

Executive Summary

ES.1 Introduction

This joint final environmental assessment/environmental impact report/environmental impact statement (EA/EIR/EIS) is a public document that assesses the environmental effects of the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project (proposed action), as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This document has been prepared in compliance with the Council on Environmental Quality Guidelines (*40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500 to 1508*), State CEQA Guidelines (*14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 14000 et seq.*), and the U.S. Department of Transportation's Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (*23 CFR 771*).

The project is subject to federal, as well as Placer County, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), and state environmental review requirements because Placer County proposes the use of federal funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Project documentation, therefore, has been prepared in compliance with both CEQA and NEPA. Placer County is the project proponent and the lead agency under CEQA. FHWA's responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and any other action required in accordance with applicable federal laws for this project is being, or has been, carried out by California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to *23 U.S. Government Code (U.S.C.) 327*. Caltrans is the lead agency under NEPA. Some impacts determined to be significant under CEQA may not lead to a determination of significance under NEPA. Because NEPA is concerned with the significance of the project as a whole, it is quite often the case that a "lower level" document is prepared for NEPA. One of the most commonly seen joint document types is an environmental assessment/environmental impact report (EA/EIR).

Following receipt of public comments on the Draft EA/EIR/EIS and circulation of the Final EA/EIR/EIS, the lead agencies are required to take actions regarding the

environmental document. Placer County will determine whether to certify the EIR and issue Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations and Caltrans will decide whether to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

Caltrans is overseeing the preparation of an EA under NEPA for the proposed action because it has been determined that the whole of the proposed action may result in a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

Placer County, the lead agency under CEQA, must evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed action when considering whether to approve the project. Placer County has determined that the appropriate level of CEQA environmental documentation is an EIR because the proposed action may have a substantial effect on the environment.

The TRPA is the lead agency responsible for certification of the document pursuant to its regional plan. An EIS has been prepared under TRPA requirements.

The organization of this EA/EIR/EIS has been prepared to follow a format agreed upon by Placer County, Caltrans, and TRPA based on the Caltrans standard environmental reference annotated outline. For the purpose of the impact discussions in this document, significance conclusions are provided in the context of CEQA and are presented in *Chapter 5*. In addition, Table ES-2, located at the end of this chapter, presents a brief summary of the impacts of the build alternatives under consideration.

The intent of this joint document is to provide the readers with a clear description of the environmental analysis conducted for this proposed action within the framework of applicable regulations. This EA/EIR/EIS serves as an informational document to be used in the local planning and decision-making process and does not recommend approval or denial of the proposed action. All substantive comments on environmental issues received during the public circulation period for the Draft EA/EIR/EIS have been responded to in this final EA/EIR/EIS and distributed to the public and agencies for consideration. Caltrans, Placer County, and TRPA will use this Final EA/EIR/EIS make the final determination of the proposed action's effect on the environment.

This document is organized in the following chapters:

- The *Executive Summary* provides a brief description of the proposed action and actions in the same geographic area, the alternatives considered, areas of known controversy, major environmental impacts, unresolved issues, benefits of the project, and other authorizations and approvals that may be required.
- *Chapter 1, Proposed Project*, presents an overview of the proposed action and a description of the project location, purpose and need, and background.
- *Chapter 2, Alternatives*, presents a description of the alternative development process, including alternatives that were considered and withdrawn and the alternatives that are evaluated in this joint document.
- *Chapter 3, Affected Environment*, constitutes the NEPA and TRPA evaluation for the proposed action. It covers the following environmental resources and issues. The following resources and issues are discussed in *Sections 3.1 to 3.16* of this chapter.
 - Air Quality
 - Cultural Resources
 - Social Environment
 - Hydrology and Flood Plains
 - Hazardous Waste/Material
 - Traffic
 - Parking
 - Land Use and Planning
 - Noise
 - Recreation
 - Public Services and Utilities

- Geology and Soils
- Water Quality
- Growth Inducing Impacts
- Visual Resources
- Biological Resources

Each section above discusses the affected environment for the resource topic (which also serves as the setting section for *Chapter 5*), environmental consequences associated with the proposed action and no-action alternative, and mitigation measures to avoid or reduce the environmental consequences.

- *Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts*, describes the impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the proposed action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.
- *Chapter 5, CEQA Impacts/Mandatory Findings of Significance*, presents the CEQA evaluation for this project. It presents the significance thresholds used to judge impacts under CEQA, and the pre- and post-mitigation CEQA significance conclusions associated with each impact.
- *Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Consultation*, describes the scoping process, includes the dates of the NOI and NOP, lists the agencies that were consulted in order to prepare this document, and lists the agencies that are receiving a copy of this document.
- *Chapter 7, List of Preparers*, lists the technical specialists who prepared or reviewed this joint document.
- *Chapter 8, References*, includes reference information for all sources and personal communications that were cited in preparation of this joint document.

The Draft EA/EIR/EIS was distributed to various public agencies, the State Clearinghouse, residents of the Kings Beach community, and other interested individuals for public review. In order to fulfill CEQA and NEPA requirements, the public review period was open from March 24 through May 26, 2007. In order to fulfill TRPA requirements, the public review period was open from April 19 through June 18, 2007. Copies of the Draft EA/EIR/EIS were available for public review during normal business hours at the Department of Public Works-Tahoe Design Division, the Community Development Resource Agency, the North Tahoe Conference Center, the North Tahoe Business Association, and the North Tahoe Public Utility District. Copies of the Draft EA/EIR/EIS were also available for review at the Kings Beach and Tahoe City libraries, Placer County's website (<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Works/Projects/KingsBeach.aspx>), and various other locations.

As the lead agency under CEQA, Placer County must provide each public agency that commented on the Draft EA/EIR/EIS a copy of the county's responses to its comments at least 10 days prior to certifying the Final EA/EIR/EIS. FHWA's responsibility for environmental review, consultation, and any other action required in accordance with applicable federal laws for this project is being, or has been, carried out by Caltrans under its assumption of responsibility pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327. Caltrans is the lead agency under NEPA. As such, Caltrans must circulate the Final EA/EIR/EIS for at least 30 days prior to issuing a Record of Decision (ROD). The entire Final EA/EIR/EIS must be provided to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), federal agencies with jurisdiction by law or special expertise, environmental regulatory agencies, the project applicant, those requesting copies, and those who submitted substantive comments on the Draft EA/EIR/EIS. In addition, notice will be given in the Federal Register of the availability of the Final EA/EIR/EIS.

The Final EA/EIR/EIS allows the public and lead agencies to review revisions to the Draft EA/EIR/EIS, comments, written responses to comments, and other components of the EA/EIR/EIS (e.g., the mitigation monitoring and reporting program [MMRP]) before approval of the project. This Final EA/EIR/EIS will serve as the environmental

document used by Placer County and Caltrans when considering whether to adopt the preferred alternative and whether to approve the project.

After completing the Final EA/EIR/EIS and before approving the project, Placer County must make the following certifications (*State CEQA Guidelines 15090 and 40 CFR 1506*).

- The Final EA/EIR/EIS was prepared in compliance with CEQA.
- The Final EA/EIR/EIS was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agencies, and the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the Final EA/EIR/EIS before approving the project.
- The Final EA/EIR/EIS reflects the lead agency’s independent judgment and analysis.

For each significant impact, the Placer County must make one of the following findings.

- Changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EA/EIR/EIS.
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency, not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EA/EIR/EIS infeasible.

Each finding must be accompanied by an explanation of the rationale for the finding. For significant and unavoidable impacts, the County must also adopt a “statement of overriding considerations” explaining the specific project benefits that outweigh the unavoidable impacts.

Placer County is also required to adopt a program for reporting or monitoring the mitigation measures that it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen impacts (*State CEQA Guidelines 15909 [d]*). These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures. This program is referred to as the MMRP (Appendix T).

Once the Draft EA/EIR/EIS is circulated and comments have been received, a Final EA/EIR/EIS is prepared that identifies the preferred alternative, discusses substantive comments received on the Draft EA/EIR/EIS, responds adequately to all comments received, and describe the mitigation measures that are to be incorporated into the proposed action. Once the Final EA/EIR/EIS is prepared, it must be circulated and made available to the public for 30 days prior to Caltrans taking any action on the project. This 30-day waiting period commences the date of publication in the Federal Register.

After preparing the Final EA/EIR/EIS, and at the time a decision is made selecting a project alternative, the Caltrans must prepare a Record of Decision (ROD) explaining its course of action. The ROD must briefly describe each alternative and explain the balancing of values that formed the basis for the selection of the alternative. The ROD must identify the environmentally preferable alternative(s), and clearly state the reasons for not selecting the environmentally preferable alternative if the selected alternative is other than the environmentally preferable alternative. The ROD should also summarize any mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the project to compensate for identified significant impacts and any measures adopted to otherwise minimize environmental harm. The ROD also must describe any monitoring or enforcement program adopted for specific mitigation measures. Caltrans must complete and sign a ROD no sooner than 30 days after publication of the FEIS notice in the Federal Register, and FHWA typically submits RODs to EPA for publication in the Federal Register.

ES.2 Project Background

Historically, Kings Beach, California, has been one of the primary commercial and recreational centers in the Lake Tahoe Basin. State Route (SR) 28 extends through the Kings Beach commercial area, which is generally defined as extending from the SR 267 intersection at the western boundary to the intersection of SR 28 and Chipmunk Street at the eastern boundary. Land uses are predominantly tourist/recreational and commercial.

Over the years, land use development in Kings Beach has been influenced by the nature of its original subdivision. The 1926 “Brockway Vista” subdivision map laid out rectangular lots in a typical grid system. Many of the lots are small, measuring 7.6 meters (24.9 feet) in width and 38.1 meters (125.0 feet) in depth. This layout has resulted in a large number of small structures confined by parcel width.

Originally constructed as a two-lane Forest Reserve road in the early 1930s, SR 28 cuts somewhat diagonally through the subdivision. Parcels in blocks adjacent to the highway are located perpendicular to the road and slightly askew from parcels and blocks in the remainder of the community. At the time, the limited width of SR 28 allowed for roadside parking and an adequate setback between the roadway and adjacent buildings. During the 1960s, the roadway was expanded to four lanes through the commercial core area. The additional lanes were provided at the expense of the setback between buildings and the road. Roadside parking was also affected. During peak summer periods, there is a shortage of available parking in portions of the commercial core area. In addition, pedestrian crossing of the highway was made more difficult due to the roadway widening. SR 28 is operated as a year-round highway. During winter periods with snow accumulation, abrasives and deicers are applied to the road surface, which can potentially affect water quality.

Placer County and TRPA adopted the *Kings Beach Community Plan* (KBCP) in 1996. That plan presents a vision intended to guide community enhancement activities. Major components of the KBCP are directed at the commercial core. These include

reconstructing SR 28, providing improved pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, installing streetscape improvements, and constructing water quality improvements.

Other projects occurring concurrently within the Kings Beach area are identified in *Chapter 4, Cumulative Impacts*.

ES.3 Purpose and Need

The purposes of the proposed action is to address bicycle and pedestrian circulation, preservation of scenery, and water quality needs within the Kings Beach Commercial Core area in a manner consistent with the KBCP. The following summarizes the community's need for the proposed action:

- Currently, pedestrian traffic is heavy at times, especially during the tourist season, and bicycle traffic is increasing. Pedestrian paths include standard sections of sidewalk and informal paths of native decomposed granite. Bike paths and roadside parking spaces are not clearly defined. Where parking is present, pedestrians are forced to walk on the road shoulder. Improvements associated with the proposed action will help to address this need and will facilitate pedestrian and bicycle mobility and safety along the KBCC.
- Several drainage systems within the project area have been found to be deficient and will be improved with this project. Improvements associated with the proposed action will improve water quality and water conveyance infrastructure within the KBCC to meet appropriate standards.
- Historically, Kings Beach has been one of the primary commercial and recreational centers in the Tahoe Basin. However, because most of the business infrastructure (motels, businesses, rentals) that was developed in the 1950s remains unchanged and continues to decline, the area has suffered with respect to scenic quality and aesthetics. The commercial core area is located within Scenic Roadway Unit 20. This Unit has been defined by the TRPA as being below the Scenic threshold value,

and therefore Out-Of-Attainment with the Basin’s Scenic Threshold. Improvements associated with the proposed action will enhance the aesthetic character of the KBCC to meet appropriate standards.

- Implementation of the proposed action will help to fully or partially implement some of the some of the projects listed in the Capital Improvement Projects and Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Improvement Program, which would make a substantial contribution toward achieving community and regional planning objectives set for the KBCC.

The proposed action will meet needs identified in the Lake Tahoe Basin Environmental Improvement Program. The objective of the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) is to achieve the Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacity, which are standards required by *Public Law 96-551* (Tahoe Regional Planning Compact) and adopted for the Tahoe Region in 1982 by the TRPA. The following EIP projects are addressed by the proposed action and this environmental document (Table ES-1):

Table ES-1. TRPA Environmental Improvement Plan Projects

EIP Number	Project Category	Project Title/Description
Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project		
787	Air Quality/Transportation	Kings Beach roadway curb/gutter sidewalk bicycle trail and water quality improvements
10060	Water Quality	Kings Beach Commercial Core
Kings Beach Watershed Improvement Project		
15	Water Quality	Kings Beach residential area treatment, Phase II
733	Water Quality	Kings Beach industrial

ES.4 Project Elements

The proposed action is located in the community of Kings Beach, which is situated along the north shore of Lake Tahoe in Placer County, California. The action area contains

both residential and commercial properties and receives high vehicular and pedestrian traffic year-round.

As currently proposed, elements of the proposed action include roadway improvements to SR 28 to accommodate anticipated future transit and pedestrian needs; the installation of sidewalks, curbs, gutters, storm drains, and water quality facilities at specific locations; drainage ditch lining and revegetation at specific locations; streetscaping; the designation of specific road sites as on-street parking; and the construction of new, off-street parking lots at specific locations within the action area.

ES.5 Alternatives Considered

As part of the proposed action, five alternatives are evaluated in the Final EA/EIR/EIS for the proposed improvements to SR 28 through the action area.

- **Alternative 1: No Build.** The existing roadway configuration would be unchanged.
- **Alternative 2.** Consists of three-lane cross-section and no on-street parking during the summer peak season on either side of SR 28, with roundabouts at Bear Street and Coon Street. A bicycle lane roughly 1.5 meters (4.9 feet) in width and a 2.9-meter (9-foot) sidewalk and landscaped planting area would be provided in both directions. Alternative 2 would also have the option of reducing the sidewalk width on both sides by 0.6 meter (2 feet) to reduce the effect of the on-street parking on through traffic. This 0.6 meter (2 feet) would be added to the parking and bike lane width throughout the action area.
- **Alternative 3.** Consists of four-lane cross-section and on-street parking along both sides of SR 28, with traffic signals at SR 267, Bear Street, and Coon Street. Left turn lanes would be provided on SR 28 at SR 267, Bear Street, Fox Street, Coon Street, and Chipmunk Street. A 1.5-meter (4.9-foot) bicycle lane and a sidewalk with a minimum 1.7-meter (5.6-foot) width would be provided in both directions.

- **Alternative 4.** Identical to Alternative 2, except that on-street parking would be prohibited over the entire year (including winter). In addition, the sidewalk and planting areas in each direction would be wider than Alternative 2.
- **Preferred Hybrid Alternative.** Identical to Alternative 2, except that on-street winter parking would be limited to 63 parking spaces, while on-street parking would be prohibited during the summer peak summer season.

Under all alternatives (except Alternative 1), Brook Avenue from Bear Street to Coon Street would be converted to one-way eastbound, providing the opportunity for additional on-street parking. Alternative 3 is the only alternative that has a nonstandard design feature, utilizing 3.3 meters (11 feet) lanes. All other alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 4) do not have any nonstandard design features.

To mitigate the loss of parking associated with various alternatives, it will be necessary to replace parking spaces lost by the proposed road improvements in a manner that addresses the parking requirements of each block affected in order to ensure that adequate parking conditions are maintained. However, no property acquisitions (including demolitions or relocations) would be associated with any of the new parking spaces.

ES.6 Preferred Alternative—Hybrid Alternative (Three Lanes with Two Roundabouts and Limited On-Street Parking)

County staff has identified a “Hybrid Alternative” as the preferred alternative that includes three travel lanes, bike lanes, seasonal on-street parking and sidewalks. Roundabouts are included at the intersections of SR 28/Bear Street and SR 28/Coon Street (Figure 2-4). The Hybrid Alternative would include \$100,000 in traffic calming improvements in the adjacent neighborhood to minimize some effects of anticipated cut through traffic identified in the Final EA/EIR/EIS. Although all alternatives will replace parking off the highway, the Hybrid Alternative will replace more parking off highway than other alternatives. The Hybrid Alternative and Alternative 2 are identical in that they

both restrict parking during the peak summer periods. However, during the non-peak winter periods, the number of available parking spaces under the Hybrid Alternative would be reduced to 63 spaces compared to 198 spaces under Alternative 2. Parallel parking would be eliminated at driveways, bus turn outs, and within the sight lines of intersections and driveways, and is prohibited during the peak summer season.

Implementation of the Hybrid Alternative would result in impacts identical to those identified for Alternative 2 for all resources areas. With regards to differences in parking between the Hybrid Alternative and Alternative 2, the Hybrid Alternative would result in 63 on-street parking spaces during the winter months, compared to the 198 spaces proposed under Alternative 2. The reduction in the number of parking spaces during the non-peak winter season is not expected to adversely affect the parking supply since the demand for parking during the winter season is lower than during the peak summer season; because of limited demand during the winter months, the 63 on-street parking spaces is sufficient to meet the limited winter parking demand. Consequently, the Hybrid Alternative would not result in any new or more severe adverse parking impacts identified for Alternatives 2 through 4.

The Hybrid Alternative was selected as the preferred alternative based on obtaining the best balance of 1) maximizing the project purpose and need; 2) minimizing environmental impacts; 3) addressing the community need for on-street parking. It was determined that the Hybrid Alternative would help to enhance pedestrian mobility to a greater extent by providing additional space for pedestrians (wider sidewalks) and shortening crossing distances across the highway, while still maintaining seasonal on-street parking, which was identified by the community as a major need.

ES.7 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Sections 3.1 to 3.16 of this document analyze the potential impacts of the proposed action for each of the resource subjects required by NEPA. Cumulative impacts are analyzed in *Chapter 4*. *Chapter 5* outlines the impacts of the proposed action for each of the resource areas required by CEQA. A summary of these impacts appears in Table ES-2.

ES.8 Consistency with Environmental Laws, Regulations, and Policies

Placer County distributed a notice of preparation (NOP) of an EA/EIR/EIS for the proposed action on November 30, 2002 (Appendix A), and the comment period that ended on December 23, 2002. A public notice was printed in four local newspapers, including the *Sierra Sun* from November 21 to 27, 2002; the *North Lake Tahoe Bonanza* on November 22, 2002; the *Tahoe World* on November 21, 2002; and the *Tahoe Daily Tribune* from November 22 to 24, 2002. In addition, 51 letters were sent to interested individuals, agencies, and groups. Placer County held an agency and public scoping meeting on the proposed action on December 5, 2002. The scoping meeting was an opportunity for agencies and the public to obtain information about the proposed action and to provide input regarding the issues they wanted addressed in the EA/EIR/EIS. Comments about the NOP were considered in the preparation of the EA/EIR/EIS.

The proposed alternatives have been reviewed within the context of numerous federal, state, and local laws, ordinances, and policies. This EA/EIR/EIS evaluates the environmental consequences with reference to specific agency standards, guidelines, and regulations that serve as evaluation criteria against which the viability of individual alternatives can be assessed. The EA/EIR/EIS provides sufficient information for the TRPA to comply with standards contained in the Tahoe Regional Plan, for Placer County to comply with standards contained in CEQA, and for Caltrans to comply with standards pursuant to NEPA.

Final selection of a preferred alternative will not be made until after the full evaluation of environmental effects.

ES.9 Issues Raised by the Public

Since publication of the Draft EA/EIR/EIS, Placer County has identified a Preferred Alternative, which is a hybrid of Alternatives 2 and 4, which were previously analyzed in

the Draft EA/EIR/EIS. The following areas of controversy were raised during the public review period, depending on the particular alternative selected, traffic congestion; pedestrian and bicycle mobility; economic impacts; and issues related to parking, transit, traffic diversion, pedestrian crossings, and right-of-way acquisition. In addition, public involvement has indicated that maintaining the character of the commercial core area, environmental issues, universal accessibility, compliance and safety, community connections, adaptability and flexibility to surrounding areas, multiuse opportunities, sightlines and views, diversity and inclusiveness, and longevity and maintenance are important issues to the community that should be considered when designing, choosing, and constructing the project elements.

Table ES-2. Summary of Environmental Impacts—Proposed Action

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation ^a	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
AIR QUALITY				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact AIR-1: Generation of Construction-Related Emissions of Ozone Precursors (Reactive Organic Gases and Oxides of Nitrogen), Carbon Monoxide, and Particulate Matter in Excess of Placer County Air Pollution Control District Standards	LS	Minimization Measure AIR-1: Implement All Applicable PCAPCD Best-Available Mitigation Measures Minimization Measure AIR-2: Implement all applicable TRPA Best Management Practices Minimization Measure AIR-3: Implement Caltrans Standard Specification 7-1.01F and Standard Specification 10	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact AIR-2: Generation of Operation-Related Emissions of Ozone Precursors (Reactive Organic Gases and Oxides of Nitrogen), Carbon Monoxide, and Particulate Matter in Excess of Placer County Air Pollution Control District Standards	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact AIR-3: Nonconformance with State Implementation Plan	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact AIR-4: Generation of Carbon Monoxide Hotspot Emissions in Excess of the Federal or State Standards	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact AIR-5: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Elevated Levels of Diesel Exhaust and an Increased Health Risk	S	Minimization Measure AIR-4: Implement Construction Emissions Control Technology	LS

NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| LS = less than significant | SU = significant and unavoidable | B = Beneficial |
| PS = potentially significant | NI = no impact | C = Cumulative |
| S = significant | NA = not applicable | |

Table ES-2. Continued

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation ^a	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact AIR-6: Atmospheric Deposition of Phosphorus from Re-Entrained Roadway Fugitive Dust into Lake Tahoe	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact AIR-7: Generation of Significant Levels of Odors	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact AIR-8: No Generation of Significant Levels of MSAT Emissions	LS	NA	NA
CULTURAL RESOURCES				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact CR-1: Potential Disturbance to Unidentified Archaeological Resources during Construction	S	Mitigation Measure CR-1: Stop Work if Buried Resources Are Discovered Inadvertently	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact CR-2: Inadvertent Discovery of Native American Human Remains	S	Mitigation Measure CR-2: Comply with State and Federal Laws Relating to Native American Remains	LS
3	Impact CR-3: Destruction or Disturbance to a Significant Architectural Resource—Felte Building	LS	NA	NA
SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact SOC-1: Displacement of a Substantial Number of People or Housing Units	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact SOC-2: Impacts on Community Cohesion	LS	NA	NA
2,3,4, hybrid	Impact SOC-4: Loss of Property Tax Revenue	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact SOC-5: Revenue Effects on Local and Roadside Businesses	LS	NA	NA

NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| LS = less than significant | SU = significant and unavoidable | B = Beneficial |
| PS = potentially significant | NI = no impact | C = Cumulative |
| S = significant | NA = not applicable | |

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation ^a	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2,3,4, hybrid	Impact SOC-6: Construction-Related Economic Impacts	S	Mitigation Measure LU-2: Provide Additional Parking for Alternative 2 Mitigation Measure TRA-3: Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan	LS
HYDROLOGY AND FLOOD PLAINS				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HYD-1: Substantial Alteration in the Quantity of Surface Runoff	LS	NA	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HYD-2: Placement of Structures that Would Impede or Redirect Flood-Flows within a 100-Year Floodplain	LS	NA	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HYD-3: Exposure of People, Structures, or Facilities to Significant Risk from Flooding, Including Flooding as a Result of the Failure of a Levee or Dam	B	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HYD-4: Creation of or Contribution to Runoff that Would Exceed the Capacity of an Existing or Planned Stormwater Management System	LS	NA	LS
HAZARDOUS WASTE/MATERIAL				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HAZ-1: Potential Hazard to the Public or the Environment Through the Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials	NI	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HAZ-2: Potential Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials Into the Environment	S	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Incorporate Measures to Reduce Potential for Accidental Release or Exposure to Hazardous Materials	LS
1, 2, 3, , hybrid 4	Impact HAZ-3: Potential Exposure of School Children to Hazardous Materials	NI	NA	NA

NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| LS = less than significant | SU = significant and unavoidable | B = Beneficial |
| PS = potentially significant | NI = no impact | C = Cumulative |
| S = significant | NA = not applicable | |

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation ^a	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HAZ-4: Potential Exposure of the Public to Contaminated Soils	S	Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Implement Measures to Reduce Potential Exposure to Contaminated Soils	LS
1, 2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HAZ-5: Potential Safety Hazards in an Airport Zone	NI	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HAZ-6: Potential Conflict with Emergency Response	S	Mitigation Measure TRA-3: Implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact HAZ-7: Potential Risk of Wild Fire	S	Mitigation Measure HAZ-3: Require Spark-Generating Construction Equipment be Equipped with Manufacturers' Recommended Spark Arresters Mitigation Measure HAZ-4: Clear Materials That Could Serve as Fire Fuel from Areas Slated for Construction Activities Before Construction Begins	LS
TRAFFIC				
2, 4, hybrid	Impact TRA-1: Degradation of SR 28 Roadway Level of Service (LOS)	S	NA	SU
2, 4, hybrid	Impact TRA-2: Increase in Average Daily Traffic on Residential Streets in Excess of Applicable Standards	S	Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Prepare a Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan	SU
1, 2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact TRA-3: Degradation of Intersection Levels of Service	S	Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Provide Westbound Right-Turn Lane at SR 28/267 Intersection	SU
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact TRA-4: Bicycle and Pedestrian Conditions along SR 28	B	NA	NA
2, 4, hybrid	Impact TRA-5: Degradation of Transit Operations	S	NA	SU

NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| LS = less than significant | SU = significant and unavoidable | B = Beneficial |
| PS = potentially significant | NI = no impact | C = Cumulative |
| S = significant | NA = not applicable | |

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation ^a	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact TRA-6: Degradation of Emergency Access or Response Times	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact TRA-7: Short-Term Construction-Related Changes in Circulation and Local Traffic Patterns	S	Mitigation Measure TRA-3: Implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan	SU
PARKING				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact PK-1: Parking Utilization in Excess of 90%	LS	NA	LS
LAND USE AND PLANNING				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact LU-1: Potential Inconsistency with Existing Land Uses	S	Mitigation Measure LU-1: Implement a Community Involvement and Public Participation Plan Mitigation Measure TRA-3: Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact LU-2: Potential Inconsistency with Local and Regional Plans and Policies	S	Mitigation Measure LU-2: Amend the Kings Beach Community Plan	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact LU-3: Impacts on Parking Availability	LS	NA	LS
NOISE				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact NZ-1: Generation of Construction Noise in Excess of Standards	S	Mitigation Measure NZ-1: Employ Noise-Reduction Construction Measures Mitigation Measure NZ-2: Prohibit Nighttime Construction Activities Mitigation Measure NZ-3: Disseminate Essential Information to Residences and Implement a Complaint/Response Tracking Program	LS

NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| LS = less than significant | SU = significant and unavoidable | B = Beneficial |
| PS = potentially significant | NI = no impact | C = Cumulative |
| S = significant | NA = not applicable | |

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation ^a	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact NZ-2: Exposure of Noise Sensitive Land Uses to Traffic Noise in Excess of Standards	LS	NA	NA
RECREATION				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact REC-1: Increase the Use of Recreational Facilities That Would Cause Physical Deterioration of the Facility	S	Mitigation Measure REC-1: Implement Measures to Minimize Effects to Kings Beach SRA	LS
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact UT-1: Impacts on Utilities	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact UT-2: Impacts on Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, and Emergency Medical Services	S	Mitigation Measure UT-1: Implement Measures to Reduce Potential Impacts on Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, and Emergency Medical Services	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact UT-3: Impacts on Stormwater Drainage Facilities	S	Mitigation Measure UT-2: Develop a Comprehensive Stormwater Drainage Conveyance Plan	LS
GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact GEO-1: Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury Caused by Fault Rupture	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact GEO-2: Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury Caused by Ground Shaking	S	Minimization Measure GEO-1: Incorporate Recommendations from Geotechnical Reports into Project Design	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact GEO-3: Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury as a Result of Development on Materials Subject to Liquefaction	LS	NA	NA

NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| LS = less than significant | SU = significant and unavoidable | B = Beneficial |
| PS = potentially significant | NI = no impact | C = Cumulative |
| S = significant | NA = not applicable | |

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation ^a	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact GEO-4: Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury as a Result of Landsliding	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact GEO-5: Temporarily Increase the Potential for Accelerated Runoff, Erosion, and Sedimentation as a Result of Grading and Construction Activities	S	Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Incorporate Recommendations from Geotechnical Reports into Project Design	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact GEO-6: Increase the Potential for Structural Damage and Injury as a Result of Development on Expansive Soils	LS	NA	NA
WATER QUALITY				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact WQ-1: Substantial Alteration in the Quality of Surface Runoff	S	Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Implement Construction BMPs Contained in the SWPPP Mitigation Measure WQ-2: Implement a Spill Prevention and Control Program	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact WQ-2: Substantial Degradation of Water Quality or Violation of any Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact WQ-3: Substantial Alterations of the Existing Drainage Pattern of the Site Area Such That Flood Risk and/or Erosion and Siltation Potential Would Increase	S	Mitigation Measure WQ-1: Implement Construction BMPs Contained in the SWPPP Mitigation Measure WQ-2: Implement a Spill Prevention and Control Program	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact WQ-4: Substantial Reduction in Groundwater Quantity or Quality	LS	NA	NA
GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact GI-1: Induce Substantial Population Growth, Either Directly or Indirectly	LS	NA	NA

NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| LS = less than significant | SU = significant and unavoidable | B = Beneficial |
| PS = potentially significant | NI = no impact | C = Cumulative |
| S = significant | NA = not applicable | |

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation ^a	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
VISUAL RESOURCES				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact VIS-1: Temporary Visual Impacts Caused by Construction Activities	LS	NA	NA
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact VIS-2: Adversely Affect a Scenic Vista	LS	NA	NA
2, 4, hybrid	Impact VIS-3: Degrade the Existing Visual Character or Quality of the Site and Its Surroundings	S	Mitigation Measure VIS-1: Implement Project Landscaping Plan to Replace Trees that are Removed, Using the Specified Guidelines	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact VIS-4: Create a New Source of Light and Glare that Affects Views in the Area	S	Mitigation Measure VIS-2: Lighting Levels Mitigation Measure VIS-3: Directed Lighting Mitigation Measure VIS-4: Highway Fixtures with Low-Sheen and Non-Reflective Surface Materials	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact VIS-5: Conflict with Policies or Goals Related to Visual Resources	LS	NA	NA
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact BIO-1: Disturbance of Urban-Altered Jeffery Pine Forest	S	Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Establish Exclusion Zones Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Seasonal Restrictions on Construction Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoid the Introduction of New Noxious Weeds Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Revegetate Disturbed Areas	LS

NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| LS = less than significant | SU = significant and unavoidable | B = Beneficial |
| PS = potentially significant | NI = no impact | C = Cumulative |
| S = significant | NA = not applicable | |

Alternative	Impact	Significance before Mitigation ^a	Mitigation	Significance with Mitigation Incorporated
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact BIO-2: Loss or Disturbance of Wetlands and Streams	S	Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Establish Exclusion Zones Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Seasonal Restrictions on Construction Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoid the Introduction of New Noxious Weeds Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Revegetate Disturbed Areas	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact BIO-3: Effects on Regional Wildlife Species of Concern	S	Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Seasonal Restrictions on Construction Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Revegetate Disturbed Areas	LS
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact BIO-4: Spread of Weedy Plant Species	S	Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoid the Introduction of New Noxious Weeds Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Revegetate Disturbed Areas	LS
CLIMATE CHANGE				
2, 3, 4, hybrid	Impact CC-1: Generation of Significant Levels of Greenhouse Gasses	LS	NA	NA

NOTES:

a. For CEQA and TRPA purposes, significance is abbreviated as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| LS = less than significant | SU = significant and unavoidable | B = Beneficial |
| PS = potentially significant | NI = no impact | C = Cumulative |
| S = significant | NA = not applicable | |