

# Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

**Form F**

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2018092031

Project Title: Meeks Bay Restoration Project

Lead Agency: Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board

Contact Name: Brian Judge

Email: brian.judge@waterboards.ca.gov Phone Number: 530-542-5426

Project Location: Tahoma El Dorado County  
*City* *County*

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The Meeks Bay Restoration Project proposes to restore and enhance ecological conditions and provide for sustainable recreation. The project involves removal of Meeks Bay Marina; restoration of Meeks Creek and associated wetland/lagoon habitat; continued management of AIS; replacement of the SR 89 bridge; reconfiguration or construction of pedestrian and vehicle circulation, trail bridges, parking areas, cabins, and campgrounds; installation of utility infrastructure and best management practices, shoreline stabilization, habitat enhancement, and resource protection features; and other associated improvements. It also involves the potential for new recreation facilities, such as a pier or paddlecraft launch that varies by action alternative, to offset the loss of motorized boating access with the removal of the marina. Resource Protection Measures and mitigation measures are incorporated into all action alternatives to minimize potential environmental impacts from construction and operation of the project.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

The EIS/EIS/EIR identified significant or potentially significant effects associated with recreation, scenic resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, and air quality. The majority of impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. However, even with the application of feasible mitigation measures, there would be significant and unavoidable impacts related to recreation and scenic resources.

There are seven mitigation measures proposed by the project: Mitigation Measure 3.1-3, Mitigation Measure 3.1-4, Mitigation Measure 3.3-2a, Mitigation Measure 3.3-2b, Mitigation Measure 3.3-2c, Mitigation Measure 3.3-3, and Mitigation Measure 3.8-1.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

Key concerns and issues that were raised by multiple individuals and which were not completely resolved through the stakeholder planning process include the following:

- Opposition to a pier or motorized boating facilities in Meeks Bay due to concerns over traffic, noise, crowding, and user conflicts;
- Concerns over the loss of moorings and motorized/sailing boat launch opportunities with the removal of the marina; and
- A desire for improved public safety access with a pier or other structure that provides public safety boat access at Meeks Bay.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

Trustee agencies:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- California State Lands Commission

Responsible agency:

- California Department of Transportation

Federal cooperating agencies:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service