies to implement reasonable and feasible mitigation for the proposed development in this plan to lessen impacts to traffic as much as possible.

Page 9, Executive Summary, last paragraph, will be revised to read:

The EIR is being prepared to provide full public disclosure of the Department's proposed actions. The Department's purposes in moving forward with the BCSP General Plan are the protection of natural and cultural features balanced with the development of recreation facilities. The activities proposed herein generally do not pose long-term significant impacts on the environment. However, implementation of elements of the General Plan may cause an increase in traffic in an area already congested with tourist traffic. Therefore a Statement of Overriding Considerations ~~will~~ is recommended ~~need~~ to be adopted for this impact. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is a written statement made by the decision-making body when it approves an environmentally damaging project. In making the decision to approve or deny a project, the decision makers must balance the benefits of the project against unavoidable environmental impacts. The Statement of Overriding Considerations is generally an explanation of this balancing. Specifically, it must explain why the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable significant environmental impacts. This Statement will be prepared as part of the Notice of Determination, for signature by the Director of the California Department of Parks and Recreation and approval by the Park and Recreation Commission as part of the adoption of this General Plan.

Page 10, Introduction, 2nd paragraph, 5th sentence, will be deleted:

~~Local residents created most of the existing trails~~.

Page 11, Purpose Acquired, 2nd paragraph, will be revised to read:

The Dollar Parcel was acquired by the California Tahoe Conservancy in 1990. The purposes of the acquisition were to protect the property's natural and cultural resources, and make the land available to the public. ~~consistent with the park designation.~~

Page 13, Purpose of General Plans, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence, will be revised to read:

Today, the primary reasons for the Department to complete a general plan for Burton Creek State Park are; to lay the foundation for possible future campground development, describe and address the immediate need to develop day use and access facilities; implement planned interpretive programming, and to implement a Road and Trail Plan for the park.

Page 24, Cultural Resources Overview, 2nd paragraph, will be revised to read:

This plan ~~is~~ was ~~currently being~~ presented to the appropriate Native American representatives for comment and consultation as required by the Department's Native American Consultation Policy and Senate Bill 18, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004. ~~The results of that consultation will be included in the Final General Plan.~~ The Washoe Tribe submitted a comment letter. The comment letter and Department response is included in the Comments and Responses Section of this document.

Page 28 - 29, Constraints on Facility Development, beginning with the 4th paragraph, will be revised to read:

Another impact on facility development in BCSP, is ~~the ongoing problem of~~ traffic congestion in Tahoe City and in the Lake Tahoe area in general. During most of July and August, holidays, and winter weekends, traffic backs up on Highways 28 and 89 leading into Tahoe City. Delays can range from minutes to an hour, with the back up sometimes measured in miles.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) ~~has an established system~~ utilizes a system ~~of~~ describing traffic quantities on two-lane highways. Called "Levels of Service for Two-Lane Highways", the system rates highway traffic ~~on an alphanumeric system~~ based on quantity of traffic and speed limit (see below). The levels of service volumes are taken during peak hours.

Traffic on Two-Lane Highways: Level of Service Definitions

LOS A – Free Flowing Conditions.

LOS B – Speeds at or near free-flow speed, but presence of other users begins to be noticeable.

LOS C – Speeds at or near free-flow speed, but freedom to maneuver is noticeably restricted.

LOS D – Conditions where speeds begin to decline slightly with increasing flow;

LOS E – Operating conditions at or near roadway capacity. Even minor Freedom to maneuver more restricted.
disruptions to the traffic stream can cause delay.

LOS F – Breakdown in vehicle flow. Queues form quickly behind point in the roadway where the arrival flow rate temporarily exceeds the departure rate.

Highway traffic around Tahoe City is currently ranked as an ~~F – heavily congested traffic~~ E by Caltrans - Operating conditions at or near roadway capacity. ~~Demand exceeds capacity and speeds vary greatly – considerable delays. The~~ Caltrans projects the future LOS for Highway 28 in the Tahoe City area to downgrade to an F. (Draft State Route 28 Transportation Concept Report). The report goes on to state:

"The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is the responsible agency within the Tahoe Basin for transportation issues, and takes the lead role in identifying transportation strategies and projects. As a result, in order to preserve the unique character of the Basin, typically, TRPA does not pursue additional roadway capacity. Since Caltrans is not the responsible agency for programming capacity increasing projects in the Basin, they cannot guarantee that the overall facility will operate at any level of service better than LOS F. Therefore, the future concept for SR 28 will remain LOS F".~~goal for highway traffic around Tahoe City is to achieve a ranking of D. This would allow for a speed of about 40 miles per hour (except right in town), with some traffic flow becoming unstable. Speeds are subject to sudden change and passing is difficult.~~

~~In order to meet this goal, Tahoe City traffic issues are currently being addressed through a new taskforce headed by Caltrans. Several alternatives to alleviate or lessen the traffic are being explored including construction of another bridge across the Truckee River, and bypasses around the town. Implementation is planned in the next five years.~~

Many of the recreation facilities proposed in this general plan are viewed by local residents as potential negative contributors to the existing traffic flow in Tahoe City. The Department's intent is to ~~plan for facilities that will allow for a Level of Service ranking D or better.~~ work closely with Caltrans and other state, federal and local agencies to implement reasonable and feasible measures to mitigate or reduce ~~significant~~ traffic impacts.

This may be achieved by implementing the improvements developed through the Caltrans Tahoe City traffic working group combined with other mitigations such as retiring of an existing campground in Lake Forest currently managed by the Department of Fish and Game, designing the facilities to encourage walking and biking, and working with other agencies to evaluate opportunities for a trolley service from the campground to nearby points of interest. Also, the size of the proposed campground has been reduced from 300 sites and two large group sites, to a campground of a range of ~~1~~ 25 - 200 sites, and one group site for 50 people.

~~In order to meet this goal, Tahoe City traffic issues are currently being addressed~~

~~through a new taskforce headed by Caltrans. Several alternatives to alleviate or lessen the traffic are being explored including construction of another bridge across the Truckee River, and bypasses around the town. Implementation is planned in the next five years.~~

~~Many of the recreation facilities proposed in this general plan are viewed as potential contributors to the existing traffic flow in Tahoe City. The Department's intent is to plan for facilities that will allow for a Level of Service ranking D or better.~~

Page 29, Planning Influences, 1st paragraph, last sentence, will be revised to read:

Additionally, numerous Department resource management policies found in the Department's Operation Manual (DOM) help guide the planning processes.

Page 32, Issue Analysis, 5th paragraph, will be revised to read:

Currently, the plan proposes, in the near term, development of day use facilities such as trails and trailhead facilities. In addition, the plan describes a long term vision that includes campground development (~~1~~ 25 - 200 campsites and one group camp for 50 people), alternative camping such as cabins and yurts, employee housing, and ~~maintenance~~ operational facilities.

Page 32, Issue Analysis, 6th and 7th paragraph, will be revised to read:

~~A primary caveat to campground development will be traffic flows along Highway 28. Development of a campground at Burton Creek State Park will be considered with engineering measures taken in Tahoe City to improve the current traffic level of Service, from a ranking of F to a level of D, as described in the Caltrans Level of Service traffic ranking system. This may be achieved by expanding existing roads, adding new roads, building a bypass around Tahoe City or developing a second bridge down river from Fanny Bridge. The Department's intent is to plan for facilities that will allow for a Level of Service D or better.~~

There are two traffic issues related to the proposed campground development in the Preliminary Plan. One is where the primary access road into the park is located and connects with Highway 28. The other issue is in regards to increased traffic from the proposed facilities and traffic flow.

The original focus of much opposition regarding the access road location was its location near Dollar Hill. The Department listened to the community and moved the proposed access road location from the Dollar Hill area to the currently proposed location at Tamarack Road. The Department will still need to work closely with Caltrans to incorporate properly designed ingress/egress engineered features on Highway 28 where the access road will connect. In order to develop

this access, the current natural preserve boundary will require adjustment. This will require a separate resolution for the Park and Recreation Commission to approve.

In regards to increased traffic and traffic flows California State Parks is committed to work with Caltrans, TRPA and other agencies to implement all feasible and reasonable mitigation measures to reduce the traffic impacts of the proposed development in the Preliminary Plan.

~~The final issue centers on the access route into the park for campground development. Two routes of access have been identified as feasible – a route entering the park near the Tamarack Lodge, and a route located at Dollar Hill. The Department has identified the route near the Tamarack Lodge as the preferred access route into the park~~

Page 46, Fire Management, last paragraph, will be revised to read:

Maintain a fire management program based on vegetation management priorities, scientific fire chronology data, historical information, monitoring data, and other park management goals.

Page 50, Carrying Capacity, 2nd paragraph, will be revised to read:
Establishing land-based carrying capacities, quantified in terms of visitor attendance levels, will be addressed through inventorying and monitoring in subsequent management planning efforts. When site-specific proposals for land uses or facilities are to be prepared, various resource maps of the proposed project location will be checked for resource constraints and sensitivities during the project's preliminary planning phases. Site-specific investigations may also be necessary. Regional coverage requirements and TRPA threshold standards will be evaluated. Any proposed development will comply with all TRPA regulations.

Page 51, Park Wide Goals and Guidelines for Circulation, two bullets will be added under the last Guidelines to read:

- Work with public transit agencies to develop bus stops at appropriate locations for park access.

- The concept of a trolley service will be explored with other local entities to shuttle people from the proposed campground and trailheads to central locations such as Tahoe City.

Page 54, Park- Wide Goals and Guidelines for Recreation, two bullets will be added to read:

- Explore offering youth recreation programs to promote connections between today's young people and the natural/cultural environments.
- Explore alternative camping facilities such as walk-in tent sites, yurts, and tent cabins to provide different camping experiences and as a potential source of new revenue generation.

Page 54, Park-Wide Goals and Guidelines for Interpretation, the entire section will be deleted and replaced to read as follows:

PARK-WIDE GOALS AND GUIDELINES FOR INTERPRETATION

Burton Creek State Park features natural, cultural and recreational resources. The park will contribute to the overall effort of land management agencies to provide access for linked recreation in the Tahoe Basin. The park contributes to the broader context of the interpretation of the physical, natural and cultural histories of the region. The park also plays a part in the effort of agencies to provide for continuing improvement of the Tahoe Basin's environmental health with particular focus on the lake's legendary water quality.

Future interpretive planning must look at how and where physical, natural, cultural and recreational stories are told within the basin. The part the park plays in interpreting these stories must be told within the broader context of other agencies, parks, sites and facilities within the basin. Integrating those locations and stories into the park's interpretive planning will provide visitors with a greater connectivity to interpretive and educational facilities and goals around the lake.

Park visitor use patterns and projections must be evaluated in order to plan interpretive facilities and programs that will best serve both management and visitor's needs.

Interpretive Themes

Interpretive themes facilitate a personal connection between the visitors' values and the park's resources to provoke enjoyable, positive, meaningful and supportive interactions.

The unifying theme for Burton Creek State Park is: We cause changes to, and are changed by, the natural environment within Burton Creek State park.

Goal

Visitors enjoy and understand the interpretation of Burton Creek State Park's natural resources within the context of the natural history of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Guidelines

- Integrate appropriate curriculum standards into interpretive planning
- Provide interpretive experiences specifically for youth
- Exhibits should have interactive, engaging components
- Integrate environmental education into interpretive planning
- Integrate forest management practices into interpretive planning
- Develop programs and facilities that facilitate visitor understanding of the value in restoring and improving the environmental health of the lake, streams and forests.
- Develop programs and facilities of special interest to park visitors that focus on specific natural resources within the park.

Primary Theme

The landscape of Burton Creek State Park is changed from the way it appeared in the past.

Supporting Themes

We've come a long way, many restoration efforts have been undertaken in Burton Creek State Park.

To restore the damaged environment we must look at both natural and cultural impacts.

The battle for environmental improvement is on-going at Lake Tahoe.

Resource protection and management practices have changed dramatically over the past century.

Goal

Visitors enjoy and understand the interpretation of Burton Creek State Park's cultural resources within the context of the cultural history of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Guidelines

- Integrate appropriate curriculum standards into interpretive planning
- Provide interpretive experiences specifically for youth
- Exhibits should have interactive, engaging components
- Develop programs and facilities that facilitate visitor understanding of the cultural history of Burton Creek State Park and the broader Tahoe Basin context within which the park exists

- Facilitate visitor understanding of the influences of settlement, logging, mining and fishing on the park
- Develop programs and facilities of special interest to park visitors that focus on specific cultural resources within the park.
- Develop appropriate interpretive period

Primary Theme

Human use changed the historic resource landscape.

Supporting Themes

Prehistoric people took only those resources they needed themselves to survive.

With settlement of the surrounding areas and the basin came destructive resource use.

Clear cutting and logging have changed the basin forever.

Early fishing practices nearly destroyed the fishery and changed the lake forever.

Goal

Visitors enjoy and understand the interpretation of Burton Creek State Park's recreational resources within the context of the recreational history of the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Guidelines

- Integrate appropriate curriculum standards into interpretive planning
- Provide interpretive experiences specifically for youth
- Exhibits should have interactive, engaging components
- Develop programs and facilities that facilitate visitor understanding of the recreational history of Burton Creek State Park and the broader Tahoe Basin context within which the park exists
- Facilitate visitor understanding of the influences of equestrian use, mountain biking, hiking, camping and day-use on the park
- Direction finding and sense of place information will be key to ensuring a positive visitor experience
- Regulatory information should be part of the interpretive message for target user groups such as equestrian users, mountain bikers, hikers and campers
- Recreational opportunity information will be needed for visitors
- Safety information will help ensure positive outcomes in the park
- Develop programs and facilities of special interest to park visitors that focus on specific recreational resources within the park.

Primary Theme

Recreation changes the modern resource landscape.

Supporting Themes
You can experience more enjoyable recreation in a well managed and restored environment.

We grow by the inch and die by the foot, trails are important for plants, animals and people.

Getting away from the madding crowds, or not, the keys to fun in parks.

Wilderness etiquette is important to everyone here and beyond.

Primary Theme

Recreational opportunities abound here with something for just about everyone.

Supporting Themes

Burton Creek offers something unique for you to see and do.

There are places to go and things to see beyond Burton Creek State Park.

Page 60, Planning Zone 1 Guidelines, delete 6th bullet:

- ~~**Separate vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian circulation to the extent possible.**~~

Page 61, Planning Zone 1 Guidelines, 1st bullet will be revised to read:

- **Consider development of a campground sized to accommodate approximately ~~1~~ 25 - 200 campsites and one group camp area for 50 people.**

Page 64, 3rd paragraph, will be revised to Read:

> The level of detail addressed in the Environmental Analysis section is comparable to the level of detail provided in the land use proposals of the Plan. What is critical, and what is set forth in the Plan, is the formulation and eventual adoption of a set of policies designed to minimize and mitigate impacts.~~them from further implementation projects~~.

Page 65, Environmental Analysis, Table 1.1, heading in right hand column will be revised to read:

Location in ~~ABDSP~~ BCSP

Page 66, second paragraph, last sentence, will be revised to read:

The sentence where CSP first appears in the paragraph on page 66 will be changed to read as follows:

Prior to taking any further action, California State Parks (CSP) must evaluate whether that action constitutes a "project" under CEQA, whether it is categorically exempt (for example routine operational), whether it may have a significant impact on the environment and if so, whether a negative declaration or an EIR needs to be prepared.

The General Plan/EIR will also be used as the basis for the State Park and Recreation Commission to make a decision regarding the proposed boundary adjustment to the Burton Creek Natural Preserve.

Page 67, Project Description, 4th paragraph, will be revised to read:

Future facility development would include all the development of an entrance road and campground ranging from ~~1~~ 25 – 200 campsites, and one group site for 50 people. A small number of yurts or rustic cabins may be constructed within the campground area for summer and/or winter use. Administrative buildings, including ~~maintenance~~ operational buildings and employee residences are planned for construction to support the facility.

Page 67, Project Description, 6th and 7th paragraphs, will be revised to read:

The Department has determined that potentially significant impacts ~~can~~ may be mitigated for all impacts except traffic. Adding traffic of any amount to the Tahoe City area may be considered significant and may not be mitigated.

Potential mitigation measures for all ~~other types of~~ potential ~~-~~impacts have been discussed. These mitigation measures reflect the specificity of the General Plan and are therefore in the form of guidelines ~~(with the exception of traffic as discussed above).~~ The most appropriate mitigation measures will be developed as specific projects are proposed, design plans are drawn up, and environmental analysis and documents developed.

Page 68, Preferred Alternative, Planning Zone 1, the 5th bullet will be revised to read:

- Plan for development of a campground in this planning zone. The actual size of the campground would be determined through analysis of use data and environmental analysis and constraints. Start the planning process by considering a facility to accommodate ~~1~~ 25 - 200 campsites, a small number of cabins and yurts, and one group camp area for 50 people . Campground development would take into consideration traffic on Highway 28, with the intent of ~~maintaining the Caltrans goal of Level of Service D~~ implementing feasible and reasonable measures to mitigate impacts of traffic flow and access on Highway 28.

Page 81, Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects, Traffic, will be revised to read

~~**Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects**~~

Traffic

Threshold

Caltrans uses the Concept Level of Service (LOS) as the CEQA level of significance threshold when evaluating the impacts of local development plans and projects. A significant impact is identified if a specific local development plan or project results in a level of service on the highway segment or intersection that is below the Concept LOS, and must be mitigated.

Impact
Potentially significant unless mitigated

Discussion
Traffic in the Tahoe City area is congested during daylight hours during the summer and winter weekends. Caltrans currently ranks traffic flow as an ~~F~~ E – ~~Considerable Delays~~ Operating Conditions at or near roadway capacity - on Highway 28, ~~the worst rating in its Level of Service traffic flow rating system.~~ In their Concept Transportation Report for Highway 28 (TCR, 2004) Caltrans has projected the LOS for Tahoe City will be downgraded in the future to a LOS of F - heavily congested traffic - in the future.

The report goes on to state:

"The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) is the responsible agency within the Tahoe Basin for transportation issues, and takes the lead role in identifying transportation strategies and projects. As a result, in order to preserve the unique character of the Basin, typically, TRPA does not pursue additional roadway capacity. Since Caltrans is not the responsible agency for programming capacity increasing projects in the Basin, we cannot guarantee that the overall

facility will operate at any level of service better than LOS F. Therefore, our concept for SR 28 will remain LOS F."

Proposed campground development and day use facilities in the General Plan may contribute to the traffic congestion. It is the intent of the Department to meet the goal of Caltrans to achieve and maintain a traffic flow Level of Service D, with only minor delays in traffic. However, this goal may not be attained.

Mitigation

California State Parks is committed to work with Caltrans, TRPA and state and federal agencies to implement all feasible and reasonable mitigation measures to reduce the traffic impacts of the proposed development in the Preliminary Plan.

Although some of the expected iIncreases in traffic from the campground development may be mitigated through various measures such as project design encouraging hike and bike trips to town, developing public transportation options, closing of the Forest Lake Campground (DFG operated), developing a trolley service from the campground to local points of interest, and limiting the size of the new campground., not all of the additional traffic may be mitigated to a level below significant. The proposed campground size will be analyzed to determine the size of campground that will maximize camping opportunity while addressing traffic impacts.

The impact That determination for the campground will be made when a traffic analysis is conducted as part of a facility development project specific CEQA document. Therefore, an increase in traffic of a yet undetermined amount, must be considered at this time an unavoidable significant environmental effect.

Responsibility:	The Department of Parks and Recreation Staff Planners
Monitoring/Reporting	Completion of Traffic Analysis as part of a project specific CEQA analysis.

Unavoidable Significant Environmental Effects

Evaluation of the specificity of this first tier review indicates that all the other potential effects from projects proposed in this General Plan can be reduced to a less than significant level with appropriate facility location, the implementation of resource management programs, and the development of other specific mitigation measures.

Until the uses, locations, and scope of facilities or management plans are specified, the actual level of impact, whether individual or cumulative, cannot be determined. However, all future plans and projects are required to be in

compliance with local, state, and federal permitting and regulatory requirements and subject to subsequent tier CEQA review and project specific mitigation.

Page 93, References, the following reference will be added:

California Department of Transportation, Transportation Concept Report, Highway 28, 2004.

Page 94, Acronyms, will be revised to read:

Page 95 - Maps
The maps will be revised to delete extraneous information and the proposed facilities on the Dollar property (except one trailhead)

ACRONYMS

BCSP – Burton Creek State Park

DPR – Department of Parks and Recreation

CNPS – California Native Plant Society

CTC – California Tahoe Conservancy

DFG – Department of Fish and Game

TRPA – Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

USFS – United States Forest Service

USFWS – United States Fish and Wildlife Service

DOM - Department Operation Manual

CSP - California State Parks

Page 107, System-Wide Planning Influences, the following will be added:

California State Parks Trails Policy