3.7 Parking

The following discussion summarizes the existing parking and regulatory environment. A complete parking study, providing additional methodology and results of the analysis, is provided in the *Kings Beach Commercial Core Parking Study* (KBCCPS), prepared by LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. (2003). The KBCCPS is included as Appendix M of this document.

Parking impacts are evaluated for the full construction of the build alternatives. Because there is no difference in this impact by year, parking impacts are not considered for specific design years. Additional on- and off-street potential parking locations are illustrated in Figure 3.7-1, while Table 3.7-1 summarizes components associated with these locations. Figure 3.7-1 and Table 3.7-1 indicate parking locations that will be built before completion of the CCIP, as well as parking locations that were initially considered but ultimately withdrawn due to existing land use conflicts or other environmental constraints.

3.7.1 Affected Environment

Parking conditions in the action area can currently be summarized as follows.

- Excluding informal parking in vacant lots and disabled-only spaces (which are only on private property or in parking lots, not on the state highway), there are approximately 1,968 parking spaces in the action area. Because 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 ROW, and 236 are along 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 action area was conducted on Friday, August 24, 1999. This data was then factored up (based on traffic counts conducted during the peak day and on the day of the counts) to reflect parking conditions on a peak Saturday in August. The total number of parked vehicles in the action area reached a maximum of 1,039 between noon and 2:00 p.m., reflecting an overall peak utilization of 53%. 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 203 identified spaces (with the remaining 43 vehicles parked in illegal or substandard spaces). Focusing only on the spaces along the SR 28 ROW (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.
- 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 action area, resulting in an estimate of 200 parked vehicles during peak periods. Although winter parking supply is reduced somewhat due to snow storage, it can be concluded that the critical parking conditions occur in summer.
- In addition to the counts of actual parking demand, an analysis was conducted to determine the number of spaces required by the Placer County and TRPA *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking, and Design* (Placer County and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 1994). This evaluation involved multiplying the parking demand rates by the number of various land uses in the action area. This analysis indicates that the actual observed parking demand exceeds the demand calculated by the applicable parking demand rates by approximately 134 parked vehicles. The actual observed parking demand is, therefore, used in this analysis to define the standards of significance.

Table 3.7-1. Summary of Potential Parking Components

Element	APN	Existing land use & Ownership	Number of parking spaces	TRPA Land Classification	Area (acres)[1]	Hard coverage (acres)[2]	LSOGs Severely Damaged	LSOGs Removed	Trees Severely Damaged[b]	Trees Removed	LSOG Quantity	Tree Quantity
Potential parking locations												
1	NA	Vacant/Private	14	5	0.09	0.04	3	0	2	2	3	7
3	090-122-030 090-122-031	Vacant/Public (Stoker Prop.)	41	1b/5	0.50	0.25	9	0	1	3	10	16
4	090-126-017	Vacant/Private	5	1b	0.14	0.07	3	0	2	2	3	7
6	090-133-008 090-133-009	Residential Motel/Private	37	5	0.42	0.21	5	0	1	3	8	7
7	090-221-013 090-221-014 090-221-020	Abandon Fuel Station/Private	40	1b/5	0.47	0.23	1	0	0	0	1	2
8	090-192-030	Vacant/Private	28	5	0.39	0.20	5	0	4	6	7	20
9	090-133-006 090-133-007	Vacant/Private	27	5	0.31	0.15	5	0	2	7	8	7
10[3]	NA	County ROW	38	1b/5	0.20	0.10	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	090-134-042	Vacant/Private	24	5	0.27	0.13	3	0	1	8	3	12
15	090-134-007	Parking/Private	11	5	0.25	0.13	1	0	4	3	2	13
17	090-134-008	Business/Private	24	5	0.25	0.13	2	0	1	2	2	11
18	090-134-006	Business/Private	11	5	0.11	0.05	0	0	0	0	0	3
19	NA	County ROW	9	5	0.05	0.03	0	0	0	3	0	3
20[3]	NA	County ROW	5	5	0.03	0.01	0	0	0	0	0	0
21	NA	County ROW	11	5	0.06	0.03	1	0	4	1	2	6
22	NA	County ROW	14	5	0.07	0.04	3	0	1	0	3	4
23	090-122-001	Vacant/Private	12	1b	0.12	0.06	2	0	0	1	2	3

Table 3.7-1. Continued

Element	APN	Existing land use & Ownership	Number of parking spaces	TRPA Land Classification	Area (acres)[1]	Hard coverage (acres)[2]	LSOGs Severely Damaged	LSOGs Removed	Trees Severely Damaged[b]	Trees Removed	LSOG Quantity	Tree Quantity
24	NA	County ROW	6	5	0.03	0.02	0	0	1	0	0	1
25	090-122-023 090-122-036 090-122-035	Vacant/private	24	5	0.36	0.18	10	0	2	7	10	23
26	NA	County ROW	14	1b/5	0.07	0.04	1	0	2	1	1	4
27	NA	County ROW	21	1b	0.12	0.06	0	0	3	5	0	8
28[3]	NA	County ROW	4	1b	0.02	0.01	0	0	0	0	0	0
29	NA	County ROW	9	5	0.04	0.02	1	0	4	1	1	6
30	NA	County ROW	13	5	0.08	0.04	3	0	1	0	3	4
31	NA	County ROW	10	1b/5	0.04	0.02	1	0	0	0	1	1
32	090-192-025	Vacant/private	30	5	0.05	0.03	0	0	2	4	0	30
33	NA	County ROW	16	1b/5	0.08	0.04	1	0	2	0	1	6
34	NA	County ROW	6	5	0.03	0.02	1	0	1	4	1	6
Totals:	NA	NA	504	NA	**4.65**	**2.33**	**61**	0	**41**	**63**	**72**	**210**
Parking locations considered and withdrawn[4]												
A	090-071-017 090-071-033	Vacant/private	42	5	0.55	0.28	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
B	090-074-023 090-074-024	Residential/private	80	5	0.94	0.47	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
C	090-071-009	Residential/private	24	5	0.29	0.14	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Totals:	NA	NA	146	NA	**1.77**	**0.89**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table 3.7-1. Continued

Element	APN	Existing land use & Ownership	Number of parking spaces	TRPA Land Classification	Area (acres)[1]	Hard coverage (acres)[2]	LSOGs Severely Damaged	LSOGs Removed	Trees Severely Damaged[b]	Trees Removed	LSOG Quantity	Tree Quantity
\Parking locations built before completion of the CCIP												
D	090-122-019	Existing parking lot/vacant/Placer County	20	5	0.29	0.14	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
E	090-126-020	Vacant/Placer County	22	5	0.21	0.11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
F	090-192-025	Vacant/Placer County	21	5	0.21	0.10	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Totals:	NA	NA	**63**	NA	**0.71**	**0.35**	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Notes:

[1] Projected area: actual area will be determined once project final design is completed.

[2] Assumes 50% coverage of total lot acreage; total area of hard coverage will be determined once project final design is completed.

[3] No trees would be removed from these potential parking locations.

[4] Parking lots have been withdrawn due to existing land use conflicts or other environmental constraints.

Source: Dokken Engineering

06676.06 EIR (03-07)

Figure 3.7-1
Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project
Potential Parking Sites

3.7.2 Regulatory Setting/Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Thresholds

3.7.2.1 FHWA

FHWA does not have any thresholds or standings pertaining to parking.

3.7.2.2 Caltrans

Caltrans does not have any thresholds or standings pertaining to parking.

3.7.2.3 Placer County

The Placer County and TRPA *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking, and Design* provides standards for the number of parking spaces required for a wide variety of land use types (Placer County and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 1994). These standards were used as the basis for the KBCCPS, on which this analysis is based.

3.7.2.4 TRPA

The TRPA does not have specific established standards that apply to the impact of roadway/streetscape projects on parking conditions. Regarding land use development, *Section 24.1.B* of the TRPA Code of Ordinance indicates that the Placer County and TRPA *Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking, and Design* will apply to the Kings Beach Commercial Community Plan area (Placer County and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency 1994). These standards and guidelines also do not address the issue of replacement parking associated with roadway/streetscape projects.

3.7.3 Environmental Consequences (Including Permanent, Temporary, Direct, Indirect)

3.7.3.1 Study Methods and Procedures

A comprehensive study of parking supply and demand in the action area was conducted in 2003 by LSC Transportation Consultants Inc. as documented in the KBCCPS (LSC Transportation Consultants Inc. 2003). This study focused on an area within one block of SR 28 between SR 267 and Chipmunk Street. The parking supply data presented in this document was updated by LSC to reflect changes in land uses and associated parking

supply between 2000 and the preparation of this environmental document in 2005, such as the removal of the Beach Barn and the conversion of the Los Compadres restaurant site to a furniture store.

As discussed below, the action area currently has adequate parking availability as a whole, but a parking shortfall exists during peak summer periods for the key area between Deer Street and Coon Street south of SR 28. Focusing on the key on-street spaces that would be impacted by the proposed action, a maximum of 45% of all on-street spaces between Deer Street and Fox Street were utilized during peak conditions, based on observations. This indicates that parking availability is limited along the beachfront area (particularly in the parking lots). However, some unused capacity currently exists in the total inventory of on-street parking available within the action area, which helps to offset some loss of parking. As a result, it is not necessary to strictly ensure that the number of parking spaces is maintained within the proposed action area. Instead, a portion of this existing on-street capacity can be utilized, so long as resulting conditions do not exceed a reasonable maximum utilization rate for on-street spaces. The parking planning profession typically considers an effective maximum utilization of parking spaces to be 90 to 95% of all spaces. This is to provide some availability of parking during peak periods to minimize excess circulation as drivers search for the last remaining parking spaces. Due to the dispersed pattern of public parking in the area, a conservative assumption is that a maximum of 90% utilization is appropriate for public spaces in Kings Beach.

For purposes of this analysis, an adverse parking effect is defined as a net loss of parking that causes public parking utilization to exceed 90% along any portion of the action corridor.

Impact PK-1: Parking Utilization in Excess of 90%

Alternative 1

Although it can be expected that there will be development of new land uses in Kings Beach in the future, it can be assumed that parking demand for new land uses will be

consistent with the parking requirements of the *Kings Beach Commercial Community Plan* and that adequate parking will be provided either on-site or in off-site, off-street lots developed for this purpose. As a result, future development will not affect the parking demand for the on-street spaces impacted by the proposed urban improvement project. Because the proposed action does not generate increased parking demand, the impact of the build alternatives is limited to the net impact on the number of parking spaces. Alternative 1 would result in no change to either on-street spaces or spaces on private parcels accessed directly from the highway.

Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, on-street parallel parking would be provided along both sides of SR 28 between Secline Street and Chipmunk Street. However, parking would be prohibited during the peak summer season from Independence Day to Labor Day, which would be accomplished by signing, temporary barricades, and enforcement.

Post-Project Parking Conditions—2008 and 2028

Although Alternative 2 (as well as the other build alternatives) would not change parking demand in the action area, it would impact parking supply in two ways.

- First, it would result in a reduction in on-street parking spaces along SR 28 between Fox and Chipmunk Street during the peak summer season from Independence Day to Labor Day. As shown in Table 3.7-2, the existing 202 on-street parking spaces would be eliminated.
- Second, the alternative would 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, the many existing spaces accessed directly off of the highway would be effectively eliminated. As shown in the center portion of Table 3.7-2, a net loss of 78 private spaces would result (from any of the build alternatives). In cases where some spaces could be replaced by providing parking in the same area outside

of the ROW (behind the sidewalk) with access off of the private driveway, it was assumed that these spaces would be provided. This total includes two spaces each along the east side of Secline Street and the west side of Fox Street just north of SR 28 that would be eliminated by the curb returns.

As indicated in Table 3.7-2, the net result associated with impacts on public and private parking spaces associated with Alternative 2 would be a net reduction of 280 parking spaces in the action area.

As a result, it is necessary to evaluate the total number of available on-street parking spaces that could be utilized without exceeding the 90% peak utilization factor. Table 3.7-3 presents an evaluation of the existing on-street parking demand and supply. Parking supply is currently 202 spaces. To be conservative, the peak accumulation of the three parking count time periods was then identified for each street segment. As shown, summing the peak demand for each segment indicates a peak on-street parking demand of 126 vehicles. Factoring to reflect 90% maximum utilization, 142 spaces are required. Taking the difference, the existing supply of on-street spaces could be reduced by 60 spaces (for the action area as a whole) while still maintaining the 90% utilization rate. Table 3.7-3 also presents this evaluation of available spaces on a block-by-block basis. Although the total action area has excess spaces, the key blocks between Deer Street and Bear Street have a net shortfall of nine on-street spaces during peak periods.

Alternative 2 would result in a net loss of 280 spaces (Table 3.7-2), which would exceed the number of spaces that could be eliminated while still attaining the 90% utilization rate (60, as indicated in Table 3.7-3).

To compensate for the loss of parking, Placer County will provide new parking spaces to meet the 90% utilization rate as part of the project, which would ensure adequate parking availability. In addition, Placer County will ensure the new parking spaces are located within a reasonable walking distance (i.e., one block) of the specific subareas of impact.

Table 3.7-2. Impact of Alternatives on Number of Parking Spaces

Alternative 2 Parking Impacts

	Public					Private	
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**

Alternative 3 Parking Impacts

	Public					Private	
Road Segment	Existing Spaces	Planned Spaces	Spaces Eliminated	Demand	Parking Shortfall	Spaces Eliminated	Total Parking Shortfall
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**

Alternative 4 Parking Impacts

	Public					Private	
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 Transportation Consultants, Inc. 2000.

New parking spaces will be provided so that the parking requirements of each block—either within that block or within an adjacent block—are met to ensure that adequate parking conditions are maintained for all subareas (by block) within the action area. This block-level analysis is warranted because the CCIP area is too large to be considered as a single parking area because drivers will not typically walk the distances from outlying areas to the areas of parking shortages. For instance, new parking spaces within the area provided between Deer and Bear Streets above the 39 required for this specific block could be used to offset the loss of parking along the adjacent blocks between Secline and Deer Streets to the west and Bear and Coon Streets to the east. Providing new parking supply in accordance with this pattern will focus parking on those blocks that have the greatest need. Unless new parking supply can be developed to exactly match this pattern, more new spaces would be provided in excess of the 220 total new spaces required to provide adequate new parking for each block.

The number of adequate parking spaces required by block is estimated by subtracting the available parking capacity (60 spaces, as indicated in Table 3.7-3) from the net impact of the alternative (280 spaces, indicated in Table 3.7-2). As indicated in Table 3.7-2, a minimum of 220 new parking spaces is required. Table 3.7-2 also indicates the number of spaces required to compensate for the loss of parking along each block (total of both sides) of SR 28. The largest number of new spaces, 61 spaces, will be required to compensate for the loss of parking between Deer and Bear Streets.

Figure 3.7-1 shows potential parking that will be added to compensate for the project alternatives. Three parking lots totaling 63 spaces have already undergone environmental review and will be built prior to the start of CCIP construction. These three lots are shown in Figure 3.7-1 with red shading. They include the Salmon Avenue parking lot (12,500 square feet) that would include 22 spaces (APN 090-126-020), the Minnow Avenue parking lot that would include 21 spaces (APN 090-192-025), and the Brook Avenue parking lot that would add 20 spaces (APN 090-122-019). Figure 3.7-1 also shows locations (both on- and off-street) from which additional future parking spaces would be selected.

The analysis of construction phasing and staging necessary to evaluate temporary construction parking impacts has also not been conducted. It can be expected that short-term loss of public parking and loss of access to private parking will occur as part of project construction. To date, Placer County has constructed one new public parking lot that can be used to offset spaces lost during construction and intends to construct several more prior to the SR 28 project. In addition, Placer County DPW will develop construction plans to minimize the number and duration of temporary loss of parking during construction, will monitor parking conditions during construction, and will work with affected property owners to minimize effects. Placer County will also provide new lots and off-site parking spaces to compensate for the loss of on-street parking.

As part of the Alternative 2, Placer County has committed to compensating for parking spaces lost as a result of the project. Consequently, Alternative 2 would not result in substantial parking effects.

Table 3.7-3. Evaluation of SR 28 Available On-Street Parking

Block (Total of Both Sides)	Existing Public Parking Supply (# of Spaces)	Observed Parking Demand				Required Parking (90% utilization)	Parking Surplus/ (Shortage)
		10 am to 12 pm	12 pm to 2 pm	2 pm to 4 pm	Maximum		
SR 267 to Secline	12	4	4	5	5	6	6
Secline to Deer	29	9	9	13	13	15	14
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	8
Fox to Chipmunk	66	15	18	8	18	20	46
Total:	**202**	**107**	**82**	**97**	**126**	**142**	**60**

Source: LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. 2003. Counts conducted August 20, 1999, factored up to reflect peak August Saturday conditions.

Alternative 3

Under Alternative 3, on-street parallel parking would be provided along both sides of SR 28 year-round.

Post-Project Parking Conditions—2008 and 2028

Alternative 3 would result in a net loss of 94 spaces, while maintaining 108 parking spaces along SR 28. As with Alternative 2, any reduction over 60 spaces would result in parking utilization rates that exceed 90%. Moreover, an additional net loss of 78 existing spaces on private lots accessed directly off of the highway would result in a total reduction of 172 parking spaces (Table 3.7-2).

As indicated in Table 3.7-2, Alternative 3 would result in a net reduction of 172 parking spaces (public and private). Subtracting the 60 spaces currently available within the 90% utilization standard from the reduced parking supply of 172 spaces indicates that a minimum of 112 parking spaces are required to compensate for parking spaces lost from implementing Alternative 3. The greatest number of new spaces (40 spaces) will be required to compensate for the loss of existing spaces between Coon and Fox Streets.

To compensate for the loss of parking, Placer County will provide new parking spaces to meet the 90% utilization rate as part of the project, which would ensure adequate parking availability. In addition, Placer County will ensure the new parking spaces are located within a reasonable walking distance (i.e., one block) of the specific subareas of impact.

New parking spaces will 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) within the action area. This block-level analysis is warranted because the CCIP area is too large to be considered as a single parking area because drivers will not typically walk the distances from outlying areas to the areas of parking shortages. No compensation is required for the block between SR 267 and Secline Street; the nine spaces available in this block would be available to partially address the parking spaces needed for the adjacent Secline-Deer Street block.

Figure 3.7-1 shows potential parking that will be added to compensate for the project alternatives. Three parking lots totaling 63 spaces have already undergone environmental

review and will be built prior to the start of CCIP construction. These three lots are shown in Figure 3.7-1 with red shading. They include the Salmon Avenue parking lot (12,500 square feet) that would include 22 spaces (APN 090-126-020), the Minnow Avenue parking lot that would include 21 spaces (APN 090-192-025), and the Brook Avenue parking lot that would add 20 spaces (APN 090-122-019). Figure 3.7-1 also shows locations (both on- and off-street) from which future additional parking spaces would be selected.

The analysis of construction phasing and staging necessary to evaluate temporary construction parking impacts has also not been conducted. It can be expected that short-term loss of public parking and loss of access to private parking will occur as part of project construction. To date, Placer County has constructed one new public parking lot that can be used to offset spaces lost during construction and intends to construct several more prior to the SR 28 project. In addition, Placer County DPW will develop construction plans to minimize the number and duration of temporary loss of parking during construction, will monitor parking conditions during construction, and will work with affected property owners to minimize effects. Placer County will also provide new lots and off-site parking spaces to compensate the loss of available on-street parking spaces.

As part of Alternative 3, Placer County has committed to compensating for parking spaces lost as a result of the project by adding spaces. Consequently, Alternative 3 would not result in substantial parking effects.

Alternative 4

Under Alternative 4, on-street parallel parking would not be provided along the entire length of the proposed action, effectively prohibiting on-street parking year-round rather than solely in the summer, as with Alternative 2. Off-street parking would be provided with side street parking and newly constructed parking lots to compensate for this loss.

Post-Project Parking Conditions—2008 and 2028

Alternative 4 would eliminate all on-street parking spaces along SR 28 in the action area, resulting in a loss of 202 spaces. As with Alternative 2, any reduction over 60 spaces would result in parking utilization rates that exceed 90%. Moreover, an additional net loss of 78 existing spaces on private lots accessed directly off of the highway would result in a net reduction of 280 spaces (Table 3.7-2).

As indicated in Table 3.7-2, Alternative 4 results in a net reduction in parking supply of 280 spaces. The number of adequate parking spaces required by block can be estimated by subtracting the available parking capacity of 60 spaces currently available within the 90% utilization standard from the net impact of the alternative (280 spaces indicated in Table 3.7-2). As indicated in Table 3.7-2, a minimum of 220 spaces is required to compensate for this alternative's impact on parking conditions. The largest number of new spaces, 61 spaces, will be required to compensate for the loss of existing spaces between Deer and Bear Streets.

To compensate for the loss of parking, Placer County, as part of the project, will provide new parking spaces to meet the 90% utilization rate, which would ensure adequate parking availability. In addition, Placer County will ensure the new parking spaces are located within a reasonable walking distance (i.e., one block) of the specific subareas of impact.

New parking spaces will 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) within the action area. This block-level analysis is warranted because the CCIP area is too large to be considered as a single parking area because drivers will not typically walk the distances from outlying areas to the areas of parking shortages.

Figure 3.7-1 shows potential parking that will be added to compensate for the project alternatives. Three parking lots totaling 63 spaces have already undergone environmental

review and will be built prior to the start of CCIP construction. These three lots are shown in Figure 3.7-1 with red shading. They include the Salmon Avenue parking lot (12,500 square feet) that would include 22 spaces (APN 090-126-020), the Minnow Avenue parking lot that would include 21 spaces (APN 090-192-025), and the Brook Avenue parking lot that would add 20 spaces (APN 090-122-019). Figure 3.7-1 also shows locations (both on- and off-street) that the project applicant is currently evaluating for future potential parking spaces.

The analysis of construction phasing and staging necessary to evaluate temporary construction parking impacts has also not been conducted. It can be expected that short-term loss of public parking and loss of access to private parking will occur as part of project construction. To date, Placer County has constructed one new public parking lot that can be used to offset spaces lost during construction and intends to construct several more prior to the SR 28 project. In addition, Placer County DPW has indicated that it will develop construction plans to minimize the number and duration of temporary loss of parking during construction, will monitor parking conditions during construction, and will work with affected property owners to minimize effects. Placer County will provide new lots and off-site parking spaces to compensate for the loss of available on-street parking.

As part of Alternative 4, Placer County has committed to compensating for parking spaces lost by adding spaces. Consequently, Alternative 4 would not result in substantial parking effects.

3.7.4 Mitigation, Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation Measures

No mitigation, avoidance, minimization, or compensation measures are required. Placer County, as part of the project, has committed to compensating for the loss of parking spaces that would result from any of the three build alternatives. Consequently, no additional mitigation or compensation would be required.

3.7.5 Compliance with Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Code

Table 3.7-4 presents an assessment of the consistency of each alternative with the adopted parking-related objectives and policies of the Kings Beach Community Plan, as adopted by TRPA and Placer County in 1996. Of those objectives and policies that pertain to the proposed action, all of the build alternatives (Alternatives 2 through 4) would be consistent with the community plan, in particular through the provision of community parking lots as mitigation for the loss of on-street parking.

Table 3.7-4. Assessment of Alternatives' Consistency with KBCP Parking Goals

	Alternatives			
	Alternative 1		Alternatives 2, 3, and 4	
Kings Beach Community Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies	Consistency with Community Plan	Discussion	Consistency with Community Plan	Discussion
Policy 1c: Implement a parking management program that provides: adequate parking, limits traffic, considers connections between parking lots, encourages community parking lots, and complements transit.	No	Not implemented	Yes	With mitigation, lots would effectively replace some or all of existing on-street parking. Detailed planning of replacement parking lots should incorporate the items identified in this policy.
Objective 2: Provide for sufficient capital improvements to meet the level of service target, meet the target for VMT reductions, and to provide adequate parking facilities as development occurs in the Community Plan area.	Not Applicable	The project is not intended to address parking for development.	Not Applicable	Does not meet level of service target. Project not intended to address VMT reduction, or to address parking associated with development.
Policy 8b: Parking within Kings Beach Commercial Community Plan should encourage the consolidation of off-street public parking within the commercial streets.	No	Not implemented	Yes	With mitigation, lots would effectively replace some or all of existing on-street parking.

Source: North Tahoe Community Plan, TRPA, Adopted April 1, 1996. LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.

KB Com Plan Consistency for Parking.wb3.