

Questions/Comments		Response
1	Has a decision been made if e bikes will be allowed?	The use of e-bikes trails in Tahoe is determined by the land manager where the path is located. For example, California State Parks does not allow e-bikes to be used on trails within their lands. Therefore, any decision on e-bikes will need to be informed by the final location, layout, and design of the trail. The decision will also need to be informed by what agency or organization owns or is responsible for the trail.
2	Will there be a MOU with Caltrans?	An MOU with Caltrans may be necessary, but this will depend on the final alignment and what agency or organization owns or is responsible for the trail.
3	How do we not have it NOT go thru the neighborhood in Tahoe hills? And Rubicon palisades? Obviously those who live there don't want a crowded bike path it inside our neighborhood roads.	No decision has been made on a preferred alignment. The Feasibility Study is intended to evaluate the options identified during the Corridor Management Plan and select a preferred alignment. The desire to not have the trail within these two neighborhoods is noted.
4	Who will maintain the trail over time?	This has not yet been determined.
5	When you refer to using local county roads (such as thru Rubicon) what does that actually look like (i.e. a new bike path on the side of the road? Or riding on the road as would be done by bikers currently?)	Depending on the preferred alignment selected, the trail could be located on the roadway or in a completely separated facility.
6	Any issues with fire department in Meeks Bay Option A?	Unknown at this time. This will be considered during the evaluation process.
7	Are objective criteria weighted more heavily than subjective criteria? How so?	The objective criteria (i.e., evaluation criteria) are equally weighted. The objective analysis uses data based scoring and ranking using the evaluation criteria to compare alignment options. The results of the objective analysis become one consideration for stakeholders, interested parties, and the Steering Committee to consider when identifying a preferred alignment.
8	Can the Rubicon and Cascade segments that are west of Hwy 89 meet accessibility requirements? How? At what cost?	Specifics related to meeting ADA requirements, such as maximum grade or steepness and required breaks or rest areas, of any particular segment are unknown at this time. Slope (steepness) of the existing ground and other physical impediments are considered within the evaluation criteria.
9	Are e-bikes allowed on the trail?	The use of e-bikes trails in Tahoe is determined by the land manager where the path is located. For example, California State Parks does not allow e-bikes to be used on trails within their lands. Therefore, any decision on e-bikes will need to be informed by the final location, layout, and design of the trail. The decision will also need to be informed by what agency or organization owns or is responsible for the trail.
10	How accurate are the maps? Some places seem to show the map going physically through cabins or weaving between cabins. Some cabins are not shown on the map.	The map of potential alignments is conceptual. The lines are not intended to reflect an exact location. The intent is to determine the general location. There may be places where the map shows the trail crossing over an existing residential structure. There is no intent to impact any residential structure with the trail.
11	Once the plan is approved, how will the sections be prioritized around the timing / order of completion?	Initial prioritizing of implementation will occur in the later phases of this Feasibility Study. The factors that will drive prioritization have not yet been identified.
12	Most of us own second homes. My concern is for property safety in our absence. Will you have additional police coverage? Trash REMOVAL due to bear population?	Law enforcement within neighborhoods or along the trail is outside of the scope of this feasibility study. The protection of private property and structures is noted as a point of importance. A maintenance agreement for the trail will be in place prior to trail implementation. The agreement will address trash removal.
13	Please share how many people are signed in to this webinar.	The October 25, 2021 public workshop #1 had 157 attendees.
14	Can you directly address the Lower Emerald Bay Tract? The cabins are not shown on the map and two proposed trails run directly through the tract (maybe even shown through cabins). The map does not show the LEBT HOA group in pink either so seems to have been missed.	The map background is the current available basemap from the BLM. A request will be made of the USFS to determine if they have additional basemap information.
15	Will the quantitative evaluation be publicly viewed with all grades and scores available for public review and comment?	Yes. The results of the evaluation process work will be shared with the public.
16	Dave Rios -- When you refer to using local county roads (such as thru Rubicon) what does that actually look like (i.e. a new bike path on the side of the road? Or riding on the road as would be done by bikers currently?)	Please see response above. Depending on the preferred alignment selected, the trail could be located be on the roadway or in a completely separated facility.
17	Do you feel that you received a great deal of input tonight on this webinar? Do you think this format is conducive to give and take for you to gather information? Will you be hosting smaller meetings later?	The October 25, 2021 workshop had a 157 participants who submitted 77 questions and comments. A post workshop Survey is currently collecting additional input. There will be additional opportunities for engagement and to gather additional input from the public. All participants from the Workshop and those who have signed up for the contact list will be notified.
18	I think we need more discussion rather than just getting responses to a few questions. How do we organize that?	For specific concerns or requests please contact Melanie Sloan TRPA Project Manager at msloan@trpa.gov. Full contact information is available in the Workshop presentation at <a href="http://www.westshoretahoetrail.com">www.westshoretahoetrail.com</a> .
19	Are you going to evaluate the speed limits on HWY 89? Lower them?	Speed limit evaluation or changes are outside the scope of this Feasibility Study. The SR 89 Corridor Management Plan identified implementing recreation zone speed limits during peak season to be implemented as a priority action item of the plan. Overall requests for adjustment of speed limits on the State Highway System should be directed to Caltrans.

20	<p>The parking challenge at Meeks Bay is brutal around HWY 89. How would Option A address the conflict between parked cars/boat trailers and biking/walking. Lots of cross traffic from people bringing beach toys etc. from their cars across HWY 89 to Meeks Bay.</p> <p>Option B, although more costly, would alleviate much of the conflict with parking and foot traffic. Also be safer.</p>	Comment noted. The evaluation criteria and process will consider parking, safety, and roadway crossings.
21	<p>The views above Bliss are just stunning, but the room is minimal. Barely enough room for two cars. How would you build out a safe path right next to this narrow road?</p>	Criteria, such as constructability, including roadway width and the need for structures or bridges, and other criteria, are what will be used to complete the alignment evaluation in the next phase of the Feasibility Study.
22	<p>Last question. Is there existing funding for this Trail work or is that to be determined in the future. The trail to Meeks Bay is fantastic and well done. Kudos to all who made that happen.</p>	Funding to construct the trail is to be determined. There are likely to be multiple local, state, and federal sources similar to the Sugar Pine Point to Meeks Bay trail. The existing trail is an example reference project that is being considered in the delivery of this Feasibility Study.
23	<p>Intersect with cultural scoring lower. What about from an educational experience with a cultural resources?</p>	The user experience evaluation criteria includes interpretive opportunities, which can include educational and cultural opportunities.
24	<p>Does a trail of this length require access to restroom or water facilities?</p>	There are no requirements for providing restroom or water facilities. However, the Feasibility Study will identify amenities to complete the trail, and these recommendations will include restrooms and other facilities.
25	<p>Are their inherent weighting issues regarding comparing evaluation criteria?</p>	The objective criteria (i.e., evaluation criteria) are equally weighted.
26	<p>When you show an option along the Highway 89 corridor is there a minimum distance from the edge of 89, the asphalt, that you can achieve? My concern is that the trail north of what we are discussing sometimes is quite close to the highway and it would seem not so save for younger and older trail walkers, riders, strollers.</p>	The specific location of the trail is unknown at this time. There is not a minimum or maximum distance from the highway that is guiding the identification of a preferred alignment at this time. If the preferred alignment is along the Caltrans right of way, there will be design standards that must be met (e.g., separation of pathway to roadway, lateral clearances, intersections and crossings, etc.)
27	<p>Can you tell us now, which potential highway crossing will be at road grade and which will not be (for example, over or under the highway)?</p>	This is not known at this time. The location and types of roadway crossings are better understood once the alignment evaluation is completed. This will be evaluated during the next phase of the Feasibility Study.
28	<p>By your maps we cannot tell which side of 89 you are considering above the Rubicon Drive loop? Are both sides of 89 still being considered?</p>	To be determined. Both sides of Hwy 89 are potential locations. The evaluation of alignment alternatives and input from stakeholders and the Steering Committee will ultimately provide guidance on which side of the Hwy the trail will reside in this specific area.
29	<p>Who are the "stakeholders?"</p>	Stakeholders include interested parties, landowners, residents, trail users, agencies, organizations, and others. Stakeholders includes a broad suite of individuals and groups who are interested in participating in the planning and implementation the SR 89 Corridor Management Plan.
30	<p>Is design for foot &amp; bike use, or include use by motorized vehicles?</p>	The trail is for those walking and bicycling. The use of e-bikes on trails in Tahoe is determined by the land manager where the path is located. For example, California State Parks does not allow e-bikes to be used on trails within their lands. Therefore, any decision on e-bikes will need to be informed by the final location, layout, and design of the trail. The decision will also need to be informed by what agency or organization owns or is responsible for the trail.
31	<p>if Option A is chosen along 89 adjacent to Meeks Bay Resort, will parking still be allowed? There's enough room for both, but could be a public safety hazard.</p>	To be determined. This will need to be considered based on the preferred alignment. For example, if the preferred trail alignment is within Caltrans' right of way, they will be involved with determining if parking is compatible with a new trail.
32	<p>How would you like to identify ourselves if we would like to make a comment?</p>	Comments were posted through the Q&A tab.
33	<p>Is there a strict time limit for comments?</p>	Participants were able to submit comments at anytime during the Workshop.
34	<p>Can you see the speakers as they speak?</p>	Speakers video feed is shown when they speak.
35	<p>How many people are on this call?</p>	The October 25, 2021 public workshop #1 had 157 attendees.
36	<p>How will you determine the relative importance or weight of each of the evaluation criteria? I see most of the analysis slanted toward engineering, constructability, and cost criteria. What about the "private landowner experience" in addition to the "user experience"?</p> <p>Private landowners have concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-litter</li> <li>-trespassing</li> <li>-noise off-street parking</li> <li>-public safety</li> <li>-property values</li> <li>-sanitation</li> </ul>	The objective criteria (i.e., evaluation criteria) are equally weighted. The objective analysis uses data based criteria to compare alignment options. The results of the objective analysis become one consideration for stakeholders, interested parties, and the Steering Committee to consider when identifying a preferred alignment. The Access & Operations evaluation criteria does include consideration for land ownership. Based on input during the Corridor Management Plan alignments have been focused on public land. The concern of property owners is noted and will be further discussed.

37	In Rubicon, there is quite a bit of debate over whether the trail should go on the mountainside shoulder of SR89 or the Lakeside shoulder. This is a KEY decision that needs to be made clear, transparent, and legally defensible. Please explain the process to arrive at the least impactful alignment.	Both sides of Hwy 89 are potential locations. The objective analysis will use data based evaluation criteria to compare alignment options. The final evaluation criteria will be informed by input from workshop participants, survey responses, and Steering Committee members. The final evaluation criteria will be applied to any segment area with multiple alignment options.  The results of the objective analysis becomes one consideration for stakeholders, interested parties, and the Steering Committee to consider when identifying a preferred alignment. The results of this objective analysis will be shared with all interested parties in spring 2022
38	Just so you are aware, I am a Rubicon homeowner NOT along the highway for 33 years and also on the Board of the League to Save Lake Tahoe and the Program Chair	Comment noted.
39	"Access and Operations" doesn't mean much to most participants. Why not use "Private Landowner Experience" as the 5th criteria in contrast to the "User Experience". That's really the tradeoff the matters.	The Access & Operations evaluation criteria does include consideration for land ownership. The Feasibility Study places an emphasis to aligning the trail on public land. The concern of property owners is noted and will be further discussed.
40	When Jeremy said that weighting of the five criteria is not planned at this time, treating each of five categories equally is a form of weighting	Comment noted.
41	The map of the Emerald Bay segment omits the Lower Emerald Bay HOA. The Option 1 alignment does not seem to follow an existing trail. As the President of the Lower Emerald Bay HOA, I would request the most detailed drawing that you have of the "Option 1" alignment on the North side of Emerald Bay.	The map background is the current available basemap from the BLM. A request will be made of the USFS to determine if they have additional basemap information.
42	Who will be responsible for the maintenance and long term upkeep of the trails? Where will the funding come from?	To be determined. A maintenance plan or agreement for the trail will be developed as apart of trail implementation. This topic will be an item of discussion for the Steering Committee and any potential owners of the trail.
43	Please provide the study that shows a demand for these trail segments. I feel the slope and distance from visitor infrastructure will not make this popularity casual recreationists and not meet the objective to get bikes off the road.	The Corridor Management Plan identified the need for this trail feasibility study. The CMP can be accessed at <a href="https://www.trpa.gov/rtp/sr-89-recreation-corridor-management-plan/">https://www.trpa.gov/rtp/sr-89-recreation-corridor-management-plan/</a>
44	We are very concerned about trail being located above upper Emerald Bay FS tract. There is no existing trail as map indicates. This was pointed out to TRPA at July meeting with FS tract and TRPA representatives. I offered to hike the area with them to show that there is no existing trail. That route is on extremely steep terrain and cuts through at least 6 springs and avalanche shoots! As a Geologist, soils in this area are very unstable! What is your PLAN B Route.	There are currently no alignment options proposed above the Upper Emerald Bay Cabins.
45	Are we talking about a multiuser trail for bikes and walkers as exists farther north?	Yes, the trail is for those walking and bicycling.
46	My recommendation is to stay away from existing homes, Minimize highway crossings and a recipe for problems is to use Caltrans ROW--way to close to the highway traffic!!	Comment noted.
47	Is this a walking trail only or bike too?	The trail is for those walking and bicycling.
48	We live in the Rubicon Bay area and have tried for four years to get internet service for primarily safety reasons, without success. What about access to emergency communication messages since so many are by internet only?	Emergency access and response is a consideration in the Access & Operations evaluation criteria. Broadband infrastructure or upgrades to existing broadband are outside the scope of this Feasibility Study.
49	Would the money for this expensive segment of trail be better used to work on correcting parking and transit issues in Emerald Bay?	The Trail Feasibility Study is one of many priority projects identified in the SR 89 Corridor Management Plan ( <a href="https://www.trpa.gov/rtp/sr-89-recreation-corridor-management-plan/">https://www.trpa.gov/rtp/sr-89-recreation-corridor-management-plan/</a> ). The study is the first priority being advanced, and that is made possible with grant funding from partner, the USFS. Along with leading the trail feasibility study, TRPA is Working with partners to identify and activate other priorities from the CMP, like transit and parking. The Feasibility Study is not intended to compare investment in a trail to other priority projects from the corridor management plan. Cost is important and is an evaluation criteria.
50	Will existing secondary neighborhood streets be used through stripping the bike path?	Depending on the preferred alignment selected, the trail could located on the roadway, with striping, or in a completely separated facility.

51	Good evening, looking at the options near cascade creek seems option 1 is to run the trail along the cascade homeowners association and then follow the switchback turns along highway 89. Option 2 looks like it runs along private property at cascade road then crosses just north of cascade creek, is that correct? Just curious how safe looping this path over the highway and up and over a significant grade with families new to biking would be? For example a mom hauling a bike trailer with a toddler, seems this would be very dangerous. If this trail goes along the HOA at cascade will there be a natural barrier provided to the homeowners? Where along this trail would the "amenities" be located and would that include restrooms and if so what would the restroom location be? Maybe a park and ride bike shuttle would be a better option to safely move people from Spring creek to the other side of emerald bay. thank you	The existing map of potential alignments is conceptual. The accuracy of the lines are not intended to reflect an exact location of the trail. The intent is to determine the general desired location. The two options currently represent for the Cascade Segment include a west or upslope option (west of Hwy 89) and an east or downslope option.
52	Are the slides going to be made available soon?	The presentation material is available on the Feasibility Study website at <a href="http://www.westshoretahoetrail.com">www.westshoretahoetrail.com</a>
53	Can we assume that the trail standard, in terms of width of trail, trail gradient, will be similar to that of the recently completed segment from Sugar Pine Point State Park to Meeks Bay?	The goal is to identify an alignment that includes as much Class 1 trail as feasible. Class 1 trail is typically a minimum of 8-feet wide, and sometimes 10-feet wide. Many factors, including slope, land ownership, right-of-way, etc. will influence the final recommendation. Some portions of the Sugar Pine Point to Meeks Bay trail that are Class 1 facilities.
54	No one has spoken to me, 9011 Rubicon Drive. We are so close to 89 that the bike path would obliterate the small amount of "backyard" we have. We are strongly opposed to a lakeside alignment through Rubicon.	Comment noted.
55	What is an "existing disturbed area?"	An existing disturbed area is any area that has been developed, paved, graded, or disturbed by an existing activity or use (e.g., highway shoulder).
56	How many feet does the Caltrans right of way include? Would you try to use eminent domain proceedings?	The Caltrans right of way varies throughout the corridor. The Trail Feasibility Study is not considering eminent domain as part of its proceedings.
57	You are really scaring me with the "scenic opportunity" talk. Bike riders "scenic opportunity" should not trump homeowner's rights. I literally won't be able to sit on the side deck and enjoy my scenic opportunity because of the noise from the bike riders and the fact that they would be looking directly at me. They have plenty of scenic views through Meeks Bay and Emerald Bay.	Comment noted.
58	For reasons I cannot understand, the Rubicon Home Owner's Association is refusing to protect our rights and is apparently not willing to get involved How do we make sure that the affected homeowners in Rubicon will be heard, and when and how is the best way to assert any objections?	Your participation in the Workshop is the first of several opportunities to participate in the Feasibility Study Process. Comments provided during and after the Workshop will be documented and considered. For specific concerns or requests please contact Melanie Sloan TRPA Project Manager at <a href="mailto:msloan@trpa.gov">msloan@trpa.gov</a> . Full contact information is available in the Workshop presentation at <a href="http://www.westshoretahoetrail.com">www.westshoretahoetrail.com</a>
59	I didn't hear you evaluate homeowner's rights. Here's a question to ask yourself - does the path seriously impair the homeowner's rights to quiet enjoyment, first and foremost, and ultimately the value of their property?	The Access & Operations evaluation criteria does include consideration for land ownership. The Feasibility Study places an emphasis to aligning the trail on public land. The concern of property owners is noted and will be further discussed.
60	I really do appreciate this presentation. However, it's very similar to what we heard a few months ago. I'm afraid decisions will be made before we have the opportunity to assert objections in a meaningful manner, before it's too late.	No decisions regarding the project or trail have been made. Your participation in the Workshop is the first of several opportunities to participate in the Feasibility Study Process. Comments provided during and after the Workshop will be documented and considered.
61	Will motorized bikes be allowed access to all trails?	The use of e-bikes trails in Tahoe is determined by the land manager where the path is located. For example, California State Parks does not allow e-bikes to be used on trails within their lands. Therefore, any decision on e-bikes will need to be informed by the final location, layout, and design of the trail. The decision will also need to be informed by what agency or organization owns or is responsible for the trail.
62	Why is there a belief there is a trail already through Emerald Bay? There is not an existing trail above Emerald Bay now though it seems that this plan acts like there is one. We are stakeholders/cabin owners in the Emerald Bay Tract and our water systems, which are very fragile, as is the water source for the Vikingsholm, have sources on that hillside. As well as being an avalanche area, the area is very steep and rugged. There is not a trail there now. Why is there a belief there is a trail there already?	The map background is the current available basemap from the BLM. NCE will ask the USFS if they have a more current or accurate basemap. The sensitivity of this area is noted and will be considered as part of the evaluation process.
63	If everything goes smoothly, how soon would we be able to ride a bike from Meeks Bay to Camp Richardson?	Completing planning, design, permitting, funding, and construction for the full corridor will take many years - and potentially decades.
64	Are all 19 evaluation criteria equally weighted?	Yes, all evaluation criteria are equally weighted.
65	Is there an estimate of how much traffic reduction will occur if the trail is implemented?	The SR 89 Corridor Management Plan conducted travel analysis on the strategies and priorities identified in the plan. The travel study did not estimate reduction in traffic from the trail alone.
66	I didn't hear directness as an evaluation criteria. I think it's valuable to consider how efficient it would be for a cyclist to take the path. If not efficient, some people will take the road instead, increasing safety risk.	This comment is noted and will be further discussed.

67	Mr. Rios mentions "user experience" very frequently. I would hope that taxpaying property owners that have invested a lot to enjoy being Tahoe residence will have priority over the visitors experience. One option considered is very close to my property on Glen Drive. I strongly suggest sticking close to HW 89 and not an excursion up the hill.	The Access & Operations evaluation criteria does include consideration for land ownership. The Feasibility Study places an emphasis to aligning the trail on public land. The concern of property owners is noted and will be further discussed.
68	In past meetings, both onsite and online, I was told you were going to try to limit the number of times the trail would cross hwy 89. Will you continue to stay with this concept?	A goal is to minimize the number of crossings within the corridor. Several evaluation criteria will help support a minimum of crossing, including cost, constructability, environmental, and user experience.
69	How wide would the trail be? Aside from hikers, what type of users would be expected on the trail - bikes, e-bikes, horses, dogs, other motorized vehicles?	The width of the trail is unknown at this time. The goal is to identify an alignment that includes as much Class 1 trail as feasible within this corridor. Class 1 trail is typically a minimum of 8-feet wide, and sometimes 10-feet wide. The recommended trail width and gradient details will be influenced by many factors, including slope, land ownership, physical constraints right-of-way, etc.. Tahoe is determined by the land manager where the path is located. For example, California State Parks does not allow e-bikes to be used on trails within their lands. Therefore, any decision on e-bikes will need to be informed by the final location, layout, and design of the trail. The decision will also need to be informed by what agency or organization owns or is responsible for the trail.
70	we are considering the route of a ROAD why are you calling it a trail?;;my mistake, I understand the topic now. Excellent presentation in my opinion. Will bike access be considered?	The trail is for those walking and bicycling.
71	How do the Rubicon west of HWY 89 routes provide for accessibility and safety transiting to connect to existing Meeks Bay trail termination for persons (whether resident or non-resident / second homeowner) residing in north Rubicon area? How does this plan consider other plans to remove pedestrians from HWY 89 in and around Emerald Bay?	The intent of any preferred alignment through the Rubicon Segment will be a connection to the Meeks Bay segment and specifically the Meeks Bay Resort and Campground. The locations and details of the connection, including any crossings of the highway, will be identified through this Feasibility Study. TRPA and the Feasibility Study team are communicating with other programs and projects ongoing within the corridor, including transit and facility improvements aimed at addressing safety within the corridor.
72	The HWY 89 roadway is incredibly dangerous. For example, Just recently my wife (ER Physician) and myself (fire / medic) rendered care to an auto vs. ped with serious limb threatening injuries. In my car I've been hit by a car driving left of center distracted by views. Did I hear correctly that a main objective of this plan is to increase safety by minimizing highway 89 crossings and getting peds off the roadway?	A goal of the SR 89 Corridor Management Plan is to advance safety throughout the corridor. Planning and implementing a trail within the corridor was identified as one of the ways to achieve this goal.
73	For the colors of the proposed trails, is the blue color the preferred path? What does green color	The colors of the lines on the map represent different options for those segments where multiple options exists.
74	I and my Rubicon neighbors are very concerned with the seemingly only part of the entire trail that goes directly through a quiet neighborhood- Glen drive. It seems as if you've made up your mind already especially when hearing of your criteria.	No decision has been made on a preferred alignment. The Feasibility Study is intended to evaluate potential alignments and select a preferred alternative. The desire to not have the trail within the Rubicon Neighborhood is noted.
75	what will the total cost of this project be and have you considered the cost vs number of people that will actually use this very steep trail	Total project costs are unknown at this time. Preliminary estimates will be developed once a preferred alignment is selected and concept designs are prepared.
76	I am curious about tonight's attendance. Can you let us know how many persons are attending?	The October 25, 2021 public workshop #1 had 157 attendees.
77	Who do Jason, Dave, and Drew, work for? What is NCE? Where is their office located? Do any of them own property in the Tahoe basin?	NCE is a local Engineering and Environmental Consulting Firm with an office in Stateline, NV. NCE has significant experience working on trail planning and design projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Jason Drew, Dave Rios, and several other NCE staff are full time residents and property owners in the Lake Tahoe Basin.