

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ENTERPRISE RANCHERIA CASINO AND HOTEL – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) assesses the environmental consequences of the Estom Yumeka Maidu Tribe's (Enterprise Rancheria or Tribe) application to have the Bureau of Indian Affairs take 40 acres into Federal trust and to develop a casino and hotel resort, parking structure, and associated facilities. In addition to the trust acquisition for gaming purposes, the proposed action includes approval by the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC) of a gaming management contract between Yuba County Entertainment (YCE) and the Tribe. The proposed project site (Yuba Site) is located approximately four miles southeast of the Community of Olivehurst, near the intersection of Forty Mile Road and State Route 65, in Yuba County, California. Other development alternatives include a reduced-size casino, non-gaming development, and a reduced-size casino on an alternative site (Butte Site). The Butte Site is approximately 40 acres and is located approximately 11 miles northeast of the City of Oroville, between the middle and south forks of the Feather River, in unincorporated Butte County, California. The effects of these development alternatives and a No Action Alternative are analyzed within this EIS.

ES.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The acquisition of the Yuba Site into Tribal trust status would greatly enhance the Tribe's economic development potential, which is the paramount objective of the Tribe. Implementation of the proposed action would assist the Tribe in meeting the following objectives:

- Restoring trust land to the Tribe in an amount equal to the amount of land previously lost as a result of federal action.
- Provide employment opportunities for tribal members.
- Improve the socioeconomic status of the Tribe by providing a new revenue source that could be utilized to build a strong tribal government, improve existing tribal housing, provide new tribal housing, fund a variety of social, governmental, administrative, educational, health, and welfare services to

- improve the quality of life of tribal members, and to provide capital for other economic development and investment opportunities.
- Allow Tribal members to become economically self-sufficient, thereby eventually removing Tribal members from public-assistance programs.

ES.3 ALTERNATIVES

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

ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

Alternative A consists of placing the 40-acre Yuba Site into Federal trust status and approval of a gaming management contract by the NIGC. The Tribe proposed to develop the site for recreation/tourism by constructing a casino, hotel, and parking structure.

The casino and hotel resort would include a main gaming hall, food and beverage services, retail space, banquet/meeting space, administrative space, pool, and spa. Several food and beverage facilities are planned, including a buffet, casino bars, and two restaurants. The resort would include an eight-story hotel with 170 rooms, a pool area, an exercise room, and an arcade. Approximately 2,750 parking spaces would be provided for the casino/hotel resort, with 600 of those spaces within a multi-level parking structure.

ALTERNATIVE B – REDUCED INTENSITY

Alternative B consists of a smaller-scale version of Alternative A, without a hotel. The design would be similar to Alternative A, but with less total square footage. As with Alternative A, development and operation of the casino would involve trust acquisition of the Yuba Site and approval of a gaming management contract.

ALTERNATIVE C – NON-GAMING USE

Alternative C consists of an amusement park and hotel development. The amusement park would include a water park, two-18 hole miniature golf courses, a restaurant, an arcade, office space, a 10-stall batting cage, a go-cart racetrack and a seven-story, 150-room hotel. The footprint of Alternative C's developed area would be similar to Alternative A. Land would be taken into Federal trust but no casino or gaming facilities would be associated with this alternative.

ALTERNATIVE D – BUTTE COUNTY LOCATION

Alternative D would consist of a much smaller-scale version of Alternative A, except excluding a hotel and would be located on the Butte Site. The gaming facility would include a casino floor, a coffee shop, a service bar, and office space. Under Alternative D, a fee to trust transfer would not occur, but would require approval of a gaming management contract.

ALTERNATIVE E – NO ACTION

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

ES.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The EIS scoping process is an opportunity for public and Federal and State agencies to provide input on the scope of the EIS. The scoping process for this EIS is briefly discussed in **Section 1.4**. A scoping report was published in July 2005, which summarized the comments that were received during the scoping period. The following is a summary of the common areas of controversy raised in the scoping process.

Commenters were concerned with the potential impacts on air quality due to construction and operational emissions and requested quantification of emissions from the development alternatives. Other issues raised included: appropriate air quality model utilization, analysis of customer trip generation numbers, thresholds for determining the significance of impacts, and appropriate mitigation for significant impacts.

Another area of concern in scoping comments was wastewater treatment, disposal, water supply, and water quality. Impacts on utilization of existing wastewater treatment facilities, water quality, and nearby residents were areas of controversy. Several issues related to local surface waters, groundwater, site drainage, and water quality were discussed.

Another area of concern for commenters was the impact on agriculture and geology. Some commenters inquired if the project would result in the reduction of agricultural land or conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance. Commenters requested that the EIS describe the agricultural value of the development site, including value of soils, and

any past or current agricultural uses of the property. Some commenters inquired as to the effects of the project on nearby agricultural properties.

Concerns regarding traffic impacts from the project were also raised during the scoping process. Commenters were concerned about the total daily trips and peak hour trips generated by the alternatives and future levels of service, impacts to roadways and intersections near the alternatives, and traffic including the Sleep Train Amphitheater.

Impacts on vegetation, wildlife, threatened/endangered species, wetlands, and waters of the U.S were discussed during the scoping meeting. Appropriate consultations with federal agencies, compliance with the Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, and Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, wetland delineations, and mitigation for significant impacts were overall issues discussed regarding biological resources.

Commenters requested the EIS discuss impacts to law enforcement services, fire and emergency medical; solid waste disposal capacities; current and proposed wastewater disposal; and impacts on the public school system. Pollution prevention in both construction and operational phases of the Alternatives, compliance with NEPA regulations, and public participation issues were also discussed.

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

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

Table ES-1 also serves to provide a brief, but comprehensive comparison of the environmental impacts of each Alternative. As shown, the No Action Alternative (Alternative E) does not result in most of the negative environmental effects that result from the development alternatives (Alternatives A-D). The No Action Alternative would also not result in the beneficial economic effects that would result from the development alternatives. The Butte Site is remote and biologically and culturally sensitive when compared with the Yuba Site. Among development alternatives on the Yuba Site, Alternative A presents the most intensive development due to its size and trip generation qualities and generally results in greater environmental impacts, both positive and negative, when compared with the other alternatives.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.2 LAND RESOURCES			
<i>Topography</i>			
A Development of Alternative A would result in grading and earthwork of the Yuba site. The site has previously been mechanically leveled for farming. The overall topography of the Yuba site would remain essentially unchanged.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D Extensive grading and earthwork would be required for development of the Butte site. Project design would ensure that the major topographic features would be preserved. Creation of soil stabilization areas with a slope of 2:1 (Appendix F) would not lead to slope instability unless they are improperly designed without erosion control measures, in which case a potentially significant impact would result.	LTS	Creation of soil stabilization areas around the building pad shall be properly compacted and shall be subject to a geotechnical review prior to construction of the areas. Proper hydroseeding, use of straw fiber rolls, and other soil erosion protection measures shall be utilized as part of a comprehensive erosion control plan.	LTS
E No development would take place on the Madera site or on the North Fork site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Soil</i>			
A Soil at the Yuba site is characterized by slow permeability rates, high runoff, high shrink-swell potential, and low erosion potential. Runoff impacts are negligible due to the relatively flat terrain of the Yuba site. The high shrink-swell potential of site soils would require an engineered foundation at the site. A geotechnical report would be prepared and submitted with the working design plans. All engineering recommendations would be adhered to.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D The soils on the Butte site have low shrink-swell potential and potentially high erosion due to steep slopes. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be implemented during construction activities and operation of the proposed project to prevent water quality impacts.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E No development would take place on the Madera site or on the North Fork site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Seismicity</i>			
A An earthquake of at least magnitude 6 can occur anywhere in California. The project design would incorporate Uniform Building Codes required for Seismic Zone 3.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Unlike Alternative A, the Yuba County Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) would not apply nor would a Tribal-State Compact be required. Therefore, Uniform Building Code standards for Seismic Zone 3 may not be in compliance with State and Federal law.	S	The project facilities shall be designed consistent with standards at least as stringent as the Uniform Building Code, including Division IV, which covers earthquake standards.	LTS
D Unlike Alternative A, the Yuba County MOU would not apply to Alternative D. Although it is anticipated that a renegotiated Butte County MOU would contain the Uniform Building Code standards for Seismic Zone 3.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E No development would take place on the Madera site or on the North Fork site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<i>Mineral Resources</i>			
A Alteration in the land use under Alternative A would not result in a loss of economically viable aggregate rock or diminish the extraction of important ores or minerals.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
B Same as Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
C Same as Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
D Same as Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
E No development would take place on the Madera site or on the North Fork site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

4.3 WATER RESOURCES

Surface Water

A The northeast corner of the Yuba site is within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) defined 100-year flood plain. The Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District currently holds an inundation easement on the site. The project buildings would be located outside of the 100-year flood zone at least 3.5 feet above the 100-year flood zone elevation. Parking areas would be designed to flood no deeper than eight inches and drive isles would flood no deeper than 1 foot. The Yuba County building official would determine if the proposed construction is consistent with the need to minimize flood damage and the site of the proposed construction is reasonable safe from flooding. There is a potential safety hazard from flooding if a public notice was not provided in advance of a flood. Alternative A may cause increased stormwater runoff and would increase existing flood storage. The proposed project would occupy approximately 11.5 acre-feet of existing flood storage and the	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe and operator(s) of the on-site developments shall maintain open lines of communication with the State Reclamation Board and the local flood control district to ensure as much notice as possible is given in the event of a pending flood action that affects the site. ▪ Prior to construction, plans shall be made available to the State Reclamation Board for review in order to confirm that storage volumes and conveyance patterns have not changed in a way that conflicts with the terms of the inundation easement. ▪ Reducing surface runoff from the site will prevent increases in downstream flooding. Surface runoff will be minimized by implementing the following measures: Where feasible, all areas outside of buildings and roads shall be kept as permeable surfaces, either as vegetation or high infiltration cover such as mulch, or gravel, or turf block. Pedestrian pathways shall use a permeable surface where possible, such as crushed aggregate or stone with sufficient permeable 	LTS
---	-----	--	-----

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
stormwater detention basins would create 13.8 acre-feet of storage. The construction of stormwater detention basins in the project design would mitigate the loss of flood storage and increased runoff. In addition to the reduction of stormwater runoff through the detention basins, several mitigation measures are recommended to aid in lessening stormwater runoff impacts.		joints (areas between stone or brick if used). Rooftops shall drain to either embedded cisterns or surrounding vegetated areas to maximize infiltration prior to concentrating runoff.	
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
D The Butte site is not within the FEMA 100-year flood zone. Construction of the proposed project would increase impervious surfaces and therefore increase stormwater runoff. The projected increase of stream flow rates downgradient of the project site would be from 1 cubic foot per second (cfs) to 3 cfs. Downstream flooding impacts are considered negligible. However, measures designed to reduce stormwater flows would be incorporated into the proposed project.	LTS	Reducing surface runoff from the site will prevent increases in downstream flooding. Surface runoff will be minimized by implementing the following measures: Where feasible, all areas outside of buildings and roads shall be kept as permeable surfaces, either as vegetation or high infiltration cover such as mulch, or gravel, or turf block. Pedestrian pathways shall use a permeable surface where possible, such as crushed aggregate or stone with sufficient permeable joints (areas between stone or brick if used). Rooftops shall drain to either embedded cisterns or surrounding vegetated areas to maximize infiltration prior to concentrating runoff.	LTS
E The No Action Alternative would not result in any site grading, construction, or new development. Thus, the existing drainage from the Yuba site and Butte site would continue to flow off-site unimpeded. Flooding at the Yuba site would continue during heavy winter storms.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Groundwater			
A On-site groundwater resources would be utilized under Alternative A. The proposed project's demand for groundwater would be approximately 137 acre-feet per year. In addition to the current estimated demand of 150 acre-feet per year from the regional groundwater basin, the overall draft from the regional groundwater	LTS	The Tribe shall implement the following water conservation measures (as applicable to the particular alternative): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Low flow faucets and/or aerators in the hotel; 	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	
<p>basin is less than the estimated 1,000 acre-feet of natural groundwater recharge. Thus, impacts to groundwater resources would be less than significant; however, mitigation has been included in Section 5.2.2 to further reduce impacts.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Low flow showerheads and/or aerators in the hotel; ▪ Voluntary towel re-use by hotel guests; ▪ Low flow faucets in public areas; ▪ Use of pressure washers and brooms (water broom) instead of hoses for cleaning; ▪ Garbage disposal on-demand; ▪ Incorporate re-circulating cooling loop for water cooled refrigeration and ice machines wherever possible; and ▪ Serve water to customers only upon request. 		
<p>B On-site groundwater resources would be utilized under Alternative B. The proposed project's demand for groundwater would be approximately 95 acre-feet per year. In addition to the current estimated demand of 150 acre-feet per year from the regional groundwater basin, the overall draft from the regional groundwater basin is less than the estimated 1,000 acre-feet of natural groundwater recharge.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS	
<p>C On-site groundwater resources would be utilized under Alternative C. The proposed project's demand for groundwater would be approximately 39 acre-feet per year. In addition to the current estimated demand of 150 acre-feet per year from the regional groundwater basin, the overall draft from the regional groundwater basin is less than the estimated 1,000 acre-feet of natural groundwater recharge.</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS	
<p>D On-site groundwater resources would be utilized under Alternative D. The proposed project's demand for groundwater would be approximately 10 acre-feet per year. This demand is considered negligible and similar to neighboring residential groundwater</p>	LTS	Same as A.	LTS	
<p>Less than Significant = LTS</p>	<p>Significant = S</p>	<p>No Effect = NE</p>	<p>Beneficial Effect = BE</p>	
<p>Alternative A = A</p>	<p>Alternative B = B</p>	<p>Alternative C = C</p>	<p>Alternative D = D</p>	<p>Alternative E = E</p>

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
withdrawals.			
E No impacts to groundwater would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended	NE
Water Quality			
<p>A Project construction may cause the following impacts to water quality: ground disturbance related erosion and accelerated sedimentation of watercourses; discharge of construction materials such as concrete washings, oil, and grease; accidental fuel and oil spills. The Tribe will obtain an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) certified National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Service (NPDES) General Stormwater Permit to comply with federal regulations for construction activities for lands on the project site under federal jurisdiction and a NPDES permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) for the construction activities for land on the project site under state jurisdiction. The WWTP is the main component of the proposed project under state jurisdiction. The NPDES permits require the preparation of a SWPPP for the project site that would provide measures for limiting water quality impacts from construction. These measures are also included as mitigation for water quality impacts in this EIS.</p>	LTS	<p>As required and enforced by the EPA under the Clean Water Act, prior to construction a SWPPP shall be prepared that addresses water quality impacts associated with construction and on-going operation of the project. Permanent water quality maintenance features shall be incorporated into the project design and operation. Water quality control measures identified in the SWPPP shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:</p>	LTS
<p>Runoff from operation of project facilities, especially surface parking lots, could flush trash, debris, oil, sediments, and grease into downstream surface waters, impacting water quality. All runoff on the project site would be directed to the stormwater detention basins, which would deter suspended solids, oil, and grease from entering adjacent watercourses. Accumulated sediment in the stormwater detention basin would be removed periodically. Additionally, the SWPPP discussed above would include measures for protecting water quality during project operation. These measures are also included as</p>		<p>General Construction Activities</p> <p>A. Existing vegetation shall be retained where possible. To the extent feasible, grading activities shall be limited to the immediate area required for construction.</p> <p>B. Temporary erosion control measures (such as silt fences, fiber rolls, vegetated swales, a velocity dissipation structure, staked straw bales, temporary revegetation, rock bag dams, and sediment traps) shall be employed for disturbed areas.</p> <p>C. No disturbed surfaces shall be left without erosion control measures in place during the winter and spring months.</p> <p>D. Construction area entrances and exits shall be stabilized with crushed aggregate.</p> <p>E. Sediment shall be retained onsite by a system of sediment basins, traps, or other appropriate measures.</p> <p>F. Petroleum products shall be stored, handled, used, and disposed of properly.</p>	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>mitigation for water quality impacts in this EIS.</p> <p>Currently a wastewater treatment and disposal facility exists onsite. The wastewater treatment and disposal facility would be expanded to accommodate wastewater from the proposed project. Wastewater effluent would be discharged to spray fields in the summer and stored in the winter. All effluent from the wastewater treatment and disposal facility would meet the secondary level California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Waste Discharge Requirements and USEPA and California Department of Health Services regulations.</p>	G.	<p>Construction materials, including topsoil and chemicals shall be stored, covered, and isolated to prevent runoff losses and contamination of groundwater.</p>	
	H.	<p>Fuel and vehicle maintenance areas shall be established away from all drainage courses and designed to control runoff.</p>	
	I.	<p>Sanitary facilities shall be provided for construction workers.</p>	
	J.	<p>Disposal facilities shall be provided for soil wastes, including excess asphalt produced during construction.</p>	
	K.	<p>The Tribe shall educate all workers in the proper handling, use, cleanup, and disposal of all chemical materials used during construction activities and provide appropriate facilities to store and isolate contaminants.</p>	
	L.	<p>The Tribe shall educate all contractors involved in the project on the potential environmental damages resulting from soil erosion prior to development by conducting a pre-construction conference. Copies of the project's erosion control plan shall be distributed at this time. All construction bid packages; contracts, plans and specifications shall contain language that requires adherence to the plan.</p>	
	M.	<p>Construction activities shall be scheduled to minimize land disturbance during peak runoff periods. Soil conservation practices shall be completed during the fall or late winter to reduce erosion during spring runoff.</p>	
	N.	<p>Creating construction zones and grading only one part of a construction zone at a time shall minimize exposed areas. If possible, grading on a particular zone shall be delayed until protective cover is restored on the previously graded zone.</p>	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		O. Utility installations shall be coordinated to limit the number of excavations.	
		P. Preserving as much natural cover, topography, and drainage as possible shall protect disturbed soils from rainfall during construction. Trees and shrubs shall not be removed unnecessarily.	
		Q. Disturbed areas shall be stabilized as promptly as possible, especially on long or steep slopes. Recommended plant materials and mulches shall be used to establish protective ground cover. Vegetation such as fast-growing annual and perennial grasses shall be used to shield and bind the soil. Mulches and artificial binders shall be used until vegetation is established. Where truck traffic is frequent, gravel approaches shall be used to reduce soil compaction and limit the tracking of sediment onto roadways.	
		R. Surface water runoff shall be controlled by directing flowing water away from critical areas and by reducing runoff velocity. Diversion structures such as terraces, dikes, and ditches shall collect and direct runoff water around vulnerable areas to prepared drainage outlets. Surface roughening, berms, check dams, hay bales, or similar devices shall be used to reduce runoff velocity and erosion.	
		S. Sediment shall be contained when conditions are too extreme for treatment by surface protection. Temporary sediment traps, filter fabric fences, inlet protectors, vegetative filters and buffers, or settling basins shall be used to detain runoff water long enough for sediment particles to settle out.	
		T. Topsoil removed during construction shall be carefully stored and treated as an important resource. Berms shall be placed around	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		topsoil stockpiles to prevent runoff during storm events.	
		U. All necessary permits and approvals shall be obtained, including a NPDES Phase II General Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Construction Activities.	
		GENERAL OPERATION MEASURES	
		V. Storm drains shall be equipped with silt and oil traps to remove oils, debris, and other pollutants. Storm drain inlets shall also be labeled "No Dumping-Drains to Streams and Rivers."	
		W. The parking lot shall be designed to allow storm water runoff to be directed to vegetative filter strips to help control sediment and to control non-point source pollution, where possible.	
		X. Permanent energy dissipaters shall be included for drainage outlets.	
		Y. The Tribe shall create, utilize, and update as necessary a maintenance plan for all Best Management Practices (BMPs).	
		Z. The project detention basin shall be designed to provide effective water quality control measures. Design and operational features of the drainage basins will include:	
		1. The drainage basins shall be designed to provide the maximum detention time for settling of fine particles.	
		2. Maximize the distance between basin inlets and outlets to reduce velocities.	
		3. Establish maintenance schedules for periodic removal of sedimentation, excessive vegetation, and debris that may clog basin inlets and outlets.	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>AA. The operator of the wastewater treatment plant shall comply with operator standards/certification as would be required for an operator of a similarly sized plant in the state of California.</p> <p>BB. On-site backup power generation shall be provided to run the collection system and necessary plant pumps and aerators to control odors during power outages.</p> <p>CC. The following manuals/plans shall be completed within 6 months of construction of the wastewater treatment plant: an Operations and Maintenance Manual that must include an emergency response plan and operation/maintenance records; a sludge disposal plan; a domestic waste spill prevention, emergency response, containment, and spill cleanup waste products disposal plan; a runoff-prevention plan/off-site aerosol prevention plan; and a hazardous materials spill prevention, emergency response, containment, and disposal plan.</p>	
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A with the exception of potential water quality impacts from the proposed water park.	LTS	<p>Same as for Alternative A, and:</p> <p>The Tribe shall ensure that any water from the water park receive treatment prior to entering the storm drainage system to reduce and, if possible, eliminate chlorine and other minerals added at the water park.</p>	LTS
D Discharges of sediment and pollutants to surface waters from construction activities and accidents are a potentially significant impact to surface water quality. Operational impacts of Alternative D from stormwater runoff would be similar to those of Alternative A. Although a stormwater detention basin is not proposed for the Butte site, silt/oil traps and a NPDES permit and SWPPP would be incorporated into the design of the proposed project.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>A new WWTP would be constructed to treat wastewater for the proposed project. Similar to Alternative A, effluent would be stored in the winter and discharged through spray fields in the summer. Due to the site being Tribal trust land, RWQCB and USEPA discharge regulations would not apply. Therefore, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce potential impacts to water quality to less than significant.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
4.4 AIR QUALITY			
<i>Construction-Related Impacts</i>			
<p>A Although construction emissions are not considered by Feather River Air Quality Management District (FRAQMD) to result in significant effects due to their temporary nature, fugitive dust generated by construction would result in significant regional nuisance and air quality impacts. Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) emissions would occur from entrainment of fugitive dust from land clearing, earth moving, and wind erosion of exposed soil. Construction activities such as grading, excavation and travel on unpaved surfaces can generate substantial amounts of dust, and can lead to elevated concentrations of PM₁₀. The generation of construction-related emissions is considered a significant impact.</p>	S	<p>A. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed FRAQMD Regulation III, Rule 3.0, Visible Emissions limitations.</p> <p>B. The primary contractor shall be responsible to ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained prior to and for the duration of onsite operation.</p> <p>C. The primary contractor shall be responsible to ensure that all construction equipment minimizes idling time to 5 minutes. (State idling rule, effective 02/01/2005)</p> <p>D. The primary contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary power generators where feasible.</p> <p>E. The primary contractor shall develop a traffic plan to minimize traffic flow interference from construction activities. The plan may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advance public notice of routing, use of public 	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>transportation, and satellite parking areas with a shuttle service.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Scheduling of operations affecting traffic for off-peak hours. 3. Minimizing obstruction of through-traffic lanes. 4. Providing a flag person to guide traffic properly and ensure safety at construction sites. <p>F. The primary contractor shall be responsible to prepare a Fugitive Dust Control Plan. The Fugitive Dust Control Plan shall include the following Fugitive Dust Control Mitigation Measures.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All grading operations on a project should be suspended when winds exceed 20 miles per hour or when winds carry dust beyond the property line despite implementation of all feasible dust control measures. 2. Construction sites shall be watered as necessary to prevent fugitive dust violations. 3. An operational water truck shall be on-site at all times. Water shall be applied as needed to control dust and to prevent visible emissions violations. 4. On-site dirt piles or other stockpiled particulate matter shall be covered, wind breaks installed, and water and/or soil stabilizers employed to reduce wind blown dust emissions. Incorporate the use of approved non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specifications to all inactive construction areas. 5. All transfer processes involving a free fall of soil or other particulate matter shall be operated in such a manner as to minimize the free fall distance and fugitive dust emissions. 	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Apply approved chemical soil stabilizers according to the manufacturers' specifications, to all-inactive construction areas (previously graded areas that remain inactive for 96 hours) including unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas. 7. To prevent track-out, wheel washers shall be installed where project vehicles and/or equipment exit onto paved streets from unpaved roads. Vehicles and/or equipment shall be washed prior to each trip. Alternatively, a gravel bed may be installed as appropriate at vehicle/equipment site exit points to effectively remove soil buildup on tires and tracks to prevent/diminish track-out. 8. Paved streets shall be swept frequently (water sweeper with reclaimed water recommended; wet broom) if soil material has been carried onto adjacent paved, public thoroughfares from the site. 9. Limit traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces to 15 miles per hour or less and reduce unnecessary vehicle traffic by restricting access. Provide appropriate training, on-site enforcement, and signage. 10. Reestablish ground cover on the construction site as soon as possible and prior to final occupancy, through seeding and watering. 11. No open burning of vegetative waste (natural plant growth wastes) or other legal or illegal burn materials (trash, demolition debris, et. al.) may be conducted at the site. Vegetative wastes shall be chipped or delivered to waste energy facilities (permitted biomass facilities), mulched, composted, or used for firewood. 	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
B Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A except the Butte County Air Quality Management District (BCAQMD) has jurisdiction over the project site for Alternative D. BCAQMD published a Compliance Advisory Bulletin outlining Fugitive Dust Mitigation Measures that list specific mitigation measures that apply to all projects with the potential to emit fugitive dust during land development activities.	S	<p>The primary contractor shall use adequate dust control measures that are implemented in a timely and effective manner during all phases of project development and construction, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water all active construction sites at least twice daily. Frequency should be based on the type of operation, soil, and wind exposure. 2. Chemical soil stabilizers on inactive construction areas (disturbed lands within construction projects that are unused for at least four consecutive days) 3. On-site vehicles limited to a speed of 15 mph on unpaved roads. 4. Land clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities suspended when winds exceed 20 miles per hour. 5. Non-toxic binders (e.g. latex acrylic copolymer) to exposed areas after cut and fill operation and hydroseed area. 6. Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible. 7. Soil pile surfaces shall be moistened if dust is being emitted from the pile(s). Adequately secured tarps, plastic or other material may be required to further reduce dust emissions. 8. Haul vehicles transporting soil into or out of the site shall be covered. 9. Paved streets adjacent to the site should be swept or washed at the end of each day as necessary to remove excessive accumulations 	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
E The No Action Alternative would not result in construction activity. Therefore, this alternative would not result in the generation of emissions associated with construction.	NE	<p>of silt and/or mud, which may have accumulated as a result of activities on the site.</p> <p>10. Temporary traffic control as appropriate during all phases of construction to improve traffic flow.</p> <p>11. Scheduled construction activities that direct traffic flow to off-peak hours as much as practicable.</p> <p>12. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 24 hours. The telephone number of the BCAQMD shall also be visible.</p> <p>13. Prior to final occupancy, the applicant demonstrates that all ground surfaces are covered or treated sufficiently to minimize fugitive dust emissions.</p> <p>No mitigation is recommended.</p>	NE
Operation-Related Impacts			
A Operation of Alternative A would result in the generation of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NO _x), and PM ₁₀ emissions. ROG, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ emissions would exceed the 25, 25, and 80 pounds per day (ppd) FRAQMD threshold, respectively. The emissions associated with operation of Alternative A can be reduced with implementation of mitigation measures, but not to a less than significant level.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall orient building structures to the north for natural cooling and the use of appropriate landscaping that maximizes the potential of passive solar design principles where feasible. ▪ The Tribe shall incorporate shade trees, adequate in number and proportional to project size, throughout the site to reduce building heating and cooling requirements. ▪ The Tribe shall provide for the use of energy-efficient lighting 	S

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		and process systems such as, low-NOx water heaters, furnaces, and boiler units. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall ensure streets shall be designed to maximize pedestrian access to transit stops where feasible. ▪ The Tribe shall include bus shelters at transit access points where deemed appropriate by Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority. ▪ The Tribe shall provide preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools. ▪ The Tribe shall incorporate transit-use incentives such as subsidized transit passes and flexible work schedules to encourage transit use and trip reduction. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure the use of clean fuel vehicles in vehicle fleet where practicable. ▪ The Tribe shall provide onsite shower/locker facilities for bicycling and pedestrian commuters. ▪ The Tribe shall construct or contribute to bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements such as trails linking commuter routes as identified in the Yuba Sutter Bikeway Master Plan. ▪ The Tribe shall contribute to construction of off-site park and ride lots as deemed feasible and appropriate by Yuba and Sutter transportation planning agencies. ▪ The Tribe shall provide on-site pedestrian facility enhancements such as walkways, benches, proper lighting, vending machines, and building access, which are physically separated from parking lot traffic. ▪ The Tribe shall feature alternative work schedules, where 	
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>practical, that allow for work hours that are compressed into fewer than five days (e.g., 9/80; 4/40; or 3/36 hour schedules); or allow Flextime¹ schedules.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall provide transit amenities e.g., bus turnouts, passenger benches, or shelters where deemed appropriate by local transportation planning agencies. ▪ The Tribe shall provide transportation (e.g., shuttles) to major transit stations and multi-modal centers. 	
B Similar to Alternative A, but lower emissions.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	S
C Similar to Alternative A, but lower emissions.	S	<p>Same as for Alternative A, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall encourage reduced setbacks for retail and employment land uses on streets with bus services consistent with zoning code requirements. ▪ The Tribe shall encourage arrangement of buildings to reduce the walking distance between each of the buildings and the nearest transit facility. ▪ The Tribe shall encourage a development pattern that discourages auto-oriented uses in areas adjacent to bus stops and other transit facilities. 	S
D Operation of Alternative A would result in the generation of ROG, NOX, and PM ₁₀ emissions. ROG, NOX, and PM ₁₀ emissions would not exceed the 25, 25, and 80 ppd BCAQMD threshold, respectively. Nonetheless, BCAQMD would require the proposed project to be subject to the standard list of mitigation measures.	LTS	<p>Same as Alternative A, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall ensure the use of energy-efficient lighting (includes controls) and process systems such as water heaters, furnaces, and boiler units. ▪ The Tribe shall ensure the use of energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioning. 	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
E The No Action Alternative would not result in the generation of emissions other than that minimal emissions currently generated by residential and/or agricultural activities.	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall provide transportation (e.g., shuttles) to major transit stations and multi-modal centers. No mitigation is recommended	LTS
<i>Carbon Monoxide Impacts</i>			
A Emissions of CO may cause a violation of short-term standards if implementation of the proposed project were to result in congestion of major roadways and intersections. However the concern for hot spots is normally limited to major signalized intersections impacted by project-related traffic where the Level of Service (LOS) is E or F. After improvements recommended by the Enterprise Rancheria Traffic Impact Analysis are implemented (Appendix H), all intersections affected by the Proposed Project would operate at LOS D or better. Alternative A would include also include a parking structure. Vehicles operating within the parking structure would generate CO emissions. All levels of the parking structure would be above grade and would include openings on the exterior surfaces to provide for flow-through ventilation.	S	Mitigation is the same as that listed for traffic impacts in Section 5.2.7	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A, but without a parking structure.	S	Mitigation is the same as that listed for traffic impacts in Section 5.2.7	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A, but without a parking structure.	S	Mitigation is the same as that listed for traffic impacts in Section 5.2.7	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A, but without a parking structure.	S	Mitigation is the same as that listed for traffic impacts in Section 5.2.7	LTS
E The No Action Alternative would not result in construction of the projects in Alternative A, B, C or D. Therefore, this alternative would not result in the generation of carbon monoxide emissions.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<i>Odor Impacts</i>			
A There are no odor generators that might impact Alternative A and Alternative A itself would not contribute odors to the region. However, if not properly operated, the expanded wastewater treatment facilities could cause a nuisance to the nearby residences. The California RWQCB requires objectionable odors to be contained in the wastewater treatment area and backup power generation to run the collection system, plant pumps, and aerators to control odors during power outages. Nonetheless, measures are included that would further reduce odor impacts.	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The WWTP expansions will be constructed with comprehensive odor control facilities, including the injection of odor control oxidants at the sewage lift station and construction of a covered headworks with odor scrubber at the WWTP. ▪ Spray drift from the WWTP or spray disposal field will not migrate out of the plant’s property boundaries. Mitigation measures 5.2.2 HH-JJ shall be implemented to ensure that migration does not occur. ▪ Spray field irrigation will cease when winds exceed 30 mph. 	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A, except that Alternative D would not be regulated by the California RWQCB since the Butte site is trust property. Therefore mitigation measures are included to reduce odor impacts to a less than significant level.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The WWTP expansions will be constructed with comprehensive odor control facilities, including the injection of odor control oxidants at the sewage lift station and construction of a covered headworks with odor scrubber at the WWTP. ▪ Spray drift from the WWTP or spray disposal field will not migrate out of the plant’s property boundaries. ▪ Spray field irrigation will cease when winds exceed 30 mph. ▪ Water quality mitigation measures under Section 5.2.2 requiring on-site backup power generation for the WWTP shall be implemented. 	LTS
E The No Action Alternative would not result in the generation of odors.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<i>Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts</i>			
<p>A The proposed developments under Alternative A would not contribute or generate toxic air contaminants. However, bus and diesel truck traffic to and from the developments, especially in loading areas, would result in an increased concentration of diesel emissions in those areas, leading to a potentially significant effect. Application of mitigation measures associated with loading docks would result in a less than significant effect.</p> <p>Potential impacts to public may result from aerial spraying from surrounding agricultural lands. The site's proposed gathering areas have been designed near the center of the Yuba Site to minimize potential impacts from pesticide drift.</p> <p>Three facilities adjacent to the project site emit Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) and are ranked in the California mandated Air Toxic "Hot Spots" program as low toxic risk to the community. The FRAQMD is only concerned with facilities posing a high toxic risk to the community.</p>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed commercial land uses (e.g., loading docks) that have the potential to emit toxic air emissions shall be located as far away as feasibly possible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors in accordance with ARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook. ▪ Air intakes associated with the heating and cooling system for buildings shall not be located next to potential TAC-emitting locations (e.g., loading docks) in accordance with ARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook. 	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A with the exception of the proposed gathering areas. The eastern portions of the go cart racing track and the water slide complex are only 25-50 feet from the site's eastern border.	S	<p>Same as for Alternative A, and:</p> <p>LL. The Tribe shall negotiate an agreement or at least maintain open lines of communication with the adjacent landowner to the east such that notice is gained prior to aerial spraying operations. During aerial spraying operations, any park components/attractions located within 50 feet of the boundary of the Yuba Site shall cease operation until after the completion of off-site aerial spraying operations.</p>	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A, except the Butte Site is not located in an	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
agricultural area, health effects from aerial spraying would not occur.			
E The No Action Alternative would not result in the generation of toxic air contaminants.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Asbestos Impacts</i>			
A No existing buildings are present on the Yuba site, therefore no impacts related to demolition related asbestos exposure are expected. No naturally occurring asbestos exists in the Yuba City/Marysville area and no off-site fill would be imported to the site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
B Similar to Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
C Similar to Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
D Implementation of Alternative D could result in the demolition of existing structures on the Butte site. Alternative D is located in a candidate area for naturally occurring asbestos (NOA). Airborne asbestos fibers pose a serious health threat if adequate control techniques are not carried out when the material is disturbed. Any demolition activity will be subject to the requirements of the Asbestos National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, 40 CFR sections 61.140 through 61.157. Strict compliance with these regulations will result in a less than significant impact.	S	MM. Prior to any grading activities at the site, the project proponent shall ensure that a geologic evaluation is conducted to determine if naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) is present within the area that will be disturbed. If NOA is found at the site the applicant shall comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos ATCM. This may include development of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and an Asbestos Health and Safety Program.	LTS
E No new development or ground disturbance would occur under Alternative E. Existing ground disturbance associated with agricultural activities would continue on the Yuba site. However, given that the Yuba site is not located in an area where NOA is expected to occur, a less than significant effect from asbestos emissions would occur under the No Action Alternative.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Federal Class I Areas Impacts

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
A There are no federal Class 1 areas within 100 kilometers of the Yuba site.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
B Similar to Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
C Similar to Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
D Lassen Volcanic National Park and Caribou Wilderness Area are the only federal Class I areas within 100 kilometers of the Butte site. Analysis of operational emissions associated with Alternative D determined that Alternative D operations would not constitute a “major source” impact to air quality.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E Given that no new development would occur and existing emissions associated with residential and agricultural activities on the Yuba and Butte sites does not rise to the level of a “major source,” the No Action Alternative would not result in significant impacts to federal Class I areas.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
General Conformity Determination			
A The proposed project is not located within a non-attainment or maintenance area, and therefore a conformity determination is not applicable pursuant to the California Air Amendment General Conformity Rule.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
B Same as Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
C Same as Alternative A.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
D Butte County is “basic” nonattainment for ozone therefore the general conformity rule’s de minimis thresholds for ozone precursors and volatile organic compounds (VOC) apply. The emissions from Alternative D are below the de minimis thresholds.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
E Under the no action alternative no construction and operation of a casino, hotel, or amusement park would occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Indoor Air Quality</i>			
A Tobacco smoke contains carcinogens (including Polycyclic Organic Matter) and smoking would be permitted indoors at the casino, resulting in a potentially significant effect to public health.	S	NN. The Tribe shall ensure that ventilation of outdoor air is consistent with ASHRAE Standard 62-1999 under all operating conditions. OO. The Tribe shall ensure that comfort levels are acceptable to most occupants, and consistent with ASHRAE Standard 55-1992, under all operating conditions. PP. The Tribe shall ensure that significant expected sources of pollutant emissions are isolated from occupants using physical barriers, exhausts, and pressure controls. QQ. The Tribe shall ensure that outdoor air entering the building is protected from contamination from local outdoor sources and from building exhausts and sanitation vents. RR. The Tribe shall ensure that provisions are made for easy access to HVAC equipment requiring periodic maintenance. SS. The Tribe shall ensure that occupant exposure to construction contaminants is minimized using protocols for material selection, preventive installation procedures, and special ventilation and pressure control isolation techniques. TT. The Tribe shall ensure the use of low-emitting building products pursuant to Integrated Waste Management Board's Section 01350 where feasible. UU. The Tribe shall provide notice of the health effects of secondhand smoke exposure to employees upon hire. VV. The Tribe shall prominently place placards periodically throughout	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
Alternative E = E			

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		the casino that summarize the health effects of secondhand smoke. The Tribe shall provide further information about the health effects of secondhand smoke to customers upon request.	
B Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C The operation of Alternatives C is in compliance with indoor air quality requirements, including environmental tobacco smoke (ETS). As smoking would be allowed in marked sections of the restaurant facilities and the hotel, there are potentially significant secondhand tobacco smoke impacts, similar to those discussed for Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
E The No Action Alternative would not result in the generation of indoor air quality impacts.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
4.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
<i>General Effects</i>			
A Potential impacts to the agriculture/cropland would be less than significant due to the relatively common and abundant nature of the agriculture/croplands habitat types in the region compared to the relatively small area (36± acres) of anticipated disturbance. Agriculture and cropland habitat is relatively abundant on a local and regional scale and is not considered a sensitive resource due to disturbance levels and dominance of non-native species.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D General impacts to the Butte Site include loss and degradation of the	LTS	Trees shall be preserved, to the extent possible, and protected with	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>mixed woodland community, chaparral community, and creek impacts.</p> <p>Alternative D would affect 0.29 acres of chaparral community. Impacts to the habitat would be less than significant due to the relatively common and abundant nature of the affected habitat type in the region, compared to the relatively small area of anticipated disturbance.</p> <p>The development of Alternative D would eliminate approximately 5.46 acres of the mixed woodland/chaparral community. Although the mixed woodland/chaparral community is regionally and locally abundant and the loss would therefore not represent a significant impact, the trees on-site provide soil and bank stabilization, conserve water, reduce radiant heat, and provide wildlife habitat.</p>		construction fencing during construction activities.	
<p>E Existing biological resources would remain as is for an unknown period of time and habitats would not be disturbed under the No-Action Alternative. Because these habitats would not be disturbed, it is assumed that all existing plant and animal species would continue to remain and a less than significant effect to biological resources would result.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Potential Effects to Wildlife and Habitats</i>			
<p>A Implementation of the project would result in an increase in human activity within the project area, which would include grading and development of approximately 36± acres of the 40±-acre Yuba Site. Some species of wildlife will avoid areas that have a high degree of human activity, thereby causing them to forage over greater distances and reducing the number of breeding and resting sites that are available. This would be an insignificant impact to species that are not federally threatened or endangered, due to the small area that</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>would be disturbed under this alternative, and the large area of similar habitat in the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>Development of the Yuba Site would result in the loss of agricultural fields that are used for hay production at the site. Agriculture fields provide limited habitat for wildlife diversity and species richness. The proposed wastewater treatment pipeline would be installed within an existing dirt access road and upgrades to the WWTP would occur within an existing facility. These habitats are not biologically sensitive wildlife habitats and are presently subject to high levels of habitat disturbance from farming practices. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts to sensitive wildlife habitats.</p>			
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D No USFWS designated critical habitat occurs within the Butte Site. Alternative D would affect 0.29 acres of chaparral community. Impacts to this habitat would be less than significant due to the relatively common and abundant nature of the affected habitat type in the region, compared to the relatively small area of anticipated disturbance.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>The development of Alternative D would eliminate approximately 5.46 acres of the mixed woodland/chaparral community. Although the mixed woodland/chaparral community is regionally and locally abundant and the loss would therefore not represent a significant impact, the trees on-site provide soil and bank stabilization, conserve water, reduce radiant heat, and provide wildlife habitat. Mitigation measures to further reduce impacts to this community are identified in Section 5.2.4.</p>			
E Existing biological resources would remain as is for an unknown period of time and habitats would not be disturbed under the No-Action Alternative. Because these habitats would not be disturbed, it	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>is assumed that all existing plant and animal species would continue to remain and a less than significant effect to biological resources would result.</p>			
<i>Waters of the U.S.</i>			
<p>A The wetland delineation identified 2.13 acres of potentially jurisdictional wetlands and other waters of the U.S. occurring within the Yuba Site. The pipeline route would cross two culverted irrigation ditches that run from north to south under the road and would cross under the irrigation ditch immediately east of the wastewater treatment plant. The wastewater treatment plant study area and pipeline route contain or are immediately adjacent to 10.03 acres of potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. (Appendix I).</p>	S	<p>The roadside ditch (0.32 acres) along Forty Mile Road is potentially subject to USACE jurisdiction. These ditches shall be avoided through modifications in the designs for the casino to completely avoid impacts to the wetland area, including impacts caused by construction equipment. Before construction activity, workers will be informed of the importance of marshes, wetlands, and seasonally flooded areas. During construction activity, temporary construction fencing shall be installed around the perimeter of the wetland so that inadvertent impacts to this area will be avoided.</p>	LTS
<p>The construction of the casino/hotel resort has been designed to avoid the 2.13-acre palustrine emergent wetland onsite. In addition, a 25-foot buffer has been incorporated into the site design to avoid potential indirect effects to the wetland. No impacts to the palustrine emergent wetland would result from the development of the casino/hotel resort.</p>			
<p>The roadside ditch (0.72 acres) adjacent to Forty Mile Road has the potential to be impacted from the development of Alternative A. The entrance to the casino would cross the ditch and the detention basin will drain to the Kimball Creek via the roadside ditch on the northwest side of the property. These activities have the potential to fill the wetland areas, resulting in a significant impact.</p>			
<p>B Similar to Alternative A, but reduced impacts to wetlands.</p>	S	<p>Same as for Alternative A.</p>	LTS
<p>C Similar to Alternative A, but reduced impacts to wetlands.</p>	S	<p>Same as for Alternative A.</p>	LTS
<p>D A formal delineation identified 0.40 acres of potentially jurisdictional wetlands or “waters of the U.S.” on the Butte Site. These features are</p>	S	<p>Due to the linear feet of stream impacts, the Tribe will be required to obtain an Individual Permit from the USACE. Mitigation measures will include</p>	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>subject to USACE jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act and any discharge of dredged or fill material within the “waters of the U.S.” would require a Clean Water Act, Section 404 permit.</p>		<p>creation and preservation of waters of the U.S. at a ratio established by the USACE.</p>	
<p>The proposed development of Alternative D would impact 0.026 acres of three intermittent channels. This impacts to waters of the U.S. represent a significant impact.</p>			
<p>E Similar to Alternative A</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is recommended.</p>	<p>LTS</p>
Federally Listed Species			
<p>A Formal consultation with the USFWS pursuant to Section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and regarding the federally Threatened giant garter snake (<i>Thamnophis gigas</i>), vernal pool tadpole shrimp (<i>Lepidurus packardii</i>), and vernal pool fairy shrimp (<i>Branchinecta lynchi</i>) was initiated on June 3, 2004. A Biological Opinion (1-1-04-I-2971) was issued by the FWS on August 29, 2005. The Service has determined the Yuba Site and the pipeline alignment does not provide suitable habitat for the vernal pool tadpole shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp. The wastewater treatment plant expansion area does not provide suitable habitat for these species, as there are no vernal pools in this area. However, there is a potential for giant garter snakes to occur in the proposed project vicinity.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>A. Construction activities within the identified habitat for giant garter snake shall be avoided as identified in the Giant Garter Snake Report, August 2005 (Appendix I). The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) guidelines for giant garter snake avoidance and minimization will be followed.</p> <p>B. All construction activity associated with the installation of the wastewater pipeline, within the adjacent roadbed, shall be conducted between May 1 and October 1. This is the active period for giant garter snakes and the potential for direct effects are lessened because the snakes are actively moving and capable of avoiding danger.</p> <p>C. Construction personnel shall participate in a USFWS approved worker environmental awareness program. Under this program, workers shall be informed about the presence of giant garter snakes and habitat associated with the species and that unlawful take of the animal or destruction of its habitat is a violation of the Act. Prior to construction activities, a qualified biologist approved by the Service shall instruct all construction personnel about: (1) the life history of the giant garter snake; (2) the importance of irrigation canals, marshes/wetlands, and seasonally</p>	<p>LTS</p>
Giant Garter Snake			
<p>Giant garter snakes are known to utilize agricultural drainage ditches, rice fields, and other aquatic habitats similar to those present in the immediate vicinity of these areas. The South Yuba Water District irrigation ditch immediately south of the proposed casino site represents potential habitat for giant garter snake. Construction activities in and around giant garter snake habitat have the potential to adversely affect this species. If giant garter snakes are present within</p>			
<p>Less than Significant = LTS</p>	<p>Significant = S</p>	<p>No Effect = NE</p>	<p>Beneficial Effect = BE</p>
<p>Alternative A = A</p>	<p>Alternative B = B</p>	<p>Alternative C = C</p>	<p>Alternative D = D</p>
		<p>Alternative E = E</p>	

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>this area, direct mortality or injury to this species could result from entombment in their winter retreats, or by being struck by construction equipment working in this area. In general, if giant garter snakes are present within the project vicinity, direct mortality or injury to this species could result from being struck by construction vehicles traveling along roadways in the project vicinity. This represents a potentially significant impact.</p>	D.	<p>flooded areas, such as rice fields, to the giant garter snake; (3) sensitive areas, detailing limits of the construction area, showing workers the designated buffers, and explaining why they must stay out of the buffers. Proof of this instruction shall be submitted to the Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office.</p> <p>No more than 24-hours prior to start of construction activities (site preparation and/or grading), the southern portion of the project area adjacent to the ditch shall be surveyed for the presence of giant garter snake. If construction activities stop on the site for a period of two weeks or more, a new giant garter snake survey should be completed no more than 24-hours prior to the re-start of construction activities.</p>	
	E.	<p>A qualified biologist shall conduct monitoring for giant garter snake during construction within the identified giant garter snake boundary area. If a snake is encountered during construction activities, the monitoring biologist shall have the authority to stop construction activities until appropriate corrective measures have been completed or it is determined that the snake will not be harmed. Giant garter snakes encountered during construction activities should be allowed to move away from construction activities on their own. Capture and relocation of trapped or injured individuals can only be attempted by personnel or individuals with current USFWS recovery permits pursuant to section 10(a)1(A) of the Act.</p>	
	F.	<p>A qualified biologist shall be available for monitoring for giant garter snakes throughout the duration of construction.</p>	
	G.	<p>Establish fencing prior to construction to demarcate the construction area and prevent encroachment of construction personnel and equipment into adjacent habitats for sensitive</p>	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		species.	
		H. Prior to the commencement of pipeline construction activities to occur between May 1 and October 1, construction fencing would be installed along the southern and northern extents of upland habitat, which border the irrigation canal and seasonal wetland in order to maintain construction activities within the construction zone easement. Upon completion of construction, permanent fencing would be installed along the border of the seasonal wetland buffer and associated upland habitat on the Yuba site. This fencing will prohibit access by pedestrians and motor vehicles to the giant garter snake aquatic and upland components. Proper signage, spaced at approximately 100-foot intervals, will convey the idea that (1) the area is sensitive and preserved habitat, and (2) management will ensure the integrity of the preserved area.	
		I. The USFWS recommends that plastic mono-filament netting (erosion control matting) not be used for erosion control. Snakes may become entangled in it. Acceptable substitutes include coconut-coir matting or tackified hydroseeding.	
		J. Implementation of BMPs to prevent the accidental release of disturbed soils, fuel, oil, or other materials associated with construction activities into sensitive habitats.	
		K. Pre-construction surveys for giant garter snake shall be completed by a qualified biologist along the South Yuba Water District irrigation ditch to follow the USFWS guidelines.	
		L. The mitigation and avoidance measures referenced and/or contained with in the Biological Opinion issued by the USFWS (Appendix H) shall be applied to the WWTP area.	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
B Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
D The development of Alternative D has the potential to impact three Federally listed species: Layne’s ragwort, California red-legged frog, and bald eagle. Although the chaparral and mixed woodland communities on the site are relatively abundant throughout the region, they are habitat for the federally threatened Layne’s ragwort. Development of Alternative D could adversely impact the species. Suitable habitat for the California red-legged frog is present within the intermittent streams and ponds on the site. Alternative D would impact three intermittent streams. This is a potentially significant impact.	S	M. The Butte Site provides habitat for the Federally threatened Layne’s ragwort. Mitigation measures for impacts to the chaparral and mixed woodland communities shall include the preservation and creation of suitable habitat on site, as recommended by the USFWS. N. The Butte Site is located within the historic range for the California red-legged frog and may contain suitable breeding, foraging, and upland dispersal habitat for this species. Mitigation shall include avoidance or other measures set by the USFWS.	LTS
E Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds</i>			
A Although there are no trees on the Yuba Site, raptor species (birds of prey) and migratory birds, other than those listed as special-status species, may potentially nest in trees and other vegetation located within the surrounding vicinity of the Yuba Site. If active raptor nests are present within approximately 500 feet of proposed construction activities, project development could adversely affect nesting activity. If active migratory bird nests are present within areas where removal of woody vegetation would occur, project development could result in significant impacts to these species.	S	<i>Swainson’s Hawk</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If project construction is to occur during the nesting season (approximately March to August), pre-construction surveys for active Swainson’s hawk nests within ¼ mile of proposed construction areas shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. ▪ Conducting construction activities within ¼ mile of active Swainson’s hawk nests shall be avoided. If construction activities are to occur within ¼ mile of an active nest, a qualified biologist shall monitor construction activities and any active nest sites. The monitoring biologist shall have the authority to stop any construction activities that are adversely affecting nesting 	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>behavior and may result in nest failure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impacts to potential foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk shall be mitigated according to the guidelines identified in the California Department of Fish and Game’s <i>Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson’s Hawks in the Central Valley of California</i>. ▪ Replacement foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk shall be provided at a ratio of 0.5 acres of land for each acre of urban development authorized under subdivision entitlements. Land protected under this requirement must be located within 10 miles of the construction site and may be protected through fee title acquisition or a conservation easement on agricultural lands or other suitable habitats acceptable to the California Department of Fish and Game and the County of Yuba or as otherwise approved by the Community Development Director. <p><i>Burrowing Owl</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for burrowing owls within the 30 days prior to construction activities to establish the status of this species on the site. If ground-disturbing activities are delayed or suspended for more than 30 days after the pre-construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed. If burrowing owls are detected within approximately 500 feet of the site, a qualified biologist shall be consulted to develop measures to avoid “take” of this species prior to the initiation of any construction activities. Avoidance measures may include the establishment of buffers and biological monitoring. 	
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<i>Nesting Raptors and Migratory Birds</i>			
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If construction activities are to occur during the nesting season (approximately March-September), pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 500 feet of the proposed construction areas. If active nests are identified in these areas, a qualified biologist shall be consulted to develop measures to avoid “take” of active nests prior to the initiation of any construction activities. Avoidance measures may include the establishment of buffers and biological monitoring. ▪ If removal of any woody vegetation is to be conducted during the nesting season (approximately March to September), a pre-construction survey for active migratory bird nests within proposed disturbance areas shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within two weeks to one month prior to vegetation removal. If vegetation removal activities are delayed or suspended for more than one month after the pre-construction survey, the site shall be resurveyed. If active migratory bird nests are identified, vegetation removal that would disturb these nests shall be postponed until after the nesting season, or a qualified biologist has determined the young have fledged and are independent of the nest site. No active nests shall be disturbed without a permit or other authorization from the USFWS. 	
B Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
D Alternative D is nearly 80 percent mixed woodland/chaparral community. The community provides habitat for nesting raptors and	S	The mitigation measures identified for Alternatives A, B, and C for nesting raptors and migratory birds shall be applied to Alternative D.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>migratory birds. The removal of large trees associated with the development of Alternative D could potentially affect nesting habitat for bald eagle, resulting in a potentially significant impact.</p>			
E Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
4.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<p>A No cultural resources eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) were recorded during the surveys or identified in the record searches. Based upon these findings, the BIA determined that no historic properties would be affected by the Proposed Action.</p>	S	<p>A. Any inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources, shall be subject to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as amended (36 CFR 800), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) (25 USC 3001 et seq.), and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA) (16 U.S.C. 470aa-mm). Specifically, procedures for post review discoveries without prior planning pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13 shall be followed.</p>	LTS
<p>Because no cultural resources have been found or indicated, the project would not result in effects to known cultural resources. Nonetheless, the potential for subsurface resources remains. Project construction will involve earthmoving and excavation for drainage facilities and wastewater ponds and could result in the disturbance of unrecorded, subsurface prehistoric and/or historic cultural resources. This represents a potentially significant impact.</p>		<p>All work within 50 feet of the find shall be halted until a professional archaeologist, or paleontologist if the find is of a paleontological nature, can assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant by the archaeologist, or paleontologist as appropriate, then representatives of the Tribe and the BIA Regional Archaeologist shall meet with the archaeologist, or paleontologist, to determine the appropriate course of action, including the development of a Treatment Plan, if necessary. All significant cultural or paleontological materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional curation, and a report prepared by the professional archaeologist, or paleontologist, according to current professional standards.</p>	
<p>No known paleontological resources occur on the Yuba Site. While the soils on-site are not typically associated with the presence of paleontological materials in the upper layers, fossils have been identified within similar environments within California. Therefore there is the potential for unreported subsurface paleontological resources to be present on-site. This represents a potentially significant impact.</p>		<p>If human remains are discovered during ground-disturbing activities on Tribal lands, pursuant to NAGPRA Section 10.4 Inadvertent Discoveries, the Tribal Official and BIA Regional</p>	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
B Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
<p>D One prehistoric archaeological resource, CA-BUT-691, and one historic-period linear resource, a segment of CA-BUT-1855H, are located within the Butte Site, but outside the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for Alternative D. For treatment purposes, CA-BUT-691, the ethnographic village of <i>Yuhemui</i>, is considered eligible for the NRHP under criterion D for its potential to yield information important to the study of prehistory. The segment of CA-BUT-1855H, the Feather River Railroad, that crosses the Enterprise Rancheria is not eligible for listing on the NRHP due to the lack of integrity of design, association, feeling, workmanship, and materials. Neither site is located within the APE for Alternative D, therefore, there would be no direct impacts to cultural resources from development of the project. However, the proximity of the site to the proposed development makes it possible that the prehistoric site would be inadvertently damaged or intentionally vandalized. This is a potentially significant impact.</p>	S	<p>Same as for Alternative A, and:</p> <p>A. Prior to start of construction activities, an archaeological testing program shall be designed and implemented to substantiate the horizontal boundaries of the prehistoric site located within the Butte site CA-BUT-691. Based upon the results of the testing program, a 50 foot buffer fence will then be put in place to deter impacts from any ground disturbing activities that may effect the prehistoric site.</p> <p>B. Prior to operation of the proposed project, permanent fencing shall be installed around the prehistoric site, including a 20-foot buffer as a formal setback, to discourage pedestrian access to, and vandalism of, the site. Security guards shall also regularly monitor the site to ensure the fence has not been breached. The site shall be maintained in its current state.</p>	LTS
<p>As with Alternative A, potentially significant impacts to unknown cultural resources could occur because the potential for subsurface archaeological resources to be present within the project area (the</p>			

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>Butte Site – Enterprise 1) is high.</p> <p>No known paleontological resources occur on the Butte Site. While the soils on-site are not typically associated with the presence of paleontological materials in the upper layers, fossils have been identified within similar environments within California. Therefore there is the potential for unreported subsurface paleontological resources to be present on-site. This represents a potentially significant impact.</p>			
E As no change in existing land use is proposed, no significant impacts to cultural or paleontological resources are expected.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

4.7 SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS and ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Employment

A Alternative A’s effect on employment would come in both the construction and operational phases. The impacts of construction would be felt for the duration of construction spending. The operational effects would be felt for as long as the casino/hotel/resort was in operation. Direct employment includes those employees who are directly employed at the facility either during construction or during operation. Indirect employment includes those employees who provide services and are employed at least in part due to the facility but are not directly employed at the facility. Induced employment includes jobs that are created due to the ripple effect of spending throughout the economy as a whole. Alternative A would result in the creation of 1,300 temporary construction-related positions. Alternative A facilities would employ 1,933 full time equivalent employees. Indirect or induced jobs would total 429 permanent positions and 655 temporary construction-related positions within Yuba and Sutter Counties, which would have a beneficial effect on the	BE	No mitigation is recommended.	BE
---	----	-------------------------------	----

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
region's unemployment rate and the local economy as a whole.			
<p>B Alternative B impacts are similar to Alternative A although reduced in size. This alternative would increase employment by approximately 688 temporary positions and 852 permanent positions. Indirect or induced jobs would total 208 permanent positions and 239 temporary construction-related positions within Yuba and Sutter Counties, which would have a beneficial effect on the region's unemployment rate and the local economy as a whole.</p>	BE	No mitigation is recommended.	BE
<p>C Alternative C's beneficial effects on construction and operation employment would be much lower given that Alternative C does not include a casino or hotel component. Alternative C would result in the creation of 643 temporary construction-related positions. Alternative C facilities would employ 1,018 full time equivalent employees. Indirect or induced jobs would total 222 permanent positions and 333 temporary construction-related positions within Yuba and Sutter Counties, which would have a beneficial effect on the region's unemployment rate and the local economy as a whole.</p>	BE	No mitigation is recommended.	BE
<p>D Under Alternative D the casino/hotel resort would be reduced in size when compared with Alternative A. Construction of Alternative D would result in less construction costs, as well as less generated output and wages as Alternative A. Under Alternative D indirect and induced output and wages would be of the same nature as Alternative A. However, less output and wages would be generated since the direct impacts of Alternative D are to a lesser degree than Alternative A. This alternative would increase employment by approximately 374 temporary positions and 340 permanent positions. Indirect or induced jobs would total 152 permanent positions and 257 temporary construction-related positions within Butte County, which would have a beneficial effect on the region's unemployment rate and the local</p>	BE	No mitigation is recommended.	BE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
economy as a whole.			
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No additional jobs would be created.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Housing			
A The local labor market could satisfy the majority of temporary and permanent jobs demanded by Alternative A. Therefore a significant number of new employees would not need to relocate from outside of Yuba and Sutter Counties. Development of Alternative A would reduce vacancy rates in the 2009 housing market of Marysville and Yuba City from 4.6% to 3.7%, and nominally reduce the number of vacant units and vacancy rates in the remainder of Yuba and Sutter Counties. Given the relatively low vacancy rates projected, this would likely have a positive impact on property values. However, this impact is not expected to be substantial enough to change the dynamics of the local housing market. This would be a less than significant impact to the housing market and would not result in the need for new housing.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A. While Alternative B would reduce vacancy rates and likely have a positive impact on property values in Yuba and Sutter Counties, the impact is not expected to be substantial enough to change the dynamics of the local housing market, and would be to a lesser degree than Alternative A. This would be a less than significant impact to the housing market and would not result in the need for new housing.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A. While Alternative C would reduce vacancy rates and likely have a positive impact on property values in Yuba and Sutter Counties, the impact is not expected to be substantial enough to change the dynamics of the local housing market, and would be to a	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
lesser degree than Alternative A.			
D Due to the majority of jobs demanded by Alternative D being satisfied by construction workers in the local labor market, and the jobs temporary in nature, a significant number of new employees would not relocate from outside of Butte County. This would be a less than significant impact to the housing market and would not result in the need for new housing.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No housing impacts would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Community Infrastructure Impacts</i>			
A As discussed above, the development of Alternative A would not have a significant amount of new employees relocated to Yuba and Sutter Counties. Enrollment in Yuba County public schools are increasing, but at a lower rate than the state average. Increased enrollment indirectly caused by Alternative A would be adequately accommodated by public schools.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended	LTS
Effects to area parks and libraries are not a significant impact due to the minor number of new employees that would relocate to Yuba County.			
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D Impacts to schools from development of Alternative D would be similar but reduced when compared to Alternative A, because of the reduced size and scope of Alternative D. The increased enrollment indirectly caused by Alternative D would be adequately accommodated by area schools, resulting in a less than significant	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
effect.			
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No community infrastructure impacts would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Social Effects</i>			
A An additional casino in Yuba County under Alternative A would not impact those people who are problem gamblers, since they already have a number of conveniently located gaming venues and non-casino outlets to participate in gambling. Therefore, impacts to problem gambling would be less than significant. Nonetheless, the Tribe has agreed in an MOU with Yuba County to “make a contribution of no less than \$60,000 per year to a charitable organization dedicated to the treatment and prevention of pathological gambling disorders and which is located and/or providing services within Yuba County. In addition, mitigation measures would be implemented to further reduce less than significant impacts to pathological and problem gambling.	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is recommended that the casino participate in responsible gaming practices and provide information to gamers and employees with regards to identifying and treating problem gaming. ▪ Maintain a database of past criminal offenders and bar their presence from the property. ▪ Maintain undercover security personnel to monitor unusual behavior in the casino and parking areas. ▪ Coordinate with local law enforcement agencies to identify and apprehend petty crime suspects. 	LTS
Development under Alternative A would be considered a large-scale development, and would introduce large number of patrons and employees into the community on a daily basis. As a result the volume of crime in the community would increase. A National Gambling Impact Study Commission (NGISC) report investigated the causal relationship between casinos and crime. The literature shows that communities with casinos are just as safe as communities that do not have casinos. Nonetheless, public service demands may increase and mitigation measures discussed below in Yuba County Fiscal Impacts would be implemented.			
B Effects to regional crime rates would be similar to Alternative A. Although the Alternative B casino would be reduced in size when compared to Alternative A, the effects to problem gambling are	LTS	Same as for Alternative A	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
conservatively not assumed to differ.			
C No pathological or problem gambling impacts would result from Alternative C since a casino component is not included. Impacts to crime would be similar but reduced when compared to Alternative A given that Alternative C would be drawing a similarly large population to the Yuba Site, but unlike Alternative A the on-site/area population would be limited to hotel guests in the evenings and during the winter, when the amusement park would not be operational.	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain undercover security personnel to monitor unusual behavior in locker room areas. ▪ Maintain a database of past criminal offenders and bar their presence from the property. ▪ Coordinate with local law enforcement agencies to identify and apprehend petty crime suspects. ▪ Restrict vehicular access in and around ticket portals and prohibit “automobile cruising on all roads within the water park.” 	LTS
D The social impacts of Alternative D would be reduced when compared to Alternative A, given that Alternative D is reduced in size and scope.	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Same as for Alternative A 	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No social impacts would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Yuba County Fiscal Impacts</i>			
A Under Alternative A the fee-to-trust transfer of the Yuba Site would remove the 40-acre site from Yuba County’s property tax rolls resulting in the loss of property tax revenue to the County. Once the site is placed in trust, the proposed developments would not be subject to the Yuba County Consolidated Fee Ordinance. Thus, the County would potentially be deprived of ordinary on-time development fees, including the County Public Facilities fee.	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No mitigation is recommended. 	LTS
Implementation of Alternative A, would increase governmental tax revenues. Specifically, governmental tax revenues would be generated for federal, state, and Yuba County local governments. Increased governmental tax revenues resulting from the			

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
implementation of Alternative A would offset negative effects due to the loss of Yuba County tax revenue. In addition, the Tribe has agreed to make various payments to Yuba County and the City of Marysville that would further compensate the County and Marysville after the implementation of Alternative A.			
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Under Alternative C, revenue impacts from loss of property taxes would be the same as Alternative A, since both alternatives involve the fee-to-trust transfer of the Yuba Site. Tax revenue sources under Alternative C would be similar to Alternative A, but revenues would be to a lesser degree than Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D Unlike the Yuba Site, the Butte Site is already held in trust, thus the development of the Butte Site would not result in impacts to Butte County revenues. The development of Alternative D would result in governmental tax revenues, which would be generated for federal, state, and Butte County local governments. Tax revenue sources under Alternative D would be similar to Alternative A, but revenues would be to a lesser degree than Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. Neither the Tribe nor the local government would benefit from the potential economic success of the development alternatives.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE CONDITIONS			
<i>Minority and Low-Income Populations</i>			
A No low-income populations and one minority population exist in Census Tract 404 at the Yuba site. This census tract is considered a minority population because 50% of the 5,343 people are considered minorities, primarily Hispanics or Latinos and Asians.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>Construction and operation of Alternative A would not adversely impact the minority population in Census Tract 404 disproportionately compared to the remaining population in Census Tract 404 or any of the other identified census tracts within proximity of Alternative A. Primary traffic impacts would occur on area highways and intersections/interchanges in the vicinity of the Yuba Site. Localized impacts on the Yuba Site, such as various impacts to land and water resources, would not affect Census Tract 404. Regional impacts, such as air quality impacts, would be distributed throughout the region rather than disproportionately effecting Census Tract 404. Alternative A would benefit all races within proximity of the Yuba Site by creating employment opportunities that would be primarily filled by the local labor market. Thus, a less than significant environmental justice impact would result.</p>			
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D No minority or low-income populations have been identified within proximity of the Butte Site.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No environmental justice impacts would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Competition			
A While the Tribe would benefit from the development of Alternative A, the surrounding tribes that operate casinos could experience decreases in winnings, and potentially be adversely impacted by the decreases.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>Alternative A is expected to capture approximately \$77 million in total gaming win from the local market. The projected reductions in gaming win from other northern California casinos likely represents a</p>			

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>small percentage of each operation’s gross gaming revenue, and would have a nominal impact on the operation of the casinos. These reductions, should they occur, would be the result of increased competition in the market and would not be directed at any one Tribe. Given that all casinos, including proposed casinos, would remain in operation after the implementation of Alternative A, a disproportionate and adverse effect to Tribes would not occur (although a nominal impact would occur) and a less than significant impact would result.</p>			
<p>B While the Tribe would benefit from the development of Alternative B, as with Alternative A, the surrounding tribes that operate casinos could experience some degree of decrease of winnings. Under Alternative B northern California casinos would experience a decline of approximately \$44 million as a result of Alternative B. Given that all casinos, including proposed casinos, would remain in operation after the implementation of Alternative B, a disproportionate and adverse effect to Tribes would not occur (although a nominal impact would occur) and a less than significant impact would result.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>C Since Alternative C would consist of a water park rather than a casino/resort, no competitive impacts would occur to the existing gaming market.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>D While the Tribe would benefit from the development of Alternative D, as with Alternative A, the surrounding tribes that operate casinos could experience some degree of decrease of winnings. Under Alternative D northern California casinos would experience a decline of approximately \$14 million. Given that all casinos, including proposed casinos, would remain in operation after the implementation of Alternative D, a disproportionate and adverse effect to Tribes would not occur (although a nominal impact would occur) and a less</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
than significant impact would result.			
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No environmental justice impacts would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
4.8 RESOURCE USE PATTERNS			
<i>Transportation/Circulation</i>			
A Alternative A would either result in an unacceptable LOS or contribute to already unacceptable operations, resulting in a significant impact at several roadway segments and intersections.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roadway segment and intersection improvements recommended under each alternative are listed in Section 5.2.7. Mitigation measures for each roadway segment and intersection are identified in the year of need. 	LTS
Alternative A is not expected to generate significant customers who access the project site by foot or bicycle nor is there developed public transit within the project area. Less than significant impacts would occur to sidewalks for pedestrians, bicycle lanes, or public transit.	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should the County wish to encourage the development of pedestrian and bicycle facilities along Forty Mile Road, the Tribe should pay a fair share of the development of such facilities. ▪ Should the County wish to encourage the development of transit service to the Forty Mile Road area / Amphitheatre area, the Tribe should pay a fair share of the development of such facilities if they allow for transit access to the Yuba Site. 	LTS
		2007	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SR-65 between First Street and Main Street (Wheatland) – The Tribe shall contribute their fair share to the Wheatland by-pass, which would decrease traffic volumes on SR-65 through Wheatland and is, therefore, the preferred measure to alleviate traffic congestion in the Wheatland area (see Figure 5-1), or contribute their fair share to making the following changes if feasible: widen the section which would also require that the four-lane section be tapered back to two lanes immediately north of First Street and south of Main Street. This would require a 250-foot widening approach taper and a 200-foot two-lane per 	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
B Similar to Alternative A.	S	<p>direction roadway section on the southbound approach to the First Street intersection and on the northbound approach to the Main Street intersection. In the other directions, a 200-foot four-lane section and a 510-foot merge section would be required as shown in Figure 5-2.</p> <p>2025</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ McGowan Parkway from SR-65 to Donald Drive - This section of roadway should be widened by 12 feet on each side from the ramp interchange to Donald Drive. Although the traffic analysis only indicates the road should be widened to an area west of SR 70, to avoid merging two lanes of traffic into one through an intersection, the widening should be provided westward through the Donald Drive intersection (see Figure 5-3). ▪ Plumas Arboga Road between SR-70 and Forty Mile Road - This section of roadway should be widened by 12 feet on each side for the entire length of the section (from the ramp interchange to Forty Mile Road, where it is already a four-lane cross section) (see Figure 5-5). ▪ The Tribe shall contribute their fair share towards the implementation of improvements to the intersections/ramps detailed in Table 5-1. 	LTS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should the County wish to encourage the development of pedestrian and bicycle facilities along Forty Mile Road, the Tribe should pay a fair share of the development of such facilities. ▪ Should the County wish to encourage the development of transit service to the Forty Mile Road area / Amphitheatre area, the Tribe should pay a fair share of the development of such facilities 	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<p>if they allow for transit access to the Yuba Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall work with the County to provide transit service to the site, if feasible. ▪ The Tribe shall pay the County traffic impact fee, to the extent that equivalent fees are not paid for under a MOU with the County. ▪ The Tribe shall contribute their fair share to widening the following roadways by a total of 24 feet (one additional through lane per direction): <p>2007</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SR-65 between First Street and Main Street (Wheatland) – The Tribe shall contribute their fair share to the Wheatland by-pass, which would decrease traffic volumes on SR-65 through Wheatland and is, therefore, the preferred measure to alleviate traffic congestion in the Wheatland area (see Figure 5-1), or contribute their fair share to making the following changes if feasible: widen the section which would also require that the four-lane section be tapered back to two lanes immediately north of First Street and south of Main Street. This would require a 250-foot widening approach taper and a 200-foot two-lane per direction roadway section on the southbound approach to the First Street intersection and on the northbound approach to the Main Street intersection. In the other directions, a 200-foot four-lane section and a 510-foot merge section would be required as shown in Figure 5-2. <p>2025</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ McGowan Parkway from SR-65 to Donald Drive - This section of roadway should be widened by 12 feet on each side from the ramp interchange to Donald Drive. Although the traffic analysis 	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
C Similar to Alternative A.	S	<p>only indicates the road should be widened to an area west of SR 70, to avoid merging two lanes of traffic into one through an intersection, the widening should be provided westward through the Donald Drive intersection (see Figure 5-3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plumas Arboga Road between SR-70 and Forty Mile Road - This section of roadway should be widened by 12 feet on each side for the entire length of the section (from the ramp interchange to Forty Mile Road, where it is already a four-lane cross section) (see Figure 5-5). ▪ The Tribe shall contribute their fair share towards the implementation of improvements to the intersections/ramps detailed in Table 5-2. ▪ Should the County wish to encourage the development of pedestrian and bicycle facilities along Forty Mile Road, the Tribe should pay a fair share of the development of such facilities. ▪ Should the County wish to encourage the development of transit service to the Forty Mile Road area / Amphitheatre area, the Tribe should pay a fair share of the development of such facilities if they allow for transit access to the Yuba Site. ▪ The Tribe shall pay the County traffic impact fee, to the extent that equivalent fees are not paid for under a MOU with the County. ▪ The Tribe shall contribute their fair share to widening the following roadways by a total of 24 feet (one additional through lane per direction): 	LTS

2007

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>SR-65 between First Street and Main Street (Wheatland)</u>– The Tribe shall contribute their fair share to the Wheatland by-pass, which would decrease traffic volumes on SR-65 through Wheatland and is, therefore, the preferred measure to alleviate traffic congestion in the Wheatland area (see Figure 5-1), or contribute their fair share to making the following changes if feasible: widen the section which would also require that the four-lane section be tapered back to two lanes immediately north of First Street and south of Main Street. This would require a 250-foot widening approach taper and a 200-foot two-lane per direction roadway section on the southbound approach to the First Street intersection and on the northbound approach to the Main Street intersection. In the other directions, a 200-foot four-lane section and a 510-foot merge section would be required as shown in Figure 5-2. 	
		2025	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>McGowan Parkway from SR-65 to Donald Drive</u> - This section of roadway should be widened by 12 feet on each side from the ramp interchange to Donald Drive. Although the traffic analysis only indicates the road should be widened to an area west of SR 70, to avoid merging two lanes of traffic into one through an intersection, the widening should be provided westward through the Donald Drive intersection (see Figure 5-3). ▪ <u>Plumas Arboga Road between SR-70 and Forty Mile Road</u> - This section of roadway should be widened by 12 feet on each side for the entire length of the section (from the ramp interchange to Forty Mile Road, where it is already a four-lane cross section) (see Figure 5-5). ▪ The Tribe shall contribute their fair share towards the implementation of improvements to the intersections/ramps 	

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		detailed in Table 5-3 .	
D Alternative D would have similar impacts to traffic as Alternative A, except impacts would occur on roadways between the project site and Chico, Oroville, Marysville and other nearby population centers.	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall work with the County to provide transit service to the site, if feasible. ▪ The Tribe shall pay the County traffic impact fee, to the extent that equivalent fees are not paid for under a MOU with the County. ▪ The Tribe shall contribute their fair share to widening the following roadways: <p style="text-align: center;">2025</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Craig Access Road from Lumpkin Road - to the site access will need to be paved and widened to 30 feet to provide at least two 12-foot travel lanes, two-foot shoulders, and one-foot curb/gutter, consistent with the County Minor Collector requirements (see Figure 5-11). ▪ The Tribe shall contribute their fair share towards the implementation of improvements to the intersections/ramps detailed in Table 5-4. 	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No traffic impacts would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<i>Land Use</i>			
A Yuba County land use regulations would not apply to land that is taken into trust. The only applicable land use regulations would be federal or Tribal. While Yuba County land use regulations would not apply to lands taken into federal trust, impacts may occur in terms the project's relation to growth and development visions as described in the Yuba County General Plan. Alternative A land uses would replace existing agricultural and open space uses and would differ from adjacent land uses. However, the proposed development would be consistent with the zoning for the site, would not physically disrupt neighboring land uses, would not prohibit access to neighboring parcels, or otherwise significantly conflict with neighboring land uses. Development of the Yuba Site has the potential to result in land use compatibility impacts with nearby sensitive receptors as discussed in detail in the other topical sections of this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D Alternative D would involve the construction of a casino on existing tribal trust property surrounded by unincorporated lands located within Butte County. As the proposed development would not take place on land currently under County jurisdiction, the General Plan does not provide a land use designation for the Butte Site or goals and policies relevant to Alternative D.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>Alternative D would result in the development of a casino and ancillary parking on approximately 6 acres of land within the 40-acre Butte Site. These land uses would replace existing rural residential and open space uses and would differ from surrounding land uses. However, the proposed development would not physically disrupt neighboring land uses, would not prohibit access to neighboring parcels, or otherwise significantly conflict with neighboring land uses.</p> <p>Development of the Butte Site has the potential to result in land use compatibility impacts with nearby sensitive receptors as discussed in detail in the other topical sections of this EIS, where applicable. Impacts may include, but are not limited to, air quality and noise effects from construction and operational activities (Sections 4.4 and 4.10 respectively); congestion on rural roads not sized to handle increased traffic (Section 4.8); and alterations of the visual resources and aesthetics of the Butte Site (Section 4.10).</p>			
<p>E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No land use impacts would occur.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<i>Agriculture</i>			
A Alternative A would result in the direct conversion of approximately 36 acres of farmland to a casino/hotel. Additionally, development of Alternative A would result in the expansion of the WWTP and subsequently the conversion of 8 acres of agricultural land to wastewater treatment related uses. According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), both the Yuba Site and the wastewater treatment area do not contain prime, important, or unique farmland.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D Development of Alternative D would not result in the conversion of farmland on-site. In addition, the Butte Site does not contain land designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Appendix P). Additionally, the land is not under Williamson Act contract.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No loss of agricultural resources would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	

4.9 PUBLIC SERVICES

Water Supply

A The average water demand for domestic purposes and landscape irrigation for Alternative A would be approximately 122,000 gpd. For this demand, a minimum firm supply of 90 gallons per minute (gpm) is recommended. The water demand would be supplied by an on-site groundwater well and associated facilities. The local Fire Marshall	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
--	-----	-------------------------------	-----

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>recommends a fire flow of 3,000 gpm for two hours. The recommended storage for the project, based on the fire flow and emergency storage of two days of peak demand, is approximately 750,000 gallons. A water storage tank would provide peak weekend flows and emergency fire flows.</p>			
<p>Alternative A and the increased use of water would not affect any nearby public water providers. The average inflow beneath the Yuba Site is estimated at 1,000 acre-feet per year. The average water demand from Alternative A is well below the estimated groundwater inflow (Luhdorff and Scalmanini, 2000).</p>			
<p>B The average water demand for domestic purposes and landscape irrigation for Alternative B would be approximately 85,000 gpd. For this demand, the minimum firm supply would be less than 90 gpm. As with Alternative A, water demand would be supplied by an on-site groundwater well, storage tank, and associated facilities.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>Alternative B and the increased use of water would not affect any nearby public water providers.</p>			
<p>C The average water demand for domestic purposes and landscape irrigation for Alternative C would be approximately 73,000 gpd. For this demand, the minimum firm supply would be less than 90 gpm. The recommended storage for the project, based on the fire flow and emergency storage of two days of peak demand, is approximately 500,000 gallons. As with Alternative A, water demand would be supplied by an on-site groundwater well, storage tank, and associated facilities.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>Alternative C and the increased use of water would not significantly affect any nearby public water providers.</p>			

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>D The average water demand for domestic purposes and landscape irrigation for Alternative D would be approximately 17,000 gpd. For this demand plus additional capacity to meet existing residential home demands, a minimum firm supply of 20 gpm is recommended. The water demand would be supplied by an on-site groundwater well and associated facilities. As with Alternative A, a fire flow of 3,000 gpm for two hours is recommended. The recommended storage for the project, based on the fire flow and emergency storage of two days of peak demand, is approximately 400,000 gallons. A water storage tank would provide these peak weekend flows and emergency fire flows.</p> <p>The increased use of water associated with Alternative D would not affect any public water providers, of which there are none near the Butte Site.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No additional water demand would occur.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Wastewater Service			
<p>A The average day flows for Alternative A would be 106,000 gpd. Wastewater service to Alternative A would be provided by upgrading the existing wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), which serves the Sleep Train Amphitheater. As the existing WWTP has weekend flows of 170,000 gpd and Alternative A is projected to have weekend flows of 141,000 gpd, it is recommended that the treatment plant have a capacity of 325,000 gpd.</p> <p>The expanded wastewater facility would disinfect and treat wastewater to a secondary level to meet Title 22 standards prior to disposal or storage. Treated effluent would be disposed to spray fields. A seasonal storage basin would be utilized during rain events. Use of treated wastewater for this purpose would not cause adverse public</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
health impacts, and would be consistent with California Department of Health Services regulations.			
B The average wastewater flow for Alternative B would be approximately 71,000 gpd. As with Alternative A, wastewater service would be provided by upgrading the existing WWTP that serves the Sleep Train Amphitheater. As the existing WWTP has weekend flows of 170,000 gpd and Alternative B is projected to have weekend flows of 100,000 gpd, it is recommended that the WWTP have a capacity of 275,000 gpd.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C The average wastewater flow for Alternative C would be approximately 35,000 gpd. As with Alternative A, wastewater service would be provided by upgrading the existing WWTP, which serves the Sleep Train Amphitheater. As the existing WWTP has weekend flows of 170,000 gpd and Alternative C is projected to have weekend flows of 39,000 gpd, the recommended treatment capacity is 225,000 gpd.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D The average day flows for Alternative D would be 11,000 gpd. Wastewater service would be provided to Alternative D by the construction of an on-site wastewater treatment system with seasonal storage and spray fields.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No additional wastewater treatment or discharge would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Solid Waste			
A Construction			
Construction of Alternative A would result in a temporary increase in waste generation. Waste that cannot be recycled would be disposed of	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>at the Ostrom Road Landfill, which accepts construction/demolition materials.</p>			
<i>Operation</i>			
<p>The waste generation resulting from Alternative A's various components is estimated to be 9.5 tons per day.</p>	LTS	<p>A. The Tribe shall install a trash compactor for cardboard and paper products.</p> <p>B. The Tribe shall install recycling bins throughout the facilities for glass, cans and paper products.</p> <p>C. Decorative trash and recycling receptacles will be placed strategically throughout the area of the Yuba Site or Butte Site, as appropriate, to encourage people not to litter at the facilities.</p> <p>D. Security guards shall be trained to discourage littering on site.</p>	LTS
<p>The Tribe would contract with Yuba-Sutter Disposal, or a similar provider, to dispose of solid waste generated by Alternative A. In addition to providing bins for recyclables, all waste is sorted at Yuba-Sutter Disposal's Materials Recovery Facility, where the remaining recyclables are separated from the waste stream and recycled.</p>			
<p>The project would not affect County diversion goals as Tribal land is classified as out-of-state waste and is not calculated in local waste diversion statistics. Due to the relatively large permitted daily capacity in relation to estimated solid waste generation, impacts to solid waste facilities would be less than significant. Mitigation is included to further reduce the amount of solid waste disposed of at the landfill.</p>			
<p>Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for sludge disposal at the expanded WWTP would be similar to the requirements for the existing plant. Thus, significant impacts from sludge disposal would not occur.</p>			
<p>B Environmental effects for Alternative B are similar to Alternative A except for reduced solid waste. The waste generation resulting from Alternative B's various components is estimated to be 4.4 tons per day.</p>	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
<p>C Environmental effects for Alternative C are similar to Alternative A except for reduced solid waste. The waste generation resulting from</p>	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>Alternative C's various components is estimated to be 4.9 tons per day.</p>			
<p>D <i>Construction</i></p>			
<p>Construction of Alternative D would result in a temporary increase in waste generation. Waste that cannot be recycled would be disposed of at the Neal Road Landfill, which accepts construction/demolition materials.</p>	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
<p><i>Operation</i></p>			
<p>The California Integrated Waste Management Board has established waste generation rates for the operation of different business types. The waste generation resulting from Alternative D's various components is estimated to be 1.24 tons per day.</p>			
<p>The Tribe would contract with one of the four hauling companies serving Butte County to dispose of solid waste generated by Alternative D. As discussed under Alternative A, waste generated on Tribal land does not affect County waste diversion goals.</p>			
<p>Alternative D is expected to generate 1.24 tons of solid waste per day, which would be well within the Neal Road Landfill's available daily capacity and which represents approximately 0.08% of the landfill's average permitted daily intake and approximately 0.16% of the actual daily intake. The landfill has an estimated remaining capacity of approximately 22 million cubic yards and an estimated closure date of 2033. Due to the relatively large permitted daily capacity in relation to estimated solid waste generation, impacts to solid waste facilities would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No new sources of solid waste would be generated.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<p>Less than Significant = LTS</p>	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
<p>Alternative A = A</p>	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
<p align="center">Alternative E = E</p>			

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<i>Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications</i>			
<p>A Alternative A's anticipated electrical service demand for the hotel and casino is approximately 6.68 megawatts. Electrical service for the proposed project would continue to be provided by PG&E. The anticipated service demand resulting from project development may require an increase in capacity at the Plumas Substation and an upgrade of the overhead lines along Plumas-Arboga Road and Forty Mile Road.</p> <p>The California Public Utilities Commission has mandated specific clearance requirements between power lines and surrounding objects or construction activities. Significant effects could occur to PG&E facilities based on activities such as grading over or under PG&E facilities, construction of structures within or adjacent to PG&E easements and planting of certain types of vegetation over or underneath PG&E facilities (Chambers, 2004). Project traffic system improvements may require the relocation of PG&E facilities, resulting in a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Natural gas would not be used for Alternative A.</p>	S	<p>The Tribe shall be responsible for a fair share of costs associated with any relocation of existing PG&E facilities to accommodate the proposed development and traffic improvements. Appropriate funds shall be made available to conduct any necessary relocation and to construct any system upgrades required by the project.</p>	LTS
<p>B Environmental effects for Alternative B are similar to Alternative A except for reduced electrical demand. The electrical demand would be proportionately less than the 6.68 megawatts estimated for Alternative A.</p>	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
<p>C Similar to Alternative B.</p>	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
<p>D Electricity and telephone services are currently provided to the Butte Site. Alternative D's anticipated electrical service demand would be well below the demand for Alternative A. The Tribe would be required to coordinate with PG&E and AT&T regarding connections to the casino and necessary upgrades. The final determination for</p>	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
<p>Less than Significant = LTS</p> <p>Alternative A = A</p>	<p>Significant = S</p> <p>Alternative B = B</p>	<p>No Effect = NE</p> <p>Alternative C = C</p>	<p>Beneficial Effect = BE</p> <p>Alternative D = D</p> <p>Alternative E = E</p>

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>service upgrades would be made during the application process.</p> <p>The California Public Utilities Commission has mandated specific clearance requirements between utility lines and surrounding objects or construction activities. Project construction would avoid existing electrical infrastructure. Project traffic system improvements may require the relocation of PG&E facilities, resulting in a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>Natural gas service is not immediately available and the nearest service connection would be near Oroville. As alternate energy sources are available, the impact to natural gas services would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No increase in electrical, natural gas, or telecommunications services would occur.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Public Health And Safety			
<p>A Once land is taken into trust, most state and local laws and ordinances pertaining to fair employment practices and the protection of the health and safety of employees and customers, would not be applicable to activities on the Yuba Site. The Tribe, however, has agreed to several provisions in the MOU.</p> <p>In addition, the Tribal-State Compact is anticipated to require similar provisions to the MOU regarding health, safety and building standards. With the provisions in the MOU and the Compact, impacts to health and safety would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>B Similar to Alternative A, except the MOU provisions would not apply.</p>	LTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall adopt and comply with standards no less stringent than state public health standards for food and beverage handling. 	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Tribe shall adopt and comply with standards no less stringent than water quality and safe drinking water standards applicable to California, by operation of either state or federal law. ▪ The Tribe shall adopt and comply with building standards no less stringent than applicable building codes, fire codes, plumbing, electrical and related codes applicable in the County by either state law or County codes. ▪ The Tribe shall adopt and comply with standards no less stringent than any County ordinances and California state laws dealing with fire safety pertaining to the operation of the resort hotel, gaming facility and ancillary facilities. ▪ The Tribe shall adopt and comply with standards no less stringent than federal work place and occupational health and safety standards. 	
C Similar to Alternative B.	LTS	Same as for Alternative B.	LTS
D Most state and local laws and ordinances pertaining to fair employment practices and the protection of the health and safety of employees and customers, would not be applicable to activities on the Butte Site.	LTS	Same as for Alternative B.	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No impacts to public health and safety would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Law Enforcement And Crime			
A Under Public Law 280, the State of California and other local law enforcement agencies have enforcement authority over criminal activities on Tribal land. Alternative A is located in the jurisdiction of the Yuba County Sheriff's Department. In general, the casino would	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>not cause a substantial increase in crime, however petty crime including vandalism, burglaries, purse snatching, pick-pocketing, coin bucket snatching, and other non-violent crimes are typical of high-traffic development such as casinos, shopping malls, and amusement parks.</p>			
<p>Impacts to the Sheriff’s Department would include increased oversight of area roadways and an increased number of service calls to the Yuba Site. To assure response coverage during peak periods it is estimated that three additional law enforcement personnel, a new patrol car, and related law enforcement equipment would be needed. It is estimated that these annual expenditures would not exceed \$750,000. The MOU between the Tribe and County provides ample funds to cover incremental expenses related to fire, police, and emergency services. Additionally, Yuba County stated in a letter to the U.S. Department of Interior, that the MOU “more than adequately mitigates all anticipated impacts of the proposed development” in part through “providing revenue to support public services to the property”. The Tribe would provide security at the casino. On-site security and County police support would be adequate under the terms of the MOU and the anticipated Tribal-State Compact.</p>			
<p>B Environmental effects for Alternative B are similar to Alternative A except for reduced law enforcement services. To assure response coverage during peak periods it is estimated police staffing and equipment may need to increase by two additional law enforcement personnel and one patrol car. These annual expenditures would not exceed \$500,000. A significant effect would result if these additional staffing and equipment needs were not met after the opening of the project.</p>	S	<p>The Tribe shall enter into an MOU or provide for a similar agreement to reimburse the affected law enforcement department for the provision of law enforcement services. This agreement would include compensation for increased equipment or staffing needs from the development.</p>	LTS
<p>C As with Alternative A, Alternative C would receive law enforcement</p>	S	<p>Same as for Alternative B.</p>	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>services from the Yuba County Sheriff’s Department. There could be a rise in crime from gangs due to the appeal of the water park to adolescents. An increase in petty crimes typical of high-traffic development such as casinos, shopping malls, and amusement parks could occur.</p> <p>Impacts to the Sheriff’s Department would include increased oversight of area roadways and an increased number of service calls to the Yuba Site. Increased gang activity would require investigative services from the Department. Annual expenditures for the Sheriff’s Department to provide service to Alternative C would not exceed \$250,000. A significant effect would result if these additional staffing and equipment needs were not met after the opening of the project.</p>			
<p>D Alternative D is located on trust land and is in the jurisdiction of the Butte County Sheriff’s Department. Impacts of crime from a casino development would be similar to Alternative A.</p>	S	Same as for Alternative B.	LTS
<p>Impacts to the Sheriff’s Department would include increased oversight of area roadways and an increased number of service calls to the Butte Site.</p>			
<p>E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No impacts to law enforcement services would occur.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Alcoholic Beverages</i>			
<p>A The facilities under Alternative A would serve alcohol, potentially increasing problems with drunken driving and underage drinking. The risk is similar to that from other businesses serving alcohol such as bars and restaurants and sports venues. These problems lead to increased service calls to the California Highway Patrol and local law enforcement. Patrons would be required to be 21 years old or over and the Tribe proposes to adopt a “Responsible Alcoholic Beverage</p>	LTS	<p>The Tribe shall pass an ordinance creating a standard policy encouraging responsible drinking and designated driver programs. As part of this policy, the gaming and entertainment facility employees serving alcohol shall undergo Responsible Beverage Service Training (RBST), also known as “server training.” RBST educates mangers, servers and sellers at alcohol establishments about strategies to avoid illegally selling alcohol to underage youth or intoxicated patrons. The goal of RBST is to decrease</p>	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Policy” that would include, but not be limited to, checking identification of patrons and refusing service to those who appear to have had enough to drink.		the number of illegal alcohol sales to underage youth and intoxicated patrons through education programs.	
B Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Alcoholic beverages would not be served at Alternative C facilities and on-site security would deter of illegal drinking on the premises. Thus, impacts from drunken driving and underage drinking would be less than significant.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No impacts from serving alcoholic beverages would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Fire Protection			
A <i>Construction</i>			
Construction of Alternative A would introduce potential sources of fire to the Yuba Site. During construction, equipment and vehicles may come into contact with wildland areas and accidentally spark and ignite vegetation. Equipment used during grading and construction activities may also create sparks which could ignite vegetation on the Yuba Site. BMPs incorporated into the project would lessen this risk.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Operation</i>			
The Yuba Site is within the Wheatland Fire Authority service area and it is anticipated that it would provide fire suppression and a portion of the emergency medical services to the Yuba Site. Alternative A would increase calls for service to the Wheatland Fire Authority, due	S	The Tribe shall enter into a binding agreement with the Wheatland Fire Authority (formerly Plumas-Brophy Fire District) or another fire protection district located within the County of Yuba, or make arrangements in lieu of	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>to an increased population of employees and patrons at the site. Most calls for service would be emergency medical assists. Additionally, the Wheatland Fire Authority anticipates the need for a 6-story ladder truck in connection with the height of the Alternative A hotel.</p>		<p>an agreement for the provision of fire and emergency medical services to the Yuba Site. This agreement would include compensation for increased equipment, staffing, or station needs from the development.</p>	
<p>A fire flow of 3,000 gpm for two hours, as recommended by the local Fire Marshall, would be provided through a 750,000 gallon storage tank, which is incorporated as part of the project. Fire protection features, including sprinkler systems and fire-resistant construction, would be incorporated into Alternative A. The Tribe has agreed to provisions in the MOU which would ensure compliance with building standards, including fire codes, no less stringent than related codes applicable in Yuba County. The Tribe has also agreed in the MOU to comply with standards no less stringent than any County ordinances and California state law dealing with fire safety and pertaining to the operation of a gaming facility or resort hotel.</p>			
<p>A large-scale residential development near the Sleep Train Amphitheater is in the planning stages. To provide adequate response times it may be necessary to build a fire station in the vicinity of the residential and casino development. Costs for a neighborhood substation along with related fire suppression equipment is estimated at \$3 to \$4 million. Ongoing staffing of 2 to 4 personnel would not exceed \$1,000,000. Equipment and other needs for the Wheatland Fire Authority or other appropriate fire protection district will be fulfilled through an agreement formed pursuant to the MOU. A significant impact would result if no agreement for services were reached.</p>			
<p>B Environmental effects for Alternative B are similar to Alternative A except the quantity of surplus water required for fire hazards is reduced. Project design would implement similar fire protection</p>	S	<p>Same as Alternative A and see Public Health and Safety, Section 4.9 above, for measures requiring compliance with applicable building and fire codes.</p>	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
measures as Alternative A. However, a significant impact would result if no agreement for fire services with the Wheatland Fire Authority were reached and if a failure to comply with appropriate building and fire codes occurred.			
C Similar to Alternative B.	S	Same as Alternative A and see Public Health and Safety, Section 4.9 above , for measures requiring compliance with applicable building and fire codes.	LTS
<i>D Construction</i>			
Fire risks during construction of Alternative D are similar to those that are found at other construction sites, and would be lessened by BMPs incorporated into the project.	S	The Tribe shall enter into a binding agreement with the Butte County Fire Department or make arrangements in lieu of an agreement for the provision of fire and emergency medical services to the Butte Site. This agreement would include compensation for increased equipment, staffing, or station needs from the development. See Public Health and Safety, Section 4.9 above , for measures requiring compliance with applicable building and fire codes.	LTS
<i>Operation</i> A fire flow of 3,000 gpm for two hours would be provided through a 400,000 gallon storage tank which is incorporated as part of the project. Fire protection features, including sprinkler systems and fire-resistant construction, would be incorporated into Alternative D. The Butte Site is within the service area of the Butte County Fire Department in cooperation with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF). Alternative D would increase calls for service to the local fire departments, due to an increased population of employees and patrons at the site. Most calls for service would be emergency medical assists. Additionally, the area is forested and prone to summer lightning strikes and fires. Increased vehicular traffic would exacerbate the risk of wildfire.			
E. Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No impacts for increased fire services would occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Emergency Medical Service

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
A Wheatland Fire Authority would respond to emergency medical services and impacts to this entity are discussed above. Bi-County Ambulance and private emergency services would provide emergency transport and bill individual patients for services provided.	LTS	An EMT certified staff person and emergency defibrillator shall be available onsite during the hours of operation.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Lifeguards would be stationed throughout the water park and would be certified to provide cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) and First Aid. Emergency services would be similar to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A	LTS
D The Butte County Fire Department in cooperation with CDF would respond to emergency medical services. Ambulances including First Responder and American Medical Response would provide emergency transport services and bills individual patients for services provided. The nearest hospital with emergency services is Oroville Hospital which also receives payment from patients for emergency medical services.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A	LTS
E Under Alternative E, development would not occur on the Yuba or Butte sites. No impacts for increased emergency medical services would occur.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
4.10 OTHER VALUES			
<i>Noise</i>			
<i>A Traffic Noise</i>			
Under Alternative A the greatest difference in traffic noise levels is predicted to be along 40-mile road at 1.5 decibels (db) north of the site and 4.5 db south of the site. A greater difference would be expected to occur along 40-mile road because it is immediately adjacent to the Yuba site. Predicted differences are also found along Plumas/Arboga road, SR-65 south, and Ostrom road. These differences are much smaller and range from 0.2 db to 0.6 db. The noise environment of all other roadways is not predicted to experience a change in noise levels from cumulative development including Alternative A. Changes in the ambient noise environment from Alternative A would not create any significant increases in traffic noise.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Construction Noise</i>			
Construction activities that could produce potentially significant noise levels include use of engine-powered equipment, power tools, impact sounds and vehicles. It is not expected that Alternative A would require the use of exceptionally annoying equipment such as pile drivers or blasting. Therefore, the concern for construction noise effects under Alternative A is primarily related to the use of powered equipment, and the duration and timing of the construction. The actual period of construction associated with Alternative A would vary with the location of the receiver, and it should be noted that the noise exposure for a given receiver would not be constant over the construction period. Alternative A would result in construction activities in close proximity to one existing residence located opposite the site on 40-Mile Road. Noise from construction in proximity of the	S	<p>A. Four buses operated in proximity to existing residences shall not be allowed to park with idling engines for more than 15 minutes in daytime hours, or more than 5 minutes at nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.).</p> <p>B. Construction activities within a half-mile of existing noise sensitive uses shall be limited to daytime hours (7 a.m. and 10 p.m.).</p> <p>C. Engine-powered construction equipment shall be fitted with adequate mufflers and enclosures as supplied by the manufacturer, maintained in good condition.</p> <p>D. Engine-powered construction equipment located adjacent to residences for more than five days of continuous use should be</p>	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
residence would be a potentially significant impact.		shielded from those residences by temporary barriers blocking line of sight between the source and receiver.	
<i>Operational Noise</i>		E. To ensure mitigation of noise produced by the Sleep Train Amphitheatre, guest lodging shall be designed to ensure that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dB Ldn, or an average interior hourly noise level of 35 dBA during concerts in nighttime hours (between 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.).	
Noise impacts from parking lots and parking structures could occur from traffic and human activities. Noise from traffic in parking lots would be limited by low traffic speeds, which would be expected to limit noises from traffic to a level that would not impact off-site residential land uses. Development of Alternative A could introduce potential noise conflicts from operations of roof- or ground-mounted air handling units associated with building heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC). Noise produced by passing trucks in loading areas could be a significant noise source. Under Alternative A loading docks would be located more than 1,000 feet from the nearest noise sensitive land use. Tour buses parked at the Yuba Site could be potentially significant noise sources. The idling of a modern diesel bus would produce a noise level of about 65 dB at 50 feet. Under Alternative A the central plant facilities would be located far from the nearest sensitive uses, and would be shielded by the casino building.			
B Traffic noise impacts would be less than Alternative A due to decreased size of Alternative B. All other noise impacts would be similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C Traffic noise impacts would be less than Alternative A due to decreased size of Alternative C. All other noise impacts would be similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
D <i>Traffic Noise</i>			
Under Alternative D, the greatest difference in noise levels is predicted to be along Oregon Creek at 9.2 dB. Other impacted roads include Lumpkin Road at 3.7 dB, Forbestown Road at 1.8 dB, and SR-162 at 0.6 dB. Changes in the ambient noise environment from the	LTS	Same as for Alternative A; however, not including Measure E.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>cumulative development including Alternative D would not create significant increases in traffic noise as compared to future conditions of the cumulative development without a Tribe project along Lumpkin Road, Forbestown Road, and SR-162. The increase in predicted future traffic noise at Oregon Creek is greater than 5.0 dB, and therefore would be a significant increase. However, even with the significant increase in noise at Oregon Creek, the noise level would be less than 60 dB L_{dn}, and therefore is not considered to be a significant noise source.</p>			
<i>Construction and Operational Noise</i>			
<p>Construction and operational noise impacts would be similar to Alternative A.</p>	S	Same as for Alternative A, except measure E.	LTS
<p>E Although background noise levels would increase (as noted above under “No Project” in the comparison tables), no new noise generating or amplifying activities or developments would occur under the No-Action Alternative. Therefore, a less than significant noise effect would result.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Hazardous Materials</i>			
<p>A Historic aerial photos and topographic maps show that the Yuba Site has been used historically for agriculture. Field and document review of the site did not reveal any indications of hazardous materials use on-site. Pesticides and fertilizers were most likely used on the site and surrounding area, however residual pesticides would not be considered to be present at levels that would pose a significant effect to human health or to the environment.</p> <p>Hazardous materials would be used in the construction and operation of Alternative A. An accidental spill of hazardous materials would</p>	S	<p>F. The Tribe shall include the following requirement in construction contract specifications for construction activities associated with the project:</p> <p>“If contaminated soil and/or groundwater are encountered or if suspected contamination is encountered during project construction, work shall be halted in the area, and the type and extent of the contamination shall be determined.” A qualified professional, in consultation with appropriate regulatory agencies, shall then develop an appropriate method to remediate the contamination. If necessary, the Tribe shall implement a</p>	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	
result in a significant impact.		remediation plan in conjunction with continued project construction.		
		G. Hazardous materials used on-site shall be stored, handled, and disposed of according to State, Federal, and manufacturer's guidelines.		
B Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS	
C Similar to Alternative A, with reduced use of hazardous materials	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS	
D Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS	
E Since the Yuba Site would continue to be utilized for agriculture, no significant hazardous material impacts would be anticipated to occur. The property could be developed in the future consistent with its zoning designation. Dependent upon the use, the parcel could be utilized for hazardous material storage and use.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS	
Visual Resources				
A The location of a gaming facility on the Yuba Site is consistent with local land use regulations and views from scenic corridors would not be noticeably affected.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS	
<p>The Yuba Site is located in an area that has relatively dark nighttime conditions, where glare from exterior lighting could be considered disruptive to the character of the area. Excessive or poorly directed illumination can be intrusive to nearby residences by reducing privacy and adversely affecting visual quality. Downcast, low-pressure sodium bulb light fixtures would be used in the parking lots, minimizing off-site light emissions. In addition, the area is rural and there are few residences that would be affected by light from the proposed facilities.</p>				
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE	
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D	Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
B Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A, but with decreased effects from night lighting.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A, but with decreased effects from night lighting.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E Under the No-Action Alternative, the Yuba Site would remain vacant. Any future development of the project site would have the potential to adversely impact visual resources.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

4.11 INDIRECT AND GROWTH INDUCING EFFECTS

Growth Inducing Effects

A *Residential Development*

Alternative A would result in an increase in the local labor force and a decrease in unemployment, which in this case would not lead to an increased demand for residential development. The projected availability of housing in the 2009 housing market for Yuba and Sutter Counties compared with direct demand from each alternative results in no need for new construction of housing for Alternative A. Therefore, induced residential growth would not occur after the implementation of Alternative A.

LTS

No mitigation is recommended.

LTS

Commercial Development

Alternative A would result in an increase in local employment outside of the Yuba Site itself, as described in **Appendix M**. However, this increase will not be substantial enough to create the need for new businesses to be introduced to the market, especially given that demand for goods and services are expected to be diffused throughout the area and largely correlated with existing residential developments

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>(no new residential development would occur, as noted above). One exception to the diffused demand expectation are demands associated with the project traffic. Although most traffic-related retail demands will be satisfied at the Yuba Site (food and beverage demands, for instance), there are no gas stations in the vicinity of Forty Mile Road and no gas station is planned under Alternative A.</p> <p>Development induced by this traffic demand would be limited by the general absence of wastewater services in the Forty Mile Road area. However, it is reasonable to assume that a gas station development with limited restroom facilities (served by a septic field) would be induced along Forty Mile Road, either within the property zoned for sports and entertainment or industrial and commercial. Given that the development would occur within land zoned for development, Alternative A would not induce disorderly commercial growth either directly or indirectly. This commercial growth could lead to other environmental effects, however. These effects are discussed below as indirect effects of Alternative A.</p> <p><i>Expansion of Services</i></p> <p>Improvements to area roadways and intersections would serve to mitigate the impacts of Alternative A on area roadway networks, not to increase capacity of roadways to accommodate future unplanned growth. In addition, no new transportation facilities would be constructed as a result of Alternative A. Therefore, growth would not be induced by the construction of improvements to roadways and intersections.</p> <p>The expansion of utilities, including the expansion of the existing WWTP would be sized to serve only Alternative A. Thus, no growth would be induced by the expansion of utilities to serve Alternative A.</p>			

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>B Although the Alternative B developments would be reduced in intensity when compared to Alternative A, they would still represent a substantial draw of traffic to the Yuba Site, which would need to travel along Forty Mile Road. Thus, under Alternative B no growth would be induced except the development of a gas station along Forty Mile Road for the same reasons discussed above under Alternative A.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>C Alternative C does not include a gaming facility and would therefore not operate at night and during the winter, however it does include a hotel. The hotel alone would not generate enough traffic to induce the development of a gas station. However, the hotel, in combination with seasonal operation of the amusement park, periodic events at the Sleep Train Amphitheatre, and SR-65 background traffic would likely lead to the development of a gas station along Forty Mile Road, as discussed under Alternative A. Thus, under Alternative C no growth would be induced except the development of a gas station along Forty Mile Road for the reasons described above and under Alternative A, where applicable.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>D Alternative D would not be expected to result in induced residential development for the reasons described above under Alternative A. Unlike Alternatives A through C, Alternative D would also not result in induced commercial development. As discussed above, the increase in local employment expected outside of the Butte Site would not be substantial enough to create the need for new businesses to be introduced to the market, including businesses along the Butte Site access road given that the Alternative D development would be the only substantial development in the area, and the activity associated with the Alternative D casino alone would not be sufficient to support the construction of a gas station near the Butte Site.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
E No change in use would occur at either the Yuba or Butte Site. Therefore, no growth would be induced under the No Action Alternative.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Indirect Effects From Off-Site Traffic Mitigation</i>			
These improvements have been identified in response to impacts analyzed in Sections 4.8 and 4.12 . Because most of the identified improvements are common to all the alternatives and because the nature and scope of effects are similar, the following analysis is provided for all the alternatives.			
<i>Land Resources</i>			
The construction of roadway improvements would require grading and the introduction of fill material to extend the existing shoulders and road bed. Earthwork could result in erosion of soils. Local jurisdictions would require the use of stable fill material, engineered embankments, and erosion control features to reduce the potential for slope instability, subsidence and erosion. In accordance with the Federal Clean Water Act, construction of roadway improvements over one acre in area would be required to comply with the NPDES General Construction Permit Program. To comply with the program, a SWPPP would be developed that would include soil erosion and sediment control practices to reduce the amount of exposed soil, prevent runoff from flowing across disturbed areas, slow runoff from the site, and remove sediment from the runoff. With standard construction practices and specifications required by the NPDES permit program, the roadway improvements identified under the project alternatives would result in less than significant indirect effects to land resources. The roadway improvements would not significantly affect the ability to extract minerals.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<i>Water Resources</i>			
<p>The development of roadway improvements at the locations identified could affect water resources due to grading and construction activities and an increase in impervious surfaces. Potential effects include an increase of surface runoff and increased erosion that could adversely affect surface water quality due to increases in sediment and roadway pollutants such as grease and oil.</p> <p>As discussed above, a SWPPP would be developed to comply with the NPDES General Construction Permit Program, which includes soil erosion and sediment control practices. The effects to runoff volumes resulting from the increase in impervious roadways would be minimal due to the limited extent of the improvements in comparison to the existing roadways. Some existing curb and gutters and stormwater drain inlets would be removed and relocated along portions of the roadways to provide space for improvements. Curb and gutters, inlets, and other drainage facilities would be reconstructed to provide adequate facilities to direct stormwater runoff. With incorporation of these drainage features and compliance with the soil erosion and sediment control practices identified in the SWPPP, for construction projects resulting in over one acre of disturbance, effects to water resources would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Air Quality</i>			
<p>Development of the roadway improvements would result in short-term construction-related air pollution emissions. The construction phase would produce two types of air contaminants: exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generated as a result of demolition and soil movement. Exhaust emissions from construction activities include those associated with the transport of workers and machinery to the site, as well as those produced on site as the</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>equipment is used. Construction of improvements would be limited in scope and duration. Thus a less than significant indirect effect would result. In addition, mitigation measures required by local jurisdictions to reduce construction emissions, in conjunction with required California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review, generally include watering the exposed soil to reduce dust, reducing speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour, and maintaining equipment properly.</p> <p>Long-term effects from roadway improvements could result if the roadway improvements resulted in localized increases in carbon monoxide concentrations and/or if the improvements contributed to traffic congestion at large intersections. The construction of improvements would not result in adverse changes or redistribution in traffic volumes and vehicle trips. Conversely, the improvements would reduce congestion and improve traffic flow. This would reduce emissions from idling vehicles at these intersections and roadway segments. Indirect effects would therefore be less than significant.</p> <p>Biological Resources</p> <p>Construction of the roadway improvements would result in the loss of some existing vegetation and modification of drainage channels. Most of the habitat that exists in the areas of roadway improvements is highly disturbed roadsides. Due to the degraded condition of the roadside areas, habitat quality is generally low and expansion of the existing facilities would not result in a significant effect to sensitive species. To address effects to sensitive habitat and species, biological surveys may be required to comply with the federal ESA and likely with CEQA before encroachment permits are issued. The lead agency under CEQA would be required to mitigate potential impacts to a less than significant level or to issue a finding of fact and statement of</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>overriding considerations if significant impacts could not be mitigated. Due to the limited nature of the improvements along existing roadways, the degraded condition of existing habitat, and the requirements of ESA/CEQA to address impacts to biological resources, the effects of the roadway improvements would be less than significant.</p> <p>Cultural Resources</p> <p>The construction of the roadway improvements has the potential to disturb or destroy historical features and archaeological resources. Grading roadsides to add traffic lanes or expanding intersections may disturb previously unknown sites. Due to prior grading of the existing roadways and occasional traffic on roadsides it is likely that resources remaining in these areas are highly disturbed and lack integrity, thus diminishing the significance of the remaining resources and resulting in a less than significant indirect effect to cultural resources from the disturbance of roadside areas.</p> <p>In addition, to address potential impacts to cultural resources, cultural surveys may be required to comply with CEQA before encroachment permits are issued. The lead agency under CEQA would be required to mitigate potential impacts to a less than significant level or to issue a finding of fact and statement of overriding considerations if significant impacts could not be mitigated. Mitigation may include the avoidance of resources, the preservation of key historical features, or the removal, documentation, and curation of cultural resources.</p> <p>Socioeconomic Conditions</p> <p>Construction of roadway improvements would result in short-term inconveniences and minor delays due to constricted traffic movements and possible temporary detouring of traffic. The intersection</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>Construction of roadway improvements would result in short-term inconveniences and minor delays due to constricted traffic movements and possible temporary detouring of traffic. The intersection</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	
<p>improvements are not expected to result in long-term disruption of access to surrounding land uses or to minority or low-income populations.</p> <p>The realignment and expansion of roadways would result in impacts to surrounding properties. In order to implement some improvements, land acquisition may be required. In most cases no additional property will be required (e.g. intersection signalization) or the amount of additional property required will be minimal. Should land acquisition be required, the owner of the property acquired is entitled to be compensated for the fair market value of the property, as required by the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution; Article I, Section 19 of the California Constitution; and Sections 1263.010 to 1263.330 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. A potentially significant impact would result should local jurisdictions be left to pay the full cost of such land acquisition. The Tribe would pay the fair-share cost of traffic mitigation, including the cost of any required land acquisition. Therefore, a less than significant indirect socioeconomic effect would result.</p> <p><i>Land Use</i></p> <p>As noted, construction of roadway improvements with no or minimal additional property requirements is not expected to cause a long-term disruption of surrounding land uses. Improvements that require land acquisition, such as realignment and expansion of roadways, could convert land from its current use. However, the amount of land required would be a narrow strip on the end of the property and should not affect the land use for the remaining property. Therefore, a less than significant indirect effect would result.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS	
<i>Agriculture</i>				
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE	
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D	Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	
<p>Construction of roadway improvements that require additional property, such as realignment and expansion of roadways, could permanently convert land from agricultural use. However, the amount of land converted would be small compared with the amount of arable land in the region. Therefore, a less than significant indirect effect to agriculture would result.</p> <p><i>Public Services</i></p> <p>Traffic improvements may require relocation of utilities near existing roadways. These utilities include overhead electricity lines and telecommunication lines. Relocation of these lines could result in a temporary break in service to some homes and businesses in the area. However, because these effects are common when upgrading and maintaining utility services, and because potential service breaks would be temporary, these effects are considered to be less than significant. No significant effects to police, fire, or emergency medical services are expected as access to homes and businesses would be maintained during the construction period.</p> <p>Construction of the proposed improvements could potentially result in noise, hazardous materials, and visual effects. Construction activities would result in short-term increases in the local ambient noise environments. However, because construction activities would be temporary in nature and are expected to occur during normal daytime hours, a less than significant effect is expected.</p> <p>The accidental release of hazardous materials used during grading and construction activities could pose a hazard to construction employees and the environment. Additionally, equipment used during grading and construction activities could ignite dry grasses and weeds in construction areas. However, these hazards, which are common to construction activities, would be minimized with adherence to</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS	
<p>Less than Significant = LTS</p> <p>Alternative A = A</p>	<p>Significant = S</p> <p>Alternative B = B</p>	<p>No Effect = NE</p> <p>Alternative C = C</p>	<p>Beneficial Effect = BE</p> <p>Alternative D = D</p>	<p>Alternative E = E</p>

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>standard operating procedures, such as refueling in designated areas, storing hazardous materials in approved containers, and clearing dried vegetation. Such procedures are commonly required by local agencies as part of permit review and/or CEQA review for roadway improvements. These potential hazards would therefore be less than significant.</p> <p>Visual effects would occur as the result of modification and expansion of existing roadways. However, because the improvements would conform to modern design standards and would be compatible visually with existing transportation facilities, a less than significant effect would occur.</p>			
<i>Indirect Effects From Induced Commercial Development</i>			
<i>Land Resources</i>			
<p>Commercial development along Forty Mile Road would likely involve grading activities. Given the area's gentle topography, significant effects to slope stability would not occur. Much of the surrounding area contains the same San Joaquin Loam soils that are found on the Yuba Site. Erosion potential for this soil is low. Thus, significant indirect effects to soil erosion would not occur. Any surrounding commercial development would be constructed according to Uniform Building Code standards, per Yuba County Ordinance Codes Section 10.05020. The area surrounding the Yuba Site does not contain any known mineral resources. Significant indirect effects to land resources would not occur.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Water Resources</i>			
<p>Adequate groundwater is available for small commercial developments located along Forty Mile Road. These developments would utilize wells drawing from the same high volume aquifer as the</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>proposed project. Any commercial development would be required to comply with the Federal Clean Water Act and/or the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Thus, effects to water quality from parking lot runoff or point sources would be less than significant. Any commercial development planned to be built within a floodplain must comply with Yuba County Ordinance Code Chapter 10.10, which requires special building permit considerations for development in a floodplain. According to Yuba County Ordinance Code Section 10.10.030, the County Building Official shall review each application for a building permit to determine whether the proposed construction is consistent with the need to minimize flood damage and the site of the proposed construction is reasonably safe from flooding. If the proposed building site is in a location that has a flood hazard, additional requirements include providing adequate drainage in order to reduce exposure to flood hazards and designing and anchoring buildings to prevent flotation, collapse, or lateral movement in the event of a flood.</p> <p>Given the lack of public wastewater collection and infrastructure in the area, septic tanks would likely be utilized for wastewater disposal for commercial development along Forty Mile Road. If improperly installed and operated, septic tanks could result in the contamination of groundwater. Any septic tanks installed would be required to conform to the standards contained in Chapter 7.07 of the Yuba County Ordinance Code, Sewage Disposal. This Chapter includes standards for the size and construction of septic tanks. Following compliance with these standards, less than significant effects to groundwater quality would occur.</p> <p><i>Air Quality</i></p> <p>Any commercial developments in the surrounding area would be</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>required to comply with the Federal Clean Air Act and/or the California Clean Air Act. Furthermore, these developments are not expected to be substantial sources of pollutants. Vehicular traffic would be expected to mainly consist of visitors to the Yuba Site and diverted background SR-65 traffic. Direct stationary sources would be minimal. Stationary emissions from an average-sized gasoline station were calculated (estimated average throughput of 65,000 gallons of gasoline sold per month). Under FRAQMD Rule 3.8, any facility, which receives or dispenses gasoline must install both phase I and II vapor recovery systems. Emissions were therefore calculated for an average-sized gasoline station, assuming phase I and II vapor recovery systems are in place. These nominal increases in ROG emissions would be well below FRAQMD significance criteria and would represent a less than significant indirect effect.</p> <p>Biological Resources</p> <p>Off-site commercial development has the potential to result in impacts to wildlife and habitats depending on the siting of the developments. All off-site developments are expected to be located within the Sports/Entertainment or Industrial/Commercial zones. These developments would be required to comply with the provisions in the zoning ordinances, which include preconstruction surveys for Swainson’s Hawk. In addition, any developments would be subject to the requirements of the state and/or federal ESA, and the state and/or federal clean water acts as well as any requirements related to a CEQA analysis, should CEQA be triggered. Therefore, significant indirect effects to wildlife and habitats would not occur.</p> <p>Cultural Resources</p> <p>Off-site commercial development projects along Forty Mile Road would be required to comply with Yuba County’s development</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
Alternative E = E			

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>standards for the Sports/Entertainment or Industrial/Commercial zones. For instance, according to Sports/Entertainment zone Standard and Requirement 9, “If evidence of subsurface archaeological resources is found during construction, excavation in the vicinity of the find shall cease, a professional archaeologist shall conduct an evaluation in accordance with state and federal laws and regulations, and the find shall be documented or preserved to the extent required by applicable laws and regulations.” After compliance with these standards, indirect effects to cultural resources would be less than significant.</p> <p>In addition, to address potential impacts to cultural resources, cultural surveys may be required to comply with CEQA. The lead agency under CEQA would be required to mitigate potential impacts to a less than significant level or to issue a finding of fact and statement of overriding considerations if significant impacts could not be mitigated. Mitigation may include the avoidance of resources, the preservation of key historical features, or the removal, documentation, and curation of cultural resources.</p>			
<i>Socioeconomic Conditions</i>			
<p>Any off-site commercial development located along Forty Mile Road would be required to pay normal County development fees. Property taxes would also continue to be assessed on the land. The development of a gas station would be expected to generate a relative few job opportunities. Significant indirect socioeconomic effects are not expected.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Resource Use Patterns</i>			
<p>Vehicular traffic for the induced commercial development would be expected to mainly consist of visitors to the Yuba Site and diverted</p>	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.8 , Resource Use Patterns.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>background SR-65 traffic. Thus, impacts to transportation networks would be similar to those of Alternatives A through C. After mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Commercial development is not inconsistent with the Sports/Entertainment or Industrial/Commercial zoning. Commercial development would not be incompatible with nearby agricultural uses given that it is occurring in land zoned for development and would not conflict with agricultural uses. Thus, a less than significant indirect land use effect would result.</p> <p>The majority of the land along Forty Mile Road within the sports/entertainment zone, including the land that is closest to the Yuba Site consists of San Joaquin loam (Map Unit 214). This is not considered prime farmland by the NRCS. Thus, development would not result in the conversion of prime farmlands to non-agricultural uses.</p> <p>Public Services</p> <p>Normal development fees and requirements by utility providers for hook up to facilities along Forty Mile Road would ensure indirect effects to public services are less than significant.</p> <p>Other Values</p> <p>Off-site commercial development along Forty Mile Road would not be visible from SR-70 and would be designed to be consistent with County design standards. Significant indirect impacts to visual resources are not expected.</p> <p>Noise generated by the construction of off-site commercial developments along Forty Mile Road would be temporary and would not require unusual or abnormally loud activities such as pile driving</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>Off-site commercial development along Forty Mile Road would not be visible from SR-70 and would be designed to be consistent with County design standards. Significant indirect impacts to visual resources are not expected.</p> <p>Noise generated by the construction of off-site commercial developments along Forty Mile Road would be temporary and would not require unusual or abnormally loud activities such as pile driving</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
----------------------	---	---------------------	--

or blasting. Operational noise is expected to be largely limited to project generated traffic visits. In addition, any commercial development would be required to comply with Chapter 8.20 of the Yuba County Ordinance Code, Noise Regulations. Thus, significant indirect effects from noise would not occur.

The land along Forty Mile Road has historically been used for agricultural purposes. As with Alternatives A through C, the potential to uncover hazardous materials is present with site disturbance. However, this potential is not considered likely because no contamination is known to exist from the nearby underground storage tanks and ground disturbing activities would likely be minimal. Should underground storage tanks be constructed compliance with Yuba County Ordinance Code (Chapter 7.08, Underground Storage Tanks) would be required. Chapter 7.08 requires a permit for the installation of an underground storage tank and requires compliance with the requirements of the Health and Safety Code and California Code of Regulations. Routine monitoring and an emergency response plan are also required for operators of underground storage tanks. Finally, Chapter 7.08 contains requirements for reporting and taking corrective action for unauthorized releases. According to Ordinance Code Section 7.08.160, corrective action shall include, but not be limited to, the following phases: 1) Preliminary Site Assessment, 2) Soil and Water Investigation, 3) Corrective Action Plan Implementation, and 4) Verification Monitoring. Therefore, significant indirect hazardous materials effects would not occur.

4.12 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Land Resources

A The valley region surrounding the Yuba Site is relatively flat in topography. Neither Alternative A nor cumulative/induced	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
--	-----	-------------------------------	-----

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>development would significantly alter topography in the region. Effects to soils associated with regional cumulative development would primarily be localized soil attrition, which is evaluated in terms of runoff characteristics, sedimentation, and flow under permitting authorities and criteria relevant primarily to Water Resources, below. Local permitting requirements and federal Clean Water Act requirements (see Section 4.3) for construction would address effects to land resources on a project-level basis.</p> <p>Neither Alternative A nor regional cumulative development would have a negative effect on seismic conditions in the area. Required development standards would ensure that cumulative development is constructed to standards appropriate for the level of seismic activity that could occur in the area.</p> <p>The area of cumulative development is not known to be rich in mineral resources. Alternative A, in combination with cumulative development, would not significantly affect mineral resources.</p>			
B Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>D Although topography is not flat in the vicinity of the Butte Site and there are known mineral resources in the area, neither cumulative nor induced development is expected (with the exception of additional rural residential development in the area). On-site land resources would not be affected by off-site rural residential development given that such development would be minimal and construction of rural residences would be temporary. Therefore, cumulative effects to land resources would not differ substantially from project effects. Significant effects to land resources would not occur because major topographic features would be preserved, a SWPPP would be</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>implemented prior to construction, the Tribal-State Compact (or Secretarial Procedures) would ensure proper seismic building codes are adhered to, the majority of the Butte Site would remain unaltered, and development of the Butte Site would not affect known or recorded mineral resources.</p>			
<p>E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Water Resources			
<p>A The proposed project would not contribute to regional flooding since on-site basins would be constructed that more than accommodate the on-site flood storage lost from the development of the proposed project. An on-site detention basin would also be constructed that ensures stormwater flows from the site are equal to or less than existing flows.</p> <p>The proposed project, in addition to other projects that may be constructed in the vicinity, are required to comply with the Clean Water Act as it relates to stormwater and point-source discharges. Compliance with stormwater pollution prevention requirements will prevent off-site development, in combination with development associated with the proposed project, from causing cumulatively significant water quality related impacts.</p> <p>The developments proposed in the Plumas Lake Specific Plan Area and North Arboga Study Area are anticipated to utilize groundwater for their water supply. Residential development typically results in lower usage of water than agriculture. Thus, the conversion of agricultural areas for residential use in the Plumas Lake and North</p>	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.3 , Water Resources.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Arboga Areas would not increase the use of groundwater in the area. Impacts to the groundwater basin would not be cumulatively significant, as the proposed project would use a relatively small increment of the available groundwater and project water use would be well below expected natural inflow rates.			
B Contributions to cumulative water resources effects would be similar to Alternative A, but slightly lessened due to the smaller scale of facilities proposed by Alternative B.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.3 , Water Resources.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative B	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.3 , Water Resources.	LTS
D Alternative D's effects to water resources would not result in a significant cumulative impact, given the less than significant effect to water resources that would result under Alternative D and the limited cumulative development that would occur in the area (additional rural residential development).	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.3 , Water Resources.	LTS
E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Air Quality			
A Ozone and PM₁₀ Emissions			
Ozone and PM ₁₀ are pollutants that affect the air basin as a whole, which includes portions of Yuba and Butte Counties as well as surrounding counties. For a conservative analysis as well as an attempt to focus on air quality trends in the Yuba Site region, project air quality effects are analyzed with the cumulative emissions associated with the county that includes the site. Therefore, cumulative air quality effects are assessed by comparing the incremental emissions	S	ROG, NO _x , and PM ₁₀ emissions associated with operation of the Proposed Project could be reduced, but not to a less than significant level by requiring the mitigation measures contained in Section 4.4 , Air Quality.	S

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION	
<p>associated with Alternative A to Yuba County-wide emissions forecasted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for long-term cumulative conditions (2020, the farthest planning horizon for countywide emission forecasts). Direct emissions of PM₁₀ increased in the air basin between 1975 and 2000 and are projected to continue increasing through 2020. This increase is due to the growth in emissions from area-wide sources, primarily construction/demolition and paved road dust. Emissions of directly emitted PM₁₀ from motor vehicles have been decreasing since 1990 even though population and vehicle miles traveled are growing, due to adoption of more stringent emissions standards.</p> <p>The incremental effect of Alternative A is a relatively minor portion of the Yuba County-wide total for one project for ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. Nonetheless, Alternative A, along with other cumulative/induced development would exacerbate the regional trend towards higher PM₁₀ emissions.</p> <p>In 2025, ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions generated by casino traffic with Alternative A would exceed the FRAQMD significance thresholds and would be a significant cumulative effect. The addition of ROG generated by the induced gas station would not result in any additional exceedance of FRAQMD emissions criteria.</p> <p><i>Carbon Monoxide Concentrations</i></p> <p>Traffic operations at signalized study intersections would be LOS D or better with Alternative A under 2025 cumulative background conditions and traffic mitigation measures. Based on criteria presented in the University of California Davis Institute of Transportation Studies document Transportation Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Protocol (Garza, et al., 1997), intersections operating at LOS D or better typically do not result in carbon monoxide</p>	S	Same as mitigation measures listed for Section 4.8 , Resource Use Patterns.	LTS	
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE	
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D	Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>concentrations that exceed State or Federal standards. Therefore, Alternative A with traffic mitigation measures, in combination with increased traffic from cumulative development would have a less-than-significant impact on air quality from carbon monoxide emissions.</p> <p><i>Toxic Air Contaminants</i></p> <p>Possible future commercial or industrial development could affect the proposed gaming facility and hotel by creating air toxics. However, because of the project area's rural character and relevant land use regulations, it is unlikely that toxic air contaminant emitting sources would locate near the Yuba Site. Any future facilities in the area, including the proposed project, would be required to meet federal, state, and local standards associated with the handling of hazardous materials, and therefore no significant cumulative impacts to the proposed project would occur.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A, but with reduced emissions.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	S
C In 2025, NO _x and PM ₁₀ emissions generated by Alternative C would exceed the FRAQMD significance thresholds and would be a significant cumulative effect. The negligible addition of ROG generated by the induced gas station would not result in any additional exceedance of FRAQMD emissions criteria. NO _x and PM ₁₀ emissions associated with operation of the Alternative C facilities could be reduced, but not to a less than significant level by requiring mitigation measures.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	S
D <i>Ozone and PM₁₀ Emissions</i>	LTS	Same as the mitigation measures contained in Section 4.4 , Air Quality.	LTS
<p>Ozone and PM₁₀ are pollutants that affect the air basin as a whole, which includes portions of Yuba and Butte Counties as well as surrounding counties. For a conservative analysis as well as an attempt</p>			

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>to focus on air quality trends in the Butte Site region, project air quality effects are analyzed with the cumulative emissions associated with the county that includes the site. Therefore, cumulative air quality effects are assessed by comparing the incremental emissions associated with Alternative D to Butte County-wide emissions forecasted by the CARB for long-term cumulative conditions (2020, the farthest planning horizon for countywide emission forecasts).</p>			
<p>The incremental effect of Alternative D is a relatively minor portion of the Butte County-wide total for one project for ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. Alternative D, along with other cumulative development, would exacerbate the regional trend towards higher PM₁₀ emissions but to a less than significant level given that the emissions fall below BCAQMD emissions thresholds.</p>			
<p>In 2025, neither ROG, NO_x, or PM₁₀ emissions generated by casino traffic with Alternative D would exceed the BCAQMD Action Level “A” thresholds.</p>			
<i>Carbon Monoxide Concentrations</i>			
<p>Similar to as Alternative A.</p>	S	Same as mitigation measures listed for Section 4.8 , Resource Use Patterns.	LTS
<i>Toxic Air Contaminants</i>			
<p>Cumulative toxic air contaminant effects would be similar to Alternative A. Given that future cumulative developments would be required to meet standards associated with the handling of hazardous materials, no significant cumulative effects would occur.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>E Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<i>Climate Change Impacts</i>			
A Emissions of greenhouse gases (GHG) have the potential to cause an increase in global temperatures. Increased global temperatures would have numerous potential impacts; therefore, this is a potentially significant effect.	S	<p>BBB. Buses and other commercial diesel-fueled vehicles shall comply with the California Air Resource Board’s (CARB) Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling (California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Division 3, Article 1, Chapter 10, Section 2485), which requires that the driver of any diesel bus shall not idle for more than five minutes at any location, except in the case of passenger boarding where a ten minute limit is imposed, or when passengers are onboard.</p> <p>CCC. The Tribe shall plant trees and vegetation on-site. The addition of photosynthesizing plants would reduce atmospheric CO2, because plants use CO2 for elemental carbon and energy production. Trees planted near buildings would result in additional benefits by providing shade to the building; thus reducing heat absorption, reducing air conditioning needs and saving energy.</p> <p>DDD The Tribe Shall use energy efficient appliances.</p> <p>EEE. Environmentally preferable materials shall be used to the extent practical for construction of facilities.</p> <p>FFF. The Tribe shall enroll in the ClimateSmart program that is offered to PG&E customs to reduce their indirect GHG emissions form electrical generation to zero. PG&E provides electricity uses with the opportunity to become “carbon neutral” under the ClimateSmart program.</p> <p>GGG The developer shall use of low-emitting building products pursuant to Integrated Waste Management Board’s Section 01350 where feasible.</p>	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
C Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
E No development would occur under Alternative E; therefore, no significant incremental contribution to GHG emissions would occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	
Biological Resources			
A Disturbance to habitats in the vicinity of the Yuba Site from induced and planned development projects could affect sensitive federally protected species. However, Alternative A will avoid or reduce impacts to such species to a less than significant project level. Other projects in the area will comply with local, State, and Federal laws regulating sensitive species to avoid impacts to such species and unavoidable impacts will be adequately mitigated as required by law. Alternative A's effects to waters of the U.S. will be avoided or mitigated. Other area developments could affect waters of the U.S. Such affects could be substantial given the amount of development planned, particularly in the Plumas Lakes area. However, the Clean Water Act requires the avoidance of impacts to waters of the U.S. or mitigation of unavoidable impacts.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.5 , Biological Resources.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.5 , Biological Resources.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.5 , Biological Resources.	LTS
D Disturbance to habitats in the vicinity of the Butte Site from additional rural residential development could affect sensitive federally protected species, but not on a large scale. However, Alternative D would avoid or reduce impacts to such species to a less than significant project level. Other projects in the area would comply with local, State, and Federal laws regulating sensitive species to avoid impacts to such species and unavoidable impacts will be adequately mitigated as	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.5 , Biological Resources.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
required by law. Alternative D's effects to waters of the U.S. will be avoided or mitigated. Other area developments could affect waters of the U.S. Such effects are likely to be minimal given that residential developments are not usually sited over creeks or other water features. In addition, the Clean Water Act requires the avoidance of impacts to waters of the U.S. or mitigation of unavoidable impacts.			
E Under Alternative E, no project-related activities would occur. Therefore, cumulative trends would continue, but the No Action Alternative would not result in significant contributions to cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Cultural Resources</i>			
A Cumulative effects to cultural resources typically occur when sites that contain cultural features or artifacts are disturbed by development. Impacts to these cultural resources are likely to occur as residential and commercial growth occurs in Yuba County. Mitigation measures are required for all development in Yuba County to comply with County policies/requirements, NEPA, NHPA, and/or CEQA.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.6 , Cultural Resources.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.6	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.6	LTS
D Similar to Alternative A, except within Butte County.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.6	LTS
E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<i>Socioeconomic Conditions/Environmental Justice</i>			

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
A Cumulative socioeconomic effects could occur in the vicinity of the Yuba Site as a result of developments that affect the lifestyle and economic well being of residents. Impacts can be both detrimental and beneficial. Examples of cumulative socioeconomic impacts might include urban blight or redevelopment, increased or decreased crime, changes in a community's tax base, and changes in the ability to access common or private property, increased or decreased regional industry and/or employment opportunities, increased or decreased healthcare for residents.	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.7 , Socioeconomic Conditions.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.7 , Socioeconomic Conditions.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A, except concerns regarding problem gambling would not apply to Alternative C, since it does not include a gaming component.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative D would be reduced compared to the effects of Alternative A, since Alternative D is substantially reduced in size and scope to Alternative A. In addition, the affected environment would be Butte County rather than Yuba and Sutter Counties.	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.7 , Socioeconomic Conditions.	LTS
E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Resource Use Patterns

A Transportation/Circulation

Alternative A would either result in an unacceptable LOS or contribute to already unacceptable operations, resulting in a significant	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.8 , Resource Use Patterns.	LTS
---	---	---	-----

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>impact at 11 roadway segments and intersections.</p> <p><i>Intersection Safety Issues</i></p> <p>Intersection safety issues would be resolved with the future construction of the Algodon interchange. No other specific cumulative intersection safety issues would result from the implementation of Alternative A. The incremental risk of increased accidents caused by increased traffic volumes from Alternative A and cumulative development, would be mitigated by traffic mitigation measures.</p> <p><i>Bicycle and Pedestrian System</i></p> <p>Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are not expected to be expanded to the Yuba Site area during the cumulative time period. There is currently no large scale residential development in the vicinity of the Yuba Site that would represent a source of bicyclists and pedestrians that may desire to visit the site. Should a residential development be constructed in the vicinity of the Amphitheatre, the need for bicyclist and pedestrian facilities will be evaluated by the County as part of the CEQA review and development approval process. Thus, a less than significant cumulative effect to the demand for future bicycle and pedestrian facilities would result. Nonetheless, mitigation measures that would further reduce the project's incremental effects on the bicycle and pedestrian system would be implemented.</p> <p><i>Transit System</i></p> <p>Currently, there are no plans to expand transit services to the Yuba site within the cumulative time period. In addition, studies of the feasibility of expanding service to the Yuba Site have determined that such an expansion of service would not be supported monetarily by the demand created. Thus, public transit facilities (the Tribe will</p>			
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>likely provide shuttle service as part of air quality mitigation measures, which would alleviate some demand for public transit service) are not expected to be expanded to the Yuba Site area during the cumulative time period. In addition, no additional housing (which could increase demands for transit service) would be induced by the project.</p> <p>Transit services are assumed to be expanded within the cumulative time period to serve planned residential development in the Plumas Lakes and North Arboga areas. Should a residential development be constructed in the vicinity of the Amphitheatre, the need for transit facilities in the vicinity of the development will be evaluated by the County as part of the CEQA review and development approval process. Thus, significant cumulative effects to traffic would therefore not occur. Nonetheless, mitigation measures would be implemented that would further reduce the project's incremental effects on the transit system.</p>			
<p>B Alternative B would either result in an unacceptable LOS or contribute to already unacceptable operations, resulting in a significant impact at 11 roadway segments and intersections. Environmental effects associated with Intersection Safety Issues, Bicycle and Pedestrian System, and Transit System would be similar to Alternative A.</p>	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.8 , Resource Use Patterns.	LTS
<p>C Alternative C would either result in an unacceptable LOS or contribute to already unacceptable operations, resulting in a significant impact at 10 roadway segments and intersections. Environmental effects associated with Intersection Safety Issues, Bicycle and Pedestrian System, and Transit System would be similar to Alternative A.</p>	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.8 , Resource Use Patterns.	LTS
<p>D Alternative D would either result in an unacceptable LOS or contribute to already unacceptable operations, resulting in a significant impact at 9 roadway segments and intersections. Environmental</p>	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.8 , Resource Use Patterns.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
effects associated with Intersection Safety Issues, Bicycle and Pedestrian System, and Transit System are considered less than significant.			
E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Land Use</i>			
A If taken into federal trust, the Yuba Site would not be subject to City or County land use jurisdiction, but it would be consistent with local zoning. In addition, Alternative A would not induce unplanned growth. Thus, Alternative A would not result in changes to local land use patterns and significant cumulative land use effects would not occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D The Butte Site is not currently subject to County land use jurisdiction. Alternative D would not induce growth. Thus, Alternative D would not result in changes to local land use patterns and significant cumulative land use effects would not occur.	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Agriculture</i>			
A As urban growth development occurs within the region, cumulative	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>effects to the County’s agriculture resources may occur from conversion of agricultural lands to other land uses. The proposed developments within the Plumas Lake Specific Plan Area will result in the urbanization of a broad area that contains prime-agricultural lands. The proposed developments within the North Arboga Study Area will result in the urbanization of an area containing farmlands of statewide importance. These developments have been planned for and approved by Yuba County, with knowledge of their effects to agricultural conversion.</p> <p>According to the NRCS, the Yuba Site does not contain prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance. Additionally, the agricultural capability of these lands is considered marginal as indicated by the combined Storie index and site assessment rating provided on the completed Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form (Appendix P). The land proposed for development is approximately 0.0004% of the farmland in the County. The induced development of a gas station along Forty Mile Road would not measurably increase this percentage and is also expected to occur on relatively marginal farmland. Given the inferior quality of the soils on the Yuba Site and generally along Forty Mile Road and the relatively small contribution to the total loss of farmlands in the County, Alternative A would not result in a significant contribution to cumulative agriculture impacts.</p>			
B Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
D Alternative D would result in the conversion of 8.25 acres of open space lands on the Butte Site, but would not result in the conversion of farmlands. As the project would not remove land from agricultural production, and is not considered important farmland, a significant	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
Less than Significant = LTS	Significant = S	No Effect = NE	Beneficial Effect = BE
Alternative A = A	Alternative B = B	Alternative C = C	Alternative D = D
			Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
contribution to cumulative agriculture effects would not occur.			
E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
Public Services			
A Public water and wastewater service providers to the cumulative developments would not be affected by Alternative A; there is adequate landfill capacity to serve Alternative A and the anticipated developments; and new developments would be required to pay development fees and/or provide facilities for utilities, law enforcement, and fire protection services.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
B The cumulative impacts for Alternative B are substantially similar to Alternative A. While Alternative B is not covered under an existing MOU, mitigation measures would reduce impacts to law enforcement and fire protection services to a less than significant level if the MOU is not renegotiated. Cumulative impacts to public services would be less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative B	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
D As there are no planned developments in the vicinity of the Butte Site (other than incremental increases in rural residential development), Alternative D would not add to incremental effects of surrounding development. With mitigation measure, impacts to public services from Alternative D would be less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.9 , Public Services.	LTS
E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
effects.			
<i>Other Values</i>			
<i>Noise</i>			
A No developments are expected in the immediate vicinity of the Yuba Site that would significantly contribute to the cumulative construction noise environment. The induced development could be developed near the Yuba Site, but construction associated with the gas station would be minimal and temporary when compared to that associated with Alternative A. The induced gas station development would generate noise levels similar to the less than significant effects of parking lot noise on the Yuba Site.	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.10 , Other Values.	LTS
B Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.10 , Other Values.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.10 , Other Values.	LTS
D No developments are expected in the immediate vicinity of the Butte Site that would significantly contribute to the cumulative construction noise environment. Even if rural residential development occurs at the same time as Alternative D, construction associated with the development would minimal and temporary when compared to that associated with Alternative D.	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.10 , Other Values.	LTS
E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Hazardous Materials</i>			
A Cumulative hazardous materials involvement has the potential to occur as a result of development occurring in the region. This involvement	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.10 , Other Values.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>could result from the use of hazardous materials in the construction process or the disturbance of existing hazardous materials present on a construction site. There are no known hazardous materials on the Yuba Site and Alternative A would not be a significant user of hazardous materials. The construction of a gas station would not result in significant hazardous materials involvement. The use of underground storage tanks would be subject to stringent local and federal regulations and would not contribute to negative effects from hazardous materials involvement in the region.</p>			
B Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.10 , Other Values.	LTS
C Similar to Alternative A	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.10 , Other Values.	LTS
<p>D Cumulative hazardous materials involvement has the potential to occur as a result of development occurring in the region. This involvement could result from the use of hazardous materials in the construction process or the disturbance of existing hazardous materials present on a construction site, however periodic and limited rural residential development in a rural area is not anticipated to present significant hazardous materials risks. There are no known hazardous materials on the Butte Site and Alternative D would not be a significant user of hazardous materials.</p>	S	Same as mitigation measures listed in Section 4.10 , Other Values.	LTS
<p>E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE
<i>Visual Resources</i>			
<p>A Substantial planned development in the Plumas Lake Specific Plan Area would result in modification of the view from SR-70, a designated scenic corridor. As noted previously, the Yuba Site is</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
<p>generally not visible from SR-70. Thus, cumulative contributions to the degradation of SR-70 views would not occur. No other developments are planned in the vicinity of the Yuba Site that would contribute to a cumulative degradation of views. The induced gas station development would be relatively small in scale and would be built on land zoned for commercial development.</p>			
<p>No developments are planned in the immediate vicinity of the Yuba Site that would contribute to increased nighttime lighting, except for the induced gas station development. Development of the gas station would be on land zoned for development (which includes exterior lighting) and would be subject to County conditions as a result of the development approval process, which are expected to include measures minimizing light emissions off of the gas station site.</p>			
<p>B Similar to Alternative A</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>C Similar to Alternative A</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>D As there are no planned developments in the vicinity of the Butte Site (other than incremental increases in rural residential development), Alternative D would not add to incremental effects of surrounding development. In addition, the proposed Alternative D development would generally not be visible from surrounding roadways.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is recommended.	LTS
<p>E Under Alternative E no new development would take place on either the Yuba Site or the Butte Site during the cumulative time period. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not result in cumulative effects.</p>	NE	No mitigation is recommended.	NE

Less than Significant = LTS

Significant = S

No Effect = NE

Beneficial Effect = BE

Alternative A = A

Alternative B = B

Alternative C = C

Alternative D = D

Alternative E = E