

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
County of Placer

TO: BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DATE: FEBRUARY 20, 2007
FROM: KEN GREHM / PETER KRAATZ
SUBJECT: SALMON AVENUE PUBLIC PARKING FACILITY PROJECT (PDSO T20060649) --
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

ACTION REQUESTED / RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a Resolution adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration (PDSO T20060649) with the required findings in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Salmon Avenue Public Parking Facility Project.

BACKGROUND / SUMMARY

The Salmon Avenue Public Parking Facility Project is located in Kings Beach on Parcel APN 090-126-020 (see attached location map) on the north side of Salmon Avenue between Coon and Fox Street.

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency adopted a strategy of entering into agreements with the Department of Public Works to provide assistance on various projects, including the Salmon Avenue Public Parking Facility. Public works managed the project development and will continue to manage the project through construction.

The lot will provide parking for 22 vehicles, with 15 full-size parking spaces (9 feet by 18 feet with 2 feet of landscape overhang), six compact parking spaces (8 feet by 14 feet with 2 feet of landscape overhang) and one van accessible handicap space. The parking surface will consist of pervious concrete in the parking stalls and conventional asphalt concrete in the aisle. In addition, the project includes a 6-foot wide sidewalk on Salmon Avenue that will connect with the neighboring post office. The project includes lighting, inside the parking area, two trash/recycling receptacles, and landscaping around the perimeter of the lot. The Salmon Avenue Public Parking Facility is being constructed to serve the future parking needs required by the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project.

ENVIRONMENTAL

A mitigated negative declaration was prepared for this project by the Placer County on December 19, 2006 pursuant to CEQA. No comments were received during the public comment period, which closed January 22, 2007. Upon adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Notice of Determination will be processed.

FISCAL IMPACT

The total cost of the project, including engineering and contingencies, is estimated to be \$500,000. The engineer's estimated cost of construction is \$385,000. The project is fully funded through Placer County Redevelopment Agency financing using North Lake Tahoe tax increment and California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank funds. Construction funding is included in the Fiscal Years 2006-07 and 2007-08 Budgets

Attachments:

Resolution
Location Map
Mitigated Negative Declaration
Project Initial Study

**Before the Board of Supervisors
County of Placer, State of California**

In the matter of: A RESOLUTION APPROVING
AND ADOPTING THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE
DECLARATION (PDSO T20060649) PREPARED
FOR THE SALMON AVENUE PUBLIC PARKING
FACILITY

Resol. No:.....

Ord. No:.....

First Reading:.....

The following RESOLUTION was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors
of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held _____,
by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Chairman, Board Of Supervisors

Attest:
Clerk of said Board

WHEREAS, parking has been identified as a need by the Redevelopment Agency in
Tahoe City, and

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Agency has negotiated an agreement with Placer
County Department of Public Works to deliver the Salmon Public Parking Facility, and

WHEREAS, the County of Placer has prepared a Mitigated Negative Declaration,
circulated it as required by law and included all necessary measures to mitigate any
significant impacts of the project.

210

Resolution No. _____

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer, State of California, that this Board approves the attached Mitigated Negative Declaration (PDSD T20060649) for the Salmon Avenue Public Parking Facility and make the following findings:

1. The mitigated negative declaration has been prepared as required by law.
2. Temporary environmental impacts from construction activities, such as noise and vehicle emissions, will be mitigated by limiting construction hours, following rules and regulations set for by local, regional, state and federal agencies for air pollution control, adhering to TRPA regulations regarding grading activities, and implementing and maintaining best management practices during project construction.
3. The mitigated negative declaration as adopted for the project reflects the independent judgment and analysis of Placer County, which has exercised overall control and direction of its preparation.
4. The mitigation plan/mitigation monitoring program prepared for the project is approved and adopted.
5. The custodian of records for the project is the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Planning Department, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140, Auburn, CA 95603.
6. The Salmon Avenue Public Parking Facility is being constructed to serve the future parking needs required by the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project.

Figure 1 Regional Location Map





Figure 2 Project Location Map





COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

John Marin, Agency Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Gina Langford, Coordinator

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Salmon Avenue Parking Facility	Plus# PDSD T20060649
Description: Proposal to create a 22 stall parking facility in Kings Beach.	
Location: North side of Salmon Avenue between Coon Street and Fox Street in Kings Beach	
Project Owner/Applicant: Placer County Redevelopment Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 260, Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 745-3157	
County Contact Person: Amy Green	530-581-6234

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on **January 22, 2007**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter and at the Kings Beach Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Board of Supervisors. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, at (530) 745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.

Recorder's Certification

214

Figure 1 Regional Location Map




Figure 2 Project Location Map





Figure 3 Proposed Parking Facility



217



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

John Marin, Agency Director

Gina Langford, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3003 • www.placer.ca.gov/planning

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

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

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

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

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Title: Salmon Avenue Parking Facility	Plus#: PDSO T20060649
Entitlements: County project	
Site Area: 12,500 square feet	
Location: Kings Beach Commercial Core	
Project Description: The applicant, Placer County, proposes to pave the project site to construct a 22-space public parking facility. Project plans include one handicapped-parking space on the west side of the lot, a 25-foot wide entrance, a 6-foot wide sidewalk along the frontage of the lot with a handicap ramp, a bike rack (with capacity for 4 bicycles), four nighttime lighting fixtures, two trash/recycling receptacles, stormwater drainage system utilizing pervious concrete, a snow storage area, and landscaping along the perimeter of the facility. The stormwater drainage system would be designed to contain runoff from a 20-year 1-hour storm event and to meet Placer County standards described in the Storm Water Management Manual (SWMM). The system consists entirely of pervious concrete with an underlying drain rock layer. In 1996, in conjunction with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), Placer County completed and adopted the Kings Beach Community Plan (KBCP) for the Kings Beach Commercial Core Area. The KBCP identifies an existing parking deficit in the KBCP Area and establishes a policy to provide for public parking lots. The purpose of the proposed project is to offset a portion of the existing parking deficit as well as accommodate planned future development in the KBCP area.	

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	General Plan / Community Plan	Existing Conditions & Improvements
Site	Plan Area 029, Special Area #1, Downtown Commercial	Kings Beach Community Plan (KBCP)	The site is an approximately 12,500 square feet, previously disturbed, undeveloped lot that slopes gently to the south. The project site is located on the north side of Salmon Avenue in the commercial core area of Kings Beach, California. Vegetation on the project site consists of five trees ranging in size from 17-32 inches diameter breast height (dbh).
North	same as project site	KBCP	Residential Property
South	same as project site	KBCP	Salmon Avenue. Across Salmon Avenue are a single-family residence and a small retail/commercial shopping center.
East	same as project site	KBCP	Mobile Home Park
West	same as project site	KBCP	U.S. Post Office

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

Placer County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable significant effects on the environment resulting from the proposed project. The subject public parking facility is intended to provide parking mitigation for the Placer County Kings Beach Commercial Core Project (KBCCIP). At this time, an administrative draft EIR/EIS is being circulated to the local, state, and federal agencies for their review and comments. The KBCCIP displaces on-highway parking spaces and these new parking facilities will help Placer County mitigate for the parking loss. If the KBCCIP does not happen, these lots have their own utility which is to meet the needs of the Kings Beach Community Plan.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

219

- ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

220

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

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

Discussion- Item I-1,2:

The proposed parking lot would not damage structures or other scenic resources that would affect the scenic quality of (State Route) SR 28 and it would not be visible from Lake Tahoe. The only structures seen from the highway would be four light fixtures and parking lot signage. Vegetation and landscaping maintain scenic effects of the property at less-than-significant levels. Signage would be designed and installed in compliance with Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design and with design standards set forth in the Kings Beach Community Plan (KBCP).

Discussion- Item I-3:

The proposed project would comply with the design standards set forth by Placer and the KBCP. These standards serve to regulate the impact of new projects on the visual character of the Kings Beach area. By complying with these guidelines, the project as proposed would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Discussion- Item I-4:

Proposed nighttime lighting for the site could create adverse light or glare effects. These potential effects will be reduced to less than significant by adherence to Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines for exterior lighting. These guidelines include:

- Maximum height for building and freestanding lighting should not exceed 14 feet.
- If property is adjacent to a residential area or residentially zoned property, the lighting should be screened from these areas.
- Lighting shall be directed away from adjacent roadways and shall not interfere with traffic or create a safety hazard.
- Upward lighting shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X

221

2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (EHS, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (PLN)				X
4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

There are no timber or agricultural resources or operations on the project site. The project site is a previously-disturbed, undeveloped lot next to the U.S. Post Office in the Commercial Core area of Kings Beach. The proposed project would be a permissible use under the KBCP.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

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

Discussion- Item III-1:

The proposed project is located in the Lake Tahoe Air Basin (LTAB) in Placer County. The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the LTAB quality plan.

Discussion- Items III-2,3:

The LTAB is currently designated as a non-attainment area for PM₁₀ with respect to the state standard; for ozone and visibility-reducing particulates with respect to the TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities numerical thresholds; and for vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and wood smoke with respect to the TRPA Environmental Threshold Carrying Capacities management thresholds. The LTAB is either in attainment or unclassified for the remaining national, state, and regional standards except for those in which status designation have not yet been determined (TRPA 2002).

The proposed project does not involve a land use that creates new vehicle trips (LSC 2006). Its purpose is to address an existing parking deficit in the Kings Beach commercial core, which indicates that motor vehicles that would use the lot already travel to Kings Beach. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a deterioration of ambient air quality standards associated with new vehicle trips.

Construction activities associated with the proposed project could result in a temporary increase in vehicle emissions (from construction vehicle operation), reactive organic gas emissions (from asphalt paving and parking space striping operations), and particulate matter emissions (i.e., fugitive dust from grading and paving activities). These increases in air pollution emissions will be reduced by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

222

Mitigation Measures- Item III-3:

MM III.1 During construction, contractors shall comply with all local, regional, state and federal regulations regarding air pollution control. For Placer County please see the Air Pollution Control District Rules and Regulations including but not limited to: Rule 202- Visible Emissions, Rule 207- Particulate Matter, Rule 213- Gasoline Transfer into Storage Containers, Rule 214- Gasoline Transfer into Vehicle Fuel Tanks, Rule 217- Cutback and Emulsified Asphalt Paving Materials, Rule 228- Fugitive Dust, Rule 240- Surface Preparation and Clean-up.

MM III.2 Grading activities would adhere to TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section VIII, Chapter 64 – Grading Standards.

MM III.3 The following Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) Best-Available Mitigation Measures and TRPA BMPs shall be implemented during project construction:

- All disturbed areas shall be adequately restabilized to minimize exposure of soil to wind and water erosion.
- All grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour and dust impacts are occurring off-site.
- During clearing, demolition, earth moving, excavation operations, or grading, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust preventive measure (e.g. hydroseeding, dust control palliative, etc.) subject to the approval of Placer County.
- Existing power sources (e.g. power poles) or clear fuel generators shall be utilized, rather than diesel powered generators.
- Low emission on-site stationary and mobile equipment shall be utilized
- Construction vehicles shall be washed on a regular basis to eliminate dust and debris.
- Diesel warm up and idling times shall be limited to 5 minutes.
- The site contractor shall have a regular maintenance program for all equipment to ensure that the equipment engines are properly tuned and maintain.
- Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Federal and/or state Health and Safety Code visible emission limitations.

Discussion- Item III-4:

Construction activities associated with the proposed project could result in a temporary increase in vehicle emissions (from construction vehicle operation), reactive organic gas emissions (from asphalt paving and parking space striping operations), and particulate matter emissions (i.e., fugitive dust from grading and paving activities).

The increase of air pollutants generated by the project could adversely affect sensitive receptors such as children and senior citizens living in the vicinity of the project. These sensitive receptors could also be temporarily affected by objectionable odors related to emissions during construction. These temporary increases in air pollution emissions would be reduced to less-than-significant levels by implementation of the Mitigation Measures III-A through III-C, above:

Mitigation Measures- Item III-4:

Refer to text in MM III.1

Refer to text in MM III.2

Refer to text in MM III.3

Discussion- Item III-5:

The proposed project is a parking lot and would not result in the creation of objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

223

1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				X
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)				X
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)				X
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)				X
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item IV-1:

No unique, rare, special status or endangered species of plants or animals have been found in the project vicinity according to biological studies initiated in support of the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project (MACTEC 2006b).

Discussion- Items IV-2,6:

The project site is a previously disturbed site in a commercial/residential urban area with very sparse vegetation. The wildlife habitat value of the project site is minimal. No unique, rare or endangered species of animals have been found in the project vicinity (MACTEC 2006b). No creeks, streams, or other surface waters traverse or run adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would not result in a change in diversity or distribution of species or number of species of animals in the project area. The proposed project will not have a negative impact on biological resources for the area.

Discussion- Item IV-3:

There are no oak woodlands on the project site or in the project vicinity.

Discussion- Item IV-4,5:

There is no riparian habitat or any wetlands on the project site.

Discussion- Item IV-7:

One of the five trees on the lot (a 31-inch diameter-at-breast-height [dbh] Jeffrey Pine) would be removed during construction of the proposed project. Removal of trees is allowed by applicable plans and ordinances with a tree removal permit from TRPA. The project applicant would obtain the necessary tree removal permits from the County and/or TRPA prior to tree removal. Therefore, no activities resulting from implementation of the proposed parking lot would conflict with local plans and ordinances.

224

Discussion- Item IV-8:

The project would not conflict with the provisions of any habitat or conservation plans or other ordinances applicable to the Kings Beach Commercial Core area.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

Discussion- Item V-1:

A Historical Property Survey Report (HSPR) prepared in support of the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project was published in February of 2006. The HSPR identified six properties in the project area that have been recommended as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register. The nearest of these properties to the project site is the Fuhrman Houses approximately three blocks north of the site. At this distance, the project as proposed would not be visible from this resource and would have no impact on this property (MACTEC No Date).

Discussion- Item V-2:

No significant archaeological sites structures, objects or other resources have been identified as being located on the project site (MACTEC 2006a).

Discussion- Item V-3:

No paleontological resources have been discovered in the project area (MACTEC 2006a).

Discussion- Items V-4,5:

Correspondence with the Washoe Tribe indicates that the project area has no history of religious, cultural, or sacred uses or would affect any unique ethnic cultural values (MACTEC 2005, EDAW 2006).

Discussion- Item V-6:

The archeological survey report did not indicate any human remains were found on the project site (MACTEC 2006a).

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				X

2/25

Initial Study & Checklist continued

2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)			X	
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)				X
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				X
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)			X	
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)				X
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)				X
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)				X
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18, 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)				X

Discussion- Item VI-1:

The proposed project is a parking lot on a relatively level site and would not result in increased exposure of people to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures. There is an earthquake fault zone that runs near Stateline on the North Shore of Lake Tahoe, but it does not cross the immediate project area. The land extension of this submerged fault located mostly below the lake is called the Incline Village fault zone (IVFZ) (Ichinose et al. 1999). A geotechnical investigation of the project site found soil composition on the site to be silty red/brown sandy layers that are not subject to ground failure (Kleinfelder 2006). All recommendations presented in the geotechnical report for the proposed project would be incorporated into the construction of the proposed parking lot (Kleinfelder 2006).

Discussion- Item VI-2:

The proposed project would disturb nearly 100 percent (12,500 square feet) of surface soil on the project site by scraping, grading, dewatering and compaction activities. Approximately 4,500 square feet of this soil would be restored to its pre-project condition or landscaped with vegetation types appropriate to the Lake Tahoe Basin. Approximately 8,000 square feet of the site will be paved. Groundwork activities would comply with all related County and TRPA grading ordinances as well as all recommendations presented in the geotechnical report for the proposed project. While the site would be graded, the relatively level topography, compliance with ordinances, and restoration of landscaped portions of the site would maintain environmental effects at less-than-significant levels.

Discussion- Item VI-3:

The project site slopes down to the south/southwest with an inclination of approximately 2.5%, and there are no notable ground surface relief features. Grading would be limited to site preparation prior to paving of the parking lot. There would be no change in topography on the project site.

Discussion- Item VI-4:

There are no unique geologic or physical features on the project site that will be destroyed, covered or modified by site preparation activities.

Discussion- Item VI-5:

Site preparation would disturb soils, so they could be temporarily susceptible to wind and water erosion. The project would be required to implement temporary best management practices (BMPs) during construction and to follow the TRPA standards for grading (TRPA Code of Ordinances, Section 8, Chapter 64). Furthermore, all control measures presented in the geotechnical report for the proposed project would be incorporated into the construction

226

of the proposed project (Kleinfelder 2006). Compliance with ordinance requirements and implementation of planned control measures would maintain erosion risks at less-than-significant levels.

Discussion- Item VI-6:

The project site is located approximately 1,000 feet north of Lake Tahoe across State Route (SR) 28. The principal natural drainage that occurs within the project vicinity is Griff Creek. A secondary outflow of the Griff Creek Channel runs parallel to Deer Street and empties into Lake Tahoe. This secondary channel is approximately 1,700 feet from the project site. No rivers, creeks, or streams traverse the project site or run between the project site and Lake Tahoe. Therefore, the project would not result in changes to deposition or erosion or changes in siltation.

Discussion- Items VI-7,8:

The proposed project is a parking lot and would not result in increased exposure of people to geologic and geomorphological hazards. The project site is not located in the shorezone of Lake Tahoe and the surrounding area is relatively level. Therefore, the project site is not subject to backshore erosion, avalanches or mudslides. A geotechnical investigation of the project site found soil composition on the site to be silty red/ brown sandy layers that are not subject to ground failure (Kleinfelder 2006).

Discussion- Item VI-9:

Soil composition on the site includes silty red/brown sandy layers. No expansive soils were identified on the site (Kleinfelder 2006).

VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (EHS)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD, EHS)			X	
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (EHS, PLN)				X
8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
9. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)			X	227

10. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Discussion- Items VII-1,2,3:

The proposed project would not involve any routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction of the proposed project would involve the short-term use and storage of hazardous materials typically associated with grading and paving, such as fuel and other substances. All materials would be used, stored, and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws including Cal-OSHA requirements and manufacturer's instructions. Therefore, the proposed project does not pose a risk of accident or upset conditions involving the release of hazardous materials.

Discussion- Item VII-4:

The project site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites (MACTEC 2006c).

Discussion- Items VII-5,6:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or located near a public or private airport or airstrip.

Discussion- Item VII-7:

Construction-related traffic and activities associated with the proposed project could temporarily obstruct or slow vehicles attempting to evacuate or access the area near the project site in the event of an emergency. However, it is not anticipated that any roadways adjacent or near the project site would have standard traffic controls in place (e.g., signage, flag personnel, coned-off lanes, or traffic barriers) and would not impair access to the area.

Discussion- Item VII-8:

The project site is a previously disturbed site located in a commercial/residential urban area with very sparse vegetation. The proposed project includes paving the majority of the project site. There is no wildland/urban interface on or adjacent to the project site and the proposed project is not expected to increase fire danger.

Discussion- Items VII-9,10:

The project will not result in any public health hazards.

VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)				X
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (EHS, ESD)			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (EHS, ESD)			X	<i>228</i>

7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
10. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
11. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)				X

Discussion- Item VIII-1:

BMPs capable of containing surface water runoff, including any water pollution contained in the surface water runoff, are included in the project design. These BMPs would be designed to meet Placer County standards per the Storm Water Management Manual as well as the requirements of TRPA's BMP code (Section 4 Chapter 25) and Water Quality code (Section 10 Chapter 82). Specifically these BMPs include: a stormwater drainage system and landscaped areas along the perimeter of the site – excepting the parking lot entrance. Installation of these BMPs would keep any contaminants possible of causing a water quality violation from entering the watershed.

Discussion- Item VIII-2:

Operation of the proposed project would not require the use of water except for landscaping irrigation. Water would be provided through the municipal system with no independent wells drawing water from beneath the site. There are no aquifers located beneath or adjacent to the project site that would potentially be affected by construction activities. Because site disturbance would be limited to surface site preparation, no short-term dewatering would occur during construction.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:

No creeks, streams, or other surface waters traverse or run adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would not affect the course or flow of any streams or other drainage areas.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:

The proposed project would result in an increase in impervious surface area square footage on the project site. The stormwater drainage system anticipates the increase in impervious surface and would be designed to contain runoff from a 20-year 1 hour storm event. The proposed drainage system is described above (Item VIII 4). The system will maintain effects of surface runoff at less-than-significant levels.

Discussion- Items VIII-5,6:

See Responses to Item VIII-1 and Item VIII-4 above.

Discussion- Item VIII-7,8,9:

The proposed project is not within a 100-year flood hazard area and does not include the construction of housing units. Construction and operation of the project would not result in increased exposure of people or property to flooding hazards. The amount of impervious surface created by the proposed project would not result in alterations to drainage patterns in the area.

Discussion- Item VIII-10:

A geotechnical investigation report prepared for the proposed project concluded that depth to groundwater is approximately 3.5 feet (Kleinfelder 2006). An approval of excavation depth of 2 feet below ground surface was issued for the proposed project in a letter from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, dated July 25, 2006. Therefore, construction-related groundwork would not interfere with the direction or rate of flow of groundwater.

Discussion- Item VIII-11:

The proposed project would include a stormwater drainage system that would be designed to capture and treat runoff from the project site and retain treated runoff for infiltration. While a small increase in stormwater runoff could

occur with the proposed parking lot, it would not change the amount of surface water in Lake Tahoe, because any increase in stormwater runoff would be collected for infiltration into groundwater, rather than discharged to the lake.

IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)				X
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items IX-1,6:

The proposed project is a parking lot. The project site is an undeveloped lot located in the Commercial Core area of Kings Beach. The proposed project would not disrupt the arrangement of or physically divide an established community.

Discussion- Item IX-2:

The theme of the Kings Beach Community Plan is "major tourist accommodation, retail and services." The proposed project would be a permissible use under the KBCP (Placer County 1996). The proposed site plan indicates that the first parking stall in the lot would be approximately 28 feet from the curbline on Salmon Avenue. The Placer County Zoning Ordinance (Article 17.54.070: Design and Improvement of Parking) requires that the first parking space within a parking lot shall be set back 40 feet from the curbline. The Kings Beach Community Plan Standards and Guidelines for Signage Parking and Design states that Placer County may permit deviations to the parking standards on the basis of an approved parking analysis.

Discussion- Item IX-3:

The project site does not contain important wildlife habitat or sensitive species. The project would comply with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects.

Discussion- Items IX-4,7:

The proposed project is a parking lot. The project site is an undeveloped lot located in a commercial/residential urban area in Kings Beach. The proposed project would not result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts, nor would it result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area.

230

Discussion- Item IX-5:

There are no timber or agricultural resources or operations on the project site.

Discussion- Item IX-8:

The proposed project is a parking lot. The project site is an undeveloped lot located in a commercial/residential urban area in Kings Beach. The proposed project would not result in economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

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

Discussion- All Items:

The geotechnical investigation did not identify any mineral resources on the project site (Kleinfelder Inc. 2006).

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

Discussion- Items XI-1,2:

The potential for post-construction noise levels was analyzed in a report prepared by j. c. brennan and associates for Placer County (j.c. brennan and associates 2006). The report determined noise generated by traffic and pedestrian activity on the site would not exceed existing background noise. Existing background noise levels do not exceed the Placer County Noise Ordinance levels, the TRPA Plan Area Statement (PAS) noise level criteria or the KBCP noise standards.

231

Discussion- Item XI-3:

The proposed project would result in intermittent short-term noise effects primarily associated with the operation of onsite construction equipment and offsite construction vehicles. The temporary noise produced during construction would vary daily depending on the type of construction activity and could result in periodic noise levels beyond those permitted by the KBCP. To minimize construction noise the following mitigation measures shall be followed:

Mitigation Measures- Item XI-3

MM XI.1 In order to mitigate the impacts of construction noise noted above, construction noise emanating from any construction activities for which a building permit or grading permit is required is prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holiday, and shall only occur:

- Monday through Friday, 6:00 am to 8:00 pm (during daylight savings)
- Monday through Friday, 7:00 am to 8:00 pm (during standard time)
- Saturdays, 8:00 am to 6:00 pm

In addition, a temporary sign shall be located throughout the project (4' x 4'), as determined by the DRC, at key intersections depicting the above construction hour limitations. Said signs shall include a toll free public information phone number where surrounding residents can report violations and the developer/builder will respond and resolve noise violations. This condition shall be included on the Improvement Plans and shown in the development notebook.

Essentially, quiet activities, which do not involve heavy equipment or machinery, may occur at other times. Work occurring within an enclosed building, such as a house under construction with the roof and siding completed, may occur at other times as well.

The Planning Director is authorized to waive the time frames based on special circumstances, such as adverse weather conditions.

Discussion- Items XI-4,5:

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or located near a public or private airport or airstrip. The nearest airstrip/airport is the Truckee airport, located approximately 11 miles from the project site.

XII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

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

Discussion- Item XI-1:

The proposed project is not a land use that would alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of population. Its purpose is to address an existing parking deficit and provide parking spaces for development that is consistent with the KBCP.

Discussion- Item XI-2:

The project site contains no homes. The proposed project is a public parking facility and would not affect housing.

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

232

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

Discussion- Item XII-1:

The proposed project would not result in a need for additional fire protection services for the area. Its purpose is to address an existing parking deficit in the Kings Beach commercial core, which indicates that motor vehicles that would use the lot already travel to Kings Beach. Therefore, no change in fire hazard or need for fire protection would occur.

Discussion- Item XII-2:

The proposed project would not result in a need for additional police protection for the area. Its purpose is to address an existing parking deficit in the Kings Beach commercial core, which indicates that motor vehicles that would use the lot already travel to Kings Beach. Increasing parking availability in the commercial core could reduce the frequency of parking violations on other streets.

Discussion- Item XII-3:

As a parking lot, the proposed project would not generate demand for new students.

Discussion- Item XII-4:

Placer County would provide maintenance of the proposed parking facility. This maintenance would be included as one of the planned aspects of the proposed project and not constitute an unplanned need.

Discussion- Item XII-5:

It is not anticipated that the proposed project would result in a need for other additional governmental services for the area.

XIV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

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

Discussion- Item XIV-1:

The proposed project would not generate new trips to the area nor is the proposed project growth-inducing. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in increased use of recreational facilities.

233

Discussion- Item XIV-2:

The proposed project is a parking lot and does not include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

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

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

Discussion- Items XV-1,2:

The purpose of the proposed project is to offset a portion of an existing parking deficit in the KBCP area. The traffic study prepared for the proposed project concluded that motor vehicles that would use the lot already travel to Kings Beach and would not result in increased vehicle trips. The traffic study also determined that existing intersection Level of Service (LOS) would not change (LSC 2006).

Discussion- Items XV-3,4:

The proposed parking lot would be constructed in accordance with Placer County engineering and design standards including safety standards related to roadway design and appropriate signage. Incorporated into these design standards are requirements related to adequate ingress and egress for emergency vehicles to the project site.

Discussion- Item XV-5:

The proposed project is a parking lot. Its purpose is to address an existing parking deficit in the Kings Beach commercial core. The proposed project would, therefore, improve parking conditions in the vicinity.

Discussion- Item XV-6:

During peak hours, a total of 7 one-way vehicle trips (2 inbound and 5 outbound) would be diverted from SR 28 to the new parking facility and from other parking areas on nearby residential side-streets. According to the traffic study, 75 percent of these trips would be generated by vehicles that would have otherwise parked along SR 28, while 25 percent of these trips would be generated by vehicles that would have otherwise parked along nearby side streets. This re-distribution of vehicle traffic would not result in an increase in traffic hazards to bicyclists or

234

pedestrians. To the extent that providing off-street parking spaces would reduce occupation of on-street parking, it would increase the area of the streets available for bicycle use.

Discussion- Item XV-7:

The proposed project is a parking lot. Its purpose is to address an existing parking deficit in the Kings Beach commercial core. The proposed project plan includes a bike rack for four bicycles as required by design policies of Placer County.

Discussion- Item XV-8:

The proposed project is a public parking facility in the Kings Beach Commercial Core Area and would not affect air traffic patterns.

XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

Discussion- Items XVI-1,2,3,6:

The proposed project would not be growth-inducing, would not result in increased generation of wastewater and therefore would not require the construction installation of any new wastewater treatment or distribution facilities. Because the purpose of the project is to address an existing parking deficit, vehicles that would use the proposed lot are already coming to Kings Beach.

Discussion- Item XVI-4:

The proposed project includes an on-site stormwater drainage system for the purpose of capturing and treating runoff from the project site. The stormwater drainage system would be designed to contain runoff from a 20-year 1-hour storm event and to meet Placer County standards per the Storm Water Management Manual (SWMM) as described under Item VIII Hydrology and Water Quality.

235

Discussion- Item XVI-5:

Operation of the proposed project would not require the use of water except for landscaping maintenance. Landscaping proposed as part of the project design includes plant species recommended by TRPA landscaping guidelines for the Tahoe Basin and would not require excessive fertilizer or water

Discussion- Item XVI-7,8:

The proposed project includes two onsite trash/recycle receptacles that would have minimal effect on existing solid waste collection and disposal systems.

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

Discussion- All Items:

This project is proposed in support of goals set forth by the Kings Beach Community Plan, so it is appropriate to characterize the project as contributing to the attainment of community goals. In compliance with the community plan, County policies and manuals, and TRPA ordinance requirements, the project's design would not degrade the local environment. No examples of major periods of California history or prehistory are present on the site. The proposed project is intended to address an existing parking deficit, so it would not lead to any substantial increase in traffic generation or visitation to Kings Beach. Therefore, it would not contribute to cumulative impact issues related to its operation. As documented in responses to individual questions, there are no substantial adverse effects on human beings.

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

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

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

236

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

Planning Department, Bill Combs, Chairperson
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Amy Green
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Wastewater, Ed Wydra
 Department of Public Works, Transportation
 Environmental Health Services, Grant Miller
 Air Pollution Control District, Brent Backus
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
 Facility Services, Parks, Vance Kimbrell
 Placer County Fire / CDF, Bob Eicholtz

Gina Langford

Signature _____ Date December 19, 2006
 Gina Langford, Environmental Coordinator

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES: The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603.

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

237

