Chapter 3 Affected Environment

3.1 Land Use Characteristics

The proposed project is located in Placer County on SR 28, beginning at the western edge of Kings Beach at the intersection of SR 267 and continuing east to the Chipmunk Street intersection. Situated at the northern rim of Lake Tahoe, the study area is made up of residential developments, subdivisions, commercial development, open space, forest land, and lake front areas. No cultivated farmlands are located within the project area or study area. The study area is bounded on the north by mountains and on the south by Lake Tahoe. The area west of the community is developed and includes the community of Tahoe Vista. To the east, a hilly peninsula and the Nevada state border bound the Town.

3.1.1 Major Land Uses

The proposed project area consists of a mix of commercial, recreation, and residential uses. Small- to medium-sized undeveloped parcels are interspersed with developed uses throughout the proposed project area. Additionally, the area includes Kings Beach State Recreation Area, operated by North Tahoe Public Utilities District (North Tahoe PUD), and Griff Creek. SR 28 is the main location for local businesses that include motels, restaurants, retail shops, and gas stations. Although developed, several parcels feature closed businesses, demolished buildings, and empty buildings for rent.

Land uses north of the proposed project area are primarily residential and include single- and multi-family units. The land in this area gradually begins to rise into the Sierra Nevada. Much of the land to the west of Chipmunk Street along SR 28 is flat and gently curved along the shoreline. To the east of Chipmunk Street, SR 28 begins to climb as it crosses into Nevada. Beyond Speckled Street, north of SR 28 and east of SR 267, the land is undeveloped and forested. The land to the east of Park Lane, along the eastern terminus of the project area, becomes more rugged and rises to a steep ridge that remains undeveloped and forested. As SR 28 progresses both east and west, land use remains consistently commercial and residential along the roadway.

3.1.2 Planning

Land use planning in the study area is governed by the Placer County General Plan, which comprises 10 elements. The general plan includes goals, standards, policies, implementation systems and objectives that guide growth and development in areas under the County's jurisdiction. The land use element, containing land use designations and policies guiding development in the study area was updated and revised in 1994. The existing land use plan for the Kings Beach area, found in the *Kings Beach Community Plan* was adopted by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and Placer County in 1996. Lands in the vicinity of the project area are generally designated for residential, commercial, and recreational uses (Kings Beach Community Plan 1996).

County and Community general plan policies relevant to the proposed project are described and evaluated in Chapter 4, *Environmental Consequences*.

Regional transportation planning for the area is conducted by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). TRPA also assists in planning for land use, housing, noise, natural hazards, air quality, water quality, community design, and bicycle networks.

3.1.3 Land Suitable for Development and Development Trends

The study area contains few parcels of undeveloped lots, none larger than a few acres. According to the Kings Beach Community Plan, an inventory of the downtown area in 1994 identified an approximate total of 180,000 sq. ft. of commercial floor space, 11,600 sq. ft. of professional office space, and 380 tourist accommodation units. The area was estimated to be 80 percent built out with few parcels of undeveloped acreage available. Additionally, 1.6 acres of land for use as residential, commercial, or multiple-use is available between Chipmunk and Beaver Streets.

The Kings Beach Community Plan identifies three Special Areas with individual development objectives. Special Area 1 is the downtown commercial area located along SR 28, with a land use classification of commercial/public service. Special Area 2 includes the east and west entries into the downtown area with an emphasis on commercial services for local residents. Residential uses, mainly single-family (one unit per parcel maximum) are also allowed. Special Area 3 is the State Beach area, and uses here are oriented toward outdoor recreation with limited commercial activity. The majority of the remaining area is designated as mixed residential, and goals are to upgrade existing structures and develop a more even density distribution.

3.2 Social Environment

The proposed project area is contained within the Kings Beach Census Designated Place (CDP), a geographic designation devised by the U.S. Census Bureau for compilation of data for the portion of the 7-mile wide area that is contained on the north shore of Lake Tahoe, between the Nevada State line going west to the Tahoe Vista CDP. The Kings Beach CDP defines the study area used to describe the social environment of the project. The social environment includes the neighborhood, demographics, public services and circulation characteristics of the study area.

3.2.1 Community/Neighborhood Characteristics

The proposed project area runs through the unincorporated community of Kings Beach, along North Lake Boulevard/SR 28 which parallels the north shore of Lake Tahoe. Single-family and multi-family homes are located on both sides of SR 28, but concentrated in the north side due to the proximity of the lake on the south. Kings Beach is mainly an older rustic community located immediately west of the Nevada-California state line. The community has many small, local-serving businesses along SR 28 and includes an elementary school, a fire dispatch unit, and a volunteer sheriff's department. Kings Beach State Recreation Area, a 700-ft public access beach, is also available to residents and visitors and is located off of SR 28. Residents use SR 28 to reach retail stores, medical services, and jobs located in the nearby cities of Incline Village,

and Tahoe City. Access to Truckee is found along SR 267, which intersects with SR 28 at the west end of the community.

3.2.2 Population Characteristics

According to the U.S. Census, the study area (Kings Beach CDP) had a population of approximately 4,307 in the year 2000, accounting for 1.7 percent of the 248,399 persons residing in the County. Between 1990 and 2000, the study area's population increased by 1,241 persons, or by 44.4 percent. This growth is consistent with the countywide increase of 75,603 persons (44 percent increase) in population during the same time.

No growth projections are available for the study area. According to projections prepared by Placer County (2005), the unincorporated area of the County designated as High Country, which includes the study area, is projected to grow at an annual rate slightly lower than 0.3 percent between 2000 and 2010. This rate is much lower than the annual growth rate of 3.7 percent for Kings Beach between 1990 and 2000.

As Table 3-1 shows, the demographics of the study area reflect a generally young population. Only a small number of senior citizens aged 65 or older reside in the area, accounting for only 3.4 percent of the population. By comparison, 13.1 percent of the countywide population is in this age group. Similarly, the median age of residents in the study area, 29.2, is substantially lower than the countywide median age of 38.0. The percentage of the population that is under age 18 (28.0 percent) remains similar, although slightly higher than that for the county (26.5 percent). The study area had a median household income of \$35,507 in 2000, which is significantly lower than the median incomes in Placer County and statewide (Table 3-1).

Table 3-1. Selected Demographic Characteristics: 2000 Census

Area	Population	Average Persons per Household	Median Age	Percent Under Age 18	Percent Age 65 or Older	Median Household Income
California	33,871,648	2.87	33.3	27.3	10.6	\$47,493
Placer County	248,399	2.63	38.0	26.5	13.1	\$57,535
Kings Beach	4,307	2.86	29.2	28.0	3.4	\$35,507

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

The racial characteristics of the study area, which are presented in Table 3-2, generally reflect a population that is largely white and Hispanic. With whites and Hispanics nearly equally distributed in the study area, 49.0 percent and 48.4 percent respectively, no other racial groups make up a significant portion of the area's population. While the study area is more similar in demographics to the state as a whole, it is markedly more diverse than the County, which is predominantly white. Persons of Hispanic or Latino heritage accounted for 48.0 percent of the study area's population in 2000, about five times greater than that of the County.

Table 3-2. Racial Distribution of Area Populations: 2000 Census

Area	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino of Any Race
California	46.7%	6.4%	0.5%	10.8%	0.3%	0.2%	2.7%	32.4%
Placer County	83.4%	0.8%	0.7%	2.9%	0.1%	0.1%	2.3%	9.7%
Kings Beach	49.0%	0.3%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	1.0%	48.4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

Note: Percentages for each area total to greater than 100% because persons of Hispanic or Latino heritage may be considered members of other racial classifications.

3.2.3 Population Growth Policies

While in Placer County, growth in the study area is primarily guided by the policies set forth by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). The TRPA sets Thresholds of Carrying Capacities for growth and development as an effort to preserve the environment. Population growth is not directly addressed, however other policies may affect this secondarily (Graves 2005).

3.2.4 Public Services and Facilities

Utilities

Electricity in the study area is provided by Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and Sierra Pacific Power Company. Southwest Gas provides natural gas services to residents. Telephone service is provided by AT&T. North Tahoe Public Utility District (PUD) provides sewer, water and recreation services to the communities of the north shore of Lake Tahoe, including the study area. Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal provides solid waste collection and disposal in the study area. Solid waste is first taken to the Eastern Regional Landfill where recyclable materials are diverted. Non-recyclable materials are then transferred to the Lockwood Landfill near Reno, Nevada (Placer County 2005).

Public Services

SR 28 is used as a primary route by law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency service providers to reach calls within the study area.

The Placer County Sheriff's Department provides law enforcement in the study area. The Placer County Sheriff's Kings Beach Service Center is located 8645 North Lake Boulevard, which is along the project site. The Kings Beach Service Center is managed by one full-time employee and staffed primarily with volunteers from the community. California Highway Patrol (CHP) also patrols the area and has an office and dispatch center located approximately 13 miles away in Truckee (Placer County Sheriff).

The North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD) provides fire protection and emergency ambulance services for the study area. NFTPD provides all risk emergency response through five stations and 50 employees and covers approximately 31 square miles from east of Donner Summit to and including the communities of western Nevada. Headquarters for NTFPD are

located in Tahoe City with the station closest to the study area located off the intersection of SR 267 and SR 28, less than one block north of the eastern limits of the project. While NTFPD has automated aid agreements with bordering Districts, NFTPD is capable of responding to wildland fires, structural fires, backcountry/ technical rescue, swift water rescue, and hazardous materials mitigation. Medical emergency services are also provided and patients may be treated by emergency medical technicians (EMTs) or taken by ambulance to Tahoe Forest Hospital in Truckee or the Incline Village Health Center (Dillon, 2005 pers. comm.).

3.2.5 Circulation/Access

Regional access to Kings Beach from the east and west is primarily provided by SR 28/North Lake Boulevard. SR 267 terminates at SR 28 at the westernmost edge of Kings Beach and provides access from Truckee. SR 28 /North Lake Boulevard can also be accessed from Interstate 89 and Highway 50, both south of the study area. Other roadways that terminate on SR 28 include Secline Street, Deer Street, Trout Avenue, Bear Street, Brook Street, Coon Street, Salmon Street, Fox Street, Minnow Street, and Chipmunk Street (see Figure 2-1).

Major study area access and circulation are provided by SR 28, which is the route primarily used by residents of Kings Beach to reach local businesses as well as the nearby cities of Incline Village and Tahoe City for shopping, services, and jobs. As the only roadway linking Kings Beach to other cities, SR 28 is an important evacuation route in case of fire or other emergencies, and is a key access route for emergency service providers. Immediately west of the study area, SR 28 intersects with SR 267, connecting residents to key job locations elsewhere, such as Truckee.

3.2.6 Parking

A comprehensive study of parking supply and demand in the study area was conducted in 2000 by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC 2000). This study focused on an area within one block of SR 28 between SR 267 and Chipmunk Street. Parking conditions in the study area can currently be summarized as follows:

Excluding informal parking in vacant lots and disabled-only spaces, there are approximately 1,968 parking spaces in the study area. As much of the existing parking is not formally striped, some of this parking capacity has been estimated based upon typical parking patterns during peak periods. Of this total, 1,530 are private spaces in developed lots, 202 are along the SR 28 right-of-way, and 236 are along the side streets. Of the 1,530 private spaces, 666 are associated with lodging or residential uses, and the remaining 864 are associated with commercial or public uses. In total, 1,302 spaces are available for commercial/public parking (excluding lodging and residential) on the streets or in private lots.

A comprehensive survey of parking utilization throughout the study area was conducted on Friday, August 24, 1999. This data was then factored up (based upon traffic counts on the peak day and on the day of the counts) to reflect parking conditions in a peak Saturday in August. The total number of parked vehicles in the area overall reached a maximum of 1,039 between noon and 2:00 P.M., reflecting an overall peak utilization of 53 percent. Parked vehicles exceeded the parking supply in the subarea along the south side of SR 28 between Deer and Coon Streets,

where a total of 246 vehicles were observed to be parking in an area with 202 identified spaces (with the remaining 43 vehicles parked in illegal or sub-standard spaces). Focusing only on the spaces along the SR 28 right-of-way (excluding spaces on private property accessed directly off of the highway), at the peak time 91 of the total 202 spaces were utilized. These figures do not reflect parking conditions during special events (Table 3-3). Based on a threshold of significance of 90 percent utilization of public parking spaces and estimates of maximum peak period parking demand, 142 public parking spaces are needed to meet the estimated peak period demand for parking throughout the project corridor.

Table 3-3. Evaluation of SR 28 Available On-Street Parking

	Existing	0	bserved Pa	rking Dem	and	Required		
Block (Total of Both Sides)	Public Parking Supply (# of Spaces)	10am to 12pm	12pm to 2pm	2pm to 4pm	Maximum	Parking (90% utilization)	Parking Surplus/ (Shortage)	
SR 267 to Secline	12	4	4	5	5	6	6	
Secline to Deer	29	9	9	13	13	15	15	
Deer to Bear	30	24	17	35	35	39	(9)	
Bear to Coon	33	34	22	19	34	38	(5)	
Coon to Fox	32	21	12	17	21	24	(2)	
Fox to Chipmunk	66	15	18	8	18	20	46	
Total	202	107	82	97	126	142	62	

Source: LSC 2000. Counts conducted August 20, 1999, factored up to reflect peak August Saturday conditions.

There is no similar available count data for winter parking use in Kings Beach. The summer beach use, however, is the single greatest generator of parking demand in the study area, resulting in an estimated 200 parked vehicles at peak. While winter parking supply is reduced somewhat due to snow storage, the critical parking conditions occur in summer.

3.3 Residential Environment

3.3.1 Housing Stock, Tenure, Vacancy Rates, and Housing Values

According to the 2000 Census, 2,284 housing units are located in the study area, representing only 2 percent of the county's housing stock (Table 3-3). The study area's housing stock is relatively older with 32.0 percent of houses constructed prior to 1960, compared to 14.4 percent countywide. While single-family housing units account for the largest share of the study area's housing stock (70.9 percent), it is still nearly 10 percent less than that for the County. The percentage of mobile homes in the study area is comparable to both county and statewide numbers (Table 3-4).

Table 3-4. Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000 Census

Area	Total Housing Units	Percent Vacant	Percent Single- Family Units	Percent Mobile Homes	Percent Constructed Prior to 1960	Percent Owner- Occupied	Median House Value	Median Rent
California	12,241,549	5.8%	64%	4.4%	32.6%	56.9%	\$211,500	\$677
Placer County	107,302	12.9%	79.8%	4.2%	14.4%	73.2%	\$213,900	\$687
Kings Beach	2,284	38.2%	70.9%	4.6%	32.0%	39.3%	\$202,400	\$574

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

In 2000, the study area's housing stock was composed of 39.3 percent owner occupied housing and 60.7 percent renter-occupied housing. During the Census, approximately 873 housing units were vacant within the study area, resulting in a relatively high vacancy rate of 38.2 percent. When seasonal and recreational homes were excluded, the vacancy rate fell to 18 percent. Nevertheless, it remains higher than the state and countywide percentages.

The median value of housing in the study area was approximately \$202,400 in 2000, which is lower than the median value of housing in Placer County and the state as a whole (Table 3-4). The lower value in the study area may reflect the influence of the study area's relatively low median household income (Tables 3-1 and 3-2). Similarly, median rental rates within the study area, at \$574, were also substantially lower than in Placer County (\$687) and statewide (\$677).

The style, condition, and age of housing in the project area vary substantially. Homes located along the shoreline on SR 28 tend to be larger, newer single-family or multi-family units. To the north of SR 28 and up among the side streets off of Chipmunk Street, the houses vary from newer multi-million-dollar homes, condos, and timeshares to older trailer parks and modest wood frame structures. New homes are still being constructed on vacant parcels, and home remodeling is occurring around the area.

3.4 Economic Setting

3.4.1 Tax Revenue

Property tax and sales revenues generated by private properties within the project area are received by Placer County. Parts of about 121 privately owned parcels are located along the permanent right-of-way area of the proposed project and are subject to the 1 percent property tax rate. Placer County received approximately \$332 million in property tax revenues during the 2003–2004 fiscal year (Placer County Comprehensive Financial Report 2003–2004).

Businesses along and adjacent to the project area potentially generate sales tax revenue through the sale of taxable products. The project area is also the location of nearly all businesses established in Kings Beach. Upwards of 75 businesses are located along this commercial strip, although data detailing the amount of sales tax generated from the area is not available.

3.4.2 Labor Force and Employment

According to the California Employment Development Department, which prepares labor force and employment estimates for California counties, Placer County's civilian labor force averaged 155,000 in 2004, of which 2,600 resided in Kings Beach. Unemployment in the County and study area averaged an estimated 4.5 percent and 4.6 percent, respectively in 2004.

Employment by industries located in Placer County provided 134,000 jobs in 2004. Goods producing, retail trade, services, and government are the dominant employers in Placer County. Major Employers include Alpine Meadows Ski Resort, Squaw Creek in Olympic Valley, Sutter Health in both Auburn and Roseville, Thunder Valley Casino in Rocklin, and Placer County Government in various locations but primarily in Auburn (California Employment Development Department 2005).

There is no detailed information regarding the study area's labor market, however according to the Kings Beach Community Plan, the area's overall goal is to provide an attractive resort community. This indicates a strong reliance on services such as tourist accommodations, restaurants, retail shops, boutiques, and leisure-oriented businesses in the area. Some of the local employers in the area include Safeway, Stone Country Automotive, Mobile Gas, Ace Hardware, Motel California, Crown Motel, Rite Aid, Crosswinds Café, Steamers, Dave's Ski Shop, Log Cabin Café, and CalNeva Resort and Spa. The retail and service sector of Kings Beach is located primarily along SR 28. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, approximately 37 percent of workers in Kings Beach had a commute of less than 15 minutes indicating employment in or near the community. For them and others who commuted further to areas in Tahoe City, Truckee, Incline Village, and Sacramento, the transportation and consumer access provided by SR 28 is a key aspect of the local economy.

Chapter 4 Environmental Consequences

This chapter discusses the effects of Alternatives 2 through 5 on land use, social characteristics (including environmental justice concerns), residential and commercial displacements, and economic activity in the project area and study area. Alternative 1 is the No-Build/No-Project Alternative and it is presumed that the existing conditions would persist under this alternative and that there would be no environmental consequences associated with Alternative 1.

4.1 Alternative 2

Alternative 2, as described in detail in Chapter 2, *Description of Alternatives* would create two roundabouts and have three lanes, with an option of reducing the sidewalk width on both sides by 0.6 m (2 ft). This 0.6m (2 ft) would be added to the parking and bike lane width throughout the project. This option would be constructed to reduce the affect of the on-street parking to through traffic. Parking, bicycle lanes, and sidewalks are included as part of this alternative. Additionally, the six intersections from SR 267 to Chipmunk Street would be improved to allow for greater pedestrian access and use. There would be no difference in impacts between Alternative 2 and its option, as the changes to the sidewalk, bike lane, and landscape will occur within the right-of-way and will not affect any adjacent properties or parking.

4.1.1 Land Use Impacts

Land use impacts evaluated in the following sections include direct and indirect conflicts with existing and planned uses, growth inducement impacts, and consistency with Placer County and Kings Beach general plans.

Conflicts with Existing Land Uses

Implementation of Alternative 2 would directly affect existing land uses in the project area by permanently displacing residential and commercial land uses. Indirect impacts associated with temporary construction-related impacts could also occur in specific portions of the project area.

Potential displacements are analyzed in detail in the Draft Relocation Impact Statement prepared for the project alternatives (Appendix A). The right-of-way would be acquired under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1979, as amended.

Direct Land Use Impacts

Land acquisitions required for Alternative 2 would affect an estimated 145 parcels, including 24 with residential uses, 97 with commercial businesses, and 24 with no developed residential or commercial land uses (including the Kings Beach State Recreation and Griff Creek parcels). Direct land use impacts would be limited to acquisitions of a few feet of frontage of property located along SR 28.

Impacts from Partial Acquisitions

Partial acquisitions under Alternative 2 would be required from 41 properties. Most of these acquisitions would consist of sliver or corner takes from parcels adjacent to the existing SR 28 right-of-way and would not result in substantial effects on existing land uses, but four acquisitions would displace uses within the existing or proposed new right-of-way. The size of the acquisitions for the affected parcels would be limited to a few feet. The following is a summary of the potential impacts on the parcels that would be most affected by partial acquisitions under Alternative 2. Sheets 1, 3 and 4 depict the anticipated acquisitions.

- **APN 117-180-007/117-180-006 (Sheet 1):** Vehicular access from SR 28 to the commercial building located at 8001 and 8011 SR 28 may be affected by this alternative. Patrons of Stone's Automotive would have to access the parking lot from SR 267, as entry along SR 28 may be discontinued.
- **APN 090-071-026/090-071-025 (Sheet 1):** The commercial property located at 8079 SR 28 would lose areas south and south-west of the building that is used by customers as a parking area. Loss of this area would require customers to access parking along Secline Street or along the proposed parking lane further east on SR 28.
- **APN 090-123-023 (Sheet 3):** SR 28 improvements along this property, currently a 7-Eleven, would restructure the area of the intersection such that vehicular access would no longer be available from SR 28. Access would be provided from Coon Street and two parking spaces would be displaced due to the widening of this entry. However, the parking lot would be created such that 6 additional spaces would be made available for customers.
- **APN 090-142-002 (Sheet 4):** May lose vehicle access along SR 28. No break in the sidewalk is planned for the parcel, and access may be entirely pedestrian. Nearby breaks in front of APNs 090-142-001 and 090-142-024 may serve as alternative points of entry.

In addition to this impact, right-of-way acquisition and roadway improvements would result in reduced setbacks and landscaping impacts on the remaining parcels along SR 28. While small portions of some existing structures encroach on the current right-of-way, this alternative would not displace any residences or buildings.

Full Acquisitions

Under Alternative 2, the right-of-way proposed for the SR 28 improvements would not require full acquisitions of any parcels.

Indirect Land Use Impacts

In addition to direct land use impacts, implementation of Alternative 2 would result in temporary and permanent indirect land use impacts. The impacts would potentially include increased traffic congestion, slower traffic speeds, diverted traffic, access changes, parking changes, and visual changes in the area adjacent to the project area. Indirect short-term impacts could result from construction activities, which would generate temporary air quality impacts (such as diesel fumes and dust) and noise from heavy equipment operations. These impacts are discussed in detail in the Air Quality Technical Report, Noise Study Report, Commercial Core Parking Study, and Traffic Report for this project.

Narrowing SR 28 and constructing sidewalks, roundabouts, and bike and parking lanes would also result in permanent changes in the visual character of the area, which would have the greatest affect on residents living in neighborhoods immediately adjacent to SR 28.

Construction of the project could also temporarily disrupt traffic circulation patterns on SR 28 and at its intersections with SR 267, Secline Street, Deer Street, Bear Street, Coon Street, Fox Street, and Chipmunk Street. Temporary effects could include increased congestion on SR 28 and on roads intersecting with SR 28 during construction, and disrupted access to businesses along SR 28. Access could also be disrupted to homes located north and south of SR 28 between SR 267 and Chipmunk Street.

To the extent possible, access to homes and businesses would be maintained during construction, with access affected for a few hours at a time. One-lane traffic control for both directions would be used during construction operations. During construction of the roundabouts, it may be necessary to use one lane for both directions overnight using portable traffic signals. Throughout construction, emergency vehicle access would be maintained for public safety.

Businesses and residences affected by construction activities would be notified at least 1 week in advance of any lane or roadway closures and impacts related to access. Personnel from emergency response services such as fire and police protection would also be notified 1–2 weeks in advance of any lane or roadway closures so that alternative routes or response actions could be taken. A traffic management plan (TMP) would be developed and implemented to control traffic during construction.

Conflicts with Planned Land Uses

No conflicts with planned uses have been identified for parcels directly affected by the proposed project.

Growth Inducement Impacts

Growth rates and patterns are influenced by various local, regional, and national forces that reflect ongoing social, economic, and technological changes. Ultimately, the amount and location of population growth and economic development that occurs in a specific area is controlled, to some extent, by local and county governments through zoning, land use plans and policies, and decisions regarding development applications. Local government and other regional, state, and federal agencies also make decisions about infrastructure (such as roads, water facilities, and sewage facilities) that may influence growth rates and the location of future development.

Transportation infrastructure is one component of the overall infrastructure that may serve to accommodate planned growth. This infrastructure may also serve to hasten or shift planned growth, or encourage and intensify unplanned growth in an area. Transportation projects may induce growth when they directly or indirectly promote, hasten, shift, or intensify planned growth or encourage unplanned growth in a community or region. Examples of growth-inducing transportation projects include construction of a new interchange on an existing freeway, which could shift and encourage growth in the vicinity of the new interchange, or construction of a new roadway through an undeveloped area, which could promote unplanned growth.

Because the proposed project does not create new roadways or increase capacity on existing roadways, it is not expected to induce growth either through hastening planned growth or promoting unplanned growth.

Consistency with Local and Regional Plans and Policies

The following section contains an evaluation of Alternative 2's consistency with plans and policies adopted by the Town, County, and TRPA.

Kings Beach Community Plan

The County and TRPA adopted the *Kings Beach General Plan* in 1996. The following goals, objectives, and policies from the community plan apply specifically to the project.

3B-1: Provide a safe and efficient transportation system for the residents of the Kings Beach area and others who use the system.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would improve the safety and efficiency of transportation for Kings Beach residents and others. The proposed project is considered to be consistent with Objective 3B-1.

3B-1a: The level of service on major roadways (i.e. arterial and collector routes as defined by Placer County) shall be LOS D, and signalized intersections shall be at LOS D (Level of Service E may be acceptable during peak periods, not to exceed four hours per day).

Alternative 2 includes two roundabouts located at the intersections of SR 28/Bear Street and SR 28/ Coon Street, which are both projected to operate at LOS B in 2028. At the intersection of SR 28/SR 267 the stoplight is projected to operate at LOS F in 2028, although implementation of Mitigation Measure T-3, described in the Traffic Report, would reduce this impact to less than significant. Roadway LOS, however, would not meet the LOS D standard in both 2008 and 2028 projections. Alternative 2 is therefore considered to be inconsistent with Policy 3B-1a.

3B-1b: Provide for the various functions currently accommodated in the public right-of-ways (e.g., through vehicle traffic, parking search, pedestrian activity, bicyclist activity, and parking).

Alternative 2 allows for currently accommodated functions of SR 28 while improving pedestrian and bicycle use. Parking elements are still considered and parking lanes are included as part of Alternative 2. Thus, Alternative 2 is considered to be consistent with Policy 3B-1b.

3B-1c: Implement a parking management program that provides: adequate parking, limits traffic, considers connections between parking lots, encourages community parking lots, and complements traffic.

With mitigation identified in Chapter 5, parking lots would effectively replace some or all of existing on-street parking. Detailed planning of replacement parking lots will incorporate the items identified in this policy. Thus, Alternative 2 is considered to be consistent with Policy 3B-1c.

3B-1d: When designing transportation improvements, consider traffic calming strategies such as alternate truck routes, speed reductions on State Route 28, entry features, highlighted pedestrian cross walks, etc.

The design of Alternative 2 calls for a decrease in the number of lanes from 4 to 3 as well as the addition of roundabouts at the intersections of SR 28/Bear Street and SR 28/Coon Street. Both of these elements are expected to slow and calm traffic along SR 28. Additionally, the inclusion of highlighted crosswalks, as planned in Alternative 2, would add to this effect. Therefore, Alternative 2 is considered to be consistent with Policy 3B-1d.

3B-5: The Plan should develop sidewalks along both sides of State Route 28 and local commercial streets. This includes landscaping, lighting, trash receptacles and bicycle racks.

Alternative 2 does include plans to install sidewalks along both sides of SR 28. Included in the design are plans for landscaping, lighting and other pedestrian-oriented features. Alternative 2 is considered to be consistent with Policy 3B-5.

3B-5a: Implement a program through review of projects or preferably through improvement districts that provides for the street improvements.

Alternative 2 is one of five alternatives considered for SR 28 improvement. Therefore, Alternative 2 is considered to be consistent with Policy 3B-5a.

Placer County General Plan

The nine elements of the *Placer County General Plan* were revised in 1994. The following goals, objectives, and policies from the Transportation and Circulation element apply specifically to the project.

Goal 3A: To provide for the long term planning and development of the County's roadway system to ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would improve the safety, efficiency, and traffic flow of SR 28 through Kings Beach between the intersections of SR 28/ SR 267 and SR 28 / Chipmunk Street. The proposed project is considered to be consistent with Transportation and Circulation Goal 3A.

- 3.A3: The County shall require that roadway rights-of way be wide enough to accommodate the travel lanes needed to carry long-range forecasted traffic volumes (beyond 2010), as well as any planned bikeways and required drainage, utilities, landscaping, and suitable separations.
- 3.A.10: The County's level of service standards for the State highway system shall be no worse than those adopted in the Placer County Congestion Management Program (CMP).
- 3.A.15: Placer County shall participate with other jurisdictions and Caltrans in the planning and programming of improvements to the State Highway system, in accordance with state and federal transportation planning and programming procedures, so as to maintain acceptable levels of service for Placer County residents on all State Highways in the County.

The proposed project is included in the adopted 2004 TRPA's *Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Transportation Plan, 2004–2027* (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 2004). Appendix A of the regional transportation plan identifies the proposed project as WQ-24: SR 28/Kings Beach curb, gutter, water collection and treatment, bicycle lanes, and landscaping/lighting.

Additionally, TRPA dictates that community plans will be adopted only after review to ensure compliance with standards set forth by the agency. The Kings Beach Community Plan was reviewed and adopted in 1996; therefore, the elements, goal, and policies contained within the community plan correspond to those established by TRPA.

4.1.2 Social Impacts

Population Impacts

There are no identified population impacts resulting from the project.

Community Cohesion Impacts

According to Caltrans guidelines for conducting community impact assessments (California Department of Transportation 1997), community cohesion is the degree to which residents have a sense of belonging to their neighborhood; a level of commitment of the residents of the community; or a strong attachment to neighbors, groups, or institutions, usually because of continued association over time. Physical barriers, such as major roadways or large open space areas, often delineate communities.

Cohesive communities are indicated by specific social characteristics, such as long average lengths of residency, home ownership, frequent personal contact, ethnic homogeneity, high levels of community activity, and shared goals. Transportation projects may divide cohesive neighborhoods when such projects act as physical barriers or are perceived as psychological barriers by residents. A transportation project perceived as a physical or psychological barrier may isolate one portion of a homogeneous neighborhood. (California Department of Transportation 1997)

Within the study area, SR 28 serves as a corridor that connects Kings Beach to surrounding communities and also provides commercial access for residents and tourists. Most homes and neighborhoods along SR 28 in the project area are located north of the roadway. Residents of these neighborhoods use vehicles to reach commercial centers or homes along SR 28, but improvements would create more pedestrian friendly access. The SR 28 roadway would be slightly narrowed and include bike lanes, pedestrian cross walks, and sidewalks, which would serve to reduce the existing physical barrier that separates the opposite sides of the commercial strip from the surrounding neighborhoods.

Access and Circulation Impacts

Operation-related traffic effects associated with the project are discussed in the traffic report prepared for the proposed project (LSC Transportation Consultants, 2003). Construction-related access issues are discussed above in the "Indirect Land Use Impacts" section. On a local and regional level, Alternative 2 would improve access and circulation in the study area by slowing

traffic on SR 28 and improving pedestrian safety along the roadway and major intersections in the project area.

In addition to the beneficial access and circulation effects of the project, minor adverse impacts on residential and commercial access could result from improvements to SR 28.

- Under Alternative 2, traffic volumes are predicted to exceed roadway capacity along SR 28 by 2028 resulting in increased traffic volumes on residential streets. This increase in traffic would exceed the Placer County standard of 2,000 average daily trips.
- Vehicular access from SR 28 to the commercial building located at 8001 and 8011 SR 28 may be impacted by this alternative. Patrons of Stone's Automotive (APN 117-180-007/117-180-006) would have to access the parking lot from SR 267; however, entry along SR 28 may be discontinued.
- The commercial property located at 8079 SR 28 (APN 090-071-026/090-071-025) would lose areas south and southwest of the building that is used by customers as a parking area. Loss of this area would require customers to access parking along Secline Street or along the proposed parking lane further east on SR 28.
- Vehicular access from the south side of the building on APN 090-123-023 (7-Eleven) would be affected, however access would continue to be provided on the southeast side of the building from Coon Street. The construction of this access area would displace parking spaces in front of the building, although additional spaces would be created with the closure of the SR 28 entrance.
- APN 090-142-002 (Sheet 4) may lose vehicular access along SR 28. No break in the sidewalk is planned for the parcel, and access may be entirely pedestrian. Nearby breaks in front of APNs 090-142-001 and 090-142-024 may serve as alternative points of entry.

Parking Impacts

Under Alternative 2, parking impacts would include both public and private properties located along SR 28 (Table 4-1). While Alternative 2 provides for on-street parking lanes along both sides of SR 28, parking would be prohibited during the summer season. This would eliminate 202 parking spaces located on public property along SR 28 during the summer.

Alternative 2 would also reduce access to existing perpendicular and angled parking spaces on private property currently accessed directly off of the state highway. While individual properties would generally be provided with curb cuts to access full driveways, many existing spaces accessed directly off of the highway would be effectively eliminated. A net loss of 78 private spaces would result from the implementation of Alternative 2.

Table 4-1. Alternative 2 Parking Impacts

			Private	T. (.) D. (1)			
Road Segment	Existing Spaces	Planned Spaces	Spaces Eliminated	Demand	Parking Shortfall	Spaces Eliminated	Total Parking Shortfall
SR267 to Secline	12	0	12	6	6	0	6
Secline to Deer	29	0	29	15	15	17	32
Deer to Bear	30	0	30	39	39	22	61
Bear to Coon	33	0	33	38	38	6	44
Coon to Fox	32	0	32	24	24	24	48
Fox to Chipmunk	66	0	66	20	20	9	29
Total	202	0	202	142	142	78	220

Source: LSC 2000.

Most businesses in Kings Beach utilize the un-sidewalked areas along SR 28 as unofficial parking spaces. While these spaces are usually limited in size, accommodating 2 to 3 vehicles, several properties would be more severely affected. These properties include:

- APN 090-071-026 / 090-071-025. The right-of-way acquisition for this intersection of SR 28/ Secline Street would affect parking along the south and southwest of the commercial building located on the parcel. Parking spaces, primarily used by customers and employees, would be displaced. This would reduce but not eliminate parking for the ACE Hardware store. The economic impact would be small even without replacement parking, however the available parking would be reduced from 11 spaces to 6 spaces, which could cause a loss of business if nearby replacement parking is not made available.
- APN 090-072-023/090-072-024. SR 28 improvements and right-of-way acquisition would displace the entire amount of parking used by customers of the business located at 8160 SR 28. The five available spaces in front of the Crosswinds café would be removed. This would be a potentially major economic impact on the business if replacement parking is not located within one block of the restaurant.
- APN 090-080-001/090-080-002. The right-of-way acquisitions would displace parking spaces in front of the commercial building located at 8338 SR 28. These spaces make up the entire amount of parking available for the building. There are three businesses located in this building: Jason's T-shirts & swim, Dana Sports and Ski, and Inside outfitters. Loss of street-side parking would have a negative effect on these businesses, however there is some parking on the side of the building and there is a large parking lot behind the building. If customers were allowed to use the parking behind the building the impact on the businesses would be minor. If customers are not allowed to use the lot behind the building, replacement parking would need to be located within a block of the businesses to avoid a major impact on the businesses.
- APN 090-075-018. SR 28 improvements would affect the entire area that currently serves as parking for customers of the business located at 8345 SR 28. Parking spaces would be displaced by the installation of the sidewalk area. The five available spaces in front of Las Panchitas café would be removed. This would be a potentially major economic impact on the business if replacement parking is not located within one block of the restaurant. It

appears that access to the restaurant would be maintained from SR 28 and that there is space at the back of the building along Trout Avenue that could be used as replacement parking. This would likely require eliminating access from Trout Avenue.

As shown in Table 4-1, the maximum number of parking spaces eliminated by Alternative 2 would be 280. This loss of parking results in a net shortfall of 142 public parking spaces and 78 private parking spaces for a total shortfall of 220 spaces. Thus, implementation of Alternative 2 would result in inadequate parking along SR 28. See Chapter 5 for a discussion of mitigation measures.

Public Services and Facilities Impacts

Utilities

No impacts on utilities are anticipated as a result of implementing Alternative 2 of this project.

Law Enforcement, Fire Protection, and Emergency Medical Services

As noted above in the "Indirect Land Use Impacts" section, travel on SR 28 could be temporarily disrupted during project construction, including short-term closures and one-lane traffic controls of SR 28 between SR 267 and Chipmunk Street. Roadway closures and traffic controls could periodically affect response times for law enforcement and emergency services providers during construction periods, although emergency vehicle access would be maintained for public safety. To limit impacts on emergency service providers, personnel from emergency response services such as fire and police protection would be notified 1–2 weeks in advance of any lane or roadway closures so that alternative routes or response actions can be taken. Notification and providing continued access on SR 28 should ensure that response times for emergency service providers are not significantly affected during construction periods.

Once SR 28 improvements have been completed, response times within the study area should be better than existing times because of improved operations of SR 28.

Environmental Justice Effects

The project has been developed in accordance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; the Uniform Relocation and Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended; and Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*. Executive Order 12898 requires each federal agency to take the appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.

Environmental justice refers to the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. The Council on Environmental Quality's *Draft Guidance for Environmental Justice* (May 24, 1996) indicates that environmental justice concerns may arise from impacts on the natural or physical environment, such as human health or ecological impacts on minority and low-income populations, or from related social or economic impacts (California Department of Transportation 1997).

An evaluation of data from the 2000 U.S. Census (U.S. Census Bureau 2000) indicates that the income and racial characteristics of the study area are markedly dissimilar to those of Placer County, with the study area comprising a proportionally larger minority population than found in Placer County (Table 3-2). Median household income in the study area is significantly lower than in Placer County (Table 3-1). Additionally, the study area has a much larger percentage (17.7 percent) of its population living below the poverty level than the percentage countywide (5.8 percent). Based on this data and field observations, it is likely that the project would have impacts on minority or low-income populations; however, the effects are largely beneficial. Improved safety for pedestrians and bicyclists along SR 28 serves residents who may rely on transportation other than vehicular. Furthermore, construction- and operations-related effects of the project would occur along the length of the commercial corridor, with effects generally spread evenly across all populations residing near the project area.

As shown in Table 44 of the Traffic Report, Alternative 2 would result in cut-through traffic on neighborhood streets that would exceed the Placer County standard of 2,000 average daily trips (LSC 2005). Alternative 2 would have beneficial effects on the community of Kings Beach as a whole, but would have localized effects associated with cut-through traffic. Because both the benefits and adverse effects of the project are local, the analysis of environmental justice effects of the project should be based on local demographics. If the localized effects associated with cut-through traffic impact a disproportionately high percentage of minorities or low-income families relative to the overall Kings Beach community, then Alternative 2 may be considered to have environmental justice concerns. The predicted cut-through traffic associated with Alternative 2 in 2028 would affect the residential area west of Bear Street to SR 267 between Speckled Avenue and SR 28 as well as the residential area around the Fox Street/Minnow Avenue intersection.

The finest level of census data on race that is available is "block" data. The finest level of census data on income that is available is "block group" data. Block group data does not provide sufficiently detailed information to analyze the income characteristics of the areas affected by cut-through traffic; therefore, the following analysis of environmental justice effects is based strictly on a comparison of the racial characteristics of the affected population with the characteristics of the Kings Beach community as a whole.

Table 4-2 shows the racial characteristics of the census blocks in the area affected by cut-through traffic associated with Alternative 2 in 2028. Table 4-2 provides a comparison of the racial characteristics of the affected area and the community of Kings Beach. As shown in Table 4-3, the racial characteristics of the affected area and of the community as a whole are generally similar. The affected area has a slightly higher percentage of minorities than the Kings Beach community; however, the difference is not significant. Therefore, the impacts associated with cut-through traffic discussed above would not result in disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects on minorities.

Table 4-2. Racial Characteristics of the Affected Area

Census Block	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino of Any Race
1004	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	52
1005	21	4	2	0	0	0	0	38
1006	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2002	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2003	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
2004	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2005	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
2006	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
2007	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2008	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Affected Area	85	4	2	1	0	0	3	102
Percent of total	43.1%	2.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	51.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

Table 4-3. Comparison of Racial Characteristics of the Affected Area and Kings Beach

Area	White	Black or African American	American Indian or Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino of Any Race
Kings Beach	49.0%	0.3%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	1.0%	48.4%
Affected Area	43.1%	2.0%	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	51.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000.

4.1.3 Relocation Impacts

No residential or commercial displacements requiring relocation are anticipated for Alternative 2.

4.1.4 Economic Impacts

The economic impacts of Alternative 2 include potential tax revenue impacts, business impacts, and construction-related economic impacts.

Local Tax Revenue Impacts

The total amount of area regarded as partial acquisitions of privately owned properties required for Alternative 2 is of such insignificance that property tax revenues currently being generated by these properties for the Town, County, and other local agencies would not be reduced. Because no retail commercial uses would be fully displaced by the proposed project, the project is not anticipated to cause changes in sales tax revenues for the Town or County.

Alternative 2 would not displace any residential property and therefore not result in losses in property tax revenue for the Town or County

Local and Roadside Business Impacts

Under Alternative 2, right-of-way acquisition and changes in access and parking could cause impacts on businesses located adjacent to SR 28 between SR 267 and Chipmunk Street. An estimated 2.7-m (9-ft) area for sidewalk construction would be needed along SR 28 and properties most impacted by this do not currently have a buffer between their buildings and the roadway or they use this area for parking. The access, parking and parcel impacts on these businesses, which are summarized below, were discussed in more detail above in the "Access and Circulation," "Parking Impacts," and "Land Use" sections of this chapter.

Alternative 2 would result in the following impacts on businesses in the study area:

- Improvements at the intersection of SR 28/ SR 267 would displace a portion of parking lot area on the corner of APN 117-180-007. The commercial building of Stone's Automotive uses this area as part of its parking lot. No parking would be displaced, but a loss of a portion of the lot would decrease the space available for vehicles to maneuver through the lot. Access change may also be imposed on the business, as entry along SR 28 may no longer be provided. However, entry along SR 267 would be maintained and so these changes should not create major problems for the business.
- Vehicular access from the south side of the building on APN 090-123-023 (7-Eleven) would be affected, however access would continue to be provided on the southeast side of the building from Coon Street. The construction of this access area would displace 2 parking spaces in front of the building, although 7 additional spaces would be created with the closure of the SR 28 entrance.
- As described in "Access and Circulation," APN 090-142-002 may lose vehicle access along SR 28. This parcel currently has no existing buildings, and as such the severity of impacts depends on the future use of this property.
- APN 090-071-026/090-071-025 would lose parking spaces as discussed in "Parking Impacts." Although access is also being discontinued from SR 28, these impacts are not anticipated to affect the operation of the businesses at this location.
- SR 28 improvements and right-of way acquisition would displace the entire amount of parking used by customers of the business located at 8160 SR 28 (APNs 090-072-023/090-072-024).
- 8338 SR 28 (APNs 090-080-001/090-080-002) would lose parking spaces due to right-of-way acquisitions. These spaces make up the entire amount of parking available for the retail businesses in this building (see "Parking Impacts" section above).
- Total loss of front parking is likely to occur at 8345 SR 28 (APN 090-075-018). Parking would be displaced by the installation of the sidewalk area (see "Parking Impacts" section above).

Construction-Related Economic Impacts

The construction of proposed improvements for Alternative 2 would have temporary economic effects in the local area and region. One temporary effect would be the increase in economic activity due to project-related spending. This would include the purchases of goods and services

required for construction and employment of workers needed for construction. The increased economic activity would prompt secondary economic activity as a portion of the construction-related revenue and employee compensation is respent in sectors throughout the local and regional economy. The extent of the economic impact of construction-related expenditures on the local and regional economy would depend on the proportion of construction expenditures that would occur in the local and regional area and on the residential location of persons employed by construction contractors.

A separate temporary economic effect would be a decrease in economic activity due to decreased tourism. As outlined in the 2003 study The Economic Significance of Travel to the North Lake Tahoe Area, tourism generates 70 percent of jobs and over \$17 million dollars in taxes in the North Lake Tahoe area. This heavy reliance on tourism can be easily affected by accessibility and transportation changes leading into and around the project area. Because SR 28 is a main corridor within the project area, the secondary economic impacts that could occur during construction periods are related to tourism. Access changes, parking disruptions and traffic delays could discourage visitors and decrease local tax revenues and sales within the project area. The extent of the economic impact of the construction-related decrease in tourist volumes on the local and regional economy would depend on the length and season of the construction period and the construction timing of other related projects. To reduce this potentially significant impact to less than significant levels, the implementation of a Community Involvement and Participation Plan (CIPP) and Traffic Management Plan is recommended. These measures would act to spread awareness about the proposed project and coordinate efforts in order to minimize impacts during construction. In addition, the cumulative effects of construction related projects on major routes of travel in the greater project area are discussed in Section 4.8, "Cumulative Impacts," in this chapter.

4.2 Alternative 3

As described in Chapter 2, *Description of Alternatives*, Alternative 3 would maintain SR 28 as a 4-lane road without the inclusion of roundabouts. Sidewalks, bike lanes, and parking lanes are planned along SR 28 in both directions. Additionally, the 6 intersections from SR 267 to Chipmunk Street would be improved to allow for greater pedestrian access and use.

4.2.1 Land Use Impacts

Conflicts with Existing Land Uses

Implementation of Alternative 3 would directly affect existing land uses in the project area by permanently displacing portions of commercial land uses. Indirect impacts associated with temporary construction-related impacts could also occur in specific portions of the project area.

The right-of-way would be acquired under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1979, as amended.

Direct Land Use Impacts

Land acquisitions required for Alternative 3 are similar to those described for Alternative 2 with the exceptions described below. Direct land use impacts would be limited to acquisitions of a few feet of frontage from property located along SR 28.

Impacts from Partial Acquisitions

Partial acquisitions under Alternative 3 would be required from two additional properties. These acquisitions consist of frontage or corner takes from parcels adjacent to the existing SR 28 right-of-way and would not result in substantial effects on existing land uses. The estimated size of the acquisitions for affected parcels would be limited to a few feet.

With the following exceptions, the direct land use impacts resulting from partial acquisitions under Alternative 3 would be similar to those described for Alternative 2, although effects on setbacks and landscaping for specific parcels could vary slightly because of differences in amounts of property required for the proposed right-of-way under Alternative 3. Following is a summary of the major differences in land use impacts between the two alternatives for the parcels most affected by the proposed project. Sheet 10 depicts the anticipated acquisitions.

- **APN 090-123-008 (Sheet 10):** SR 28 improvements would not create a break in the pavement directly in front of the building resulting in a change of access for customers of this business.
- **APN 090-123-023 (Sheet 10):** SR 28 improvements would not require the parking lot restructuring and access change required under Alternative 2. Under this alternative, only a small amount of frontage take would be necessary to create the corner sidewalk in front of the business located at 8593 SR 28.
- APN 090-135-030 (Sheet 10): SR 28 improvements along the area between the Kings Beach State Recreation Area and its parking lot would create a pedestrian entry and require a larger amount of frontage than under Alternative 2.

As described for Alternative 2, right-of-way acquisition and roadway improvements under Alternative 3 would result in reduced setbacks and landscaping impacts on the remaining parcels along SR 28. And while small portions of some existing structures encroach on the current right-of-way, this alternative would not displace any residences or buildings.

Full Acquisitions

Under Alternative 3, there would be no requirement for full acquisition of any parcels.

Consistency with Local and Regional Plans and Policies

Consistency with local and regional plans and policies for Alternative 3 would be identical to Alternative 2 with one exception:

3B-1a: The level of service on major roadways (i.e. arterial and collector routes as defined by Placer County) shall be LOS D, and signalized intersections shall be at LOS D (Level of Service E may be acceptable during peak periods, not to exceed four hours per day).

Under Alternative 3, roadway LOS is expected to meet the LOS D standard in both the 2008 and 2028 projections. Alternative 3 includes traffic signals located at the intersections of SR 28/Bear Street and SR 28/ Coon Street, which are both projected to operate at LOS C in 2008. However, at the intersection of SR 28/SR 267 the stoplight is projected to operate at LOS F in 2028. Implementation of Mitigation Measure T-3, described in the Traffic Report, would reduce this impact to less than significant. Alternative 3 is therefore considered to be consistent with Policy 3B-1a.

Access and Circulation Impacts

The construction- and operations-related changes in access and circulation resulting from Alternative 3 would be similar to those described for Alternative 2, with the following exceptions:

- No significant diversion of traffic onto residential streets would occur under this alternative in both 2008 and 2028.
- The existing entry to the Jenkin's Building (APN 090-123-008) would be discontinued in this alternative. No break in the sidewalk is planned for the parcel, and access may be entirely pedestrian along SR 28. Nearby breaks in front of APNs 090-123-010 and 090-123-023 may serve as alternative points of entry.
- Right-of-way acquisition from the business located at 8593 SR 28 (7-Eleven) would not result in access or parking changes proposed under Alternative 2. Instead, access would remain available along SR 28 and Coon Street and no parking would be affected. Corner frontage take would be the only impact under Alternative 3.

Parking Impacts

Unlike Alternative 2, the on-street parking lanes would be provided year round under Alternative 3 such that parking impacts would be similar to those described for Alternative 2, with the following exceptions:

- The anticipated parking impact on APN 090-123-023 under Alternative 2 would not occur under Alternative 3.
- The total anticipated loss of parking on public and private property under Alternative 3 is expected to equal 172 spaces (Table 4-4).

Table 4-4. Alternative 3 Parking Impacts

			Public			Private	Total Parking
Road Segment	Existing Spaces	Planned Spaces	Spaces Eliminated	Demand	Parking Shortfall (Surplus)	Spaces Eliminated	Shortfall (Surplus)
SR267 to Secline	12	15	-3	6	(9)	0	(9)
Secline to Deer	29	18	11	15	(3)	17	14
Deer to Bear	30	22	8	39	17	22	39
Bear to Coon	33	22	11	38	16	6	22
Coon to Fox	32	8	24	24	16	24	40
Fox to Chipmunk	66	23	43	20	(3)	9	6
Total	202	108	94	142	34	78	112

Source: LSC 2000.

While less than the loss expected under Alternative 2, this loss of parking results in a net shortfall of 34 public parking spaces and 78 private parking spaces for a net shortfall of 112 spaces. Thus, implementation of Alternative 3 would potentially result in inadequate parking along SR 28.

4.2.2 Relocation Impacts

As under Alternative 2, the right-of-way required for Alternative 3 would not displace any existing structures.

4.2.3 Economic Impacts

Local and Roadside Business Impacts

Under Alternative 3, impacts on businesses in the project area caused by changes in setbacks, access, and parking would be the same as those described for Alternative 2, with the following exceptions:

- The business located at 8593 SR 28 (APN 090-123-023) would not be affected as described under Alternative 2. This alternative creates no change on the existing parcel other than a small corner frontage take.
- The existing entry to the Jenkin's Building (APN 090-123-008) would be discontinued in this alternative. No break in the sidewalk is planned for the parcel, and access may be entirely pedestrian along SR 28. However, entry in front of APNs 090-123-010 and 090-123-023 would be maintained so these changes should not create major problems for businesses located in this building.

4.3 Alternative 4

As described in Chapter 2, *Description of Alternatives*, Alternative 4 would be identical to Alternative 2 with the exception of the parking lanes. Alternative 4 would omit the parking lanes in favor of widening the sidewalk area.

4.3.1 Land Use Impacts

Conflicts with Existing Land Uses

Implementation of Alternative 4 would directly affect existing land uses in the project area by permanently displacing portions of commercial land uses. Indirect impacts associated with temporary construction-related impacts could also occur in specific portions of the project area.

The right-of-way would be acquired under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1979, as amended.

Direct Land Use Impacts

Land acquisitions required for Alternative 4 are similar to those described for Alternative 2, with a few exceptions described below. Direct land use impacts would be limited to acquisitions of a few feet of frontage from property located along SR 28.

Impacts from Partial Acquisitions

Partial acquisitions under Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 with two exceptions. These acquisitions would consist of frontage or corner takes from parcels adjacent to the existing SR 28 right-of-way and would not result in substantial effects on existing land uses, but would displace uses within the existing or proposed new right-of-way. The estimated size of the acquisitions for affected parcels would differ from Alternative 2 by no more than a few feet.

The direct land use impacts resulting from partial acquisitions under Alternative 4 would be similar to those described for Alternative 2, although effects on landscaping for specific parcels could vary slightly because of differences in the proposed right-of-way under Alternative 4. Following is a summary of the major differences in land use impacts between the two alternatives for the parcels most affected by the proposed project. Sheets 15 and 17 depict the anticipated acquisitions.

- Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 090-071-029 (Sheet 15): SR 28 improvements would implement a right-of-way acquisition that would change access to the business located at 8299 SR 28.
- **APN 090-134-029** (Sheet 17): Under this alternative, SR 28 improvements would create a single break in the pavement front of the business located at 8700 SR 28 (as opposed to two under Alternative 2) that would result in a change of access for customers of this business.

As described for Alternative 2, right-of-way acquisition and roadway improvements under Alternative 4 would result in reduced setbacks and fencing and landscaping impacts on the remaining parcels along SR 28. And while small portions of some existing structures encroach on the current right-of-way, this alternative will not displace any residences or buildings.

Full Acquisitions

Under Alternative 4, there would be no requirement for full acquisition of any parcels.

Indirect Land Use Impacts

The indirect air quality and noise impacts of Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2, as described in the "Indirect Land Use Impacts" section for Alternative 2 and as discussed in the project Air Quality Technical Report and Noise Study Report.

Consistency with Local and Regional Plans and Policies

Consistency with local and regional plans and policies for Alternative 4 would be identical to those described for Alternative 2.

4.3.2 Social Impacts

Population Impacts

Under Alternative 4, residential displacements and population impacts would be the same as those described for Alternative 2.

Community Cohesion Impacts

The community cohesion effects of Alternative 4 would be the same as those described for Alternative 2.

Access and Circulation Impacts

The construction- and operations-related changes in access and circulation resulting from Alternative 4 would be identical to those described for Alternative 2, with the exception of impacts on APNs 090-071-029 and 090-134-029.

- The existing entry along SR 28 to Dave's Ski Shop and Tahoe's Paddle and Oar (APN 090-071-029) would be discontinued in this alternative. No break in the sidewalk is planned for the parcel and access may be entirely pedestrian along SR 28. Access would be maintained along Deer Street, and may serve as the only point of entry for customers to the building located at 8299 SR 28.
- A single entry to the business located at 8700 SR 28 would be provided under this alternative instead of two as proposed under Alternative 2.

Parking Impacts

The parking impacts of this alternative are identical to those described for Alternative 2, with one exception:

• No on-street parking spaces would be provided along SR-28, effectively prohibiting on-street parking year-round rather than solely in summer (Table 4-5).

Table 4-5. Alternative 4 Parking Impacts

				Private	Tatal Davidson		
Road Segment	Existing Spaces	Planned Spaces	Spaces Eliminated	Demand	Parking Shortfall	Spaces Eliminated	Total Parking Shortfall
SR267 to Secline	12	0	12	6	6	0	6
Secline to Deer	29	0	29	15	15	17	32
Deer to Bear	30	0	30	39	39	22	61
Bear to Coon	33	0	33	38	38	6	44
Coon to Fox	32	0	32	24	24	24	48
Fox to Chipmunk	66	0	66	20	20	9	29
Total	202	0	202	142	142	78	220

Source: LSC 2000.

4.3.3 Economic Impacts

Local and Roadside Business Impacts

Under Alternative 4, impacts on businesses in the project area caused by changes in setbacks, access, and parking would be the same as those described for Alternative 2, with the following exceptions.

- The businesses located at 8299 SR 28 (APN 090-071-030) would lose access along SR 28.
 However, entry along Deer Street would be maintained so these changes are not anticipated to create major problems for businesses located in this building.
- A secondary point of entry for APN 090-134-029 is not planned under this alternative. A single entry along SR 28 would be used by customers to access the business. This change is not expected to affect the operation of the business located at 8700 SR 28.

4.4 Cumulative Impacts

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) directs federal agencies to examine the consequences of proposed activities in light of an overall goal to protect and enhance the human environment. The agencies must examine direct and observable effects and those that may be indeterminate and not easily recognized.

The implementing regulations for NEPA, which are provided in the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR Sections 1500–1508), define cumulative effects as the combined effects of independent projects and the proposed action on the environment. Cumulative effects refer to those effects

...that result from the incremental impact of a proposed action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Cumulative effects can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. (40 CFR 1508.7)

Secondary effects are those that are "caused by an action and are later in time or farther removed in distance but are still reasonably foreseeable." (40 CFR 1508.8). These are generally induced by the initial action.

4.4.1 Related Projects

The following is a list of projects that are planned to occur within the Tahoe Basin area:

- EIP project #14** Brockway Summit Erosion Control PLA 267 PM 6.67 8.38 Lead Agency CT
- EIP project #15 Kings Beach Residential Area Treatment Phase II PLA 28 PM 9.8 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #28 Snow Creek SEZ Restoration PLA 28 PM 8.32 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #51 Burton Creek Linked Project-Stream Hab Restoration PLA 28 PM 1.6 Lead Agency CA Parks
- EIP project #82 Scenic Road Unit #1 Tahoe Valley Improvement ED 89 PM 8.56 9.71 Lead Agency CSLT
- EIP project #83 Scenic Road Unit #7 Meeks Bay Improvement ED 89 PM 9.8 11.5 Lead Agency ED County
- EIP project #84 Scenic Road Unit #9 Tahoma Improvement PLA 89 Utility Undergrounding various locations, Lead Agency PLA/ED Counties
- EIP project #85 Scenic Road Unit #10 Quail Creek Improvement PLA 89 PM 1.5 2.6 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #86 Scenic Road Unit #11 Homewood Improvement PLA 89 PM 2.6 3.6 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #87 Scenic Road Unit #13 Sunnyside Improvement PLA 89 PM 5.8 7.2 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #88 Scenic Road Unit #14 Tahoe Tavern Improvement PLA 89 PM 7.2 8.57 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #90 Scenic Road Unit #16 Lake Forest Improvement PLA 28 PM 1.84 3.5 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #91 Scenic Road Unit #18 Carnelian Bay Improvement PLA 28 PM 4.6 5.9 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #92 Scenic Road Unit #19 Flick Point Improvement PLA 28 PM 6.0 Lead Agency PLA County

.

^{**} Indicates that these projects require in-lane construction-related activity and presently have overlapping construction time frames (construction seasons 2006–2010). Many of the other listed projects have not been scheduled and are subject to current funding restraints and programming fluctuations

- EIP project #93 Scenic Road Unit #20 Tahoe Vista Improvement PLA 28 PM 7.3 11.0 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #101 Scenic Road Unit #42 Outlet Improvement PLA 89 PM 8.57 8.77 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #104 Scenic Road Unit #40 Brockway Cutoff Improvement PLA 267 PM 8.9 –
 9.8 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #105 Scenic Shore Unit #9 Rubicon Bay Improvement ED 89 PM 19.5 24.9 Lead Agency El Dorado County
- EIP project #122** Incline Village Tourist Water Quality 3 mile long project in the Incline Village area along SR 28 Lead Agency Washoe County
- EIP project #133 Truckee/Fanny Bridge SEZ Restoration PLA 89 PM 8.3 8.5 Lead Agency PLA County/TCPUD
- EIP project #134 Tahoe City Undergrounding Phase 2 PLA 28 0.5 0.7 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #135 Tahoe City Electrical Sub-Station Relocation PLA 89 PM 8.9 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #145 Carnelian Area Drainage System PLA 28 PM 5.7 5.9 Lead Agnecy
- EIP project #147 Stabalize Meeks Creek Phase Istrean Hab Restor ED 89 PM 24.9 Lead Agency USFS
- EIP project #149 Tahoe Vista SR 28 Utility Undergrounding PLA 28 PM 8.3 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #420 Carnelian Bay SR 28 Utility Undergrounding PLA 28 PM 1.85 5.8 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #501 Scenic Road Unit #43 Lower Truckee River Improvement PLA 89 PM 8.77
 12.1 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #608 Emerald Bay Viaduct Scenic Restoration ED 89 PM 17.5 17.9 Lead Agency CT
- EIP project #700 Meeks Creek Phase II Stream Habitat Restoration ED 89 PM 24.9 Lead Agency USFS
- EIP project #762 Class II: SR 28 Dollar Hilltop to North Stateline PLA 28 PM 3.5 11.0 Lead Agency CT
- EIP project #765 Class III: SR 89 Cascade to Emerald Bay ED 89 PM 14.4 17.Lead Agency CT
- EIP project #775 SR 89 Homewood Area Pedestrian Facilities PLA 89 PM 2.4-2.6 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #787** Kings Beach Roadway Intersection Sidewalk & Bicycle Trail PLA 28
 PM 9.88 10.23 Lead Agency PLA County 2007 -2009

- EIP project #788** SR 28 & SR 267 Intersection Improvements PLA 267 PM 9.9 Lead Agency CT
- EIP project #854** Fanny Bridge Pedestrian/Bicycle Improvements PLA 89 PM 8.48 Lead Agency PLA County/TCPUD/TRPA
- EIP project #855 SR 89 Realignment at Tahoe City Wye PLA 28 PM 8.5 Lead Agency TRPA
- EIP project #873 SR 89 Cascade Creek Area Retaining Walls ED 89 PM 14.4 –16.4 Lead Agency CT
- EIP project #998** SR 28 Tahoe City to SR 267 Intersection/Chipmunk St to North Stateline PLA 28 PM 0.00 9.34/10.0 11.0 Lead Agency CT
- EIP project #none** SR 89 Water Quality and Roadway Improvements ED 89 PM 8.6 27.4 Lead Agency CT
- EIP project #1001 Snow Creek Wildlife-Habitat Restoration PLA 28 PM 9.2 9.3 Lead Agency PLA County
- EIP project #10156** Ponderosa Ranch To Mnt Rose Hwy Improvements 5 mile long project on SR 28 east of the North Stateline Lead Agency NDOT
- Truckee River Corridor Access Plan PLA 89 PM 0.00 8.6 Lead Agency Placer County
- The Rock Retaining Wall Replacement Project** ED 89 PM 16.4 16.5 Lead Agency CT (24 hour closure of both lanes 04-05/06)
- Incline Village General Improvement District Project**Sewer Line Project 3.5 mile south from Lakeshore Blvd/SR 28 To Sand Harbor State Park, 24/7 lane closure 04/01 06/01

The large number of upcoming projects planned within the Lake Tahoe Region may potentially have a secondary impact on the local economy due to the potential for concurrent construction of multiple projects and the cumulative effect this would have on access to the Lake Tahoe region.

4.4.2 Economic Impacts

The Lake Tahoe region draws a multitude of visitors a year and in 2002 alone, tourists spent nearly \$355 million dollars in the local region (Runyan 2003). The influence tourism has on the local economy is substantial, as studies have shown that tourism generates over 70 percent of jobs and over 60 percent of earnings locally (Runyan 2003).

Tourism is very closely linked with accessibility. The less accessible an area is, the less likely it is to receive visitors. A recent example of this relationship can be found in the 2006 rockslide that closed Highway 140, blocking a main route into Yosemite Park for months. While the park itself maintained tourist volumes through the closures, businesses along Highway 140 reported lost earnings of as much as 70 percent (NPR 2006). This can translate into millions of dollars in lost revenue over time, and in this example, approximately \$14 million lost for Mariposa County this summer alone (Yosemite 2006).

The communities along the circumference of Lake Tahoe can only be accessed by a few routes including, SR 28, SR 89, and Highway 50. These routes are the only means of traveling between major points of interest, both locally and along the circumference of the lake. The west and north Lake Tahoe area is a uniquely prosperous environment that is sensitive to disruptions. On the western side of the lake, the main thoroughfare is heavily traveled and subject to congestion, especially during peak travel seasons, as it is mainly a two-lane road. The configuration of the major routes around the lake makes detours of traffic during major construction implausible.

Inconvenience and disruptions will inevitably discourage visitors as closures along portions of these routes would cause increased congestion, longer travel times, isolation of certain areas and frustration amongst travelers. As the length of construction periods becomes extended over a period of 'seasons' and many of the projects listed above begin to take place at once, the loss in daily visitors can become more pronounced.

As with the Highway 140 example, the disruption in accessibility can translate into great financial losses for the County. Nearly half of all taxes generated by travel spending in the Lake Tahoe area come from local sales tax and transient occupancy taxes (Runyan 2003). A decrease in traffic volumes brought about by multiple road closures and construction projects may ultimately translate into substantial losses in visitor spending taxes. This loss in tax revenues could directly affect the ability of local governments to provide services at sufficient levels.

Since the stability and the sustainability of the west and northern Lake Tahoe economy have become extremely dependent on revenue from tourism, it is important to recognize that transportation routes play a vital role in the region's socioeconomic environment. Any activity that substantially restricts access over extended periods to areas of commerce is likely to substantially affect local revenues, tax revenues, employment, and growth.

The implementation of a Regional Transportation Management Plan (RTMP) would keep construction-related cumulative economic impacts to the west and north shores of Lake Tahoe below a significant level.

Chapter 5 Mitigation Measures

This chapter describes design features included in the proposed project and mitigation measures that the County commits to implement as part of the proposed project to reduce adverse impacts related to land use, consistency with general plan policies, circulation and access, parking, public services, and residential displacements. These measures would be implemented as part of any of the build alternatives unless otherwise specified. Other technical reports prepared for this project discuss mitigation measures for land use conflicts related to construction and operational impacts

5.1 Project Design Features

The proposed project includes the following design features that reduce impacts:

- implement administrative actions needed to provide variances to setback requirements for all properties that would be in noncompliance with Town and County minimum setback requirements as a result of SR 28 widening and intersection improvements.
- reconstruct driveways, as needed, and replace fencing, landscaping, and signage displaced and disturbed by project construction activities.

5.2 Committed Mitigation for Land Use Impacts

Placer County will implement the following measures to mitigate for the land use impacts of the project:

- Create a Community Involvement and Public Participation Plan (CIPP) according to the Caltrans Tahoe Basin Public Communication and Outreach Guidelines (2006). The County will identify stakeholders within the project area and create a CIPP inline with the Caltrans guidelines that will allow for coordination between local agencies and generate public awareness about the proposed project. By providing the following outreach mechanisms, the CIPP would minimize construction-related impacts through advanced planning and public participation. The following public outreach actions are recommended to be included in the CIPP:
 - Informational brochures or flyers included in utility bill mailings to homeowners, renters, and business operators with information and updates regarding construction-related details.
 - Implementation of regularly conducted "stakeholder-wide" project development team (PDT) meetings. These meeting also can be used as a mechanism for spreading project-related information to the constituencies of the various groups.
 - Use of the local media outlets, including radio, newspaper, and television ads to publicize the project and update information.

• Implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) that will identify the locations of temporary detours and signage to facilitate local traffic patterns and through-traffic requirements. The TMP will specify timeframes for roadway and lane closures. Placer County will notify affected businesses and residences at least 1 week in advance of any lane or roadway closures or impacts related to access. Personnel of emergency response services such as fire and police protection also will be notified 1–2 weeks in advance of any lane or roadway closures so that alternative routes could be taken.

5.3 Committed Mitigation for Parking Impacts

According to the parking study prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC 2000), the study area currently has adequate parking availability as a whole, but a parking shortfall exists during peak summer periods for some key areas. Based on a threshold of significance of 90 percent utilization of public parking spaces and estimates of maximum peak period parking demand, 142 public parking spaces are needed to meet the estimated peak period demand for parking throughout the project corridor (Table 3-3).

Due to variances between parking loss under each alternative, each alternative requires its own mitigation. The design demand for public parking (as shown in the parking tables in Chapter 4) can be subtracted from the planned spaces to determine the number of spaces required, by block, to provide adequate parking.

Currently, one parking lot, which provides approximately 24 parking spaces, has been constructed on previously vacant land on Brooke Street. The County is giving final approval for two additional lots that each will provide approximately 22 parking spaces. In addition, a variety of other sites have been identified along the project corridor as potential candidates for provision of the remainder of necessary parking. The exact location and size of these lots will not be available until the County has completed its review and final approval.

Mitigation Measure P1-Alternative 2: As shown in Table 4-1, this alternative yields a net reduction in public and private parking supply of 280 spaces. Because no public parking is planned under Alternative 2, 142 additional spaces would be required to meet anticipated demand for public parking. Additionally, 78 private parking spaces eliminated by Alternative 2 would need to be replaced. The largest number of new spaces (61) will be required to address the loss of parking between Deer and Bear Streets. New parking spaces should be provided in a manner that addresses the parking requirements of each block either within that block or within an adjacent block, in order to ensure that adequate parking conditions are maintained for all sub-areas (by block) of the study area. For instance, new parking spaces within the commercial core area provided between Deer and Bear Streets above the 61 required for this specific block could be used to mitigate the loss of parking along the adjacent block between Secline and Deer Streets to the west and between Bear and Coon Streets to the east. Providing new parking supply in accordance with this pattern will also focus parking on those blocks that have the greatest need. Unless new parking supply can be developed to exactly match this pattern, more than the minimum 220 total new spaces may be required to provide adequate new parking for each block. With this measure, the impact is mitigated to levels below the standard of significance.

- Mitigation Measure P2 -Alternative 3: As shown in Table 4-4, this alternative yields a net reduction in public and private parking supply of 172 spaces. Because 108 public parking spaces are planned under Alternative 3, 34 additional spaces would be required to meet anticipated demand for public parking. Additionally, 78 private parking spaces eliminated by Alternative 3 would need to be replaced. The largest number of new spaces (40) will be required to address the loss of existing spaces between Coon and Fox Streets. New parking spaces should be provided in a manner that addresses the parking requirements of each block either within that block or within an adjacent block, in order to ensure that adequate parking conditions are maintained for all sub-areas of the study area. (For the block between SR 267 and Secline Street where no mitigation would be required, the nine spaces available with the project alternative would be available to partially address the required mitigation spaces for the adjacent Secline Deer block). With this measure, the impact is mitigated to levels below the standard of significance.
- Mitigation Measure P3 Alternative 4: As shown in Table 4-5, this alternative yields a net reduction in public and private parking supply of 280 spaces. Because no public parking is planned under Alternative 4, 142 additional spaces would be required to meet anticipated demand for public parking. Additionally, 78 private parking spaces eliminated by Alternative 4 would need to be replaced. The largest number of new spaces (61) will be required to address the loss of existing spaces between Deer and Bear Streets. New parking spaces should be provided in a manner that addresses the parking requirements of each block either within that block or within an adjacent block, in order to ensure that adequate parking conditions are maintained for all sub-areas of the study area. With this measure, the impact is mitigated to levels below the standard of significance.

5.4 Committed Mitigation for Public Services Impacts

Placer County will implement the following measures for reducing potential impacts on police and fire response times during project construction:

- Allow emergency vehicles through any roadway segments temporarily closed for construction purposes. This measure will be incorporated into the TMP prepared for the project.
- Notify emergency service providers, including the NTFPD and the County sheriff, at least
 one week in advance of detours and roadway or lane closures. Notifications will include the
 location and duration of closures, allowing providers to advise dispatchers and station
 personnel about alternative routes. This measure will be incorporated into the TMP prepared
 for the project.

5.5 Committed Mitigation for Relocation Impacts

Although the proposed project would not result in displacement of residents or businesses, the following mitigation is presented in the event that an unforeseen displacement would occur.

Federal and state laws (i.e., the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 Public Law 91-646, as amended April 2, 1987; California Government Code, Chapter 16, Section 7260, et seq. [the Uniform Relocation Act]) require that relocation assistance be provided to any person, business, or nonprofit organization displaced because of the acquisition of real property by a public entity for public uses. Compliance with the federal act is required where federal funds are to be used in the acquisition or construction of the project. This assistance is not considered mitigation, per se, but an entitlement because compensation is required by other than environmental laws, and is provided regardless of the magnitude of the impact. The Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1970 (as amended) and the California Relocation Assistance Act (Government Code Section 7260 et seq.) both require that, within a reasonable period of time prior to displacement, comparable replacement housing will be available or provided for each displaced person. Such assurance must be specifically given on every project requiring residential displacement. (California Department of Transportation 1997.)

A local certified public agency shall carry out the relocation plan to help eligible displaced individuals move with as little inconvenience as possible. All rights and services provided under Public Law 91-646, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, shall be strictly adhered to. Persons displaced as a result of the project shall receive fair and equitable treatment and shall not suffer disproportionate injuries as a result of programs designed for the benefit of the public as a whole. Relocation resources will be made available to all commercial and residential displacees without discrimination. Appraisals to determine actual market value will be conducted for each property to be relocated once a final alignment has been selected and the environmental document is certified. See Appendix B, "Important Relocation Assistance Information," for a more-detailed discussion of relocation assistance available to project displacees.

5.6 Committed Mitigation for Cumulative Impacts

Caltrans requires TMPs for all construction activities on the State Highway System. Where several consecutive, related, or linking projects within a region or corridor create a cumulative need for a TMP, Caltrans coordinates individual TMPs or develops a single interregional TMP (RTMP). When implemented, a TMP results in a minimized project-related traffic delay and accidents by the effective combination of public and motorist information, demand management, incident management, system management, alternate route strategies, construction strategies, and other strategies.

TMPs are designed to reduce the amount of significant delay time due to lane closures and construction-related activity. Significant delay time is 30 minutes above normal recurring traffic delay on the existing facility or the delay threshold set by the district traffic manager, whichever is less. Caltrans traffic management has indicated that state route corridors on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe might require a cumulative delay time of less than 30 minutes per TMP guidelines. The Caltrans TMP Unit is still making determinations of thresholds for delays as the development of the RTMP is being undertaken.

It is recommended that Caltrans develop a RTMP due to the large number of related transportation improvement proposals scheduled to occur within a similar time frame in the greater project area. An RTMP would be expected to promote greater coordination between agencies and projects to minimize potentially significant impacts associated with multiple construction projects.

The following are objectives to be achieved from the RTMP, as described from the Caltrans draft *Guidelines for Projects Located on the California State Highways in the Lake Tahoe Basin*:

- Provide accurate and timely information to the public;
- Minimize traffic delays while maximizing public and worker safety during construction;
- Minimize impacts to businesses, residences, schools, public services, and special events during construction;
- Provide design and instructional information regarding traffic management to the Project Engineer and Resident Engineer, and project-specific Standard Special Provisions (SSPs) to be included in the project contract; and
- Ensure that no more than 30 minutes of cumulative corridor delay will occur.

Timing and execution remain the greatest concern for the multitude of proposed construction projects in the immediate and greater project area. The degree of economic impact to the North Shore and West Shore of the Lake Tahoe Basin may be directly influenced by construction scheduling and staging of these projects. Therefore, project coordination between Caltrans functional units is a crucial aspect in keeping the effect of potential cumulative impacts associated with construction at levels that are less than significant, as defined under NEPA. In particular, interagency synchronization within Caltrans would include the TMP Unit, Environmental Management, District 03 Public information Office, Construction Engineering, and the project development teams. Close contact with local stakeholder agencies also will need to be maintained in order to minimize cumulative socioeconomic-related impacts that would otherwise result from these related projects.

Chapter 6 Significance Conclusions under CEQA

Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines provides guidance for the evaluation of project land use, population, housing, social, and public services impacts. Based on these guidelines, the project is considered to have a significant impact if it would:

- induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (such as by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (such as through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere;
- displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere;
- physically divide an established community;
- conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;
- convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on maps pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;
- conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract;
- involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use;
- result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or
 physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered
 governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental
 impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance
 objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, or other public facilities; or
- result in an inadequate parking supply.

Under CEQA, the social and economic effects of projects are not normally considered impacts on the environment; therefore, no criteria have been developed to evaluate the significance of purely social or economic effects of the project. These purely social or economic effects include tax revenue changes, construction-related economic effects (such as employment changes), and potential sales effects for private businesses caused by parking and access impacts. Although CEQA allows social or economic changes to be used to determine the significance of the physical changes of the project, the significance of the physical changes themselves are addressed elsewhere in the document and other technical reports prepared for this project.

Table 6-1 identifies the premitigation and postmitigation significance conclusions for each impact under CEQA based on the criteria described above.

Table 6-1. Summary of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Significance Conclusions Associated with the Project Alternatives

Page 1 of 3

	Impacts	Level of Significance ^a	Mitigation Measures
Land use			
Alternative 1 (no Project)	Inconsistent with local plans and policies of the KBCP	S/LTS	Implement one of the Alternatives (2-4).
Alternative 2	Partial permanent acquisitions on 145 parcels (24 residential, 97 commercial, and 24 with no developed uses); reduced setbacks, and loss of fencing and landscaping on some parcels	LTS/LTS	None Proposed
	Indirect air quality, noise, and visual impacts	See Note b	
	Temporary disruption of traffic circulation patterns during construction	S/LTS	Implement a Transportation Management Plan
	Inconsistent with local plans and Policy 3B-1a; Roadway LOS	S/S	None Proposed
	Intersection LOS	S/LTS	Implement Mitigation Measure T-3 (Traffic Report) to reduce intersection impacts.
Alternative 3	In addition to those listed under Alternative 2, partial permanent acquisitions to 3 parcels; reduced setbacks, and loss of fencing and landscaping on some parcels	LTS/LTS	None Proposed
	Indirect air quality, noise, and visual impacts	See Note b	
	Temporary disruption of traffic circulation patterns during construction	S/LTS	Implement Transportation Management Plan
	Inconsistent with local plans and Policy 3B-1a, Intersection LOS	S/S	Implement Mitigation Measure T-3 (Traffic Report)
Alternative 4	In addition to those listed under Alternative 2, partial permanent acquisitions on 2 commercial parcels; reduced setbacks, and loss of fencing and landscaping on some parcels	LTS /LTS	None Proposed
	Indirect air quality, noise, and visual impacts	See Note b	
	Temporary disruption of traffic circulation patterns during construction	S/LTS	Implement Transportation Management Plan
	Inconsistent with local plans and Policy 3B-1a, Roadway LOS	S/S	None Proposed
	Intersection LOS	S/LTS	Implement Mitigation Measure T-3 (Traffic Report)

	Impacts	Level of Significance ^a	Mitigation Measures
Double Roundabout	In addition to those listed under Alternative 2, partial permanent acquisitions on 7 parcels (2 residential, 4 commercial, and 1 with no developed uses); reduced setbacks, and loss of fencing and landscaping on some parcels	LTS/LTS	None Proposed
	Full permanent acquisitions of two parcels (1Commercial Building). APNs 117-180-007 and 117-180-006	LTS/LTS	Compensate displaced land uses in conformance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (see Note c)
	Indirect air quality, noise, and visual impacts	See Note b	
	Temporary disruption of traffic circulation patterns during construction	S/LTS	Implement a Transportation Management Plan
	Consistent with local plans and policies	LTS/LTS	None Proposed
Social			
Alternative 1 (no Project)	No Impacts	N/A	None Proposed
Alternative 2	Potential elimination of driveway on APN 090-142-002 (undeveloped); reduced access to structures on APNs 117-180-007, 117-180-006 (Stone's Automotive), 090-071-026/090-071-025 (Ace Hardware), and 090-123-023 (7-11)	LTS/LTS	None Proposed
	Net loss of 280 parking spaces (at maximum during the summer).	S/LTS	Implement Parking Mitigation P1
Alternative 3	In addition to those listed under Alternative 2, reduced access to commercial building on APN 090-123-008 (Jenkins' Building) and corner frontage takes to APN 090-123-023 (less than under Alt.2).	LTS/LTS	None Proposed
	Net loss of 172 parking spaces	S/LTS	Implement Parking Mitigation P2
Alternative 4	In addition to those listed under Alternative 2, reduced access to APNs 090-071-029 (Dave's Ski, Tahoe Paddle), and 090-134-029 (Subway).	LTS/LTS	None Proposed
	Net loss of 280 parking spaces	S/LTS	Implement Parking Mitigation P3
	Net loss of 225 parking spaces.	S/LTS	Implement Parking Mitigation P4

	Impacts	Level of Significance ^a	Mitigation Measures
Double	In addition to those listed under Alternative 2:	LTS/LTS	None Proposed
Roundabout	Altered access changes to APNs 117-180-052, 117-180-050 (residential);		
	Elimination of access to structure and elimination of parking lot around business on APNs 117-180-007, 117-180-006 (Stone's Automotive	LTS/LTS	Compensate displaced land uses in conformance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act ^c
Public Services			
Alternative 1 (no Project)	None		N/A
Alternative 2	Potential increase in emergency response times during construction	S/LTS	Implement a Transportation Management Plan
Alternative 3	Potential increase in emergency response times during construction	S/LTS	Implement a Transportation Management Plan
Alternative 4	Potential increase in emergency response times during construction	S/LTS	Implement a Transportation Management Plan
Double Roundabout	Potential increase in emergency response times during construction	S/LTS	Implement a Transportation Management Plan
Relocation			
Alternative 1 (no Project)	No Impact	N/A	None Required
Alternative 2	No Impact	N/A	None Required
Alternative 3	No Impact	N/A	None Required
Alternative 4	No Impact	N/A	None Required
Double Roundabout	Relocation resources available for one displaced commercial business, APNs 117-180-007 / 117-180-006	LTS/LTS	Compensate displaced land uses in conformance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act ^c

Notes:

a. Significance conclusion before mitigation/significance conclusion after mitigation

S = significant.

LTS = less than significant.

NA = not applicable.

- b. See the Air Quality Technical Report, Noise Study Report, and Visual Resources Technical Report for this project for details.
- c. Required by a law other than CEQA.

Chapter 7 References Cited

7.1 Printed References

- California Department of Transportation. 1997. *Community impact assessment*. (Caltrans Environmental Handbook Volume 4.) Sacramento, CA.
- California Department of Transportation. [No date available] Draft Tahoe Basin Public Communication and Outreach Guidelines. District 3: Division of Planning and Local Assistance.
- California Employment Development Department. 2005. *Major employers in Placer County*. Available: http://www.calmis.ca.gov/file/majorer/countymajorer.cfm?CountyCode=000061.
- LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC). 2000. Kings Beach Commercial Core Parking Study Technical Memorandum Number One: Evaluation of Existing and Future Conditions. Updated in 2005. Prepared for Placer County Department of Public Works. Tahoe City, California.
- LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC). 2003. Kings Beach Commercial Core Traffic Study, Draft Study Report. Prepared for Placer County Department of Public Works. Tahoe City, California.
- LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (LSC). 2005. *Kings Beach Urban Improvement Project Traffic Report*. November. Prepared for Placer County. Tahoe City, California.
- North Tahoe Community Plan Team. 1996. *Kings Beach Community Plan*. Prepared for Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.
- NPR. 2006. NPR.ORG website. *Rockslide Near Yosemite Chokes off Small Town*. June 20, 2006. Available at < http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5498017> Acessed: August 23, 2006.
- Placer County. 2000-2005. Placer County Sheriff. *Kings Beach Service Center*. Available: http://www.placer.ca.gov/sheriff/stations/kbsc.htm
- Placer County. 2005. *Placer County Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. Fiscal Year* 2003-2004. Available: http://www.placer.ca.gov/auditor/cafr/year03-04.htm.
- Placer County. 2005. Placer County Economic and Demographic Profile. Available: http://www.placer.ca.gov/business/current-edp/econ-demo-profile.htm.
- Runyan, Dean and Associates. 2003. *Economic Significance of Travel to the North Lake Tahoe Area*. Prepared for the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association. Tahoe City, Ca. December 2003.

- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and Tahoe Metropolitan Transportation Organization. 2004. Lake Tahoe Basin Regional Transportation Plan, 2004-2027. Stateline, NV.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. 2000 U.S. Census data for Placer County, Kings Beach and California Census Designated Place: Table DP-1, profile of general demographic characteristics; DP-3, profile of selected economic characteristics; and DP-4, profile of selected housing characteristics. Washington, DC.
- Yosemite Association. 2006. Newsroom. *It's Hard for Mariposa Co. Not to Slide Into Despair*. Available http://www.yosemite.org/newsroom/clips2006/june/060406.htm Accessed: August 23, 2006.

7.2 Personal Communications

- Dillon, Pat. Captain/Paramedic. North Tahoe Fire Protection District. Kings Beach, California. Interview. November 14, 2005.
- Graves, Ed. Director. Office of Economic Development. Placer County, California. Telephone conversation. November 16, 2005.

Chapter A Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvements Draft Relocation Impact Statement

EXHIBIT 10-EX-3A (REV 5/2001) Page 1 of 5

RELOCATION IMPACT STATEMENT (DR	AF I/FINAL)
(Form #)	

Dist.	County	Route	KP (PM)	EA	
Project Description:					
Federal Project No.:					

I. Purpose of the Relocation Impact Statement

The purpose of this Draft Relocation Impact Statement is to provide the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), local agencies, and the public with information on the impact this project will have on residential and non-residential occupants within the project area. All displacees will be treated in accordance with the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, and the California Relocation Act. No relocation impacts are proposed under any of the build project alternatives.

II. Summary of Residential and Non-Residential Displacements

Alternative	Single-Family Units	Mobile Homes	Multi-Family Units	Residential Displacements (Units/Residents)*	Non-Residential Displacements
SR 28 Alternative 2	0	0	0	0	0
SR 28 Alternative 3	0	0	0	0	0
SR 28 Alternative 4	0	0	0	0	0

Estimate of residents is based on an average of 3.53 residents per unit (2000 Census): Source: U.S. Census Bureau. Residential displacees were not interviewed nor contacted to complete surveys.

III. Summary of Relocation Resources Available to Displacees

A visual inspection of the area confirmed the availability of numerous vacant lots both commercial and residential in nature... Due to building restraints placed on the area, any new construction must comply with the guidelines set out by TRPA.

IV. Statement of Findings

This is a summary of the type of displaces, their needs if known from interviews, and the plan (resources, money, time) to relocate them into replacement property.

No contacts have been made with potential displacees to discuss the project or potential impacts on properties.

Project Displacements

As discussed in the Community Impact Assessment prepared for the proposed project, no potential displacements are anticipated under any of the build alternatives. Therefore, no relocations of businesses or residents are necessary with implementation of the proposed project.

V. **Relocation Procedure**

RELOCATION IMPACT STATEMENT (DRAFT/FINAL) (Cont.)

(Form #)

EXHIBIT 10-EX-3A (REV 5/2001) Page 2 of 5

Although the proposed project would not result in the displacement of residents or businesses, the following statement is presented in the event that an unforeseen displacement would occur:

The displacees will be contacted by a Relocation Agent, who will ensure that eligible displacees receive their full relocation benefits, including advisory assistance, and that all activities will be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Relocation resources shall be available to all displacees, free of discrimination. At the time of the first written offer to purchase, owner occupants are given a detailed explanation of Caltrans' Relocation Program and Services. Tenant occupants of properties to be acquired are contacted soon after the first written offer to purchase, and also are given a detailed explanation of Caltrans' Relocation Program and Services. In accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, Caltrans will provide relocation advisory assistance to any person, business, farm or non-profit organization displaced as a result of the acquisition of real property for public use.

Right of Way Agent	Date	
Right of Way Agent	Date	
APPROVED:		
G . D. L. CW.		
Senior Right of Way Agent	Date	

C: Project Manager
Project Engineer
Environmental
Region/District RW DDC
Region/District P&M

Chapter B Important Relocation Assistance Information

Appendix B Important Relocation Assistance Information

B.1 Introduction

The following explanation of residential relocations is general in nature and is not intended to be a complete statement of federal and state relocation laws and regulations. Any questions concerning relocation should be addressed to Placer County's (County's) right-of-way staff.

Any persons to be displaced will be assigned to a relocation advisor, who will work closely with each displacee in order to see that all payments and benefits are fully utilized, and that all regulations are observed, thereby avoiding the possibility of displacees jeopardizing or forfeiting any of their benefits or payments. At the time of the first written offer to purchase, owner-occupants are given a detailed explanation of the State of California's relocation services. Tenant occupants of properties to be acquired are contacted soon after the first written offer to purchase, and also are given a detailed explanation of the relocation program. To avoid loss of possible benefits, no individual, family, business, farm, or nonprofit organization should commit to purchase or rent a replacement property without first contacting the County's relocation advisor.

B.2 Relocation Assistance Advisory Services

In accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, the County will provide relocation advisory assistance to any person, business, farm, or nonprofit organization displaced as a result of the acquisition of real property for public use. The County will assist displacees in obtaining comparable replacement housing by providing current and continuing information on the availability and prices of both houses for sale and rental units that are "decent, safe, and sanitary." Nonresidential displacees will receive information on comparable properties for lease or purchase.

Residential replacement dwellings will be in equal or better neighborhoods at rents or prices within the financial ability of the individuals and families displaced, and will be reasonably accessible to their places of employment. Before any displacement occurs, comparable replacement dwellings that are open to all persons, regardless of race, color, religion, sex, and national origin, and which are consistent with the requirements of Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, will be offered to displacees. This assistance will also include the supplying of information concerning federal- and state-assisted housing programs, and any other known services being offered by public and private agencies in the area.

Persons who are eligible for relocation payment(s) and who are legally occupying a property required for the project will not be asked to move without first being given at least 90 days

written notice, and not unless at least one decent, safe, and sanitary replacement residence, available on the market, is offered to them by the County.

B.3 Residential Relocation Payments Program

The Relocation Payment Program will help eligible residential occupants by paying certain costs and expenses. These costs are limited to those necessary for or incidental to the purchase or rental of the replacement dwelling and actual reasonable moving expenses to a new location within 50 miles of the displacement property. Any actual moving costs in excess of the 50 miles are the responsibility of the displacee. A summary of the Residential Relocation Program follows.

B.3.1 Moving Costs

Any displaced person, who lawfully occupied the acquired property, regardless of the length of occupancy in the property acquired, will be eligible for reimbursement of moving costs. Displacees will receive either the actual reasonable cost involved in moving themselves and personal property up to a maximum of 50 miles or a fixed payment based on a fixed moving cost schedule.

B.3.2 Purchase Supplement

In addition to moving and related expense payments, fully eligible homeowners may be entitled to payments for increased costs of replacement housing.

Homeowners who have owned and occupied their property for 180 days or more prior to the date of the first written offer to purchase the property may qualify to receive a price differential payment and may qualify to receive reimbursement for certain nonrecurring costs incidental to the purchase of the replacement property. An interest differential payment is also available if the interest rate for the loan on the replacement dwelling is higher than the loan rate on the displacement dwelling, subject to certain limitations on reimbursement based upon the replacement property interest rate. The maximum combination of these three supplemental payments that the owner-occupant can receive is \$22,500. If the total entitlement (without the moving payments) is in excess of \$22,500, the Last Resort Housing Program will be used. (See the explanation of the Last Resort Housing Program below).

B.3.3 Rental Supplement

Tenants who have occupied the property to be acquired by the County for 90 days or more and owner-occupants of 90–79 days prior to the date of the first written offer to purchase may qualify to receive a rental differential payment. This payment is made if the County determines that the cost to rent a comparable "decent, safe, and sanitary" replacement dwelling will be more than the present rent of the displacement dwelling. As an alternative, the tenant may qualify for a down payment benefit designed to assist in the purchase, subject to certain limitations noted below under the "Down Payment" section. The maximum amount payable to any tenant of 90 days or

more and any owner-occupant of 90-179 days, in addition to moving expenses, is \$5,250. If the total entitlement for rental supplement exceeds \$5,250, the Last Resort Housing Program will be used.

In addition to the occupancy requirements, in order to receive any relocation benefits, the displaced person must buy or rent and occupy a "decent, safe, and sanitary" replacement dwelling within 1 year from the date the department takes legal possession of the property, or from the date the displacee vacates the displacement property, whichever is later.

B.3.4 Down Payment

The down payment option has been designed to aid owner-occupants of 90-179 days and tenants with no less than 90 days of continuous occupancy prior to the County's first written offer. The down payment and incidental expenses cannot exceed the maximum payment of \$5,250. The 1-year eligibility period in which to purchase and occupy a "decent, safe, and sanitary" replacement dwelling will apply.

B.3.5 Last Resort Housing

Federal regulations (49 Code Federal Regulations [CFR] 24) contain the policy and procedure for implementing the Last Resort Housing Program on federal-aid projects. Last resort housing benefits are, except for the amounts of payments and the methods in making them, the same as those benefits for standard residential relocations as explained above. Last resort housing has been designed primarily to cover situations where a displacee cannot be relocated because of lack of available comparable replacement housing, or when the anticipated replacement housing payment exceeds the \$5,250 and \$22,500 limits of the standard relocation procedure, because either the displacee lacks the financial ability or other valid circumstances. In certain exceptional situations, Last Resort Housing may also be used for tenants of less than 90 days.

After the first written offer to acquire the property has been made, the County will, within a reasonable length of time, personally contact the displacees to gather important information, including:

- preferences in area of relocation;
- number of people to be displaced and the distribution of adults and children according to age and sex;
- location of school and employment;
- specific arrangements needed to accommodate any family member(s) special needs; and
- financial ability to relocate into comparable replacement dwelling which will adequately house all members of the family.

B.4 Additional Information

B.4.1 Relocation Payments Not Income

Reimbursement for moving costs and replacement housing payments are not considered income for the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or resources for the purpose of determining the extent of eligibility of a displace for assistance under the Social Security Act, local "Section 8" Housing programs, or other federal assistance programs.

B.4.2 Right to Appeal

Any person, business, farm, or nonprofit organization that has been refused a relocation payment by the County's relocation advisor or believes that the payment(s) offered by the agency are inadequate, may appeal for a special hearing of their compliant. No legal assistance is required. Information about the appeal procedure is available from the relocation advisor.