STATE OF CALIFORNIA - BUSINESS, TRANSPORTATION, AND HOUSING AGENCY GRAY DAVIS, Governor
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 3
P. O. BOX 911
MARYSVILLE, CA 95901
TDD (916) 741-4509
FAX (916) 740-4825
(916) 741-5435

September 20, 2002

Donner Memorial State Park
03-NEV-080-13.075
02NEV0015

RECEIVED
SEP 24 2002
NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER

California State Parks
Northern Service Center
ATTN: Gundrun Baxter, Project Manger
One Capitoal Mall, Sutie 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the above referenced document.

This report discusses highway signs for the State Park on pages 48 and 90. It should be noted that the visibility of the sign for westbound traffic on I-80 should be improved after the agricultural inspection station is relocated. The preferred museum site would be reached by driving on Coldstream Road, instead of directly from Donner Pass Road. This may be confusing for park visitors, especially at the existing four-way stop intersection of Donner Pass Road with Coldstream Road and the I-80 eastbound ramps. It may be difficult to install signs that would be clear to all visitors. This may create unnecessary turning movements in the area. A proposed signing plan should be prepared, with review by Caltrans and the Town of Truckee, before this museum location is pursued further. It should be noted that the four-way stop intersection will probably reconstructed into a signalized or roundabout intersection in the future. 1

On page 106 this report describes a trail that would link the preferred museum site to the rest of the park. It is stated that the trail would be designed to encourage museum visitors to walk to the park's other attractions. This trail is not shown on any of the maps, but it appears as though it would be long enough that few museum visitors would use it to get to the day use areas. They would probably drive from the museum to the day use areas along the lake. This would increase the traffic impacts of this museum location. 2

Caltrans should be invited to the kickoff scoping meeting, at least for the traffic portion, and the traffic model should be reviewed by Caltrans. 3

We are requesting a copy of conditions of approval for this project issued by your department. If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 274-0641-5829

Sincerely,

Ann Marie Robinson
Office of Regional and Transit Planning

Winston H. Hickox
Secretary for
Environmental
Protection

California Regional Water Quality Control Board

Lahontan Region

2501 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, California 96150
Phone (530) 542-5400 • FAX (530) 544-2271
Internet: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb6

Gray Davis
Governor

RECEIVED
SEP 2 6 2002
NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER

September 23, 2002

Gudrun Baxter, Project Manager
Northern Service Center
One Capital Mall, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

COMMENTS ON THE DONNER MEMORIAL STATE PARK PRELIMINARY GENERAL PLAN – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, TRUCKEE, NEVADA COUNTY (SCH# 2001102069)

The staff of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Regional Board) has received the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Donner Memorial State Park Preliminary General Plan prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Regional Board staff understands that the general plan addresses the demand for increased visitor attendance and the need to improve and simplify traffic circulation at the entrance area.

The Preliminary General Plan identifies the development and maintenance of the following facilities that may have an impact on water quality:

- New museum/visitor center
- Group day use facilities
- Group camp facilities
- Parking for the museum/visitor center, group day use, and buses
- Entrance, visitor, and maintenance roads
- Trails, including trail connections and associated support facilities (trailheads)
- Interpretive exhibits/facilities
- Rehabilitation of areas where the landscape has been disturbed

Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the early consultation document for the proposed project. Regional Board staff has the following comments.

1. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general permit for storm water discharges is required for construction activities resulting in a land disturbance of five acres or more. Beginning March 1, 2003 this requirement will apply to all construction activities resulting in land disturbances of one acre or more. The project applicant can obtain a Notice

of Intent (NPDES general permit application) for storm water discharge associated with construction projects on the web at http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/stormwtr/construction.htm.

As part of the NPDES Permit, the project proponent is required to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to commencing construction activities. The SWPPP is subject to review by the Regional Board. The Regional Board will require submittal of both temporary and permanent grading/drainage and erosion control plans as part of the SWPPP. However, project construction may commence prior to Regional Board staff review of the SWPPP and prior to any Regional Board staff request for modification to the SWPPP.

2. The project will need to include appropriate best management practices (BMPs) that, at a minimum, prevent storm water runoff from impervious surfaces generated by the 20-year 1-hour storm event (0.7 inches of rain) from discharging to surface waters. The use of such BMPs is intended to avoid adverse impacts to surface water hydrology (increasing peak flows, increasing flow velocities, etc.), which generally lead to adverse water quality impacts (increased channel instability, bank erosion, increasing pollutant concentrations, etc.). Such BMPs may include, but not be limited to, infiltration trenches, infiltration galleries, infiltration basins or other methods to retain the storm water runoff. Calculations used to determine sizing, capacity, and treatment capabilities of these devices shall be included in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and stormwater runoff from all impervious surfaces (roofs, driveways, dirt roads, parking lots, etc.) must be considered. The "Truckee River Hydrologic Unit Project Guidelines For Erosion Control" (enclosed) must be followed. At a minimum, the EIR should commit to disposing of storm water runoff from impervious surfaces in a manner that does not adversely impact surface water hydrology. The EIR should also identify probable methods for achieving this objective. 4

In addition to managing the storm water runoff volume generated by the above-referenced storm, it is equally important to ensure that the storm water is adequately treated prior to disposal. Storm water runoff may contain sediment, petroleum products, other vehicular fluids, metals, nutrients from fertilizers and other sources, pesticides, and deicing products. The EIR should identify probable source-control measures and treatment measures that will be implemented to prevent storm water pollution from adversely impacting both ground and surface water quality. 5

Additionally, the EIR should mitigate potential storm water impacts during the anticipated lifetime of the project and facilities. The BMPs to be implemented will vary on whether the controls are designed to be temporary during construction, or permanent. It is imperative that the BMPs to be implemented are adequately maintained for the life of the project. This includes the construction and post-construction periods. The EIR should include a temporary and permanent BMP maintenance plan and identify who will be responsible for ensuring its implementation, and when necessary updating/modifying the plan. 6

3. The information provided does not indicate potential locations of snow storage. Snow removed from areas associated with development often contains sediments, oils, greases, petroleum products, and other constituents that would normally be collected and treated 7

through various best management practices. The EIR should discuss probable methods that will be employed to protect both surface and ground water quality from pollutants associated with snow removal and disposal activities. The EIR should also discuss proposed deicing methods for road and parking areas, deicing material storage and handling areas, and associated BMPs. 7

4. Surface waters within Donner Memorial State Park include Donner Creek, Cold Creek, Donner Lake, and unnamed ponds in Coldstream Canyon, all tributary to the Truckee River. The Truckee River has been placed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List, which identifies water quality impaired surface waters. The Truckee River has been identified as being water-quality impaired due to excessive sedimentation. Any increase in sediment loading to the Truckee River and its tributaries is a significant impact. This includes wetlands and ephemeral drainages located within the watershed. The EIR must adequately identify and protect all perennial and ephemeral/intermittent surface waters and other surface waters (rivers, streams, drainage swales, wetlands, springs, etc.) within and immediately adjacent to the project site. A wetland delineation study should be conducted to identify any wetland areas on the property that could be affected by the project, and a program to protect wetlands and other surface waters from disturbance during and after construction should be developed as part of the EIR. Mitigation may include fences at locations where there is easy access to the wetlands and other surface waters and signs to educate the community on the importance of protecting these natural resources. 8

5. The project proponent should contact the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps) regarding any proposal to disturb surface waters, including any wetlands and floodplain areas. It may be necessary to obtain a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the Army Corps, which may then require the project proponent to obtain Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Board. 9

6. Alternative 2 (expand existing site), Alternative 3 (expansion at China Cove Road), and the unevaluated Teichert property expansion all have the potential to encroach on surface water drainages that are tributary to the Truckee River. The *Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region* (Basin Plan) contains prohibitions regarding the discharge of waste to surface waters of the Truckee River Hydrologic Unit, and the discharge and threatened discharge of wastes to 100-year flood plains of the Truckee River and its tributaries. The Basin Plan also contains exemption criteria. For more details regarding the Regional Board's Basin Plan prohibitions, please refer to pages 4.1-3 and 4 of the Basin Plan, which can be viewed online at: http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/rwqcb6/BPlan/Bplan.pdf. 10

   It is important that the EIR identifies all of the prohibition areas related to surface waters and 100-year flood plain areas. It is equally important the EIR demonstrate compliance with the prohibitions or demonstrate how **any proposed disturbance** within the prohibition areas satisfies the exemption criteria specified in the Basin Plan. This applies to, but is not limited to, proposed disturbance associated with transportation, utility, residential, commercial, industrial, and recreation-related development activities. Basin Plan exemption criteria is located on page 4.1-4.

Summary

It is Regional Board staff's opinion that additional environmental documentation is required for the Donner Memorial State Park General Plan due to the number and significance of the issues identified above. The Donner Memorial State Park General Plan EIR should address the issues identified above. 11

Regional Board staff look forward to working with you and your staff on this project. If you have any questions or comments regarding issues related to this matter, please contact Robin Mahoney at (530) 542-5417 or myself at (530) 542-5432.

Sincerely,

Scott C. Ferguson, Chief
Northern Watersheds Unit

Enclosures: Truckee River Hydrologic Unit Project Guidelines for Erosion Control

cc: Nevada County Environmental Health Department/Janet Mann
Nevada County Planning Department
California Department of Fish and Game/Region 2
Tahoe Truckee Sanitation Agency/Craig Woods
Truckee Sanitary District/Ossian Butterfield
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District/Matt Kelly

RFM/cgT: Donner Memorial State Park General Plan

TRUCKEE RIVER HYDROLOGIC UNIT
PROJECT GUIDELINES FOR EROSION CONTROL

In the interest of protection surface water quality from unnatural or accelerated erosion caused by land development, the following guidelines shall be followed:

1. Surplus or waste materials and/or fill of earthen material shall not be placed in drainage ways or within the 100-year flood plain of any surface water of the Truckee River Hydrologic Unit.
2. All loose piles of soil, silt, clay, sand, debris, or other earthen materials should be protected in a reasonable manner to prevent the discharge of these materials to waters of the State.
3. After completion of a construction project, all surplus or waste earthen materials should be removed from the site and deposited in an approved disposal location or stabilized onsite.
4. Dewatering should be done in a manner so as to eliminate the discharge of earthen materials from the site.
5. Land disturbance associated with project construction is prohibited between October 15th and May 1st. For projects taking one construction season, erosion control measures are to be effective prior to the onset of winter. For projects taking longer than one season, complete winterization is required.
6. Where possible, existing drainage patterns should not be significantly modified.
7. Drainage swales disturbed by construction activities should be stabilized by appropriate soil stabilization measures to prevent erosion.
8. All non-construction activities should be protected by fencing or other means to prevent unnecessary disturbance.
9. During construction, temporary gravel, hay bale, earthen, or sand bag dikes and/or non-woven filter fabric fence should be used as necessary to prevent discharge of earthen materials from the site during periods of precipitation or runoff.
10. Runoff from impervious surfaces shall be treated or contained onsite for up to and the including a 20-year, 1-hour storm. A 20-year, 1-hour storm would drop 0.7 inches of rain in the California portion of the Truckee River Basin. Runoff leaving the project site must meet specific constituent levels prior to discharge to storm drainage systems or natural watercourses.
11. Revegetated areas should be continually maintained in order to assure adequate growth and root development. Erosion control facilities should be installed with a routine maintenance and inspection program to provide continued integrity of erosion control facilities.
12. Waster drainage waters in excess of that which can be adequately retained on the property should be collected before such waters have a chance to degrade, and should be treated, if necessary, before discharge from the property.
13. Where construction activities involve the crossing and/or alteration of a stream channel, such activities require a prior written agreement with the California Department of Fish and Game and should be timed to occur during the period in which stream flow is expected to be lowest for the year.

Gudrun Baxter - Comments on Donner Memorial State Park Prelim. GeneralPlan/Draft EIR

From: "JP Tindell" <JP.Tindell@co.nevada.ca.us>
To: <gbaxt@parks.ca.gov>
Date: 9/26/02 4:00 PM
Subject: Comments on Donner Memorial State Park Prelim. GeneralPlan/Draft EIR
CC: "John Rumsey" <John.Rumsey@co.nevada.ca.us>, "Mark Tomich" <Mark.Tomich@co.nevada.ca.us>

RECEIVED
SEP 26 2002
NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER

The comments we have regarding the Donner Memorial State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR (dtd. 8/02) are as follows:

Nevada County is currently developing a Nonmotorized Rural Recreational Trails Master Plan, which fulfills a County General Plan Policy regarding establishment of a "comprehensive, integrated countywide trail system."
We are strongly supportive of the Plan's goal to prepare a Roads and Trails Management Plan, and would appreciate the opportunity to provide input to and review of it prior to adoption. Linkages to the County's Trails Plan and the recently adopted Town of Truckee Trails Plan should be considered. 12

Thank you for this opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Plan/EIR. Please contact me if you have additional questions.

J.P. Tindell, Senior Planner/Recreation
County of Nevada
950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, CA 95959
530.470.2536, fax: 265.1798
jp.tindell@co.nevada.ca.us

Town Council
Ronald J. Florian, Mayor

Ted Owens, Mayor Pro Tem

Don McCormack
Maia Schneider
Joshua J. Susman

Department Heads
Stephen L. Wright, Town Manager
J. Dennis Crabb, Town Attorney
Tony Lashbrook, Community Development
Jill R. Olsen, Administrative Services
Patt Osborne, Town Clerk
Alex Terrazas, Assistant to the Manager
Daniel P. Wilkins, Public Works Director/Engineer

RECEIVED
SEP 26 2002
NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER

September 23, 2002

Gudrun Baxter, Project Manager
Donner Memorial State Park
General Plan Project
Northern Service Center
One Capitol Mall, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Donner Memorial State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR August 2002

Dear Mr. Baxter,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Preliminary General Plan and Draft EIR for Donner Memorial State Park. The Town of Truckee Community Development, Public Works and Engineering Departments have reviewed The Draft Plan and compiled the following comments:

ISSUES/AREAS OF CONCERN

1. **DRAINAGE**

   The General Plan may lead to the need for more impervious surfaces added to the subject site. The Truckee River is on the Clean Water Act, Section 303(d) list as being water-quality impaired due to excessive sedimentation. Any increase in sedimentation loading to the Truckee River and its tributaries is a significant impact. It is recommended that the draft EIR provide policies to address drainage and means of water quality so that policies are in place before a Watershed Management Plan is adopted. 13

2. **NOISE**

   Land use compatibility coupled with noise is an important consideration in the planning and design process. Some land uses are more susceptible to noise intrusion than others depending on the nature of activities with that use. It is recommended that a noise study be prepared to determine the impact of the land uses envisioned in the General Plan on existing and planned uses adjacent to the subject site. 14

10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA 96161-3306

Administration: 530-582-7700 / Fax: 530-582-7710 / *e-mail: truckee@townoftruckee.com*
Community Development: 530-582-7820 / Fax: 530-582-7889 / *e-mail: cdd@townoftruckee.com*
Animal Control/Vehicle Abatement: 530-582-7830 / Fax: 530-582-7889 / *e-mail: animalcontrol@townoftruckee.com*

3. **AIR QUALITY**

Existing and new traffic activity on arterial roadways may result in localized carbon monoxide (CO) hot spots during worst-case conditions. Through the draft EIR process it is recommended that air quality emissions generated by the future projects be established in order for the Town of Truckee to determine the impacts and affects on the Truckee Basin. General Plan policies may need to be created in order to mitigate air quality impacts to a zero impact. 15

4. **BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT**

Sensitive biological resources could be disturbed or eliminated as a result of new development accommodated through the General Plan. It is recommended that a biological assessment be prepared in order to determine the plan's impact on the environment as it relates to the protection of wetlands and wildlife. The best option is to avoid sensitive organisms and habitats, however, alternative policies should be developed such as the option to transplant sensitive plants to suitable habitat off-site or creation of compensation habitat via reclamation of disturbed areas; wetland habitats should not be considered for a mitigation banking type policy due to the inability to recreate the exact habitat lost. 16

Vegetation control is a necessity for public health and safety, but means to eradicate invasive and/or non-native species can have significant effects on wildlife habitat, air and water quality as well as soil productivity and overall forest health. It is recommended that the draft EIR address vegetation control and potential impacts. Non-organic and/or toxic pest and vegetation control measures can contaminate water sources and affect reproductive cycles of aquatic species. Materials applied to the soil surface can be moved off-site through runoff. Careful consideration should be given to treatment methods and applicability.

5. **PUBLIC UTILITIES**

It is recommended that an assessment of future available service capacity be prepared in order to determine the demand at build-out for sewer and water. 17

6. **HAZARDS**

It is recommended that the following potential hazards be addressed and mitigated: 18

a) Flooding Hazards
b) Topographic Hazards
c) Snow Avalanche Hazards
d) Fire Hazards

7. **LAND USE COMPATIBILITY**

Land Use incompatibility occurs when the activities related to one land use negatively impact a different nearby land-use. Such incompatibilities may result from noise, odors, public access, traffic patterns, and lighting. Land uses that create potential incompatibilities are commercial, public facilities, recreational uses, timber harvesting, etc, in close proximity to sensitive uses such as residential areas and wildlife habitat. It is recommended that policies be established to address impacts from land use incompatibility through the creation of specific development standards. 19

In addition to land use incompatibilities, determinations of the future level of use should be considered in the General Plan process. Although park use is expected to grow even in the no build scenario, projections should be made as part of the anticipated need. Such projections should include anticipated number of visitors and increased levels of traffic as part of the cumulative impact analysis.

8. **CIRCULATION**

The general plan proposes road, trail and parking improvements including the addition of a second entrance into the park along Donner Pass Road and the expansion of available parking onsite. These improvements are considered in the Draft General Plan in order to accommodate the increasing population of future visitors. Since the visitor population will increase due to a larger accommodating facility, there may be a significant impact to Town of Truckee roads leading to the park. To meet plan acceptance by the Town of Truckee, the amount of traffic increase **must be** documented and a traffic impact fee, calculated by the Town of Truckee, **must be** paid. 20

9. **OTHER**

Maps are a primary tool used by readers to interpret how goals and policies apply to specific areas. When maps are difficult to understand or are of poor quality, ideas can be lost or misrepresented. It is recommended that the GIS generated maps labeled 2-10 be re-evaluated for their usability.

The Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR discusses the increased volunteer opportunities within the park as future use expands. It is recommended that the general plan create guidelines or policies for a volunteer program. 21

The life expectancy of the General Plan is not clearly stated. It is recommended that the General Plan be for a specific period of time such as from 2002-2012, or from 2002-2022. 22

If you have any questions regarding this letter please contact Denyelle Nishimori at the Community Development Department, Planning Division at (530) 582-7820.

Sincerely,

Tony Lashbrook
Community Development Director

CABPRO

California Association of Business, Property and Resource Owners

---

PO Box 3105
Truckee, CA 96160

September 23, 2002

Ms. Gudrun Baxter
Project Manager
CA Department of Parks & Recreation
PO Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

Original Sent Certified Mail, return receipt requested

RE: Donner Memorial State Park – Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR comments

Dear Gudrun:

Please accept these comments on behalf of the CABPRO members who own property in Coldstream Canyon and also our members who live or own property in the Donner Lake area. We look forward to seeing these comments incorporated into the final plan.

Don't hesitate to contact me at 530-582-4051 (or email: davison@sierra.net) if you have any questions about these comments.

Sincerely,

Pat Davison

Pat Davison
CABPRO Field Director

RECEIVED
OCT 0 1 2002
NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER

cc: State Senator Rico Oller
State Assemblyman Tim Leslie
Placer County Supervisor Rex Bloomfield

P.S. thanks for the extension of time!!

GENERAL COMMENTS

DPR 7/19/02 Response to CABPRO 6/14/02 Scoping Comments - THANK YOU for the responses to our comment letter!

Maps – great selection but some questions arise:

Didn't State Parks acquire the NW ¼ of Section 20 in the 1991 transaction with the Nature Conservancy? It is not shown on the maps here. 23

Regional Land Use & Recreation – Forest Service campground symbols need to be repositioned, ACOE property at Martis Creek Lake should be shown as public land, RR track/snowsheds in Section 21 east of Lakeview Canyon should be shown as private property (unless something has changed recently?) 24

Existing Land Use – why wasn't Forest Service and private property identified?

Emigrant Trail – Several Plan statements reference visitor use of the Emigrant Trail alignment. This is a controversial subject. We request that no public map be produced by State Parks until the disputed alignment over private property is resolved.

Acreage of Zones – Please provide the numerical breakdown of acres in each planning zone. 25

Data Collection – We support the collection of needed data to provide a baseline of current resource conditions, with regular monitoring to identify changes. This is a much better approach to decision making than guessing which option is best, or choosing an option that favors preservation as an automatic response. There should be peer review of scientific information and public involvement as data is interpreted for policy making.

Plan Lifespan – No mention is made as to the length of time this plan will apply – is it 10 years or 50 years? 26

Subsequent Plans – Please insure that I am on the mailing list for the preparation of any subsequent plans.

Plan Amendments - Do the subsequent implementation plans (Cultural, Natural Resources, Watershed, etc.) become General Plan Amendments? Are there other ways to trigger a Plan Amendment? 27

Indicators of Achievement - these appear to be absent from the text of the Plan and EIR:

Target Dates - for completion of the Natural Resources, Cultural Resources, Vegetation Management, Watershed Management, and Roads and Trails Plans

Overall Goals – work targets describing achievement (i.e. 5 acres of aspen grove will be restored each year, or 10 acres of park land will be surveyed for archeological significance each year) 28

Costs – what are expected costs for individual subsequent plans or total estimate of costs to implement the preferred plan (separate from the preferred Museum site)?

Visitor Capacity – projected increase in visitation, from the baseline estimate of 200,000 visitors per year (p.59), is acknowledged but not quantified. How can mitigation be assumed as adequate and impacts

insignificant without any quantification of increase? Are we talking about a 1% annual increase in 10 years, or a 10% increase per year for 10 years? This question not only pertains to adverse impacts on the park itself and adjacent private lands (disturbance to wildlife, increased fire danger, visual intrusion, vandalism, contaminated surface and groundwater from inappropriate sanitation practices), but also to non-park functions (i.e. traffic, vehicle emissions, employee housing, visitor lodging, etc.). A private party (i.e. Northstar or Squaw Valley) could not escape scrutiny of this extremely important item, nor did State Parks ignore a proposed minor increase in use by a neighbor. State Parks' strong opposition to Mr. Hahn's lot split was based on potentially negative impacts to the Park from **3 new homes** (not 30 or 300!) on adjacent private property (Knott letter to Placer County 7/13/01: "Increased traffic through the park, increased sedimentation into stream courses, increased noise and air pollution, increased potential for human caused fire, increased trash and law enforcement contacts.") Visitor increase is already occurring, without any plans in place. THIS OMISSION MUST BE REMEDIED. WE URGE SERIOUS DISCUSSION OF VISITOR USE IN THE FEIR AND SUBSEQUENT PLANS. 28

Glossary - Please consider adding a glossary of commonly used terms.

Governor's Executive Order D-78-89 (Evaluate Potential Private Property Impacts of Agency Proposals) – This EO has not been rescinded, as best as we can tell. Please add this to your list of "System-Wide Planning Influences – Appendix F." A copy is attached for your reference. 29

Roads and Trails Plan Monitoring – Monitoring of use, after this specific plan is completed, was not included in the plan description and should be. 30

Donner Lake – In addition to the dam being owned by Sierra Pacific Power Company, SPPC and the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District jointly own the rights to store water in the top 12 feet of the lake.

Truckee vs. Nevada County Jurisdiction – This was confusing. Please clarify who has jurisdiction over Coldstream Road. It was our understanding that the Town of Truckee inherited all county roads and planning authority upon incorporation. Outside the Town limits, Nevada County or Placer County take over. 31

Easements and Encumbrances – As part of the Phase 1 acquisition, Trust for Public Lands reserved "a road easement across an existing dirt road for the purpose of providing access to the owner's adjacent property." (DGS Staff Analysis, 2/8/02 PWB Meeting, page 94). Also, the 1991 grant deed from The Nature Conservancy to State Parks for the parcels in Sections 19, 20, 25, and 30 includes a covenant (Exhibit A) requiring that the parcels "shall only be used for state park purposes" and prohibits the use of the parcels "for access to real property located westerly and/or southerly of the real property (granted to DPR) for commercial ski or ski-related development." 32 The validity of the TNC covenant is questionable though, since a public right of way exists through Coldstream Canyon and DPR's acquisition of the parcels in the Canyon does not extinguish the public right of way (no matter what the right of way is used for). 33

Adjacent Land Uses – Privately owned parcels south of the railroad bend also include primary residential dwellings. Primary and secondary residential dwellings surround Donner Lake on the north, west, and south

sides. Private acreage exists north of the park's potential acquisitions in Section 22.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Page 72 Park Activities

"While park activities have probably not substantially disrupted the ecological integrity of wetland, riparian, and lake shore habitats..."

We could argue that soil compaction and wildlife disturbance, at the very least, are substantial impacts resulting from legal and ongoing park activities. These impacts are acceptable from our perspective – that is not the point. Plan text should be re-worded to include park activities along with other uses that impact riparian and wetland areas. Thank you for including language that includes "community participation" (page 73) when restoration choices are being made. 34

Pages 73 and 85 Guideline for public education and "interpretive information" on water quality

The guideline on page 73 can be very helpful and should be directed to in-park visitors, addressing proper sanitation practices (washing dishes, backcountry disposal of human waste, avoid riparian areas, etc). The guideline on page 85 referring to general water quality pales in comparison to some of the more daunting tasks to be undertaken by the Plan. The suggestion on page 85 is being handled by other entities. Either delete or make this a low priority. 35

Page 82 Guideline to ascertain potential future habitat linkage needs

Please add a sentence explaining how and when this assessment or decision will be done (in the Natural Resources Management Plan?) This could generate various questions about species distribution and survival but more likely the debate will focus on whether the intended target species would use the potential linkage. 36

Page 135 No Project Alternative and Visual Character

It is inappropriate to say that protection of scenic resources, through acquisition or easement, may not occur in the No Action alternative. The very fact that Phase 1 expansion did occur without a General Plan in place is evidence that the statement needs to be modified or deleted. 37

Page 139 Acquisitions and Easements as Protection

"... the possible acquisitions and conservation easements discussed in the General Plan will act to protect existing park resources, preserve viewsheds, and enhance plant and wildlife habitat by providing habitat linkages and buffers." 38

In our opinion, acquisition of land and easements will probably preserve viewsheds. It is arguable that

expansion of the park will protect existing resources and enhance habitat. Such a general statement deserves a qualifier (i.e. in some cases). If expansion was planned with no human use, then perhaps a statement could be made about maintaining or enhancing preservation values. But with expansion comes visitor use. Visitor use is not impact-free. Justifying expansion on the basis of resource protection is tenuous, unless the expansion was tied to alleviating unmet demand for a certain use. The Plan has not demonstrated that an unmet demand for primitive, backcountry dispersed non-motorized recreation will be satisfied by the acquisitions. 38

Influence on Adjacent Private Lands

Page 75-6 Prescribed Fire/Mechanical Thinning

Thank you for mentioning mechanical thinning on pages 75 and 76. We agree with the guidelines on page 76 requiring the Park to integrate its fire objectives into regional policies. We agree that road maintenance can be a crucial part of an overall management strategy. What is not clear is the role of the Park in suppression of a fire (i.e. do we or don't we 'let it burn') and the role that adjacent private landowners play in the decision to use prescribed fire. Please add "suppression policy" and "role of private landowner" into the scope of the Vegetation Management Plan or whatever planning document will cover that. 39

Page 80 Reintroduction of Extirpated Native Species

We repeat the suggestion in our scoping letter that such reintroduction "will not adversely impact adjacent non-Park uses or activities." (6/14/02 Davison Comments to DPR) Why was this suggestion not included as part of the evaluation criteria? Why venture into species reintroduction this way when it may cause a backlash against the park? Species reintroduction can be a very controversial topic. A determination about impacts to adjacent uses and activities should be made <u>with</u> property owner input, emphasizing a cooperative approach. 40

Page 93 Potential Land Acquisition

Thank you for the repeated reference to willing sellers. We also hope that the Park will not do anything that eventually forces an owner to sell, such as a continued objection to a plan or permit on private land. Many owners find themselves selling out of sheer frustration with the third party objections to activities that are legally permitted.

Please change the evaluation of recreational use from "at the time of acquisition" to "before acquisition with full public involvement." Unless we missed something, no tangible consideration was given to the recreation potential at the time of the Phase 1 acquisition. The notice of a public hearing for the expansion (April 2001) was accompanied by a map of all potential acquisitions and Q&A for the Hewlett parcel in Section 26. Verbal comments made to property owners were very generic, with someone even remarking that the lands could sit in State Park hands for a few years before the public has legal access. The lack of information to the public and adjacent landowners about potential types and amount of use of the Phase 1 lands was disconcerting and unnecessary. We would strongly support a change in that policy.

Page 82 Buffers

"Buffers... lie between the park's boundary and adjacent developments... Buffers may be necessary where activities on neighboring lands create adverse impacts.... Guidelines – Perform studies to assess adverse impacts to prime park resources from such conditions as commercial development, degraded watersheds, leaching of toxins, and runoff from railroad maintenance.... Seek cooperative agreements with adjacent landowners, neighbors, and local jurisdictions to provide for needed buffers adjacent to existing park resources."

We hope you mean that special buffers will be established within the park boundaries and not the result of zoning or land use designations suggested outside the park. If that is not the case, the following comments apply. 41

The language about buffers for park purposes seems to contradict the DPR/Keck /Baxter letter to Davison 7/19/02, page 4: "The General Plan will not make recommendations for the use or management of adjacent park lands, except to support the acquisition, from willing sellers, of lands that may provide links to other properties...." DPR response page 5 of that same letter states, "Future planning efforts for the Coldstream Canyon area of the park and for the newly acquired properties will consider compatibility of land uses and expressed concerns and comments of adjacent property owners..." DPR response on page 8, "The General Plan will not make recommendations regarding the use or management of private properties around the park."

The private property owners were there first. Please refrain from the classic "airport" debate, where newcomers demand that offensive airport operations cease, even though the airport was there long before the newcomers showed up. State Parks bought into a neighborhood where commercial activity has occurred for over 100 years. Degraded watersheds, leaching of toxins, and runoff are legitimate concerns due to health and safety or environmental reasons. To place "commercial development" into the same category not only ignores Placer County's role as the decision maker on adjacent lands but sets up some arbitrary and as yet unknown criteria for acceptability. Is all commercial development going to be suspect? Or just certain kinds of activity? Mr. Hahn's snowmobiling business?

The bias against development also throws into question (or now more truthfully reveals?) DPR's answers back in February when Public Works Board was reviewing the acquisition of Phase 1 (750 acres). The answers in response to our questions about use on private parcels (at that time relating to Larry Hahn's request for increased residential density and a General Plan Amendment) reiterated that "DPR respects Placer County's General Plan and zoning currently in effect. It is not DPR's mission to attempt to change current land use on private property and the department has no authority to 'mandate' any land use or zoning issues... DPR does not advocate for certain zoning requirements upon purchase of either new parks (or additions to existing parks) by having staff approach the County Planning Department to request a change in zoning of private property to serve our particular needs. If an adjoining property under private ownership is developed in accordance with existing zoning and within the law, we as neighbors are only concerned with issues that deal in situations of drainage, unauthorized use of our lands, refuse disposal, or any other issue which potentially damages adjoining public lands and associated natural and/or cultural resources in a manner that would not

have happened if the development had not been undertaken." (2/4/02 DPR/Westrup to Tilton, pages 1 and 2).

My comments to the Public Works Board at the time were, "This opens the door wide to interpretation. And when park preservation is the frame from which you view new activities, any change in use ... may be perceived as potentially damaging. This sentence is unsettling." (PWB minutes from 2/8/02 meeting, p. 12)

Never once did DPR staff state during the acquisition hearing and process that their goal was to "establish, maintain, and preserve buffers" on neighboring lands around the park. Had that been so clearly said, we most likely would have opposed the expansion. Please delete or substantially modify the Buffers Goal and Guidelines. 41

Page 97-8 Non-Park Management Standards

"To sustain the aesthetic and audible qualities unique to the park, both in-park and surrounding land management practices are critical .... a responsibility that should be shared. State Park planners... as well as representatives from other responsible agencies and neighboring landowners must work cooperatively..."

"Ensure visible and audible standards contained in the guiding documents, such as county and Town of Truckee general plans, are followed both in the park and on surrounding lands identified as having significant aesthetic impacts on the park."

The troubling language here pertains to possible new designations on adjacent lands. Which lands does this statement refer to? Will the Park go through a new public process to identify/designate these significant lands? Doesn't that contradict previous statements that the General Plan will not make recommendations regarding use or management of private properties around the park? Wouldn't most of the surrounding lands have some "aesthetic impact" on the park (if that land can be seen from anywhere in the park's 1,750 acres)? 42

CONCLUSION – The general topic of Park/Private Property interface prompts the obvious question – should the Park interject itself now in the planning process to control or limit what it views as "unacceptable" (not health and safety) use or activity on adjacent private land? No. That is the purview of Placer County or the Town of Truckee. The Park should defer to the local agencies and respect existing standards and zoning for private land. The draft Park Plan can, and does in some cases, emphasize a cooperative approach to accomplish a desired goal for some resources. That is a much better approach.

43

At the same time, should the Plan address the fact that new or increased park activities may be "visually offensive" (page 121) or "increase the threat of vandalism or damage" (page 127) to adjacent owners ? Yes. That is most definitely the purview of the State Park and we appreciate recognition of the need to consider adjacent owners when new uses are being proposed. We look forward to the preparation of the Natural Resources and other plans where these impacts will be analyzed with all affected parties.

Filed in the office of the Secretary of State of the State of California Dec. 20, 1989
March Fong Eu, Secretary of State
By Louella Cruz, Deputy

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

EXECUTIVE ORDER D-78-89

WHEREAS, the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, applicable to the State of California by the Fourteenth Amendment, and Article I, Section 19, of the California Constitution, guarantee that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation; and

WHEREAS, recent United States Supreme Court decisions in Nollan v. California Coastal Commission, 483 U. S. 825 and First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Glendale v. County of Los Angeles, 482 U. S. 304, have affirmed that state governmental actions, including regulations, that do not formally invoke the condemnation power may result in a taking of private property, even temporarily, for which just compensation is required; and

WHEREAS, responsible fiscal management and fundamental principles of good government require that government decision makers evaluate carefully the effect of their regulatory actions on constitutionally protected private property rights; and

WHEREAS, the executive branch of the State of California is comprised of numerous agencies, departments, boards, and commissions whose decisions may potentially affect private property interests; and

WHEREAS, state government should be a leader in demonstrating sensitive consideration of protected private property rights and in avoiding unintended and undue financial burdens on the state budget, while state agencies fulfill their statutory duties;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, George Deukmejian, Governor of the State of California, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes of the State of California, do hereby issue this order to become effective immediately:

RECEIVED
OCT 0 1 2002
NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER

1. All agencies, departments, boards, and commissions shall:

a. Consistent with fulfilling their statutory duties, evaluate their proposed regulatory actions in light of guidance provided in the aforementioned Supreme Court decisions and other relevant judicial authority in order to ensure the appropriate protection of private property rights consistent with the provisions of the United States and California Constitutions.

b. Assure that their actions are properly supported by the administrative record, by statutory and other legal authority, and fully comply with the guidance set forth by the United States Supreme Court, including consideration of the following principles:

(i) Governmental actions resulting in a physical invasion, or physical damage to private property may constitute a taking.

(ii) Governmental actions which interfere with the use and enjoyment of, or access to and from private property may constitute a taking.

(iii) For governmental actions which amount to a taking the actions result in a "temporary" taking.

2. The legal staff of the Department of General Services may be requested to provide guidance and technical assistance to any departments seeking to evaluate the potential private property impacts of agency proposals.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this 20th day of December 1989.

Signed
George Deukmejian
Governor of California

ATTEST:

Signed
March Fong Eu
Secretary of State

Disabled Equestrians Organization
231 Glenwood Ave
Woodside, Calif. 94062
650-851-8343 Voice
650-851-3914 FAX
www.DisabledEquestrians.org
mailto: donp@disabledequestrians.org
Sept 5, 2002

California State Parks
Northern Service Center
ATTN: Gudrun Baxter, Project Manager
One Capitol Mall Ste 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Donner Memorial State Park General Plan/ Draft EIR
Comments due in writing by September 20, 2002

Dear Ms. Baxter:

The Disabled Equestrians Organization (DEO) represents individuals that are moderately disabled and use a horse or mule to provide them access to trails in the outdoors. The causes of their disabilities are varied, and include accidents, old age and disease. Some of the areas affected are knees, lungs, hearts, backs, ankles and eyesight. In spite of the diversity of aliments, they all share a common solution to their disabilities: they use a horse or mule to carry their worn out bodies to the places that millions of Americans enjoy: the beautiful high country of the Sierras, the rolling hills of the California coast, and many other public parks and forests.

The DEO is very concerned about Federal, State and Local agencies that are restricting, limiting or reducing the use of horses on the public trails they manage. There appears to be a concerted effort by some people who seem to think such restrictions are somehow good for the environment. We disagree with this conclusion, but the issue we are concerned about is far more important.

The Americans with Disabilities Act, Public Law 101-336 enacted July 26, 1990 and the Department of Justice's regulation implementing title II, subtitle A, of the ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in all services, programs, and activities provided to the public by Federal, State and local governments. A disability as defined by ADA is a " physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of an individual". To watch the roar of the falls in Yosemite, see the snow-capped peaks of the high Sierras, listen to the wind rustling in the aspens, these are truly a major life activity.

RECEIVED
SEP 0 9 2002

The Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 requires all buildings and facilities built or renovated with Federal funds be accessible to and usable to physically disabled persons. This law forms the foundation of the legal mandate requiring Federally funded facilities and programs to be accessible to and usable by physically disabled persons.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended in 1978 states "No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity conducted by Federal financial assistance or by an Executive Agency." This Act further broadens the Architectural Barriers Act in that it requires program accessibility in all services provided with Federal dollars.

To deny disabled horsemen the right to use their horse to access the public trails is a clearly a violation of Federal law and results in discrimination against disabled equestrians. The closures are reducing opportunities for disabled equestrians to access the backcountry. It is essential that disabled equestrians have a place to park their trailer to unload their horse, a place for their horse to spend the night, and the permission to ride on the trails. 44

We do not want to see our funds and public funds spend on a lawsuit to enforce our rights. We would rather work with the public agencies to improve the trails, raise funds for outdoor programs, expand horse camps, and raise public awareness. But if we are denied our rights, a lawsuit will be our only recourse.

Now that we have established our role, there are several concerns regarding the Donner Memorial State Park General Plan/ Draft EIR

In a recent meeting between equestrians and Mr. Karl Knapp on the Road and Trail Plan portion of the Draft Plan, positive information was exchanged on equestrian needs for horses accessing the Coldstream Canyon. It became apparent, however, that the Draft Plan and EIR were not sufficiently specific in a number of areas of interest to horsemen. The following is a request to assure that the Final version of the Plan and EIR be amended to reflect specific needs of the equestrian community.

While page 92 discusses the intent to "design group camps" no provision has been made specifically for inclusion of a Horse Camp. With Mr. Knapp's assistance we have identified the Lower Teichert Pond Area as the best possible location for such a camp. The camp should be on relatively flat land, in the forest, have both potable water and livestock water, and adequate unpaved pads for long rig parking (up to 56 feet) with easy ingress and egress. The Skillman Group Camp 15 miles down Highway 20 has been suggested as a desirable template. Please look to the horsemen to cost share or donate trail signs, troughs, picnic tables, hitch racks and corrals for such a horse camp.

A horse camp in this location will provide a missing capability between the Robey Horse Camp and the Euer Valley/Jackson Meadows on the S-N axis of the Pacific Crest Trail, and between Lonely Meadows/ Kingvale and Davies Creek on the W-E axis.

SEP 0 8 2002

We strongly support the intention of the plan expressed on page 90 to "provide more loop trails, staging areas, and backcountry trail experiences". However, it is unclear whether provision will be made specifically for adequate day parking for equestrian rigs. Again many of these rigs are long, requiring large turning radii. We prefer unpaved surfaces. If the Teichert gravel storage area becomes available (about a quarter mile inside the gate near the 76 Station or other similar location) this would be an ideal spot to stage rigs from. Such parking facilities could double as emergency staging areas, when needed.

We endorse the intent of the plan to provide LINKAGE to planned and existing trails such as the PCT, Truckee Town Trails, Donner Rim Trail, Place General Plan trails, etc. We are gratified to have worked with Mr. Knapp to identify our needs for a number of loop trails in the area of differing lengths and an adequate rig day- parking area. Please refer to the needs expressed to Mr. Knapp in our meeting of September 2 that include equestrian access:

Emigrant Canyon/ Coldstream Pass in the saddle between Mts. Judah and Donner Lakeview Canyon

Ridge route on the Schallenberger to complete the Donner Lake Rim Trail Smaller loop routes in the valley floor

Horsemen have been instrumental in providing significant donations to the Truckee Donner Land Trust that have helped make the Schallenberger Ridge available to the State. We would feel more comfortable if the final Plan document more specifically recognized right of access of disabled equestrians, and thus ask you for inclusion/clarification of the issues listed above in.

We understand that this planning process is long and will involve other potential opportunities to provide input and/or attend workshops. Please place my contact information on your notification list for future actions.

We appreciate your consideration of this request and look forward to working with you to make the Coldstream Canyon into a wonderful recreation area for disabled equestrians.

Please keep us informed of your progress in insuring this plan will comply with Federal Law.

Regards from

Sincerely,

Donald E. Pugh
President
mailto: donp@disabledequestrians.org

RECEIVED
SEP 0 0 2002
[illegible]

TRUCKEE ▼ DONNER
LAND TRUST

P.O. Box 8816, Truckee . CA 96162
10118 Donner Pass Road Upstairs
Tel. 530.582.4711 ▼ Fax 530.582.5528
email: info@tdlandtrust.org ▼ website: www.tdlandtrust.org

President
James L. Olmsted

Vice President
Kathleen Ritchie

Founding Board Member
Dan Wendin

Board of Directors
Ralph "Bud" Hunt
Tamara Lieberman
William Oudegeest
Matt Rusanoff
Scott Ryan
William Thauvette
Wendell Ulberg

Advisory Council
Bob Clark
Craig Close
John Cobourn
Kathleen Eagan
Greg Faulkner
Mark Himmelstein
Bob Herhusky
William McGlashan
Steve Michel
Stephanie Olivieri
James L. Porter, Jr.
Craig Ritchey
Bill Thomason

Executive Director
Perry Norris

Director of Land Conservation
Jeff Cutler

Membership Services Coordinator
Nancy Delumyea

Development Associate
Susan Sheffield

Contributions to the Truckee Donner Land Trust are tax-deductible under section 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Service Code

September 13, 2002

California Department of Parks and Recreation
Northern Service Center
One Capitol Mall, Suite 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

SEP 24 2002

Attention: Donner Memorial State Park General Plan Team

Dear Planning Staff,

I am writing on behalf of the Truckee Donner Land Trust to submit the Trust's comments on the Donner Memorial State Park Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR. We appreciate being given the opportunity to submit comments and commend the planning team for undertaking this timely planning effort. With expansion in the use of existing facilities and with the expansion of the size of the Park the time is definitely ripe for a comprehensive planning approach. With that said, here are the Truckee Donner Land Trust's comments on the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR.

1) The Preliminary General Plan could a better job of detailing imminent acquisitions. The current document does not specifically mention the Hewlett donation, the remaining Schallenberger Ridge and Lakeview Canyon lands, or the TDLT parcels that will most likely all be conveyed to the State and become part of the Park around the same time the General Plan becomes finalized. The maps included continue this lack of clarity by showing all these parcels as potential acquisitions in Map 3 but only showing the Trust for Public Land parcel in Map 2. These lands are all significantly beyond the "potential acquisition" threshold and are merely waiting for the final pieces of the funding puzzle to come together for conveyance to the State. These acquisitions have had broad support from both the public and private sectors. 45

2) We are concerned that the Preliminary General Plan/Draft EIR seems to give guidance that is compromised or has the potential to be compromised by the Park's own actions. Specifically, the jet ski concessionaire operation and other motorized recreational opportunities within the Park potentially conflict with several guidelines and goals. 46

3) While we understand the need for a General Plan to provide flexibility into the future, we are concerned that this planning document outlines necessary future planning and studies, in particular for Planning Zone 3, yet doesn't provide a timeline or implementation schedule that would allow use of all the individual reports and plans in conjunction with each other once they are completed. This approach puts the Park at risk of coming up with plans that conflict with each other, and also could lead to a failure to adequately assess cumulative impacts resulting from implementation of all the individual plans. For example, the Park could complete a roads and trails plan only to find that parts of it cannot be implemented due to the results of the watershed plan or biological inventories. 47

It is our hope that the planning process for the Park will progress as rapidly as possible towards implementation of plans to help maximize the Park's benefit to the public. Our comments above are not meant to detract from our general support for the Preliminary General Plan but are merely our ideas on how the Plan could be even better. Thank you again for undertaking this daunting planning effort and for giving us the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Perry Norris
Director

Bill Wraith

California State Parks
Northern Service Center
ATTN: Gudrun Baxter, Project Manager
One Capitol Mall Ste 500
Sacramento, CA 95814

RECEIVED
SEP 0 9 2002
NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER

Re: Donner Memorial State Park General Plan/ Draft EIR
Comments due in writing by September 20, 2002

Dear Ms. Baxter,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan. In a recent meeting between equestrians and Mr. Karl Knapp on the Road and Trail Plan portion of the Draft Plan, positive information was exchanged on equestrian needs for horses accessing the Coldstream Canyon. It became apparent, however, that the Draft Plan and EIR were not sufficiently specific in a number of areas of interest to horsemen. The following is a request to assure that the Final version of the Plan and EIR be amended to reflect specific needs of the equestrian community.

- While page 92 discusses the intent to "design group camps" no provision has been made specifically for inclusion of a Horse Camp. With Mr. Knapp's assistance we have identified the Lower Teichert Pond Area as the best possible location for such a camp. The camp should be on relatively flat land, in the forest, have both potable water and livestock water, and adequate unpaved pads for long rig parking (up to 56 feet) with easy ingress and egress. The Skillman Group Camp 15 miles down Highway 20 has been suggested as a desirable template. 48
- Please look to the horsemen to cost share or donate trail signs, troughs, picnic tables, hitch racks and corrals for such a horse camp.

- A horse camp in this location will provide a missing capability between the Robey Horse Camp and the Euer Valley/Jackson Meadows on the S-N axis of the Pacific Crest Trail, and between Lonely Meadows/ Kingvale and Davies Creek on the W-E axis.

- We strongly support the intention of the plan expressed on page 90 to "provide more loop trails, staging areas, and backcountry trail experiences". However, it is unclear whether provision will be made specifically for adequate day parking for equestrian rigs. Again many of these rigs are long, requiring large turning radii. We prefer unpaved surfaces. If the Teichert gravel storage area becomes available (about a quarter mile inside the gate near the 76 Station or other similar location) this would be an ideal spot to stage rigs from. Such parking facilities could double as emergency staging areas, when needed. 49

- No provision has been made for potential Volunteer Trail Patrol. Many of us serve in this capacity in other land management jurisdictions and would be happy to be certified, or otherwise available for you. 50

We endorse the intent of the plan to provide LINKAGE to planned and existing trails such as the PCT,

Truckee Town Trails, Donner Rim Trail, Place General Plan trails, etc. We are gratified to have worked with Mr. Knapp to identify our needs for a number of loop trails in the area of differing lengths and an adequate rig day- parking area. Please refer to the needs expressed to Mr. Knapp in our meeting of September 2 that include equestrian access:

- Emigrant Canyon/ Coldstream Pass in the saddle between Mts. Judah and Donner
- Lakeview Canyon
- Ridge route on the Schallenberger to complete the Donner Lake Rim Trail
- Smaller loop routes in the valley floor

Horsemen have been instrumental in providing significant donations to the Truckee Donner Land Trust that have helped make the Schallenberger Ridge available to the State. We would feel more comfortable if the final Plan document more specifically recognized equestrian needs, and thus ask you for inclusion/clarification of the issues listed above in.

We understand that this planning process is long and will involve other potential opportunities to provide input and/or attend workshops. Please place my contact information on your notification list for future actions.

We appreciate your consideration of this request and look forward to working with you to make the Coldstream Canyon into a wonderful recreation area for low impact users, including equestrians. Let us know how we can help you further during this process.

Regards from

Bill and Leslie Wraith III
110 Sausal Drive
Portola Valley, CA 94028
September 6, 2002

RECEIVED
SEP 09 2002
NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER

9/6/2002

Corporate Office
3500 American River Drive
Sacramento, CA 95864-5805
P.O. Box 15002
Sacramento, CA 95851-1002
(916) 484-3011 • FAX (916) 484-7012

TEICHERT AGGREGATES

Established 1887

September 20, 2002

RECEIVED
SEP 24 2002
NORTHERN SERVICE CENTER

Gudrun Baxter
California State Parks
Northern Service Center
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

RE: DONNER MEMORIAL STATE PARK PRELIMINARY GENERAL PLAN/DRAFT EIR

Dear Gudrun:

Thanks again for the opportunity to review the preliminary General Plan/EIR for Donner Memorial State Park. A. Teichert and Son, Inc. is pleased to participate in such an exciting project for both State Parks and the residents of California. In order to assist you in refining this draft document, we would like to offer the following comments/suggestions:

PAGE#	COMMENT	
iii	Alternative 3 is more appropriately described by the word "new" rather than future. The use of the term "future" may erroneously imply a chosen alternative.	
6	The designation of two preferred alternatives is confusing and conflicts with other sections of the plan. An option may be to state that various alternatives were analyzed, two were considered viable (possibly labeled as Alternatives A and B) and that Alternative A is the preferred alternative.	51
6	Under the second paragraph, the first sentence should read, "The Department, along with Teichert, applied for and was awarded a federal Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) grant in July of this year for $3.1 million, to work in partnership to build a new museum/visitor center on a portion of Teichert's land."	52
6	At the end of the second paragraph under New Museum/Visitor Center Alternatives, the sentence should read that, "The proposed land donation	53

would also include a large pond that has been reclaimed to support wildlife and native vegetation and open space recreation." 53

88 Under the last guideline (Work with other trails associations….) you may want to include a reference to the Town of Truckee Trails Master Plan which was recently adopted. This master plan actually provides some conceptual trail alignments which tie into existing park property.

95 Under interpretive period it appears that you are describing three groups of importance: The Washo Tribe, emigrants from the east between 1844-1946, and the "modern times". Your interpretive period summary and unifying themes on pages 95-97 should reflect that. In addition, the role of transportation over the Sierra Nevada (Native Americans, trails, railroad, highway, etc.) was portrayed as a significant theme for the new museum/visitor center. It may be helpful to reiterate this theme within the document.

102 Second paragraph first sentence should read 35 acres. 54

105 Bullet number 3 under guidelines should be revised to read, "The purpose of the new museum/visitor center is to support the mission of the Department, provide a California gateway experience, and inspire park and museum visitors with lasting impressions of the natural, cultural and recreational resources in the park. Most importantly, and in accordance with the TEA proposal concept, the nexus of change that occurred following the advent of emigration through the area will be the focus of interpretation to promote a broader understanding of the early pioneers heading west for new futures and opportunities in California." 55

106 Under bullet number 5 a new trail alignment is discussed. It would be helpful if proposed trail additions and realignments were graphically depicted somewhere in the document. 56

115 It would be helpful to refer to the Teichert and Lakeside alternatives as alternatives A and B as discussed on the first page of this comment letter. By utilizing this language the paragraph could be revised to read, "This analysis focuses on the environmental effects of Alternative B, the Lakeside alternative, where the proposed museum/visitor center location is within current park boundaries. The environmental effects of Alternative A, the Teichert alternative, will be evaluated in a separate project specific environmental document as required by the federal TEA grant program." 57

116 Revise bullet number 5 to read, "Provide a new museum/visitor center on property east of the current park boundary (Alternative A), or a site adjacent to Donner Lake (Alternative B)." 58

134	The language of the first paragraph under alternatives is somewhat unclear. Perhaps the paragraph could be revised to read, "Three in-park alternatives were evaluated which led to Alternative B, the Lakeside Area museum/visitor site. Alternative A, the Teichert site has not been evaluated in this alternatives analysis as it is not currently State Park property."	59
137	The term future should be replaced with "new" when discussing the location of a museum at China Cove Road.	
Map 4	The reference to the unconsolidated material/potential contamination on the Teichert property should be revised to eliminate all references to potential contamination. A Phase 1 prepared for the site has cleared the property of potential contamination.	60
Matrices	In the top right section labeled "Teichert Property, Visitor Center" the first cell should read, "Under the terms of the awarded grant, ……."	

Thanks again for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft plan. If you have any questions, or need further clarification on any of our comments, please feel free to call me at 484-3237.

Best Regards,

Mike Isle, AICP
Assistant Project Manager

Enclosures

c: Kim Nystrom
Laura Wilson
Randy Sater
John Briggs