

3.3 Social Environment

3.3.1 Affected Environment

The action area is contained within the Kings Beach Census Designated Place (CDP), a geographic designation devised by the U.S. Census Bureau (USCB) for compilation of data for the portion of the 11.27-kilometer-wide (7.0-mile-wide) area contained on the north shore of Lake Tahoe between the Nevada state line and the Tahoe Vista CDP. The Kings Beach CDP defines the study area used to describe the social environment of the proposed action. The social environment includes the neighborhood, demographics, public services, and circulation characteristics of the study area as described in the *Community Impact Assessment Kings Beach Commercial Core Project* (Appendix F).

3.3.1.1 Community/Neighborhood Characteristics

The action area runs through the unincorporated community of Kings Beach, along North Lake Boulevard SR 28, which parallels the north shore of Lake Tahoe. Single- and multifamily homes are located on both sides of SR 28 but are concentrated north of the highway due to the proximity of the lake on the south side. Kings Beach is mainly an older rustic community located immediately west of the Nevada-California state line. The community has many small, local-serving businesses along SR 28 and includes an elementary school, a fire dispatch unit, and a volunteer sheriff's department. Kings Beach State Recreation Area, a 213.36-meter (700-foot) public access beach, is also available to residents and visitors and is located off of SR 28. Residents use SR 28 to reach retail stores, medical services, and jobs located in the nearby cities of Incline Village, and Tahoe City. Access to Truckee is along SR 267, which intersects with SR 28 at the western end of the community.

3.3.1.2 Population Characteristics

According to the USCB, the study area Kings Beach CDP had a population of approximately 4,307 in the year 2000, accounting for 1.7% of the 248,399 persons residing in Placer County. Between 1990 and 2000, the study area's population increased

by 1,241 persons, or by 44.4%. This growth is consistent with the countywide increase of 75,603 persons (44% increase) in population during the same time.

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

As Table 3.3-1 shows, the demographics of the study area reflect a generally young population. Only a small number of senior citizens aged 65 or older reside in the area, accounting for only 3.4% of the population. By comparison, 13.1% of the countywide population is in this age group. Similarly, the median age of residents in the study area, at 29.2, is substantially lower than the countywide median age of 38.0. The percentage of the population that is under age 18 (28.0%) remains similar, although it is slightly higher than that for the county (26.5%). The study area had a median household income of \$35,507 in 2000, which is significantly lower than the median incomes in Placer County and statewide (Table 3.3-1).

Table 3.3-1. Selected Demographic Characteristics: 2000 Census

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

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2005.

The racial characteristics of the study area, which are presented in Table 3.3-2, generally reflect a population that is largely white and Hispanic. With whites and Hispanics nearly equally distributed in the study area (49.0% and 48.4% respectively), no other racial groups make up a significant portion of the area’s population. Although the study area is

more similar in demographics to the state as a whole, it is markedly more diverse than Placer County, which is predominantly white. Persons of Hispanic or Latino heritage accounted for 48.4% of the study area’s population in 2000, about five times greater than that of Placer County.

Table 3.3-2. Racial Distribution of Area Populations: 2000 Census

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

Note:

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

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2005.

3.3.1.3 Residential Environment

According to the 2000 Census, 2,284 housing units are located in the study area, representing only 2% of the county’s housing stock (Table 3.3-3). The study area’s housing stock is relatively older with 32.0% of houses constructed prior to 1960, compared to 14.4% countywide. Although single-family housing units account for the largest share of the study area’s housing stock (70.9%), they are still nearly 10% less than that of the county. The percentage of mobile homes in the study area is comparable to both county- and statewide numbers (Table 3.3-3).

Table 3.3-3. Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000 Census

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

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2005.

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

The median value of housing in the study area was approximately \$202,400 in 2000, which is lower than the median value of housing in Placer County and the state as a whole (Table 3.3-3). The lower value in the study area may reflect the influence of the study area’s relatively low median household income (Table 3.3-1). Similarly, median rental rates (Table 3.3-3) within the study area, at \$574, were also substantially lower than in Placer County (\$687) and statewide (\$677).

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

3.3.1.4 Economic Setting

Tax Revenue

Property tax and sales revenues generated by private properties within the action area are received by Placer County. Parts of about 121 privately owned parcels are located along the permanent ROW area of the proposed action and are subject to the 1% property tax rate. During the 2003–2004 fiscal year, Placer County’s countywide property tax revenues were approximately \$332 million (Placer County 2005b).

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

Labor Force and Employment

According to the California Employment Development Department (CEDD), which prepares labor force and employment estimates for California counties, Placer County’s civilian labor force averaged 155,000 in 2004, of which 2,600 resided in Kings Beach. In 2004, unemployment in the county and study area averaged an estimated 4.5% and 4.6%, respectively.

Employment by industries located in Placer County provided 134,000 jobs in 2004. Goods producing, retail trade, services (including tourism), and government are the dominant employers in Placer County. As outlined in the 2003 study *The Economic Significance of Travel to the North Lake Tahoe Area*, tourism generates 70% of jobs and over \$17 million dollars in taxes in the North Lake Tahoe area (Dean Runyan Associates 2003). Major employers include Alpine Meadows Ski Resort; Squaw Creek in Olympic Valley; Hewlett-Packard in Roseville; Oracle in Rocklin; Sutter Health in both Auburn and Roseville; Thunder Valley Casino in Rocklin; and the Placer County government,

which is in various locations but primarily in Auburn (California Employment Development Department 2005).

Information regarding sales tax revenues for the Kings Beach action area was provided by Placer County and indicates that the Kings Beach action area generated \$374,875 for Placer County in 2005. According to the Kings Beach Community Plan, the area's overall goal is to provide an attractive resort community. This indicates a strong reliance on services such as tourist accommodations, restaurants, retail shops, boutiques, and leisure-oriented businesses in the area. Some of the local employers in the area include Stone Country Automotive, TransAm Gas (formerly Mobil), Ace Hardware, Motel California, Crown Motel, Rite Aid, Crosswinds Café, Steamers, Dave's Ski Shop, and Log Cabin Café. The retail and service sector of Kings Beach is located primarily along SR 28. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, approximately 37% of workers in Kings Beach had a commute of less than 15 minutes, indicating employment in or near the community. For them and those who commute farther to areas in Tahoe City, Truckee, Incline Village, and Sacramento, the transportation and consumer access provided by SR 28 is a key aspect of the local economy.

3.3.2 Regulatory Setting/Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Thresholds

3.3.2.1 National Environmental Policy Act

Under NEPA, the "human environment" encompasses both social and economic impacts. Economic and social effects must be discussed if they are interrelated with natural or physical environmental effects (*40 CFR sec. 1508.14*). For example, if an economic or social effect causes a physical change to the environment or vice versa, then these economic and social effects should be discussed in the environmental document.

In addition, NEPA requires that to the fullest extent possible other laws be integrated into the NEPA process (*40 CFR sec. 1502.25[a]*). This requirement applies to Executive Order (EO) 12898 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, both of which are applicable to community resources.

All projects with a federal action must comply with EO 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*, signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994. EO 12898 directs federal agencies to take the appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high numbers of adverse effects on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations that are caused by federal projects. *Low income* is defined based on the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines. For 2004, this was \$18,850 for a family of four.

All considerations under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes have also been included in this document. Caltrans' commitment to upholding the mandates of Title VI is evidenced by its Title VI Policy Statement, signed by the Director.

3.3.2.2 California Environmental Quality Act

Under CEQA, consideration of economic and/or social changes only occurs when they result in a physical change to the environment (*CEQA Guidelines §15064[f], 15382*).

3.3.2.3 Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

TRPA Resolution No. 82-11, adopted August 1982, outlined the environmental threshold carrying capacities for the Lake Tahoe Region. The *environmental threshold carrying capacity* is defined as:

an environmental standard necessary to maintain significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, or natural value of the region or to maintain public health and safety within the region.

The thresholds set forth in Resolution 82-11 address the following nine components of the environment of the Tahoe Region: water quality, soil conservation, air quality, vegetation preservation, wildlife, fisheries, noise, recreation, and scenic resources. As such, TRPA does not specifically include criteria for determining significance of social environments.

Although there is no threshold standard for economic indicators, TRPA recognizes the interdependence of environmental quality, economic health, and social-well being in the Lake Tahoe region. TRPA considers the impacts of the Regional Plan on the region's economy. Furthermore, in Article 1 of the TRPA Compact, (*Public Law 96-551*) the economic and social health of the Tahoe basin is addressed in the following findings:

- The waters of Lake Tahoe and other resources of the region are threatened with deterioration or degeneration, which endangers the natural beauty and economic productivity of the region.
- Maintenance of the social and economic health of the region depends on maintaining the significant scenic, recreational, educational, scientific, natural public health values provided by the Basin.

Responsibilities for providing recreational and scientific opportunities, preserving scenic and natural areas, and safeguarding the public who live, work and play in or visit the region are divided among local governments, regional agencies, the States of California and Nevada, and the federal government.

3.3.2.4 Population Growth Policies

Although located in Placer County, growth in the study area is guided primarily by the policies set forth by the TRPA. The TRPA sets thresholds of carrying capacities for growth and development as an effort to preserve the environment. Population growth is not directly addressed, but other policies may affect this secondarily (Graves pers. comm.).

3.3.3 Environmental Consequences (including Temporary, Direct, Indirect)

This section discusses the effects of Alternatives 1 through 4 on social characteristics (including environmental justice concerns), residential and commercial displacements, and economic activity in the action area.

NEPA criteria for determining adverse effects are listed in *40 CFR 1508.27*. In compliance with EO 12898, the proposed action was considered to have an adverse effect under NEPA if it would result in disproportionately high numbers of significant adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. Provisions in the EO apply to programs involving Native Americans.

The proposed action has been developed in accordance with the CRA 1964, as amended; the Uniform Relocation and Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended; and EO 12898. EO 12898 requires each federal agency to take the appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low-income populations that result from its programs, policies, and activities.

Environmental justice refers to the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. The Council on Environmental Quality's *Guidance for Environmental Justice* (Council on Environmental Quality 1997) indicates that environmental justice concerns may arise from impacts on the natural or physical environment, such as human health or ecological impacts on minority and low-income populations, or from related social or economic impacts (California Department of Transportation 1997b). According to Caltrans guidelines for conducting community impact assessments (California Department of Transportation 1997b), *community cohesion* is the degree to which residents have a "sense of belonging" to their neighborhood; a level of commitment of the residents of the community; or a strong attachment to neighbors, groups, or institutions, usually because of continued association over time. Physical barriers, such as major roadways or large open space areas, often delineate communities.

Cohesive communities are indicated by specific social characteristics, such as long average lengths of residency, home ownership, frequent personal contact, ethnic homogeneity, high levels of community activity, and shared goals. Transportation

projects may divide cohesive neighborhoods when such projects act as physical barriers or are perceived as psychological barriers by residents. A transportation project perceived as a physical or psychological barrier may isolate one portion of a homogeneous neighborhood (California Department of Transportation 1997b).

Impact SOC-1: Displacement of a Substantial Number of People or Housing Units

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 is the no-build alternative, and it is assumed that the existing conditions would persist under this alternative and that the proposed action would not occur. No changes would occur to the social environment within the action area that would displace a substantial number of people or housing units. This alternative would not result in any adverse effects on people or housing units, and consequently no mitigation measures are required.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4

There are no identified population or housing impacts resulting from either of these alternatives. There would be no adverse effects, and no mitigation is required.

Impact SOC-2: Impacts on Community Cohesion

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 is the no-build alternative. Existing conditions would persist under this alternative, and no effects would occur on community cohesion. No mitigation is required.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4

Within the study area, SR 28 serves as the corridor connecting Kings Beach to surrounding communities, and it also provides commercial access for residents and tourists. Most homes and neighborhoods along the SR 28 action area are located north of SR 28. Residents of these neighborhoods use vehicles to reach commercial centers or homes along SR 28, but improvements would create more pedestrian friendly access. The SR 28 roadway would be slightly narrowed under Alternatives 2 and 4 and would

include bike lanes, pedestrian crosswalks, and sidewalks under all alternatives. Under Alternatives 2 and 4, sidewalks would be widened to 2.9 meters (9.5 feet) and 5.3 meters (17.4 feet), respectively. Under Alternative 3, the sidewalk would be widened to 1.7 meters (5.6 feet). Alternatives 2 and 4 would be more conducive to pedestrian and bicycle mobility than Alternative 3. All alternatives would serve to reduce the existing physical barrier that separates the opposing sides of the commercial strip from the surrounding neighborhoods. This is a beneficial effect and no mitigation measure is required.

Impact SOC-3: Disproportionate Environmental Effects on Races, Cultures, or Incomes (Environmental Justice)

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 is the no-build alternative. Existing conditions would persist under this alternative, and there would be no adverse environmental justice–related effects on income, culture, or race. No mitigation is required.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4

An evaluation of data from the 2000 U.S. Census (U.S. Census Bureau 2000) indicates that the income and racial characteristics of the study area are markedly dissimilar to those of Placer County, with the study area comprising a proportionally larger minority population (Hispanic) than found in Placer County (Table 3.3-2). Median household income in the study area is significantly lower than in Placer County (Table 3.3-1). Additionally, the study area has a much larger percentage (17.7%) of its population living below the poverty level than the percentage countywide (5.8%). Based on this data and field observations, it is likely that the proposed action would have impacts on minority or low-income populations, but the effects are largely beneficial. Improved safety for pedestrians and bicyclists along SR 28 serves residents who may rely on transportation other than motor vehicles. Furthermore, construction and operations-related effects of the proposed action would occur along the length of the commercial corridor, with effects generally spread evenly across all populations residing near the action area. Based on the above discussion and analysis, Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 will not cause disproportionately

high and adverse effects on any minority or low-income populations as per E.O 11898 regarding environmental. Therefore, Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 are not considered to potentially cause disproportionately high or adverse human health and environmental effects on minority or low-income residents. None of the alternatives would result in substantial adverse effect and no mitigation measures are required.

Impact SOC-4: Loss of Property Tax Revenue

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 is the no-build alternative. Existing conditions would persist under this alternative, and no adverse effects on property tax revenue would occur. No mitigation is required.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4

The total amount of area regarded as partial acquisitions of privately owned properties required for Alternatives 2 through 4 is of such insignificance that property tax revenues currently being generated by these properties for Placer County and other local agencies would not be reduced. Because no retail commercial uses would be fully displaced by the alternatives, the proposed action is not anticipated to cause changes in sales tax revenues for Placer County.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would not displace any residential property and therefore not result in losses in property tax revenue for Placer County. Therefore, this is not considered an adverse effect and no mitigation measure is required.

Impact SOC-5: Revenue Effects on Local and Roadside Businesses

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 is the no-build alternative. Existing conditions would persist under this alternative, and no adverse effects on local and roadside businesses would occur. No mitigation is required.

Alternative 2

Under Alternative 2, ROW acquisition and changes in access and parking could cause impacts on businesses located adjacent to SR 28 between SR 267 and Chipmunk Street. An estimated 2.74 meters (9 feet) of total area for sidewalk construction would be needed along SR 28, and properties most impacted by this do not currently have a buffer between their buildings and the roadway or they use this area for parking.

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

- Improvements at the intersection of SR 28/SR 267 would displace a portion of parking lot area on the corner of APN 117-180-007. The commercial building of Stone's Automotive uses this area as part of its parking lot. No parking would be displaced, but a loss of a portion of the lot would decrease the space available for vehicles to maneuver through the lot. Access change may also be imposed on the business, as entry along SR 28 may no longer be provided. However, entry along SR 267 would be maintained, so these changes should not create major problems for the business. This is not considered an adverse effect and no mitigation is required.
- The commercial property located at 8079 SR 28 (APN 090-071-026/090-071-025) would lose areas south and southwest of the building that is used by customers as a parking area. Loss of this area would require customers to access parking along Secline Street or along the proposed parking lane further east on SR 28. This is not considered an adverse effect and no mitigation measure is required.
- Vehicular access from the south side of the building on APN 090-123-023 (7-Eleven) would be impacted, but access would continue to be provided on the southeast side of the building from Coon Street. Construction of this access area would displace two parking spaces in front of the building, although seven additional spaces would be created with the closure of the SR 28 entrance. This is not considered an adverse effect and no mitigation is required.

- APN 090-142-002 may lose vehicle access along SR 28. This parcel currently has no existing buildings, and as such the severity of impacts depends on the future use of this property. This is not considered an adverse effect and no mitigation measure is required.
- APN 090-071-026/090-071-025 would lose approximately 10 spaces of parking. Although access is also being discontinued from SR 28, the loss of the 10 parking spaces is not anticipated to affect the operation of the businesses at this location. However, Placer County has committed to compensating for parking spaces that would be lost as a result of either build alternative (see discussion under *Section 3.7*). SR 28 improvements and ROW acquisition would displace the entire amount of parking used by customers of the business located at 8160 SR 28 (APNs 090-072-023/ 090-072-024).
- 8338 SR 28 (APNs 090-080-001/ 090-080-002) would lose approximately 12 parking spaces due to ROW acquisitions. These spaces make up the entire amount of parking available for the retail businesses in this building. However, Placer County has committed to compensating for parking spaces that would be lost as a result of either build alternative (see discussion under *Section 3.7*). This alternative would modify SR 28 from a four-lane cross section roadway to a three-lane cross section roadway, which would result in more traffic congestion than the four-lane alternative.

Alternative 3

Impacts on businesses in the action area caused by changes in setbacks, access, and parking would be the same as those described for Alternative 2 (NEPA Impacts) with the following exceptions.

- The business located at 8593 SR 28 (APN 090-123-023) would not be impacted as described under Alternative 2. This alternative creates no change on the existing parcel other than a small corner frontage take. This is not considered an adverse effect and no mitigation is required.

- The existing entry to the Jenkin's Building (APN 090-123-008) would be discontinued in this alternative. No break in the sidewalk is planned for the parcel and access may be entirely pedestrian along SR 28. However, entry in front of APNs 090-123-010 and 090-123-023 would be maintained so these changes should not create major problems for businesses located in this building. This is not considered an adverse effect and no mitigation measure is required.
- The traffic congestion associated with the three-lane alternatives would not occur under the four-lane alternative, but this alternative would result in less room for sidewalks and bicycle access due to the extra lane, which could result in less pedestrian and bicycle mobility along the KBCC. In addition, the wider lanes associated with the four-lane alternative could make pedestrian crossing across SR 28 more difficult, compared to the three-lane alternative. These factors could result in fewer economic benefits to the KBCC area than would occur under the three-lane alternative, as less pedestrian and bicycle mobility could result in fewer shoppers in the KBCC area.

Alternative 4

Impacts on businesses in the action area caused by changes in setbacks, access, and parking would be the same as those described for Alternative 2 (NEPA Impacts) with the following exceptions.

- The existing entry along SR 28 to Dave's Ski Shop and Tahoe's Paddle and Oar (APN 090-071-029) would be discontinued in this alternative. No break in the sidewalk is planned for the parcel and access may be entirely pedestrian along SR 28. However, entry along Deer Street would be maintained, so these changes are not anticipated to create major problems for businesses located in this building. This is not considered an adverse effect and no mitigation is required.
- A secondary point of entry for the business located at 8700 SR 28 (APN 090-134-029) is not planned under this alternative. A single entry along SR 28 would be used by customers to access the business. This change is not expected to impact the

operation of the business located at 8700 SR 28. This is not considered an adverse effect and no mitigation measure is required.

Impact SOC-6: Construction-Related Economic Impacts

Alternative 1

Alternative 1 is the no-build alternative. Existing conditions would persist under this alternative, and no construction related economic effects would occur. No mitigation is required.

Alternatives 2, 3, and 4

The construction of proposed improvements for Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 would have temporary economic effects in the local area and region. One temporary effect would be the increase in economic activity due to project related spending. This would include the purchases of goods and services required for construction and employment of workers needed for construction. The increased economic activity would prompt secondary economic activity as a portion of the construction-related revenue and employee compensation is spent in sectors throughout the local and regional economy. The extent of the economic impact of construction-related expenditures on the local and regional economy would depend on the proportion of construction expenditures that would occur in the local and regional area and on the residential location of persons employed by construction contractors.

A separate temporary economic effect would be a decrease in economic activity due to decreased tourism. As previously indicated, tourism generates 70% of jobs and over \$17 million dollars in taxes in the North Lake Tahoe area (Dean Runyan Associates 2003). This heavy reliance on tourism can be easily affected by accessibility and transportation changes leading into and around the action area. Because SR 28 is a main corridor within the action area, the secondary economic impacts that could occur during construction periods are related to tourism. Access changes, parking disruptions, and traffic delays could discourage visitors and decrease local tax revenues and sales within the action area. The extent of the economic effect of the construction-related decrease in

tourist volumes on the local and regional economy would depend on the length and season of the construction period and the construction timing of other related projects. Implementation of a Community Involvement and Participation Plan (CIPP) through Mitigation Measure LU-1, as described in *Section 3.8, Land Use*, and a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) through Mitigation Measure TRA-3 in *Section 3.6, Traffic*, would minimize this effect. These measures would act to spread awareness about the proposed action and coordinate efforts in order to minimize the effects of construction activities. In addition, the cumulative effects of construction-related projects on major routes of travel in the greater action area could also affect the regional economy. To minimize these effects, the implementation of an interregional Transportation Management Plan (RTMP) is recommended to coordinate efforts between agencies and the scheduling of projects. The Caltrans TMP Unit is still making determinations of thresholds for delays as the development of the RTMP is being undertaken

3.3.4 Mitigation, Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation Measures

Mitigation Measure LU-1: Implement a Community Involvement and Public Participation Plan

This mitigation measure is described in *Section 3.8, Land Use*.

Mitigation Measure TRA-2: Implement Construction Traffic Management Plan during Construction

This mitigation measure is described in *Section 3.6, Traffic*.

3.3.5 Compliance with Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Code

TRPA regularly monitors economic conditions and considers the impacts of the Regional Plan on the region's economy. In meeting the needs outlined above, the proposed action will contribute to the achievement of planning goals at the community and regional level.