

6 TRPA-MANDATED SECTIONS

6.1 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED

Section 5.8.B(2) of TRPA's Code of Ordinances requires an environmental impact statement (EIS) to include "any significant adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the project be implemented." Chapter 5 of this EIS assesses the project-specific and cumulative environmental effects of five Beach Club project alternatives, and concludes that project impacts are less than significant or that mitigation measures recommended in this EIS would reduce significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

6.2 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

The irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources is the permanent loss of resources for future or alternative purposes. Irreversible and irretrievable resources are those that cannot be recovered or recycled or those that are consumed or reduced to unrecoverable forms. The Beach Club project alternatives would result in the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of energy and material resources during construction and operations.

Energy would be expended in the form of gasoline, diesel fuel, oil for equipment and transportation vehicles, and human labor. Construction activities would generate non-recyclable materials, such as solid waste and construction debris. Electricity would be expended for the construction and operations of the residential units. Using these nonrenewable resources is expected to account for a small portion of the resources in the Lake Tahoe Basin and their area of origin (generally, northern California and Nevada) and would not affect the availability of these resources for other needs within the Basin.

Building materials for the Beach Club project would include rocks, wood, concrete, glass, roof shingles, steel, and other materials. Future use of the site would remain consistent with the PAS 077 (residential) and PAS 070A (recreational) land use designations; therefore, future use of the site with or without the Beach Club project is anticipated to result in using nonrenewable resources.

6.3 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

A TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist was prepared for the project and was circulated with a notice of preparation (NOP) for public comment. The TRPA Initial Environmental Checklist concluded that the following issue areas would result in no impact or a less-than-significant impact given the resource conditions of the project area (e.g., clearly, none of the relevant resources are present or could be substantially affected by the project): agricultural resources, mineral resources, and utilities and public services.

All of the remaining environmental resources are analyzed in Chapter 5 of this EIS. The analysis in this document determines that the proposed project and project alternatives would result in a less-than-significant impact on land use and water recreation. The analysis also determines that, with the implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project and project alternatives would have less-than-significant impacts on: population and housing; geology, soils, and land capability and coverage; hydrology and water quality; transportation and parking; air quality; noise; vegetation and wildlife; scenic resources; cultural resources; water recreation and shorezone; and human health.

6.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Chapter 5 of TRPA's Code of Ordinances requires a discussion of the relationship between a project's local short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity. The following discussion addresses how the Beach Club project would affect the short-term use and the long-term productivity of the environment. In general, "short-term" is used here to refer to the construction period, while "long-term" refers to the operational life of the Beach Club project and beyond.

The project site is currently occupied by the Tahoe Shores Mobile Home Park. The proposed project and project alternatives would result in continued use of the project site for residential purposes by providing market rate and/or moderate income housing units. The proposed project (Alternative A) would expand the recreational component in PAS 070A by constructing a beach and swim club and expanding the existing pier. The proposed construction activities would result in a short-term increase in use of the environment.

Construction of the Beach Club project Alternatives A, B, C and E would result in the use of energy and resources to clear the existing mobile home park from the site and construct new residential and recreational facilities. The No Project – Jere Williams Plan Alternative (Alternative D) would result in less use of energy and resources to maintain and operate the existing mobile home park because the site would not be cleared and reconstructed. The Beach Club project construction alternatives would result in short-term construction-related impacts such as: interference with local traffic and circulation, air emissions, increases in ambient noise levels, disturbance of wildlife, and construction-related runoff. However, these impacts would be temporary, occurring only during construction, and are not expected to alter the long-term productivity of the natural environment.

Approval of the Beach Club project would commit the project site to long-term development; it is expected that to do otherwise would be economically infeasible for the property owner. The project would, however, help to sustain natural resources and support social and economic health. The project alternatives would reduce the existing land coverage and would implement temporary and permanent best management practices (BMPs) to retain, infiltrate, and treat stormwater runoff, thereby improving the water quality of runoff into Lake Tahoe. Utility lines would be moved underground and buildings would be designed to comply with TRPA's scenic requirements. The number of residents at the project site would be reduced under Alternative B, which would reduce the traffic and associated air quality and noise effects relative to existing conditions. Alternative A would also reduce the number of residents at the project site, but the inclusion of the swim and beach club would result in an incremental increase in daily traffic and associated air emissions and noise. Under Alternatives C, D and E, the population would remain essentially the same as the existing mobile home park and the traffic, air quality, and noise effects would remain the same, except in the case of Alternative C where the expected trips per multifamily unit would be slightly higher than the existing mobile home units and, as such, related traffic, air quality, and noise effects would be incrementally greater. The proposed project (Alternative A) would also restore approximately 2 acres of SEZ habitat associated with the Burke Creek Meadow. The Beach Club project would provide safe, professionally managed, and professionally maintained housing that would incorporate quality design and energy efficiency and utilize energy-efficient appliances and equipment. The housing would support vacationers as well as permanent residents of South Lake Tahoe.

On the whole, the project's long-term beneficial effects related to BMPs and improved water quality of runoff, reduction in site coverage, and improved aesthetics would outweigh the potentially significant short-term impacts to the environment resulting primarily from project construction and the long-term incremental increases in traffic with related increases in air emissions and noise. In addition, Alternative A would result in approximately 2 acres of SEZ restoration. Although Alternatives B and C do not currently propose SEZ restoration, it is also possible that, through the TRPA approval process, these alternatives would also incorporate some SEZ restoration.

6.5 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 5.8.B(8) of TRPA's Code of Ordinances requires an EIS to include a discussion of the "growth-inducing impact of the proposed project." Examples of potential growth-inducing actions include developing additional water supply, increasing wastewater treatment capacity, or other types of services in previously unserved areas, extending transportation routes into previously undeveloped areas, and establishing major new employment opportunities.

Growth inducement may not be considered necessarily detrimental, beneficial, or of insignificant consequence. Induced growth is considered a significant impact only if it directly (or indirectly) affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services, or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth, in some other way, significantly affects the environment.

The project would not open an undeveloped area to development, change land use designations, or expand services or utilities. The proposed project would result in the redevelopment of a currently developed site. The proposed project alternatives would be consistent with the designated land uses for the project site and would not result in any change of zoning. The project would not expand public services or utilities, but would utilize services and utilities that already serve the project site. The project would not remove obstacles to growth nor result in growth-inducing impacts.

The proposed project alternatives would result in a population that is similar to or less than the current site population. Under Alternative A, the proposed project, Alternatives C, the Two Multifamily Complexes Alternative, and Alternatives D and E, the no-project alternatives, the population on the project site would remain essentially the same as current conditions. Alternative A would result in a reduction of 12 units. It is anticipated that many of the units, especially the market-rate units, would be purchased as vacation homes, and the permanent resident population at the project site would be reduced. Alternative B, the Two Single-Family Estates Alternative, would result in the greatest reduction of residents on the project site because there would be a reduction of 153 units on the project site. Under Alternative C, 155 condominiums would be constructed, resulting in an equivalent number of units and similar population to the existing conditions and to the two no-project alternatives. However, because of the increased cost of ownership of condominiums in Alternative C or of improved mobile homes and manufactured housing in Alternatives D and E, it is anticipated that the population would transition from permanent residents to more vacation and second home ownership, effectively reducing the day-to-day population at the project site.

The Beach Club project alternatives would provide primarily residential uses. Under Alternatives A, D, and E the housing complex or the mobile home park would continue to require one full-time on-site manager. Under Alternative A, recreational uses and uses accessory to the recreation uses would also be constructed at the proposed beach and swim club, including a restaurant, bar, assembly room, gym and changing room; therefore, it is anticipated that this alternative would generate the need for up to 25 employees. Under Alternative C, it is anticipated that two full-time on-site managers would be necessary, one for each multifamily complex. Under Alternative B, Two Single-Family Estates, there would be no need for on-site managers. Up to 25 new employees is not considered substantial growth. Although the development alternatives would generate a short-term demand for workers during the construction phases of the project, their presence would be temporary. The Beach Club project would not foster substantial economic growth or generate a significant number of new jobs.

Because the Beach Club project would not generate an increase in residential units or population, it would not directly foster growth. Because the project would not open an undeveloped area to development, change land use designations, or expand services or utilities, it would not remove obstacles to growth. Therefore, the project would not be growth inducing.