EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NORTH FORK RANCHERIA HOTEL AND CASINO
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NORTH FORK RANCHERIA CASINO AND HOTEL – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) assesses the environmental consequences of the North Fork Rancheria of Mono Indians' (Tribe) application to have the Bureau of Indian Affairs take 7 parcels totaling 305 acres into Federal trust and to develop a casino and hotel resort, parking structure, and associated facilities. In addition to the trust acquisition for gaming purposes, the proposed action includes approval by the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC) of a gaming management contract between SC Madera Management, LLC and the Tribe. The proposed site (Madera site) is located in southwest Madera County, just north of the City of Madera and adjacent to State Route 99. Other development alternatives include a reduced-size casino, non-gaming development, and a reduced-size casino on an alternative site (North Fork site). The 80-acre North Fork site is located east of the Madera site, approximately three miles west of the community of North Fork. The effects of these development alternatives and a No Action alternative are analyzed within this EIS.

ES.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

A lack of economic development opportunities exists for the Tribe primarily due to a lack of funds for project development and operation. The Tribe has no sustained revenue stream that could be used to fund programs and provide assistance to Tribal members. Among the Tribe's membership there is a high reliance upon the Federal and State governments for social services.

The acquisition of the Madera site into Tribal trust status would allow the Tribe to take advantage of the financial opportunities provided by Congress through the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA), greatly enhancing the Tribe's economic development potential, which is the paramount objective of the Tribe. Implementation of the proposed action would assist the Tribe in meeting the following objectives:

- Improve the socioeconomic status of the Tribe by providing an augmented revenue source that could be used to strengthen the Tribal Government; fund a variety of social, housing, governmental, administrative, educational, health and welfare services to improve the

quality of life of Tribal members; and provide capital for other economic development and investment opportunities.

- Provide employment opportunities to the Tribal and non-Tribal community.
- Make donations to charitable organizations and governmental operations, including local educational institutions.
- Fund local governmental agencies, programs, and services.
- Allow the Tribe to establish economic self-sufficiency.

ES.3 ALTERNATIVES

This document describes and analyzes four development alternatives plus the No Action alternative. Alternative A is the Tribe's Preferred Alternative. Three of the development alternatives include placing land into Federal trust. The remaining development alternative, Alternative D, would occur on the North Fork site, which is currently in Federal trust. The alternatives are described in detail in Section 2.0 and are summarized below.

ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project consists of placing the 305-acre Madera site into Federal trust status and approval of a gaming management contract by the NIGC. The Tribe proposed to develop the site for recreation/tourism by constructing a casino, hotel, and parking structure.

The casino and hotel resort would include a main gaming hall, food and beverage services, retail space, banquet/meeting space, administrative space, pool, and spa. Fifteen food and beverage facilities are planned, including a buffet, six bars, three restaurants, and a five-tenant food court. The resort would include a multi-story hotel with 200 rooms, a pool area, and a spa. Approximately 4,500 parking spaces would be provided for the casino/hotel resort, with 2,000 of those spaces within a multi-level parking structure.

ALTERNATIVE B – REDUCED INTENSITY

Alternative B consists of a smaller-scale version of Alternative A, but without hotel or pool components. The design would be similar to Alternative A with approximately 40 percent of the total square footage. As with Alternative A, development and operation of the casino would involve trust acquisition of the Madera site and approval of a gaming management contract.

ALTERNATIVE C – NON-GAMING USE

Alternative C consists of a mixed-use retail development, such as a commercial business park or "strip mall". This development would include two large "big box" retail stores, three restaurants,

and smaller storefronts. The land would be taken into Federal trust but no gaming or hotel would be associated with this alternative.

ALTERNATIVE D – NORTH FORK LOCATION

Alternative D would consist of a smaller-scale version of Alternative A on the North Fork site. This alternative would not include retail, high limit gaming, entertainment, hotel, or pool components. Alternative D would require that the North Fork site be transferred from individual trust to Tribal trust status or the approval of a lease agreement between the individual trust beneficiaries and the Tribe.

ALTERNATIVE E – NO ACTION

Under the No Action Alternative, neither the 305-acre Madera site nor the 80-acre North Fork site would be developed as described under any of the alternatives identified. The Madera site would not be taken into trust and would continue to be utilized for open space, agricultural, and rural residential uses. The North Fork site would continue to be utilized for open space and rural residential uses. Under this alternative, the Tribe would not attain its basic objective of economic self-sufficiency.

ES.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The EIS scoping process is an opportunity for public and Federal and State agencies to provide input on the scope of the EIS. The scoping process for this EIS is described in **Section 1.5**. A scoping report was published in July 2005, which summarized the comments that were received during the scoping period. The following is a summary of the common areas of controversy raised in the scoping process.

Commenters were concerned with the effects of a casino and hotel development on air quality. Some commenters requested that the EIS discuss the methodology used to calculate air quality impacts and what regulations would be analyzed for compliance.

Another area of concern in scoping comments was impacts to water supply and water quality. Commenters asked that the EIS estimate the water demand of the project. Water quality concerns included the impact on the water quality of nearby water bodies and cumulative impacts to water quality.

Concerns regarding traffic impacts from the project were also raised during the scoping process. Commenters were concerned with effects to traffic circulation and mitigation that would be required for impacts. Commenters requested that the EIS analyze the following roadways: State

Route 99, primary and secondary roads in the project vicinity, and state and county roads. Commenters were concerned with cumulative and growth inducing effects, as they related to traffic impacts.

A major area of concern for commenters was the impact on agriculture. Some commenters inquired if the project would result in the reduction of agricultural land or conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance. Commenters requested that the EIS describe the agricultural value of the development site, including value of soils, and any past or current agricultural uses of the property. Some commenters inquired as to the effects of the project on nearby agricultural properties.

ES.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, MITIGATION, AND SIGNIFICANCE CONCLUSIONS SUMMARY

The environmental consequences of the alternatives analyzed within the Draft EIS are summarized in **Table ES-1**. Mitigation measures have been identified where feasible to address specific effects regardless of whether they are considered "significant." Mitigation measures identified in the design process have been incorporated into the project description. In addition, measures have been identified to mitigate specific effects identified during the preparation of the Draft EIS. These measures and significance conclusions are summarized in **Table ES-1**. Abbreviations for alternatives and significance are identified at the bottom of the table.

Table ES-1 also serves to provide a brief, but comprehensive comparison of the environmental impacts of each Alternative. As shown, the No Action Alternative (Alternative E) does not result in most of the negative environmental effects that result from the development alternatives (Alternatives A-D). The No Action Alternative would also not result in the beneficial economic effects that would result from the development alternatives. The North Fork site is remote and environmentally and culturally sensitive when compared with the Madera site. Thus, although the development on the North Fork site proposed under Alternative D is much smaller than that proposed under the other alternatives (on the Madera site), many negative environmental effects are unique or more significant under Alternative D. For instance, development on the North Fork site would have much greater negative effects to special status species than development on the Madera site. Therefore, extensive mitigation measures are recommended for Alternative D to reduce these effects to a less than significant level. Potential airport-related impacts is one impact area that is present for the Madera site, but not the North Fork site, given the proximity of the Madera Municipal Airport to the Madera site. However, potential inconsistencies with airport operations can be mitigated to a less than significant level for all of the development alternatives occurring on the Madera site. Among development alternatives on the Madera site, Alternative A presents the most intensive development and generally results in greater environmental impacts, both positive and negative, when compared with the other alternatives.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.2 LAND RESOURCES				
Topography				
A	Development of Alternative A would result in localized alterations to the topographical characteristics of the Madera site. However, the overall topography of the Madera site would remain essentially unchanged.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Buildout of the proposed project under Alternative C would entail similar topographical alterations as discussed for Alternatives A and B, although on a smaller scale.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	Buildout of Alternative D would entail localized alteration and the general topographical character of the region would remain unchanged. Creation of soil stabilization areas with a slope of 2:1 would not lead to slope instability unless they are improperly designed without erosion control measures, in which case a potentially significant impact would result.	S	Creation of soil stabilization areas around the building pad shall be properly compacted and shall be subject to a geotechnical review prior to construction of the areas. Proper hydroseeding, use of straw fiber rolls, and other soil erosion protection measures shall be utilized as part of a comprehensive erosion control plan.	LTS
E	No development would take place on the Madera site or on the North Fork site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Soil				
A	Soils at the Madera site range from poorly drained to excessively drained, with generally moderate erosion hazards. The development of a Grading and Drainage plan would address and reduce erosion hazards to a less than significant level.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Since the Madera site is flat and level, no impact would occur associated with landslide hazards. Moreover, the BMPs outlined for erosion control would also diminish slide hazards localized around drainages and detention basins.			
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	The soils on the North Fork Rancheria are subject to erosion. The Grading and Drainage plan outlines several Best Management Practices (BMPs), including the development of an erosion control plan, that would address and negate erosion hazards. While the North Fork site is surrounded by inclined ground surfaces, the Grading and Drainage Plan includes the incorporation of BMPs for compaction and erosion control that would negate slide hazards around building and parking features, drainages and detention basins.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	No development would take place on the Madera site or on the North Fork site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Seismicity				
A	The nearest seismic hazard is the San Andreas Fault, located approximately 40 miles southwest of the Madera site. Thus, risk for soil liquefaction and seismically induced flooding is low. The hazards to public safety related to seismically induced structural failure would be considered a potentially significant impact.	S	Construction of facilities shall adhere to the Uniform Building Code. Specifically, Chapter 16 of the 1997 UBC addresses structural design requirements for buildings and other structures (including hazardous materials storage facilities) that are consistent with rational analyses and well-established principles of mechanics. Division IV covers earthquake design, which has provisions to safe guard against major structural failures and loss of life. In this regard, the 1997 UBC design requirements include seismically induced characterization, and near-source attenuation effects. Use of the 1997 UBC will allow for ground shaking-related hazards to be managed from a geologic, geotechnical, and structural standpoint	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			such that risks to the health or safety of workers or members of the public would be reduced to a less than significant level.	
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	The North Fork Rancheria is approximately 80 miles northeast of the San Andreas Fault. Another fault system exists approximately six miles to the northeast of the North Fork site. Thus, risk for soil liquefaction and seismically induced flooding is low. The hazards to public safety associated with potential structural failure under these conditions would be considered a significant impact.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
E	No development would take place on the Madera site or on the North Fork site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Mineral Resources				
A	Alteration in the land use under Alternative A would not result in a loss of economically viable aggregate rock or diminish the extraction of important ores or minerals.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
B	Same as Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
C	Same as Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
D	Same as Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
E	No development would take place on the Madera site or on the North Fork site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.3 WATER RESOURCES			
Surface Water			
A The Madera site is located almost completely within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) defined 100-year flood plain. The Grading and Drainage Plan incorporates fill to elevate the finished floor of the proposed gaming facility at least one foot above the FEMA 100-year floodplain so that effects to building structure and patron safety during a flood event would be less than significant. Alternative A would create a loss of floodplain storage and increased storm runoff. The construction of a storm drainage system, grassy swales, and stormwater detention basins in the project design would mitigate the loss of flood storage and increased runoff. Since a loss of flood-storage would not occur and post-project runoff and flow rates would equal pre-project levels with detention basins, impacts to flooding would be less than significant. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are proposed that would further reduce impacts to flooding	LTS	▪ To reduce the project's potential to increase surface runoff, impervious surfaces shall be minimized where feasible. Where feasible, all areas outside of buildings and roads will be kept as permeable surfaces, either as vegetation or high infiltration cover such as mulch, gravel, or turf block. Pedestrian pathways shall use a permeable surface where possible, such as crushed aggregate or stone with sufficient permeable joints (areas between stone or brick if used). Rooftops shall drain to vegetated driplines to maximize infiltration prior to concentrating runoff. ▪ An erosion control plan will be developed with the primary intent to decrease pollutants entering the water columns, with a secondary intent of trapping pollutants before they exit the site. ▪ The Tribe shall comply with all provisions stated in the Clean Water Act (CWA). As required by the General Construction NPDES permit issued by the USEPA under the CWA, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared that will address water quality impacts associated with construction of the project. Water quality control measures identified in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan shall include, but not be limited to, Best Management Practices (BMPs) described below: a. Existing vegetation shall be retained where possible. To the extent feasible, grading activities shall be limited to the immediate area required for construction. b. Temporary erosion control measures (such as silt fences, staked straw bales, and temporary revegetation) shall be employed for disturbed areas.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		c. No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months. d. Sediment shall be retained on-site by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures. e. A spill prevention and countermeasure plan shall be developed, if necessary, which will identify proper storage, collection, and disposal measures for potential pollutants (such as fuel, fertilizers, pesticides, etc.) used on-site. f. Petroleum products shall be stored, handled, used, and disposed of properly. g. Construction materials, including topsoil and chemicals, shall be stored, covered, and isolated to prevent runoff losses and contamination of groundwater. h. Fuel and vehicle maintenance areas shall be established away from all drainage courses and designed to control runoff. i. Sanitary facilities shall be provided for construction workers. j. Disposal facilities shall be provided for soil wastes, including excess asphalt produced during construction. k. All workers and contractors shall be educated in the proper handling, use, cleanup, and disposal of all chemical materials used during construction activities. l. All contractors involved in the project shall be educated on the potential environmental damages resulting from soil erosion prior to development by conducting a pre-construction conference. Copies of the project's erosion control plan shall be distributed at this time. All construction bid packages; contracts, plans and	

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		specifications shall contain language that requires adherence to the plan. m. Construction activities shall be scheduled to minimize land disturbance during peak runoff periods. Soil conservation practices shall be completed during the fall to reduce erosion during the rainy seasons. n. Construction zones shall be created and only one part of a construction zone shall be graded at a time to minimize exposed areas. If possible, grading on a particular zone shall be delayed until protective cover is restored on the previously graded zone. o. Utility installations shall be coordinated to limit the number of excavations. p. Disturbed soils shall be protected from rainfall during construction by preserving as much natural cover, topography, and drainage as possible. Trees and shrubs shall not be removed unnecessarily. q. Disturbed areas shall be stabilized as promptly as possible, especially on long or steep slopes. Recommended plant materials and mulches shall be used to establish protective ground cover. Vegetation such as fast growing annual and perennial grasses shall be used to shield and bind the soil. Mulches and artificial binders shall be used until vegetation is established. Where truck traffic is frequent, gravel approaches shall be used to reduce soil compaction and limit the tracking of sediment off site. r. Surface water runoff shall be controlled by directing flowing water away from critical areas and by reducing runoff velocity. Diversion structures such as terraces, dikes, and ditches shall collect and direct runoff water	

Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE	
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D	Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			around vulnerable areas to prepared drainage outlets. Surface roughening, berms, check dams, hay bales, or similar devices shall be used to reduce runoff velocity and erosion. s. Sediment shall be contained when conditions are too extreme for treatment by surface protection. Temporary sediment traps, filter fabric fences, inlet protectors, vegetative filters and buffers, or settling basins shall be used to detain runoff water long enough for sediment particles to settle out. t. Topsoil removed during construction shall be carefully stored and treated as an important resource. Berms shall be placed around topsoil stockpiles to prevent runoff during storm events. u. The disturbance of soils shall be avoided and minimized as fully as possible. ▪ Fertilizer use shall be limited to the minimum amount necessary, taking into account any nutrient levels in the recycled water source. Fertilizer shall not be applied prior to a rain event. ▪ Landscape irrigation shall be adjusted based on weather conditions and shall be reduced or eliminated during the wet portion of the year in order to prevent excessive runoff. ▪ Potable water conservation measures shall be adopted including electronic dispensing devices in faucets.	
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	According to FEMA, the North Fork site is designated as being	S	Same as Alternative A, as well as:	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	located within the Sierra National Forest Zone D where flood hazards are undetermined. Since the North Fork site is located in a mountainous, forested region with steep topography, flooding associated with a 100-year floodplain is very unlikely to occur. Construction of Alternative D would create new impervious surfaces which would prevent groundwater infiltration and increase surface runoff, potentially causing flooding. A Drainage Plan has been prepared that includes storm drainage improvements, including an overland drainage release and stormwater detention basin. A loss of flood-storage would not occur and post-project runoff and flow rates would equal pre-project levels with the detention basins. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are proposed that would further reduce impacts to flooding. It is unknown whether on-site surface waters are connected to groundwater. It is possible, although unlikely given the low levels of pumping that would occur under Alternative D, that a significant affect to surface water flows would occur from project pumping.		• The Tribe shall implement a stream flow monitoring program for all on-site streams as soon as is feasible after project approval and preferably at least one year before opening of the project facilities to the public (to allow for baseline monitoring). • Should project pumping (considered separately from other new projects in the area and weather considerations) cause the reduction of on-site stream flows by 25 percent or more, the Tribe shall implement a program to reduce surface water flow impacts in consultation with the USEPA and Madera County.	
E	The No Action Alternative would not result in any site grading, construction, or new development. Thus, the existing drainage from the Madera site and North Fork site would continue to flow off-site unimpeded. Flooding at the Madera site would consist of inundation of present day, agricultural landforms.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Groundwater			
A	On-site groundwater resources would be utilized under Alternative A. Groundwater recharge may not be sufficient to	LTS	▪ Stormwater BMPs that promote infiltration of water from stormwater runoff and on-site disposal of treated	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
compensate for drawdown effects caused by pumping. Adjacent groundwater wells may also be impacted by a lowered table, but impacts would remain less than significant. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are proposed that would reduce drawdown impacts to groundwater.		wastewater shall be implemented. BMPs for enhancing infiltration of stormwater runoff have the potential to increase the rate of natural recharge at the site, while on-site disposal of treated wastewater will return groundwater originating from the casino wells back to the aquifer. The effectiveness of these measures to reduce drawdown impacts is directly proportional to the rate of new recharge compared with the pumping rate. Given the limited amount of rainfall received in Madera County, additional recharge from stormwater BMPs would have a minimal effect on the drawdown effects of on-site pumping, offsetting such effects by only 1.6 percent. Irrigating on-site landscaping combined with the use of on-site sprayfields and/or leachfields would have a far greater offsetting effect on the aquifer, reducing drawdown from 7 to 49 percent. Under each alternative, if treated wastewater is disposed via a leachfield, the recharge rate would be at the upper end of this range; whereas, if the treated wastewater is disposed in a sprayfield, the recharge rate would be in the lower end of the range. ▪ If on-site groundwater resources are used for water supply, groundwater sampling and analysis shall be performed to determine if treatment is necessary. If treatment is necessary, an on-site water treatment plant shall be constructed to treat drinking water to USEPA standards. ▪ The Tribe shall adopt water conservation measures to reduce the consumption of groundwater as mandated by the regional groundwater management plan. ▪ The Tribe shall implement a groundwater monitoring program. ▪ The Tribe shall implement a program to compensate neighboring well owners for impacts to well operation, as	

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			described in **Section 5.2.2**.	
B	Water would be supplied by privately operated wells on-site. Analysis of the drawdown curves shows that all of the known off-site wells located within a one-mile radius of the Madera site would experience some drawdown effects from proposed pumping on the site. A significant effect to neighboring wells from on-site groundwater pumping would not occur. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce the impacts of drawdown.	LTS	Same as Alternative A, plus effects to regional overdraft shall be reduced by Tribal contributions to a reserved water bank or groundwater recharge area in an amount at least equivalent to property pumping rates.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative B, except lesser effects to drawdown.	LTS	Same as Alternative A, plus effects to regional overdraft shall be reduced by Tribal contributions to a reserved water bank or groundwater recharge area in an amount at least equivalent to property pumping rates.	LTS
D	If on-site groundwater is utilized, new pumping wells on the North Fork site would be constructed. The proposed pumping rate is comparable to or lower than the tested sustainable pumping rates of existing wells in the area of the North Fork site; therefore, the aquifer would likely produce water at the proposed rate. Potentially significant effects to neighboring wells ranging from reduced pumping capacity to a well going dry are expected. Mitigation measures are included that would reduce drawdown impacts to a less than significant level.	S	Same as Alternative A, plus effects to regional overdraft shall be reduced by Tribal contributions to a reserved water bank or groundwater recharge area in an amount at least equivalent to property pumping rates.	LTS
E	No impacts to groundwater would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended	NE
	Water Quality			
A	Discharges of pollutants to surface waters from construction activities associated with development of Alternative A would be subject to Clean Water Act permitting requirements. Compliance	LTS	Same mitigation measures as listed for Surface Water Impacts.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
with USEPA requirements would ensure impacts to water quality during construction would be less than significant. Nonetheless, see **Section 5.2.2** for a list of recommended mitigation measures, including recommended BMPs for incorporation into a SWPPP. Runoff from operation of project facilities, especially surface parking lots, could flush trash, debris, oil, sediments, and grease into downstream surface waters, impacting water quality. Site planning includes minimization of impermeable surfaces, stormwater detention basins, and sediment/grease traps to reduce and control impacts to downstream resources. Wastewater treatment may occur at the City of Madera wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), which is treated to State and Federal standards before disposal. Therefore, no significant impacts to surface water quality would occur from implementation of off-site wastewater treatment. Alternatively, wastewater may be treated at an on-site WWTP. The proposed treatment and disposal facility provides for the use of reclaimed water for specified uses. All water used for reclamation would be of a quality consistent with California Department of Health Services (DHS) regulations under Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 3, of the California Administrative Code. The water produced by this treatment system is highly treated, exceeds State and Federal standards, and poses no health risks for the intended uses. Disposal options for on-site treatment include surface water discharge, spray disposal, sub-surface disposal, or a combination of surface and sub-surface disposal. Surface water discharge requires acquisition of an NPDES permit. Due to the high quality of effluent, impacts to water quality from wastewater treatment would be less than significant.			
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Discharges of sediment and pollutants to surface waters from construction activities and accidents are subject to Clean Water Act permitting requirements. Operational impacts of Alternative D from stormwater runoff would be similar to those of Alternative A, except at a different location (the North Fork site). Options for wastewater treatment include off-site and on-site treatment. Each of these options would satisfy State and Federal standards. Wastewater treatment may occur at the County-operated WWTP that serves the Community of North Fork. Wastewater at the County WWTP is treated to State and Federal standards before disposal; therefore, less than significant impacts to surface water quality would occur from use of the off-site WWTP for disposal. Alternatively, wastewater may be treated at an on-site WWTP. All water used for reclamation would meet Title 22 standards of the California Code of Regulations. Disposal options for on-site treatment include, surface water discharge, spray disposal, sub-surface disposal, or a combination of surface and sub-surface disposal. Surface water discharge requires acquisition of an NPDES permit. Due to the high quality of effluent, impacts to water quality from wastewater treatment would be less than significant.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
E	Since existing land uses would persist and no wastewater would be generated, there would be no effect on current water quality.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

4.4 AIR QUALITY

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Construction-Related Impacts				
A	Alternative A would result in new construction activity, which would generate air pollutant emissions, primarily PM_{10} from entrainment of fugitive dust from land clearing, earth moving, and wind erosion of exposed soil. Construction activities such as grading, excavation and travel on unpaved surfaces can generate substantial amounts of dust, and can lead to elevated concentrations of PM_{10}. The generation of construction-related emissions is considered a significant impact.	S	▪ During construction, the Tribe shall comply with San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) Regulation VIII (Fugitive Dust Rules). ▪ All construction mitigation measures shall be incorporated into a Construction Emissions Mitigation Plan. ▪ The Tribe shall prepare an inventory of all equipment prior to construction and identify the suitability of add-on emission controls for each piece of equipment before groundbreaking. Control technologies such as particle traps control approximately 80 percent of diesel particulate matter. Specialized catalytic converters (oxidation catalysts) control approximately 20 percent of diesel particulate matter, 40 percent of carbon monoxide emissions, and 50 percent of hydrocarbon emissions. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure that diesel-powered construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained, and shut off when not in direct use. ▪ The Tribe shall prohibit engine tampering to increase horsepower, except when meeting manufacturer's recommendations. ▪ The Tribe shall locate diesel engines, motors, and equipment staging areas as far as possible from the closest residences. ▪ The Tribe shall require the use of low sulfur diesel fuel (<15 parts per million sulfur) for diesel construction equipment, if available. ▪ The Tribe shall reduce construction-related trips of workers and equipment, including trucks. A construction traffic and parking management plan shall be developed that minimizes traffic	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		interference and maintains traffic flow. ▪ The Tribe shall lease or buy newer, cleaner equipment (1996 or newer model), using a minimum of 75 percent of the equipment's total horsepower. ▪ The Tribe shall use lower-emitting engines and fuels, including electric, liquefied gas, hydrogen fuel cells, and/or alternative diesel formulations. ▪ Prior to the start of any construction activity on the site, the Tribe shall create a Dust Control Plan pursuant to SJVAPCD Rule 8021. ▪ In addition to full compliance with all applicable Regulation VIII requirements, the Tribe shall implement the following dust control practices, drawn from Tables 6-2 and 6-3 of SJVAPCD's *Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts* (GAMAQI), during construction: a. All disturbed areas, including soil stockpiles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purposes, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover. b. All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. c. All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.	

Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE	
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D	Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		d. When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least six inches of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained. e. All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. (The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions.) (Use of blower devices is expressly forbidden.) f. Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor soil stockpiles, piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. g. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph; and h. Install erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.	
B Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
E The No Action Alternative would not result in construction activity. Therefore, this alternative would not result in the	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
generation of emissions associated with construction.			
Operation-Related Impacts			
A Operation of Alternative A would result in the generation of ROG and NO_X, emissions. Both ROG and NO_X emissions would be more than the 10-ton-per-year significance thresholds and would be a significant effect. The emissions associated with operation of Alternative A can be reduced with implementation of mitigation measures, but not to a less than significant level.	S	▪ The Tribe shall provide transportation to major transit stations and multi-modal centers. ▪ The Tribe shall provide transit amenities such as bus turnouts, shelter benches, street lighting, route signs, and displays to encourage use of public transportation. ▪ The Tribe shall provide for, or contribute to, dedication of land for off-site bicycle trails linking the project to designated bicycle community routes. ▪ The Tribe shall maximize the potential of passive solar design principles. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure the use of clean fuel vehicles. ▪ The Tribe shall provide a parking lot design that includes clearly marked and shaded pedestrian pathways between transit facilities and building entrances. ▪ The Tribe shall provide amenities for employees who walk, bike or utilize public transportation. ▪ The Tribe shall provide electric vehicle charging facilities. ▪ The Tribe shall provide preferential parking for vanpools and carpools. ▪ The Tribe shall provide on-site pedestrian facility enhancements. ▪ A parking structure is proposed. If the parking structure includes mechanical ventilation and exhaust, the exhaust should be vented in a direction away from inhabited areas.	S

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			▪ The Tribe shall provide adequate ingress and egress at entrances to the Casino. ▪ The Tribe shall contract only with commercial landscapers who operate equipment that complies with California Air Resources Board certification standards, or standards adopted no more than three years prior to date of use. ▪ The Tribe shall adopt an anti-idling ordinance for the facility.	
B	Similar to Alternative A, but lower emissions.	S	Same as Alternative A.	S
C	Similar to Alternative A, but lower emissions.	S	▪ The Tribe shall provide transportation to major transit stations and multi-modal centers. ▪ The Tribe shall provide transit amenities such as bus turnouts, shelter benches, street lighting, route signs, and displays to encourage use of public transportation. ▪ The Tribe shall provide for, or contribute to, dedication of land for off-site bicycle trails linking the project to designated bicycle community routes. ▪ The Tribe shall maximize the potential of passive solar design principles. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure the use of clean fuel vehicles. ▪ The Tribe shall provide a parking lot design that includes clearly marked and shaded pedestrian pathways between transit facilities and building entrances. ▪ The Tribe shall provide amenities for employees who walk, bike or utilize public transportation.	S

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			▪ The Tribe shall provide electric vehicle charging facilities. ▪ The Tribe shall provide preferential parking for vanpools and carpools. ▪ The Tribe shall provide on-site pedestrian facility enhancements. ▪ The Tribe shall adopt an anti-idling ordinance for the facility. ▪ The Tribe shall encourage reduced setbacks for retail and employment land uses on streets with bus services consistent with zoning code requirements. ▪ The Tribe shall provide adequate ingress and egress to public facilities. ▪ The Tribe shall encourage a development pattern that discourages auto-oriented uses in areas adjacent to bus stops and other transit facilities.	
D	Operation of Alternative D would result in the generation of ROG and NO_X, emissions. Both ROG and NO_X emissions would be less than the 10 tons per year significance thresholds.	LTS	▪ The Tribe shall adopt an anti-idling ordinance for the facility.	LTS
E	The No Action Alternative would not result in the generation of emissions other than that minimal emissions currently generated by residential and/or agricultural activities.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
	Carbon Monoxide Impacts			
A	As described in the traffic study, traffic operations at signalized study intersections would be LOS D or better under 2008 background conditions with Alternative A and traffic mitigation measures. Intersections operating at LOS D or better typically	S	Mitigation is the same as that listed for traffic impacts in **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	do not result in CO concentrations that exceed State or Federal standards. This impact is significant and with traffic mitigation would be reduced to less than significant.			
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Mitigation is the same as that listed for traffic impacts in **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Mitigation is the same as that listed for traffic impacts in **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Mitigation is the same as that listed for traffic impacts in **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
E	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Mitigation is the same as that listed for traffic impacts in **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
	Odor Impacts			
A	There are no odor generators that might impact Alternative A and Alternative A itself would not contribute odors to the region. Unlike common open pond WWTPs, the proposed on-site WWTP would utilize Membrane Bioreactor (MBR) technology, would be fully enclosed, and would not produce odors. However, even a MBR WWTP, if not properly operated, could represent a potentially significant source of odors.	S	▪ The WWTP shall be constructed with comprehensive odor control facilities, including the injection of odor control oxidants at the sewage lift station and construction of a covered headworks with odor scrubber at the wastewater treatment plant. ▪ Spray drift from the WWTP or spray disposal field shall not migrate out of the disposal field boundaries. ▪ Spray field irrigation shall cease when winds exceed 30 mph. ▪ The WWTP shall be staffed with operators who are qualified to operate the plant safely, effectively, and in compliance with all permit requirements and regulations. The operators shall have qualifications similar to those required by the State Water Resources Control Board Operator Certification Program for municipal wastewater treatment plants. This program specifies	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			that for tertiary level wastewater treatment plants with design capacities of 1.0 MGD or less, the chief plant operator must be a Grade III operator. Supervisors and Shift Supervisors must be Grade II operators. An Operations and Maintenance Program must be followed by the plant operators. Emergency preparedness shall include all appropriate measures, including a high level of redundancy in the major systems.	
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A, as well as: ▪ Prior to construction, the Tribe shall obtain a letter from the SJVAPCD confirming that the proposed use will not create an objectionable odor.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
E	The No Action Alternative would not result in the generation of odors.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts			
A	The proposed developments under Alternative A would not contribute or generate toxic air contaminants. However, bus and diesel truck traffic to and from the developments, especially in loading areas, would result in an increased concentration of diesel emissions in those areas, leading to a potentially significant effect. Application of mitigation measures associated with loading docks would result in a less than significant effect.	S	▪ Air intakes associated with the heating and cooling system for buildings shall not be located next to potential TAC-emitting locations (e.g., loading docks) in accordance with the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) Air Quality and Land Use Handbook.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE	
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D	Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
E	The No Action Alternative would not result in the generation of toxic air contaminants. Existing diesel emissions from agricultural operations on the Madera site would continue. These emissions would be temporary and relatively infrequent resulting in a less than significant effect.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Asbestos Impacts				
A	Implementation of Alternative A could result in the demolition of existing structures on the Madera site. Airborne asbestos fibers pose a serious health threat if adequate control techniques are not carried out when the material is disturbed. Any demolition activity will be subject to the requirements of the Asbestos National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, 40 CFR sections 61.140 through 61.157. Strict compliance with these regulations will result in a less than significant impact. Based on the fact that Alternative A is located on the valley floor, no naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) would be expected. No off-site fill that could potentially contain NOA would be required because on-site grading would balance. Thus, a less than significant effect from naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) would result.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
D	Similar to Alternative A except that the North Fork site is in a candidate area for NOA, resulting in the potential for potentially significant asbestos emissions during construction.	S	▪ The primary contractor shall be notified of CARB's Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) regulating serpentinite and asbestos-bearing ultramafic rock materials used for surfacing applications subjected to vehicular, pedestrian, or non-pedestrian use, such as cycling and horse-back riding. ▪ Under the CARB ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, prior to any grading activities at the site, the Tribe shall ensure that a geologic evaluation is conducted to determine if NOA is present within the area that will be disturbed. If NOA is found at the site, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos ATCM.	LTS
E	No new development or ground disturbance would occur under Alternative E. Existing ground disturbance associated with agricultural activities would continue on the Madera site. However, given than the Madera site is not located in an area where NOA is expected to occur, a less than significant effect from asbestos emissions would occur under the No Action Alternative.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Federal Class I Areas Impacts				
A	Yosemite National Park, Pinnacles National Monument, Ansel Adams Wilderness Area, Kaiser Wilderness Area, and John Muir Wilderness Area are the only federal Class I areas within 100 kilometers of the Madera site. Analysis of operational emissions associated with Alternative A show that Alternative A does not constitute a "major source" and therefore does not trigger need for preconstruction review and assessment of impacts. Thus, a less than significant effect to Class I areas would result.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	Given that no new development would occur and existing emissions associated with residential and agricultural activities on the Madera and North Fork sites does not rise to the level of a "major source," the No Action Alternative would not result in significant impacts to federal Class I areas.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Indoor Air Quality				
A	Tobacco smoke contains carcinogens (including Polycyclic Organic Matter) and smoking would be permitted indoors at the casino, resulting in a potentially significant effect to public health.	S	▪ The casino floor shall be ventilated to at least the standards of the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE), *Ventilation for Acceptable Indoor Air Quality*, ASHRAE Standard 62-2001. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure that comfort levels are acceptable to most occupants, and consistent with ASHRAE Standard 55-1992, under all operating conditions. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure that significant expected sources of pollutant emissions are isolated from occupants using physical barriers, exhausts, and pressure controls. ▪ A non-smoking gaming area shall be provided. ▪ Signage shall be displayed or brochures made available to casino patrons describing the health effects of second-hand smoke. ▪ The Tribe shall provide notice of the health effects of secondhand smoke exposure to employees upon hire. ▪ Outdoor air entering the building shall be protected from contamination from local outdoor sources, from building	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			exhausts, and from sanitation vents. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure that provisions are made for easy access to heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment requiring periodic maintenance. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure the use of low-emitting building products. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure that occupant exposure to construction contaminants is minimized using protocols for material selection, preventive installation procedures, and special ventilation and pressure control isolation techniques ▪ The Tribe shall seek LEED certification for project components, where possible.	
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	The operation of Alternatives C is in compliance with indoor air quality requirements, including environmental tobacco smoke (ETS). As smoking would be allowed in marked sections of restaurants, there are potentially significant secondhand tobacco smoke impacts, similar to those discussed for Alternative A.	S	▪ A non-smoking area shall be provided in restaurants. ▪ Signage shall be displayed or brochures made available to restaurant (that permit smoking) guests describing the health effects of second-hand smoke. ▪ The Tribe shall provide notice of the health effects of secondhand smoke exposure to employees upon hire. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure that significant expected sources of pollutant emissions are isolated from occupants using physical barriers, exhausts, and pressure controls. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure that outdoor air entering the building is protected from contamination from local outdoor sources and from building exhausts and sanitation vents. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure that occupant exposure to construction	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			contaminants is minimized using protocols for material selection, preventive installation procedures, and special ventilation and pressure control isolation techniques. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure that provisions are made for easy access to HVAC equipment requiring periodic maintenance. ▪ The Tribe shall seek LEED certification for project components, where possible.	
D	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
E	The No Action Alternative would not result in the generation of indoor air quality impacts.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

4.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Potential Effects to Wildlife and Habitats

A	Development of Alternative A would affect habitats that are utilized by wildlife species. Affected habitat provides limited resources for wildlife due to frequent plowing and weed control measures associated with farming practices. Species found in cultivated habitats are typically widespread and accustomed to disturbances Potential impacts to Schmidt Creek, Dry Creek, and downstream aquatic habitat from the discharge of tertiary treated wastewater include changes in flow and vegetation characteristics of the waterways. The riparian vegetation within the Schmidt Creek ditch is not continuous and is primarily composed of herbaceous species, both upland and	LTS	▪ To prevent impacts to aquatic habitat due to a change in water temperature, the water temperature of Dry Creek above its confluence with Schmidt Creek shall be monitored. Measures such as a cooling pond or cooling tower shall be used if necessary to decrease the temperature of the effluent to within five degrees Fahrenheit of the temperature of the creek. In accordance with the RWQCB Basin Plan, at no time shall the temperature of the receiving body of water be altered more than five degrees Fahrenheit.	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	hydrophytic. The addition of a permanent water source in Schmidt Creek ditch would stimulate the growth of hydrophytic vegetation and create conditions for the growth of a diverse riparian habitat. The addition of high quality recycled water to Dry Creek would flush particulates, remove debris, increase low flows, and provide better habitat for anadromous fish by supplying more water for the development of shading riparian vegetation. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur.			
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Development of Alternative D is within the Interior Live Oak Woodland utilized by a wide variety of fauna, and as such, would affect the vegetation community and the two streams located in the northwestern part of the property. Although there is an abundance of similar habitat within the area, the value lies in the mostly undisturbed nature of the site (intrinsic value). Wildlife, unaccustomed to human disturbance, would decrease in the immediate area and along the periphery of the development, being displaced by species adapted to human activity. This impact would be significant. Potential impacts to the on-site unnamed tributary of Willow Creek and downstream aquatic habitat from the discharge of tertiary treated wastewater include changes in flow and vegetation characteristics of the waterways. The addition a permanent water source would stimulate the growth of hydrophytic vegetation and create conditions for the growth of a diverse riparian habitat in the unnamed tributary. Willow Creek would benefit from increased flows of high quality recycled water by providing better habitat for resident rainbow trout. Thus, a less than significant impact would result.	S	▪ To prevent impacts to aquatic habitat due to a change in water temperature, the water temperature of Willow Creek above its confluence with the unnamed stream shall be monitored. Measures such as a cooling pond or cooling tower shall be used if necessary to decrease the temperature of the effluent to within five degrees Fahrenheit of the temperature of the creek. In accordance with the RWQCB Basin Plan, at no time shall the temperature of the receiving body of water be altered more than five degrees Fahrenheit. ▪ Where appropriate, vegetation removed as a result of project activities shall be replaced with native species that are of value to local wildlife. Native plants have a significant cultural value, are generally more valuable as wildlife food sources and require less irrigation, fertilizers, and pesticides than exotic species.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
E	The current agricultural and rural residential forms of land use for both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain unchanged, thus no impacts to biological resources would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	State Special Status Species			
A	Three state special status species have the potential to occur on the Madera site: Swainson's hawk, northern harrier, California horned lark, and hoary bat. However, Alternative A would not significantly impact these species, which are not afforded protection under the Endangered Species Act.	LTS	In addition to mitigation listed under Potential Effects to Wildlife and Habitats the following mitigation is recommended: • Within one month prior to tree removal, a qualified bat biologist shall conduct surveys to determine whether special-status bat species are roosting in the trees. If tree removal activities are delayed or suspended for more than one month after the pre-construction survey, the trees shall be resurveyed. If special-status bat species are roosting in trees at the site, a qualified bat biologist will remove or relocate the bats.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Three state special status species have the potential to occur on the North Fork site: tree anemone, northern goshawk, and pallid bat. However, Alternative D would not significantly impact these species, which are not afforded protection under the Endangered Species Act.	S	In addition to mitigation listed under Potential Effects to Wildlife and Habitats the following mitigation is recommended: • Within one month prior to tree removal or building demolition, a qualified bat biologist shall conduct surveys to determine whether special-status bat species are roosting in the trees or buildings. If tree removal or building demolition activities are delayed or suspended for more than one month after the pre-construction survey, the trees or buildings shall be resurveyed. If special-status bat	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			species are roosting in trees or buildings at the site, a qualified bat biologist will remove or relocate the bats.	
E	The current agricultural and rural residential forms of land use for both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain unchanged, thus no impacts to biological resources would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Federally Listed Species			
A	Biological field surveys showed the Madera site does not provide habitat for the Federally listed special-status invertebrates, fish, amphibians, reptiles, or plant species. Habitats on site are classified as ruderal and subject to constant human disturbances. The effects, therefore, will be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	Potentially six species could be affected by the development of Alternative D. Of these species, two have the potential to occur on the site: Mariposa pussypaws (*Calyptridium pulchellum*) and valley elderberry longhorn beetle (*Desmocerus californicus dimorphus*). The loss of Interior Live Oak Woodland could significantly affect the habitat of the Mariposa pussypaws; mitigation would decrease the impact to a less than significant level. Due to the presence of elderberry shrubs, development of the site could significantly impact valley elderberry longhorn beetle	S	In addition to mitigation listed under Potential Effects to Wildlife and Habitats the following mitigation is recommended: • Protocol-level plant surveys for the Mariposa pussypaws, shall occur prior to development activities. Surveys shall be conducted within the blooming period for this species (April to August). If this species is not detected on site, no mitigation is necessary. However, if this species is detected and will be affected by the development of Alternative D, avoidance, preservation, and/or compensation measures shall be implemented in accordance with the USFWS requirements.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
populations. Alternative D has the potential to impact 50 elderberry plants.		▪ Two of the elderberry plants on the North Fork site shall be avoided using the following measures: a. If feasible, the elderberry shrubs shall be completely avoided using a 100-foot buffer. This buffer shall be fenced using standard construction fencing material. Signs shall be placed every 50 feet along the fencing indicating that the area is habitat for a threatened species, and is not to be disturbed; b. If it necessary to disturb areas within the 100-foot avoidance buffers, USFWS shall be consulted before any disturbance is begun. In areas where encroachment on the 100-foot avoidance buffer has been approved by USFWS, a buffer at least 20 feet from the dripline of the shrubs shall be maintained. Any habitat within the 100-foot buffer that was damaged during construction shall be restored once the construction activities have been completed. This includes erosion control and re-vegetation with appropriate native plants; c. Once the construction of Alternative D facilities has been completed, permanent measures shall be taken to protect the elderberry shrubs from adverse impacts from the project. These measures can include fencing, signs, weeding, and trash removal. Additionally, no mowing shall take place within five feet of the driplines of the elderberry shrubs. ▪ To mitigate the loss of 50 elderberry shrubs, the following measures will ensure that impacts are less than significant: a. All elderberry shrubs with at least one stem greater than one inch in diameter at ground level and that are healthy enough to survive transplanting shall be transplanted to a USFWS-approved conservation area. The transplanting shall take place between November and January.	

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			Transplanting methods will be in accordance with USFWS conservation guidelines. Additionally, for each elderberry stem at least one inch in diameter at ground level impacted by Alternative D, a variety of associated species native to the conservation area shall be interspersed with the elderberry seedlings.	
E	The current agricultural and rural residential forms of land use for both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain unchanged, thus no impacts to biological resources would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Migratory Birds and Other Special-Status Species			
A	Alternative A could adversely affect active migratory bird nests if vegetation removal activities associated with project construction occur during the nesting season. This is a potentially significant impact.	S	▪ If feasible, vegetation removal activities shall occur outside of the nesting season (approximately March through September) for migratory birds. If vegetation removal activities are to be conducted during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for active migratory bird nests in and around proposed disturbance areas within one month prior to vegetation removal. If vegetation removal activities are delayed or suspended for more than one month after the pre-construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed. If active migratory bird nests are identified, vegetation removal that would disturb these nests shall be postponed until after the nesting season, or a qualified biologist has determined the young have fledged and are independent of the nest site. No active nests shall be disturbed without a permit or other authorization from the USFWS.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A.	S	If feasible, vegetation removal shall occur outside of the nesting season (the nesting season is approximately March through September) for migratory birds. If vegetation removal activities are to be conducted during the nesting season, a pre-construction survey for active migratory bird nests in and around proposed disturbance areas shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within one month prior to vegetation removal. If vegetation removal activities are delayed or suspended for more than one month after the pre-construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed. If active migratory bird nests are identified, vegetation removal that would disturb these nests shall be postponed until after the nesting season, or a qualified biologist has determined the young have fledged and are independent of the nest site. Avoidance of an active nest can include a 100 to 500-foot buffer depending on the topography of the immediate area and the species of bird. No active nests shall be disturbed without a permit or other authorization from the USFWS.	LTS
E	The current agricultural and rural residential forms of land use for both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain unchanged, thus no impacts to biological resources would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Waters of the U.S.			
A	A delineation of waters of the U.S. occurring within the site identified the Schmidt Creek realignment ditch and other seasonal wetlands totaling 8.51 acres. These features are subject to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. The construction of facilities will have no direct effects to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. because the proposed casino and associated facilities are all located elsewhere on the Madera site. A clear-span bridge is	LTS	▪ Temporary fencing shall be installed around areas of wetlands and identified jurisdictional waters of the U.S., as shown on the USACE verified, waters of the U.S. map. Fencing shall be located no closer than a minimum of 25 feet in accordance with the USACE. Fencing shall be installed prior to any construction and shall remain in place until all construction activities on the site have been completed.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	proposed over the Airport ditch to connect the access road to Road 23, thereby avoiding any impact to the creek. All other potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. have been avoided in the design phase and protected from indirect effects by a 50-foot buffer.		▪ Construction staging areas shall be located away from the wetlands and identified jurisdictional waters of the U.S. Temporary stockpiling of excavated or imported material shall occur only in approved construction staging areas. Excess excavated soil shall be used on site or disposed of at a regional landfill or other appropriate facility. Stockpiles that are to remain on the site through the wet season shall be protected to prevent erosion (e.g. seeding and silt fences or straw bales).	
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Approximately 1.19 acres of potential jurisdictional waters of the U.S. have been identified within the project area. Potential project-related impacts to these waters include the loss of three streams located in the northwestern portion of the property, totaling approximately 0.2 acres. Other potential effects include dewatering, increased turbidity, increased temperature, and an increase in pollutant loads of downstream habitats. These impacts are potentially significant.	S	▪ USACE verification of identified waters of the U.S shall be obtained and a 404 permit shall be obtained from USACE prior to any discharge of dredged or fill material into "waters of the U.S." The Tribe shall comply with all the terms and conditions of the permit and compensatory mitigation shall be in place prior to any direct effects to "waters of the U.S." ▪ A wetland mitigation plan to mitigate impacts to jurisdictional wetlands shall be developed as part of the USACE permit process. Wetland mitigation shall be accomplished through creation/restoration of seasonal wetlands within an open space preserve subject to conservation easements. This creation/restoration shall provide an increase in the inventory of seasonal wetlands for the area. The scale of seasonal wetland restoration (proposed 2:1 ratio) shall be sufficient to satisfy the ratio of replacement acreage to impacted acreage required by regulatory agencies based on wetland functions and values present on the North Fork site. A detailed mitigation plan shall be designed that shall include monitoring and reporting requirements, responsibilities, performance success criteria, reporting procedures and contingency requirements.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE	
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D	Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		▪ A 401 permit shall be obtained from the USEPA prior to the discharge of tertiary-treated effluent into any of the drainages on the site. The Tribe shall comply with all the terms and conditions of the permit as mitigation for all impacts to downstream habitat and fish species.	
E The current agricultural and rural residential forms of land use for both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain unchanged, thus no impacts to biological resources would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
4.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
Cultural Resources			
A Alternative A would not have a significant effect on known cultural resources. One site, remnants of a historic farm complex, has been evaluated as not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and is located outside the proposed developed area of the Madera site. There is a possibility that previously unknown archaeological resources will be encountered during construction. This would be a potentially significant effect.	S	▪ Any inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources, shall be subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as amended (36 CFR 800), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC 3001 et seq.), and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 U.S.C. 470aa-mm). Specifically, procedures for post review discoveries without prior planning pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 shall be followed. ▪ All work within 50 feet of the find shall be halted until a professional archaeologist, or paleontologist if the find is of a paleontological nature, can assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant by the archaeologist, or paleontologist as appropriate, then representatives of the Tribe shall meet with the archaeologist, or paleontologist, to determine the appropriate course of action, including the development of a Treatment Plan, if necessary. All significant cultural or paleontological materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional curation, and a report prepared by the professional archaeologist, or paleontologist, according to	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			current professional standards. ▪ If human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities related to Alternative A, work shall halt in the vicinity, the Madera County Coroner should be notified immediately, and pursuant to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), Section 10.4 Inadvertent Discoveries, the Tribal Official and BIA representative will be contacted immediately. No further disturbance shall occur until the Tribal Official and BIA representative have examined the findings and agreed on the appropriate course of action.	
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Although seven archaeological sites have been previously identified on the North Fork site, only one site is located within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development area of the North Fork site. The site may be impacted by slope stabilization activities. Additionally, there is a possibility that previously unknown archaeological resources will be encountered during construction.	S	In addition to mitigation measures listed for Alternative A, the following mitigation measure is recommended: ▪ Temporary protective construction fencing shall be placed around the prehistoric site, including a 5-foot buffer, to prevent damage to the resource from slope stabilization activities. If the site cannot be avoided during construction, a professional archaeologist will consult with the Tribe and the BIA to determine the appropriate action.	LTS
E	As change in existing land use is proposed, no significant effects to cultural or paleontological resources are expected.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Paleontological Resources			
A	No known paleontological or unique geological resources exist on the Madera site. Given disturbance over time, primarily due to grading from agricultural operations, the upper layer of soils underlying the Madera site are not known to contain	S	Same mitigation measures as listed for Cultural Resources.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	paleontological resources. However, discoveries at the Fairmead Landfill site suggest that there is potential for significant paleontological resources to be present beneath the ground surface. Discovery of previously unknown paleontological resources during construction activities could be a potentially significant effect.			
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same mitigation measures as listed for Cultural Resources.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same mitigation measures as listed for Cultural Resources.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same mitigation measures as listed for Cultural Resources.	LTS
E	As change in existing land use is proposed, no significant effects to cultural or paleontological resources are expected.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	4.7 SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS			
	Employment and Population			
A	Alternative A's effect on employment would come in both the construction and operational phases. The impacts of construction would be felt for the duration of construction spending. The operational effects would be felt for as long as the casino/hotel/resort was in operation. Direct employment includes those employees who are directly employed at the facility either during construction or during operation. Indirect employment includes those employees who provide services and are employed at least in part due to the facility but are not directly employed at the facility. Induced employment includes jobs that are created due to the ripple effect of spending throughout the economy as a whole. Alternative A would result in the creation of 2,441 temporary construction-related positions. Alternative A facilities would employ 1,461 full time	BE	No mitigation is recommended.	BE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	equivalent employees. Indirect or induced job would total 2,319 permanent positions within Madera County, which would result in a beneficial effect on the region's unemployment rate and the local economy as a whole. A total of 836 new residents would move into Madera County as a result of Alternative A.			
B	Alternative B impacts are similar to Alternative A although reduced in size. This alternative would increase employment by approximately 1,802 temporary positions and 1,485 permanent positions. Using the same employee per household ratio used for Alternative A, a total of 534 new County residents would be expected under Alternative B, increasing the population from 141,007 to 141,541.	BE	No mitigation is recommended.	BE
C	Alternative C's beneficial effects on construction and operation employment would be much lower given that Alternative C does not include a casino or hotel component. This alternative would increase employment by approximately 271 temporary positions and 995 permanent positions. Approximately 194 new County residents are expected under Alternative C, with 97 expected to settle in the City of Madera, increasing the City population from 50,842 to 50,939.	BE	No mitigation is recommended.	BE
D	Alternative D's effects on construction and operation employment would be substantially reduced given that Alternative D does not include a hotel component, and would be located in a competitively disadvantaged area. This alternative would increase employment by approximately 351 temporary positions and 167 permanent positions.	BE	No mitigation is recommended.	BE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Using the same employee per household ration used for Alternative A, a total of 32 new County residents would be expected under Alternative D, increasing the population from 141,007 to 141,039.			
E	As both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain undeveloped, potential socioeconomic effects resulting from development would not occur, including beneficial effects to employment and the economy and negative effects to local services.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Social Effects			
A	After surveying similar California casino communities and reviewing relevant literature, no definitive link between casinos and regional crime rates was found. Therefore, although an increase in calls for service is expected, an increase in regional crime rates would not result from Alternative A. Thus, Alternative A's impact to crime would be less than significant. It is assumed that Alternative A would result in an increase in the number of problem gamblers of 0.5 percent. Thus, after the implementation of Alternative A, the percentage of problem gamblers will be 1.5 percent of the adult population, an increase of 705 to 2,115 people. Given the current patient-to-counselor ratio and an additional 59 people seeking treatment for problem gaming (10 to 20 percent of problem gamblers are expected to seek treatment) in Madera County, it is estimated that the County would need to hire a half-time licensed counselor to treat the problem gamer population, which is estimated to cost approximately $39,000. Given that the Tribe has agreed in the County MOU to contribute $50,000 per year to compensate these service programs, effects to problem	LTS	The following mitigation measures are recommended: ▪ The Tribe shall contract with a gambling treatment professional to train management and staff to develop strategies for recognizing and addressing customers whose gambling behavior may strongly suggest they are experiencing serious to severe difficulties. ▪ The Tribe shall refuse service to any customer whose gambling behavior convincingly exhibits indications of problem or pathological gambling. ▪ The Tribe shall respectfully and confidentially provide the customer (as described above) with written information that includes a list of professional gambling treatment programs and self-help groups. ▪ The Tribe shall implement procedures to allow for voluntary self-exclusion, enabling gamblers to ban themselves from a gambling	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	gambling would be less than significant.		establishment for a specified period of time.	
B	Effects to regional crime rates would be similar to Alternative A. Although the Alternative B casino would be reduced in size when compared to Alternative A, the effects to problem gambling are conservatively not assumed to differ. Under Alternative B, the County MOU funding may not apply and annual funds would not be provided for problem gambling services. Thus, a potentially significant effect would result.	S	Same as Alternative A, as well as: ▪ The Tribe shall reimburse Madera County in the following amounts: $1,790,191 (one-time, prior to the opening of the Alternative B developments to the public) and $1,257,989 (annually) for fiscal impacts. ▪ The Tribe shall pay the City of Madera $43,579 annually for fiscal impacts.	LTS
C	The potential concerns regarding effects to crime and problem gambling that are associated with operation of a casino would not be present with the retail development proposed for Alternative C. Commercial uses associated with a shopping center and restaurants are not expected to characteristically result in increased crime rates in the region. Thus, Alternative C's impact to crimes would be less than significant.	LTS	▪ The Tribe shall reimburse Madera County in the following amounts: $1,947,256 (one-time, prior to the opening of the Alternative C developments to the public) and $430,299 (annually) for fiscal impacts. ▪ The Tribe shall reimburse the City of Madera $15,832 annually for fiscal impacts.	LTS
D	Effects to regional crime rates would be similar to Alternative A. Although the Alternative D casino would be reduced in size when compared to Alternative A, the effects to problem gambling are conservatively not assumed to differ. Under Alternative D, the County MOU would not apply and annual funds would not be provided for problem gambling services. Thus, a potentially significant effect would result.	S	Same as Alternative A, as well as: ▪ The Tribe shall reimburse Madera County in the following amounts: $1,539,065 (one-time, prior to the opening of the Alternative D developments to the public) and $871,256 (annually) for fiscal impacts. ▪ The tribe shall reimburse the City of Madera for $1,959 annually for fiscal impacts.	LTS
E	As both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain undeveloped, no social effects resulting from development	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	would occur.			
	Surrounding Property Values			
A	Agricultural, industrial, and average-value rural residential uses predominate the project area. Despite public perception, property values tend to increase on land surrounding casino properties. This is assumed to occur due to the attraction of such land to speculators and possibly the preference to live near such amenities. Therefore, land values in the region and in the vicinity of the Madera site are not expected to be significantly impacted by Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Some of the same concerns with lowering property values may be present with respect to Alternative C, given that it proposes a large retail development. However, some of the same assumptions to increasing property values due to speculation would also apply. Therefore, land values in the region and in the vicinity of the Madera site would not be significantly affected by Alternative C.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	As with Alternative A, high-value residential properties are not present in the immediate vicinity of the North Fork site and nuisance effects would be minimized because of the heavy tree cover and varied terrain within and surrounding the North Fork site. Thus, land values in the region and in the vicinity of the North Fork Site would not be significantly affected by Alternative D.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	As both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain undeveloped, no effects to property values resulting from	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
development would occur.			
Economic Effects to Local Government			
A The project would impact government services through the demand that the casino/hotel resort itself would create and through the demand created by the new residents who would move to Madera County to work in the casino. The casino/hotel resort is anticipated to increase demands on fire protection services, law enforcement services, judicial services, prison services, behavioral health services, and resource management services. New residents would increase costs to Madera County and the City of Madera. Costs to the County from the introduction of new residents, based on the present County budget and services provided, include costs to administrative services, fire protection services, law enforcement services, judicial services, prison services, behavioral health services, social services, educational services, and resource management services. Costs to the City of Madera from the introduction of new residents, based on the present City budget and services provided, include costs to City administration, the finance department, the City attorney, public works, law enforcement services, fire protection services, community development, parks and recreation, and grant oversight. There are two main sources of revenue the County and the City of Madera can expect under Alternative A: payments under the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the County and the Tribe, and indirect tax revenue. Alternative A would negatively affect County revenue received from property taxes on the Madera site after it is taken into trust by the	BE	No mitigation is recommended.	BE

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Federal Government. Overall, MOU contributions and tax revenues generated by Alternative A by far outweigh any negative fiscal impacts to either the City of Madera or Madera County.			
B	Although the demands on County and City services are similar to those of Alternative A, they are generally smaller, given the reduced intensity size and scope of the Alternative B casino. The terms of the MOU negotiated between the County and Tribe apply only to Alternative A. Thus, MOU revenues are not expected under Alternative B unless the County and the Tribe renegotiate the existing MOU. Only one source of revenue is expected under Alternative B: indirect tax revenue. Alternative B would negatively affect County revenue received from property taxes on the Madera site after it is taken into trust by the Federal Government. Overall, annual and one-time County costs exceed revenues for Alternative B. City of Madera annual costs would exceed revenues generated by Alternative B. These additional costs would require either that the City and County raise taxes or provide a lower quality of services to the casino (where applicable) and its residents.	S	▪ The Tribe shall reimburse Madera County in the following amounts: $1,790,191 (one-time, prior to the opening of the Alternative B developments to the public) and $1,257,989 (annually) for fiscal impacts. ▪ The Tribe shall reimburse the City of Madera for $43,579 annually for fiscal impacts.	LTS
C	Alternative C would impact government services through the demand for services that the Alternative C developments would create and the demand created by the new residents who would move to Madera County to work in the Alternative C developments. The development itself is anticipated to increase demands on fire protection services, law enforcement services, prison services, and resource management services. Services affected by the introduction of new residents are	S	▪ The Tribe shall reimburse Madera County in the following amounts: $1,947,256 (one-time, prior to the opening of the Alternative C developments to the public) and $430,299 (annually) for fiscal impacts. ▪ The Tribe shall reimburse the City of Madera for $15,832 annually for fiscal impacts.	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	similar to those described for Alternative A. The terms of the MOU negotiated between the County and Tribe apply only to Alternative A. Thus, MOU revenues are not expected under Alternative C unless the County and the Tribe were to renegotiate the existing MOU. Thus, only one source of revenue is expected under Alternative C: indirect tax revenue. Alternative C would negatively affect County revenue received from property taxes on the Madera site after it is taken into trust by the Federal Government. Overall, County one-time and annual costs exceed revenues. For the City of Madera annual costs exceed revenues. These additional costs would require that the City and County raise taxes or provide a lower quality of services to the Madera site and its residents.			
D	Although the demands on County and City services are similar to those of Alternative A, they are smaller, given the reduced intensity size and scope of Alternative D. MOU revenues are not expected under Alternative D unless the County and the Tribe were to renegotiate the existing MOU. Thus, only one source of revenue is expected under Alternative D: indirect tax revenue. As the North Fork site is already held in trust by the Federal Government and not subject to property tax, Alternative D would not negatively affect County revenue received from property taxes. Overall, County one-time and annual costs exceed revenues from Alternative D. In addition, City of Madera annual costs exceed revenues from Alternative D. These additional costs would require either that the City and County raise taxes or provide a lower quality of services to the casino (where	S	▪ The Tribe shall reimburse Madera County in the following amounts: $1,539,065 (one-time, prior to the opening of the Alternative D developments to the public) and $871,256 (annually) for fiscal impacts. ▪ The Tribe shall reimburse the City of Madera for $1,959 annually for fiscal impacts.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	applicable) and its residents.			
E	As both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain undeveloped, no potential economic effects resulting from development would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Economic Effects to the Madera Irrigation District (MID)			
A	If the Madera site is taken into trust, local taxes and assessments would no longer apply. The seven parcels comprising the Madera site are currently within the MID service area and are therefore subject to various assessments which MID uses to fund its operations. The Madera site MID assessments currently total approximately $6,800. However, the Madera site would no longer be within the MID service area and MID would not accrue costs related to the site. Therefore, this would be a less than significant effect. Nonetheless, the Tribe has negotiated a MOU with MID to compensate for economic effects to the district.	LTS	▪ No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A, except the terms of the MID MOU would not apply.	LTS	▪ The Tribe shall reimburse the MID in the amount of $6,800 (annually) for fiscal impacts. ▪ The Tribe shall implement groundwater mitigation measures discussed in **Section 5.2.2.**	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A, except the terms of the MID MOU would not apply.	LTS	▪ The Tribe shall reimburse the MID in the amount of $6,800 (annually) for fiscal impacts. ▪ The Tribe shall implement groundwater mitigation measures discussed in **Section 5.2.2.**	LTS
D	Development of the North Fork Site would have no impact on	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	the Madera Irrigation District. The potential impacts of groundwater pumping on neighboring well owners, including the proposed mitigation measures outlined in **Section 5.2.2** are provided below.			
E	As both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain undeveloped, no potential effects to the MID resulting from development would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Increased Pumping Costs for Neighboring Wells			
A	On-site groundwater pumping would result in effects to neighboring wells, potentially including increased pumping and maintenance costs. However, significant increases in costs would not occur.	LTS	The Tribe shall implement groundwater mitigation measures discussed in **Section 5.2.2.**	LTS
B	Fiscal effects to the MID would be the similar to Alternative A given that the Madera site would be taken into trust under Alternative B. A less than significant effect would result.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Fiscal effects to the MID would be the similar to Alternative A given that the same Madera site would be taken into trust under Alternative C. A less than significant effect would result.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Given the uncertainties of the groundwater characteristics under the North Fork site, economic effects to neighboring well owners from on-site pumping are unknown and therefore potentially significant.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
E	As both the Madera site and North Fork site would remain undeveloped, no potential effects increased pumping costs at neighboring wells resulting from development would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE	
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D	Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Environmental Justice				
A	Potential environmental justice impacts would occur if Alternative A resulted in any disproportionately high and/or adverse effects to local minority populations in the vicinity of the Madera site, including competition-related effects to area tribal casinos. No low-income communities were identified in the vicinity of the Alternative A development, nor were any disproportionately high or adverse effects to minority communities identified. The Alternative A casino component would compete with nearby existing and proposed tribal casinos. The proposed project would compete most directly with the Chukchansi, Table Mountain and the proposed Big Sandy facilities. While actual revenues are proprietary it is projected that a revenue decline would be felt at Chukchansi, Table Mountain, and Big Sandy facilities. The Palace and Tuolumne Black Oak would also be impacted, though the revenue declines at both of those facilities would be much lower. The effect on revenues ultimately depends on many factors, including the saturation level of the market and the ability of individual casinos to add features and effectively market their facilities. Even with estimated revenue declines, all of the facilities are expected to remain open and to continue to generate profits for their tribal owners. The effect is therefore less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Under Alternative C, all localized environmental effects would be less than significant after mitigation and no impacts specific to identified minority communities were identified. Alternative C does not have a casino component and therefore would not represent potential competition to nearby tribal casinos. The	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	effect is therefore less than significant.			
D	No minority communities are present in the vicinity of the North Fork site. Effects to existing tribal casinos are similar to Alternative A although reduced in scale. The effect is therefore less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	As no development is proposed, there would be no disproportionate effects to low-income or minority populations.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	4.8 RESOURCE USE PATTERNS			
	Transportation			
A	With the addition of project traffic under Alternative A, five freeway segments, one roadway segment, and fourteen study intersections are shown to operate at an unacceptable LOS. Alternative A's contribution to unacceptable traffic operations represents a significant impact.	S	Roadway segment and intersection improvements recommended under each alternative are listed in **Section 5.2.7**. Mitigation measures for each roadway segment and intersection are identified in the year of need. Where roadway segments and intersections are shown as having an acceptable LOS with the addition of traffic from the project alternatives the Tribe shall pay for a proportionate share of costs for the recommended mitigation.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	With the addition of project traffic under Alternative D one study intersection is forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
E	The traffic conditions under the No Action Alternative would be the same as the baseline conditions for each target year. No	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	new traffic would be added to the local roadways or State Route 99.			
	Land Use			
A	Alternative A would involve commercial development on land that is currently outside Madera city limits but within the City's area of influence. Alternative A would be consistent with most goals, objectives, and policies of Madera County and the City of Madera, including those outlined in the Madera County General Plan. It should be noted, however, that Madera County or City of Madera land use regulations would not apply to the Madera site once the land is taken into trust. The only applicable land use regulations would be Tribal, as the Madera site would become reservation land. The Tribe has entered into an MOU with Madera County, with terms relevant to land use including a commitment by the Tribe to not develop a golf course or water park on the Trust property, except under conditions specified in the MOU. The Madera site is within the influence of the Madera Municipal Airport. Distracting lights, which could be mistaken for airport lights or runways, are considered a hazard and a potentially significant impact. Other possible conflicts could occur between airport operations and Alternative A, including nuisance effects on the Madera site from aircraft overflights; blocking airspace over the Madera site with tall trees, buildings, or other objects; and electrical interference. Potential conflicts represent a potentially significant effect to airport operations. The proposed wastewater and stormwater detention ponds may attract birds, especially during spring and fall migrations. However, wildlife is only considered a hazard if it blocks the direct flight path. The detention basins would be approximately 0.5 miles away from the landing zone and	S	▪ In order to reduce the amount of light that would otherwise escape from the Madera site, the Tribe shall provide nighttime lighting for the parking areas that shines only on the parking areas and not surrounding areas. This can be achieved by employing down pointing lighting fixtures and low-pressure sodium bulbs. ▪ The Tribe shall either maintain current avigation easements within Zones A, B1, and B2 on the Madera site or shall enter into an agreement with the City of Madera to allow for the actions contained in the current avigation easement. This will prevent impacts to human safety or to airport operations. The easement or agreement shall address: a. Overflight: A right-of-way for free and unobstructed passage of aircraft through the airspace of the property at any altitude above a surface specified in the easement (set in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 and/or criteria for terminal instrument approaches). b. Impacts: A right to subject the property to noise, vibration, fumes, dust, and fuel particle emissions associated with normal airport activity. c. Height Limits: A right to prohibit the construction or growth of any structure, tree, or other object that would enter the acquired airspace. d. Access and Abatement: A right-of-entry onto the property, with appropriate advance notice, for the purpose of	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	outside of the flight path. No significant effects, such as precluding existing or planned land uses or disruption of access or conflicts with existing land uses, would occur. Placing the casino near the middle of the Madera site leaves a buffer between the casino/hotel and surrounding rural residences. The buffer would minimize effects of noise and light on nearby residences as well as conflicts with surrounding agricultural land uses.		removing, marking, or lighting any structure or other object that enters the acquired airspace. e. Other Restrictions: A right to prohibit electrical interference, glare, misleading light sources, visual impairments, and other hazards to aircraft from being created in the property.	
	Due to the proximity of the proposed project to the Madera Municipal Airport, the temporary use of a crane to construct the proposed project features may impact navigable airspace. This is a potentially significant impact.	S	The Tribe shall submit a "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) due to the temporary use of a crane to construct the projects on the Madera site prior to construction. Cranes shall not operate unless the FAA determines that their operation will not cause a hazard to air navigation.	LTS
B	Similar to A, although light emissions and other potential conflicts would be slightly lessened due to the less intensive development planned for Alternative B.	S	▪ Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to A, although light emissions and other potential conflicts would be slightly lessened due to the less intensive development planned for Alternative C.	S	▪ Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Alternative D would result in commercial development on land that is currently held in trust by the Federal Government. Alternative D would be consistent with most goals, objectives, and policies of Madera County. Alternative D is outside the influence of an airport and thus would not affect airport	LTS	In order to reduce the amount of light that would otherwise escape from the North Fork site, the Tribe shall provide nighttime lighting for the parking areas that shines only on the parking areas and not surrounding areas. This can be achieved by employing down pointing lighting fixtures and low-pressure sodium bulbs.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	function. No significant effects, such as precluding existing or planned land uses or disruption of access or conflicts with existing land uses, would occur. Placing the casino near the middle of the North Fork site would create a buffer between the casino and surrounding rural residential properties. The buffer would minimize effects of noise and light on nearby residences.			
E	All current land uses would be retained.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Agriculture				
A	Alternative A would impact some locally important farmlands, though the site is not currently used for high-value agricultural crops. Since the area is shown to have poor quality agricultural soils and a large portion of the Madera Site would remain as open space that could be used for agricultural purposes, Alternative A would have a less than significant impact to agriculture. Nonetheless, mitigation measures have been included that would further reduce impacts to agriculture.	LTS	An agricultural conservation easement shall be purchased (either directly or through an organization or agency whose purpose includes the acquisition and stewardship of agricultural conservation easements) that is at least as large as the area of agricultural land converted on the Madera site. At least a portion of the agricultural conservation easements shall be designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or farmland of local importance.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Soils within the North Fork site have not been mapped by the NRCS, and thus have not been designated according to their farming potential. Based on the location and topography of the North Fork site and the lack of agricultural activity on the site and surrounding properties, it is concluded that the North Fork site does not contain important farmland. Alternative D would	LTS	No mitigation is recommended	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	therefore have a less than significant impact on agriculture			
E	Land zoned for agricultural uses would not be altered and present uses would continue.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	4.9 PUBLIC SERVICES			
	Water Supply			
A	Since water would be supplied either wholly from on-site wells or from an on-site well in combination with City Well No. 26 (which would continue to be used solely for redundancy or fire flow), a reduction in available capacity of the City's water facilities would not occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	Water to supply Alternative D would be provided by either well water or the Madera County Maintenance District 8A. Development of an off-site water supply source would require the construction of water conveyance infrastructure from the North Fork site to the nearest County facilities. While the District has capacity to serve the project, the addition of Alternative D would introduce an unplanned water demand to the overall water supply system. Because adequate water is available from the County, and the Tribe would pay for all infrastructure upgrades required to serve the site, there would be no significant impact to water supply services.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	Under the No Action Alterative water supply to the Madera site would not be necessary.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Wastewater			
A	Wastewater treatment and disposal would occur through an independent on-site system or through connection to the City of Madera WWTP. The on-site treatment options would have no effect on local public service providers because they would be fully paid for and operated by the Tribe. Obtaining City of Madera sewer service would require connection to the City sewer lines. While the City has available capacity to accept wastewater from the casino-hotel, obtaining City of Madera sewer service would require connection to the City sewer lines. Additional sewer line would be need as well as potential expansion of existing lift stations. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided.	S	The following mitigation measure is recommended if off-site wastewater service is utilized: ▪ The Tribe would form an agreement with the City of Madera to pay the fair share cost of improvements and upgrades to connect to the City of Madera sewer line. The Tribe would also pay the fair share cost of future expansion/improvements to increase wastewater capacity of the City of Madera wastewater treatment plant (see below).	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Wastewater treatment and disposal would occur through an independent on-site system or connection to the Madera County WWTP for the community of North Fork. The on-site treatment and disposal options would have no effect on local public service providers because they would be fully paid for and operated by the Tribe on-site. Obtaining Madera County sewer service would require connection to the County sewer lines. By adding the Alternative D wastewater flows to the expanded WWTP, the plant would be near capacity.	S	The following mitigation measure is recommended if off-site wastewater service is selected. ▪ The Tribe would form an agreement with the County of Madera to pay the fair share cost of improvements and upgrades to connect to the County of Madera sewer line. The Tribe would also pay the fair share cost of future expansion/improvements to increase wastewater capacity of the County of Madera wastewater treatment plant (see below).	LTS
E	No wastewater treatment or discharge would be necessary under the No Action Alternative.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Solid Waste			
A	Construction of Alternative A would result in a temporary and therefore insignificant increase in waste generation. The waste generation resulting from operation of Alternative A's various components is estimated to be 7.6 tons per day. Though the impact is not considered significant, additional mitigation measures are proposed under Alternative A, which would further reduce the affects to the landfill.	LTS	▪ Construction waste shall be recycled to the fullest extent practicable by diverting green waste and recyclable building materials from the solid waste stream. ▪ Environmentally preferable materials shall be acquired to the extent practical for construction of facilities. ▪ Installation of a trash compactor for cardboard and paper products. ▪ Solid waste shall be recycled to the fullest extent practicable by diverting green waste and recyclable materials from the solid waste stream. ▪ Installation of recycling bins throughout the facilities for glass, cans and paper products.	LTS
B	Construction of Alternative B would result in a temporary and therefore insignificant increase in waste generation. The waste generation resulting from operation of Alternative B's various components is estimated to be 5.2 tons per day.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Construction of Alternative C would result in a temporary and therefore insignificant increase in waste generation. The waste generation resulting from operation of Alternative C's various components is estimated to be 1.3 tons per day.	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Construction of Alternative D would result in a temporary and therefore insignificant increase in waste generation. The waste generation resulting from operation of Alternative D's	LTS	Same as Alternative A.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	various components is estimated to be 0.79 tons per day.			
E	No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, the No Action Alternative would not result in solid waste production.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Electric and Natural Gas Services			
A	The Madera site would be served from the existing overhead PG&E electric facilities extending east/west along Avenue 17. Additionally, PG&E could provide natural gas service via the distribution pressure gas lines stepped down from the transmission gas facilities, located adjacent to the Madera site. PG&E has adequate facilities and is willing to serve the Madera site, thus the impact to electric facilities is less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	The North Fork site would be served by the existing PG&E overhead electric 12-kilovolt line near Road 225 and Rainbow Road. PG&E has indicated that they have adequate facilities and would provide service to the site upon acceptance of application and the required site plans. As there are no natural gas facilities in the vicinity of the North Fork site, the project would utilize solely electric appliances or propane.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, the No Action Alternative would not result in effects to electric or natural gas services.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Telecommunications			
A	SBC is responsible for providing service connection to the property line. The developer is responsible for any on-site infrastructure required to meet the SBC connection at the property boundary. There are no capacity issues with telecommunications services in the area, thus the impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	Ponderosa Telephone Company could provide service to the North Fork Site. Service would require an extension of fiber cable from Road 225 along Rainbow Drive plus a cabinet on site. The Tribe would be required to pay for this extension.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, the No Action Alternative would not result in effects to telecommunication services.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Law Enforcement			
A	Development of Alternative A would increase demands on law enforcement, judicial, and correctional services due to the new resident population created by new employees moving to Madera County and the City of Madera. Operations of Alternative A would also increase calls for service due to the increased patron/employee population at the Madera site. As funding in the MOU would fund increased demands and on-site security would be provided, the impact would be less than	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	significant.			
B	Development of Alternative B would increase demands on law enforcement, judicial, and correctional services due to the new resident population created by new employees moving to Madera County and the City of Madera. Annual costs to the City and County would exceed revenues from Alternative B. Additionally, operation of Alternative B would require the hiring of five deputies and one-half sergeant. The Tribe does not currently have an agreement to pay for these services under Alternative B.	S	The Tribe shall make one-time and annual payments to the City of Madera and Madera County as discussed previously under the mitigation measures for Socioeconomic Conditions, **Section 5.2.6**. These payments would fund increased demands on City and County law enforcement services.	LTS
C	Development of Alternative C would increase demands on law enforcement, judicial, and correctional services due to the new resident population created by new employees moving to Madera County and the City of Madera. Annual costs to the City and County would exceed revenues from Alternative C. Additionally, operation of Alternative C would require the hiring of five deputies and one-half sergeant. The Tribe does not currently have an agreement to pay for these services under Alternative C.	S	Same as Alternative B.	LTS
D	Development of Alternative D would increase demands on law enforcement, judicial, and correctional services due to the new resident population created by new employees moving to Madera County and the City of Madera. Annual costs to the City and County would exceed revenues from Alternative D. Additionally, operation of Alternative D would require the hiring of three deputies and one-half sergeant. Tribe does not currently have an agreement to pay for these services under Alternative C.	S	Same as Alternative B.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
E	No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, the No Action Alternative would not result in effects to law enforcement.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Fire Protection/ Emergency Medical Services			
A	Construction may introduce potential sources of fire to the Madera site. This would pose potentially significant impacts to nearby fire departments that could be called to respond. Development of Alternative A would increase calls for service to fire protection services due to the new resident population created by new employees moving to Madera County and the City of Madera. Operations of Alternative A would also increase calls for service due to the increased patron/employee population at the Madera site. The incorporation of fire protection features and contributions outlined within the MOU would reduce potentially significant effects on fire services to a less than significant level.	S	Any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester will be equipped with an arrester in good working order. This includes, but is not limited to, vehicles, heavy equipment, and chainsaws. During construction, staging areas, wilding areas, or areas slated for development using spark-producing equipment will be cleared of dried vegetation or other materials that could serve as fire fuel. To the extent feasible, the contractor will keep these areas clear of combustible materials in order to maintain a firebreak.	LTS
B	Construction of Alternative B may introduce potential sources of fire to the Madera site as described under Alternative A, but smaller in scale due to less developed acreage. Alternative B would increase calls for service to fire protection services due to the new resident population and an increased population of employees and patrons on site. Costs to the City and County to serve this new population and Alternative B facilities would exceed revenues.	S	Same as A, as well as: The Tribe shall make one-time and annual payments to the City of Madera and Madera County as discussed above under the mitigation measures for Socioeconomic Conditions, **Section 5.2.6**. These payments would fund increased demands on City and County fire protection and emergency medical services.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative B.	S	Same as Alternative B.	LTS
D	Construction of Alternative D may introduce potential sources of fire to the North Fork site as described under Alternative A,	S	Same as Alternative B.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	but smaller in scale due to less developed acreage. The risk of a serious wildfire would be greater than Alternative A due to the density of vegetation and rural residential developments surrounding the North Fork site. Alternative D would increase calls for service to fire protection services due to the new resident population and an increased population of employees and patrons on site. Costs to the City and County to serve this new population and Alternative D facilities would exceed revenues.			
E	No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, an increased need for fire protection and emergency medical services would not result.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Food and Water Supply			
A	Once land is taken into trust, state and local laws and ordinances pertaining to food and water safety for employees and customers would not be applicable, though all recent Tribal-State Compacts have required that tribes "adopt and comply with standards no less stringent than state public health standards for food and beverage handling." It is assumed that the Tribe's compact will include similar provisions. The Tribe has additionally assured Madera County in its MOU with the County that it would adopt appropriate food and beverage handling provisions and safe drinking water standards. It should also be noted that the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) would be applied to the public water supply at the casino/hotel resort to ensure that public safety is projected. No significant effect to public health and safety due to inadequate food and water safety precautions would occur with operation of Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
B	Similar to Alternative A. Though the terms of the MOU would not apply, the Tribe would adhere to State Compact and SDWA standards for food and water safety.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Once land is taken into trust, state and local laws and ordinances pertaining to food and water safety for employees and customers would not be applicable to activities on the Madera site. Therefore, there is a concern that food and water safety would be neglected, impacting the health and safety of employees and customers. Unlike Alternatives A, B, and D, a Tribal-State Compact would not be required for Alternative C. Thus, if a MOU with food and beverage safety provisions was not renegotiated, the SDWA would apply but Compact food safety provisions would not, resulting in a potentially significant effect to public health. Mitigation measures contained in **Section 5.2.8** would reduce this effect to a less than significant level.	S	▪ The Tribe shall adopt and comply with standards no less stringent than state public health standards for food and beverage handling. ▪ The Tribe shall allow inspection of food and beverage services by state or county health inspectors, during normal hours of operation, to assess compliance with these standards, unless inspections are routinely made by an agency of the United States government to ensure compliance with equivalent standards of the United States Public Health Services.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative B.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, food and water safety issues would not apply.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Schools				
A	Schools are located away from the primary areas of project-generated traffic and mitigation measures for traffic would ensure that roads and intersections operate at an acceptable service level. Alternative A would result in an increase of 175 new students. This growth is not substantially larger than current expected growth, thus the development of a new school would not be warranted, and the impact would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
B	Schools are located away from the primary areas of project-generated traffic and mitigation measures for traffic would ensure that roads and intersections operate at an acceptable service level. Alternative B would result in an increase of 112 new students. This growth rate is not substantially larger than current expected growth. Costs to the County, including the cost for educational services, exceed revenues from Alternative B, as shown in **Section 4.7.1**.	S	The Tribe shall make annual payments to Madera County as discussed previously under the mitigation measures for Socioeconomic Conditions, **Section 5.2.6**. These payments would fund increased demands on County educational services.	LTS
C	Schools are located away from the primary areas of project-generated traffic and mitigation measures for traffic would ensure that roads and intersections operate at an acceptable service level. Alternative C would result in an increase of 81 new students. This growth rate is not substantially larger than current expected growth. Costs to the County, including the cost for educational services, exceed revenues from Alternative C, as shown in **Section 4.7.1**.	S	Same as Alternative B.	LTS
D	Operation of Alternative D would increase traffic in the vicinity of the North Fork site including roads near North Fork Elementary School. Three intersections within a mile of the school were analyzed in the traffic study for increased traffic due to development of Alternative D. These three intersections would continue to operate at the same service levels. Alternative D would result in an increase of 7 new students. This growth rate is not substantially larger than current expected growth. Costs to the County, including the cost for educational services, exceed revenues from Alternative D, as shown in **Section 4.7.1**.	S	Same as Alternative B.	LTS
E	No development would take place under this alternative. There would be no increased traffic related hazards to school children. An increased demand on school services would not	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
occur.				
4.10 OTHER VALUES				
Noise				
A	Truck delivery, loading dock, parking lot, on-site traffic flow, and off-site traffic noises are expected to be less than significant based on the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor and noise level generated in comparison the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance. Construction activities will result in short-term increases in the local ambient noise environment in excess of the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance. Due to highly variable mechanical equipment noise levels, mechanical equipment may exceed the significance criteria.	S	Construction Noise Consequences - Where feasible, construction activities shall be restricted to weekdays and normal daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.). Mechanical Equipment Noise Consequences - All mechanical equipment shall be designed, installed, and screened where feasible; so as to generate average noise levels of 52 dBA or less at the property lines of existing sensitive receptors. This sound level reduction can be achieved through the use of sound walls and berms, noise attenuating building materials, and vegetative screening as well as through regular monitoring of noise generating equipment.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
E	The No Action Alternative would result in a continuation of existing uses on the Madera and North Fork site. As such, the No Action Alternative would not increase the ambient noise environment through construction or operation of facilities.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Hazardous Materials				
A	The Phase I ESA identified several recognized environmental conditions that should be corrected before site development	S	The following mitigation are specific to the Madera Site:	LTS

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
work commences. These include elemental sulfur found in a cattle feeder; two 55-gallon drums, used oil filters, several five gallon buckets of waste oils, several one gallon containers of suspected paints and/or paint thinners, a 500-gallon above ground storage tank, and several agricultural wells with electrical supply boxes in various forms of disrepair. The on-site wells could pose a threat to groundwater quality since they represent a conduit for contaminants. Abandoned agricultural equipment could contain residual fuels or agricultural chemicals that would pose a threat to the environment. If these environmental conditions are not corrected, potentially significant environmental impacts could occur. Mitigation is included to correct these environmental conditions. Although not anticipated, construction personnel could encounter contamination during construction-related earth moving activities. This could pose a risk to human health and/or the environment. During grading and construction the use of hazardous materials would include substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, motor oil, hydraulic fluid, solvents, cleaners, sealants, welding flux, various lubricants, paint, and paint thinner. The most likely possible hazardous materials releases would involve the dripping of fuels, oil, and grease from construction equipment, which would occur in relatively low toxicity and concentration. No long-term effects to the soil or groundwater would occur and typical construction management practices limit and often eliminate the effect of such accidental releases. An accident involving a service or refueling truck could pose a hazard to construction employees as well as to the environment. Should on-site wastewater treatment occur, the wastewater treatment plant would require the delivery, storage, and use of hazardous materials, particularly the use of sodium hypochlorite (bleach) and citric acid. Diesel fuel storage tanks		▪ The uncontained elemental sulfur located in one of the cattle feeders shall be removed from the site and properly disposed according to State and local regulations. ▪ All 55-gallon drums, one-gallon containers, household debris, farming equipment, and any unmarked containers shall be removed from the site and properly disposed. The contents of any unmarked containers will be identified by a licensed hazardous materials transporter and subsequently contained within Department of Transportation approved containers prior to removal. The hazardous materials contractor would use standard EPA protocols to identify the contents. Once identified a hazardous waste manifest shall be generated prior to transport. Madera County Environmental Health shall be notified prior to removal but only after the materials have been identified. ▪ The 500-gallon diesel above ground storage tank shall be removed from the site. ▪ All non-functioning agricultural wells with associated piping and electrical supply boxes shall be abandoned according to State/local regulations. The following are general mitigation measures relating to hazardous materials: ▪ In the event that contaminated soil and/or groundwater are encountered during construction related earth-moving activities, all work shall be halted until a professional hazardous materials specialist or a qualified individual can assess the extent of contamination. If contamination is determined to be significant representatives of the Tribe shall consult with USEPA to determine the appropriate course of action, including the development of a Sampling Plan and	

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
will be needed for the operation of four emergency generators provided for the casino. Improper storage of diesel fuels could create a potentially significant risk of soil and groundwater contamination. During operation of the facilities under Alternative A, the majority of waste produced would be non-hazardous. The small quantities of hazardous materials that would be utilized would include motor oil, hydraulic fluid, solvents, cleaners, lubricants, paint, and paint thinner. The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be generated are common to commercial sites and do not pose unusual storage, handling or disposal issues. A hazardous materials release could occur that would pose a hazard to human health or the environment if these materials are not stored, handled, or disposed of according to State, Federal, and manufacturer's guidelines. The amount and types of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during the operation of Alternative A could have a potentially significant impact to the environment and public.		Remediation Plan if necessary. ▪ In the event that suspected hazardous materials are encountered during construction-related earth-moving activities, all work shall be halted until a professional hazardous materials specialist or an equivalent qualified individual can identify the material. If the material is determined to be hazardous a representative from the Tribe shall meet with USEPA to determine the appropriate course of action, including the appropriate disposal of the material according to State and Federal regulations. ▪ To reduce the potential for accidental releases, fuel, oil, and hydraulic fluids shall be transferred directly from a service truck to construction equipment tanks and shall not otherwise be stored on-site. Paint, thinner, solvents, cleaners, sealants, and lubricants used during construction shall be stored in a locked utility building, handled per the manufacturers' directions, and replenished as needed. ▪ Personnel shall follow written standard operating procedures (SOPs) for filling and servicing construction equipment and vehicles. The SOPs, which are designed to reduce the potential for incidents involving the hazardous materials, shall include the following: a. Refueling shall be conducted only with approved pumps, hoses, and nozzles. b. Catch-pans shall be placed under equipment to catch potential spills during servicing. c. All disconnected hoses shall be placed in containers to collect residual fuel from the hose.	

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		d. Vehicle engines shall be shut down during refueling. e. No smoking, open flames, or welding shall be allowed in refueling or service areas. f. Refueling shall be performed away from bodies of water to prevent contamination of water in the event of a leak or spill. g. Service trucks shall be provided with fire extinguishers and spill containment equipment, such as absorbents. h. Should a spill contaminate soil, the soil shall be put into containers and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. i. All containers used to store hazardous materials shall be inspected at least once per week for signs of leaking or failure. All maintenance and refueling areas shall be inspected monthly. Results of inspections shall be recorded in a logbook that would be maintained on-site. ▪ The amount of hazardous materials used in project construction and operation shall be consistently kept at the lowest volumes needed. ▪ The least toxic material capable of achieving the intended result shall consistently be used to the extent practicable. ▪ A hazardous materials and hazardous waste minimization program shall be developed, implemented, and reviewed annually by the Tribe to determine if additional opportunities for hazardous materials and hazardous waste minimization are	

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			feasible, for both project construction and operation. ▪ The contractor shall be requested to avoid and minimize the use of hazardous materials during the project's construction to the fullest extent practicable. ▪ The use of pesticides and toxic chemicals shall be minimized or less toxic alternatives shall be used to the greatest extent feasible in landscaping. ▪ All permanent storage tanks shall have double walls with integrated leak detection systems. If a leak occurs within the inner tank, the outer tank shall contain the leak, while a pressure sensor signals the leak on the indicator panel of the generator unit. Security personnel, trained in emergency response procedures, shall regularly monitor the generator units.	
B	Existing environmental conditions are the same as those described for Alternative A. Potentially significant construction and operation effects are similar to those described under Alternative A although on a smaller scale due to the reduced size of Alternative B.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
C	Existing environmental conditions are the same as those described for Alternative A. Potentially significant construction and operation effects are similar to those described under Alternative A although on a smaller scale due to the reduced size of Alternative C.	S	Same as Alternative A.	LTS
D	The Phase I ESA conducted by AES identified one site that was listed on several regulatory agency databases for hazardous materials releases. The site is located down gradient with respect to the anticipated groundwater flow direction from the North Fork Rancheria. Implementation of	S	In addition to the general mitigation measures listed for Alternative A, the following mitigation specific to the North Fork site is recommended: ▪ Before site development work begins groundwater and soil	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	this Alternative will not cause the environment or public to be affected by known hazardous materials currently on the North Fork site. Water from one domestic well on the North Fork site has been reported to have an unpleasant taste and odor and a visible oily sheen on the surface that could signify an existing environmental condition on the North Fork site. Potentially significant construction and operation effects are similar to those described under Alternative A. Under Alternative D, substantially less construction would take place and potential for impacts would be lessened.		samples shall be collected in the area of the domestic well located on the site. Soil samples, groundwater samples, and water from the well shall be analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons and volatile organic compounds. If the analytical results exceed regulatory action levels, appropriate steps shall be taken to identify the source of contamination.	
E	There is no reportable hazardous materials contamination in or near the North Fork or Madera sites. Existing uses on the sites would continue under the No Action Alternative and no effects from hazardous materials would result.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Visual Resources			
A	An area of urban development amidst the primarily undeveloped agricultural lands of the Madera site would represent a change to the viewshed and be visible from several public vantage points. However, existing commercial/industrial development in the area would serve to reduce the intensity of the casino/hotel resort's visual impact. Further, the casino/hotel resort has also been designed to reduce visual effects. Finally, no local or State-designated scenic corridors would be affected by the implementation of Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	The impacts on the viewshed by Alternative B would be similar, although lessened due to the reduced intensity program and absence of a hotel, when compared with	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Alternative A. The removal of the hotel, in particular, would lessen the visual impact of the developments when viewed from a distance.			
C	The impacts on the viewshed by Alternative C would be similar, but lessened when compared with Alternative A due largely to the absence of a hotel. The design of the commercial developments would be attractive but probably less architecturally elaborate when compared with Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	An area of urban development in the otherwise undeveloped rural residential lands of the North Fork site would represent a change to the viewshed, but would not be visible from any public vantage points. In addition, no local or State-designated scenic corridors would be affected by the implementation of Alternative D.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	No urban transformation of the Madera site or North Fork site would take place under Alternative E. Existing land uses would continue into the foreseeable future.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	4.11 CUMULATIVE			
	Land Resources			
A	The principal effects to Land Resources associated with Countywide development would be localized topographical changes and soil attrition. Local permitting requirements for construction would address regional stormwater, geotechnical, seismic and mining hazards; therefore, no cumulative impacts related to Land Resources would occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D	As with Alternative A, local permitting requirements for construction would address regional stormwater, geotechnical, seismic and mining hazards; therefore, no significant cumulative impacts related to land resources would occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E	Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Water Resources				
A	As described in **Section 4.3**, all of the known off-site wells located within a one-mile radius of the Madera site would experience minor drawdown effects from proposed pumping for Alternative A. Cumulative developments would increase use of the underground aquifer, and could result in a reduced water supply. However, Alternative A would not result in a significant cumulative contribution to regional groundwater overdraft based on provisions for recharge in the MID MOU. Cumulative effects to water quality may take place as the result of future developments in combination with Alternative A. Alternative A could contribute to changes in runoff characteristics and water quality located near the Madera site as a result of project development. However, the Tribe has made appropriate design allowances which would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative effects to a less than significant level. Other development projects incorporate similar or identical measures as required by local regulations and Federal law. With the incorporation of these features,	LTS	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.3**, Water Resources.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Alternative A would not result in cumulative water quality effects.			
B	Similar to Alternative A, but slightly lessened due to the smaller scale of the facilities proposed by Alternative B. Also the terms of the MID MOU would not apply to Alternative B, resulting in a potentially significant contribution to regional groundwater overdraft conditions.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.3**, Water Resources.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A, but slightly lessened due to the smaller scale of the facilities proposed by Alternative C. Also the terms of the MID MOU would not apply to Alternative C, resulting in a potentially significant contribution to regional groundwater overdraft conditions.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.3**, Water Resources.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A, but lessened due to the smaller scale of the facilities proposed by Alternative D. Additionally, impacts would be located near the North Fork Site. Also, the proposed pumping rate for Alternative D is relatively small and is not expected to result in noticeable regional impacts. Thus, a less than significant cumulative impact to groundwater resources would result.	LTS	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.3**, Water Resources.	LTS
E	Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Air Quality			
A	Ozone and PM Emissions - Alternative A, along with other cumulative development would exacerbate the regional trend towards higher PM_{10} emissions but to a less than significant level, because of dust control measures being successfully implemented throughout the air basin. In 2020, both ROG and	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.4**, Air Quality and **Section 4.8**, Resource Use Patterns. Mitigation could potentially reduce the cumulative effects of Alternative A to a less than significant level, but without empirical data to generate a repeatable reduction rate, it is conservatively assumed that substantial	S

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
NO_x unmitigated emissions generated by Alternative A would still exceed the 10-tpy significance thresholds. Carbon Monoxide Concentrations - Traffic operations at signalized study intersections would be LOS D or better with Alternative A under 2030 long-term future cumulative background conditions and traffic mitigation measures. Intersections operating at LOS D or better typically do not result in CO concentrations that exceed State or Federal standards. This impact is significant and with traffic mitigation would be reduced to less than significant. Odor Effects - Several commercial centers are planned in the area around the intersection of Avenue 17 and State Route 99. The SJVAPCD's list of common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the SJV occur mostly in manufacturing/industrial zones and no industrial areas are projected for the area, therefore Alternative A, in combination with cumulative development, would have a less than significant odor effect. Toxic Air Contaminants - Several commercial centers are planned in the area around the intersection of Avenue 17 and State Route 99. Potential toxic air contaminant sources such as gasoline dispensing facilities and dry cleaners could be located in these commercial areas. The SJVAPCD permit process, City permitting processes, and future environmental review processes will combine to ensure that Alternative A, in combination with cumulative development, would have a less than significant effect from toxic air contaminants. Climate Change - Construction and Operation of Alternative A would result in the generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. GHG emissions may have a significant impact on climate change. The emissions associated with construction		reductions would not occur and that a significant cumulative effect on air quality remains after mitigation.	

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	and operation of Alternative A can be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measures			
B	Ozone and PM Emissions - Alternative B, along with other cumulative development, would exacerbate the regional trend towards higher PM_{10} emissions but to a less than significant level because of dust control measures being successfully implemented throughout the air basin. In 2020, ROG unmitigated emissions generated by Alternative B would still exceed the 10-tpy significance thresholds. Carbon Monoxide Concentrations - Traffic operations at signalized study intersections would be LOS D or better with Alternative B under 2030 long-term future cumulative background conditions and traffic mitigation measures. Intersections operating at LOS D or better typically do not result in CO concentrations that exceed State or Federal standards. This impact is significant and with traffic mitigation would be reduced to less than significant. Cumulative impacts from odors, toxic air contaminants, and climate change are similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.4**, Air Quality and **Section 4.8**, Resource Use Patterns. Mitigation could potentially reduce the cumulative effects of Alternative B to a less than significant level, but without empirical data to generate a repeatable reduction rate, it is conservatively assumed that substantial reductions would not occur and that a significant cumulative effect on air quality remains after mitigation.	S
C	Ozone and PM Emissions – As with Alternative A, both ROG and NO_x unmitigated emissions generated by Alternative C would still exceed the 10-tpy significance thresholds in 2020. Carbon Monoxide Concentrations - Traffic operations at signalized study intersections would be LOS D or better with Alternative C under 2030 long-term future cumulative background conditions and traffic mitigation measures. Intersections operating at LOS D or better typically do not result in CO concentrations that exceed State or Federal standards. This impact is significant and with traffic mitigation	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.4**, Air Quality and **Section 4.8**, Resource Use Patterns. Mitigation could potentially reduce the cumulative effects of Alternative C to a less than significant level, but without empirical data to generate a repeatable reduction rate, it is conservatively assumed that substantial reductions would not occur and that a significant cumulative effect on air quality remains after mitigation.	S

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	would be reduced to less than significant. Cumulative impacts from odors, climate change, and toxic air contaminants are similar to Alternative A.			
D	Ozone and PM Emissions - Alternative D, along with other cumulative development, would exacerbate the regional trend towards higher PM_{10} emissions but to a less than significant level, because of dust control measures being successfully implemented throughout the air basin. Carbon Monoxide Concentrations - Traffic operations at signalized study intersections would be LOS D or better with Alternative D under 2030 long-term future cumulative background conditions and traffic mitigation measures. Intersections operating at LOS D or better typically do not result in CO concentrations that exceed State or Federal standards. This impact is significant and with traffic mitigation would be reduced to less than significant. Odor Effects - The SJVAPCD's list of common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors in the SJV occur mostly in manufacturing/industrial zones and no industrial areas are projected for the area, therefore Alternative D in combination with any cumulative development would have a less than significant odor effect. Toxic Air Contaminants - No industrial or commercial areas are projected for the area; therefore Alternative D in combination with cumulative development would have a less than significant effect from toxic air contaminants. Climate Change - Cumulative impacts are similar to Alternative A but reduced due to the reduced level of development and	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.8**, Resource Use Patterns.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	reduced traffic generated by Alternative D.			
E	Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Biological Resources			
A	Wildlife and Habitats - Disturbance to habitats and increases in human activity within the vicinity from other proposed projects could incrementally contribute to past, present and future effects to wildlife and habitats. The habitat on the Madera site that would be disturbed by Alternative A is presently disturbed agricultural land, which is of relatively little biological value. In addition, sensitive wetland habitat on the Madera site would be avoided. Thus, Alternative A's contribution to the cumulative effects to wildlife and habitats in the region would be less than significant. Federally Listed Species - Disturbance to vernal pools, burrowing owl habitat, San Joaquin pocket mouse habitat, San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and California tiger salamander habitat and increases in human activity within the vicinity from other proposed projects, including the Caltrans SR-99 freeway improvement projects and local planned development projects, could cumulatively affect Federally listed species. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact to threatened and/or endangered species. Other projects in the area will comply with local and Federal laws regulating threatened and/or endangered species to avoid impacts to such species, and unavoidable impacts will be adequately mitigated through the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Therefore, a less than significant cumulative effect to Federally listed species would result.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.5**, Biological Resources.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Migratory Birds - Alternative A and other projects, when considered cumulatively, could result in potentially significant impacts to nesting migratory birds. Other projects in the area will avoid and/or adequately mitigate for migratory birds by following the regulations set forth in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Waters of the U.S. - Any adverse indirect effects to waters of the U.S. would be avoided by the implementation of project features designed to prevent increased erosion and sedimentation and increase flood storage on the site. Other projects in the area will follow the provisions set forth in the Clean Water Act to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level.			
B	The impacts of Alternative B to biological resources are similar, but lessened due to the smaller scope of Alternative B facilities, when compared with those of Alternative A.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.5**, Biological Resources.	LTS
C	The impacts of Alternative C to biological resources are similar, but lessened due to the smaller scope of Alternative C facilities, when compared with those of Alternative A.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.5**, Biological Resources.	LTS
D	Wildlife and Habitats - Disturbance to habitats and increases in human activity within the vicinity from other proposed projects could incrementally contribute to past, present and future effects to wildlife and habitats. The habitat on the Madera site that would be disturbed by Alternative A is presently used for rural residential purposes and open space. However, over 50 percent of the North Fork site would remain in its present state. In addition, most of the sensitive wetland habitat on the North Fork site would be avoided. Thus, Alternative D's contribution to the cumulative effects to wildlife and habitats in the region would be less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.5**, Biological Resources.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Federally Listed Species - An increase in human activity within the vicinity of the North Fork site from Alternative D and other proposed projects in the area could cumulatively and adversely affect Federally listed species. It is assumed, that other projects in the area will comply with Federal laws regulating threatened and/or endangered species to avoid impacts to such species and unavoidable impacts will be adequately mitigated through the USFWS. Therefore, a less than significant cumulative effect to threatened and/or endangered species would result. Migratory Birds - Alternative D and other projects, when considered cumulatively, could result in significant impacts to nesting migratory birds. This is potentially a significant impact. Other projects in the area will avoid and/or adequately mitigate for migratory birds by following the regulations set forth in the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Waters of the U.S. - Alternative D would directly affect approximately 0.1 acres of "waters of the U.S." Other projects in the area will follow the provisions set forth in the Clean Water Act to reduce project impacts to a less than significant level of impact. Alternative D could result in significant cumulative effects to waters of the U.S.			
E	Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Cultural Resources			
A	Cumulative effects to cultural resources typically occur when sites that contain cultural features or artifacts are disturbed by development. Impacts to these cultural resources are likely to	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.6**, Cultural Resources.	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	occur as residential and commercial growth occurs in Madera County, including near the community of Madera and its surrounding cities. The records search and archival research indicate that the study area is in a region sensitive for both prehistoric/pre-contact resources and historic-period resources. Significant cumulative impacts to cultural resources could occur if sites continued to be lost, damaged, or destroyed without appropriate recordation, preservation, or data recovery.			
B	Potential cumulative impacts for cultural resources issues would be similar to those of Alternative A.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.6**, Cultural Resources.	LTS
C	Potential cumulative impacts for cultural resources issues would be similar to those of Alternative A.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.6**, Cultural Resources.	LTS
D	Significant cumulative impacts to cultural resources could occur if sites were lost, damaged, or destroyed without appropriate recordation or data recovery. The North Fork site is located in a more culturally sensitive location than the Madera site. However, less development is also planned during the cumulative time period in the vicinity of the North Fork site. Since no known cultural resources would be affected by Alternative D, and limited cumulative development is planned in the area, a less than significant cumulative effect to known resources would occur.	LTS	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.6**, Cultural Resources.	LTS
E	Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Socioeconomic Conditions			

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
A	Alternative A would introduce a substantial new source of economic activity to Madera County. The creation of jobs would serve the growing County population. Alternative A would add to the diversification of the local economy. As population growth occurs in the region, fiscal demands on local governments will increase for necessary services. The local governments in the region address increased service demand from new developments by requiring various development fees and assessments. Alternative A would not be subject to development fees. However, the Tribe has entered into a MOU with Madera County, by which the Tribe agrees to pay fees equivalent to development fees, ensuring that Alternative A's impact to the cumulative fiscal demands on local government is less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B	Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative B would be similar to those of Alternative A, except that the MOU with the County would not apply. Thus, costs would potentially be incurred by the County, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative effect.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.7**, Socioeconomic Conditions.	LTS
C	Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative C would be similar to those of Alternative A, except that potential economic beneficial effects would be lessened, the concerns with gaming on the site would not apply, and the MOU with the County would not apply. A number of cumulative retail projects are currently planned in the vicinity of the Madera site. As with Alternative B, costs would potentially be incurred by the County, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative effect.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.7**, Socioeconomic Conditions.	LTS
D	Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative D would be similar to those of Alternative A, except that beneficial effects to the regional economy and the Tribe would be substantially	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.7**, Socioeconomic Conditions.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	lessened and the MOU with the County would not apply. Thus, costs could potentially be incurred by the County, resulting in a potentially significant cumulative effect.			
E	Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Resource Use Patterns			
A	Transportation/Circulation – In 2030, 6 freeway segments, 1 roadway segment, and 13 intersections are shown to operate at an unacceptable LOS without the addition of project traffic. With the addition of project traffic under Alternative A, 6 freeway segments, 1 roadway segment, and 17 intersections are shown to operate at an unacceptable LOS, resulting in a significant impact. Land Use - Although Alternative A would not be entirely consistent with the Madera County General Plan, no significant effects have been identified. Since no other tribal projects are planned on the Madera site and all other development occurring around the Madera site would be required to comply fully with local planning guidelines, no significant cumulative land use effects would occur. Agriculture - The development projects in the area would lead to a loss of agricultural land. Assuming this trend continues due to the future population increase expected in Madera County, tens of thousands of acres of farmland would be lost during the next several decades. Given that Alternative A would not induce further development in the region and would develop less than half of the Madera site, the loss of farmland is not considered a significant contribution to the cumulative	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.8**, Resource Use Patterns.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	loss of agricultural land. Nonetheless, mitigation is included that would reduce cumulative impacts to the loss of agricultural land.			
B	Transportation/Circulation – The cumulative impact is similar to Alternative A. With the addition of project traffic under Alternative B, 6 freeway and 2 roadway segments, 18 intersections are shown to operate at an unacceptable LOS, resulting in a significant impact. Land Use - Cumulative land use effects would be similar to those of Alternative A, given the similar, although reduced intensity, land use. Agriculture - Cumulative effects to agriculture would be similar to those of Alternative A, but reduced due to the reduced intensity development. Nonetheless, mitigation is included that would reduce cumulative impacts to the loss of agricultural land.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.8**, Resource Use Patterns.	LTS
C	Transportation/Circulation - The cumulative impact is similar to Alternative A. With the addition of project traffic under Alternative C, 6 freeway segments, 1 roadway segment, and 18 intersections are shown to operate at an unacceptable LOS, resulting in a significant impact. Land Use - Cumulative land use effects would be lessened when compared to those of Alternative A. Although Alternative C would also not be entirely consistent with many local land use plans, it would represent a more typical type of development than a casino. As with Alternative A, a less than significant cumulative land use effect would result. Agriculture - Cumulative effects to agriculture would be similar to those of Alternative A, but reduced due to the reduced	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.8**, Resource Use Patterns.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	intensity of development. Nonetheless, mitigation is included that would reduce cumulative impacts to the loss of agricultural land.			
D	Transportation/Circulation - With or without the addition of project traffic, four study intersections are forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS, resulting in a significant impact. Land Use - Although Alternative D would not be entirely consistent with the Madera County General Plan, the General Plan would not apply to the North Fork site, as it is currently trust property. No significant effects have been identified. Since no other tribal projects are planned and all other development occurring around the North Fork site would be required to comply fully with local planning guidelines, no significant cumulative land use effects would occur. Agriculture - Soils within the site have not been designated according to their farming potential. Based on the location and topography of the North Fork site, it is unlikely that the North Fork site contains important farmland. Due to the inferior quality of land available for farming purposes on the North Fork site and in the area of cumulative rural residential development in the vicinity of the North Fork site, cumulative impacts to agriculture from the development of Alternative D are considered less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.8**, Resource Use Patterns.	LTS
E	Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Public Services			

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
A	Public Water Utilities - Alternative A would not cause a loss of capacity with any public water utility. Thus, the cumulative effects of cumulative development on public water systems would be affected by Alternative A. Wastewater Service - Since the Madera site is outside of the City's service area, the Tribe would be required to develop an agreement with the City to receive off-site service. The agreement would ensure that the City has the desire and capacity to accept wastewater for Alternative A and will require that the Tribe pay all costs to develop wastewater service lines to the property and the continuing costs of service. With the negotiation of such an agreement, no significant cumulative effects to wastewater service would occur. Given the high quality of effluent that would be discharged from an on-site WWTP, no significant water quality degradation would occur and thus indirect cumulative effects to downstream public water users and dischargers would be less than significant, even considering future development and expansion of public wastewater treatment facilities. Solid Waste - Alternative A would represent 0.69% of the landfill's daily intake. The remaining 500 tons is ample daily capacity for Alternative A and housing and business development expected in Madera County and the City of Madera. The expected closure date of the landfill is 2032. Due to County planning and landfill capacity, the cumulative impacts to solid waste services would be less than significant. Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications - PG&E has confirmed that it can provide service for Alternative A. The electrical demands of the anticipated cumulative projects are unknown. PG&E planning departments work with city and county planners to ensure that adequate capacity is available	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
for future development. Individual projects would be responsible for paying development or user fees to receive electrical, natural gas, cable, and telephone services. Thus, the cumulative effects would be less than significant. Law Enforcement - Both commercial and housing projects generate calls for service and patrol needs. Adverse effects could include an insufficient number of patrolling officers and inadequate facilities. The local governments in the region address increased service demand from new developments, such as law enforcement services, by requiring various development fees and assessments, and through increased property tax increments. Alternative A would generate a need for additional officers, and through the MOU, the Tribe is funding 5.5 additional County officers and funding for the City of Madera. Additionally, the positions and funding that the Tribe is funding would be beneficial in providing additional officers for expected growth. Thus, the cumulative effect would be less than significant. Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services - Alternative A would be primarily served by the Madera County Fire Department; thus no significant cumulative effects would occur to the City of Madera Fire Department. Through the MOU the Tribe would provide funding for County fire protection services to serve Alternative A. Cumulative developments in unincorporated Madera County may generate a need for additional fire protection and emergency medical services. The local governments in the region address increased service demand from new developments, such as fire protection services, by requiring various development fees and assessments, and through increased property tax increments. Additionally, the positions that the Tribe is funding would be beneficial in providing additional firefighters and equipment for expected growth. Thus, the cumulative effect to fire protection			

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	services would be less than significant. Emergency medical services would be provided through a private service provider. These services are primarily funded by the individuals requiring service, through that individual's health insurance provider. The ambulance company's fee structure would account for any additional equipment or staff needed to serve the needs of Alternative A in combination with cumulative population growth. Thus, significant cumulative effects to emergency medical services would not occur. School Services – Alternative A, in combination with other planned development, would result in an increase in students that would need to be accommodated by local school districts. However, this increase in students can be accommodated by existing capacity and planned development of school facilities, which is ongoing due to population growth in Madera County. Thus, a significant cumulative effect to school services would not occur.			
B	Effects to public services would be similar to those of Alternative A, except that the MOU with the County would not apply, resulting in potentially significant impacts to public services.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.9**, Public Services.	LTS
C	Effects to public services would be similar to those of Alternative A, except that the MOU with the County would not apply, resulting in potentially significant impacts to public services.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.9**, Public Services.	LTS
D	Cumulative effects to public services would be lessened when compared to those of Alternative A, given the much smaller development planned under Alternative D. However, under Alternative D, the MOU with the County would not apply,	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.9**, Public Services.	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	resulting in potentially significant impacts to public services.			
E	Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
	Other Values			
A	Noise - Cumulative project-related traffic noise level increases are only predicted to increase by 1.4 dBA at the nearest receptor. The predicted cumulative increase in noise is below the FICON significance criteria. Therefore, there are no significant cumulative noise effects issues associated with this alternative. Hazardous Materials - Cumulative hazardous materials involvement has the potential to occur as a result of continuing development occurring in the region. This involvement could result from the use of hazardous materials in the construction process or the disturbance of existing hazardous materials present on a construction site. There are no existing known hazardous materials on the Madera site. Visual Resources - Development of Alternative A would not be consistent with all local land use regulations and would contribute to cumulative visual impacts. However, the Madera site is not located in a scenic corridor or an area of high aesthetic value. Substantial development is present in all directions from the Madera site, except to the west. The proposed project would be attractively designed as a resort facility and, in combination with other nearby development, would not constitute a significant cumulative visual effect.	S	Same as mitigation recommended above for **Section 4.10**.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
B	Noise - Cumulative project-related traffic noise level increases are only predicted to increase by 0.1 dBA at the site and 1.5 dBA at the nearest receptor. The predicted cumulative increase in noise is below the FICON significance criteria, therefore, a less than significant cumulative impact would result. Hazardous Materials - Cumulative hazardous materials impacts would be similar to Alternative A, given the similar scope of construction that would occur on the Madera site and the identical cumulative development that would occur in the County. Visual Resources - Cumulative visual resources effects would be similar to those of Alternative A, except reduced in intensity given that Alternative B would not include the development of a hotel.	S	Same as mitigation recommended above for **Section 4.10**.	LTS
C	Noise - Cumulative project-related traffic noise level increases are only predicted to increase by 0.1 dBA at the site and 1.5 dBA at the nearest receptor. The predicted cumulative increase in noise is below the FICON significance criteria, therefore, a less than significant cumulative impact would result. Hazardous Materials - Cumulative hazardous materials impacts would be similar to Alternative A, given the similar scope of construction that would occur on the Madera site and the identical cumulative development that would occur in the County. Visual Resources - Cumulative visual resources effects would be similar to those of Alternative A. Although the Alternative C development would be a more typical kind of development and smaller in height, it may not be considered as aesthetically	S	Same as mitigation recommended above for **Section 4.10**.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	attractive as the Alternative A development, although such assessments are subjective. As with Alternative A, a less than significant cumulative visual resources effect would result.			
D	Noise - Cumulative project-related traffic noise level increases are only predicted to increase on average by 3.1 dBA. The predicted cumulative increase in noise is below the FICON significance criteria. Therefore, there are no significant cumulative noise effects. Hazardous Materials - Cumulative hazardous materials involvement has the potential to occur as a result of continuing development occurring in the region. However, the primarily rural residential development occurring in the vicinity of the North Fork site does not typically result in significant use or storage of hazardous materials. There are no existing known hazardous materials on the North Fork site. Although, the amount and types of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during the construction and operation of Alternative D could have a potentially significant impact to the environment and public. Mitigation would reduce the impacts from construction and operation to a less than significant level. Visual Resources - Cumulative development is limited in the area of the North Fork site. In addition, the North Fork site is not easily visible from public vantage points. Thus, the development proposed by Alternative D, in combination with other nearby rural residential development, would not represent a significant cumulative effect to visual resources.	S	Same as mitigation recommended above for **Section 4.10**.	LTS
E	Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
to cumulative effects.			
4.12.2 INDIRECT EFFECTS FROM OFF-SITE TRAFFIC MITIGATION			
Land Resources			
The construction of roadway improvements would require grading and the introduction of fill material to extend the existing shoulders and roadbed. The increase of impervious surfaces and additional earthwork could result in erosion of soils. Local jurisdictions would require the use of stable fill material, engineered embankments, and erosion control features to reduce the potential for slope instability, subsidence and erosion. With standard construction practices and specifications required by the NPDES permit program, the roadway improvements identified under the project alternatives are expected to result in less than significant indirect effects to land resources. The roadway improvements would not significantly affect the ability to extract minerals.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Water Resources			
The development of roadway improvements at the locations identified could affect water resources due to grading and construction activities and an increase in impervious surfaces. Potential effects include an increase of surface runoff and increased erosion that could adversely affect surface water quality due to increases in sediment and roadway pollutants such as grease and oil. The effects to runoff volumes resulting from the increase in impervious roadways are expected to be minimal due to the limited extent of the improvements in comparison to the existing roadways. With incorporation of drainage features and compliance with the soil erosion and sediment control practices identified in the SWPPP, for construction projects resulting in over one acre of disturbance, effects to water resources would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Air Quality			
Development of the roadway improvements would result in short-term construction-related air pollution emissions. The construction phase would produce exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generated as a result of demolition and soil movement. Construction of improvements would be limited in scope and duration. Thus a less than significant indirect effect would result. In addition, mitigation measures are typically required by local jurisdictions to reduce construction emissions, often in conjunction with required CEQA review. Long-term effects from roadway improvements could result if the roadway improvements resulted in localized increases in carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations and/or if the improvements contributed to traffic congestion at large intersections. The	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE	
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D	Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
construction of improvements would not result in adverse changes or redistribution in traffic volumes and vehicle trips. Conversely, it is expected that the improvements would reduce congestion and improve traffic flow, reducing emissions from idling vehicles. Long-term effects would therefore be less than significant.			
Biological Resources			
Construction of the roadway improvements would result in the loss of some existing vegetation and modification of drainage channels. Removal of sensitive native vegetation and vegetation that provides habitat for special-status species or supports migratory birds could result in potentially significant effects. The modification of intermittent drainages and the direct loss or harm to sensitive animal species are also considered potentially significant effects.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Most of the habitat that exists in the areas of roadway improvements is highly disturbed roadsides. Due to the degraded condition of the roadside areas, habitat quality is generally low and it is unlikely that expansion of the existing facilities would result in a significant effect to sensitive species. In addition, there are no mapped wetlands in the areas of traffic improvements. Due to the limited nature of the improvements along existing roadways, the degraded condition of existing habitat, and the requirements of CEQA to address impacts to biological resources, the effects of the roadway improvements would be less than significant.			
Cultural Resources			
Grading roadsides to add traffic lanes or expanding intersections may disturb previously unknown sites. Due to prior grading of the existing roadways and occasional traffic on roadsides it is likely that resources remaining in these areas are highly disturbed and lack integrity, thus diminishing the significance of the remaining	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
resources. To address potential impacts to cultural resources, cultural surveys may be required to comply with CEQA. The lead agency under CEQA would be required to mitigate potential impacts to a less than significant level or to issue a finding of fact and statement of overriding considerations if significant impacts could not be mitigated. Therefore, a less than significant indirect effect to cultural resources would result.			
Socioeconomic Conditions			
Construction of roadway improvements would result in short-term inconveniences and minor delays due to constricted traffic movements and possible temporary detouring of traffic. The intersection improvements are not expected to result in long-term disruption of access to surrounding land uses or to minority or low-income populations. The realignment and expansion of roadways would result in impacts to surrounding properties. In order to implement some improvements, land acquisition may be required. In most cases no additional property will be required (e.g. intersection signalization) or the amount of additional property required will be minimal. Should land acquisition be required, the owner of the property acquired is entitled to be compensated for the fair market value of the property, as required by the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; Article I, Section 19 of the California Constitution; and Sections 1263.010 to 1263.330 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. A potentially significant impact would result should local jurisdictions be left to pay the full cost of such land acquisition.	S	The Tribe would pay the fair-share cost of traffic mitigation, including the cost of any required land acquisition.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Resource Use Patterns			
Transportation - Traffic mitigation measures are meant to improve transportation facilities. Impacts to traffic operations would be temporary and necessary consequences of construction in order to facilitate long-term improvements. A less than significant effect would therefore result.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Land Use - Construction of roadway improvements with no or minimal additional property requirements is not expected to cause a long-term disruption of surrounding land uses. Improvements that require land acquisition, could convert land from its current use. However, the amount of land required would be a narrow strip on the end of the property and should not affect the land use for the remaining property. Therefore, a less than significant indirect effect would result.			
Agriculture - Construction of roadway improvements that require additional property, such as realignment and expansion of roadways, could permanently convert land from agricultural use. However, the amount of land converted would be small compared with the amount of arable land in Madera County. Therefore, a less than significant indirect effect to agriculture would result.			
Public Services			
Traffic improvements may require relocation of utilities near existing roadways. However, because these effects are common when upgrading and maintaining utility services, and because potential service breaks would be temporary, these effects are considered to be less than significant. No significant effects to police, fire, or emergency medical services are expected as access to homes and businesses would be maintained during the construction period.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Other Values			
Construction activities would result in short-term increases in the local ambient noise environments. However, because construction activities would be temporary in nature and are expected to occur during normal daytime hours, a less than significant effect is expected. The accidental release of hazardous materials used during grading and construction activities could pose a hazard to construction employees and the environment. Additionally, equipment used during grading and construction activities could ignite dry grasses and weeds in construction areas. However, these hazards, which are common to construction activities, would be minimized with adherence to standard operating procedures. Such procedures are commonly required by local agencies as part of the CEQA review for roadway improvements. These potential hazards are therefore considered to be less than significant. Visual effects would occur as the result of modification and expansion of existing roadways. However, because the intersections would conform to modern design standards and are expected to be landscaped to suit the settings, a less than significant effect would occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
4.12.3 INDIRECT EFFECTS FROM OFF-SITE PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION			
Land Resources			
The construction of off-site pipelines would occur primarily along existing roadways and would require trenching and backfilling/re-paving in order to install the pipelines within the roadway.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Therefore, effects to land resources would be similar to those discussed above under off-site roadway improvements, except the effects would be somewhat lessened. Disturbances would occur largely within currently disturbed roadways. A less than significant indirect effect to land resources would result.			
Water Resources			
Effects to water resources would be similar to those discussed under off-site roadway improvements, except the effects would be lessened. Disturbances would occur largely within currently disturbed roadways. New impervious surfaces and therefore additional pollutant runoff would not occur. Thus, a less than significant indirect effect to water resources would result.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Air Quality			
Installation of water and wastewater pipelines would result in short-term construction-related air pollution emissions. The construction phase would produce two types of air contaminants: exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generated as a result of demolition and soil movement. Construction of improvements would be limited in scope and duration. Thus a less than significant indirect effect would result. In addition, mitigation measures are typically required by local jurisdictions to reduce construction emissions, often in conjunction with CEQA review.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Biological Resources			
Most of the habitat that exists in the areas of the pipeline alignment is highly disturbed roadsides or totally disturbed roadways. Due to the degraded condition of the roadway/roadside areas, habitat quality is generally low and it is unlikely that extending the existing pipeline facilities would result in a significant effect to sensitive species. The pipelines would not occur on mapped wetland areas	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
except for stream crossings, which would potentially require California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Section 1600 permit and a USACE Section 404 permits. Due to the limited nature of the pipeline alignment along existing roadways, the degraded condition of existing habitat, and the requirements of CEQA, the CDFG, and the USACE to address impacts to biological resources, the effects of extending existing pipelines would be less than significant.			
Cultural Resources			
Grading roadways/roadsides and trenching to add pipeline may disturb previously unknown sites. Due to prior grading of the existing roadways and occasional traffic on roadsides, it is likely that resources remaining in these areas are highly disturbed and lack integrity, thus diminishing the significance of the remaining resources. To address potential impacts to cultural resources, cultural surveys may be required to comply with CEQA. The lead agency under CEQA would be required to mitigate potential impacts to a less than significant level or to issue a finding of fact and statement of overriding considerations if significant impacts could not be mitigated. Therefore, a less than significant indirect effect to cultural resources would result.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Socioeconomic Conditions			
Effects to socioeconomic conditions from construction of pipelines would be very similar to the effects noted above to construction of roadway improvements. These effects are primarily limited to temporary inconvenience due to construction and would not result in a significant indirect effect.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Resource Use Patterns			
Transportation – Construction of the pipelines could occur along roadways, impacting traffic flow. However, since the construction and traffic effects would be temporary, a less than significant effect to transportation would result. Land Use - Construction of the pipelines would require utility easements, which would limit future construction. Underground utility easements typically prohibit the construction of building improvements, but may permit the construction of non-structural improvements, such as paved surface parking or landscaping. The pipelines would be constructed to follow public roads and would not be in an area where a building would normally be built or where an agricultural field would be plowed. Therefore, less than significant indirect impacts to land uses would occur. Agriculture – Agricultural fields usually include a buffer between the crops and public throughways. The pipelines are not expected to extend past this buffer area, and would therefore not affect agricultural practices. Therefore, no significant indirect impact to agriculture would occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Public Services			

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
As with traffic improvements, the extension of water and wastewater lines could result in a temporary break in public services to some homes and businesses in the area. However, because these effects are common when upgrading and maintaining utility services, and because potential service breaks would be temporary, these effects are considered to be less than significant. Access to homes and businesses would be maintained during the construction period.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Other Values			
Construction of the proposed water and wastewater lines could potentially result in noise and hazardous materials effects. However, because construction activities would be temporary in nature and are expected to occur during normal daytime hours, a less than significant effect would occur. The accidental release of hazardous materials used during construction activities could pose a hazard to construction employees and the environment. Additionally, equipment used during construction activities could ignite dry grasses and weeds in construction areas. However, these hazards, which are common to construction activities, would be minimized with adherence to standard operating procedures, such as refueling in designated areas, storing hazardous materials in approved containers, and clearing dried vegetation. These potential hazards are therefore considered to be less than significant. Because the proposed water and wastewater lines would be constructed below ground, visual indirect effects would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS | Significant = S | No Effect = NE | Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A | Alternative B = B | Alternative C = C | Alternative D = D | Alternative E = E