

5.3.10 Public Services and Utilities

This section describes potential effects of the KBSRA General Plan Revision and Pier Rebuild Project on public services and utilities systems. Public services considered in the analysis include fire protection and emergency services, and law enforcement. Utilities considered include water, wastewater, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications. The effects resulting from General Plan implementation under all of the alternatives described herein would be the same regardless of ownership of the Plaza parcels.

The existing conditions related to public services and utilities are summarized in Section 2.3.3, Utilities and Service Systems, in Chapter 2, Existing Conditions, of this document. A more detailed description of the existing public services and utilities at the project site and a summary of pertinent regulations are included in the Resources Inventory and Existing Conditions Report, available on the Kings Beach SRA webpage (www.parks.ca.gov/PlanKBSRA) and at CSP and TRPA offices during normal business hours through consideration of project approval.

The primary issues raised during scoping that pertain to public services and utilities included:

- ◆ North Tahoe Public Utility District (NTPUD) expressed concern about maintaining access to the sewer collection main that crosses KBSRA and suggested that long-term planning at KBSRA should consider options for access easements or relocation of the sewer main.
- ◆ Protect the sewer infrastructure during any project construction.
- ◆ Tahoe-Truckee Sanitation Agency (T-TSA) identified information needs about proposed new fixtures that would be required for T-TSA to properly assess the impact of the project on T-TSA services. Additionally, T-TSA does not issue will serve letters and all capacity allocations for services are made on a first-come first-serve basis for all projects within their service area.

The proposed project does not include new housing or other project elements that would increase the permanent resident population in Kings Beach, resulting in an increased demand for school or library facilities. Additionally, there is available capacity in schools near KBSRA. No impact would occur and impacts related to these services are not evaluated further in this EIR/EIS.

The proposed project would not result in an increase in demand for telecommunications services or need to extend additional telecommunications lines to the project site. No impact would occur and impacts related to telecommunications services are not evaluated further in this EIR/EIS.

Water quality and stormwater issues are addressed in Section 5.3.7, Hydrology and Water Quality.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Analysis Methodology

Water Supply

Additional water demand resulting from implementation of the KBSRA General Plan Revision and Pier Rebuild Project was conservatively estimated. For the purposes of the analysis herein, the term fixture refers to faucets, toilets, drinking fountains, showerheads, and foot-wash showers. The average annual demand per fixture and average peak demand per fixture were derived from the annual water demand

from 2012 through 2015, which was provided by NTPUD (Stelter, pers. comm., 2016a), and the number of existing fixtures.

Wastewater

Sewer flows are assumed to mirror domestic water usage without irrigation. There is no assumed loss between water use and wastewater generation. A fixture unit is defined in the 2016 California Plumbing Code as a scaling factor in terms of the load-producing effects on the plumbing system. The capacity of the wastewater collection system serving KBSRA is based on number of fixture units.

Energy

Levels of construction- and operation-related energy consumption for the project were measured in megawatt-hour (MWh) of electricity, million British Thermal Units (MMBtu) of natural gas, and gallons of gasoline and diesel fuel. Energy consumption estimates were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.1 computer program. Where project-specific information was not known, CalEEMod default values based on the project’s location were used. Table 5.3.10-1 summarizes the levels of energy consumption for each year of construction, the levels of energy consumption for the first year of operation during the build-out year of 2021, and the gasoline and diesel consumption estimates for the project in 2021.

Table 5.3.10-1 Annual Operational Energy Use and Fuel Consumption for 2021		
Construction		
Year	Gasoline (gal/year)	Diesel (gal/year)
2019	664	6,610
2020	5,706	17,296
2021	6,195	17,549
Total	12,565	41,455
Operation		
Energy Consumption		
All Land Uses	Energy Consumption	Units
Electricity	1,350	MWh/year
Natural Gas	283	MMBtu/year
Fuel Consumption		
Vehicle Category	Gasoline (gal/year)	Diesel (gal/year)
Passenger Vehicles	2,922	25
Trucks	2,827	1,138
Buses	48	54
Other Vehicles	10	2
Total	5,806	1,220
Notes: MWh/year=megawatt hour per year, gal/year=gallons per year		
Detailed calculations are provided in the technical analysis materials available on the project webpage (www.parks.ca.gov/PlanKBSRA).		
Source: Compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2017		

Significance Criteria

Significance criteria for determining impacts to public services and utilities are summarized below.

CEQA Criteria

Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, impacts to public services and utilities would be significant if the project would:

- ◆ exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board;
- ◆ require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects;
- ◆ have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or require new or expanded entitlements;
- ◆ result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments;
- ◆ be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws;
- ◆ result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy during construction or operations or require new or expanded energy facilities that could cause significant environmental effects; or
- ◆ result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services including fire protection and law enforcement.

TRPA Criteria

The public services, energy, and utilities criteria from the TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist were used to evaluate the public services and utilities impacts of the alternatives. Impacts to public services and utilities would be significant if the project would:

- ◆ have an unplanned effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services related to fire protection, police protection, maintenance of public facilities, including roads, or other governmental services;
- ◆ use substantial amounts of fuel or energy;
- ◆ substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, or require the development of new sources of energy;
- ◆ result in the need for new systems or substantial alterations to power and gas utility facilities;
- ◆ result in the need for new systems or substantial alterations to solid waste and disposal;
- ◆ utilize additional water at an amount which will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the service provider; or

- ◆ utilize additional sewage treatment capacity at an amount which will exceed the maximum permitted capacity of the sewage treatment provider.

Environmental Impacts

Impact 5.3.10-1: Increased demand for water supply

The additional annual water demand for the Alternative 2 General Plan revision would be 713,500 gallons. The increase in water demand associated with implementation of Alternative 2 would be a 0.12 percent increase over existing NTPUD water demand and would represent 0.04 percent of NTPUD's total water supplies. NTPUD would have adequate water supply to serve the project. Water demand increases associated with implementation of the General Plan revision for Alternatives 3 and 4 would be approximately the same as that for Alternative 2. Alternatives 2 through 4 would also reduce its water demand through facility design and implementation of water conservation measures that would meet Title 24 requirements. This impact would be **less than significant** for Alternatives 2 through 4.

There would be **no impact** for Alternative 1. The pier rebuild project under Alternatives 2 through 4 would result in no increase in water demand and, therefore, would have **no impact** on water supply.

Alternative 1: No Project

General Plan Revision

Because the 1980 General Plan Development Plan would remain unchanged and no upland improvements would be made under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in water demand over that which could occur under existing conditions and therefore **no impact** to water supply.

Pier Rebuild Project

Because the existing Kings Beach pier would remain and there would be no other improvements under the No Action Alternative, there would be no new water demand and therefore **no impact** to water supply.

Alternative 2: Eastern Pier Alternative (Proposed Project)

General Plan Revision

The existing water demand at KBSRA is associated with the two restroom facilities, a foot wash station, and irrigation of the California Tahoe Conservancy (Conservancy) parcels (i.e., the plaza area) in the northeastern portion of the KBSRA General Plan area. Between 2012 and 2015, the average annual water demand at KBSRA was 685,750 gallons (see Table 5.3.10-2).

As part of the General Plan revision associated with Alternative 2, an additional six restroom stalls (each with one toilet and one sink) and two overhead outdoor showers would be constructed and a new 14,000-square foot or greater lawn area would require irrigation during spring and summer months. Implementation of Alternative 2 may result in an increase in the number of special events, but would not be anticipated to result in an increase in size of the events. The increase in annual water demand associated with the additional stalls, sinks, and outdoor showers would be approximately 225,500 gallons (see Table 5.3.10-2). Because the existing restroom building in the central portion of KBSRA would be reconstructed as part of its expansion and would be required to install low flow, water conserving fixtures, the water demand associated this facility would likely be reduced or only incrementally greater than existing conditions.

The increase in annual water demand associated with lawn irrigation is estimated to be approximately 488,000 gallons per year (compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2016). The volume of water required to irrigate the proposed lawn area may vary through the irrigation season from May through September. Additionally, artificial turf could be used for the lawn instead of natural grass, which would result in no increase in water demand for irrigation. The future water demand at KBSRA shown in Table 5.3.10-2 assumes an irrigated lawn would be installed; thus, a conservative estimate of water use for irrigation is provided here. Irrigation water demand at the Conservancy parcels would be similar to existing conditions. In the past, irrigation measured at the Conservancy parcels by NTPUD has included irrigation for the Kings Beach Corridor Improvement Project streetscape improvements and landscaping; however, irrigation for those uses is no longer provided through the Conservancy parcels.

NTPUD has sufficient water supplies to meet current and projected water demands in their service area during normal, single dry, and multiple dry water years (NTPUD 2013:42 – 44). Additionally, NTPUD has combined surface and groundwater rights of 5,873 acre-feet per year (afy; 1,913 million gallons [mg]), which exceeds the estimated demand of 1,782 afy (580 mg) in 2015 and the estimated cumulative demand of 3,079 afy (1,003 mg) in 2030 (Stelter, pers. comm., 2016b; NTPUD 2013). NTPUD has confirmed there is sufficient water supply to serve water demand associated with implementation of Alternative 2 (Stelter, pers. comm., 2017a). The increase in water demand associated with implementation of Alternative 2 would be a 0.12 percent increase over existing NTPUD water demand and would represent 0.04 percent of NTPUD's total water supplies.

Table 5.3.10-2 Existing and Future Water Demand at KBSRA

	Water Demand (gallons)
Existing Average Peak Day Water Demand ¹	2,560
Existing Average Annual Water Demand ¹	306,000
Existing Average Annual Irrigation Demand	379,750
Total Existing Average Annual Water Demand²	685,750
Increase in Annual Landscape Irrigation Demand	488,000
Increase in Annual Water Demand ¹	225,500
Increase in Peak Day Demand ¹	620
Total Increase in Annual Water Demand²	713,500
Total Future Annual Water Demand³	1,399,250

¹ Existing water demand is associated with water fixtures, including sink faucets, toilets, foot-wash showers, and drinking fountains.

² Total existing annual water demand for existing conditions and the increase is the sum of annual water demand and annual irrigation demand.

³ Total future annual water demand is the sum of total existing annual water demand and increase in cumulative annual water demand associated with increase in number of sink faucets, toilets, and outdoor showers.

Note: Average demand is shown here, because the water demand at KBSRA fluctuated between 2012 and 2015.

Source: Stelter, pers. comm., 2016a, 2017b; compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2017

Implementation of improvements associated with Alternative 2 would comply with KBSRA General Plan Guideline RES 11.3 and the CSP Standard and Special Project Requirements, which require incorporation of water conservation measures into the landscape, such as low volume irrigation. Additionally, the new restroom facilities would install toilets, sinks, and outdoor showers that exceed

2016 Title 24 water efficiency requirements. With implementation of the water-saving measures, Alternative 2 would also be consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan Policy PS-2.1 to reduce water demand through implementation of water conservation measures.

NTPUD would have adequate water supply to serve improvements proposed by the General Plan revision for Alternative 2. Additionally, Alternative 2 would reduce its water demand through facility design and implementation of water conservation measures that would meet 2016 Title 24 requirements. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

With the eastern pier, there would be no increase in water demand associated with this scenario. There would be **no impact** on water supplies.

Alternative 3: Central Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on water demand from implementation of Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the park amenities that are included in Alternative 3 would for the most part include minor refinements in location or size compared to those associated with Alternative 2. Although Alternative 3 would result in no administrative office at KBSRA and fewer restrooms compared to Alternative 2, implementation of Alternative 3 would be expected to result in a similar increase in visitation and water use that would occur for Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 3 on water demand would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

With the central pier, there would be no increase in water demand associated with this scenario. There would be **no impact** on water supplies.

Alternative 4: Western Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on water demand from implementation of Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that are included in Alternative 4 would for the most part include minor refinements in location or size compared to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 4 on water demand would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

With the western pier, there would be no increase in water demand associated with this scenario. There would be **no impact** on water supplies.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Impact 5.3.10-2: Effects on water conveyance and treatment infrastructure

The Alternative 2 General Plan revision would include six additional restroom stalls and associated sinks and outdoor showers. The existing water delivery infrastructure at the project site includes a 12-inch main outfitted with a 2-inch composite flow meter and water line and a connection is also provided for irrigation of the Conservancy parcels. California State Parks would submit an application and pay fees to NTPUD for an increase in water service at KBSRA. The NTPUD water supply infrastructure, including National Avenue Water Treatment Plant, has sufficient capacity to serve the water treatment demand for the project. The effects on water conveyance and treatment infrastructure from implementation of Alternatives 3 and 4 would be similar to those of Alternative 2. This impact would be **less than significant** for Alternatives 2 through 4.

There would be **no impact** for Alternative 1. The pier rebuild project under Alternatives 2 through 4 would result in no increase in water demand and, therefore, would have **no impact** on water conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

Alternative 1: No Project

General Plan Revision

Because the 1980 General Plan Development Plan would remain unchanged and no upland improvements would be made under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in water demand over that which could occur under existing conditions and therefore **no impact** to water conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

Pier Rebuild Project

Because the existing Kings Beach pier would remain and there would be no other improvements under the No Action Alternative, there would be no new water demand and therefore **no impact** to water conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

Alternative 2: Eastern Pier Alternative (Proposed Project)

General Plan Revision

The water supply infrastructure for the project would need to meet the increase in annual water demand estimated at approximately 713,500 gallons per year from six additional restroom stalls, outdoor showers, and irrigation for the new lawn included in the Alternative 2 General Plan revision. The water main serving KBSRA is a 12-inch pipe outfitted with a 2-inch composite flow meter and water line (Stelter, pers. comm., 2016a). A separate water connection is also located at KBSRA for irrigation of the Conservancy parcels in the northeastern portion of the General Plan area. California State Parks would be required to submit plans, an application, and pay connection fees for new toilets, sinks, and outdoor showers to NTPUD. NTPUD has confirmed that the water supply infrastructure that would serve KBSRA, including the 12-inch main and the National Avenue Water Treatment Plant, have sufficient capacity to meet the increase in water demand associated with Alternative 2 (Stelter, pers. comm., 2017a). The National Avenue Water Treatment Plant that treats surface water that is supplied to KBSRA has sufficient capacity to serve the minor increase in demand associated with implementation of Alternative 2.

Because California State Parks would submit an application and pay fees to NTPUD for an increase in water service and water supply infrastructure that would serve the project is adequate to serve the water demand and fire flow needs, this impact is **less than significant**.

[Pier Rebuild Project](#)

With the eastern pier, there would be no increase in water demand associated with this scenario. There would be **no impact** to water conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

[Alternative 3: Central Pier Alternative](#)

[General Plan Revision](#)

Impacts on water conveyance and treatment infrastructure from implementation of Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 3 would include only minor refinements in location or size compared to Alternative 2. Although Alternative 3 would result in no administrative office at KBSRA and fewer restrooms compared to Alternative 2, implementation of Alternative 3 would be expected to result in a similar increase in visitation and water use that would occur for Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 3 on demand for water conveyance and treatment infrastructure would be **less than significant**.

[Pier Rebuild Project](#)

With the central pier, there would be no increase in water demand associated with this scenario. There would be **no impact** to water conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

[Alternative 4: Western Pier Alternative](#)

[General Plan Revision](#)

Impacts on water conveyance and treatment infrastructure from implementation of Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 4 would include only minor refinements in location or size compared to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 4 on water conveyance and treatment infrastructure would be **less than significant**.

[Pier Rebuild Project](#)

With the western pier, there would be no increase in water demand associated with this scenario. There would be **no impact** to water conveyance and treatment infrastructure.

[Mitigation Measures](#)

No mitigation measures are required.

[Impact 5.3.10-3: Effects on wastewater conveyance](#)

Implementation of Alternative 2 General Plan revision would result in an estimated net increase in wastewater flows over existing conditions of 225,500 gallons per year, or a daily peak demand of 620 gallons per day (gpd). NTPUD and T-TSA have confirmed there is currently sufficient wastewater conveyance capacity to serve the project (Stelter, pers. comm., 2017a; Parker, pers. comm., 2017). California State Parks would submit applications and pay fees to NTPUD and T-TSA for an increase in wastewater conveyance service at KBSRA. Potential conflicts with the NTPUD sewer main that crosses through KBSRA would be minimized through coordination with NTPUD and avoidance during construction. The effects on wastewater conveyance capacity from implementation of Alternatives 3 and 4 would be similar to those of Alternative 2. This impact would be **less than significant** for Alternatives 2 through 4.

There would be **no impact** for Alternative 1. The pier rebuild project under Alternatives 2 through 4 would result in no increase in wastewater flows and, therefore, would have **no impact** on wastewater conveyance.

Alternative 1: No Project

General Plan Revision

Because the 1980 General Plan Development Plan would remain unchanged and no upland improvements would be made for the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in wastewater flows over that which could occur under existing conditions and therefore **no impact** to wastewater conveyance infrastructure.

Pier Rebuild Project

Because the existing Kings Beach pier would remain and there would be no other improvements under the No Action Alternative, no wastewater flows would be generated and therefore **no impact** to wastewater conveyance infrastructure.

Alternative 2: Eastern Pier Alternative (Proposed Project)

General Plan Revision

KBSRA currently includes a seven-stall restroom and a foot wash in the central portion of the site and a four-stall restroom at the east end of the site near Brockway Vista Avenue. Implementation of Alternative 2 would include a new administrative office building with a restroom, new two-stall restroom in the western portion of KBSRA, and a new 10-stall restroom and up to two outdoor showers to replace the existing central restroom. Alternative 2 would result in six new toilets and sinks and two overhead showers at KBSRA.

The existing wastewater generated at KBSRA is associated with the two restroom facilities at KBSRA. NTPUD does not meter wastewater services; however, it is assumed that wastewater flows would be similar to the water demand generated at the site (Stelter, pers. comm., 2016a). The wastewater generated at KBSRA does not include irrigation water or foot-wash station demand, because water from these facilities would not flow to the sewer and wastewater conveyance infrastructure. Therefore, the wastewater demand would be lower than the water demand. If the foot-wash stations would ever be relocated then that would provide an opportunity to assess, in coordination with NTPUD, the potential to convey foot wash drain water to wastewater lines. As shown in Table 5.3.10-2, existing annual average wastewater flows are 306,000 gallons and existing average peak day flows are approximately 2,560 gpd. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in an estimated increase in wastewater flows of 225,500 gallons per year and an increase in peak day wastewater flows of 620 gpd.

KBSRA is currently served by a 4-inch line, which can serve up to 216 fixture units. Based on the number of existing toilets and sinks at KBSRA that flow to the wastewater collection system, there are around 55 existing fixture units. Alternative 2 would increase the wastewater generated at KBSRA through the addition of six toilets and sinks and two outdoor showers for a total of 31 estimated additional fixture units. The wastewater service line has sufficient capacity for an additional approximately 160 fixture units, which is sufficient to meet the additional wastewater flows generated by implementation of Alternative 2. NTPUD has confirmed that the wastewater conveyance infrastructure that serves KBSRA has sufficient capacity to meet the increase in wastewater demand associated with Alternative 2 (Stelter, pers. comm., 2017a).

NTPUD has expressed concern about maintaining adequate legal access to the sewer main that generally follows the old Brockway Vista Road right-of-way and runs through the event center plaza and beach areas at KBSRA (Stelter, pers. comm., 2017a). With implementation of the General Plan revision and construction of new facilities, CSP would coordinate with NTPUD to maintain access to the sewer main for NTPUD and to avoid conflicts with the NTPUD sewer main during construction.

T-TSA has confirmed that the Truckee River Interceptor that conveys wastewater from NTPUD, and other areas in the North Tahoe area, currently has sufficient capacity to serve the project (Parker, pers. comm., 2017). However, T-TSA does not issue will serve letters and all capacity allocations are made on a first-come, first-served basis for all projects within T-TSA's service area. CSP would be required to submit a formal application to T-TSA for service and capacity allocation.

The new restroom facilities would install fixtures that exceed 2016 Title 24 water efficiency requirements. With implementation of the water-saving measures, Alternative 2 would also be consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan Policy PS-2.1 to reducing water demand through implementation of water conservation measures.

NTPUD would have adequate wastewater conveyance capacity to serve improvements proposed by the General Plan revision for Alternative 2. Additionally, Alternative 2 would reduce its wastewater flows through facility design and implementation of water conservation measures that would meet 2016 Title 24 requirements. Potential conflicts with the NTPUD sewer main through KBSRA would be minimized through coordination with NTPUD and avoidance during construction. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

With the eastern pier, construction workers would be served by existing restrooms. There would be no increase in wastewater collection and conveyance needed to implement this scenario. There would be **no impact** to wastewater conveyance infrastructure.

Alternative 3: Central Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on wastewater conveyance infrastructure from implementation of Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 3 would be similar in location and size compared to Alternative 2. Although Alternative 3 would result in no administrative office at KBSRA and fewer restrooms compared to Alternative 2, implementation of Alternative 3 would be expected to result in a similar increase in visitation that would occur for Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 3 on demand for wastewater conveyance and conflicts with the NTPUD sewer main through KBSRA would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

With the central pier, construction workers would be served by existing restrooms. There would be no increase in wastewater collection and conveyance needed to implement this scenario. There would be **no impact** to wastewater conveyance infrastructure.

Alternative 4: Western Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on wastewater conveyance infrastructure from implementation of Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 4 would be similar in location and size compared to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 4 on demand for wastewater conveyance and conflicts with the NTPUD sewer main through KBSRA would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

With the western pier, construction workers would be served by existing restrooms. There would be no increase in wastewater collection and conveyance needed to implement this scenario. There would be **no impact** to wastewater conveyance infrastructure.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Impact 5.3.10-4: Effects on wastewater treatment

Implementation of Alternative 2 General Plan revision would result in a net increase in annual wastewater flows over existing conditions of an estimated 225,500 gallons and increase in peak day demand of approximately 620 gpd. The T-TSA Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) has sufficient available capacity to serve the project (Parker, pers. comm., 2017). California State Parks would submit an application and pay fees to T-TSA for an increase in wastewater treatment service at KBSRA. The effects on wastewater treatment capacity from implementation of Alternatives 3 and 4 would be similar to those of Alternative 2. This impact would be **less than significant** for Alternatives 2 through 4.

There would be **no impact** for Alternative 1. The pier rebuild project under Alternatives 2 through 4 would result in no increase in wastewater flows and, therefore, would have **no impact** on wastewater treatment.

Alternative 1: No Project

General Plan Revision

Because the 1980 General Plan Development Plan would remain unchanged and no upland improvements would be made under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in wastewater flows over that which could occur under existing conditions and therefore **no impact** to wastewater treatment.

Pier Rebuild Project

Because the existing Kings Beach pier would remain and there would be no other improvements under the No Action Alternative, no wastewater flows would be generated and therefore **no impact** to wastewater treatment.

Alternative 2: Eastern Pier Alternative (Proposed Project)

General Plan Revision

Wastewater treatment for the project site occurs at the T-TSA WRP in Truckee. Implementation of the Alternative 2 General Plan revision would result in construction of an additional six toilets and sinks at KBSRA, generating a minor increase in demand for wastewater treatment over existing conditions. The estimated increase in wastewater peak flows generated by implementation of

Alternative 2 would be approximately 620 gpd, which is generally equivalent to the water demand for the new restroom facilities (see Table 5.3.10-1).

The WRP has a capacity of 9.6 million gpd based on a seven-day dry weather average flow basis (Parker, pers. comm., 2017). To date, the maximum recorded 7-day average flow over the summer months was 6.4 million gpd in July 2011. Based on this information, the remaining available capacity at the treatment plant is estimated to be 3.2 million gpd, which would be sufficient to treat the additional wastewater flows, an estimated 620 gpd on peak days, generated by implementation of Alternative 2. T-TSA does not issue will serve letters and capacity allocations are made on a first-come, first-served basis; therefore, CSP would be required to submit a formal application to T-TSA for service and capacity.

Because there is adequate wastewater treatment capacity at the T-TSA WRP to serve the Alternative 2 General Plan revision, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

With the eastern pier, there would be no increase in wastewater flows associated with this scenario. There would be **no impact** to wastewater treatment infrastructure.

Alternative 3: Central Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on wastewater treatment from implementation of Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 3 would be similar in location and size compared to Alternative 2. Although Alternative 3 would result in no administrative office at KBSRA and fewer restrooms compared to Alternative 2, implementation of Alternative 3 would be expected to result in a similar increase in visitation and wastewater that would occur for Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 3 on demand for wastewater treatment would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

With the central pier, there would be no increase in wastewater flows associated with this scenario. There would be **no impact** to wastewater treatment infrastructure.

Alternative 4: Western Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on wastewater treatment from implementation of Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 4 would have small refinements in location or size compared to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 4 on demand for wastewater treatment would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

With the western pier, there would be no increase in wastewater flows associated with this scenario. There would be no impact to wastewater treatment infrastructure.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Impact 5.3.10-5: Increased demand for solid waste collection and disposal

Solid waste collection is currently provided by Tahoe Truckee Sierra Disposal (TTSD). After recyclable materials are sorted by TTSD at the Eastern Regional Landfill and Materials Recovery Facility (MRF), solid waste is disposed of at Lockwood Regional Landfill in Nevada. Implementation of Alternatives 2 through 4 would result in an incremental increase in solid waste generation proportionate with a 10 percent or less increase in visitation at KBSRA and would generate some construction and demolition debris associated with new facilities. The Eastern Regional Landfill and MRF and Lockwood Regional Landfill both have sufficient capacity to meet the additional construction and operation solid waste collection and disposal demand of the alternatives. This impact would be **less than significant**.

The pier rebuild project under Alternatives 2 through 4 would generate temporary construction and demolition waste from removal of the existing pier and construction of the new pier. These alternatives would not result in an increase in solid waste that would cause the MRF or Lockwood Regional Landfill to exceed their capacities and, therefore, they would have a **less-than-significant** impact on solid waste collection and disposal.

Alternative 1 would have **no impact** on waste generation and solid waste collection and disposal.

Alternative 1: No Project

General Plan Revision

Because the 1980 General Plan Development Plan would remain unchanged and no upland improvements would be made under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in generation of solid waste over that which could occur under existing conditions and therefore **no impact** to solid waste collection and disposal services.

Pier Rebuild Project

Because the existing Kings Beach pier would remain and there would be no other improvements under the No Action Alternative, there would be no generation of solid waste and therefore **no impact** to solid waste collection and disposal services.

Alternative 2: Eastern Pier Alternative (Proposed Project)

General Plan Revision

Solid waste collection for the dumpsters at KBSRA is provided by TTSD. During the summer (June through August), there are two 6-yard dumpsters at the main parking lot and two 6-yard dumpsters at the parking lot near Coon Street. For the remainder of the year, there are only two dumpsters, one in each location. Recyclable materials are collected as part of the solid waste collection service and sorted at the Eastern Regional Landfill and MRF in Truckee. Alternative 2 would result in new trash enclosures for the dumpsters. The anticipated 10 percent or less increase in visitation at KBSRA that would be anticipated from implementation of Alternative 2 would result in a similar increase in solid waste generation; thus, potentially increasing the collection frequency by TTSD. Most of the increase in visitation, and associated solid waste increases, would likely follow existing visitation patterns in which most people visit KBSRA during the summer. Solid waste generated by special events would increase with the anticipated increase in number of events that could occur with implementation of Alternative 2. Special event applicants would be required, as under existing conditions, to coordinate solid waste collection with TTSD directly.

After recyclable materials are separated from solid waste at the MRF in Truckee, the remaining solid waste is hauled to Lockwood Regional Landfill for disposal. The MRF is permitted to receive 800 tons (3,556 cubic yards) of material daily (CalRecycle 2015). The MRF receives an average of 205 tons per day (911 cubic yards) and has available capacity to receive an additional 595 tons per day (2,644 cubic yards; TTSD 2018a, 2018b). The facility is achieving a near 50 percent diversion rate. The Lockwood Regional Landfill has a disposal capacity of 302.5 million cubic yards with a remaining capacity of more than 267 million cubic yards (NDEP 2017). There is sufficient capacity at the MRF and Lockwood Regional Landfill to accept the anticipated incremental increase in solid waste generated at KBSRA.

Construction and demolition (C&D) waste would be generated by construction of new facilities, including restrooms, the administrative building, and removal of playground equipment. In accordance with Section 5.408 of the CALGreen Code, the project would implement a Construction Waste Management Plan for recycling and/or salvaging for reuse of a minimum of 65 percent of C&D debris generated during project construction.

The changes at KBSRA that would occur with implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in an increase in solid waste that would cause the MRF or Lockwood Regional Landfill to exceed permitted capacities. The project would also comply with all federal and state statutes and regulations related to solid waste reduction and recycling. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The Alternative 2 eastern pier would not result in a long-term increase in solid waste generated during operation of the pier. C&D waste would be generated by removal of the existing pier and rebuilding of the pier. In accordance with Section 5.408 of the CALGreen Code, CSP or its contractors would implement a Construction Waste Management Plan for recycling and/or salvaging for reuse of a minimum of 65 percent of C&D debris generated during project construction.

As described above, the Lockwood Landfill has a remaining capacity over 267 million cubic yards, and has adequate capacity to accept construction-related waste materials. Because the eastern pier would not generate a long-term increase in solid waste does and would only contribute construction-generated waste for which there is adequate capacity, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 3: Central Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on demand for solid waste collection and disposal from implementation of Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 3 would be similar in location and size compared to Alternative 2. Although Alternative 3 would result in no administrative office at KBSRA and fewer group pavilion areas compared to Alternative 2, implementation of Alternative 3 would be expected to result in a similar increase in visitation that would occur for Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 3 on solid waste collection and disposal would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The Alternative 3 central pier would result in similar C&D waste as described above for the Alternative 2 eastern pier alternative. For the reasons described above for Alternative 2, the solid waste collection and disposal impact from implementation of the Alternative 3 central pier would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 4: Western Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on demand for solid waste collection and disposal from implementation of Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 4 would be similar in location and size compared to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 4 on solid waste collection and disposal would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The Alternative 4 western pier would result in similar C&D waste as described above for the Alternative 2 eastern pier alternative. For the reasons described above for Alternative 2, the solid waste collection and disposal impact from implementation of the Alternative 4 western pier would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Impact 5.3.10-6: Result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy

Alternatives 2 through 4 would increase electricity and natural gas consumption at the project site relative to existing conditions; however, the project would include renewable energy sources such as solar photovoltaic systems to power general plan related facilities such as administrative buildings and restrooms. Project-related buildings would be required to meet the California Code of Regulations Title 24 standards for building energy efficiency. Construction energy consumption would be temporary and would not require additional capacity or increased peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. Alternatives 2 through 4 would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. This impact would be **less than significant**.

There would be **no impact** for Alternative 1.

Alternative 1: No Project

General Plan Revision

Because the 1980 General Plan Development Plan would remain unchanged and no upland improvements would be made under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in energy use and therefore **no impact** on electricity or natural gas supplies or infrastructure or inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy.

Pier Rebuild Project

Because the existing Kings Beach pier would remain and there would be no other improvements under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in energy use and therefore **no impact** on electricity or natural gas supplies or infrastructure or result in inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy.

Alternative 2: Eastern Pier Alternative (Proposed Project)

General Plan Revision

Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the consideration of the energy implication of a project. CEQA requires mitigation measures to reduce “wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary” energy usages (Public Resources Code Section 21100, subdivision [b][3]). Neither the law nor the State

CEQA Guidelines establish criteria that define wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use. Compliance with the California Code of Regulations Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards would result in energy-efficient buildings. However, compliance with building codes does not adequately address all potential energy impacts during construction and operation. For example, energy would be required to transport people and goods to and from the project site.

Energy would be required to construct the project, operate, and maintain construction equipment, as well as produce and transport construction materials. The one-time energy expenditure required to construct the physical up-land buildings and shoreline pier would be nonrecoverable. Most energy consumption would result from operation of construction equipment and vehicle trips associated with commuting by construction workers and haul trucks supplying materials. An estimated 12,565 gallons of gasoline and 41,455 gallons of diesel fuel would be consumed to enable project construction. The energy needs for project construction would be temporary and is not anticipated to require additional capacity or increase peak or base period demands for electricity or other forms of energy. Construction equipment use and associated energy consumption would be typical of that associated with the construction of minor non-residential projects in a rural setting.

Operation of the project would be typical of non-residential land uses requiring electricity and natural gas for safety lighting, space and water heating, and landscape maintenance activities. Indirect energy use would include wastewater treatment and solid waste removal. The project would increase electricity and natural gas consumption in the Tahoe region relative to existing conditions, but would not require the construction of new utility connections to existing electrical and natural gas facilities.

The project would meet the California Code of Regulations Title 24 Standards for energy efficiency that are in effect at the time of construction. As the standards are updated on a triennial basis, building energy efficiency would continue to improve throughout the project's buildout (20 years).

Fuel consumption associated with vehicle trips generated by the project would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary. The project would generate an estimated peak daily increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) of 1,925 (155,105 annual VMT) and would consume 5,806 gallons of gasoline and 1,220 gallons of diesel fuel per year.

Fuel estimates were calculated from the combination of fuel consumption rates and fuel mix by vehicle class from the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) EMFAC 2014 model with overall VMT and mode share by vehicle class modeled for the project in CalEEMod (see the technical analysis materials available on the project webpage [www.parks.ca.gov/PlanKBSRA]). State and federal regulations regarding standards for vehicles in California are designed to reduce wasteful, unnecessary, and inefficient use of energy for transportation.

According to Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines, the means to achieve the goal of conserving energy include decreasing overall per capita energy consumption, decreasing reliance on natural gas and oil, and increasing reliance on renewable energy sources. The project would include the use of solar photovoltaics on general plan related facilities such as the administrative building and new restrooms. Further, the project's buildings would be required to meet the Title 24 building efficiency standards in effect at the time of construction. These actions would reduce building energy consumption and would reduce per capita energy use compared to other similar projects.

The project's energy consumption through construction, building operation, and transportation would not be considered wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. This impact would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The Alternative 2 eastern pier would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Energy would be consumed during the demolition of the existing pier and rebuilding the pier. The energy intensity of constructing and operating the proposed pier would be less than the projected consumption described above. For the reasons stated previously, the eastern pier would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy; therefore, this impact would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 3: Central Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Energy impacts from implementation of Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 3 would be similar in magnitude and location as compared to Alternative 2. Further, Alternative 3 would result in no administrative office at KBSRA and fewer group pavilion areas compared to Alternative 2, which would result in an overall decrease in operational energy usage as compared to Alternative 2. Although, implementation of Alternative 3 would be expected to result in an increased in visitation, this increase would be similar to that which would occur under Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, energy use impacts from implementation of Alternative 3 would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The Alternative 3 central pier would result in similar energy usage as described above for the Alternative 2 eastern pier alternative. For the reasons described above for Alternative 2, energy-related impacts of the Alternative 3 central pier would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 4: Western Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

The potential for inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy from implementation of Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 4 would be similar in location and size compared to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the potential for inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy from implementation of Alternative 4 would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The Alternative 4 western pier would not result inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy similar to Alternative 2 described above, because the western pier alternative would include a similar sized pier with the same associated components, including safety lighting, as proposed for the eastern pier. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the potential for inefficient and wasteful consumption of energy from implementation of the Alternative 4 western pier would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Impact 5.3.10-7: Increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical services

Fire protection and emergency services at KBSRA are provided by the North Tahoe Fire Protection District (NTFPD). Implementation of Alternatives 2 through 4 would result in an increase in visitation at KBSRA by up to 10 percent over existing conditions, which could result in an incremental increase in demand for fire protection and emergency services. NTFPD has indicated that the increase in visitation would not be anticipated to increase demand for fire protection and emergency services such that there would be an adverse impact on station operations or response times (Conradson, pers. comm., 2017). Furthermore, construction of the new facilities would meet fire protection and safety requirements identified in the Uniform Fire Code, Uniform Building Code, and CSP Standard Project Requirements. For these reasons, the impact on fire protection and emergency services from Alternatives 2 through 4 General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 1 would have **no impact**.

Alternative 1: No Project

General Plan Revision

Because the 1980 General Plan Development Plan would remain unchanged and no upland improvements would be made under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in demand for fire protection and emergency medical services over that which could occur under existing conditions and therefore **no impact** on fire protection and emergency medical services.

Pier Rebuild Project

Because the existing Kings Beach pier would remain and there would be no other improvements under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in demand for fire protection and emergency medical services and therefore **no impact** on fire protection and emergency medical services.

Alternative 2: Eastern Pier Alternative (Proposed Project)

General Plan Revision

Implementation of the Alternative 2 General Plan revision would result in new facilities at KBSRA that include reconfiguration of the parking areas and improved circulation, a new entry kiosk, a new administration building, a new concessionaire building, 12-foot shared-use path, new lawn and stage area, and additional restroom stalls. The existing emergency access from North Lake Boulevard (State Route [SR] 28) between the North Tahoe Event Center and the commercial building east of the event center would remain as part of the General Plan revision. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in a 10 percent or less increase in visitation to KBSRA, which, in turn, would result in an incremental increase in demand for fire protection and emergency response services. Potential impacts on fire protection and emergency services could occur if new facilities are not designed properly, and adequate emergency access and fire flow is not provided. Implementation of the project would have minimal effects on operations at nearby intersections and on operations of adjacent roadway segments and, thus, would not contribute to degrading emergency access along SR 28 (see Impacts 5.3.13-1, 5.3.13-2, 5.3.13-7, and 5.3.13-8 in Section 5.3.13, Transportation and Circulation).

Fire protection and emergency services at KBSRA are provided by NTFPD. Station #52 at 288 North Shore Boulevard is the nearest fire station to KBSRA at less than one-half mile to the west. NTFPD has indicated that they do not expect the project to result in an increase in fire protection or emergency

response demand related to the project such that there would be an adverse impact on station operations or response times (Conradson, pers. comm., 2017).

New facilities at KBSRA would be constructed according to minimum necessary fire protection and safety requirements identified in the Uniform Fire Code and Uniform Building Code. Additionally, the construction of future facilities would implement CSP Standard Project Requirements to reduce impacts. With implementation of Standard Project Requirements for developing a Fire Safety Plan as well as other typical construction practices, such as using heavy equipment that include spark arrestors for reducing the chance of fire, the potential impacts on fire protection and emergency response services would be reduced. In addition, the General Plan revision would require implementation of the following goal and guideline:

- ◆ GOAL OP 2 and Guideline OP 2.1 state that CSP would enter into a partnership or agreement with NTFPD to clarify management responsibilities and share resources as it relates to emergency response.

Construction and operation of new facilities associated with the Alternative 2 General Plan revision would implement General Plan goals and guidelines and CSP Standard Project Requirements and construction of facilities in accordance with Uniform Fire Code and Uniform Building Code to meet minimum necessary fire protection and safety requirements. Therefore, Alternative 2 impacts on fire protection and emergency services would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

NTFPD has indicated that they do not expect the pier rebuild that would occur as part of Alternative 2 to result in an increase in fire protection or emergency response demand such that there would be an adverse impact on station operations or response times (Conradson, pers. comm., 2017). For these reasons as well as those described above for the Alternative 2 General Plan revision, the Alternative 2 eastern pier would result in a **less-than-significant** impact on fire protection and emergency services.

Alternative 3: Central Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on demand for fire protection and emergency medical services from implementation of Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the types of park amenities that would occur with Alternative 3 would be similar in location and size compared to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 3 on fire protection and emergency medical services would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The Alternative 3 central pier would not result in an increase in fire protection or emergency response demand such that there would be an adverse impact on station operations or response times similar to Alternative 2 described above, because the central pier alternative would include a similar sized pier with the same associated components, including safety lighting, as proposed for the eastern pier. For these reasons as well as those described above for the Alternative 2 General Plan revision, the Alternative 3 central pier would result in a **less-than-significant** impact on fire protection and emergency services.

Alternative 4: Western Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on demand for fire protection and emergency medical services from implementation of Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities that would occur with Alternative 4 would be similar in location and size compared to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 4 on fire protection and emergency medical services would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The Alternative 4 western pier would not result in an increase in fire protection or emergency response demand such that there would be an adverse impact on station operations or response times similar to Alternative 2 described above, because the central pier alternative would include a similar sized pier with the same associated components, including safety lighting, as proposed for the eastern pier. For these reasons as well as those described above for the Alternative 2 General Plan revision, the Alternative 4 western pier would result in a **less-than-significant** impact on fire protection and emergency services.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Impact 5.3.10-8: Increased demand for law enforcement services

Law enforcement services at KBSRA are primarily provided by a CSP ranger. Through an agreement with the Placer County Sheriff, law enforcement service needs that occur when the ranger is not present are met by the Sheriff. Implementation of Alternatives 2 through 4 would result in an increase in visitation at KBSRA by up to 10 percent over existing conditions. CSP has identified an existing need for a second ranger to patrol KBSRA. The demand for law enforcement services would increase with the addition of new facilities at KBSRA, including a longer pier, and additional special events. With implementation of General Plan goals and guidelines, additional rangers would be provided as new facilities and an expanded pier are added. Special event applicants would be required to fund additional staff to meet the increase in law enforcement demand associated with their event. For these reasons, the impact on law enforcement services from Alternatives 2 through 4 would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 1 would have **no impact**.

Alternative 1: No Project

General Plan Revision

Because the 1980 General Plan Development Plan would remain unchanged and no upland improvements would be made under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in demand for law enforcement services over that which could occur under existing conditions and therefore **no impact** on law enforcement services.

Pier Rebuild Project

Because the existing Kings Beach pier would remain and there would be no other improvements under the No Action Alternative, there would be no increase in demand for law enforcement services over that which could occur under existing conditions and therefore **no impact** on law enforcement services.

Alternative 2: Eastern Pier Alternative (Proposed Project)

General Plan Revision

Implementation of Alternative 2 General Plan revision could increase visitation to KBSRA by up to 10 percent over existing conditions and an anticipated increase in the number of special events, which would result in an increased demand for law enforcement protection services so that there would be up to three or four total rangers staffed at KBSRA (Linkem, pers. comm., 2017). Similar to existing conditions, special event applicants would be required to fund additional staff to meet the increase in law enforcement demand associated with their event.

Law enforcement services at KBSRA are provided by CSP rangers. Currently, one full-time ranger is assigned to KBSRA (Linkem, pers. comm., 2017). This ranger splits their time between KBSRA and other CSP areas in the north shore (e.g., Tahoe State Recreation Area in Tahoe City), with most of their time spent at KBSRA. Rangers from other CSP areas patrol KBSRA when the KBSRA ranger is off duty. KBSRA has an existing need for an additional ranger to meet law enforcement demand. CSP has an agreement with the Placer County Sheriff in which the Sheriff responds to incidents at KBSRA if a ranger is not present.

The General Plan revision includes a goal and associated guidelines to ensure that law enforcement needs are provided at acceptable levels at KBSRA:

GOAL OP 4 and Guidelines OP 4.1 and OP 4.2 state that it is a goal of KBSRA to have sufficient staffing and funding to meet the needs for public safety and management through planning for staffing and management needs based on use patterns, use of volunteers to complement staff, and seek additional funding sources to complement base funding levels. Implementation of these guidelines as part of project operations would result in providing additional rangers as additional facilities are added to meet the increase in demand for law enforcement services.

With implementation of General Plan goals and guidelines, which would result in increasing the number of rangers at KBSRA as additional facilities are added and visitation increases, Alternative 2 would result in **less-than-significant** impacts on law enforcement services.

Pier Rebuild Project

The rebuilt, longer eastern pier that would be constructed with Alternative 2 would result in an increase in visitation and use of the pier, which could increase demand for law enforcement (Linkem, pers. comm., 2017). For the reasons described above for the Alternative 2 General Plan revision, the impact on law enforcement services from implementation of the Alternative 2 eastern pier would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 3: Central Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on demand for law enforcement services from implementation of Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the types of park amenities and park use that would occur with Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 3 on law enforcement services would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The rebuilt, longer central pier that would be constructed for Alternative 3 would result in an increase in visitation and use of the pier, similar to that described above for Alternative 2, which could increase demand for law enforcement (Linkem, pers. comm., 2017). For the reasons described above for Alternative 2, the impact on law enforcement services from implementation of the Alternative 3 central pier would be **less than significant**.

Alternative 4: Western Pier Alternative

General Plan Revision

Impacts on demand for law enforcement services from implementation of Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2 because the increase in park amenities and park use that would occur with Alternative 4 would be similar to Alternative 2. For these reasons and those described above for Alternative 2, the impact from implementation of Alternative 4 on law enforcement services would be **less than significant**.

Pier Rebuild Project

The rebuilt, longer western pier and extended motorized boat ramp that would be constructed for Alternative 4 would result in an increase in visitation and use of the pier, similar to that described above for Alternative 2, which could increase demand for law enforcement (Linkem, pers. comm., 2017). The boat ramp extension would be modest and while it would be expected to increase the period of time that the boat ramp is open, it would not provide access during all lake levels and would not be expected to result in a substantial increase in demand for law enforcement over existing conditions. For the reasons described above for Alternative 2, the impact on law enforcement services from implementation of the Alternative 4 western pier would be **less than significant**.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Cumulative Impacts

Water supply and wastewater conveyance services for KBSRA and the surrounding areas are provided by NTPUD. Additional wastewater conveyance, treatment, and disposal is provided by T-TSA. Solid waste collection is provided by TTDS and solid waste is disposed of at the Lockwood Regional Landfill. Electric and natural gas services are provided by Liberty Utilities and Southwest Gas Corporation, respectively. Fire protection is provided by NTFPD. Law enforcement is provided by CSP rangers at KBSRA and by the Placer County Sheriff's Department as a supplement to CSP ranger patrols and for the surrounding areas. The geographic scope for the cumulative effects on these public services and utilities would be the service area for each of these public service and utility providers.

As described in Impacts 5.3.10-1 through 5.3.10-8, all public service and utility providers are currently able to meet the needs of residents, workers, and visitors year-round. Therefore, no existing significant impacts on public services and utilities impacts currently exist. The public services and utilities impacts of the General Plan revision and pier rebuild action alternatives would be less than significant (see Impacts 5.3.10-1 through 5.3.10-8).

Water

Cumulative projects that could combine with the General Plan revision to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on water supply and water supply infrastructure include buildout of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Regional Plan within the service area for NTPUD and implementation

of the Kings Beach Center Design Concept and North Tahoe Event Center projects. As identified in Impacts 5.3.10-1 and 5.3.10-2, the General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would result in a less than significant impact related to water supply and water supply conveyance and treatment infrastructure. As identified in the NTPUD 2010 Urban Water Management Plan and confirmed by NTPUD staff, there would be sufficient water supplies to meet future demand of these projects (Stelter, pers. comm., 2016a). Additionally, anytime a specific project is proposed, NTPUD may require a capacity analysis to be performed by the project to ensure the areas of the system being tapped for service are adequate in serving the proposed project. If deficiencies are found, any system improvements required to serve the proposed project would be a condition of the project through which the project constructs system improvements and NTPUD takes ownership of the new facilities. For these reasons, the General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would not combine with cumulative projects to result in a significant cumulative impact on water supply and water supply infrastructure.

Wastewater

Cumulative projects that could combine with the General Plan revision to result in a cumulatively considerable impact on wastewater conveyance and treatment infrastructure include buildout of the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Regional Plan within the service area for NTPUD and implementation of the Kings Beach Center Design Concept and North Tahoe Event Center projects. Considering the limited anticipated growth that could occur within their service area, NTPUD generally has adequate capacity in their wastewater collection system (Stelter, pers. comm., 2016a). The same requirements for capacity analysis and needed system improvements described for water supply above related to NTPUD infrastructure would also apply to their wastewater collection services. Although the current T-TSA wastewater conveyance system has the capacity to meet the wastewater conveyance demand for the region, a pinch point exists along the Truckee River Interceptor (TRI) near Olympic Valley, which could affect the potential for the system to accommodate increased wastewater flows. The General Plan revision and cumulative projects identified above would contribute wastewater to the TRI. Any excess capacity in the TRI is allocated on a first-come, first-served basis and all future projects that would use this conveyance would be required to demonstrate that sufficient wastewater conveyance capacity is available. The T-TSA WRP has a capacity of 9.6 million gallons per day (mgd) based on a seven-day dry weather average flow basis (Parker, pers. comm., 2017). The remaining available capacity at the treatment plant is estimated to be 3.2 mgd. Currently, there is ample available capacity to serve projected future development, including the buildout of the cumulative projects listed above. The T-TSA WRP is designed to address buildout of its service area which includes cumulative projects located within the Town of Truckee and Placer County (Placer County 1994, Town of Truckee 2006). Also, the T-TSA emergency overflow ponds located between Riverview Park and the Truckee River are designed to hold additional volume that could be generated during peak flows until such flows could be processed by the treatment plant (T-TSA 2009). No project would be permitted without confirmation from the service provider that available capacity exists at the WRP. For these reasons, the General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would not combine with cumulative projects to result in a significant cumulative impact on NTPUD and T-TSA wastewater conveyance and wastewater treatment infrastructure or on the T-TSA WRP.

Solid Waste

Contributions of solid waste to the landfill associated with the project operations would be minimal associated with a 10 percent or less increase in visitation at KBSRA. The project operations would achieve the 50 percent waste diversion requirements of AB 939 through diversion of recyclable materials at the MRF. Construction and demolition (C&D) activities associated with the General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would be required to recycle or salvage for reuse a minimum of 65 percent of C&D debris in accordance with Section 5.408 of the CALGreen Code. The cumulative

projects listed in Table 5.1-4 in Section 5.1.4, Cumulative Impacts, would contribute to the generation of solid waste during construction activities and operations that could be sorted and transferred through the MRF and disposed at the Lockwood Regional Landfill. These projects would also achieve solid waste reductions during operations and construction as required by AB 939 and Section 5.408 of the CALGreen Code.

The Eastern Regional Landfill Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) is permitted to receive 800 tons (3,556 cubic yards) of material daily (CalRecycle 2015). The MRF receives an average of 205 tons per day (911 cubic yards) and has available capacity to receive an additional 595 tons per day (2,644 cubic yards; TTSD 2018a, 2018b). Lockwood Regional Landfill presently has a capacity of 302.5 million cubic yards, over an area of 856.6 acres. Based on the April 2010 aerial survey the Landfill contained a waste volume of approximately 32.8 million cubic yards (NDEP 2016). Given that approximately 90 percent of the landfill capacity is available, there would be sufficient and available capacity to meet solid waste disposal needs for the foreseeable future. For these reasons, the General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would not combine with cumulative projects to result in a significant cumulative impact on solid waste disposal.

Energy

Liberty Utilities and Southwest Gas Corporation employ various programs and mechanisms to support provision of these services to new development; various utilities charge connection fees and re-coup costs of new infrastructure through standard billings for services. There is currently sufficient infrastructure and energy supply to support existing demand. Implementation of the General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would result in an incremental increase in demand for energy.

Many of the cumulative projects identified in Table 5.1-4 in Section 5.1.4, Cumulative Impacts, that would be served by these energy providers involve redevelopment of existing developed sites or areas, including buildout of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Regional Plan and the Kings Beach Center Design Concept, North Tahoe Event Center, and Kings Beach Library Relocation. Other cumulative projects would result in demand for electricity that would primarily be associated with new lighting, such as the road and pedestrian projects, which would be an incremental increase over existing conditions. Through their established process to provide connections, electricity, and natural gas supply to new development, Southwest Gas and Liberty Utilities use plans provided by developers to determine if or when upgrades in the system would be required to meet demand. In California, the General Plan revision and pier rebuild project and the cumulative projects would be required to implement energy efficiency measures in accordance with Title 24 to reduce energy demand. For these reasons and because the utilities have procedures to plan for system improvements to keep pace with projected demand, the General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would not combine with cumulative projects to result in a significant cumulative impact on energy efficiency and consumption.

Fire Protection and Emergency Services

As described in Impact 5.3.10-7, the project would result in a minor increase of visitors at KBSRA of 10 percent or less over existing conditions that would not adversely affect NTFPD staffing or operations (Conradson, pers. comm., 2017). During holidays and other periods of high tourist visitation (e.g., ski season, summer weekends), visitation to the area increases, which, in combination with buildout of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Regional Plan and development of the Kings Beach Center Design Concept, could affect fire protection and emergency services ratios and response times. Implementation of individual projects could require improved or expanded facilities for fire protection and emergency services provided by NTFPD, the construction of which could result in adverse environmental effects. However, project-level environmental review for specific projects would be

required to have adequate water supply for fire suppression. Additionally, new construction projects pay mitigation fees to NTFPD that are used for costs associated with recovery of fire and life safety activities. NTFPD is also funded through developer agreements and federal grants that are used for providing additional fire equipment and infrastructure that helps NTFPD in working to achieve the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1710 standards (Schwartz, pers. comm., 2016). For these reasons, the General Plan revision and pier rebuild Project would not combine with the cumulative projects to result in a significant cumulative impact on fire protection and emergency services.

Law Enforcement

Law enforcement at KBSRA is provided by CSP rangers, implementation of the General Plan revision would result in increasing the number of rangers at KBSRA as demand increases with new facilities, and the cumulative project law enforcement demands would be served by Placer County Sheriff. For these reasons, the General Plan revision and pier rebuild project would not combine with the cumulative projects to result in a significant cumulative impact on law enforcement services.

This page intentionally left blank.