

4.16 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS

This section of the EIS summarizes the unavoidable adverse environmental effects that would result from the development of the project alternatives. This summary is based on the environmental analysis provided in **Section 4** of this EIS.

4.16.1 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Significant impacts to the topography of the La Center Interchange Site would result from development of Alternative D as key topographic features of the site would be substantially altered or eliminated by cutting and filling for building pads and parking areas.

Due to the necessity for substantial grading to provide adequate drainage to the casino-resort complex and Tribal facilities proposed under Alternative E, significant impacts to topography would result under this alternative on the Ridgefield Interchange Site.

4.16.2 WATER RESOURCES

If wastewater discharge is not diverted to a publicly owned treatment facility (POTW) for Alternatives A, B, and C, while the quality of the discharge would meet all applicable standards, the discharge would change the hydraulic character of the Type 5 unnamed stream on-site from a seasonal stream to a perennial stream by increasing flow-rates year round. As discussed in **Section 4.5**, **Biology**, and **Section 5.0**, mitigation measures are recommended that would ensure impacts remain less than significant.

If wastewater is diverted to a POTW, the loss of the ability to utilize reclaimed water would increase project water use for Alternatives A, B, and C. This would not be a significant impact because Clark Public Utilities has the capacity to supply water to the proposed project.

4.16.3 AIR QUALITY

Emissions from Alternatives A, B, C, D, and E are considered to be from “indirect” sources; that is a facility or building that attracts motor vehicle traffic and, indirectly, causes pollution. Total emissions from these “indirect” sources would exceed conformity thresholds of 100 tons per year for VOC, NO_x, and CO (**Section 4.4**, **Table 4.4-5**). Although conformity thresholds are not applicable they are utilized as significance standards. Alternatives A, B, C, D, and E would also be significant trip generators and, therefore, operational vehicular emissions from these alternatives would be significant. These operational emissions can be mitigated through implementation of measures described in **Section 5.2.3**. After mitigation the impact from “indirect” emissions would still exceed conformity thresholds and therefore still have a significant adverse effect. However, the “indirect” emissions, which are responsible for the exceedance of the conformity standards, are mainly emitted

from outside the immediate project area and therefore an analysis of the project region was performed to better understand the true regional significance to air quality. Section 4.4, Table 4.4-5 shows, in parentheses, the percentage of project emissions that would occur due to implementation of the Proposed Project to the regional emissions inventory. In Alternative A and B CO emissions would only comprise 0.6% of the total regional emissions, while NO_x shows only 0.4%, and VOCs 0.3%. Using the criteria of the general conformity regulations, if an area has equal or greater than 10% of the regions emissions inventory the project is considered to have a significant impact. As shown above the percentage of regional emissions that the Proposed Project will emit is far less than 10%. Thus, since the “indirect” emissions will be emitted outside the project area, from a regional standpoint the project emissions would be considered less than significant.

4.16.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Permanent features associated with the facilities under Alternatives A, B, C, D, and E, such as night lighting, have the potential to impact migratory bird species. Certain lighting types, including pulsating and strobe lights, could potentially attract birds that could be injured or killed upon impact. Downcast lighting would be installed to minimize the attraction of birds. However, there would be residual unmitigable impacts to wildlife associated with nighttime lighting as any type of artificial light can cause spatial disorientation in birds by creating a false horizon. This may cause them to fly toward backlit windows in an effort to correct their flight resulting in serious injury or death. With careful project design and incorporation of mitigation measures recommended in **Section 5.0**, this impact would be less than significant.

4.16.5 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

No unavoidable adverse effects have been identified for cultural and paleontological resources.

4.16.6 SOCIOECONOMICS CONDITIONS

Substitution effects are expected to divert some small portion of the area’s disposable income to the proposed facility, while increased employment opportunities would result in an increased demand for goods and services and a resulting increase in the service economy. It is expected that even with the implementation of a cooperative marketing program, substitution effects would result in the existing card rooms in La Center losing market share under Alternatives A, B, C, and E. The loss of income to existing establishments through the substitution effect is not a significant socioeconomic impact to the region. The City of La Center may be expected to lose up to 66% of their revenue derived from card room taxes and fees. Although contributions to the City’s General Fund would not be affected, this reduction in revenue would result in less allocation to the City’s fund used for capital improvement projects. Mitigation for replacement of lost revenue for at least 10 years is included in **Section 5.0**. It should be noted that alternate funding for capital improvement projects are available through federal and state grants, local bond measures, and/or increases in retail tax, permit fees,

property tax or development fees. Thus, it is assumed that during the 10-year period of payments the City could arrange for alternative funding mechanisms similar to surrounding jurisdictions.

Therefore, because the loss of these funds will not prevent the City from continuing governmental functions and providing public services, this is not considered a significant effect. Additionally, the Tribe has offered to enter into an agreement with La Center to address the replacement of taxes and fees, and to provide for funding of capital facilities projects and certain transportation improvements. The agreement would also provide for payment for services provided by the City of La Center and could also address a joint marketing program with the City and the existing card rooms. At this time, an agreement between the City of La Center and the Tribe has not been reached.

4.16.7 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

While implementation of shuttle bus service may be expected to result in reduced transportation impacts to I-5 and I-205 segments on events nights, three segments may still experience reduced levels of service. It should be noted that the improvements currently proposed for I-205 between SR-500 and the Glenn Jackson Bridge and the under the Columbia River Crossing DEIS should independently ameliorate these impacts. No other unavoidable adverse effects have been identified for transportation and circulation.

4.16.8 LAND USE

No unavoidable adverse effects have been identified for land use.

4.16.9 PUBLIC SERVICES

No unavoidable adverse effects have been identified for public services.

4.16.10 NOISE

No unavoidable adverse effects have been identified relating to noise.

4.16.11 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

No unavoidable adverse effects have been identified relating to hazardous materials.

4.16.12 AESTHETICS

The use of glass panels and reflective detailing for Alternatives A, B, C, D, and E could increase off-site glare and result in unmitigable glare impacts to travelers on Interstate 5 (I-5) and/or to local residents.