

4.8 RESOURCE USE PATTERNS

4.8.1 INTRODUCTION

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

A detailed traffic study was developed for the proposed alternatives and is presented in **Appendix M** of this EIS.

Consultation

Consultation with the County and City of Madera, City of Chowchilla and Caltrans has occurred throughout project development and the environmental study process and is ongoing. Scoping meetings were held with the above-listed agencies to present traffic study methodology and parameters and solicit comments and input useful for analysis of potential traffic impacts resulting from the proposed build alternatives. During the development of the traffic study, information regarding planned transportation and development (both residential and commercial) projects was obtained from the County and City of Madera, the City of Chowchilla and Caltrans.

Methodology

The methodology in which the traffic study is based is discussed in **Section 3.8** and **Appendix M**. The Build-Out (2008) Without Project forecasted traffic volumes were calculated using growth increment/growth rate data developed from the 2001 and the 2025 No Project model runs. For City or Caltrans segments and intersections showing negative or no growth by 2008, a 1% growth factor applied to the Existing count data was used to calculate the 2008 Without Project volumes and should be considered worst-case. For County segments and intersections that are showing negative or no growth by 2008, a 3% growth factor applied to the Existing count data was used to calculate the 2008 Without Project traffic volumes and should be considered worst-case.

Trip Generation

During the traffic scoping process with the County and City of Madera, City of Chowchilla and Caltrans District 6, trip generation methodology was discussed and agreed upon. The following methodology and sources were determined appropriate for analysis of potential traffic impacts resulting from build-out of any of the build alternatives.

Land uses for the various build alternatives are identified as casino, hotel, and retail/commercial. Both hotel and retail/commercial uses have been classified in the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (7th edition) (ITE, 2003). While trip rates for casinos are found in the ITE manual, these rates are for Nevada-style gaming and are not an appropriate rate for the casino alternatives evaluated herein. Trip rates were derived not only from standards contained within the ITE periodicals, but also relevant publications by other entities such as the

San Diego Area Association of Governments (SANDAG), or actual counts at local casinos. The resources from which the casino land use trip rates were derived were from several case studies, which are described in **Appendix M**. Utilizing trip generation rates from comparable facilities for the North Fork Project provides a conservative estimate of a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips. A p.m. peak hour trip rate of 3.93 trips/thousand square feet of gaming facility was utilized in this analysis.

Hotel Land Uses. The hotel component base trip generation information was developed using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation* manual and the corresponding software. The traffic study (**Appendix M**) concluded that when a hotel is part of a casino-hotel establishment, the daily trip rate for the hotel was 3.0 trips per room. **Table 4.8-1** shows the project trip generation rate for the casino and hotel and the distribution of entering versus exiting traffic in terms of percentage.

TABLE 4.8-1
PROJECT TRIP RATE AND DIRECTIONAL DISTRIBUTION (CASINO AND HOTEL LAND USES)

Land Use	Period	Average Rate	Directional Distribution (%)	
			Enter	Exit
Casino (per ksf casino floor area)	Daily	43.8 ¹	50	50
	A.m. Peak of Street	2.36 ¹	70	30
	P.m. Peak of Street	3.93 ¹	53	47
Hotel (per room)	Daily	3.00 ²	50	50
	A.m. Peak of Street	0.21 ²	61	39
	P.m. Peak of Street	0.22 ²	53	47

NOTES: ¹ ksf = one thousand square feet.

² Trip rate is ITE Land Use Code 310 – Hotel. Rate reduced by 36.5% to account for internal capture to/from casino.

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES, 2006.

Alternative C Land Uses. The Alternative C trip generation information was developed using the ITE *Trip Generation* manual and the corresponding software (ITE, 2003). The following describes the likely land uses proposed under Alternative C and the corresponding land use code, as reported in the ITE *Trip Generation* manual:

- Free-standing discount superstores: similar to the free-standing discount stores described in Land Use 815, with the exception that they also contain a full-service grocery

department under the same roof that shares entrances and exits with the discount store area.

- Discount club: a discount store or warehouse where shoppers pay a membership fee in order to take advantage of discounted prices on a wide variety of items such as food, clothing, tires and appliances; many items are sold in large quantities or bulk.
- Fast-food restaurant with drive-through window: characterized by a large carryout clientele; long hours of services (some are open for breakfast, all are open for lunch and dinner, some are open late at night or 24 hours) and high turnover rates for eat-in customers.
- High-turnover (sit-down) restaurants: consist of sit-down, full-service eating establishments with turnover rates of approximately one hour or less.

Table 4.8-2 presents the daily and a.m. and p.m. peak hour average rates and the directional distribution for Alternative C land uses.

TABLE 4.8-2
PROJECT TRIP RATE AND DIRECTIONAL DISTRIBUTION (ALTERNATIVE C LAND USES)

Land Use	Period	Average Rate ¹	Directional Distribution (%)	
			Enter	Exit
Free Standing Discount Superstore	Daily	49.21	50	50
	A.m. Peak of Street	1.84	51	49
	P.m. Peak of Street	3.87	49	51
Discount Club	Daily	41.80	50	50
	A.m. Peak of Street	0.56	71	29
	P.m. Peak of Street	4.24	50	50
Fast Food Restaurant w/drive-through	Daily	496.12	50	50
	A.m. Peak of Street	53.11	51	49
	P.m. Peak of Street	34.64	52	48
High Turnover (sit-down) Restaurant	Daily	127.15	50	50
	A.m. Peak of Street	11.52	52	48
	P.m. Peak of Street	10.92	61	39

NOTES: The rates shown are based on the number of square feet as the independent variable.

¹ Per thousand square feet.

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc., 2006; AES, 2006.

Level of Service Threshold

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) considers LOS C transitioning to D to be acceptable measure. LOS D, E or F is unacceptable. Madera County considers LOS D to be acceptable, and LOS E or F unacceptable. Each table presenting LOS results at the study

roadway segments and intersections under Build-Out conditions (2008) are shown with the corresponding LOS threshold for reference. **Section 3.8.1** provides more discussion of the LOS thresholds.

Signal Warrant Analysis

Rural and urban peak hour volume warrants (Warrant 3) were prepared for all unsignalized intersections, as appropriate, based on the methodology presented in the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (US DOT FHWA, 2003), and the *MUTCD California Supplement* (US DOT FHWA, 2004). According to the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*, “the satisfaction of a traffic signal warrant or warrants shall not in itself require the installation of a traffic control signal.” Therefore, prior to making a final determination on installation of a proposed signal, a thorough engineering investigation, including collision history, should be conducted.

2008 Without Project Condition

This section discusses the 2008 traffic conditions without the project trips added for the Madera site and the North Fork site. These conditions represent the 2008 baseline (no project) scenario.

Planned Roadway Improvements

Roadway improvements in the Madera site study area, as reported in the Madera County 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and through information provided by Caltrans, include improvements to signalize and convert the freeway ramp to a “hook” ramp at Avenue 16 at the SR-99 SB ramps. This improvement is anticipated to be in place by 2008 and therefore was considered as such.

Traffic Results

Madera Site

Figures 4.8-1 and **4.8-2** present the 2008 Without Project Lane Configuration and Traffic Controls for the Madera site study intersections.

Table 4.8-3 summarizes the results of this weekday freeway and roadway segment analysis for the 2008 level of service conditions. As shown in **Table 4.8-3** below, based on 2008 traffic volumes, the following seven freeway segments and one roadway segment currently operate at an unacceptable LOS:

- SR-99 SB – North of Avenue 18½
- SR-99 NB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17
- SR-99 SB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17
- SR-99 NB – South of Avenue 17

Figure 4.8-1 Madera Site – 2008 Lane Configuration and Intersection Control

Figure 4.8-2 Madera Site – 2008 Lane Configuration and Intersection Control

TABLE 4.8-3
 FREEWAY AND ROADWAY SEGMENT PERFORMANCE –
 2008 WITHOUT PROJECT (MADERA SITE)

Segment	LOS Threshold	2008 w/o Project			
		LOS		Density (pc/mi/ln) ¹	
		AM	PM	AM	PM
Freeway Segment					
SR-99 NB – North of Avenue 18½	C	C	C	24.1	25.7
SR-99 SB – North of Avenue 18½	C	C	D	19.9	33.6
SR-99 NB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17	C	D	D	26.9	28.2
SR-99 SB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17	C	C	E	21.6	39.1
SR-99 NB – South of Avenue 17	C	D	F	31.6	---
SR-99 SB – South of Avenue 17	C	C	F	23.1	---
Roadway Segment					
Avenue 18½ - Road 24 to Road 23	D	B	B	NA	NA
Road 23 – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17	D	B	C	NA	NA
Avenue 17 – Road 23 to SR-99	D	A	F	NA	NA
Avenue 17 – SR-99 to Road 27	D	F	F	NA	NA
Golden State Boulevard – Avenue 17 to Road 23	D	A	A	NA	NA

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

NA = not applicable.

¹ density = passenger car per mile per lane.

--- = beyond software limitations

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES 2006.

- SR-99 SB – South of Avenue 17
- Avenue 17 – Road 23 to SR-99
- Avenue 17 – SR 99 to Road 27

2008 without project intersection conditions are presented in **Table 4.8-4**. The following Twelve study intersections show an unacceptable LOS without the addition of project traffic:

- Avenue 18½ at SR-99 SB ramps/Road 23
- Avenue 18½ at SR-99 NB ramps/Road 23
- Avenue 17 at SR-99 NB ramps
- Avenue 17 at SR-99 SB ramps
- Avenue 12/Golden State Boulevard at SR-99 SB ramps
- Avenue 17 at Road 23
- Avenue 17 at Golden State Boulevard
- Avenue 16 at Schnoor Avenue
- Avenue 16/Avenue 16 Connector at SR 99 NB Ramps
- Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR 99 NB Ramps
- SR-145/Madera Avenue at SR-99 NB ramps
- Olive Avenue/Avenue 14/SR-99 SB on-ramp at SR-145

TABLE 4.8-4
INTERSECTION PERFORMANCE-
2008 WITHOUT PROJECT (MADERA SITE)

Intersection	LOS Threshold	2008 w/o Project			
		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay (secs) ¹	LOS	Delay (secs)
Avenue 18½ at SR-99 SB ramps/Road 23					
• WB Left-Through	C	A	8.9	A	8.9
• NB Approach		D	25.6	F	63.3
• SB Approach		D	30.0	F	178.0
Avenue 18½ at SR-99 NB ramps					
• EB Left	C	A	8.5	A	8.3
• NB Approach		E	44.3	F	144.0
Avenue 17 at SR-99 SB ramps					
• SB Approach	C	F	153.6	F	8216
Avenue 17 at SR-99 NB ramps					
• EB Left	C	B	10.2	C	15.7
• NB Approach		F	738.0	F	5934
Avenue 12/Golden State Boulevard at SR-99 SB ramps					
• SB Left-Through	C	A	8.4	A	9.0
• WB Approach		C	15.6	F	303.5
Avenue 12 at Golden State Boulevard					
	D	C	20.9	C	29.8
Avenue 12 at SR-99 NB ramps					
	C	B	13.9	B	14.6
Avenue 18 at Road 23					
• NB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.7	A	8.0
• SB Left-Through-Right		A	7.8	A	8.0
• WB Approach		B	10.8	B	11.0
• EB Approach		B	11.1	B	13.4
Avenue 17 at Road 23					
• NB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.5	A	7.6
• SB Left-Through-Right		A	7.8	A	8.2
• WB Approach		B	14.7	F	50.5
• EB Approach		B	12.5	C	7.0
Avenue 17 at Golden State Boulevard					
• EB Left-Through-Right	D	A	9.1	B	11.0
• WB Left-Through-Right		A	8.9	B	13.7
• NB Approach		F	73.0	F	---
• SB Approach		F	282.2	F	---
Ellis Street at Road 26					
	D	B	14.62	F	96.48
Avenue 15½ at Road 23					
• NB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.8	A	8.5
• SB Left-Through-Right		A	7.9	A	8.2
• WB Approach		B	11.9	B	14.6

Intersection	LOS Threshold	2008 w/o Project			
		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay (secs) ¹	LOS	Delay (secs)
• EB Approach		A	9.77	C	16.62
Avenue 14 at Road 23	D	A	9.77	C	16.62
Avenue 16 at Schnoor Avenue					
• NB Left		A	7.4	A	7.6
• SB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.8	A	7.7
• WB Approach		B	11.5	F	63.4
• EB Approach		B	14.2	E	49.5
Avenue 16 at SR-99 SB ramps	C	B	14.8	C	21.3
Avenue 16/Avenue 16 Connector at SR-99 NB ramps	C				
• EB Left		B	12.6	D	26.5
Avenue 16 at SR-99 NB ramp connector					
• SB Left-Through	C	A	8.2	A	9.5
• WB Right		A	9.6	B	12.8
Gateway/Avenue 16 at SR 99 NB Ramps	C				
• WB Left		B	11.1	C	15.4
Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR-99 NB ramps	C	B	14.2	D	35.1
Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR-99 SB ramps	C	B	13.0	C	34.3
SR-145/Madera Avenue at SR-99 NB ramps	C	D	36.5	D	54.8
Olive Avenue/Avenue 14 at SR-99 SB off-ramp	C	B	15.4	C	29.8
Olive Avenue/Avenue 14/SR-99 SB on-ramp at SR-145	C	C	26.6	E	61.1
Avenue 18½ at Pistachio Drive					
• EB Approach	D	A	8.9	A	9.1
• SB Approach		C	22.5	D	25.5
Avenue 18½ at Golden State Boulevard					
• EB Approach	D	A	7.7	A	7.8
• SB Approach		B	11.1	B	12.2

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

¹ Delay in seconds per vehicle.

N/A = Not Available

--- = beyond software limitations

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES 2006.

Figures 4.8-3 and 4.8-4 present the 2008 Without Project intersection volumes at each of the Madera site study intersections.

North Fork Site. The 2008 Without Project Lane Configuration and Traffic Controls for the North Fork site study intersections are the same as shown in Section 3.8-2. No changes in roadway geometry are planned in the North Fork site area between the existing conditions and 2008.

Figure 4.8-3 Madera Site – 2008 Intersection Volumes

Figure 4.8-4 Madera Site – 2008 Intersection Volumes

2008 Without Project conditions are presented in **Table 4.8-5**. The following study intersection shows an unacceptable LOS:

- SR-41 at Road 200

TABLE 4.8-5
INTERSECTION OPERATIONS-
2008 WITHOUT PROJECT (NORTH FORK SITE)

Intersection	LOS Threshold	2008 w/o Project			
		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay (secs) ¹	LOS	Delay (secs)
SR-145 at SR-41	C	B	19.7	C	25.1
SR-41 at Road 200					
• SB Left	D	A	8.3	B	10.7
• WB Approach		F	87.7	E	47.5
SR-41 at Thornberry Road					
• SB Left	C	A	9.5	A	9.4
• WB Approach		C	22.2	C	17.7
SR-41 at SR-49	C	B	16.6	C	24.2
Malum Ridge Road at Road 225 (Mammoth Pool Road)	D	A	8.36	A	8.85
Road 225 (Mammoth Pool Road) at Cascadel Road					
• SB Left	D	A	7.4	A	7.3
• WB Approach		A	8.8	A	8.6
Cascadel Road at Mission Drive (Federal Road 209)					
• WB left-Through	D	A	7.3	A	7.3
• NB Approach		A	8.8	A	8.8
North Fork Road at Auberry Road					
• NB Left-Through-Right		A	7.5	A	7.6
• SB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.6	A	7.5
• WB Approach		A	9.6	B	10.1
• EB Approach		B	10.2	A	9.7
North Fork Road at Crane Valley Road					
• EB Left-Through	D	A	7.5	A	7.5
• SB Approach		A	9.3	B	10.0

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

¹ Delay in seconds per vehicle.

SOURCE: TPG Consulting 2006; AES 2006.

Figure 4.8-5 presents the 2008 Without Project intersection volumes at each of the North Fork site study intersections.

Figure 4.8-5 North Fork Site – 2008 Intersection Volumes

4.8.2 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

This section discusses the 2008 with Project condition where project trips calculated for Alternative A are added to the baseline condition.

Trip Generation

Project trip generation was calculated for Alternative A, based on the earlier discussed trip generation methodology, and is presented in **Table 4.8-6**.

TABLE 4.8-6
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION - ALTERNATIVE A

Land Uses	Size	Daily	AM		PM	
			In	Out	In	Out
Casino	268,480 sf ¹	11,759	443	190	559	496
Hotel	224,530 sf/200 Rooms ²	600	25	16	23	21
Total	493,010 sf/200 Rooms	12,359	468	206	582	517

NOTES: ¹ sf = square feet.

² Trip rate is ITE Land Use Code 310 – Hotel. Rate reduced by 36.5% to account for internal capture to/from casino.

³ All figures are approximate.

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES, 2006.

No captured or pass-by trip reductions were utilized other than the hotel trips captured by the casino as identified in the San Diego study documents and discussed in the previous trip generation section.

Trip Distribution and Assignment

A distribution pattern was prepared based on model-generated trip distribution data. Based on the trip distribution pattern presented in **Figure 4.8-6**, the project trips were assigned to the local project area roadways. Trip counts at each of the study intersections are presented in **Figures 4.8-7** and **4.8-8**.

2008 Traffic Condition With Project

This section discusses the 2008 traffic conditions with Alternative A project trips added. The 2008 Without Project conditions are reported as a baseline.

Freeway and Roadway Segment Performance

Table 4.8-7 summarizes the results of this weekday freeway and roadway segment analysis for the 2008 With Project (Alternative A) level of service conditions. As shown in **Table 4.8-7** below, the following five freeway segments and one roadway segment are shown to operate at an unacceptable LOS:

TABLE 4.8-7
 FREEWAY AND ROADWAY SEGMENT PERFORMANCE –
 2008 WITH ALTERNATIVE A

Segment	LOS Threshold	2008 w/o Project				With Alternative A			
		LOS		Density (pc/mi/ln) ¹		LOS		Density (pc/mi/ln)	
		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
Freeway Segment									
<i>SR-99 NB – North of Avenue 18½</i>	C	C	C	24.1	25.7	C	D	24.3	26.3
<i>SR-99 SB – North of Avenue 18½</i>	C	C	D	19.9	33.6	C	D	20.3	34.6
<i>SR-99 NB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17</i>	C	D	D	26.9	28.2	D	D	26.9	28.2
<i>SR-99 SB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17</i>	C	C	E	21.6	39.1	C	E	21.6	39.1
<i>SR-99 NB – South of Avenue 17</i>	C	D	F	31.6	---	E	F	35.4	---
<i>SR-99 SB – South of Avenue 17</i>	C	C	F	23.1	---	C	F	24.1	---
Roadway Segment									
<i>Avenue 18½ – Road 24 to Road 23</i>	D	B	B	NA	NA	B	B	NA	NA
<i>Road 23 – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17</i>	D	B	C	NA	NA	B	C	NA	NA
<i>Avenue 17 – Road 23 to SR-99</i>	D	A	F	NA	NA	B	F	NA	NA
<i>Avenue 17 – SR-99 to Road 27</i>	D	F	F	NA	NA	F	F	NA	NA
<i>Golden State Boulevard – Avenue 17 to Road 23</i>	D	A	A	NA	NA	A	A	NA	NA

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

NA = not applicable.

OF = Overflow

--- = beyond software limitations

¹ density = passenger car per mile per lane.

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES 2006.

- SR-99 SB – North of Avenue 18½
- SR-99 NB – North of Avenue 18½
- SR-99 NB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17
- SR-99 SB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17
- SR-99 NB – South of Avenue 17
- SR-99 SB – South of Avenue 17
- Avenue 17 – SR-99 to Road 27
- Avenue 17 – Road 23 to SR-99

Intersection Performance

- The 2008 Without Project traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips expected to be generated by Alternative A. **Table 4.8-8** summarizes the 2008 with Alternative A Peak Hour intersection conditions. The 2008 Without Project intersection conditions are provided as a baseline. With the addition of project traffic under Alternative A, the following 14 study intersections are forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS:

TABLE 4.8-8
INTERSECTION OPERATIONS – 2008 WITH ALTERNATIVE A

Intersection	LOS Thresh- hold	2008 w/o Project				Alternative A			
		AM		PM		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay (secs) ¹	LOS	Delay (secs)	LOS	Delay (secs)	LOS	Delay (secs)
Avenue 18½ at SR-99 SB ramps/Road 23									
• WB Left-Through	C	A	8.9	A	8.9	A	9.0	A	9.0
• NB Approach		D	25.6	F	63.3	E	45.1	F	---
• SB Approach		D	30.0	F	178.0	F	56.6	F	397.7
Avenue 18½ at SR-99 NB ramps									
• EB Left	C	A	8.5	A	8.3	A	8.7	A	8.6
• NB Approach		E	44.3	F	144.0	F	62.7	F	284.2
Avenue 17 at SR-99 SB ramps									
• SB Approach	C	F	153.6	F	8216	F	564.7	F	29611
Avenue 17 at SR-99 NB ramps									
• EB Left	C	B	10.2	C	15.7	B	10.6	C	16.9
• NB Approach		F	738.0	F	5934	F	1610	F	13114
Avenue 12/Golden State Boulevard at SR-99 SB ramps									
• SB Left-Through	C	A	8.4	A	9.0	A	8.04	A	9.0
• WB Approach		C	15.6	F	303.5	C	16.4	F	331.3
Avenue 12 at Golden State Boulevard									
	D	C	20.9	C	29.8	C	22.8	C	30.8
Avenue 12 at SR-99 NB ramps									
	C	B	13.9	B	14.6	B	14.8	B	17.5
Avenue 18 at Road 23									
• NB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.7	A	8.0	A	7.7	A	8.0
• SB Left-Through-Right		A	7.8	A	8.0	A	8.0	A	8.2
• WB Approach		B	10.8	B	11.0	B	11.0	B	11.7
• EB Approach		B	11.1	B	13.4	B	12.5	C	16.5
Avenue 17 at Road 23									
• NB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.5	A	7.6	A	7.5	A	7.7
• SB Left-Through-Right		A	7.8	A	8.2	A	7.9	A	8.4
• WB Approach		B	14.7	F	50.5	C	16.2	F	100.9
• EB Approach		B	12.5	C	7.0	B	13.2	C	20.0
Avenue 17 at Golden State Boulevard									
• EB Left-Through-Right	D	A	9.1	B	11.0	B	10.5	B	14.1
• WB Left-Through-Right		A	8.9	B	13.7	A	8.9	B	13.7
• NB Approach		F	73.0	F	---	F	417.0	F	---
• SB Approach		F	282.2	F	---	F	---	F	---
Ellis Street at Road 26									
	D	B	14.62	F	96.48	C	15.31	F	110.19
Avenue 15½ at Road 23									
• NB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.8	A	8.5	A	7.8	A	8.6

4.0 Environmental Consequences

• SB Left-Through-Right		A	7.9	A	8.2	A	8.0	A	8.3
• WB Approach		B	11.9	B	14.6	B	12.5	C	15.9
• EB Approach		B	12.5	C	16.9	B	13.1	C	18.4
Avenue 14 at Road 23	D	A	9.77	C	16.62	B	10.09	C	19.49
Avenue 16 at Schnoor Avenue									
• NB Left		A	7.4	A	7.6	A	7.4	A	7.6
• SB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.8	A	7.7	A	7.8	A	7.8
• WB Approach		B	11.5	F	63.4	B	12.4	F	125.2
• EB Approach		B	14.2	E	49.5	C	15.9	F	84.3
Avenue 16 at SR-99 SB ramps	C	B	14.8	C	21.3	B	14.9	C	21.4
Avenue 16/Avenue 16 Connector at SR-99 NB ramps									
• EB Left		B	12.6	D	26.5	B	13.2	D	32.8
Avenue 16 at SR-99 NB ramps Connector									
• SB Left-Through	C	A	8.2	A	9.5	A	8.2	A	9.6
• WB Right		A	9.6	B	12.8	A	9.6	B	12.8
Gateway/Avenue 16 at SR 99 NB Ramps									
• WB Left	C	B	11.1	C	15.4	B	11.2	C	16.1
Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR-99 NB ramps									
	C	B	14.2	D	35.1	B	14.5	D	36.4
Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR-99 SB ramps									
	C	B	13.0	C	34.3	B	13.1	D	41.7
SR-145/Madera Avenue at SR-99 NB ramps									
	C	D	36.5	D	54.8	D	39.4	E	64.5
Olive Avenue/Avenue 14 at SR-99 SB off-ramp									
	C	B	15.4	C	29.8	B	15.6	C	32.1
Olive Avenue/Avenue 14/SR-99 SB on-ramp at SR-145									
	C	C	26.6	E	61.1	C	30.2	E	69.5
Avenue 18½ at Pistachio Drive									
• EB Approach		A	8.9	A	9.1	A	8.9	A	9.1
• SB Approach	D	C	22.5	D	25.5	C	23.3	D	27.0
Avenue 18½ at Golden State Boulevard									
• EB Approach		A	7.7	A	7.8	A	7.7	A	7.8
• SB Approach	D	B	11.1	B	12.2	B	11.3	B	12.5

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

¹ Delay in seconds per vehicle.

N/A = Not Available

--- = beyond software limitations

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES 2006.

Figure 4.8-6 Madera Site – Trip Distribution Percentages With Alternative A

Figure 4.8-7 Madera Site – Intersection Trip Assignment With Alternative A

Figure 4.8-8 Madera Site – Intersection Trip Assignment With Alternative A

- Avenue 18½ at SR-99 SB ramps/Road 23
- Avenue 18½ at SR-99 NB ramps
- Avenue 17 at SR-99 SB ramps
- Avenue 17 at SR-99 NB ramps
- Avenue 12/Golden State Boulevard at SR-99 SB ramps
- Avenue 17 at Road 23
- Avenue 17 at Golden State Boulevard
- Ellis Street at Road 26
- Avenue 16 at Schnoor Avenue
- Avenue 16/Avenue 16 connector at SR99 NB ramps
- Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR 99 NB ramps
- Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR 99 SB ramps
- SR-145/Madera Avenue at SR-99 NB ramps
- Olive Avenue/Avenue 14/SR-99 SB on-ramp at SR-145

Figures 4.8-9 and 4.8-10 present the 2008 With Alternative A intersection volumes at each of the Madera site study intersections.

Impact Analysis

Alternative A's contribution to unacceptable traffic operations represents a significant impact. Mitigation measures for the 2008 With Project (Alternative A) are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** of this document. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures, each of the intersections and roadway segments that are shown to have an unacceptable LOS would be improved to an acceptable LOS. This would result in a less than significant impact.

LAND USE

Consistency with Local Land Use Regulations

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 be converted to reservation land. The Tribe relies upon the Tribal Council, the governing body of the Tribe, to guide and regulate land use on tribal lands. The Tribal Government desires to work cooperatively with local and State authorities on matters related to land use. Accordingly, Madera County and the City of Madera land use regulations are assessed below.

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 (see **Section 3.8.3**).

Figure 4.8-9 Madera Site – 2008 Intersection Volumes With Alternative A

Figure 4.8-10 Madera Site – 2008 Intersection Volumes With Alternative A

Table 4.8-9 lists the policies of the Madera County General Plan and indicates the consistency of each project alternative, for ease of comparison.

The Tribe entered into an MOU with Madera County on August 16, 2005. MOU terms relevant to land use include the following:

- A. 6 (g) No Golf Course. The Tribe does not intend to, and unless otherwise agreed by the City of Madera, the Tribe shall not, construct a golf course on the Trust Property until the earlier of (i) twenty years from the date of the MOU, (ii) the date on which the aggregate number of rounds of golf played on the Madera Municipal Golf course in any given calendar year exceeds 60,000 18-hole equivalent rounds, or (iii) the date on which the Madera Municipal Golf Course is sold or ceases operations.
- B. 6 (h) No Water Park. The Tribe does not intend to, and, unless otherwise agreed by the County, the Tribe shall not develop, construct or operate a water park on the Trust Property within twenty years from the date of the MOU.

Note that consistency or inconsistency with local land use regulations does not by itself constitute an environmental impact. Environmental impacts, such as potential conflicts with neighboring land uses, are discussed below.

Airport Compatibility

The Madera site is within the influence of the Madera Municipal Airport. Most of the proposed development sections of the Madera site are within Zone D, with a portion of the parking lot and an access road lying in Zones B1 and B2. No development would occur in Zone A (**Figure 3.8-12**).

No Alternative A structures would exceed 70 feet in height, well below the 150 foot building restriction that applies to the portions of the Madera site where development is proposed (**Figure 3.8-13**).

Madera Municipal Airport's main runway is approximately 5,544 feet long (Madera, 2007), which subjects all objects within 20,000 feet and exceeding a 100:1 horizontal slope to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) notification requirements. The proposed hotel/casino for Alternative A would be within 20,000 feet of the airport runway and approximately 71.5 feet tall (including a lightning rod). The proposed hotel/casino for Alternative A is subject to FAA notification because it exceeds the 100:1 horizontal slope requirement. All other proposed structures for Alternative A, including the parking, water and wastewater structures do not exceed the 100:1 horizontal slope requirement for development adjacent to an airport runway.

TABLE 4.8-9
MADERA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN LAND USE CONSISTENCY

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
Commercial Land Use						
1.D	To designate adequate commercial land for and promote development of commercial uses to meet the present and future needs of Madera County residents and visitors and maintain economic viability.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Action and Alternatives would add a major commercial attraction to the region. Development of each alternative will ensure that any negative effects are mitigated to the fullest extent possible.
1.D.4	To designate adequate commercial land for and promote development of commercial uses to meet the present and future needs of Madera County residents and visitors and maintain economic vitality.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Action and Alternatives would add a major commercial attraction to the region. Development of each alternative will ensure that any negative effects are mitigated to the fullest extent possible.
Jobs-Housing Balance						
1.F	To work toward a jobs-housing balance in existing urban areas and new growth areas.	No	No	No	No	The Proposed Action and Alternatives are estimated to draw from 10 to 263 new households to the County, depending on the alternative, without providing additional housing. Yet, existing housing can accommodate new households and this number of new households would only occupy up to 0.8% of the currently proposed housing projects.
1.F.2	Designate and encourage the development of employment-generating uses in appropriate areas near existing and designated residential development.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Action and Alternatives would result in the creation of numerous employment opportunities within Madera County.
Visual and Scenic Resources						
1.H	To protect the visual and scenic resources of Madera County as important quality-of-life amenities and asset in the promotion of recreation and tourism.	No	No	No	No	The Proposed Action and the Alternatives at the Madera site would represent a change to the viewshed and be visible from several public vantage points. The Alternative at the North Fork site would represent a change to the viewshed, but not be visible from public vantage points.
1.H.1	Require that new development in scenic rural areas avoid location structures along ridgelines, on steep slopes, or in other highly-visible locations, except when the location is necessary to avoid hazards or when the screening measures to minimize the visibility of structures and graded areas are incorporated into the project.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The Madera site does not contain ridgelines or steep slopes. The North Fork site consists almost entirely of steep slopes, including the proposed location for the Alternative D casino.
1.H.2	Require new development to incorporate sound soil conservation practices and minimizes land alterations.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	A grading and drainage plan that includes erosion control measures will be used for the design and build out of the Proposed Project and Alternatives. Substantial land alteration is necessary for the development of a casino on the North Fork site.
Streets and Highways						
2.A	To provide for the long-range planning and development of the County's roadway system, ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods, and provide sufficient access	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Traffic studies were conducted to assess the effect of the Proposed Project and Alternatives on traffic and roadways. Mitigation for negative traffic impacts is contained in Section 5.2.7 .

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
	to existing and new development.					
2.A.9	To identify the potential impacts of new development on traffic service levels, the County shall require the preparation of traffic impact analyses for developments determined to be large enough to have potentially significant traffic impacts. The County may allow exceptions to the level of service standards where it finds that the improvements or other measures required to achieve the LOS standards are unacceptable.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Traffic studies were conducted to assess the effect of the Proposed Project and Alternatives on traffic and roadways. Mitigation for negative traffic impacts is contained in Section 5.2.7 . Acceptable LOS standards are maintained after mitigation.
2.A.17	Require proposed new development projects to analyze their contribution to increased traffic and to implement improvements necessary to address the increase.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Traffic studies were conducted to assess the effect of the Proposed Project and Alternatives on traffic and roadways. Mitigation for negative traffic impacts is contained in Section 5.2.7 .
2.A.19	Assess fees on new development sufficient to cover the fair share portion of that development's impacts on the local and regional transportation system. Exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits and when alternative sources of funding can be identified to offset foregone revenues.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Traffic studies were conducted to assess the effect of the Proposed Project and Alternatives on traffic and roadways. Mitigation for negative traffic impacts is contained in Section 5.2.7 .
2.A.21	Require that new nonresidential development provide for off-street parking, either on-site or through contributions to consolidated lots or structures, particularly where these facilities are located in or near residential areas.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Surface parking spaces and parking structure spaces will be provided for Alternatives A and B. Surface parking spaces will be provide for Alternatives C and D.
Transit Goal						
2.B	To promote a safe and efficient mass transit system, including both rail and bus, to reduce congestion, improve the environment, and provide viable non-automotive means of transportation in and through Madera County	No	No	No	No	No mass transit system is planned for transportation to and from the Proposed Project or Alternatives. Various mass-transit related mitigation measures are recommended in Section 5.0 to reduce air quality and transportation impacts. Railway-specific mitigation measures are not included.
2.B.7	Require new development to provide sheltered public transit stops, with turnouts. The County will also consider development of turnouts in existing developed areas when roadway improvements are made or as deemed necessary for traffic flow and public safety.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No mass transit system is planned for transportation to and from the Proposed Action or Alternatives. Various mass-transit related mitigation measures, including providing public transit stops, are recommended in Section 5.0 , for all alternatives except for Alternative D, to reduce air quality and transportation impacts.
Transportation Control Measures (TCM)						
2.C	To maximize the efficient use of transportation facilities so as to: 1) reduce travel demand on the County's roadway system; 2) reduce the amount of investment required in new or expanded facilities; 3) reduce the quantity of emissions of pollutants from automobiles; and 4) increase the energy	No	No	No	No	The Proposed Action and Alternatives will increase the travel demand on the County's roadway system.

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
	efficiency of the transportation system.					
2.C.4	Encourage major traffic generators to develop and implement trip reduction measures.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No trip reduction measures are proposed by any of the project alternatives. Trip reduction measures are recommended in Section 5.2.3 .
2.C.5	Require major development projects to prepare transportation studies that address potential use of bicycle routes and facilities and the use of public transportation.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Traffic studies were conducted to assess the effect of the Proposed Project and Alternatives on traffic and roadways. These studies addressed impacts and potential use of non-automobile transportation. Mitigation for negative traffic impacts is contained in Section 5.2.7 .
Non-motorized Transportation						
2.D	To provide a safe, comprehensive, and integrated system of facilities for non-motorized transportation to meet the needs of commuters and recreational users.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Non-motorized transportation systems would be provided according to applicable plans when developing the Proposed Project and Alternatives, including traffic mitigation.
2.D.7	Require developers to finance and install pedestrian walkways, equestrian trails, and multipurpose paths in new development, as appropriate.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Non-motorized transportation systems, including pedestrian walkways, would be provided according to applicable plans when developing the Proposed Project and Alternatives, including traffic mitigation.
General Public Facilities and Services						
3.A	To ensure the timely development of public facilities and to maintain an adequate level of service to meet the needs of existing and future development.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would maintain an adequate level of service for their public facilities, including water and wastewater facilities.
3.A.1	Ensure through the development review process that adequate public facilities and services are available to serve new development. The County shall not approve new development where existing facilities are inadequate unless the applicant can demonstrate that all necessary public facilities will be installed or adequately financed and maintained (through fees or other means).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adequate public facilities and services will be installed as part of the construction of the Proposed Project or Alternatives.
Public Facilities and Services Funding						
3.B	To ensure that adopted facility and service standards are achieved and maintained through the use of equitable funding methods.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would fund any additional improvements and maintenance required for the public services to the Proposed Project or Alternatives.
3.B.1	Require that new development pay its fair share of the cost of developing new facilities and services and upgrading existing public facilities and services subject to the requirements of California Government Code Section 66000, et seq. (AB1600); exceptions may be made when new development generates significant public benefits (e.g., low income housing) and when alternative sources of funding can be identified to offset foregone revenues.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would be required to pay for its fair share of the cost of constructing public facilities required by the Proposed Project or Alternatives.
Water Supply and Delivery						

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
3.C	To ensure the availability of an adequate and safe water supply and the maintenance of high quality water in water bodies and aquifers used as sources of domestic and agricultural water supply.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The USEPA NPDES storm water program would regulate discharge of stormwater from construction activities at the site of the Proposed Project or Alternatives. The Proposed Project and Alternatives would be designed to incorporate stormwater detention basins and the use of sediment/grease traps.
3.C.1	Approve new development only if an adequate water supply to serve such development is demonstrated.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	An on-site groundwater well would be able to adequately supply the Proposed Project and Alternatives.
3.C.2	Approve new development based on the following guidelines for water supply: a. Urban and suburban developments should rely on community water systems. b. Rural communities should rely on community water systems. Individual wells may be permitted in cases where no community water system exists or can be extended to the property but development will be limited to densities, which can be safely developed with wells. c. Agricultural areas should rely on public water systems where available, otherwise individual water wells are acceptable.	No	No	No	No	After consultation with the City of Madera, it is proposed that Alternatives A-C rely primarily on on-site wells for their water supply. Alternative D would rely either on on-site supply or a community water system.
3.C.3	Limit development in areas identified as having severe water table depression to uses that do not have high water usage or to uses served by a surface water supply.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The sites for the Proposed Project and Alternatives have not been identified as having severe water table depression. Mitigation measures are included in Section 5.2.2 to reduce impacts to groundwater.
3.C.4	Require that water supplies serving new development meet state water quality standards.	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	The water supplies for the gaming alternatives would be required by any Tribal-State Compact to meet federal and state water quality standards. Alternative C development would be required to meet federal water quality standards.
3.C.5	Require that new development adjacent to bodies of water used as domestic water sources adequately mitigate potential water quality impacts on these water bodies.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The USEPA NPDES storm water program would regulate discharge of stormwater from construction activities at the site of the Proposed Project or Alternatives. The Proposed Project and Alternatives would be designed to incorporate stormwater detention basins and the use of sediment/grease traps.
3.C.6	Promote efficient water use and reduced water demand by: a. Requiring water-conserving design and equipment in new construction. b. Encouraging water-conserving landscaping and other conservation measures. c. Encouraging retrofitting existing development with water-conserving devices. d. Encouraging use of recycled or gray water for landscaping.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would conserve water as recommended in Section 5.2.2 . If an on-site wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) is constructed, gray water would be recycled in the operation of each alternative development.

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
3.C.7	Promote the use of reclaimed wastewater to offset the demand for new water supplies.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	If an on-site WWTP is used for the Proposed Project or Alternatives, reclaimed water would be used for toilet flushing and landscape irrigation.
Wastewater Collection, Treatment and Disposal						
3.D	To ensure adequate wastewater collection and treatment and the safe disposal of liquid and solid waste.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Wastewater from the Proposed Project and Alternatives would be treated either at an on-site or off-site WWTP.
3.D.2	Promote efficient water use and reduced wastewater system demand by: a. Requiring water-conserving design and equipment in new construction; b. Encouraging retrofitting with water-conserving devices; and c. Designing wastewater systems to minimize inflow and infiltration, to the extent economically feasible.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would conserve water as recommended in Section 5.2.2 .
3.D.3	Permit on-site sewage treatment and disposal on parcels where all current regulations can be met; where parcels have the area, soils, and other characteristics that permit such disposal facilities without threatening surface or groundwater quality or posing any other health hazards; and where community sewer service is not available and cannot be provided.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives may include an on-site WWTP while complying with all current regulations.
3.D.4	Require that the development, operation, and maintenance of on-site disposal systems complies with the requirements and standards of the County Department of Environmental Health.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Development, operation, and maintenance of on-site disposal systems for the Proposed Project and Alternatives would comply with County standards and requirements.
Storm Drainage and Flood Control						
3.E	To provide efficient, cost-effective, and environmentally sound storm drainage and flood control facilities.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Construction of the Proposed Project and Alternatives would comply with the Grading and Drainage Plan and would be designed to incorporate the stormwater detention basins and the use of sediment/grease traps.
3.E.2	Require new development to provide protection from the 100-year flood as a minimum.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Construction of the Proposed Project and Alternatives would comply with the Grading and Drainage Plan, which includes elevation of proposed development above the 100-year floodplain elevation.
3.E.4	Require new development to pay its fair share of the costs of Madera County storm drainage and flood control improvements.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Such payments would not be necessary, given that storm drainage systems would be contained on-site. Detention basins would ensure that off-site drainage is equal or less than pre-development levels.
3.E.5	Encourage project designs that minimize drainage concentrations and impervious coverage and maintain, to the extent feasible, natural site drainage conditions.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would include construction of a storm drainage system to manage stormwater flow that would convey the stormwater detention basins, and would include the use of vegetated swales and vegetated stormwater detention basins. Natural site cover will be maintained to the extent possible.
3.E.6	Future drainage system discharges shall comply with	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Future drainage system discharges for the Proposed Project and

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
	applicable state and federal pollutant discharge requirements.					Alternatives would comply with applicable state and federal pollutant discharge requirements.
3.E.7	Encourage the use of natural stormwater drainage systems to preserve and enhance natural features.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would include construction of a storm drainage system to manage stormwater flow that would convey the stormwater detention basins, and would include the use of vegetated swales and vegetated stormwater detention basins.
Landfills, Transfer Stations, and Solid Waste Recycling						
3.F	To ensure the safe and efficient disposal or recycling of solid waste generated in Madera County.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recycling bins would be installed for the Proposed Project and Alternatives. Green waste and recyclables would be separated from main waste, and cardboard and paper products would be compacted.
3.F.2	Promote maximum use of solid waste source reduction, recycling, composting, and environmentally safe transformation of wastes.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recycling bins would be installed for the Proposed Project and Alternatives. Green waste and recyclables would be separated from main waste, and cardboard and paper products would be compacted.
3.F.6	Require that all new development comply with applicable provisions of the Madera County Integrated Waste Management Plan.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would comply with the applicable provisions of the Madera County Integrated Waste Management Plan.
Law Enforcement, Fire, and Emergency Medical Services						
3.G	To ensure the prompt and efficient provision of law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical facility and service needs.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would make one-time and annual payments to the City of Madera and Madera County to fund increased law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical services. These payments would either be made in the current MOU with Madera County under Alternative A, or as recommended in Section 5.2.6 for the remaining alternatives.
3.G.3	Require new development to pay its fair share of the costs for providing law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical facilities, subject to the requirements of California Government Code Section 66000 et seq. (AB1600).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would make one-time and annual payments to the City of Madera and Madera County to fund increased law enforcement, fire, and emergency medical services. These payments would either be made in the current MOU with Madera County under Alternative A, or as recommended in Section 5.2.6 for the remaining alternatives.
3.G.4	Require that new development be designed to maximize safety and security and minimize fire hazard risks to life and property.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would be designed to maximize safety and practice preventative measures such as the use of spark arrestors on equipment.
Fire Protection Services						
3.H	To protect residents of and visitors to Madera County from injury and loss of life and to protect property and watershed resources from fires.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would make one-time and annual payments to the City of Madera and Madera County to fund increased fire protection services. These payments would either be made in the current MOU with Madera County under Alternative A, or as recommended in Section 5.2.6 for the remaining alternatives. Additional fire protection mitigation measures are contained in Section 5.2.8 . These MOU contributions and mitigation measures have been determined after discussions with local fire protection providers regarding adequate service requirements for each

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
						alternative.
3.H.4	Require new development to develop or fund fire protection facilities that, at a minimum, maintain the (above) service level standards (see Policy 3.H.1 or 3.H.2 in the Madera County General Plan Policy Document or Section 3.8 of this document for service level standards).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would make one-time and annual payments to the City of Madera and Madera County to fund increased fire protection services. These payments would either be made in the current MOU with Madera County under Alternative A, or as recommended in Section 5.2.6 for the remaining alternatives. Additional fire protection mitigation measures are contained in Section 5.2.8 . These MOU contributions and mitigation measures have been determined after discussions with local fire protection providers regarding adequate service requirements for each alternative.
3.H.5	Ensure that all proposed developments are reviewed for compliance with fire safety standards by responsible local fire agencies per the Uniform Fire Code and other state and local ordinances.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Fire protection features, including sprinkler systems and fire-resistant construction, would be incorporated into the Proposed Project and Alternatives. They would comply with applicable fire safety standards.
Utilities						
3.J.3	Require proposed new development in identified underground conversion districts and along scenic corridors to construct underground utility lines on and adjacent to the site of proposed development or, when this is infeasible, to contribute funding for future undergrounding.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Gas and electricity can be hooked up to existing overhead PG&E lines located near the site and telecommunication cables can be extended to the property line for the Proposed Project and Alternatives.
Agriculture and Natural Resources						
5.A	To designate adequate agricultural land and promote development of agricultural uses to support the continued viability of Madera County's agricultural economy.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The development for Alternatives A-C is located primarily on Farmland of Local Importance as classified by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). More than half of the Madera site would remain in open space and could be used for agricultural purposes under Alternatives A-C, however. In addition, Section 5.2.7 recommends the purchase of agricultural conservation easements to mitigate the conversion of agricultural land under Alternatives A-C. Alternative D is not located on Important Farmland.
5.A.1	Maintain agriculturally designated areas for agricultural uses and direct urban uses to designated new growth areas, existing communities, and/or cities.	No	No	No	No	The Madera site is currently zoned for agricultural uses and would be partially developed under Alternatives A-C. Alternative D is currently trust land and is therefore not subject to local land use regulations. The North Fork site is not, however, a designated growth area, existing community, or city.
5.A.2	Discourage the conversion of prime agricultural land to urban uses unless an immediate and clear need can be demonstrated that indicates a lack of land for non-agricultural uses.	No	No	No	Yes	A very small piece of prime agricultural land would be converted from agricultural uses under Alternatives A-C. The North Fork site does not include prime agricultural land.
5.A.3	Ensure that new development and public works projects do	No	No	No	Yes	The Madera site is currently zoned for agricultural uses and would be

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
	not encourage further expansion of urban uses into designated agricultural areas.					partially developed under Alternatives A-C. Alternative D is currently trust land and is therefore not subject to local land use regulations.
5.A.5	Allow the conversion of existing agricultural land to urban uses only within designated urban and rural residential areas, new growth areas, and city spheres of influence where designated for urban development on the General Plan Land Uses Diagram.	No	No	No	No	The Madera site is currently zoned for agricultural uses and would be partially developed under Alternatives A-C. Alternative D is currently trust land and is therefore not subject to local land use regulations, including the General Plan.
5.A.6	Encourage continued and, where possible, increased agricultural activities on lands designated for agricultural uses.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Madera site is currently zoned for agricultural uses and would be partially developed under Alternatives A-C. Alternative D is currently trust land and is therefore not subject to local land use regulations.
5.A.13	Require development within or adjacent to designated agricultural areas to incorporate design, construction, and maintenance techniques that protect agriculture and minimize conflicts with adjacent agricultural uses.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Action and Alternatives have been designed to minimize conflicts with adjacent agricultural uses to the extent possible. In addition, Section 5.2.7 recommends that a Tribal right to farm ordinance be enacted.
Water Resources						
5.C	To protect and enhance the natural qualities of Madera County's streams, creeks and groundwater.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would generally protect and enhance the natural qualities of Madera County's streams, creeks, and groundwater to the extent possible through avoidance, flood control, mitigation measures (see Section 5.0) and BMPs.
5.C.2	Minimize sedimentation and erosion through control of grading, cutting of trees, removal of vegetation, placement of roads and bridges, and use of off-road vehicles. The County shall discourage grading activities during the rainy season, unless adequately mitigated, to avoid sedimentation of creeks and damage to riparian habitat.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	All grading activities for the Proposed Project and Alternatives would be done using SWPPP measures and BMPs as outlined in the Grading and Drainage Plan and required by the Clean Water Act.
5.C.3	Require new development of facilities near rivers, creeks, reservoirs, or substantial aquifer recharge areas to mitigate any potential impacts of release of pollutants in floodwaters or flowing river, stream, creek, or reservoir waters.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	All grading activities for the Proposed Project and Alternatives would be done using SWPPP measures and BMPs as outlined in the Grading and Drainage Plan and required by the Clean Water Act. Construction of the Proposed Project and Alternatives would comply with the Grading and Drainage Plan and would be designed to incorporate the stormwater detention basins and the use of sediment/grease traps.
5.C.4	Require the use of feasible and best management practices (BMPs) to protect streams from the adverse effects of construction activities, and shall encourage the urban storm drainage systems and agricultural activities to use BMPs.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	All grading activities for the Proposed Project and Alternatives would be done using SWPPP measures and BMPs as outlined in the Grading and Drainage Plan and required by the Clean Water Act. Construction of the Proposed Project and Alternatives would comply with the Grading and Drainage Plan and would be designed to incorporate the stormwater detention basins and the use of sediment/grease traps.
5.C.5	Approve only wastewater disposal facilities that will not contaminate groundwater or surface water.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The WWTP used for the Proposed Project or Alternatives would use an immersed membrane bioreactor (MBR) system to provide tertiary-treated

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
						water for reuse or disposal. Wastewater disposal would be regulated according to the requirements of the Clean Water Act.
5.C.7	Protect groundwater resources from contamination and further overdraft by encouraging water conservation efforts and supporting the use of surface water for urban and agricultural uses wherever feasible.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would conserve water as recommended in Section 5.2.2 . If an on-site wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) is constructed, gray water would be recycled in the operation of each alternative development.
Wetland and Riparian Areas						
5.D	To protect wetland communities and related riparian areas throughout Madera County as valuable resources.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Wetlands and riparian areas would be completely avoided by Alternatives A-C. A small amount of wetlands would be impacted by Alternative D. Such impacts would be mitigated, as required by the Clean Water Act.
5.D.1	Comply with the wetlands policies of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the California Department of Fish and Game. Coordination with these agencies at all levels of project review shall continue to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures and the concerns of these agencies are adequately addressed.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	All federal environmental laws would apply to trust land.
5.D.2	Require new development to mitigate wetland loss in both regulated and non-regulated wetlands through any combination of avoidance, minimization, or compensation.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Wetlands and riparian areas would be completely avoided by Alternatives A-C. A small amount of wetlands would be impacted by Alternative D. Such impacts would be mitigated, as required by the Clean Water Act.
5.D.3	Development should be designed in such a manner that pollutants and siltation will not significantly adversely affect the value or function of wetlands.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would be designed to incorporate stormwater detention basins and the use of sediment/grease traps.
5.D.4	Require riparian protection zones around natural watercourses. Riparian protection zones shall include the bed and bank of both low- and high-flow channels and associated riparian vegetation, the band of riparian vegetation outside the high-flow channel, and buffers of 100 feet in width as measured from the top of bank of unvegetated channels and 50 feet in width as measured from the outer edge for the canopy of riparian vegetation. Exceptions may be made in existing developed areas where existing development and lots are located within the setback areas.	No	No	No	No	Buffers would be maintained around riparian areas to the extent possible (these buffers would not be 100 feet in width, in all cases, however), although some encroachment would occur under Alternative D.
5.D.5	Identify and conserve remaining upland habitat areas adjacent to wetlands and riparian areas that are critical to the feeding or nesting of wildlife species associated with these wetland and riparian areas.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Upland habitat areas adjacent to wetlands and riparian areas would be conserved to the extent possible.
5.D.6	Require new private or public developments to preserve and enhance existing native riparian habitat unless public safety concerns require removal of habitat for flood control or other	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Riparian habitat would be preserved and enhanced under Alternatives A-C. Some riparian habitat would be developed under Alternative D.

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
	public purposes. In cases where new private or public development results in modification or destruction of riparian habitat for purposes of flood control, the developers shall be responsible for creating new riparian habitats within or near the project area at a ration of three acres of new habitat for every acre destroyed.					
Fish and Wildlife Habitat						
5.E	To protect, restore, and enhance habitats that support fish and wildlife species so as to maintain populations at viable levels.	No	No	No	No	Alternatives A-D would affect wildlife habitats, but not at levels that would threaten the viability of species populations. Nonetheless, Alternatives A-D are development projects whose main purpose is not habitat restoration.
5.E.2	Require development in areas known to have particular value of wildlife to be carefully planned and, where possible, located so that the reasonable value of the habitat for wildlife is maintained.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unlike the North Fork site, the Madera site is not particularly valuable for wildlife. Wildlife habitat on approximately half of the North Fork site would be substantially degraded under Alternative D.
5.E.3	Encourage private landowners to adopt sound wildlife habitat management practices, as recommended by the California Department of Fish and Game officials and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Construction and development of the Proposed Project or Alternatives would maintain wildlife habitat to the extent required by the Endangered Species Act and as recommended in Section 5.2.4 .
Vegetation						
5.F	To preserve and protect the valuable vegetation resources of Madera County.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project or Alternatives would not have a significant effect on regional vegetation resources.
5.F.1	Encourage landowners and developers to preserve the integrity of existing terrain and natural vegetation in visually sensitive areas such as hillsides and ridges, and along important transportation corridors.	No	No	No	No	The integrity of existing terrain will be maintained under Alternatives A-C. Natural vegetation will not be preserved under Alternative A-C, which would be located along SR-99, an important transportation corridor. Neither the integrity of existing terrain, nor existing vegetation would be maintained under Alternative D, which is located in a visually sensitive area.
5.F.2	Require developers to use native and compatible non-native species, especially drought-resistant species, to the extent possible in fulfilling landscaping requirements imposed as conditions of discretionary permit approval or for project mitigation.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Native plants would be used as recommended in Section 5.2.4 to mitigate for the removal of native vegetation under Alternative D. be used to the extent possible for landscaping. Use of native plants in landscaping is recommended in Section 5.2.3 to conserve water.
5.F.6	Require that new development preserve natural woodlands to the maximum extent possible.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives have been designed to preserve natural woodlands to the maximum extent possible.
Open Space for the Preservation of Natural Resources						
5.H	To preserve and enhance open space lands to maintain the natural resources of the County.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives have been designed to preserve and enhance open space lands to maintain natural resources to the extent possible.

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
5.H.2	Require that new development be designed and constructed to preserve the following types of areas and features as open space to the maximum extent feasible: a. High erosion hazard areas; b. Scenic and trial corridors; c. Streams and streamside vegetation; d. Wetlands; e. Other significant stands of vegetation; f. Wildlife corridors; and g. Any areas of special ecological significance.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The Proposed Project and Alternatives have been designed to preserve the noted areas to the maximum extent possible, with the exception of Alternative D, which would encroach into wetlands.
5.H.5	Require that significant natural, open space, and cultural resources be identified in advance of development and incorporated into site-specific development project design.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Significant natural, open space, and cultural resources have been identified as part of constraints analyses and analyses during the preparation of this Environmental Impact Statement, and have been considered by the Tribe and the lead agency in designing the Proposed Project and Alternatives.
Air Quality						
5.J	To protect and improve air quality in Madera County and the region.	No	No	No	No	Alternatives A-D would marginally contribute to worsening regional air quality.
5.J.5	Require new development projects that exceed adopted SJVUAPCD emission thresholds to submit an air quality analysis for review and approval. Based on this analysis, the County shall require appropriate mitigation measures consistent with the SJVUAPCD's 1991 Air Quality Attainment Plan (or updated edition).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	An air quality analysis has been completed for the Proposed Project and Alternatives. Mitigation measures have been recommended as a result of this analysis (Section 5.2.3).
5.J.11	Require developers to pave all access roads, driveways, and parking areas serving new commercial and industrial development.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Access roads, driveways, and parking areas would be paved under the Proposed Project and Alternatives.
Air Quality – Transportation/Circulation						
5.K	To integrate air quality planning with the transportation planning process.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives have incorporated air quality planning with the transportation planning process.
5.K.1	Require new development to be planned to result in smooth flowing traffic conditions for major roadways. This includes traffic signals and traffic signal coordination, parallel roadways, and intra- and inter-neighborhood connections where significant reductions in overall emissions can be achieved.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives have incorporated air quality planning with the transportation planning process. For instance, analysis determined that the development alternatives' impact on CO would be considered significant if the project would degrade operation of a signalized intersection to level of service (LOS) E or F, or substantially worsen LOS at a signalized intersection already operating at F. Traffic impacts would be mitigated to reduce these LOS levels.
5.K.5	Require large new developments to dedicate land for and construct appropriate improvements for suitably located park-	No	No	No	No	No park-and-ride lots are proposed for the Proposed Project or Alternatives.

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
	and-ride lots, subject to the requirements of California Government Code Section 66000 et seq. (AB 1600).					
Seismic and Geological Hazards						
6.A	To minimize loss of life, injury, and property damage due to seismic and geological hazards.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project or Alternatives would minimize loss of life, injury, and property damage due to seismic and geological hazards to the extent possible.
6.A.1	Require the preparation of a soils engineering and geologic-seismic analysis prior to permitting development in areas prone to geological or seismic hazards (i.e., groundshaking, landslides, liquefaction, critically expansive soils).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Construction of the Proposed Project or Alternatives would incorporate earthquake design provisions, which safe guard against major structural failures and loss of life.
Flood Hazards						
6.B	To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, damage to property, and economic and social dislocations resulting from flood hazards.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project or Alternatives would minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, property damage, and economic and social dislocations resulting from flood hazards to the extent possible.
6.B.1	Require flood-proofing of structures in areas subject to flooding.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Grading and Drainage Plan incorporates fill to elevate the finished floor of the Proposed Project or Alternatives at least 1.0 foot above the FEMA 100-year floodplain.
6.B.3	Restrict uses in designated floodways to those that are tolerant of occasional flooding and do not restrict or alter flow of floodwaters. Such uses may include agriculture, outdoor recreation, mineral extraction, and natural resource areas.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Action or Alternatives will be designed in a manner constant with the requirements for structures within the 100-year flood plain.
6.B.4	Require that all development within areas subject to 100-year floods be designed and constructed in a manner that will not cause floodwaters to be diverted onto adjacent property or increase flood hazards to other areas.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Construction of the Proposed Project and Alternatives would comply with the Grading and Drainage Plan and would be designed to incorporate the stormwater detention basins.
6.B.5	Require flood control structures, facilities, and improvements to be designed to conserve resources, incorporate and preserve scenic values, and to incorporate opportunities for recreation, where appropriate.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would design flood control improvements to conserve resources and preserve scenic values and recreation to the extent possible. Stormwater detention basins, for instance, would be vegetated.
Fire Hazards						
6.C	To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, and damage to property and watershed resources resulting from unwanted fires.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would make one-time and annual payments to the City of Madera and Madera County to fund increased fire protection services. These payments would either be made in the current MOU with Madera County under Alternative A, or as recommended in Section 5.2.6 for the remaining alternatives. Additional fire protection mitigation measures are contained in Section 5.2.8 . These MOU contributions and mitigation measures have been determined after discussions with local fire protection providers regarding adequate service requirements for each alternative.

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
6.C.3	New development shall be required to have water systems that meet County fire flow requirements. Where minimum fire flow is not available to meet County standards, alternative fire protection measures, including sprinkler systems, shall be identified and may be incorporated into development if approved by the appropriate fire protection agency.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would comply with County fire flow requirements.
6.C.4	The County shall review project proposals to identify potential fire hazards and prevent or mitigate such hazards to acceptable levels of risk.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would make one-time and annual payments to the City of Madera and Madera County to fund increased fire protection services. These payments would either be made in the current MOU with Madera County under Alternative A, or as recommended in Section 5.2.6 for the remaining alternatives. Additional fire protection mitigation measures are contained in Section 5.2.8 . These MOU contributions and mitigation measures have been determined after discussions with local fire protection providers regarding adequate service requirements for each alternative.
6.C.5	Require development to have adequate access for fire and emergency vehicles and equipment. All major subdivisions shall have two points of ingress and egress.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would make one-time and annual payments to the City of Madera and Madera County to fund increased fire protection services. These payments would either be made in the current MOU with Madera County under Alternative A, or as recommended in Section 5.2.6 for the remaining alternatives. Additional fire protection mitigation measures are contained in Section 5.2.8 . These MOU contributions and mitigation measures have been determined after discussions with local fire protection providers regarding adequate service requirements for each alternative.
Airport Hazards						
6.D	To minimize the risk of loss of life, injury, damage to property, and economic and social dislocations resulting from airport hazards.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would minimize associated airport hazards.
6.D.1	Ensure that new development around airports does not create safety hazards such as lights from direct or reflective sources, smoke, electrical interference, hazardous chemicals, or fuel storage in violation of adopted safety standards.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would provide nighttime lighting for the parking areas that shines only on the parking areas and not surrounding areas. The Tribe would also limit building height and prohibit anything that interferes with aircraft from the site.
6.D.2	Limit land uses in airport safety zones to those uses listed in the applicable airport comprehensive land use plans (CLUPs) as compatible uses. Exceptions shall be made only as provided for in the CLUPs. Such uses shall also be regulated to ensure compatibility in terms of location, height, and noise.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Tribe would either maintain current aviation easements within Zones A, B1, and B2 on the Madera site or enter into an agreement with the City of Madera to allow for the protections contained in the current aviation easement. The North Fork site is not located in an airport safety zone.
Noise						
7.A	To protect County residents from the harmful and annoying	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Proposed Project and Alternatives would protect residents from

Madera County General Plan		Land Use Consistency (Yes or No)				Discussion
Section	Goal or Policy Summary	Alt A	Alt B	Alt C	Alt D	
	effects of exposure to excessive noise.					excessive noise exposure.
7.A.2	Noise created by new transportation noise sources, including roadway improvement projects, shall be mitigated so as not to exceed 60 db L _{dn} within the outdoor activity areas of existing or planned noise-sensitive land uses and 45 dB L _{dn} in interior spaces of existing or planned noise-sensitive land uses.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Increased noise from the Proposed Project and Alternative traffic, as described in Section 4.10 , would be minimal and would not be expected to exceed these levels at noise sensitive locations.
7.A.5	Noise which will be created by new non-transportation noise sources, or existing noise sources, or existing non-transportation noise sources which undergo modification that may increase noise levels, shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the noise level standards of Table 7.A.4 (of the Madera County General Plan Policy Document) on lands designated for noise-sensitive uses. This policy does not apply to noise levels associated with agricultural operations.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Noticeable noise associated with Alternatives A-D would be transportation related.
7.A.6	Enforce the State Noise Insulation Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 24) and chapter 35 of the Uniform Building code (UBC) concerning interior noise exposure for multi-family housing, hotels and motels.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Increased noise from the Proposed Project and Alternative traffic, as described in Section 4.10 , would be minimal and would not be expected to exceed these levels at noise sensitive locations.
7.A.7	Where the development of a project may result in land uses being exposed to existing or projected future noise levels exceeding the levels specified by the policies of the noise section of the General Plan, the County shall require an acoustical analysis early in the review process so that noise mitigation may be included in the project design.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	An acoustical analysis was prepared for the Proposed Project and the Alternatives.

SOURCE: County of Madera, 1995; AES, 2006.

In compliance with FAA notification requirements, the latitude, longitude, height, and distance to the Madera Municipal Airport runway of each of the four corners of the proposed hotel/casino for Alternative A were submitted to the FAA. The FAA analyzed all four corners and issued a “determination of no hazard to air navigation” statement on January 18, 2007 (**Appendix V**). The FAA determined that the location and development of a 72-foot tall hotel/casino would not constitute a hazard to air navigation. The FAA also stated that marking and lighting are not necessary for aviation safety.

The height of a crane to construct the project features would exceed the FAA 100:1 horizontal slope requirement for Alternative A. The crane height would range between 30 to 50 feet above the project features and would represent a significant impact if found to be a hazard to air navigation during construction. Mitigation measures presented in **Section 5.2.7** would reduce impacts to less than significant for potential hazards to air navigation due to the temporary use of a crane.

The proposed wastewater retention and stormwater detention ponds (**Section 2**) may attract birds, especially during spring and fall migrations. However, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has indicated that the wildlife is only considered a hazard if it blocks the direct flight path (Chiang, 2005). The nearest detention basin would be approximately 0.5 miles away from the landing zone and outside of the flight path. Therefore, no significant impact to airport operations from these ponds would occur. In addition, stormwater detention ponds would be designed to detain stormwater for relatively short periods of time during storm events. These ponds would be dry for the vast majority of the year.

Distracting lights which could be mistaken for airport lights are considered a hazard to flight and are prohibited within Airport Compatibility Zones A, B1, B2, and D. Pilots may also confuse well-lit parking lots for airport runways. Light is a potentially significant impact to airport operations. Mitigation is recommended in **Section 5.2.7** that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

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. Mitigation is recommended in **Section 5.2.7** that would reduce these effects to a less than significant level.

Effects to Project Area

Land uses surrounding the Madera site include SR-99, rural residential, agriculture, commercial, a golf course, and the Madera Municipal Airport. Development of Alternative A would add light, noise, and traffic to the surrounding environment, potentially resulting in disturbances to

rural residences in the area. In addition, commercial development in a predominately agricultural area potentially subjects patrons and employees to nuisance effects from surrounding agricultural operations, such as noise and dust. Placing the casino near the middle of the Madera site (see **Section 2.2**) leaves a buffer between the casino/hotel and surrounding rural residential and agricultural uses. The buffer would minimize effects of noise and light on nearby residences and the effects of surrounding agricultural operations on the proposed developments. Furthermore, the Madera County right to farm ordinance (Ord. 522 § 2(part), 1989) will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the site. Additionally, the Tribe and the Madera Irrigation District (MID) have signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) under which the Tribe agrees to accept the inconvenience of nearby agricultural operations (see **Section 2.2.10**), further reducing the potential for conflicts with neighboring land uses. Thus, no significant effects, such as precluding existing or planned land uses or disruption of access or significant conflicts with existing land uses, would occur. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** that would reduce land use effects.

AGRICULTURE

As shown in **Sections 3.2** and **3.8**, the Madera site includes a variety of soils with varying suitability for agricultural use. The majority of the site, including the area slated for development under Alternatives A, B, and C (all have similar footprints), is classified as farmland of local importance. Farmland of local importance is defined as tracts of land that are not identified as having national (prime or unique farmland) or statewide importance, but which have nonetheless been identified by a local agency as important farmlands (7 C.F.R. § 657.5).

Most of the proposed development area (**Figure 4.8-11**) is made up of San Joaquin sandy loam 0 to 3% slope soils (SaA). SaA soils have a poor Storie Index rating of 27. A rating of 27 indicates that the soil has severe limitations and requires special management for use as crops (see **Table 3.8-14**). A small portion of the development area also occurs on Atwater loamy sand 0 to 3% slope soils (AwA). AwA soils have a good Storie Index rating of 76, indicating that the soil is suitable for most crops, but has minor limitations that require a few special management needs. Finally, a small portion of the development area occurs on Tujunga loamy sand 0 to 3% slope soils (TwA). TwA soils have an average Storie Index rating of 56, indicating that the soil is suited to a few crops or to special crops and requires special management.

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) requires that federal agencies evaluate the value of farmland in order to evaluate adverse effects of its proposed action on the protection of farmland. According to the FPPA, farmland value is determined by a combination of two ratings: 1) the land evaluation rating and 2) the site assessment rating (7 C.F.R. § 658.5).

Insert Figure 4.8-11, Impact to Agricultural Soils

The land evaluation rating is completed by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and is based on information from several sources including soil surveys, NRCS field office technical guides, soil potential/productivity ratings, land capability classifications, and important farmland determinations. Based on this information, farmland proposed for conversion is assigned a rating between 0 and 100 points, representing the relative value, for agricultural production, of the farmland to be converted compared to other farmland in the same local government jurisdiction.

The site assessment rating is completed by the Federal agency and is based on specified criteria meant to evaluate the characteristics of the site and surrounding area, other than on-site soil characteristics, that tend to affect the value of the site for agricultural production. For instance, one criterion is the size of the site in relation to the average-size farming unit in the County. A larger site is more valuable for agricultural production than a smaller site and is therefore assigned a higher rating by the Federal agency. The Federal agency must assign a rating for each of the twelve FPPA-defined site assessment criteria (see Part VI of Form AD-1006, contained in **Appendix Q**). Maximum points for each criterion ranges from 5 to 20 points, for a maximum total site assessment rating of 160 points.

The FPPA recommends that the Federal agency combine the land evaluation rating with the site assessment rating to identify the effect of its proposed action on farmland, and make a determination as to the suitability of the site for protection as farmland. Once the combined score is computed, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) recommends that sites receiving a total score of less than 160 not be given further consideration for protection and no additional sites need to be evaluated (in an attempt to reduce impacts by protecting the site in question). Sites receiving scores totaling 160 or more should be given increasingly higher levels of consideration for protection (7 C.F.R. § 658.4).

The NRCS has evaluated the relative value of the farmland to be converted under either Alternatives A, B, or C (all have a similar footprint) to be 69 out of 100 (the land evaluation rating). The site assessment rating has been computed at 74 out of 160. The combined FPPA point total is 143 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix Q**).

Given the generally poor quality of agricultural soils where development is proposed, the combined FPPA score of 143, and the retention of a large portion of the site as open space that could be used for agricultural purposes, Alternative A would have a less than significant impact on agriculture. In addition, the Tribe has agreed in the MID MOU to establish arrangements with local providers for the sale and purchase of local agricultural products and to establish an agricultural demonstration project for educational purposes on the Madera site, promoting and

benefiting regional agricultural operations. Nonetheless, mitigation measures have been included in **Section 5.2.7** that would further reduce Alternative A's impacts to agriculture.

4.8.2 ALTERNATIVE B - REDUCED INTENSITY

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

This section discusses the 2008 with Project condition where project trips calculated for Alternative B are added to the baseline condition.

Trip Generation

Project trip generation was calculated for Alternative B, based on the earlier discussed methodology and is presented in **Table 4.8-10**. No captured or pass-by trip reductions were utilized.

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Based on the trip distribution pattern presented in **Figure 4.8-12**, the project trips were assigned to the local project area roadways. Trip counts at each of the study intersections are presented in **Figures 4.8-13** and **4.8-14**.

TABLE 4.8-10
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION - ALTERNATIVE B

Land Uses	Size	Daily	AM		PM	
			In	Out	In	Out
Casino	198,990 sf ¹	8,716	328	141	414	368
Total	198,990 sf	8,716	328	141	414	368

NOTES: ¹sf = square feet.

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES, 2006.

2008 Traffic Conditions

This section discusses the 2008 traffic conditions with Alternative B project trips added. The 2008 without Project conditions are reported as a baseline.

Figure 4.8-12 Madera Site – Trip Distribution Percentages With Alternative B

Figure 4.8-13 Madera Site – Intersection Trip Assignment With Alternative B

Figure 4.8-14 Madera Site – Intersection Trip Assignment With Alternative B

Freeway and Roadway Segment Performance

Table 4.8-11 summarizes the results of this weekday freeway and roadway segment analysis for the 2008 With Project (Alternative B) level of service conditions. As shown in **Table 4.8-11** below, the following six freeway segments and two roadway segment are shown to operate at an unacceptable LOS:

- SR-99 SB – North of Avenue 18½
- SR-99 NB – North of Avenue 18½
- SR-99 NB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17
- SR-99 SB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17
- SR-99 NB – South of Avenue 17
- SR-99 SB – South of Avenue 17
- Avenue 17 – SR-99 to Road 27
- Avenue 17 – Road 23 to SR 99

TABLE 4.8-11
FREEWAY AND ROADWAY SEGMENT PERFORMANCE –
2008 WITH ALTERNATIVE B

Segment	LOS Threshold	2008 w/o Project				With Alternative B			
		LOS		Density (pc/mi/ln) ¹		LOS		Density (pc/mi/ln)	
		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
Freeway Segment									
<i>SR-99 NB – North of Avenue 18½</i>	C	C	C	24.1	25.7	C	D	24.3	26.1
<i>SR-99 SB – North of Avenue 18½</i>	C	C	D	19.9	33.6	C	D	20.2	34.3
<i>SR-99 NB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17</i>	C	D	D	26.9	28.2	D	D	26.9	28.2
<i>SR-99 SB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17</i>	C	C	E	21.6	39.1	C	E	21.6	39.1
<i>SR-99 NB – South of Avenue 17</i>	C	D	F	31.6	---	D	F	34.2	---
<i>SR-99 SB – South of Avenue 17</i>	C	C	F	23.1	---	C	F	23.8	---
Roadway Segment									
<i>Avenue 18½ – Road 24 to Road 23</i>	D	B	B	NA	NA	B	B	NA	NA
<i>Road 23 – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17</i>	D	B	C	NA	NA	B	C	NA	NA
<i>Avenue 17 – Road 23 to SR-99</i>	D	A	F	NA	NA	A	F	NA	NA
<i>Avenue 17 – SR-99 to Road 27</i>	D	F	F	NA	NA	F	F	NA	NA
<i>Golden State Boulevard – Avenue 17 to Road 23</i>	D	A	A	NA	NA	A	A	NA	NA

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

NA = not applicable.

OF = overflow.

¹ density=passenger car per mile per lane.

--- = beyond software limitations

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES 2006.

Intersection Performance

The 2008 Without Project traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips expected to be generated by Alternative B. **Table 4.8-12** summarizes the 2008 With Alternative B Peak Hour intersection conditions. The 2008 Without Project intersection conditions are provided as a baseline. With the addition of project traffic under Alternative B, the following 14 study intersections are forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS:

- Avenue 18½ at SR-99 SB ramps/Road 23
- Avenue 18½ at SR-99 NB ramps
- Avenue 17 at SR-99 SB ramps
- Avenue 17 at SR-99 NB ramps
- Avenue 12/Golden State Boulevard at SR-99 SB ramps
- Avenue 17 at Road 23
- Ellis Street at Road 26
- Avenue 16 at Schnoor Avenue
- Avenue 16/Avenue 16 connector at SR 99 NB ramps
- Avenue 17 at Golden State Boulevard
- Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR 99 NB ramps
- Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR 99 SB ramps
- SR-145/Madera Avenue at SR-99 NB ramps
- Olive Avenue/Avenue 14/SR-99 SB on-ramp at SR-145

TABLE 4.8-12
PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION CONDITIONS - 2008 WITH ALTERNATIVE B

Intersection	LOS Thres-hold	2008 w/o Project				Alternative A			
		AM		PM		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay (secs) ¹	LOS	Delay (secs)	LOS	Delay (secs)	LOS	Delay (secs)
<i>Avenue 18½ at SR-99 SB ramps/Road 23</i>									
• WB Left-Through	C	A	8.9	A	8.9	A	8.9	A	9.0
• NB Approach		D	25.6	F	63.3	E	45.9	F	458.3
• SB Approach		D	30.0	F	178.0	E	45.9	F	324.1
<i>Avenue 18½ at SR-99 NB ramps</i>									
• EB Left	C	A	8.5	A	8.3	A	8.6	A	8.5
• NB Approach		E	44.3	F	144.0	F	55.4	F	239.1
<i>Avenue 17 at SR-99 SB ramps</i>									
• SB Approach	C	F	153.6	F	8216	F	402.7	F	19627
<i>Avenue 17 at SR-99 NB ramps</i>									
• EB Left	C	B	10.2	C	15.7	B	10.5	C	16.5
• NB Approach		F	738.0	F	5934	F	1301	F	10493

Avenue 12/Golden State Boulevard at SR-99 SB ramps									
• SB Left-Through	C	A	8.4	A	9.0	A	8.4	A	9.0
• NB Approach		C	15.6	F	303.5	C	16.2	F	323.1
Avenue 12 at Golden State Boulevard									
	D	C	20.9	C	29.8	C	23.1	D	35.1
Avenue 12 at SR-99 NB ramps									
	C	B	13.9	B	14.6	B	15.1	C	20.2
Avenue 18 at Road 23									
• NB Left-Through-Right		A	7.7	A	8.0	A	7.7	A	8.0
• SB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.8	A	8.0	A	7.9	A	8.2
• WB Approach		B	10.8	B	11.0	B	10.9	B	11.3
• EB Approach		B	11.1	B	13.4	B	12.0	C	15.4
Avenue 17 at Road 23									
• NB Left-Through-Right		A	7.5	A	7.6	A	7.5	A	7.6
• SB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.8	A	8.2	A	7.9	A	8.3
• WB Approach		B	14.7	F	50.5	C	15.7	F	83.6
• EB Approach		B	12.5	C	7.0	B	12.9	C	19.2
Avenue 17 at Golden State Boulevard									
• EB Left-Through-Right		A	9.1	B	11.0	B	10.1	B	13.1
• WB Left-Through-Right	D	A	8.9	B	13.7	A	8.9	B	13.7
• NB Approach		F	73.0	F	---	F	205.9	F	---
• SB Approach		F	282.2	F	---	F	346.2	F	---
Ellis Street at Road 26									
	D	B	14.62	F	96.48	C	15.09	F	106.43
Avenue 15½ at Road 23									
• NB Left-Through-Right		A	7.8	A	8.5	A	7.8	A	8.6
• SB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.9	A	8.2	A	7.9	A	8.3
• WB Approach		B	11.9	B	14.6	B	12.4	C	15.5
• EB Approach		B	12.5	C	16.9	B	12.9	C	17.9
Avenue 14 at Road 23									
	D	A	9.77	C	16.62	A	9.99	C	18.41
Avenue 16 at Schnoor Avenue									
• NB Left		A	7.4	A	7.6	A	7.4	A	7.6
• SB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.8	A	7.7	A	7.8	A	7.7
• WB Approach		B	11.5	F	63.4	B	12.2	F	105.0
• EB Approach		B	14.2	E	49.5	C	15.4	F	72.9
Avenue 16 at SR-99 SB ramps									
	C	B	14.8	C	21.3	B	14.9	C	21.4
Avenue 16/Avenue 16 Connector at SR-99 NB ramps									
• EB Left	C	B	12.6	D	26.5	B	12.9	D	30.5
Avenue 16 at SR-99 NB ramp connector									
• SB Left-Through	C	A	8.2	A	9.5	A	8.2	A	9.6
• WB Right		A	9.6	B	12.8	A	9.6	B	12.8

Gateway/Avenue 16 at SR 99 NB Ramps										
• WB Left	C	B	11.1	C	15.4	B	11.2	C	15.9	
Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR-99 NB ramps										
	C	B	14.2	D	35.1	B	14.5	D	36.7	
Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR-99 SB ramps										
	C	B	13.0	C	34.3	B	13.0	D	40.0	
SR-145/Madera Avenue at SR-99 NB ramps										
	C	D	36.5	D	54.8	D	38.5	E	61.7	
Olive Avenue/Avenue 14 at SR-99 SB off-ramp										
	C	B	15.4	C	29.8	B	15.7	C	31.7	
Olive Avenue/Avenue 14/SR-99 SB on-ramp at SR-145										
	C	C	26.6	E	61.1	C	30.1	E	67.2	
Avenue 18½ at Pistachio Drive										
• EB Approach	D	A	8.9	A	9.1	A	8.9	A	9.1	
• SB Approach		C	22.5	D	25.5	C	23.0	D	26.5	
Avenue 18½ at Golden State Boulevard										
• EB Approach	D	A	7.7	A	7.8	A	7.7	A	7.8	
• SB Approach		B	11.1	B	12.2	B	11.2	B	12.4	

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

¹ Delay in seconds per vehicle.

--- = beyond software limitations

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES 2006.

Figures 4.8-15 and 4.8-16 present the 2008 With Alternative B intersection volumes at each of the Madera site study intersections.

Impact Analysis

Alternative B's contribution to unacceptable traffic operations represents a significant impact. Mitigation measures for the 2008 with Project (Alternative B) are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** of this document. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures, each of the intersections and roadway segments that are shown to have an unacceptable LOS would be improved to an acceptable LOS. This would result in a less than significant impact.

LAND USE

Consistency with Local Land Use Regulations

Once the Madera site is converted to reservation land, the only applicable land use regulations would be Tribal. Madera County or City of Madera land use regulations would not apply. The Tribe desires to work cooperatively with local and State authorities on matters related to land use. Accordingly, Madera County and the City of Madera park land use regulations and project effects are assessed below.

Figure 4.8-15 Madera Site – 2008 Intersection Volumes With Alternative B

Figure 4.8-16 Madera Site – 2008 Intersection Trip Assignments With Alternative B

Alternative B would involve commercial development on land that is currently outside Madera city limits but within the City's area of influence. Alternative B would be consistent with most goals, objectives, and policies of Madera County and the City of Madera (**Table 3.8-7, Table 4.8-9**).

Note that consistency or inconsistency with local land use regulations does not by itself constitute an environmental impact. Environmental impacts, such as potential conflicts with neighboring land uses, are discussed below.

Airport Compatibility

The Madera site is within the influence of the Madera Municipal Airport. Most of the Alternative B development sections of the Madera site are within Zone D, with a little of the parking lot and an access road lying in Zones B1 and B2. No development would occur in Zone A (**Figure 3.8-12**).

No Alternative B structures would exceed 50 feet in height, well below the 150-foot building restriction that applies to the portions of the Madera site where development would occur (**Figure 3.8-13**). The proposed casino for Alternative B would be within 20,000 feet of the airport runway and approximately 51.5 feet tall (including a lightning rod). The proposed casino for Alternative B is subject to FAA notification because it exceeds the 100:1 horizontal slope requirement. All other proposed structures for Alternative B, including the parking, water and wastewater structures do not exceed the 100:1 horizontal slope requirement for development adjacent to an airport runway. The height of the proposed casino for Alternative B is approximately 20 feet less than Alternative A and in the same location; the FAA determination of no hazard to air navigation for Alternative A would therefore also apply to Alternative B.

The height of a crane to construct the project features would exceed the FAA 100:1 horizontal slope requirement for Alternative B. The crane height would range between 30 to 50 feet above the project features and would represent a significant impact if found to be a hazard to air navigation during construction. Mitigation measures presented in **Section 5.2.7** would reduce impacts to less than significant for potential hazards to air navigation due to the temporary use of a crane.

The proposed wastewater retention and stormwater detention ponds (**Section 2**) may attract birds, especially during spring and fall migrations. However, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has indicated that the wildlife is only considered a hazard if it blocks the direct flight path (Chiang, 2005). The nearest detention basin would be approximately 0.5 miles away from the landing zone and outside of the flight path. Therefore, no significant impact to airport operations from these ponds would occur. In addition, stormwater detention ponds would

be designed to detain stormwater for relatively short periods of time during storm events. These ponds would be dry for the vast majority of the year.

As with Alternative A (**Section 4.8.1**), light emissions and other possible conflicts are present between Alternative B developments and the Madera Municipal Airport. Although these potential conflicts would be slightly lessened due to the less intensive development planned for Alternative B, potential impacts to human safety or normal airport operations would be a potentially significant impact. Mitigation is recommended in **Section 5.2.7** that would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

Effects to Project Area

As with Alternative A, development of Alternative B would add light, noise, and traffic to the surrounding environment, but at a marginally reduced level, potentially resulting in disturbances to rural residences in the area. Unlike Alternative A, the terms of the MID MOU would not apply to Alternative B. Commercial development in a predominately agricultural area potentially subjects patrons and employees to nuisance effects from surrounding agricultural operations, such as noise and dust. As with Alternative A, the Alternative B developments would be placed near the middle of the Madera site (see **Section 2.2**), leaving a buffer between the casino and surrounding rural residential and agricultural uses. The buffer would minimize effects of noise and light on nearby residences and the effects of surrounding agricultural operations on the proposed developments. Furthermore, the Madera County right to farm ordinance (Ord. 522 § 2(part), 1989) will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the site. Thus, no significant effects, such as precluding existing or planned land uses or disruption of access or significant conflicts with existing land uses, would occur. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** that would reduce land use effects.

AGRICULTURE

Effects to agriculture would be similar to Alternative A given Alternative B's similar development footprint. As with Alternative A, the combined FPPA point total is 143 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix Q**).

Given the generally poor quality of agricultural soils where development is proposed, the combined FPPA score of 143, and the retention of a large portion of the site as open space that could be used for agricultural purposes, Alternative B would have a less than significant impact on agriculture. Nonetheless, mitigation measures have been included in **Section 5.2.7** that would further reduce Alternative B's impacts to agriculture.

4.8.3 ALTERNATIVE C – NON-GAMING ALTERNATIVE

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

This section discusses the 2008 With Project condition where project trips calculated for Alternative C are added to the baseline condition.

Trip Generation

Trip generation rates for Alternative C were derived from the ITE *Trip Generation* manual presented previously in the Trip Generation discussion. These trip rates were applied to the project components to produce the project trip generation amounts, shown in **Table 4.8-13**.

TABLE 4.8-13
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION - ALTERNATIVE C

Size (sf) ¹	Type	Land Use Code	Daily	AM		PM	
				In	Out	In	Out
125,000	Free Standing Discount Superstore	813	6,151	118	113	238	246
100,000	Discount Club	861	4,180	40	16	212	212
3,000	Fast Food with Drive-Through Restaurant	934	1,488	81	78	54	50
4,000	High Turnover Sit Down Restaurant	932	509	24	22	27	17
5,000	High Turnover Sit Down Restaurant	932	636	30	28	33	21
Total			12,964	293	257	564	546

NOTES: ¹ sf = square feet

SOURCE: ITE, 2003; TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES, 2006.

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Based on the trip distribution pattern presented in **Figure 4.8-17**, the project trips were assigned to the local project area roadways. Trip counts at each of the study intersections are presented in **Figures 4.8-18** and **4.8-19**.

2008 Traffic Conditions

This section discusses the 2008 traffic conditions with Alternative C project trips added. The 2008 Without Project conditions are reported as a baseline.

Freeway and Roadway Segment Performance

Table 4.8-14 summarizes the results of this weekday freeway and roadway segment analysis for the 2008 With Project (Alternative C) level of service conditions. As shown in **Table 4.8-14** below, the following six freeway and two roadway segments are shown to operate at an unacceptable LOS:

Figure 4.8-17 Madera Site – Trip Distribution Percentages With Alternative C

Figure 4.8-18 Madera Site – Intersection Trip Assignment With Alternative C

Figure 4.8-19 Madera Site – Intersection Trip Assignment With Alternative C

- SR-99 SB – North of Avenue 18½
- SR-99 NB – North of Avenue 18½
- SR-99 NB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17
- SR-99 SB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17
- SR-99 NB – South of Avenue 17
- SR-99 SB – South of Avenue 17
- Avenue 17 – SR-99 to Road 27
- Avenue 17 – Road 23 to SR 99

TABLE 4.8-14
FREEWAY AND ROADWAY SEGMENT PERFORMANCE –
2008 WITH ALTERNATIVE C

Segment	LOS Threshold	2008 w/o Project				Alternative C			
		LOS		Density (pc/mi/ln) ¹		LOS		Density (pc/mi/ln)	
		AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
Freeway Segment									
SR-99 NB – North of Avenue 18½	C	C	C	24.1	25.7	C	D	24.4	26.3
SR-99 SB – North of Avenue 18½	C	C	D	19.9	33.6	C	D	20.2	34.6
SR-99 NB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17	C	D	D	26.9	28.2	D	D	26.9	33.9
SR-99 SB – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17	C	C	E	21.6	39.1	C	E	21.6	39.1
SR-99 NB – South of Avenue 17	C	D	F	31.6	---	D	F	33.9	---
SR-99 SB – South of Avenue 17	C	C	F	23.1	---	C	F	24.3	---
Roadway Segment									
Avenue 18½ – Road 24 to Road 23	D	B	B	NA	NA	B	B	NA	NA
Road 23 – Avenue 18½ to Avenue 17	D	B	C	NA	NA	C	C	NA	NA
Avenue 17 – Road 23 to SR-99	D	A	F	NA	NA	A	F	NA	NA
Avenue 17 – SR-99 to Road 27	D	F	F	NA	NA	F	F	NA	NA
Golden State Boulevard – Avenue 17 to Road 23	D	A	A	NA	NA	A	A	NA	NA

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

NA = not applicable

OF = overflow

¹ density = passenger car per mile per lane

--- = beyond software limitations

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES 2006.

Intersection Performance

As shown in **Table 4.8-15**, with the addition of project traffic under Alternative C, the following 15 study intersections are forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS:

- Avenue 18½ at SR-99 SB ramps/Road 23
- Avenue 18½ at SR-99 NB ramps
- Avenue 17 at SR-99 SB ramps
- Avenue 17 at SR-99 NB ramps
- Avenue 12/Golden State Boulevard at SR-99 SB ramps

- Avenue 12 at SR-99 NB ramps
- Avenue 17 at Road 23
- Avenue 17 at Golden State Boulevard
- Ellis Street at Road 26
- Avenue 16 at Schnoor Avenue
- Avenue 16/Avenue 16 connector at SR99 NB ramps
- Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR 99 NB ramps
- Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR 99 SB ramps
- SR-145/Madera Avenue at SR-99 NB ramps
- Olive Avenue/Avenue 14/SR-99 SB on-ramp at SR-145

TABLE 4.8-15
INTERSECTION OPERATIONS - 2008 WITH ALTERNATIVE C

Intersection	LOS Thres-hold	2008 w/o Project				Alternative A			
		AM		PM		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay (secs) ¹	LOS	Delay (secs)	LOS	Delay (secs)	LOS	Delay (secs)
Avenue 18½ at SR-99 SB ramps/Road 23									
• WB Left-Through	C	A	8.9	A	8.9	A	8.9	A	9.0
• NB Approach		D	25.6	F	63.3	E	35.6	F	---
• SB Approach		D	30.0	F	178.0	E	43.8	F	387.0
Avenue 18½ at SR-99 NB ramps									
• EB Left	C	A	8.5	A	8.3	A	8.7	A	8.6
• NB Approach		E	44.3	F	144.0	F	65.3	F	286.9
Avenue 17 at SR-99 SB ramps									
• SB Approach	C	F	153.6	F	8216	F	458.3	F	29610
Avenue 17 at SR-99 NB ramps									
• EB Left	C	B	10.2	C	15.7	B	10.4	C	16.9
• NB Approach		F	738.0	F	5934	F	1294	F	12966
Avenue 12/Golden State Boulevard at SR-99 SB ramps									
• SB Left-Through	C	A	8.4	A	9.0	A	8.4	A	9.0
• NB Approach		C	15.6	F	303.5	C	16.5	F	333.5
Avenue 12 at Golden State Boulevard									
	D	C	20.9	C	29.8	C	22.3	C	30.4
Avenue 12 at SR-99 NB ramps									
	C	B	13.9	B	14.6	B	15.1	B	17.0
Avenue 18 at Road 23									
• NB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.7	A	8.0	A	7.7	A	8.0
• SB Left-Through-Right		A	7.8	A	8.0	A	7.9	A	8.2
• WB Approach		B	10.8	B	11.0	B	10.7	B	11.8
• EB Approach		B	11.1	B	13.4	B	12.0	C	16.7
Avenue 17 at Road 23									
	D								

4.0 Environmental Consequences

• NB Left-Through-Right		A	7.5	A	7.6	A	7.5	A	7.7
• SB Left-Through-Right		A	7.8	A	8.2	A	7.9	A	8.4
• WB Approach		B	14.7	F	50.5	C	16.1	F	104.5
• EB Approach		B	12.5	C	7.0	B	13.1	C	20.3
Avenue 17 at Golden State Boulevard									
• EB Left-Through-Right		A	9.1	B	11.0	A	9.9	B	14.0
• WB Left-Through-Right	D	A	8.9	B	13.7	A	8.9	B	13.7
• NB Approach		F	73.0	F	---	F	224.1	F	---
• SB Approach		F	282.2	F	---	F	4224	F	----
Ellis Street at Road 26	D	B	14.62	F	96.48	C	15.1	F	110.38
Avenue 15½ at Road 23									
• NB Left-Through-Right		A	7.8	A	8.5	A	7.8	A	8.6
• SB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.9	A	8.2	A	7.9	A	8.3
• WB Approach		B	11.9	B	14.6	B	12.4	C	16.0
• EB Approach		B	12.5	C	16.9	B	13.0	C	18.4
Avenue 14 at Road 23	D	A	9.77	C	16.62	B	10.04	C	19.38
Avenue 16 at Schnoor Avenue									
• NB Left		A	7.4	A	7.6	A	7.4	A	7.6
• SB Left-Through-Right	D	A	7.8	A	7.7	A	7.8	A	7.8
• WB Approach		B	11.5	F	63.4	B	12.2	F	121.5
• EB Approach		B	14.2	E	49.5	C	15.2	F	82.8
Avenue 16 at SR-99 SB ramps	C	B	14.8	C	21.3	B	14.9	C	21.4
Avenue 16/Avenue 16 Connector at SR-99 NB ramps									
• EB Left	C	B	12.6	D	26.5	B	13.0	D	32.3
Avenue 16 at SR-99 NB ramps Connector									
• SB Left-Through	C	A	8.2	A	9.5	A	8.2	A	9.6
• WB Right		A	9.6	B	12.8	A	9.6	B	12.8
Gateway/Avenue 16 at SR 99 NB Ramps									
• WB Left	C	B	11.1	C	15.4	B	11.2	C	16.1
Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR-99 NB ramps									
	C	B	14.2	D	35.1	B	14.5	D	36.5
Cleveland Avenue/Avenue 15½ at SR-99 SB ramps									
	C	B	13.0	C	34.3	B	13.3	D	42.1
SR-145/Madera Avenue at SR-99 NB ramps									
	C	D	36.5	D	54.8	D	38.0	E	64.5
Olive Avenue/Avenue 14 at SR-99 SB off-ramp									
	C	B	15.4	C	29.8	B	16.1	C	32.1
Olive Avenue/Avenue 14/SR-99 SB on-ramp at SR-145									
	C	C	26.6	E	61.1	C	29.7	E	69.8
Avenue 18½ at Pistachio Drive									
▪ EB Approach	C	A	8.9	A	9.1	A	8.9	A	9.1

▪ SB Approach		C	22.5	D	25.5	C	23.1	D	27.0	
Avenue 18½ at Golden State Boulevard										
• EB Approach		D	A	7.7	A	7.8	A	7.7	A	7.8
• SB Approach			B	11.1	B	12.2	B	11.2	B	12.5

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

¹ Delay in seconds per vehicle.

--- = beyond software limitations

SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES 2006.

Figures 4.8-20 and 4.8-21 present the 2008 With Alternative C intersection volumes at each of the Madera site study intersections.

Impact Analysis

Alternative C’s contribution to unacceptable traffic operations represents a significant impact. Mitigation measures for the 2008 With Project (Alternative C) are discussed in Section 5.2.7 of this document. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures, each of the intersections and roadway segments that are shown to have an unacceptable LOS would be improved to an acceptable LOS. This would result in a less than significant impact.

LAND USE

Consistency with Local Land Use Regulations

Once the Madera site is converted to reservation land, the only applicable land use regulations would be Tribal. Madera County or City of Madera land use regulations would not apply. The Tribe desires to work cooperatively with local and State authorities on matters related to land use. Accordingly, Madera County and the City of Madera land use regulations and project effects are assessed below.

Alternative C would involve commercial development on land that is currently outside Madera city limits but within the City’s area of influence. Alternative C would be consistent with most goals, objectives, and policies of Madera County and the City of Madera (Table 3.8-7, Table 4.8-9).

Note that consistency or inconsistency with local land use regulations does not by itself constitute an environmental impact. Environmental impacts, such as potential conflicts with neighboring land uses, are discussed below.

Airport Compatibility

The Madera site is within the influence of the Madera Municipal Airport. Most of the Alternative C development sections of the Madera site are within Zone D, with a little of the

Figure 4.8-20 Madera Site – 2008 Intersection Volumes With Alternative C

Figure 4.8-21 Madera Site – 2008 Intersection Volumes With Alternative C

parking lot and an access road lying in Zones B1 and B2. No development would occur in Zone A (**Figure 3.8-12**).

No Alternative C structures would exceed 50 feet in height, well below the 150 foot building restriction that applies to the portions of the Madera site where development would occur (**Figure 3.8-13**). Alternative C is not subject to FAA notification because the height of the proposed project's structures and distances to the Madera Municipal Airport runway do not exceed the 100:1 horizontal slope requirement.

The height of a crane to construct the project features may exceed the FAA 100:1 horizontal slope requirement for Alternative C. The crane height would range between 30 to 50 feet above the project features and would represent a significant impact if found to be a hazard to air navigation during construction. Mitigation measures presented in **Section 5.2.7** would reduce impacts to less than significant for potential hazards to air navigation due to the temporary use of a crane.

The proposed wastewater retention and stormwater detention ponds (**Section 2**) may attract birds, especially during spring and fall migrations. However, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has indicated that the wildlife is only considered a hazard if it blocks the direct flight path (Chiang, 2005). The nearest detention basin would be approximately 0.5 miles away from the landing zone and outside of the flight path. Therefore, no significant impact to airport operations from these ponds would occur. In addition, stormwater detention ponds would be designed to detain stormwater for relatively short periods of time during storm events. These ponds would be dry for the vast majority of the year.

As with Alternative A (**Section 4.8.1**), light emissions and other possible conflicts are present between Alternative C developments and the Madera Municipal Airport. Although these potential conflicts would be slightly lessened due to the less intensive development planned for Alternative C, potential impacts to human safety or normal airport operations would be a potentially significant impact. Mitigation is recommended in **Section 5.2.7** that would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level.

Effects to Project Area

As with Alternative A, development of Alternative C would add light, noise, and traffic to the surrounding environment, but at a marginally reduced level, potentially resulting in disturbances to rural residences in the area. Unlike Alternative A, the terms of the MID MOU would not apply to Alternative C. Commercial development in a predominately agricultural area potentially subjects patrons and employees to nuisance effects from surrounding agricultural operations, such as noise and dust. As with Alternative A, the Alternative C developments would be placed near the middle of the Madera site (see **Section 2.2**), leaving a buffer between

the retail developments and surrounding rural residential and agricultural uses. The buffer would minimize effects of noise and light on nearby residences and the effects of surrounding agricultural operations on the proposed developments. Furthermore, the Madera County right to farm ordinance (Ord. 522 § 2(part), 1989) will continue to protect neighboring farmers from nuisance suits brought by the Tribe or potential patrons on the site. Thus, no significant effects, such as precluding existing or planned land uses or disruption of access or significant conflicts with existing land uses, would occur. Nonetheless, mitigation measures are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** that would reduce land use effects.

AGRICULTURE

Effects to agriculture would be similar to Alternative A given Alternative C’s similar development footprint. As with Alternative A, the combined FPPA point total is 143 out of 260 possible points, which is lower than the USDA protection threshold of 160 points (**Appendix Q**).

Given the generally poor quality of agricultural soils where development is proposed, the combined FPPA score of 143, and the retention of a large portion of the site as open space that could be used for agricultural purposes, Alternative C would have a less than significant impact on agriculture. Nonetheless, mitigation measures have been included in **Section 5.2.7** that would further reduce Alternative C’s impacts to agriculture.

4.8.4 ALTERNATIVE D – NORTH FORK LOCATION

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

This section discusses the 2008 With Project condition where project trips calculated for Alternative D are added to the baseline condition.

Project Trip Generation

Project trip generation was calculated for Alternative D, based on the earlier discussed trip generation methodology and is presented in **Table 4.8-16**.

TABLE 4.8-16
PROJECT TRIP GENERATION – ALTERNATIVE D

Land Uses	Size	Daily	AM			PM		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Casino	26,001 sf ¹	1,139	43	18	61	54	48	102
Total	26,001 sf	1,139	43	18	61	54	48	102

NOTES: ¹ sf = square foot.
All figures are approximate.
SOURCE: TPG Consulting, Inc. 2006; AES, 2006.

Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

Based on the trip distribution pattern presented in **Figure 4.8-22**, the project trips were assigned to the local project area roadways. Trip counts at each of the study intersections are presented in **Figure 4.8-23**.

2008 Traffic Conditions

This section discusses the 2008 traffic conditions with Alternative D project trips added. The 2008 Without Project conditions are reported as a baseline.

Peak Hour Intersection Operations

The 2008 Without Project traffic volumes were combined with vehicle trips that are expected to be generated by Alternative D. **Table 4.8-17** summarizes the 2008 with Alternative D Peak Hour intersection conditions. The 2008 Without Project intersection conditions are provided as a baseline. Alternative D project traffic would worsen already unacceptable intersection operations at the SR-41 at Road 200 intersection.

TABLE 4.8-17
INTERSECTION OPERATIONS -
2008 WITH ALTERNATIVE D

Intersection	LOS Threshold	2008 w/o Project				With Alternative D			
		AM		PM		AM		PM	
		LOS	Delay (Secs) ¹	LOS	Delay (Secs)	LOS	Delay (Secs)	LOS	Delay (Secs)
SR-145 at SR-41	C	B	19.7	C	25.1	B	19.8	C	25.2
SR-41 at Road 200									
• SB Left		A	8.3	B	10.7	A	8.3	B	10.7
WB Approach	C	F	87.7	E	47.5	F	88.7	F	50.9
SR-41 at road 420 (Thornberry Road)									
• SB Left		A	9.5	A	9.4	A	9.5	A	9.4
• WB Approach	C	C	22.2	C	17.7	C	22.2	C	17.7
SR-41 at SR-49	C	B	16.6	C	24.2	B	16.6	C	24.5
Malum Ridge Road at Road 225 (Mammoth Pool Road)	D	A	8.36	A	8.85	A	8.57	A	8.87
Road 225 (Mammoth Pool Road) at Cascadel Road									
• SB Left	C	A	7.4	A	7.3	A	7.5	A	7.4
• WB Approach		A	8.8	A	8.6	A	8.9	A	8.8
Cascadel Road at Mission Drive									
• WB Left -Through	C	A	7.3	A	7.3	A	7.4	A	7.4
• NB Approach		A	8.8	A	8.8	A	8.9	A	9.0
North Fork Road at Auberry Road									
• NB Left -Through-Right		A	7.5	A	7.6	A	7.5	A	7.6
• SB Left -Through-Right	C	A	7.6	A	7.5	A	7.6	A	7.6
• WB Approach		A	9.6	B	10.1	A	9.7	B	10.2
• EB Approach		B	10.2	A	9.7	B	10.4	A	9.8
North Fork Road at Crane Valley Road									
• EB Left -Through	C	A	7.5	A	7.5	A	7.5	A	7.5
• SB Approach		A	9.3	B	10.0	A	9.4	B	10.2

NOTES: **Bold** text denotes unacceptable LOS.

¹ Delay in seconds per vehicle.

SOURCE: TPG Consulting 2006; AES 2006.

Figure 4.8-22 North Fork Site – Trip Distribution Percentages With Alternative D

Figure 4.8-23 North Fork Site- Intersection Trip Assignment with Alternative D

Figure 4.8-24 presents the 2008 With Alternative D intersection volumes at each of the North Fork site study intersections.

Impact Analysis

Alternative D's contribution to unacceptable traffic operations represents a significant impact. Mitigation measures for the 2008 with Project (Alternative D) are discussed in **Section 5.2.7** of this document. With the incorporation of project mitigation measures, the intersection shown to have an unacceptable LOS would be improved to an acceptable LOS. This would result in a less than significant impact.

LAND USE

Consistency with Local Land Use Regulations

The North Fork site is currently held in trust by the BIA. Madera County land use regulations do not apply to the North Fork site. This would not change with the implementation of Alternative D. The Tribal Government desires to work cooperatively with local and State authorities on matters related to land use. Accordingly, Madera County land use regulations and project effects are assessed below.

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 (**Section 3.8.3**). **Table 4.8-9** lists policies of the Madera County General Plan and indicates consistency with the project alternatives.

Note that consistency or inconsistency with local land use regulations does not by itself constitute an environmental impact. Environmental impacts, such as potential conflicts with neighboring land uses, are discussed below.

Airport Compatibility

Alternative D is outside the influence of the Madera Municipal Airport or any other airport. Therefore, all impacts to airport function would be less than significant.

Effects to Project Area

Land uses surrounding the North Fork site include rural residences. No significant effects, such as precluding existing or planned land uses or disruption of access or conflicts with existing land uses, would occur. However, development of Alternative D would add light, noise, and traffic to the surrounding environment, potentially resulting in disturbances to rural residences in the area. Placing the casino near the middle of the North Fork site (**Section 2.5**) would create a buffer between the casino and surrounding rural residential properties. The buffer would minimize effects of noise and light on nearby residences. Thus, no significant effects, such as precluding existing or planned land uses or disruption of access or significant conflicts with existing land

Figure 4.8-24 North Fork Site – 2008 Intersection Volumes With Alternative D

uses, would occur. Nonetheless, mitigation measures for light and traffic are discussed in **Section 5.2.7**.

AGRICULTURE

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 Federal, state, or locally important farmland. Due to the inferior quality of land available for farming purposes, impacts to agriculture from the development of Alternative D would be less than significant.

4.8.6 ALTERNATIVE E – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

The traffic conditions under the No Action Alternative are described as the baseline conditions for each target year (see 2008 No Project description for each Alternative). No new traffic would be added to the local roadways or State Route 99; therefore, no new traffic impacts would occur under this alternative.

LAND USE

Under this alternative, all current land uses would be retained. No impact would occur under the No Action Alternative

AGRICULTURE

Land zoned for agricultural uses would not be altered and present uses would continue. No impact would occur under the No Action Alternative.