Appendix S. Initial Study for the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project

Appendix S Initial Study for the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project

Supporting documentation of all CEQA checklist determinations is provided in Chapter 3 of this Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Report/ Environmental Impact Statement. Documentation of "No Impact" determinations is provided at the beginning of Chapter 3. Discussion of all impacts, avoidance, minimization, and/or compensation measures under the appropriate topic headings in Chapter 3.

PLACER COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

11414 B Avenue, Auburn, CA 95603 (530) 889-7470/FAX (530) 889-7499

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with the policies of the Placer County Board of Supervisors regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, this document, constitutes the Initial Study on the proposed project. This Initial Study provides the basis for the determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If it is determined that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report will be prepared which focuses on the areas of concern identified by this Initial Study.

I. BACKGROUND

Title of Project: **Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project** EIAQ # **3739**

II. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

A. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers.

B. "Less than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are negligible and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.

C. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" 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 Section IV, EARLIER ANALYSES, may be cross-referenced).

D. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is 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, 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 [Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. Earlier analyses are discussed in Section IV at the end of the checklist.

G. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., 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.

Environmental Issues *(See attachments for information sources)*	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
1. LAND USE PLANNING. Would the proposal:				
a. Conflict with general plan/community plan/specific plan designation(s) or zoning, or policies contained within such plans?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: *Placer County and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) adopted the* North Tahoe Community Plan *(*Community Plan*) in 1996. That plan presents a vision intended to guide Kings Beach's community enhancement activities. Major components of the* Community Plan *are directed at the commercial core. These include reconstruction of SR28, providing improved pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, the installation of streetscape improvements, and the construction of water quality improvements.*

The Community Plan *includes a list of capital improvement projects intended to achieve identified Community Plan goals. Similarly, the Environmental Improvement Program (EIP) established by TRPA, lists projects considered necessary to achieve environmental goals in the Lake Tahoe Basin. Finally, expanding opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle travel is a key element in both regional and community transportation plans. By meeting the identified*

need for improved pedestrian and bicyclist mobility, the proposed project will implement (fully or partially) projects listed in the Community Plan*, in the May 2001 EIP update, and it will help achieve transportation goals. By doing so, the project will contribute to the achievement of planning goals at the community and regional level.*

By meeting the identified need for improved pedestrian and bicyclist access at intersections, the proposed project will implement (fully or partially) projects listed in the Community Plan*, and it will help achieve regional transportation goals. By meeting the identified need for aesthetic improvements, the proposed project will implement (fully or partially) projects listed in the* Community Plan *and the EIP. By satisfactorily meeting the identified need for improving water quality, the proposed project will implement (fully or partially) several projects listed in the* Community Plan *and in the year 2001 EIP update*.

Although in meeting these needs the project will contribute to the achievement of planning goals, the selection of certain project alternatives may necessitate the need to amend the Community Plan*. As it currently stands, The* Community Plan *states that traffic levels of service will remain at a certain level. Under some project alternatives, level of service criteria may not be met.*

Mitigations: *Mitigation measures, including amendments to the* Community Plan*, may be required to address the potential change in level of service that may occur under some project alternatives. No other measures are anticipated.*

Environmental Issues ***(See attachments for information sources)***	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
3. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a. Unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e. Any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	☒	☐	☐	☐
f. Changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake?	☒	☐	☐	☐
g. Exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Discussion: *Examination of the Soil Survey of the Tahoe Basin, California and Nevada (SCS 1974) indicates that the soils represented in the project area are not inherently unstable. The potential for unstable soil conditions is remote. The majority of the project area will require only slight modification of surfaces for roadway and parking lot construction. However, there is the potential for larger changes to topography within drainage basin areas. Mitigation measures are described below to reduce potential impacts. No unique geologic or physical features are present within the project area. No impacts to these types of features will occur as a result of the project. The proposed project will not result in a significant increase of erosion on or off site. The proposed project does not contain components that will result in changes in depositional or erosional processes within and in the vicinity of the project area. Finally, the proposed project will not expose people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards.*

Mitigations: *Mitigation measures, such as modifications in design and the addition of landscaping to drainage basins, will reduce impacts to topography or ground surface relief to a less than significant level. No other mitigation measures are anticipated.*

Environmental Issues ***(See attachments for information sources)***	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
4. WATER. Would the proposal result in:				
a. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	☐	☒	☐	☐

c. Discharge into surface waters or other alterations of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e. Changes in currents, or the course of direction of water movements?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f. Change in the quantity of groundwater, either through direct additions of withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?	☐	☒	☐	☐
g. Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	☐	☒	☐	☐
h. Impacts to groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i. Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	☒	☐	☐	☐
j. Impacts to 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: *Elements of the proposed project will lead to a change in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and surface runoff. Analyses that are currently being conducted will show if these changes lead to potentially significant impacts and if mitigation measures are necessary. Runoff from proposed impervious surfaces including roadways, parking lots, and sidewalks, will be collected and directed toward storm water treatment facilities. These facilities will be designed to remove heavy sand particles and grease/oil. Discharge from these facilities will be dissipated through areas that provide infiltration and evaporation. Combined, these features will be designed to provide storage for storm events that will be sufficient to detain the 20-year, 1-hour storm. The components within the proposed project will be designed to accommodate 100-year storm events. Therefore, the proposed project will not expose people or property to water related hazards beyond what is currently present. By filtering sand and grease/oil from impermeable surfaces, the proposed project should improve water quality by reducing sediment and nutrient transport. Analyses are being conducted to determine the extent to which the collection, conveyance, and treatment of urban storm water runoff will affect the amount of surface water in nearby water bodies. In addition, in the process collecting and conveying runoff, the project may have the potential to alter existing urban drainage patterns. The extent to which these urban drainage patterns will be altered is yet to be determined. It is unlikely that there will be a significant impact to the amount of surface water or the direction of water movement as a result of the proposed project. The storm water treatment facilities could result in a minor addition to ground water but it is not expected to greatly affect the quantity of ground water in the area. Other on-site development will not result in the change in quantity of the groundwater nor will it affect recharge rates. It is also unlikely that the project will result in the alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters. The treatment of storm water runoff will reduce the potential discharge of contaminents to surface and groundwaters, especially when compared with the current site conditions. As a result, the proposed project may provide a net improvement to ground water quality. However, because the proposed project involves the infiltration of surface runoff, analyses may show that these efforts produce an impact to groundwater quality. Therefore, mitigation may be required. Construction of the proposed project does not include a domestic water system nor will there be a need for groundwater withdrawal. The only use of water associated with the proposed project is the irrigation of landscaping during the growing season. Water used for irrigation of landscaping will be provided by the North Tahoe Public Utility District. As previously stated, the project has the potential to alter urban drainage patterns that flow to Lake Tahoe. Although the proposed storm water treatment facilities are likely to have an overall beneficial effect on this watershed, analyses may show an impact that requires mitigation.*

Mitigations: *Mitigation measures will be incorporated if analyses show that the proposed project will lead to significant changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or surface runoff. Other measures will be implemented to avoid impacts to groundwater quality and the Lake Tahoe watershed, should analyses determine this is necessary. No further mitigation measures are anticipated.*

Environmental Issues ***(See attachments for information sources)***	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
6. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:				
a. Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	☐	☒	☐	☐

f. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☒	☐	☐	☐
g. Rail, waterborne, or air traffic impacts?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Discussion: *The proposed project will not increase the capacity of the roadway. A level of use consisted with past and existing patterns is expected. As a result, the proposed project will not cause an increase in vehicle trips. However, depending on the selection of certain project alternatives, an increase in congestion may occur that may require mitigation. All project features will be designed to current standards and will not represent a hazard to safety. If the proposed project, through selection of certain alternatives, leads to an increase in traffic congestion, there is the potential for inadequate emergency access that may require mitigation. The proposed project will remove a portion of the existing parking in the Kings Beach Commercial Core area. The reduction in parking will be mitigated by the creation of new parking spaces within the project area. No net loss of parking will occur as a result of the proposed project. However, certain business may end up with a reduced number of parking spaces. This may represent an impact to that individual business. A major component of the proposed project includes providing facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists within the project area. Therefore, the project does not represent a hazard or barrier nor will it conflict with these transportation uses. The proposed project is not located near an airport or railroad. It will have no impacts to these modes of transportations.*

Mitigations: *Mitigation for the possible increase in traffic congestion under certain project alternatives will be defined after completion of traffic analyses. To facilitate access for emergency uses, alternative routes that avoid potentially congested areas will be identified. Any parking removed to incorporate project components will be restored within the Kings Beach Commercial Core Improvement Project area. This will occur as close to individual businesses that lose parking facilities as possible. No other mitigation measures are anticipated.*

Environmental Issues ***(See attachments for information sources)***	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
11. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in need for new or altered government services, in any of the following areas:				
a. Fire Protection?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Sheriff Protection?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Schools?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Other governmental services?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Discussion: *Neither the type nor level of use within the project area will change as a result of the proposed action. Therefore, the need for most public services is not expected to change when compared with the existing condition. However, the proposed project will include the installation of storm water drainage facilities and other components that require maintenance. Impacts may result that requires mitigation if these components are not properly maintained.*

Mitigations: *To reduce potential impacts from installation of new components within the project area, regularly scheduled maintenance will occur to ensure proper functioning condition of these components. No other mitigation measures are anticipated.*

Environmental Issues ***(See attachments for information sources)***	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
12. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
a. Power or natural gas?	☒	☐	☐	☐
b. Communication systems?	☒	☐	☐	☐
c. Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	☒	☐	☐	☐
d. Sewer, septic systems, or wastewater treatment and disposal facilities?	☒	☐	☐	☐
e. Storm water drainage?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f. Solid waste materials recovery or disposal?	☒	☐	☐	☐
g. Local or regional water supplies?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Discussion: *The proposed project will not result in the need for new facilities or alternations to utilities for power or natural gas, communications, water treatment or distribution, or sewer treatment facilities. Improvements to the storm*

water drainage system are proposed. However, the proposed project will not result in the need for new systems (beyond what is proposed), or substantial alterations to the current drainage system outside of the proposed project area. Construction will result in the generation of solid waste from excavated soils and standard construction debris. Placer County, the project proponent, will be responsible for contracting the collection and removal of solid waste. The licensed contractor is required to comply with all applicable regulations. In accordance with Section 64.5c of the Code, any solid waste will be collected and transported to a TRPA approved landfill located outside of the Tahoe Basin. Water will be used to support proposed landscaping, however, this use of additional water will not exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider (North Tahoe Public Utility District).

Mitigations: *No mitigation measures are anticipated.*

Environmental Issues ***(See attachments for information sources)***	No Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Potentially Significant Impact
III. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
A. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☒	☐	☐	☐
B. 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.)	☒	☐	☐	☐
C. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☒	☐	☐	☐

Discussion:

Mitigations:

IV. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [State CEQA guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. In this case a discussion should identify the following on attached sheets.

A. **Earlier analyses used.** Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

B. **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.

C. **Mitigation measures.** For effects that are checked as "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigiation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 31083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino,* 202 Cal. App. 3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors,* 222 Cal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

V. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED

- ☒ California Department of Fish and Game
- ☒ California Department of Transportation (e.g. Caltrans)
- ☒ California Regional Water Quality Control Board
- ☐ California Department of Forestry
- ☒ U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
- ☒ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- ☐ National Marine Fisheries Service
- ☐ Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo)
- ☐ California Department of Health Services
- ☐ California Integrated Waste Management Board
- ☒ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
- ☐ California Department of Toxic Substances
- ☐ Other _____

_____

VI. DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

A. I find that the proposed project is categorically exempt (Class ____) from the provisions of CEQA. ☐

B. I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

C. I find 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 on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

D. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in an previously adopted Negative Declaration, and that only minor technical changes and/or additions are necessary to ensure its adequacy for the project. An **ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY-ADOPTED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

E. I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required (i.e. Project, Program, or Master EIR). ☐

F. I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, and at least one effect has not been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures that have been adequately addressed in an earlier document are described on attached sheets (see Section IV above). An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** will be prepared to address those effect(s) that remain outstanding (i.e. focused, subsequent, or supplemental EIR). ☐

G. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in a peviously certified EIR, and that some changes and/or additions are necessary, but none of the conditions requiring a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR exist. An **ADDENDUM TO THE PREVIOUSLY-CERTIFIED EIR** will be prepared. ☐

H. I find that the proposed project is within the scope of impacts addressed in a previously-certified Program EIR, and that no new effects will occur nor new mitigation measures are required. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures that have been adequately addressed in an earlier document are described on attached sheets, including applicable mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project (see Section IV above). **NO FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT** will be prepared [see CEQA Guidelines, Section 15168(c)(2)], 15180, 15181, 15182, 15183. ☐

I. Other _____ ☐

VII. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments Consulted):

Name: Rebecca Bond Date: 11/5/02

Title: Associate Civil Engineer, Public Works, Tahoe Engineering Division