4.10 OTHER VALUES

4.10.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

NOISE

Overview

The project has the potential to affect the existing ambient noise environment in the immediate project vicinity as follows:

- Construction activities associated with the development of Alternative A would cause short-term increases in the ambient noise environment.
- Mechanical equipment associated with the heating, ventilating, air conditioning (HVAC), cold food storage and wastewater treatment systems could cause an appreciable permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the immediate project vicinity.
- Truck deliveries/loading dock activities associated with the ongoing operation of the facility would result in intermittent increases in ambient noise in the immediate vicinity of loading dock areas.
- On-site traffic flow and parking lot activities associated with Alternative A would cause increases in the ambient noise environment.
- Increases in traffic volumes on the local roadway network as a result of the operation of Alternative A would result in increases in traffic noise levels along roadways that serve the Madera site.

Methodology

To evaluate changes in the ambient noise environment resulting from development of Alternative A, a combination of noise surveys, use of existing acoustical literature and studies, and application of accepted noise prediction methodologies was employed. Absolute noise levels generated by the on-site noise sources described above were compared against the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) exterior noise abatement criteria of 67 dB to evaluate the consequences of on-site noise sources relative to existing noise-sensitive uses (residential) located in the project vicinity.

Changes in off-site traffic noise levels which would result from the project alternatives were compared against the Federal Interagency Commission on Noise (FICON) existing ambient noise level significance criteria (**Table 4.10-1**) to evaluate traffic noise consequences at existing sensitive receptors located along the roadway network which would serve the project site.

A more specific description of the methodology employed in the evaluation of environmental consequences for each of these project components follows.

Federal Interagency Committee on Noise

Some guidance as to the significance of changes in ambient noise levels is provided by the 1992 findings of FICON, which assessed the annoyance effects of changes in ambient noise levels resulting from aircraft operations. The FICON recommendations are based upon studies that relate aircraft and traffic noise levels to the percentage of persons highly annoyed by the noise. Annoyance is a summary measure of the general adverse reaction of people to noise that generates speech interference, sleep disturbance, or interference with the desire for a tranquil environment.

The rationale for the FICON recommendations is that it is possible to consistently describe the annoyance of people exposed to transportation noise in terms of Ldn. The changes in noise exposure that are shown in **Table 4.10-1** are expected to result in equal changes in annoyance at sensitive land uses. Although the FICON recommendations were specifically developed to address aircraft noise impacts, they are used in this analysis for traffic noise described in terms of Ldn. For non-transportation noise sources affecting noise-sensitive land uses, an increase in ambient noise levels of 5 dB is considered to be potentially significant.

TABLE 4.10-1
MEASURES OF SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE FOR TRANSPORTATION NOISE EXPOSURE

Ambient Noise Level Without Project (L_{dn})	Significant Impact Assumed to Occur if the Project Increases Ambient Noise Levels By:
<60 dB	+ 5 dB or more
60-65 dB	+3 dB or more
>65 dB	+1.5 dB or more

SOURCE: FICON, 1992.

Federal Noise Abatement Criteria

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) establishes Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) for various land uses, which have been categorized, based upon activity and sensitivity to noise, as indicated in **Table 4.10-2**. The **Table 4.10-2** standards that are applicable to this project are 67 dB L_{eq} exterior noise level standard for Residences and Motels (Category B), and the 52 dB interior noise level standard applied to those same uses under Category E.

Construction Noise Evaluation Methodology

During the construction phase of the project, noise from construction would dominate the noise environment in the immediate area. Equipment used for construction generates noise levels as indicated in **Table 4.10-3**. Maximum noise levels from different types of equipment under different operating conditions could range from 85 dB to 88 dB at a distance of 50 feet. Construction activities are usually temporary in nature, typically occurring during normal working hours. Construction noise impacts could be significant if nighttime operations or use of unusually noisy equipment resulted in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby residents.

TABLE 4.10-2
FHWA NOISE ABATEMENT CRITERIA

Activity Category	L_{eq} (h), dBA	Activity Category Description
A	57 (Exterior)	Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need, and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.
B	67 (Exterior)	Picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries, and hospitals.
C	72 (Exterior)	Developed lands, properties, or activities not included in Categories A or B above.
D	---	Undeveloped lands.
E	52 (Interior)	Residences, motels, hotels, public meeting rooms, schools, churches, libraries, hospitals, and auditoriums.

NOTE: Hourly A-weighted sound level, decibels (dBA).
SOURCE: Federal Highway Administration, 2000.

TABLE 4.10-3
TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NOISE LEVELS

Type of Equipment	Maximum Noise Level, dBA at 50 feet
Scrapers	88
Bulldozers	87
Heavy Trucks	88
Backhoe	85
Pneumatic Tools	85

SOURCE: Bolt, Beranek, and Newman, 1971.

Noise would also be generated during the construction phase by increased truck traffic on area roadways. Project-generated noise sources would be truck traffic associated with transport of heavy materials and equipment to and from construction sites. This noise increase would be of short duration, and would likely occur primarily during daytime hours.

Mechanical Equipment Noise Evaluation Methodology

Although information pertaining to specific equipment types, sizes, location, and sound output is unavailable, it is likely that a combination of chillers, compressors, fans, condensers, pumps, blowers, and cooling towers would be needed to meet the project's refrigeration, HVAC, and water/wastewater treatment requirements. While specific noise levels at nearby residential uses cannot be accurately quantified at this time, recognition of the noise-generation of such equipment has been included in the assessment of potential environmental noise consequences.

Truck Deliveries and Loading Dock Activity Noise Evaluation Methodology

Truck deliveries are an integral part of commercial activities, as the delivery of food and/or merchandise to such facilities is a routine occurrence. To determine typical loading dock noise levels, noise level data collected at a typical loading dock were utilized. This level of activity is estimated to represent a reasonable worst-case hour of loading dock activity. Existing data indicates that during a busy hour of loading dock operations, the measured hourly average (L_{eq}) noise level was 60 dB at a distance of 50 feet from the loading dock (AES, 2003).

On-Site Traffic and Parking Lot Noise Evaluation Methodology

Parking lot noise can be an annoyance to adjacent sensitive receptors. Estimates of the maximum noise levels associated with some parking lot activities are presented in **Table 4.10-4.** Conversations in parking areas may also be an annoyance to adjacent sensitive receptors. Sound levels of speech typically range from 33 dB at 50 feet for normal speech to 50 dB at 50 feet for very loud speech.

TABLE 4.10-4
NOISE LEVELS GENERATED BY PARKING LOT NOISE ACTIVITIES

Noise Source	Maximum Noise Levels (dBA)
Car Door Slamming	63
Car Starting	60
Car Accelerating	55
Car Idling	65
People Shouting, Laughing	61

SOURCE: VRPA Technologies, 2005.

Off-Site Traffic Noise Evaluation Methodology

To evaluate noise levels due to traffic, Sound 2000, the Caltrans version of the FHWA STAMINA 2.0/OPTIMA Traffic Noise Prediction Program, was used. The model allows the use of either the California reference energy mean emission levels (Calveno curves) or the National reference energy mean emission levels for automobiles, medium trucks and heavy trucks, with consideration given to vehicle volume, speed, roadway configuration, distance to the receiver, and the acoustical characteristics of the site. **Appendix O** contains the noise study and noise model input data. The traffic noise prediction model results are provided in **Table 4.10-5** for Alternative A. As shown in the following table, projected noise increases are well below the 5 dB FICON significance criteria. Existing and future noise level data for the nearest sensitive receptor is also provided in **Table 4.10-5**.

TABLE 4.10-5
ALTERNATIVE A - PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS
FOR YEAR 2008 (dBA)

Receptor	2008 No Project Leq	2008 Plus Project Leq	2008 No Project vs. 2008 Plus Project (Difference)
Madera Site	55.8	55.9	0.1
Residential Receptor	63.3	64.9	1.6

SOURCE: VRPA Technologies, 2005.

Noise Effects

Construction Noise Effects

Construction activities will result in short-term increases in the local ambient noise environment in excess of the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance. It is conservatively assumed that construction activities will take place on the entire Madera site, with the closest sensitive receptor (rural residence) from the property line of the Madera site located approximately 200 feet away. While air absorbs noise at the rate of 3 dB to 6 dB per doubling of distance, noise generated by construction activities would attenuate between 9 dB and 18 dB, and may exceed the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance (ONCC, 2000). Mitigation measures identified in **Section 5.0** will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mechanical Equipment Noise Effects

Due to the considerable distance between the proposed development and the nearest sensitive receptors (~1800 feet from proposed developed area and nearest rural residence), mechanical equipment noise associated with the operation of Alternative A is not expected to approach significant noise levels in those areas. Nonetheless, because mechanical equipment noise levels can be highly variable, it is assumed that noise levels from this equipment may exceed the significance criteria, and the noise levels are therefore considered to be significant. Mitigation measures identified in **Section 5.0** will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Truck Delivery/Loading Dock Noise Effects

As noted above, noise measurements taken at a typical loading dock were observed to be 60 dB at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source (AES, 2003). Because this observed noise level is well below the FHWA 67 dB exterior noise standard for sensitive receptors and the nearest sensitive receptors are located at least 1,800 feet from the proposed loading dock facilities, no significant noise effects associated with truck delivery and loading dock noise are anticipated.

On-Site Traffic Flow and Parking Lot Noise Effects

Parking lot activities, including vehicles arriving and departing, engines starting and stopping, car doors opening and closing, and busses idling, are predicted to generate noise levels of approximately 55 to 65 dB L_{eq} at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source (**Table 4.10-1**). The proposed parking areas are located approximately 1,800 feet from the nearest sensitive receptor located south of the Madera site. Because air absorbs noise at the rate of 3 to 6 dB per doubling of distance, noise generated within the parking lot would attenuate at least 18 dB to 36 dB before reaching the nearest off-site receptor (ONCC, 2000). As a result, noise from on-site traffic flow and parking activities is considered less than significant.

Off-Site Traffic Noise Effects

Development of Alternative A would result in changes in traffic noise levels as identified in **Table 4.10-5**. According to this table, project-related traffic noise is predicted to increase an average of 0.1 dB over existing conditions. Additionally, an analysis of the closest sensitive receptor to the south on Golden State Boulevard shows that project-related traffic will result in an increase of 1.6 dB at this location. Both of these estimated noise increases are below FICON significance criteria. Off-site traffic noise effects are considered less than significant.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Existing Sources

Analytical Environmental Services conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the Madera site in May 2005 (**Appendix P**). An update to the Phase I ESA was conducted in July 2007 (**Appendix P**). The Phase I ESAs concluded that there are no obvious signs of gross contamination, however, several recognized environmental conditions were noted. Present inside one of the cattle feeders on the Madera site was an uncontained yellow powder. The powder is elemental sulfur that is commonly used on grape crops and as an insect repellant on cattle. Several five-gallon buckets of waste oil, two 55-gallon drums, and several unmarked one-gallon containers of suspected paint or paint thinners were noted in one of the barns and corral area. A 55-gallon drum containing used oil filters was observed adjacent to a metal storage building located on the site. There were no visible soil stains around the 55-gallon drum. There was an empty 500-gallon aboveground storage tank located on the site; no signs of spills or leaks were evident in the area around the tank. Additionally, several agricultural wells with associated piping and electrical supply boxes were located throughout the site. These boxes were in various forms of disrepair; some did not appear functional. The on-site wells could pose a potential environmental threat to ground water 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. The previously mentioned environmental conditions if not properly addressed could result in significant environmental impacts. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.9** that will reduce the potential significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Construction

As noted above, several recognized environmental conditions have been found on-site. If not properly addressed prior to construction, these conditions could result in a potentially significant effect to construction workers.

The possibility exists that undiscovered contaminated soil and/or groundwater exists on the Madera site. This possibility is slight given past uses of the Madera site have been limited to agricultural uses. 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. The unanticipated discovery of contaminated soil and/or groundwater could have a potentially significant effect on construction workers or to the public.

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. These materials would be used for the operation and maintenance of equipment, and directly in the construction of the facilities. Fueling and oiling of construction equipment would be performed daily. The most likely possible hazardous materials releases would involve the dripping of fuels, oil, and grease from construction equipment. The small quantities of fuel, oil, and grease that may drip from properly maintained vehicles would occur in relatively low toxicity and concentration. No long-term effects to the soil or groundwater would occur. Typical construction management practices limit and often eliminate the effect of such accidental releases. An accident involving a service or refueling truck would present the worst-case scenario for the release of a hazardous substance. Depending on the relative hazard of the hazardous material, if a spill of significant quantity were to occur, the accidental release could pose a hazard to construction employees as well as to the environment. This impact is potentially significant. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Operation

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 (HydroScience, 1999, in AES, 2002). Sodium hypochlorite is used in wastewater treatment, in household laundry detergents, and in photochemical and pulp and paper industries. Sodium hypochlorite ingestion can cause severe gastrointestinal corrosion; inhalation can cause pulmonary edema. Citric acid is used in hair products, household cleaners, and in electroplating, printing, and machinery manufacturing industries. For the proposed wastewater treatment plant, a weak (5% strength) solution of sodium hypochlorite would be used to clean or inhibit biogrowth in the immersed membranes used to filter out solids. Sodium hypochlorite

would be stored in a 55-gallon drum, within a chemical spill containment area inside the wastewater treatment plant building. A citric acid solution is periodically used to remove buildup of inorganic materials. Citric acid is purchased in dry form in 40-pound sacks. A 50-gallon mixing tank inside the wastewater treatment plant would be used to prepare the liquid citric acid solution. Both the sodium hypochlorite and the citric acid are pumped directly to a chemical dip tank when required for use.

Diesel fuel storage tanks will be needed for the operation of four emergency generators provided for the casino, one emergency generator and one fire pump provided for the hotel, and one emergency generator provided for the wastewater treatment facility and human resources building. The generators will be operated according to the manufacturer's operating procedures. Improper storage of diesel fuels could create a potentially significant risk of soil and groundwater contamination.

During operation of the facilities included 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. These materials would be utilized for the operation and maintenance of the casino, emergency generators, and other project facilities. 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. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.9** to reduce potential impacts to less than significant from the operation of Alternative A.

VISUAL RESOURCES

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, including Road 23, Avenue 18, Golden State Boulevard, and State Route 99. Development in the area includes a gas station, a fast food restaurant, and a hotel development at the intersection of State Route 99 and Avenue 18½; a large commercial greenhouse and a large auto salvage facility adjacent to the northwest corner of the site; and the Madera Municipal Airport and various commercial and light industrial facilities about a mile to the south of the site. Thus, although agricultural and rural residential uses are prevalent in the area surrounding the Madera site, commercial uses and industrial development are present in the vicinity of the site. The existing

commercial/industrial development would serve to reduce the intensity of the casino/hotel resort's visual impact on the area.

The casino/hotel resort has also been designed to reduce visual effects. An architectural rendition of the casino/hotel resort is shown in **Figure 2-2**. The proposed casino/hotel resort has been designed to avoid architectural features, such as the use of neon, which may be especially incompatible with a non-urban setting. Instead, the use of earth tones in paints and coatings, and native building materials such as stone have been utilized extensively in the project design. Architectural treatment incorporated into the various structures also serves to break up and soften the massing of the proposed buildings. In addition, landscape amenities have been incorporated into the project design to complement buildings and parking areas, including raised landscaped areas and plantings of trees and shrubs. Finally, no local or State-designated scenic corridors would be affected by the implementation of Alternative A. Thus, effects to visual resources would be less than significant.

4.10.2 ALTERNATIVE B – REDUCED INTENSITY

NOISE

The Overview and Methodology presented in Alternative A apply to the noise discussion for Alternative B.

Construction Noise Effects

As with Alternative A, construction activities may result in short-term increases in the local ambient noise environment in excess of the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance. While construction activities will be reduced in scale and likely occur during a shorter construction duration, noise generated by construction activities may be as loud as 88 dB. Although noise would attenuate between 9 dB and 18 dB, this may exceed the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance. This is considered a significant effect. Mitigation measures identified in **Section 5.0** will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mechanical Equipment Noise Effects

The building layout for Alternative B is similar to that of Alternative A but on a reduced scale. While there is considerable distance between the proposed development and the nearest sensitive receptors, mechanical equipment noise is highly variable and may exceed the FHWA significance criteria of 67 dB. Mitigation measures identified in **Section 5.0** will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Truck Delivery/Loading Dock Noise Effects

The building layout for Alternative B is similar to that of Alternative A but on a reduced scale. As noted above, the observed noise levels for typical loading dock activities are well below the

FHWA 67 dB exterior noise standard for sensitive receptors and sensitive receptors are located at least 1,800 feet from the proposed facilities. Therefore, no significant noise consequences are identified for this aspect of the project.

On-Site Traffic Flow and Parking Lot Noise Effects

The proposed parking layout proposed for Alternative B is similar to that of Alternative A but on a reduced scale. As with Alternative A, parking lot noise from Alternative B would attenuate at least 18 dB to 36 dB before reaching the nearest off-site receptor (ONCC, 2000). As a result, on-site traffic flow and parking lot noise effects are considered to be less than significant.

Off-Site Traffic Noise Effects

Development of Alternative B would result in changes to traffic noise levels similar to those of Alternative A. It is estimated that project-related traffic noise would result in an increase of 0.1 dB over existing conditions. Additionally, an analysis of the closest sensitive receptor on Golden State Boulevard shows that worst case project-related traffic would result in an increase of no more than 1.6 dB at this location (**Table 4.10-6**). Both of these estimated noise increases are below FICON significance criteria. Off-site traffic noise effects are considered to be less than significant.

TABLE 4.10-6
ALTERNATIVE B PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS
FOR YEAR 2008 (dBA)

Receptor	2008 No Project Leq	2008 Plus Project Leq	2008 No Project vs. 2008 Plus Project (Difference)
Madera Site	55.2	55.3	0.1
Residential Receptor	63.3	64.9	1.6

SOURCE: VRPA Technologies, 2005.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Existing Sources

The 2007 Phase I ESA identified several RECs in connection with the Madera site. Refer to **Section 3.10.2** for existing conditions and on-site RECs that were identified in the Phase I ESA. Refer to the hazardous materials discussion in **Section 4.10.1** for existing sources, as it pertains to hazardous materials. The previously mentioned environmental conditions, if not properly addressed, could result in significant environmental impacts. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.9** that will reduce the potential significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Construction

Potentially significant impacts resulting from Alternative B are similar to those described under Alternative A. However, potentially significant impacts would be on a smaller scale due to the reduced size of Alternative B. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the impacts to less than significant level.

Operation

The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative B would be the similar to those of Alternative A. This could have a potentially significant impact to the environment and public, although on a smaller scale than Alternative A. Refer to **Section 4.10.1** for a discussion of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative B. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.10** to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

VISUAL RESOURCES

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 Alternative A. The removal of the hotel, in particular, would lessen the visual impact of the developments when viewed from a distance, since the Alternative A hotel is proposed to be much higher in elevation than the casino. This is a less than significant impact.

4.10.3 ALTERNATIVE C – NON-GAMING USE

NOISE

The Overview and Methodology presented in Alternative A apply to the noise discussion for Alternative C.

Construction Noise Effects

Similar to Alternative A, construction activities may result in short-term increases in the local ambient noise environment in excess of the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance. While construction activities will be reduced in scale and would likely occur during a shorter construction duration, noise levels may be as loud as 88 dB. Although noise generated by construction activities would attenuate between 9 dB and 18 dB, this may exceed the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance. This is considered a significant effect. Mitigation measures identified in **Section 5.2.9** will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mechanical Equipment Noise Effects

The location of the proposed development on the Madera site for Alternative C is similar to that of Alternative A but with a different layout and reduced development footprint. As a result, the distance from on-site mechanical equipment to the nearest off-site sensitive receptor would be

similar to that of Alternative A. While there is considerable distance between the proposed development and the nearest sensitive receptors, mechanical equipment noise is highly variable and may exceed the FHWA significance criteria of 67 dB. Mitigation measures identified in **Section 5.0** will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Truck Delivery/Loading Dock Noise Effects

The location of the proposed development on the Madera site for Alternative C is similar to that of Alternative A but with a different layout and reduced development footprint. As a result, truck delivery and loading dock noise effects would be similar to those described under Alternative A. As noted above, the observed noise levels for typical loading dock activities are well below the FHWA 67 dB exterior noise standard and sensitive receptors are located at least 1,800 feet from the proposed facilities. Therefore, no significant noise consequences are identified for this aspect of the project.

On-Site Traffic Flow and Parking Lot Noise Effects

The parking areas proposed for Alternative C are in a similar location to those described under Alternative A. As with Alternative A, parking lot noise from Alternative C would attenuate approximately 18 dB to 36 dB before reaching the nearest off-site receptor approximately 1800 feet away. As a result, on-site traffic flow and parking lot noise effects are considered to be less than significant.

Off-Site Traffic Noise Effects

Development of Alternative C would result in changes in traffic noise levels similar, but lower than those of Alternative A. It is estimated that project-related traffic noise would result in an increase of 0.1 dB over existing conditions. Additionally, an analysis of the closest sensitive receptor on Golden State Boulevard shows that worst case project-related traffic would result in an increase of no more than 1.6 dB at this location (**Table 4.10-7**). Both of these estimated noise

TABLE 4.10-7
ALTERNATIVE C - PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS FOR YEAR 2008 (dBA)

Receptor	2008 No Project L_{eq}	2008 Plus Project L_{eq}	2008 No Project vs. 2008 Plus Project (Difference)
Madera Site	58.2	58.3	0.1
Residential Receptor	63.3	64.9	1.6

SOURCE: VRPA Technologies, 2005.

increases are below FICON significance criteria. Off-site traffic noise effects are considered to be less than significant.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Existing Sources

The 2007 Phase I ESA identified several RECs in connection with the Madera site. Refer to **Section 3.10.2** for existing conditions and onsite RECs that were identified in the Phase I ESA. Refer to the hazardous materials discussion in **Section 4.10.1** for existing sources, as it pertains to hazardous materials. The previously mentioned environmental conditions, if not properly addressed, could result in significant environmental impacts. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.9** that will reduce the potential significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Construction

Potentially significant impacts resulting from Alternative C are similar to those described under Alternative A. However, potentially significant impacts would be on a smaller scale due to the reduced size of Alternative C. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the impacts to less than significant level.

Operation

The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative C would be the similar to those of Alternative A. This could have a potentially significant impact to the environment and public, although on a smaller scale than Alternative A. Refer to **Section 4.10.1** for a discussion of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative C. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.10** to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

VISUAL RESOURCES

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 that of Alternative A. This is a less than significant impact.

4.10.4 ALTERNATIVE D – NORTH FORK LOCATION

NOISE

The Overview and Methodology presented in Alternative A apply to the noise discussion for Alternative D.

Construction Noise Effects

Construction activities may result in short-term increases in the local ambient noise environment in excess of the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance. While construction activities will be reduced in scale and likely occur during a shorter construction duration when compared to those of Alternatives A through C, noise generated by construction activities would be as loud as 88 dB and exceed the FHWA 67 dB threshold of significance. This is considered a significant effect. Mitigation measures identified in **Section 5.0** will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Mechanical Equipment Noise Effects

Mechanical equipment noise levels can be highly variable and it is assumed that noise levels from this equipment will exceed the significance criteria for the sensitive receptors located on the North Fork site. This is considered a significant effect. Mitigation measures identified in **Section 5.0** will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Truck Delivery/Loading Dock Noise Effects

As noted above, noise measurements taken at a typical loading dock were observed to be 60 dB at a distance of 50 feet from the loading dock (AES, 2003). Because this observed noise level is well below the FHWA 67 dB exterior noise standard for sensitive receptors, no significant noise consequences are identified for this aspect of the project.

On-Site Traffic Flow and Parking Lot Noise Effects

Parking lot activities, including vehicles arriving and departing, engines starting and stopping, car doors opening and closing, and busses idling, are predicted to generate noise levels of approximately 55 to 65 dB L_{eq} at a distance of 50 feet from the noise source (**Table 4.10-4**). The proposed parking areas would be located within 100 feet of the nearest on-site sensitive receptor. However, because this observed noise level is well below the FHWA 67 dB exterior noise standard for sensitive receptors, no significant noise consequences are identified for this aspect of the project. As a result, on-site traffic flow and parking lot noise effects are considered to be less than significant.

Off-Site Traffic Noise Effects

Development of Alternative D would result in changes in traffic noise levels as identified in **Table 4.10-8**. According to this table, project-related traffic noise level increases are predicted to increase an average of 4.8 dB over existing conditions. This estimated noise increase is below FICON significance criteria. Off-site traffic noise effects are considered to be less than significant.

TABLE 4.10-8
ALTERNATIVE D PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS
FOR YEAR 2008 (dBA)

Receptor	2008 No Project L_{eq}	2008 Plus Project L_{eq}	2008 No Project vs. 2008 Plus Project (Difference)
North Fork Site	39.3	44.1	4.8

SOURCE: VRPA Technologies, 2005.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Existing Sources

Analytical Environmental Services conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the North Fork site in September 2005 (**Appendix P**). The Phase I ESA identified one site near the North Fork 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. No hazardous materials contamination was found on the North Fork site. Implementation of this Alternative will not cause the environment or public to be affected by known hazardous materials currently on the North Fork site. Refer to **Section 3.10.2** for existing conditions, as it pertains to hazardous materials on the North Fork site.

Water from one of domestic wells 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. Although this sheen has not been recently verified, it could be a sign of a existing source of contamination, which could result in a potentially significant effect either during construction or operation. Mitigation is included in **Section 5.2.9** to reduce this potentially significant impact to a less than significant level.

Construction

Under Alternative D, substantially less construction would take place than for the other development alternatives, and the potential for impacts to workers would therefore be lessened. Nonetheless, a potentially significant impact would remain due to the risk of disturbing unknown hazardous materials during construction. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.9** to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

Operation

The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative D would be the similar to those of Alternative A. This could have a

potentially significant impact to the environment and public, although on a smaller scale than Alternative A. Refer to **Section 4.10.1** for a discussion of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative D. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.2.10** to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

VISUAL RESOURCES

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. Thus, effects to visual resources would be less than significant.

4.10.5 ALTERNATIVE E – NO ACTION

NOISE

The No Action Alternative would result in a continuation of existing uses on the Madera and North Fork sites. As such, the No Action Alternative would not increase the ambient noise environment through construction or operation of facilities. No new significant effect would result under the No Action Alternative.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

There is no reportable hazardous materials contamination in or near the Madera or North Fork sites. Existing uses on the Madera and North Fork sites would continue under the No Action Alternative. No effects from hazardous materials would result from the No Action Alternative.

VISUAL RESOURCES

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. No visual effects would result.