

## 4.9 PUBLIC SERVICES

### 4.9.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

#### WATER SUPPLY

Estimated water demands for Alternative A facilities are shown in **Table 4.9-1**. These estimates assume recycled water is not available for irrigation, toilet flushing, and other non-potable uses. The domestic water demand with the use of recycled water is shown in **Table 4.9-2**. As can be seen from **Table 4.9-1**, the total average day demand for potable water, without water recycling, is estimated to be 380,000 gallons per day (gpd). It is projected that a total of 4.0 acres of landscaping would be installed with an average water demand of 5,000 gpd/acre. Therefore, a total water demand of 20,000 gpd is assumed for irrigation purposes. The recommended water supply is the average day demand of domestic water plus landscape irrigation demand.

**TABLE 4.9-1**  
ESTIMATED WATER DEMANDS WITHOUT RECYCLED WATER (GPD)  
– ALTERNATIVE A

Water Demands	Alternative A
Weekday Day	346,000
Weekend Day	464,000
Average Day Demand <sup>1</sup>	380,000
Average Day Landscape Irrigation <sup>2</sup>	20,000
<b>Recommended Water Supply<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>400,000</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Water demands = wastewater flows/0.95.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated at average daily demand of 5,000 gpd/acre landscaping. Type and acreage of landscaping assumed.

<sup>3</sup> Recommended water supply = average day demand plus landscape irrigation.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

**TABLE 4.9-2**  
ESTIMATED WATER DEMANDS WITH RECYCLED WATER (GPD)  
– ALTERNATIVE A

Site Layout Alternative	Alternative A
Average Day Water Demand <sup>1</sup>	400,000
Recycled Water Demand	127,000
Recommended Domestic Water Supply <sup>2</sup>	273,000

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> 5/7 weekday + 2/7 weekend day.

<sup>2</sup> Recommended supply = average day domestic water minus recycled water.

Water demands rounded to the nearest 100 gpd.

Recycled water demand includes toilet flushing and process water.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

As described in **Section 2.0**, the Proposed Action would include dual plumbed fixtures to use recycled water for toilet flushing and for irrigation purposes should on-site wastewater treatment be chosen.

The proposed water storage tanks for domestic and recycled water would provide sufficient storage to accommodate the estimated peak flow demand (464,000 gpd). During weekday flows when the demand is less than the average day demand, water storage tanks would be filled to provide weekend reserves. The average day demand is used to establish the water supply required from on- or off-site sources.

### ***Water Facilities***

The following discusses preliminary water supply, water treatment, water storage, and pumping requirements to supply the proposed development.

#### *Groundwater Wells*

The California Department of Water Resources has records for 259 water production wells within 2 miles of the Madera Site. The wells range in depth from approximately 120 feet to over 700 feet. The new on-site well(s) would be drilled to a depth of at least 600 feet. Groundwater quality is generally good, but manganese levels tend to increase with depth in the vicinity of the Madera site.

#### *City of Madera Domestic Water Service*

The City of Madera's nearest water well is well No. 26, located at Airport Drive. This well is approximately 600 feet deep and has a capacity of approximately 1,300 gpm. The City uses this well for standby and fire flow demands. Municipal Well No. 25, approximately a half-mile southeast of the airport, supplies the airport's water and has a production capacity of approximately 2,200 gpm. Connection to the City's water supply would require a looped system to the well, utilizing a new on-site well for primary and continuous water supply. Well No. 26 would continue to be used for redundancy and fire flow capacity in the looped system. An on-site storage tank may also be required to supplement redundancy and fire flow.

#### *Water Storage and Pump Station*

An on-site water storage tank would be required to store water produced by any on-site wells. The anticipated capacity requirements of the tank are summarized in **Table 4.9-3** below. The tank would be made of welded steel construction, meeting all American Water Works Association (AWWA) specifications for welded steel tanks. The tank would be cylindrical and could be partially or completely constructed below grade.

**TABLE 4.9-3**  
DOMESTIC WATER STORAGE REQUIREMENTS WITH RECYCLED WATER  
– ALTERNATIVE A

Site Layout Alternative	Alternative A
Domestic Water Storage (gallons) <sup>1</sup>	651,000
Fire Suppression (gallons) <sup>2</sup>	500,000
Domestic Water Storage Tank Capacity (gallons) <sup>3</sup>	1,151,000
Recommended Approximate Domestic Water Storage Tank Capacity (gallons) <sup>4</sup>	1,200,000

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> 2.0 times the weekend day water demand if water is recycled.  
<sup>2</sup> Assumed storage required.  
<sup>3</sup> Domestic water storage plus fire suppression.  
<sup>4</sup> Rounded up to the nearest common tank size increment.  
Water demands rounded up to the nearest 1,000 gal.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

Because the Madera site is relatively flat, construction of a pump station would be required to maintain appropriate water pressure throughout the on-site distribution system and convey water from the storage tank to project facilities. Flow requirements would be satisfied by two fixed-speed high-service pumps that would each pump half the capacity of the project flow requirements.

#### ***Effects to Public Water Utilities***

As noted above, water to supply Alternative A would be provided by on-site well water. Development of a City of Madera looped system would require the construction of water conveyance infrastructure from the City's nearest facilities. During operation of the casino, it is expected that 278 gpm, without recycled water, and 190 gpm with recycled water, would be required to adequately meet the water demands of Alternative A. Since water supply for Alternative A would be supplied either wholly from on-site wells or from an on-site well in combination with City Well No. 26 (used solely during maintenance of the primary on-site well or for fire flow), a reduction in available capacity of the City's water facilities would not occur. In addition, the Tribe would be required to pay for the cost of constructing the piping and related facilities required to create a looped system with the City. Therefore, Alternative A's effect on public water utilities would be less than significant.

#### ***WASTEWATER***

**Tables 4.9-4 and 4.9-5** provide estimated wastewater flows and resulting wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) design capacity for Alternative A. The use of recycled water would reduce the overall treated effluent disposal requirements, however use of recycled water would only be possible with use of an on-site WWTP. The following discussion evaluates impacts to public

services from wastewater treatment and disposal options. The on-site options include sprayfield disposal, leachfield disposal, combination sprayfield/leachfield disposal, surface water discharge, and water reuse and are described in **Section 2.2.7**. These options would have no effect on local public service providers because they would be fully paid for and operated by the Tribe on-site. Off-site disposal options include connection to the City of Madera WWTP.

**TABLE 4.9-4**  
ESTIMATED WASTEWATER FLOWS FOR ALTERNATIVE A

	Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	Unit (gpd/ft <sup>2</sup> )	Base Flow (gpd)	Typical Weekday Flows (gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Typical Weekend Flows (gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Average Day Flows (gpd) <sup>2</sup>
Casino	121,630	1.25	151,700	87,200	128,900	99,100
Back of House	50,000	1.37	68,500	27,400	41,400	31,400
Retail	1,185	0.01	12	5	9	8
Food and Beverage	67,365	1.56	105,200	50,700	89,500	61,800
Entertainment/Lounge	7,000	0.54	3,780	1,500	2,400	1,800
Hotel	207,680	0.16	32,700	16,100	31,600	20,500
Pool and Spa	16,850	0.35	4,320	1,800	3,700	2,400
Central Plant/Cooling Towers	21,300	3.10	66,000	49,500	49,500	49,500
<b>Total<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>493,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>432,000</b>	<b>230,000</b>	<b>350,000</b>	<b>270,000</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Used for calculation purposes only.

<sup>2</sup> Average day Flows = 5/7 weekday + 2/7 weekend.

<sup>3</sup> Wastewater flows rounded to the nearest 10,000 gpd.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

**TABLE 4.9-5**  
DESIGN WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT FLOWS  
– ALTERNATIVE A

Site Layout Alternative	Alternative A Flows (GPD)
Weekday Day	230,000
Weekend Day	350,000
Average Day <sup>1</sup>	270,000
Recycled Water Demand	107,000
Average Day Disposal Flows <sup>2</sup>	163,000

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> 5/7 weekday + 2/7 weekend day.

<sup>2</sup> Wastewater flow minus recycled water.

Wastewater flows rounded to the nearest 100 gpd.

Estimated from similar facilities.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

Development of an on-site wastewater treatment plant would produce treated effluent meeting NPDES requirements and Title 22 disinfected tertiary recycled water treatment standards. Additionally, wastewater would be treated to ensure compliance with all applicable discharge

limitations of a NPDES permit for surface discharge of treated effluent to waters of the U.S. On-site wastewater treatment and disposal options would not impact public services. Given the high quality of effluent that would be discharged from an on-site WWTP, no significant water quality degradation would occur (see **Section 4.3.1**) and thus indirect effects to downstream public water users and dischargers would be less than significant.

The 7.0-MGD capacity City WWTP currently has an average demand of 5.7 MGD. Planned expansion of the treatment plant would increase the WWTP's maximum capacity to 10.1 MGD. The expansion would provide the City with sufficient capacity until 2023. Alternative A would require approximately 0.27 MGD of treatment capacity. While the City has available capacity to accept wastewater from the casino-hotel, obtaining City of Madera sewer service would require connection to the City sewer lines. An additional sewer line would be needed as well as potential expansion of existing lift stations. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### ***SOLID WASTE***

##### ***Construction***

Construction of Alternative A would result in a temporary increase in waste generation. Potential solid waste streams from construction would include the following:

- Paper, wood, glass, and plastics from packing materials, waste lumber, insulation, and empty non-hazardous chemical containers;
- Excess concrete; and
- Excess metal, including steel from welding/cutting operations, packing materials, and empty non-hazardous chemical containers, and aluminum from packing materials and electrical wiring.

Waste that cannot be recycled would be disposed of at the Fairmead Landfill, which accepts construction/demolition materials. This impact would be considered temporary and not significant. Nonetheless an additional mitigation measure as discussed in **Section 5.2.8** would further reduce effects to the landfill.

##### ***Operation***

The California Integrated Waste Management Board has estimated waste disposal rates for the operation of various business types and residences. The business rates are expressed as tons per employee per year. The waste generation resulting from Alternative A's various components is estimated to be 7.6 tons per day (**Table 4.9-6**).

Solid waste services are expected to be provided by the City or County of Madera, which are subject to the state's recycling requirements. The development would not affect City or County diversion goals as waste from Tribal land is classified as out-of-state waste and is not calculated in local waste diversion statistics. The Alternative A development's solid waste generation would represent approximately 1.5% of the Fairmead Landfill's remaining daily capacity, which is well within capacity and is therefore less than significant. Mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8** to further ensure a reduction in the amount of waste that is landfilled.

**TABLE 4.9-6**  
SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ESTIMATE – ALTERNATIVE A

Employment Category	Number of Jobs	Business Type	Rate (Tons/Employee/Year)	Tons per Year	Tons per Day
Gaming	405	38 <sup>1</sup>	0.9	364.5	1.0
Hotel	72	32 <sup>2</sup>	2.1	151.2	0.41
Food and Beverage	502	29 <sup>3</sup>	3.1	1556.2	4.3
Other Dept.	144	33 <sup>4</sup>	1.7	244.8	0.67
Entertainment	6	33	1.7	93.5	0.26
Administrative	55	33	1.7	95.2	0.26
Marketing	56	33	1.7	10.2	0.028
Maintenance	105	33	1.7	178.5	0.49
Security	90	38	0.9	81	1.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>1435</b>			<b>2775.1</b>	<b>7.6</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Includes SIC code 79 Amusement and Recreation Services.

<sup>2</sup> Includes SIC code 70 Hotels.

<sup>3</sup> Includes SIC code 58 Eating and Drinking Places.

<sup>4</sup> Includes SIC code 73 Business Services.

SOURCE: CIWMB, 2005; AES, 2005.

### ***ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS SERVICES***

PG&E is the electricity and natural gas provider in the vicinity of the Madera site. The Madera site would be served from the existing overhead electric facilities extending east/west along Avenue 17. Additionally, PG&E could provide natural gas service via the distribution pressure gas lines stepped down from the transmission gas facilities that extend north/south between Golden State Boulevard and Highway 99, located adjacent to the Madera site. PG&E has adequate facilities and is willing to serve the Madera site (Barrow, pers. comm., 2005), thus the impact to electric facilities is less than significant.

### ***TELECOMMUNICATIONS***

SBC has facilities located along Avenue 18 on the south side of the street and Road 23 on the east side of the street. SBC also has a cable along Golden State Boulevard north of Avenue 17. SBC is responsible for providing service connection to the property line, most likely two 4-inch diameter conduits. The developer is responsible for any on-site infrastructure required to meet the SBC connection at the property boundary (Olivo, pers. comm., 2005). There are no capacity

issues with telecommunications services in the area; thus, the impact would be less than significant.

***PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY***

***Law Enforcement***

Development of Alternative A would increase calls for service to law enforcement agencies due to the new resident population created by new employees moving to Madera County and the City of Madera. Operations of Alternative A would also increase calls for service due to the increased patron/employee population at the Madera site.

***New Residents***

The new resident population is estimated to be 836 new residents. Of these new residents, 418 would reside in the City of Madera and 418 would reside in Madera County (**Section 4.7**). Those residents residing in the City of Madera would increase demands on the City of Madera Police Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the City for police services would be \$46,001. Revenues to the City exceed costs to the City as shown in **Section 4.7**. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.

New residents residing in unincorporated areas of Madera County would increase demands on the Madera County Sheriff's Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the County for Sheriff Department services would total \$23,458. Additionally, judicial services and correctional services for new residents are estimated at \$12,356 and \$45,144, respectively (**Section 4.7**). Revenues to the County exceed costs to the County as shown in **Table 4.7-18** of **Section 4.7**. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.

***Operational***

The Madera site is currently within the jurisdiction of the Madera County Sheriff's Department, which would serve Alternative A. Alternative A would increase calls for service due to the development of the site and the new presence of employees and patrons at the site. Research suggests that an increase in crime from the project would result from an increased population at the site and not from casino gambling itself. Data examining the link between casino gambling and crime, including the results of the study by the National Opinion Research Center, is presented in **Section 4.7**. The increased calls for service associated with Alternative A have the potential to increase response times and decrease the level of service provided by the Madera County Sheriff's Department. One deputy sheriff position covering 24 hours/day for 365 days/year requires the hiring of five individuals. Additionally, the Department maintains a ratio of 1 sergeant for every 10 deputies. With these standards, the Sheriff's Department estimates that

Alternative A would require the hiring of an additional five deputies and one-half sergeant to the department. The cost of one-half sergeant and five deputy positions is estimated at \$506,391 (**Appendix R**).

As discussed in **Section 2**, the Tribe has agreed in the MOU to supplement the County's budget for law enforcement with an annual contribution of \$415,000 or contribute an amount equal to the costs of the salary and benefits of one-half a sergeant position and five deputy positions. These additional positions would ensure 24-hour public safety coverage 365 days a year at the proposed casino and hotel, and provide adequate coverage during vacation time, sick time and time off of public safety staff. With the construction of the casino, the department will consider deployment options, including an on-site service office. The Tribe would employ security personnel to provide surveillance of the casino, parking areas, and surrounding grounds. Security guards would carry two-way radios to request and respond to back up or emergency calls. As funding in the MOU would fund Sheriff's Department expectations of increased demands and on-site security would be provided, the impact would be less than significant.

#### *Judicial and Correctional Services*

Increased calls for law enforcement services from Alternative A would impact judicial and correctional services. As outlined in **Table 4.7-18** in **Section 4.7**, the revenues provided by the MOU exceed the costs to the County. Funding for burdens on these services would come from the \$100,000 contribution for additional public safety support and administrative positions and the \$500,000 contribution for the public facilities budget. This impact would be less than significant.

#### *Fire Protection/Emergency Medical Services*

Development of Alternative A would increase calls for service to fire protection services due to the new resident population created by new employees moving to Madera County and the City of Madera. Operations of Alternative A would also increase calls for service due to the increased patron/employee population at the Madera site.

#### *New Residents*

As discussed under law enforcement services, development of Alternative A would result in 836 new residents, of which 418 would reside in the City of Madera and 418 would reside in Madera County. Those residents residing in the City of Madera would increase demands on the City of Madera Fire Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the City for fire services would be \$18,350. Revenues to the City exceed costs to the City as shown in **Table 4.7-19** of **Section 4.7**. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.

New residents residing in unincorporated areas of Madera County would increase demands on the Madera County Fire Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the County would total \$10,947. Revenues to the County exceed costs to the County as shown in **Table 4.7-18** of **Section 4.7**. Thus, this impact would be less than significant.

#### *Construction Effects*

Construction may introduce potential sources of fire to the Madera site. During construction, equipment and vehicles may come in contact with wildland areas and accidentally spark and ignite vegetation. Equipment used during grading and construction activities may also create sparks which could ignite dry grass on the site. This risk, which is similar to those that are found at other construction sites, would pose potentially significant impact to nearby fire departments that could be called to respond. Mitigation measures are described in **Section 5.2.8** that would reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

#### *Operation Effects*

As the site is currently undeveloped, there are few calls for service for fire protection and emergency medical services from the site. Currently the Madera County Fire Department, administered and staffed by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), serves the project site. Development of Alternative A would increase calls for service to the County Fire Department, due to an increased population of employees and patrons on site. Fire protection features, including sprinkler systems and fire-resistant construction, would be incorporated into Alternative A and are discussed in **Section 2.2.2**. The Tribe has committed in the MOU (**Appendix C**) to supplement the County's budget for fire protection service with an annual contribution of \$1,200,000 or contribute an amount equal to the costs of the salary and benefits of three fire captains/fire apparatus engineers and six firefighters/fire apparatus engineer positions. The incorporation of fire protection features and contributions outlined within the MOU would reduce potentially significant operational effects on fire services to a less than significant level.

#### *Food and Water Safety*

Once land is taken into trust, state and local laws and ordinances pertaining to food and water safety for employees and customers would not be applicable to activities on the Madera site. Therefore, there is a concern that food and water safety would be neglected, impacting the health and safety of customers and employees.

All recent (1999 – present) Tribal-State Compacts have required that tribes “adopt and comply with standards no less stringent than state public health standards for food and beverage handling.” The Compacts have required further that tribes “allow inspection of food and beverage services by state or county health inspectors, during normal hours of operation, to assess

compliance with these standards, unless inspections are routinely made by an agency of the United States government to ensure compliance with equivalent standards of the United States Public Health Service.” The recent Compacts have also have required compliance with “standards no less stringent than federal water quality and safe drinking water standards applicable in California.” As with food safety, the Compacts have required that tribes “allow for inspection and testing of water quality by state or county health inspectors, as applicable, during normal hours of operation, to assess compliance with these standards, unless inspections and testing are made by an agency of the United States pursuant to, or by the Tribe under express authorization of, federal law, to ensure compliance with federal water quality and safe drinking water standards.” Violations of these food, beverage, and water quality standards are treated as violations of the Compact. It is assumed that similar standards will be included in the Tribal-State Compact (or procedures issued by the Secretary of the Interior in lieu of a Compact) with the North Fork Tribe.

The Tribe has additionally assured Madera County in its MOU with the County that it would adopt the food and beverage handling provisions and the safe drinking water standards from the 1999 model State compact in the unexpected event that such provisions are not included in the Compact between the North Fork Tribe and the State.

Finally, it should be noted that the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) (in addition to other federal laws) is applicable on trust land. Water quality standards set by the SDWA would be applied to the public water supply at the casino/hotel resort to ensure public safety is protected. The drinking water system in the casino/hotel resort would be regulated as a Non-Transient/Non-Community (NTNC) public water system under the SDWA.

The USEPA has been consulted regarding the proposed NTNC public water system for the casino/hotel resort. After drilling the on-site wells but prior to use of the wells, the USEPA would require schematics of the system showing the well location, storage, any treatment (including disinfection), well construction details and drilling logs, anticipated visitor and employee population numbers, flow rate, and storage capacities. Typically the USEPA will visit the site at least once and perform a walk-through of the entire facility.

Baseline monitoring would be submitted to the USEPA before the public uses the water. Similar NTNC systems have requirements for monthly coliform testing, quarterly lead and copper testing and more extensive testing that is conducted annually. Monitoring requirements for the Alternative A system would likely be similar, but would be determined by the USEPA based on the size of the facility, the anticipated population, and other factors specific to the project. The USEPA would assign a Public Water System Identification Number to the drinking water system and would require the submittal of a monitoring plan for compliance with SDWA standards.

Given that the Tribal-State Compact (or Secretarial procedures) would require compliance with state food and beverage handling standards and that the SDWA would apply to trust land, a significant effect to public health and safety due to inadequate food and water safety precautions would not occur.

**SCHOOLS**

Operation of Alternative A would increase traffic primarily on the roads surrounding the Madera Site and Highway 99. There are no schools within a mile of the project or along Highway 99 where project traffic would be concentrated. As discussed in Section 4.8.2 with the traffic mitigation measures all affected roads would operate at an acceptable level. The impact of traffic on school children’s safety would be less than significant as schools are located away from the primary areas of project-generated traffic and mitigation measures for traffic would ensure that roads and intersections operate at an acceptable service level.

Alternative A would result in a population increase of 836 people with approximately 175 new students. Most students would enter the Madera Unified School District (Appendix R). This is a 1% increase over the current number of students, compared to the normal growth of almost 2.9% per year (500 students). This growth rate is not substantially larger than current expected growth, thus the development of a new school would not be warranted (also see Section 4.7.1). This impact would therefore be less than significant.

**4.9.2 ALTERNATIVE B – REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE**

**WATER SUPPLY**

The methodology used to establish potable water demand for Alternative A was used to establish potable water demand for Alternative B. Please refer to Section 4.9.1 for a description of the methodology. Table 4.9-7 and Table 4.9-8 show the water demand with and without recycled water for Alternative B.

**TABLE 4.9-7**  
ESTIMATED WATER DEMANDS WITHOUT RECYCLED WATER  
– ALTERNATIVE B (GPD)

Water Demands	Alternative B
Weekday Day <sup>1</sup>	211,000
Weekend Day <sup>1</sup>	280,000
Average Day Demand <sup>1</sup>	231,000
Average Day Landscape Irrigation <sup>2</sup>	20,000
<b>Recommended Water Supply<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>251,000</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Water demands = wastewater flows/0.95.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated at average daily demand of 5,000 gpd/acre landscaping. Type and acreage of landscaping assumed.

<sup>3</sup> Recommended water supply = average day demand plus landscape irrigation.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

**TABLE 4.9-8**  
ESTIMATED WATER DEMANDS WITH RECYCLED WATER  
– ALTERNATIVE B (GPD)

Site Layout Alternative	Alternative B
Average Day Water Demand <sup>1</sup>	251,000
Recycled Water Demand	85,000
Recommended Domestic Water Supply <sup>2</sup>	166,000

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> 5/7 \* week day + 2/7 \* weekend day.  
<sup>2</sup> Recommended supply = average day domestic water minus recycled water.  
Water demands rounded to the nearest 100 gpd.  
Recycled water demand includes toilet flushing and process water.  
SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

### ***Water Facilities***

The water supply for Alternative B would be provided by an on-site groundwater well, as described under Alternative A. One million gallons of domestic water storage would be provided to store water produced by on-site well(s) (may not be necessary if a looped system with the City is utilized). The water storage tank would be made of welded steel construction, meeting all American Water Works Association (AWWA) specifications for welded steel tanks. The tank would be cylindrical and could be partially or completely constructed below grade.

Because the Madera site is relatively flat, construction of a pump station would be required to maintain appropriate water pressure throughout the on-site distribution system and convey water from the storage tank to project facilities. Flow requirements would be satisfied by two fixed-speed high-service pumps that would each pump half the capacity of the project flow requirements.

### ***Effects to Public Water Utilities***

As noted above, water to supply Alternative B would be provided by on-site well water. Development of a City of Madera looped system would require the construction of water conveyance infrastructure from the City's nearest facilities. During operation of the casino, it is expected that 174 gpm without recycled water, or 116 gpm, with recycled water, would be required to adequately meet the water demands of Alternative B. Since water supply for Alternative B would be supplied either wholly from on-site wells or from an on-site well in combination with City Well No. 26 (used solely during maintenance of the primary on-site well or for fire flow), a reduction in available capacity of the City's water facilities would not occur. In addition, the Tribe would be required to pay for the cost of constructing the piping and related facilities required to create a looped system with the City. Therefore, Alternative B's effect on public water utilities would be less than significant.

**WASTEWATER**

Tables 4.9-9 and 4.9-10 provide estimated wastewater flows and resulting WWTP design capacity for Alternative B. The use of recycled water would reduce the overall treated effluent disposal requirements, however use of recycled water would only be possible with use of an on-site WWTP. The following discussion evaluates impacts to public services from wastewater treatment and disposal options. The on-site options include sprayfield disposal, leachfield disposal, combination sprayfield/leachfield disposal, surface water discharge, and water reuse and are described in Section 2.3.6. These options would have no effect on local public service providers because they would be fully paid for and operated by the Tribe on-site. Off-site disposal options include connection to the City of Madera WWTP.

**TABLE 4.9-9**  
ESTIMATED WASTEWATER FLOWS FOR ALTERNATIVE B

	Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	Unit (gpd/ft <sup>2</sup> )	Base Flow (gpd)	Typical Weekday Flows (gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Typical Weekend Flows (gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Average Day Flows (gpd) <sup>2</sup>
Casino	90,255	1.02	91,820	52,800	78,100	60,000
Back of House	37,825	1.39	52,420	21,000	31,600	24,000
Retail	1,185	0.01	12	5	9	6
Food and Beverage	53,725	1.46	78,640	37,900	66,800	46,100
Entertainment/Lounge	7,000	0.54	3,7800	1,500	2,400	1,800
Central Plant/Cooling Towers	9,000	4.44	40,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
<b>Total<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>199,000</b>		<b>270,000</b>	<b>140,000</b>	<b>210,000</b>	<b>160,000</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Used for calculation purposes only.

<sup>2</sup> Average Day Flows = 5/7 Weekday + 2/7 Weekend.

<sup>3</sup> Wastewater flows rounded to the nearest 10,000 gpd.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

Development of an on-site wastewater treatment plant would produce treated effluent meeting NPDES requirements and Title 22 disinfected tertiary recycled water treatment standards. Additionally, wastewater would be treated to ensure compliance with all applicable discharge limitations of a NPDES permit for surface discharge of treated effluent to waters of the U.S. On-site wastewater treatment and disposal options would not impact public services. In addition, given the high quality of effluent that would be discharged from an on-site WWTP, no significant water quality degradation would occur (see Section 4.3.2) and thus indirect effects to downstream public water users and dischargers would be less than significant.

Obtaining City of Madera sewer service would require connection to the City sewer lines located approximately five miles southwest of the Madera site. The 7.0-MGD capacity City WWTP currently has an average demand of 5.7 MGD. Planned expansion of the treatment plant would increase the WWTP's maximum capacity to 10.1 MGD. The expansion would provide the City with sufficient capacity until 2023. Alternative B would require approximately 0.16 MGD of

treatment capacity. While the City has available capacity to accept wastewater from the casino-hotel, obtaining City of Madera sewer service would require connection to the City sewer lines. An additional sewer line would be needed as well as potential expansion of existing lift stations. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**TABLE 4.9-10**  
DESIGN WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT FLOWS  
– ALTERNATIVE B

Site Layout Alternative	Alternative B Flows (GPD)
Weekday Day	140,000
Weekend Day	210,000
Average Day <sup>1</sup>	160,000
Recycled Water Demand	65,000
Average Day Disposal Flows	105,000

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> 5/7 \* week day + 2/7 \* weekend day.  
<sup>2</sup> Wastewater flow minus recycled water.  
Wastewater flows rounded to the nearest 100 gpd.  
Estimated from similar facilities.  
SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

### ***SOLID WASTE***

Construction waste from Alternative B would consist of the same materials as those listed under Alternative A. Waste would be disposed of at the Fairmead Landfill. This impact is temporary and not significant.

Based on the number and job types of employees it is estimated that Alternative B would generate 5.2 tons per day of solid waste (**Table 4.9-11**). Solid waste services are expected to be provided by the City or County of Madera, which are subject to the state's recycling requirements. The development would not affect City or County diversion goals as waste from Tribal land is classified as out-of-state waste and is not calculated in local waste diversion statistics. The Alternative B development's solid waste generation would represent approximately 1.04% of the Fairmead Landfill's remaining daily capacity, which is well within capacity and is therefore less than significant. Mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8** to further ensure a reduction in the amount of waste that is landfilled.

### ***ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS SERVICES***

As with Alternative A, the Madera site would be served from the existing overhead electric facilities extending east/west along Avenue 17. Additionally, PG&E could provide natural gas service via the distribution pressure gas lines stepped down from the transmission gas facilities

that extend north/south between Golden State Boulevard and Highway 99, located adjacent to the Madera site. PG&E has adequate facilities and is willing to serve the Madera site (Barrow, pers. comm., 2005), thus the impact to electric facilities is less than significant.

**TABLE 4.9-11**  
SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ESTIMATE – ALTERNATIVE B

Employment Category	Number of Jobs	Business Type	Rate (Tons/Employee/Year)	Tons per Year	Tons per Day
Gaming	319	38	0.9	287.1	0.8
Food and Beverage	349	29	3.1	1,081.9	3.0
Other Dept.	101	33	1.7	171.7	0.5
Administrative	50	33	1.7	85	0.2
Marketing	51	33	1.7	86.7	0.2
Entertainment	6	33	1.7	10.2	0.03
Maintenance	74	33	1.7	125.8	0.3
Security	68	38	0.9	61.2	0.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,018</b>			<b>1,909.6</b>	<b>5.2</b>

SOURCE: CIWMB, 2005; AES, 2005.

### **TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

Alternative B would be served from the same SBC facilities as Alternative A. Depending on final design, Alternative B may require an extension of lines to meet at the Madera site. SBC is responsible for providing service connection to the property line, most likely two 4-inch diameter conduits. The developer is responsible for any on-site infrastructure required to meet the SBC connection at the property boundary (Olivo, pers. comm., 2005). There are no capacity issues with telecommunications services in the area; thus the impact would be less than significant.

### **PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY**

#### **Law Enforcement**

As with Alternative A, development of Alternative B would increase calls for service to law enforcement agencies due to the new resident population and operation of Alternative B facilities.

#### **New Residents**

The new resident population would be 534 new residents. Of these new residents, 267 would reside in the City of Madera and 267 would reside in Madera County (**Section 4.7.1**). Those residents residing in the City of Madera would increase demands on the City of Madera Police Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the City for police services would be \$29,383. Annual costs to the City would exceed revenues as shown in **Table 4.7-32** of **Section 4.7**. Thus, this impact is considered significant. Mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

New residents residing in unincorporated areas of Madera County would increase demands on the Madera County Sheriff's Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the County for Sheriff's Department services would total \$14,984. Additionally, judicial services and correctional services for new residents are estimated at \$7,893 and \$28,836, respectively. Annual costs to the County would exceed revenues as shown in **Table 4.7-31** of **Section 4.7**. Thus, this impact is considered significant. Mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Operational*

As with Alternative A, the Madera site is within the jurisdiction of the Sheriff's Department. Alternative B would require the hiring of five deputies and one-half sergeant, at an estimated cost of \$506,391 (**Section 4.7.1**). This is based on the similar size and operations when compared to Alternative A. Hiring standards and ratios are described under Alternative A. The Tribe does not currently have an agreement to pay for these services under Alternative B. As with Alternative A, the Tribe would employ security personnel for surveillance and patrol onsite; however, even with on-site security there would be increased demands on the Sheriff's Department. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Judicial and Correctional Services*

As with Alternative A, increased calls for law enforcement services would impact judicial and correctional services. However, as outlined in **Section 4.7**, **Table 4.7-31**, annual costs to the County exceed the revenues from taxes. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Fire Protection/Emergency Medical Services*

As with Alternative A, Alternative B would increase calls for service to fire protection services due to the new resident population, construction of facilities, and operation of Alternative B.

#### *New Residents*

As discussed under law enforcement services, development of Alternative B would result in 534 new residents, of which 267 would reside in the City of Madera and 267 would reside in Madera County. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the City for fire services would be \$11,721. Costs to the City would exceed revenues from the project, as shown in **Table 4.7-32** of **Section 4.7**. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

New residents residing in unincorporated areas of Madera County would increase demands on the Madera County Fire Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the County would total \$6,993. Costs to the County exceed revenues from the project, as shown in **Table 4.7-31** of **Section 4.7**. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Construction Effects*

Construction of Alternative B may introduce potential sources of fire to the Madera site as described under Alternative A, but smaller in scale due to less developed acreage. This risk of fire, which is similar to those that are found at other construction sites, would pose potentially significant impacts to nearby fire departments that could be called to respond. Mitigation measures that would reduce the risk of construction fires to a less than significant level are listed in **Section 5.2.8**.

#### *Operation Effects*

Development of Alternative B would increase calls for service to the County Fire Department, due to an increased population of employees and patrons on site. Fire protection features, including sprinkler systems and fire-resistant construction, would be incorporated into Alternative B and are discussed in **Section 2.0**. Nonetheless, additional local fire protection resources would be required to serve Alternative B. Costs to the County exceed revenues from the project, as shown in **Table 4.7-31** of **Section 4.7**. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Food and Water Safety*

Once land is taken into trust, state and local laws and ordinances pertaining to food and water safety for employees and customers would not be applicable to activities on the Madera site. Therefore, there is a concern that food and water safety would be neglected, impacting the health and safety of customers and employees.

Although the terms of the County MOU would not apply, any renegotiated MOU with the County is expected to contain the food and beverage handling and safe drinking water provisions noted under Alternative A. Even if such provisions are not included, given that the Tribal-State Compact (or Secretarial procedures) would require compliance with state food and beverage handling standards and that the SDWA would apply to trust land (as analyzed in more detail under Alternative A), a significant effect to public health and safety due to inadequate food and water safety precautions would not occur.

**SCHOOLS**

As discussed for Alternative A, the impact of traffic on school children's safety would be less than significant as schools are located away from the primary areas of project-generated traffic and mitigation measures for traffic would ensure that roads and intersections operate at an acceptable service level.

Alternative B would result in a population increase of 534 people with approximately 112 new students. Most students would enter the Madera Unified School District (**Appendix R**). This is a 0.6% increase over the current number of students, compared to the normal growth of 2.9% per year (500 students). This growth rate is not substantially larger than current expected growth, thus the development of a new school would not be warranted (also see **Section 4.7.1**). Costs to the County, including the cost for educational services, exceed revenues from Alternative B, as shown in **Section 4.7.1**. Thus, this impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8** that would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**4.9.3 ALTERNATIVE C – RETAIL ALTERNATIVE****WATER SUPPLY**

The methodology used to establish the potable water demand for Alternative A was also used to establish potable water demand for Alternative C. Refer to **Section 4.9.1** for a description of the methodology. **Table 4.9-12** and **Table 4.9-13** show the water demand with and without recycled water for Alternative C.

**TABLE 4.9-12**  
ESTIMATED WATER DEMANDS WITHOUT RECYCLED WATER  
– ALTERNATIVE C (GPD)

<b>Water Demands</b>	<b>Alternative C</b>
Weekday Day	15,000
Weekend Day	25,000
Average Day Demand <sup>1</sup>	18,000
Average Day Landscape Irrigation <sup>2</sup>	5,000
<b>Recommended Water Supply<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>23,000</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Water demands = wastewater flows/0.95.

<sup>2</sup> Estimated at average daily demand of 5,000 gpd/acre landscaping. Type and acreage of landscaping assumed.

<sup>3</sup> Recommended water supply = average day demand plus landscape irrigation.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

**TABLE 4.9-13**  
ESTIMATED WATER DEMANDS WITH RECYCLED WATER  
– ALTERNATIVE C (GPD)

Site Layout Alternative	Alternative C
Average Day Water Demand <sup>1</sup>	23,000
Recycled Water Demand	12,000
Recommended Domestic Water Supply <sup>2</sup>	11,000

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> 5/7 \* week day + 2/7 \* weekend day.  
<sup>2</sup> Recommended supply = average day domestic water minus recycled water.  
Water demands rounded to the nearest 100 gpd.  
Recycled water demand includes toilet flushing and process water.  
SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

### ***Water Facilities***

The water supply for Alternative C would be provided by an on-site groundwater well, as described under Alternative A. One 600,000-gallon domestic water storage tank would be provided to store water produced by on-site well(s) (may not be necessary if a looped system with the City is utilized). The tank would be made of welded steel construction, meeting all AWWA specifications for welded steel tanks. The tank would be cylindrical and could be partially or completely constructed below grade.

Because the Madera site is relatively flat, construction of a pump station would be required to maintain appropriate water pressure throughout the on-site distribution system and convey water from the storage tank to project facilities. Flow requirements would be satisfied by two fixed-speed high-service pumps that would each pump half the capacity of the project flow requirements.

### ***Effects to Public Water Utilities***

As noted above, water to supply Alternative C would be provided by on-site well water. Development of a City of Madera looped system would require the construction of water conveyance infrastructure from the City's nearest facilities. During operation of the casino, it is expected that 16 gpm without recycled water, or 8 gpm, with recycled water, would be required to adequately meet the water demands of Alternative C. Since water supply for Alternative C would be supplied either wholly from on-site wells or from an on-site well in combination with City Well No. 26 (used solely during maintenance of the primary on-site well or for fire flow), a reduction in available capacity of the City's water facilities would not occur. In addition, the Tribe would be required to pay for the cost of constructing the piping and related facilities required to create a looped system with the City. Therefore, Alternative C's effect on public water utilities would be less than significant.

**WASTEWATER**

Tables 4.9-14 and 4.9-15 provide estimated wastewater flows and resulting WWTP design capacity for Alternative C. The use of recycled water would reduce the overall treated effluent disposal requirements, however use of recycled water would only be possible with use of an on-site WWTP. The following discussion evaluates impacts to public services from wastewater treatment and disposal options. The on-site options include sprayfield disposal, leachfield disposal, combination sprayfield/leachfield disposal, surface water discharge, and water reuse and are described in Section 2.4.6. These options would have no effect on local public service providers because they would be fully paid for and operated by the Tribe on-site. Off-site disposal options include connection to the City of Madera WWTP.

**TABLE 4.9-14**  
ESTIMATED WASTEWATER FLOWS FOR ALTERNATIVE C

	Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	Unit (gpd/ft <sup>2</sup> )	Base Flow (gpd)	Typical Weekday Flows (gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Typical Weekend Flows (gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Average Day Flows (gpd) <sup>2</sup>
Retail	225,000	0.12	27,700	11,100	17,300	12,900
Food and Beverage	12,000	0.63	7,500	3,600	6,400	4,400
<b>Total<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>237,000</b>		<b>35,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>24,000</b>	<b>17,000</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Used for calculation purposes only.

<sup>2</sup> Average day flows = 5/7 Weekday + 2/7 Weekend.

<sup>3</sup> Wastewater flows rounded to the nearest 10,000 gpd.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

**TABLE 4.9-15**  
DESIGN WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT FLOWS  
– ALTERNATIVE C

Site Layout Alternative	Alternative C Flows (GPD)
Weekday Day	15,000
Weekend Day	24,000
Average Day <sup>1</sup>	17,000
Recycled Water Demand	5,000
Average Day Disposal Flows <sup>2</sup>	12,000

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> 5/7 weekday + 2/7 weekend day.

<sup>2</sup> Wastewater flow minus recycled water.

Wastewater flows rounded to the nearest 100 gpd.

Estimated from similar facilities.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

Development of an on-site wastewater treatment plant would produce treated effluent meeting NPDES requirements and Title 22 disinfected tertiary recycled water treatment standards. Additionally, wastewater would be treated to ensure compliance with all applicable discharge

limitations of a NPDES permit for surface discharge of treated effluent to waters of the U.S. On-site wastewater treatment and disposal options would not impact public services. In addition, given the high quality of effluent that would be discharged from an on-site WWTP, no significant water quality degradation would occur (see Section 4.3.3) and thus indirect effects to downstream public water users and dischargers would be less than significant.

Obtaining City of Madera sewer service would require connection to the City sewer lines located approximately five miles southwest of the Madera site. The 7.0-MGD capacity City WWTP currently has an average demand of 5.7 MGD. Planned expansion of the treatment plant would increase the WWTP’s maximum capacity to 10.1 MGD. The expansion would provide the City with sufficient capacity until 2023. Alternative C would require approximately 0.017 MGD of treatment capacity. While the City has available capacity to accept wastewater from the casino-hotel, obtaining City of Madera sewer service would require connection to the City sewer lines. An additional sewer line would be needed as well as potential expansion of existing lift stations. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in Section 5.2.8. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

**SOLID WASTE**

Construction waste from Alternative C would consist of the same materials as those listed under Alternative A. Waste would be disposed of at the Fairmead Landfill. This impact is temporary and not significant.

Based on the number and job types of employees, it is estimated that Alternative C would generate 1.3 tons per day of solid waste (Table 4.9-16). Solid waste services are expected to be provided by the City or County of Madera, which are subject to the state’s recycling requirements. The development would not affect City or County diversion goals as waste from Tribal land is classified as out-of-state waste and is not calculated in local waste diversion statistics. The Alternative C development’s solid waste generation would represent approximately 0.26% of the Fairmead Landfill’s remaining daily capacity, which is well within capacity and is therefore less than significant. Mitigation is provided in Section 5.2.8 to further ensure a reduction in the amount of waste that is landfilled.

**TABLE 4.9-16**  
SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ESTIMATE – ALTERNATIVE C

Employment Category	Number of Jobs	Business Type	Rate (Tons/Employee/Year)	Tons per Year	Tons per Day
Retail	695	26 <sup>1</sup>	0.3	208.5	0.6
Food and Beverage	80	29 <sup>2</sup>	3.1	248	0.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>775</b>			<b>456.5</b>	<b>1.3</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Includes SIC code 26 Retail Trade – General Merchandise Stores.

<sup>2</sup> Includes SIC code 58 Eating and Drinking Places.

SOURCE: AES, 2006; CIWMB, 2005.

***ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS SERVICES***

As with Alternative A, the Madera site would be served from the existing overhead electric facilities extending east/west along Avenue 17. Additionally, PG&E could provide natural gas service via the distribution pressure gas lines stepped down from the transmission gas facilities that extend north/south between Golden State Boulevard and Highway 99, located adjacent to the Madera site. PG&E has adequate facilities and is willing to serve the Madera site (Barrow, pers. comm., 2005), thus the impact to electric facilities is less than significant.

***TELECOMMUNICATIONS***

Alternative C would be served from the same SBC facilities as Alternative A. Depending on final design, Alternative C may require an extension of lines to meet at the Madera site. SBC is responsible for providing service connection to the property line, most likely two 4-inch diameter conduits to the street. The developer is responsible for any on-site infrastructure required to meet the SBC connection at the property boundary (Olivo, pers. comm., 2005). There are no capacity issues with telecommunications services in the area; thus the impact would be less than significant. Exact on-site infrastructure for Alternative C will be determined upon approval of the final construction plans.

***PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY***

***Law Enforcement***

Development of Alternative C would increase calls for service to law enforcement agencies due to the new resident population and operation of Alternative C facilities.

***New Residents***

The new resident population is estimated to be 388 new residents. Of these new residents, 194 would reside in the City of Madera and 194 would reside in Madera County (**Section 4.7.1**). Those residents residing in the City of Madera would increase demands on the City of Madera Police Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the City for police services would be \$21,350. Annual costs to the City would exceed revenues as shown in **Table 4.7-44** of **Section 4.7.1**. Thus, this impact is considered significant. Mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

New residents residing in unincorporated areas of Madera County would increase demands on the Madera County Sheriff's Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the County for Sheriff's Department services would total \$10,887. Additionally, judicial services and correctional services for new residents are estimated at \$5,735 and \$20,952, respectively. Annual costs to the County would exceed revenues as shown in **Table 4.7-43** of **Section 4.7**. Thus, this impact is considered significant.

Mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

*Operation*

Under Public Law 280, the State of California and other local law enforcement agencies have enforcement authority over criminal activities on Tribal land. The Madera County Sheriff's Department would provide law enforcement services to Alternative C. Alternative C would result in fewer calls for service for public safety-related incidences than the other alternatives. This reduction is due to the fact that fewer visitors would access the facility and the hours of operation would be reduced. However, calls for service and the need for law enforcement presence would still increase on the property due to the development of land currently undeveloped. In other retail centers, often a deputy is staffed on a full-time basis to handle events on the property including car theft, shoplifting, disorderly conduct, and emergency situations. It is estimated that operation of Alternative C would require the hiring of as many as five deputies and one-half sergeant, at an estimated cost of \$506,391 (**Section 4.7.1**). Hiring standards and ratios are described under Alternative A. As there is no agreement for funding of these services, the impact to the department is considered significant. Mitigation measures have been included in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

*Judicial and Correctional Services*

Increased calls for law enforcement services would impact judicial and correctional services. As the level of criminal activity would be lower than for Alternative A due to size, and the types of crimes would not be expected to be particularly complex, less work is projected under this alternative for the judicial system. As outlined in **Section 4.7, Table 4.7-43**, annual costs to the County exceed the revenues from taxes. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

***Fire Protection/Emergency Medical Services***

Alternative C would increase calls for service to fire protection services due to new resident population, construction of facilities, and operation of Alternative C.

*New Residents*

As discussed under law enforcement services, development of Alternative C would result in 288 new residents, of which 194 would reside in the City of Madera and 194 would reside in Madera County. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the City for fire services would be \$8,517. Costs to the City exceed revenues from the project, as shown in **Table 4.7-44 of Section 4.7**. This impact is considered

significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

New residents residing in unincorporated areas of Madera County would increase demands on the Madera County Fire Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the County would total \$5,081. Costs to the County exceed revenues from the project as shown in **Table 4.7-43** of **Section 4.7**. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Construction Effects*

Construction of Alternative C would introduce potential sources of fire to the Madera site that are similar to those described under Alternative A, but smaller in scale due to less developed acreage. This risk of fire, which is similar to those that are found at other construction sites, would pose potentially significant impacts to nearby fire departments that could be called to respond. Mitigation measures that would reduce the risk of construction fires to a less than significant level are listed in **Section 5.2.8**.

#### *Operation Effects*

As a large retail facility, Alternative C would have a reduced demand on fire protection services when compared with the other development alternatives. Alternative C would result in fewer calls for service for medical-related and fire-related incidences than the other alternatives. This reduction is due to fewer visitors to the facility and shorter hours of operation. There is currently no fire station that can respond within the County's response goal of 4 minutes.

According to Division Chief Paul Helm, Alternative C would still require a new fire station and fire truck. Due to the height of buildings, an aerial apparatus would not be required. The cost of a fire protection facility and fire truck would be approximately \$1,575,000. Operation of the station would require 3 fire captains, 3 fire engineers, and 12 volunteers as discussed under Alternative B. The cost of these positions, volunteer fees, and equipment sets would total \$480,570 annually (**Section 4.7.1**). As there is no current agreement for providing these services under Alternative C, the impact is considered significant. Mitigation measures that would fund these services are listed in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Food and Water Safety*

Once land is taken into trust, state and local laws and ordinances pertaining to food and water safety for employees and customers would not be applicable to activities on the Madera site. Therefore, there is a concern that food and water safety would be neglected, impacting the health and safety of customers and employees. Given that the SDWA would apply to trust land (as

analyzed in more detail under Alternative A), a significant impact to public health and safety due to inadequate water safety precautions would not occur.

Although the terms of the County MOU would not apply, any renegotiated MOU with the County is expected to contain the food and beverage handling and safe drinking water provisions noted under Alternative A. However, if such terms were not included in a renegotiated MOU or the MOU was not renegotiated, a potentially significant effect to public health could occur if Tribal food and beverage handling standards were inadequate. Mitigation measures contained in **Section 5.2.8** would ensure this effect is mitigated to a less than significant level.

### ***SCHOOLS***

As discussed for Alternative A, the impact of traffic on school children's safety would be less than significant as schools are located away from the primary areas of project-generated traffic and mitigation measures for traffic would ensure that roads and intersections operate at an acceptable service level.

Alternative C would result in a population increase of 388 people with approximately 81 new students entering the Madera Unified School District. This is a 0.5% increase over the current number of students and normal growth is 2.9% per year (500 students). This growth rate is not substantially larger than current expected growth, thus the development of a new school would not be warranted (also see **Section 4.7.1**). Costs to the County, including the cost for educational services, exceed revenues from Alternative C, as shown in **Section 4.7.1**. Thus, this impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8** that would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

## **4.9.4 ALTERNATIVE D – NORTH FORK LOCATION**

### ***WATER SUPPLY***

The methodology used to establish potable water demand for Alternative A was used to establish potable water demand for Alternative D. Refer to **Section 4.9.1** for a description of the methodology. **Table 4.9-17** and **Table 4.9-18** show the water demand with and without recycled water for Alternative D.

### ***Water Facilities***

The water supply for Alternative D would be provided by groundwater wells or be supplied from the Madera County Maintenance District 8A. The County of Madera assessed the groundwater conditions in eastern Madera County (County of Madera, 2002). The study found that the overall water balance and current water demands in the foothill region suggest that a sufficient quantity of water is available on a regional basis to meet current demands and support some future development. The study included a detailed review 1,492 well log records in the foothill region.

The median well yield is 8.5 gpm and average well yield is 22 gpm. These well yields are based on drillers initial airlift tests, so actual production may be lower. Well yields should be confirmed by means of a 72-hour pumping test.

**TABLE 4.9-17**  
ESTIMATED WATER DEMANDS WITHOUT RECYCLED WATER  
– ALTERNATIVE D (GPD)

Water Demands	Alternative D
Weekday Day	19,000
Weekend Day	30,000
Average Day Demand <sup>1</sup>	22,000
Average Day Landscape Irrigation <sup>2</sup>	5,000
<b>Recommended Water Supply<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>27,000</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Water demands = wastewater flows/0.95.  
<sup>2</sup> Estimated at average daily demand of 5,000 gpd/acre landscaping. Type and acreage of landscaping assumed.  
<sup>3</sup> Recommended water supply = average day demand plus landscape irrigation.  
 SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

Should water supply be provided by the District, a 600,000-gallon domestic water storage tank would be provided for fire suppression needs. Because the topography of the North Fork site varies, it may be necessary to construct a pump station if the proposed storage tank cannot be placed in a location suitable to provide pressurized flow.

**TABLE 4.9-18**  
ESTIMATED WATER DEMANDS WITH RECYCLED WATER  
– ALTERNATIVE D (GPD)

Site Layout Alternative	Alternative D
Average Day Water Demand <sup>1</sup>	27,000
Recycled Water Demand	13,000
Recommended Domestic Water Supply <sup>2</sup>	14,000

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> 5/7 \* week day + 2/7 \* weekend day.  
<sup>2</sup> Recommended supply = average day domestic water minus recycled water.  
 Water demands rounded to the nearest 100 gpd.  
 Recycled water demand includes toilet flushing and process water.  
 SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

**Effects to Public Water Facilities**

Water to supply Alternative D could be provided by either well water or the Madera County Maintenance District 8A. Development of an off-site water supply source would require the construction of water conveyance infrastructure from the North Fork site to the nearest County facilities. During operation of the casino, it is expected that 19 gpm without recycled water, and

10 gpm with recycled water, would be required to be extracted from on-site water wells. While the District has capacity to serve the project, the addition of Alternative D would introduce an unplanned water demand to the overall water supply system. Because adequate water is available from the County, and the Tribe would pay for all infrastructure upgrades required to serve the site, there would be no significant impact to water supply services.

#### WASTEWATER

Tables 4.9-19 and 4.9-20 provide estimated wastewater flows and resulting WWTP design capacity for Alternative D. The use of recycled water would reduce the overall treated effluent disposal requirements, however use of recycled water would only be possible with use of an on-site WWTP. The following discussion evaluates impacts to public services from wastewater treatment and disposal options. The on-site options include sprayfield disposal, leachfield disposal, combination sprayfield/leachfield disposal, surface water discharge, and water reuse and are described in Section 2.5.6. These options would have no effect on local public service providers because they would be fully paid for and operated by the Tribe on-site.

Development of an on-site wastewater treatment plant would produce treated effluent meeting NPDES requirements and Title 22 disinfected tertiary recycled water treatment standards. Additionally, wastewater would be treated to ensure compliance with all applicable discharge limitations of a NPDES permit for surface discharge of treated effluent to waters of the U.S. On-site wastewater treatment and disposal options would not impact public services. In addition, given the high quality of effluent that would be discharged from an on-site WWTP, no significant water quality degradation would occur (see Section 4.3.4) and thus indirect effects to downstream public water users and dischargers would be less than significant.

**TABLE 4.9-19**  
ESTIMATED WASTEWATER FLOWS FOR ALTERNATIVE D

	Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	Unit (gpd/ft <sup>2</sup> )	Base Flow (gpd)	Typical Weekday Flows (gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Typical Weekend Flows (gpd) <sup>1</sup>	Average Day Flows (gpd) <sup>2</sup>
Casino	15,451	1.00	15,500	8,900	13,180	10,130
Back of House	6,000	1.18	7,050	2,820	4,260	3,230
Food and Beverage	4,550	2.87	13,050	6,280	11,090	7,660
<b>Total<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>26,000</b>		<b>36,000</b>	<b>18,000</b>	<b>29,000</b>	<b>21,000</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Used for calculation purposes only.

<sup>2</sup> Average day flows = 5/7 weekday + 2/7 weekend.

<sup>3</sup> Wastewater flows rounded to the nearest 10,000 gpd.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

**TABLE 4.9-20**  
DESIGN WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT FLOWS  
– ALTERNATIVE D

Site Layout Alternative	Alternative D Flows (GPD)
Weekday Day	18,000
Weekend Day	29,000
Average Day <sup>1</sup>	21,000
Recycled Water Demand	8,000
Average Day Disposal Flows <sup>2</sup>	13,000

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> 5/7 weekday + 2/7 weekend day.  
<sup>2</sup> Wastewater flow minus recycled water.  
Wastewater flows rounded to the nearest 100 gpd.  
Estimated from similar facilities.

SOURCE: HSE, 2006; AES, 2006.

Off-site disposal options include connection to the Madera County WWTP for the community of North Fork. Obtaining County sewer service would require connection to the County sewer lines located approximately one mile northwest of the North Fork site. The 31,000 gpd capacity WWTP plant is currently near maximum capacity and is undergoing an expansion to 60,000 gpd of capacity. By adding the Alternative D wastewater flows to the expanded WWTP, the plant would be near capacity. This impact is significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

### ***SOLID WASTE***

Construction waste from Alternative D would consist of the same materials as those listed under Alternative A. Waste would be disposed of at the Fairmead Landfill. This impact is temporary and not significant.

Based on the number and job types of employees it is estimated that Alternative D would generate 0.79 tons per day of solid waste (**Table 4.9-21**). Solid waste services are expected to be provided by the City or County of Madera, which are subject to the state's recycling requirements. The development would not affect City or County diversion goals as waste from Tribal land is classified as out-of-state waste and is not calculated in local waste diversion statistics. The Alternative D development's solid waste generation would represent approximately 0.16% of the Fairmead Landfill's remaining daily capacity, which is well within capacity and is therefore less than significant. Mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8** to further ensure a reduction in the amount of waste that is landfilled.

### ***ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS SERVICES***

PG&E is the company that provides electricity service in the vicinity of the North Fork site. PG&E has an existing overhead electric 12-kilovolt line near Road 225 and Rainbow Road.

PG&E has indicated that they would provide service to the site upon acceptance of application and the required site plans. The service would be installed under PG&E's existing tariffs, Rules 15 and 16, on file with the Public Utilities Commission (Barrow, pers. comm., 2005). PG&E has

**TABLE 4.9-21**  
SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ESTIMATE – ALTERNATIVE D

<b>Employment Category</b>	<b>Number of Jobs</b>	<b>Business Type</b>	<b>Rate (Tons/Employee/Year)</b>	<b>Tons per Year</b>	<b>Tons per Day</b>
Gaming	62	38 <sup>1</sup>	0.9	55.8	0.15
Food and Beverage	49	29 <sup>2</sup>	3.1	151.9	0.42
Other Dept	12	33	1.7	20.4	0.06
Administrative	16	33	1.7	27.2	0.07
Marketing	4	33	1.7	6.8	0.02
Maintenance	9	33	1.7	15.3	0.04
Security	10	38	0.9	9	0.03
<b>Total</b>	<b>162</b>			<b>286.4</b>	<b>0.79</b>

NOTES: <sup>1</sup> Business Type 38 Includes SIC code 73 Business Services.

<sup>2</sup> Business Type 29 Includes SIC code 58 Eating and Drinking Places.

SOURCE: CIWMB, 2005; AES, 2006.

adequate facilities and is willing to serve the North Fork site (Barrow, pers. comm., 2005), thus the impact to electric facilities is less than significant.

There are no natural gas facilities in the vicinity of the North Fork site (Barrow, pers. comm., 2005). The project would utilize solely electric appliances or propane. Implementation of Alternative D is expected to result in a less than significant effect to electric and natural gas services.

### ***TELECOMMUNICATIONS***

In order for the Ponderosa Telephone Company to provide telecommunication service to the North Fork site, an extension would be necessary to extend fiber cable from Road 225 along Rainbow Drive. Infrastructure would include fiber cable from Road 225 plus a cabinet on site (Westfall, pers. comm., 2005). Ponderosa Telephone Company could provide service and the Tribe would be required to fund the extension of the cable, so the impact is less than significant.

### ***PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY***

#### ***Law Enforcement***

Development of Alternative D would increase calls for service to law enforcement agencies due to the new resident population and operation of Alternative D facilities.

#### ***New Residents***

The new resident population would be 32 new residents. Of these new residents, 12 would reside in the City of Madera and 20 would reside in Madera County (**Section 4.7.1**). Those residents

residing in the City of Madera would increase demands on the City of Madera Police Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the City for police services would be \$1,321. Annual costs to the City would exceed revenues as shown in **Table 4.7-57** of **Section 4.7**. Thus, this impact is considered significant. Mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

New residents residing in unincorporated areas of Madera County would increase demands on the Madera County Sheriff's Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the County for Sheriff's Department services would total \$1,122. Additionally, judicial services and correctional services for new residents are estimated at \$591 and \$2,160, respectively. Annual costs to the County would exceed revenues as shown in **Table 4.7-56** of **Section 4.7**. Thus, this impact is considered significant. Mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Operational*

The North Fork site is within the jurisdiction of the Sheriff's Department. Operation of Alternative D would require the hiring of three deputies and one-half sergeant, at an estimated cost of \$326,503 (**Section 4.7.1**). Assuming that the rate of calls is proportional to the size of the facility, Alternative D would result in fewer calls for sheriff assistance than Alternative A. Fewer calls would require fewer officers to respond to those calls. Hiring standards and ratios are described under Alternative A. The Tribe would employ security personnel for surveillance and patrol on-site; however, even with on-site security there would be increased demands on the Sheriff's Department. The Tribe does not currently have an agreement to pay for Sheriff services under Alternative D. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Judicial and Correctional Services*

As with Alternative A, increased calls for law enforcement services would impact judicial and correctional services. As outlined in **Section 4.7**, **Table 4.7-56**, annual costs to the County exceed the revenues from taxes. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### *Fire Protection/Emergency Medical Services*

As with Alternative A, Alternative D would increase calls for service to fire protection services due to the new resident population, construction of facilities, and operation of Alternative D.

*New Residents*

As discussed under law enforcement services, development of Alternative D would result in 32 new residents, of which 12 would reside in the City of Madera and 20 would reside in Madera County. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the City for fire services would be \$527. Costs to the City exceed revenues from the project, as shown in **Table 4.7-57** of **Section 4.7**. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

New residents residing in unincorporated areas of Madera County would increase demands on the Madera County Fire Department. Based on 2004 per capita expenditures and the number of new residents, it is estimated that the annual cost to the County would total \$524. Costs to the County exceed revenues from the project, as shown in **Table 4.7.56** of **Section 4.7**. This impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8**. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less than significant.

*Construction Effects*

Construction and operation of Alternative D may introduce potential sources of fire to the North Fork site. Although construction would be shorter in duration and take place over a smaller area than Alternative A, the risk of a serious wildfire would be greater due to the density of vegetation and rural residential developments surrounding the North Fork site. This risk of fire, which is similar to those that are found at other construction sites in the Sierra Nevada foothills, would pose a potentially significant impact to nearby fire departments that could be called to respond. Mitigation measures that would reduce the risk of construction fires to a less than significant level are listed in **Section 5.2.8**.

*Operation Effects*

Development of Alternative D would increase calls for service to the County Fire Department, due to an increased population of employees and patrons on site.

Development of Alternative D will increase the calls for service and may decrease the response times in the area. The response times in the vicinity of the North Fork site range from 10 to 15 minutes. It is difficult to quantify the precise affect the increase in calls would have on response times from the station, but qualitatively the increase could be a potentially significant impact. As discussed in **Section 2**, a Tribal security force would provide daily public safety needs of the casino. Mitigation measures listed in **Section 5.2.8** would further the effects from Alternative D on fire protection services in Madera County to a less than significant level.

### ***Food and Water Safety***

Given that the North Fork is already held in trust, state and local laws and ordinances pertaining to food and water safety for employees and customers would not apply to activities on the site. Therefore, there is a concern that food and water safety would be neglected, impacting the health and safety of customers and employees.

Although the terms of the County MOU would not apply, any renegotiated MOU with the County is expected to contain the food and beverage handling and safe drinking water provisions noted under Alternative A. Even if such provisions are not included, given that the Tribal-State Compact (or Secretarial procedures) would require compliance with state food and beverage handling standards and that the SDWA would apply to trust land (as analyzed in more detail under Alternative A), a significant effect to public health and safety due to inadequate food and water safety precautions would not occur.

### ***SCHOOLS***

Operation of Alternative D would increase traffic in the vicinity of the North Fork site including roads near North Fork Elementary School. Three intersections within a mile of the school were analyzed in the traffic study for increased traffic due to development of Alternative D. These intersections are 1) Malum Ridge Road and Road 225, 2) Road 225 and Cascadel Road, and 3) North Fork Road and Auberry Road. These three intersections would continue to operate at the same service levels (TPG Consulting, 2005). As intersections would operate at the same service levels, the impact to school children from increased traffic would be less than significant.

Alternative D would result in a population increase of 32 people with approximately 7 new students. Most students would enter the Chawanakee Unified School District. Due to the smaller number of students generated, a new school would not be warranted. Additional costs, described in **Section 4.7.1**, would be incurred to hire teachers and for other incidental costs of the new students. Costs to the County, including the cost for educational services, exceed revenues from Alternative D, as shown in **Table 4.7-56 of Section 4.7.1**. Thus, this impact is considered significant and mitigation is provided in **Section 5.2.8** that would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

## **4.9.5 ALTERNATIVE E – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

### ***WATER SUPPLY***

Under the No Action Alternative, water supply to the Madera site would not be necessary. No development would take place. Thus, no effect to water supply services would result from the No Action Alternative.

***WASTEWATER***

No wastewater treatment or discharge would be necessary under the No Action Alternative. Thus, no effect to wastewater services would result.

***SOLID WASTE***

No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, the No Action Alternative would not result in solid waste production. Thus, no effect to solid waste services would result from the No Action Alternative.

***ELECTRIC AND NATURAL GAS SERVICES***

No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, the No Action Alternative would not result in effects to electric or natural gas services. The Tribe would not contribute to the expansion of utility service in and around the Madera or North Fork site.

***TELECOMMUNICATIONS***

No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, the No Action Alternative would not result in effects to telecommunication services. The Tribe would not contribute to the expansion of utility service in and around the Madera or North Fork site.

***PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY***

***Law Enforcement***

No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, the No Action Alternative would not result in effects to law enforcement.

***Fire Protection/Emergency Medical Service***

No development would take place under this alternative. Thus, an increased need for fire protection and emergency medical services would not result. Thus, no effects to fire protection or emergency medical services would result from the No Action Alternative.

***Schools***

No development would take place under this alternative. There would be no increased traffic related hazards to school children. An increased demand on school services would not occur. Thus, no effect to school services would result from the No Action Alternative.