



**COUNTY OF PLACER**  
**Community Development Resource Agency**

**ENVIRONMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
SERVICES**

John Marin, Agency Director

Gina Langford, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3080 • www.placer.ca.gov/planning

## INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

### A. BACKGROUND:

Project Title: <b>Kings Beach Town Center</b>	Plus# PEIR 20080036
Entitlements: Community Plan Amendment, Subdivision Map, Conditional Use Permit, Design Review	
Site Area: 4.30 acres	APN: 090-133-003, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 015, 016, 018; 090-126-020, 021, 022, 024, 039, 040.
Location: The Kings Beach Town Center project site is located within the downtown commercial area of the Kings Beach Community. The project encompasses a city block fronted by Highway 28 on the south, Salmon Avenue on the north, Fox Street on the east and Coon Street on the west. The project also includes six parcels located on the north side of Salmon Avenue, and does not include the existing post office and community clinic.	

### Project Description:

The Kings Beach Town Center project proposes to redevelop an existing commercial/residential site with a pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development which will include a combination of residential, commercial, medical and professional offices, public facilities (e.g. civic, governmental, quasi-governmental offices) and parking uses.

The project proposes a Tentative Subdivision Map which will merge the existing 18 parcels into seven parcels and will include both residential and commercial air space condominiums. Residential units will range from three-bedroom, two-bath units to studio units. Commercial units will range from 500 square feet to 3,500 square feet. Additional entitlements required include a Conditional Use Permit, as required by the Kings Beach Community Plan for residential, public facility and parking uses, Design Review and amendments to both the Kings Beach Community Plan and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's (TRPA) Code of Ordinances. Amendments to the Community Plan and TRPA Code may also be needed to address increases to building height and building setback reductions, residential and commercial lot sizes, increased residential density, increased lot coverage and a reduction to the parking requirement.

The amendments to the Community Plan and TRPA Code of Ordinances will be consistent with the TRPA's Community Enhancement Program. The Community Enhancement Program seeks net gain solutions for the Lake

Tahoe Basin by creating an incentive-based development program which will implement environmental improvements, enhance the quality of life for residents, improve the visitor experience and contribute to the long-term economic vitality of the Tahoe region.

The proposed development includes approximately 39,615 square feet of retail uses, 33,000 square feet of office, 24,000 square feet of public service, 89,145 square feet of residential uses, and a parking structure. A summary of each proposed parcel is provided below:

Parcel One will include a 148,000 square-foot four-level parking structure (approximately 44 feet in height) with 417 parking spaces. The parking structure will serve the proposed uses on-site as well as provide public parking for the Kings Beach State Recreation Area located south of the project.

Parcel Two will include a 17,000 square-foot, two and half-story building (approximately 45 feet in height) which will include 7,000 square feet of office uses at the ground level and 10,000 square feet of residential uses on the second levels. The project proposes that the ten residential units on Parcel Two will be workforce/employee housing. An additional, six workforce/employee-housing units are proposed to be located off-site within the King Beach Area. The applicant has also proposed that a proportion of the office building on Parcel Two may potentially serve as a new County library facility.

Parcel Three will include a 24,000 square-foot, two-story office building (approximately 56 feet in height). The applicant is proposing this building might serve as the new location for the Tahoe Area Placer County Government Center or other public facilities/office use.

Parcel Four will include a 31,600 square-foot, three-story building (approximately 49 feet in height) which will include 12,800 square feet of retail uses at the ground level and 18,800 square feet of office/professional uses on the second and third levels. Medical offices are proposed to be located in the office/professional floor space of the building. These offices will provide primary care to patients through office services. A dental office is proposed to provide general dentistry services.

Parcel Five will include a 15,000 square-foot, two-story building (approximately 39 feet in height) which will include 7,500 square feet of retail at the ground level and 7,500 square feet of office use on the second level. In addition, an existing 1,486 square-foot building (currently occupied by Scrap’s Dog Bakery) will be renovated and incorporated into the development.

Parcels Six and Seven will include two 98,460 square-foot, three to four-story buildings (approximately 72 feet in height) which will include 19,315 square feet of retail at the ground level and 79,145 square feet of residential uses on the second, third and fourth levels. The project proposes that the 60 residential units on Parcels Six and Seven may become a combination of market-rate condominiums, Condo-Hotel or fractional residence units.

**Project Site:**

Approximately 80 percent of the site is developed with a mixture of residential, commercial, and recreational uses. Existing uses include: Kentucky Fried Chicken Restaurant, Scraps Dog Bakery, the Re/Max building which includes a realty office and Tahoe Forest Hospice Thrift Store, Sprints of Tahoe building, Lucky 7 Tattoo Shop, Mad About Music Shop, Kings Beach Miniature Golf Course, Hands of Fortune Trailer Park, and other residential uses. The site contains a minimal slope (<5%) and no natural drainages are apparent.

**B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

Location	Zoning	General Plan/Community Plan	Existing Conditions & Improvements
Site	PAS 029 Downtown Commercial Area (Special Area #1)	North Tahoe Community Plan (Kings Beach)	Developed with commercial and residential uses
North	PAS 028 Residential Area	North Tahoe Community Plan (Kings Beach)	Developed with residential uses
South	PAS 029 Downtown Commercial Area (Special Area #1) and Recreation Area (Special Area #3)	Same as project site	Same as project site
East	PAS 029 East and West Entry Area (Special Area #2)	Same as project site	Same as project site
West	Same as project site	Same as project site	Same as project site

### C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference will occur:

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ North Tahoe Community Plan EIR

Section 15183 states that "projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site." Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or will be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

### D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including "No Impact" answers.
- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
  - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

- ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

**I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)	X			
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)	X			
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)	X			
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)	X			

**Discussion- Items I-1,2:**

The Kings Beach Town Center project proposes to redevelop an existing commercial/residential site with a pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development which including a combination of residential, commercial, medical and professional offices, public facilities (e.g. civic, governmental, quasi-governmental offices) and parking uses. The proposed buildings range from 39 to 72 feet in height. The proposed project is located within the Lake Tahoe Region along State Highway 28. All state highways which lie within the Tahoe Region are designated Scenic Highway. Development of the proposed project may impact the Scenic Highway quality. The project site contains numerous large trees. The proposed project will re-grade the majority of the project site and may result in substantial tree removal. The EIR will include photographic simulations of the proposed project that primarily contemplate visual impacts as viewed from State Highway 28 and Lake Tahoe. The potential scenic vista and scenic resource impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project will be discussed and evaluated in the EIR.

**Discussion- Items I-3,4:**

The land use patterns in the area consist of a wide range of commercial, residential, and some recreational areas. Development of the proposed project may impact the character of the surrounding land uses and may create new sources of light or glare in the area. These impacts will be discussed and further evaluated in the EIR.

**II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (PLN)				X
4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The project site is located in a Downtown Commercial Area zone with a commercial land use designation and is surrounded by commercial and residential uses. It does not contain farmlands or any agricultural uses on the site or around the project site and the project is not proposing any agricultural uses. There are no agricultural resource impacts associated with the project.

**III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (APCD)	X			
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (APCD)	X			
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (APCD)	X			
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (APCD)	X			
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (APCD)	X			

**Discussion- Item III-1:**

Based on the preliminary project analysis, the air quality impacts resulting from the proposed project may result a cumulatively considerable net increase in the region and conflict with the objectives in Placer County Air Quality Plan to attain the federal and state ambient air quality standards. This potential will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR.

**Discussion- Items III-2,3:**

The proposed project is located in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is designated as non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard. Based on the preliminary project analysis, the air pollution emissions generated from the proposed project will exceed the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (District's) threshold for ozone precursors and particulate matters. The exceedance may result a cumulatively considerable net increase to the Lake Tahoe air basin. The detailed air quality impacts will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR.

**Discussion- Items III-4,5:**

Based upon the preliminary project analysis, the project may potential expose nearby residents to substantial pollutant concentrations, and/or create objectionable odors as a result of diesel exhausts from construction equipment. This potential will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR.

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				X
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)				X
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)				X
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)	X			
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Items IV-1,2:**

The project site consists of 4.3 acres, is located in a Downtown Commercial zoning district and is currently developed with the various commercial, residential and storage buildings, and paved surfaces. The project site is also surrounded by existing commercial and residential uses. The redevelopment of the site will not impact special-status species or protected habitat due to the extent of development on and around the project site.

**Discussion- Item IV-3:**

The proposed project will redevelop the existing site which does not contain oak woodlands. No oak woodland communities are located in proximity to the project site.

**Discussion- Item IV-4:**

The project site consists of 4.3 acres, is located in a Downtown Commercial zoning district and is currently developed. The proposed redevelopment of the site will not result in a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat, as the project site does not contain any riparian habitat.

**Discussion- Items IV-5,8:**

The project site consists of 4.3 acres, is located in a Downtown Commercial zoning district and is currently developed. The proposed redevelopment of the site will not result in a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act as there are no federally protected wetlands

as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act on the project site. The proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.

**Discussion- Item IV-6:**

The project site consists of 4.3 acres, is located in a Downtown Commercial zoning district and is currently developed. The proposed redevelopment of the site will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, wildlife species, established native resident, migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

**Discussion- Item IV-7:**

The site does contain a number of coniferous trees. The proposed project will re-grade the majority of the project site and may impact existing trees on-site. Potential tree impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project will be discussed and evaluated in the EIR for this project.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)			X	
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)			X	
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)			X	
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	

**Discussion- Items V-1,2,3,6:**

The project site consists of 4.3 acres, is located in a Downtown Commercial zoning district and is currently developed with various commercial, residential and storage buildings, paved surfaces. The site is surrounded by existing commercial and residential uses. The Placer County Museums Division has issued three memoranda in regards to parcels within the project area containing structures 50 years old, or older. All subject buildings were determined by the Museums Division not to meet the criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. Since the project area was previously disturbed and the existing structures on the property are not historically significant, the proposed project will have impact on the historic or cultural resource for this area.

A possibility exists that significant historic, archeological, or paleontological resources might be unearthed as a result of project construction activities. Any significant historic, archeological, or paleontological resources located on the site may be significantly negatively impacted as a result of grading required for the construction of this project. The following standard conditions will be required as part of the projects permit approval to address this concern:

If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and an archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s). If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect will be provided on the Improvement Plans for the project.

Following a review of the new find and consultation with appropriate experts, if necessary, the authority to proceed may be accompanied by the addition of development requirements which provide protection of the site

and/or additional measures necessary to address the unique or sensitive nature of the site. With implementation of these conditions of approval, impacts will remain less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Items V-4,5:**

The proposed project does not have the potential to cause a physical change, which will affect known unique ethnic cultural values, as there are no known unique ethnic features on the site. The proposed project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area as there are no religious or sacred uses on the site. No mitigation measures are necessary.

**VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)	X			
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)	X			
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)	X			
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)	X			
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)	X			
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)	X			
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)	X			
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)	X			
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18, 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)	X			

**Discussion- All Items:**

The project proposes approximately 100,000 square feet of building area for office, retail, and public service, a parking garage, and 72 residential housing units. The probable environmental effects of the various project elements include the potential to result in unstable earth conditions or geologic hazard, ultimately create significant disruptions of the soil, create substantial changes in topography, result in the modification of any unique geologic feature, result in a significant increase in erosion, result in changes in erosion that may modify the characteristics of a lake, or be located on unstable soil, expansive soil, or subject to geologic hazards. The EIR for this project will include an analysis of the geologic impacts and provide mitigations to address any impacts of the proposed project.

**VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD)	X			
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)		X		
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)			X	

**Discussion- Item VII-1:**

The project will not include any industrial uses. It will have professional office, commercial, and residential uses. Any hazardous materials used will likely be within the reporting requirements. As a condition of this project, any business planning to use hazardous materials will be required to contact Environmental Health Services for review and requirements. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VII-2:**

Construction of the proposed project will involve the short-term use and storage of hazardous materials typically associated with grading, such as fuel and other substances. All materials will be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws including Cal-OSHA requirements and manufacture’s instructions. Therefore, the proposed project does not pose a risk of accident or upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VII-3:**

Based upon the preliminary project analysis, the project may results in a substantial air toxic emission such as diesel engine exhausts. This potential will be evaluated and discussed in the EIR.

**Discussion- Item VII-4,9:**

The site is listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The project site includes a former gas station – the Unocal 76 station (APN 090-133-011) which operated from the 1950’s until 1971. This site had several underground storage tanks which were removed in May 2007. There was significant

contamination of the site which resulted in the removal of 564 tons of contaminated soil. The site is undergoing groundwater monitoring review by the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board(RWQCB) and is currently in the process of obtaining a “no further action” letter from Lohantan RWQCB. Since the project site has had the significant contamination removed, is undergoing groundwater monitoring, and is seeking a “no further action” letter, the exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Item VII-5,6:**

The project is not located in proximity to an airstrip or airport. The closest airport to the project site is the Truckee Airport, approximately eight miles northwest of the project site.

**Discussion- Item VII-7:**

The project site is located in a commercial and residential area and is not located in an area where wildlands are located adjacent to urbanized areas.

**Discussion- Item VII-8:**

The project proposes to build several large residential and commercial buildings and is likely to have a stormwater detention system. Stormwater detention systems have the potential to allow for the breeding of mosquitoes and this is a potentially significant impact. The potential to allow for the breeding of mosquitoes will be mitigated to less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measure.

**Mitigation Measures- Item VII-8:**

MM VII.1 In order to discourage the breeding of mosquitoes which have the potential to cause disease to humans and other hosts, the project proponent will abide by the Placer Mosquito Abatement District (PMAD) construction guidelines for stormwater detention systems. PMAD will review the improvement plans.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)	X			
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)	X			
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)	X			
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)	X			
7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)	X			
8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)	X			
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)	X			

10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)	X			

**Discussion- Item VIII-1:**

The project is will not violate any potable water quality standards as it will be using treated municipal water for its domestic purposes. The project will not be using a groundwater source for its potable water supply.

**Discussion- Item VIII-2:**

The project proposes the use of public treated surface water supplies, so there are no direct impacts to groundwater quantity or direction due to well withdrawals. However, the introduction of residential uses and impervious surfaces may have indirect groundwater recharge capability impacts in some areas. The soil types in the project area are not conducive to recharge, except perhaps along major drainage ways. As this project does not involve disturbance of major drainage ways, impacts related to groundwater recharge are less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

**Discussion- Items VIII-3,4,5,6,7,8,9,12:**

The proposed project will result in the approval of approximately 100,000 square feet of building area for office, retail, and public service, a parking garage, and 72 residential housing units. The probable environmental effects of the various project elements include the potential to alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, increase the rate and amount of surface runoff, expose people/property to flooding, alter floodplain conditions and up and down stream, increase stormwater discharges degrading surface water quality, and impact the watershed of important surface water resources (Lake Tahoe). The project site is not located within any levee or dam failure inundation area. The EIR for this project will include an analysis of the hydrology/hydrologic and water quality impacts and provide mitigations to address any impacts of the proposed project.

**IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN)	X			
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)			X	
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)	X			
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X

7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Items IX-1,5,6,7,8:**

The Kings Beach Town Center project proposes to redevelop an existing commercial/residential site with a pedestrian friendly mixed-use development. The proposed project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community as it is surrounded by a mix of residential and commercial uses. The redevelopment of the site will not affect agricultural and timber resources or operations. The project will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area, as the proposed uses were anticipated for this area as set forth in the Kings Beach Community Plan. The proposed project will not cause economic or social changes that will result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration.

**Discussion- Items IX-2,4:**

The Kings Beach Town Center project proposes to redevelop an existing commercial/residential site with a pedestrian friendly mixed-use development which will include a combination of residential, commercial, medical and professional offices, public facilities (e.g. civic, governmental, quasi-governmental offices) and parking uses. The land use patterns in the area consist of a wide range of commercial, residential, with some recreational areas. Development of the proposed project may impact the surrounding land uses or may create land use conflicts. Potential land use impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project will be discussed and evaluated in the EIR for this project. The EIR will also evaluate land use issues to ensure conformance with existing land capability standards and applicable planning documents.

**Discussion- Item IX-3:**

The proposed redevelopment project may conflict with the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance, as it requires the removal of coniferous trees. However, impacts resulting from conflicts with the Tree Preservation Ordinance are considered less than significant as impacts to protected trees will be required to comply with the requirements set forth in the Tree Preservation Ordinance, which will bring the project into compliance with the Tree Preservation Ordinance. No mitigation measures are required.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- All Items:**

The project includes the redevelopment of an existing commercial and residential site. There are no known mineral resources on the site, or delineated in the general area of the site in the Kings Beach Community Plan. The proposed project will not result in any negative impacts to mineral resources.

**XI. NOISE** – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN)	X			
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)	X			
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)	X			
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X

**Discussion- Items XI-1,2,3:**

The Kings Beach Town Center project proposes to redevelop an existing commercial and residential site with a pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development which will include a combination of residential, commercial, medical and professional offices, public facilities and parking uses. A Noise Assessment for the proposed project has not been completed. The EIR will assess potential short-term (i.e., construction) noise impacts relative to sensitive receptors and their potential exposure. The EIR will also assess long-term (i.e., operational) noise impacts, including increased noise from mobile, stationary, and area sources for the proposed project. The EIR will discuss and analyze the exposure of sensitive receptors to potential noise from all sources particularly adjacent business, roads and State Highway 28 and determine appropriate mitigation measures in consultation with Placer County.

**Discussion- Items XI-4,5:**

The project is not located in proximity to an airstrip or airport. The closest airport to the project site is the Truckee Airport, approximately eight miles northeast. Accordingly, there will be no noise impact generated by an airport or airstrip.

**XII. POPULATION & HOUSING** – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)	X			
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)	X			

**Discussion- Item XII-1:**

The proposed redevelopment will create job opportunities and new residences. The current project proposal does not identify the number of new employees that this project will generate. Potential population and housing impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project will be discussed and evaluated in the EIR for this project.

**Discussion- Item XII-2:**

The project proposes to redevelop existing residential property with a mixed-use project. Accordingly, impact with the displacement of existing housing will be addressed in the EIR that is to be prepared for this project.

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES** – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which may cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)	X			
2. Sheriff protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)	X			
3. Schools? (EHS, ESD, PLN)	X			
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (EHS, ESD, PLN)	X			
5. Other governmental services? (EHS, ESD, PLN)	X			

**Discussion- Items XIII-1,2,3,4:**

The probable environmental effects of the various project elements will include an increase in the demand for fire, emergency medical and law enforcement services with the construction of additional development. There will also be an increase in student enrollment and an increased burden on public facilities with the construction of the proposed project. This increase in demand may require the provision of new or physically altered governmental services or facilities which may potentially create additional environmental impacts. The EIR for this project will include an analysis of the public service impacts and provide mitigation measures to address any additional physical impacts created as a result of the proposed project.

**Discussion- Item XIII-5:**

The Kings Beach Town Center project proposes to redevelop an existing commercial and residential site with a pedestrian friendly mixed-use development. Public facilities have been included as potential uses for the site. Parcel Three has been identified as a potential site to relocate the Tahoe Area Placer County Government Center. In addition, the applicant has proposed that a proportion of the office building on Parcel Two may potentially serve as a new County library facility. Environmental impacts associated with the potential relocation of these public facilities will be discussed and further evaluated in the EIR for this project.

**XIV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)	X			
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)			X	

**Discussion- Item XIV-1:**

The project proposes mixed-use development that includes a four-level parking structure with 417 parking spaces which will serve the uses on-site as well as potentially provide public parking for the Kings Beach State Recreation Area located south of the project. As part of the Community Enhancement Program, providing parking for public access to the State Park may allow for existing parking to be removed from the State Park. Potential recreational impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project will be discussed and evaluated in the EIR.

**Discussion- Item XIV-2:**

The project proposes 70 residential units. A fitness center is proposed within the market-rate component of the project (60 units). A central plaza is also proposed which may include an outdoor amphitheater and other community gathering spaces. The project will have no adverse physical effect on the environment, and no mitigation measures are required.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)	X			
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)	X			
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)	X			
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)	X			
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)	X			
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)	X			
7. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (ESD)	X			
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (ESD)				X

**Discussion- Items XV-1,2,3,4,6,7:**

The proposed project will result in the approval of approximately 100,000 square feet of building area for office, retail, and public service, a parking garage, and 72 residential housing units. The probable environmental effects of the various project elements include the potential for an increase in traffic volumes in relation to the existing and/or future traffic load and capacity. An increase in traffic volumes has the potential to exceed Level of Service standards established in the General and Community Plans. There may be an increase in potential hazards because of design proposals that may include construction of roadways that may not meet the current minimum County standards. Impacts may occur due to vehicle sight distance at the proposed encroachments onto existing roadways and there may be the potential for inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses and roadways. In addition, there may be a potential for inadequate parking capacity/supply and conflicts with pedestrian or bicycle uses on the proposed circulation system. Finally, a potential exists for conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation such as bus turnouts/park-and-ride lots. Potential transportation and circulation impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project will be discussed and evaluated in the EIR.

**Discussion- Item XV-5:**

The project proposes a parking structure as a component of this project. The adequacy of the parking provided on-site, the impacts of the parking being relocated from the State Beach and the utilization of transit services will be discussed and further evaluated in the EIR for this project.

**Discussion- Item XV-8:**

The project will not create changes in air traffic patterns or substantially increase the air traffic levels.

**XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)	X			
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)	X			
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)				X
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)	X			
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)	X			
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)	X			
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS)	X			

**Discussion- Items XVI-1,2,4:**

The probable environmental effects of the project include the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements due to the construction of new retail/office square footage and residential units. The project has the potential to require or result in the construction of new wastewater collection or treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities and new storm water drainage facilities. The project also has the potential to require sewer service that may not be available by the areas waste water treatment provider. The EIR for this project will include an analysis of the utility and service systems and provide mitigation measures to address any impacts.

**Discussion- Item XVI-3:**

The proposed project will not result in the construction of new on-site sewage disposal systems.

**Discussion- Items XVI-5,6:**

The project area is currently served by the North Tahoe Public Utility District for both public sewer and water services. The project proponent will include an analysis in the EIR that discusses the ability of providing sufficient water supplies to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or if new or expanded entitlements are needed.

Additionally, the EIR should discuss if there is sufficient capacity in the sewer system for the proposed project. The EIR will include in the discussion, the ability and willingness of the Truckee Tahoe Sanitary Agency and Truckee Sanitary District to serve this project in full buildout.

**Discussion- Item XVI-7:**

Solid waste in the project area is collected by Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD) and processed at the Eastern Regional Materials Facility (MRF). The MRF is owned by Placer County and operated by TTSD under contract with the County. At the MRF, recyclables are recovered and the residual waste is disposed at Lockwood Landfill in Nevada.

The EIR will provide an estimate of the amount of solid waste generated during construction and after project completion for each sector (residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional). The analysis will also calculate the percent increase in waste received over current conditions and determine if the increase in waste will significantly affect the processing capabilities of the MRF or exceed its permit limits.

If the waste generated by the project creates a potentially significant impact, mitigation measures will be required as part of the EIR (e.g. construction waste recycling and on-site recycling programs).

**E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially impact biological resources, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<b>X</b>	
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<b>X</b>	
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<b>X</b>	

**F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES** whose approval is required:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

**G. DETERMINATION** – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

The proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

**H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE** (Persons/Departments consulted):

- Planning Department, Jennifer Dzakowic, Chairperson
- Engineering and Surveying Department, Phillip A. Frantz
- Engineering and Surveying Department, Wastewater, Ed Wydra
- Department of Public Works, Transportation
- Environmental Health Services, Grant Miller
- Air Pollution Control District, Yu-Shuo Chang
- Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
- Facility Services, Parks, Vance Kimbrell
- Placer County Fire/CDF, Bob Eicholtz, Brad Albertazzi



Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date January 30, 2009  
 Gina Langford, Environmental Coordinator

**I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:**

The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

<b>County Documents</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
<b>Trustee Agency Documents</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
<b>Site-Specific Studies</b>	Planning Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____

	Engineering & Surveying Department, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parking Analysis _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Site Remediation Report _____
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	Air Pollution Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> URBEMIS Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan		
<input type="checkbox"/> _____		
Mosquito Abatement District	<input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	