EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

GRATON RANCHERIA CASINO AND HOTEL – FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared to assess the environmental consequences of the National Indian Gaming Commission's (NIGC) approval of a gaming management contract between the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (Tribe) and SC Sonoma Management, LLC. The foreseeable consequence of this federal action will be the transfer of land into trust and the development of a casino/hotel resort either on the Wilfred site, the Stony Point site or the Lakeville site, in Sonoma County, California. The effects of eight alternatives, including an alternative use and a No Action alternative, are analyzed within this FEIS.

ES.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose and need for approving the gaming management contract is to allow the Tribe to develop uses that will improve the long-term economic condition of the Tribe and its members through the development of a stable, sustainable source of employment and revenue. Revenues generated from the economic development would be used to improve the quality of life of Tribal members by supporting social, housing, governmental, administrative, educational, and health and welfare services. Revenues could also be used to provide capital for other revenue generating activities, for contributions to charitable organizations, and to fund local government activities. The federal action additionally serves the needs of the NIGC to promote economic development and the self-governance capability of the Tribe through the highest and best use of the Tribe's land. Finally, the action would effectuate the Congressional directive embodied in the Graton Rancheria Restoration Act of 2000.

ES.3 ALTERNATIVES

This document describes and analyzes seven development alternatives and a No Action alternative. Alternative A is the Tribe's Proposed Project. Development alternatives have been selected which potentially meet the Purpose and Need, although at varying degrees for each. The alternatives are described in detail in **Section 2.0** and are summarized below. Note that Alternatives A, B, C, D, F, and H require the proposed action of approval of a gaming

management contract. Alternatives E and G do not require the approval of a gaming management contract.

ES.3.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED PROJECT

The Proposed Action consists of the NIGC's approval of a gaming management contract between the Tribe and SC Sonoma Management, LLC. The foreseeable consequence of this action would be the development of a casino-hotel resort on a portion of approximately 252 acres of land (Wilfred site) that would be taken into trust for the Tribe. The development of a casino-hotel resort is planned on approximately 66 acres in the northeast corner of the Wilfred site and would total approximately 762,300 square feet in area. The remainder of the Wilfred site would remain undeveloped and be used for open space, pasture, biological habitat, and recycled water sprayfields. The casino-hotel resort would include restaurants, a 300-room hotel, an entertainment venue, banquet/meeting space, and a pool and spa. A list of proposed project components are summarized in **Table 2-1**. The casino-hotel resort would employ approximately 2,400 employees. The Tribe would enter into a Tribal-State Compact, as required by the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) to govern the conduct of Class III gaming activities, or comply with procedures established by the Secretary of the Interior (pursuant to IGRA and 25 C.F.R. 291) in the event that the State and the Tribe are unable to agree to a compact. Expected minimum compact (or Secretarial procedures) provisions can be found in **Section 2.2**. One off-site and two on-site options have been identified for treating the wastewater flow that would be generated by Alternative A.

ES.3.2 ALTERNATIVE B – NORTHWEST STONY POINT CASINO

Alternative B consists of the development of a casino-hotel resort on the northwest portion of approximately 360 acres of land (Stony Point site) that would be taken into trust for the Tribe. Under Alternative B, the development of a casino-hotel resort is planned on approximately 76 acres of the northwest corner of the Stony Point site. The remainder of the Stony Point site would remain undeveloped and be used for open space, pasture, biological habitat, and recycled water sprayfields. The components of the casino-hotel resort would be the same as those proposed for Alternative A. The exact layout of the various components of the casino-hotel resort would be reconfigured to accommodate the northwest corner of the Stony Point site. Employment and Tribal-State Compact terms would not differ from those of Alternative A. Wastewater treatment and disposal for Alternative B would be provided by one of two on-site options. Additionally, the wastewater treatment facility planned for Alternative B would be same in size and scope as proposed for Alternative A.

ES.3.3 ALTERNATIVE C – NORTHEAST STONY POINT CASINO

Under Alternative C, the components of the casino/hotel resort would be the same as to Alternative A, however; located on the Stony Point site. The casino/hotel resort would be located on approximately 101 acres on the northeast corner of the Stony Point site, as opposed to the 76-acre northeast corner development planned for Alternative B. The wastewater treatment and disposal would be similar to Alternative B.

ES.3.4 ALTERNATIVE D – REDUCED INTENSITY (STONY POINT SITE)

Alternative D consists of a smaller-scale version of Alternative B. The casino/hotel resort's general location would not differ from Alternative B. Project components would differ from those included in Alternative B. As summarized in **Table 2-3**, components of the reduced intensity casino/hotel resort would include a reduced casino gaming area, fewer restaurants and bars, banquet meeting space with reduced service facilities, a pool, and a 100-room hotel without a spa. On-site water/wastewater facilities are planned for Alternative D.

ES.3.5 ALTERNATIVE E – BUSINESS PARK

Alternative E consists of the development of an approximately 500,000 square-foot business park on the northwest corner of the Stony Point site. Under this alternative the NIGC would not approve a management contract between the Tribe and SC Sonoma Management LLC.

ES.3.6 ALTERNATIVE F – LAKEVILLE CASINO

Alternative F consists of the development of a casino/hotel resort on the Lakeville site.. Under Alternative F, the casino/hotel resort would be located in southern Sonoma County near the intersection of Lakeville Highway and State Route 37 (SR-37) on approximately 79 acres in the central portion of the approximately 322-acre site. The components of the casino/hotel resort would be identical to those proposed for Alternative A.

ES.3.7 ALTERNATIVE G – NO ACTION

Under the No Action Alternative, none of the sites would be brought into trust or developed as described under any of the alternatives identified. For the purposes of the analysis in this EIS, the sites are assumed to remain in active agricultural use. A portion of the Wilfred Site, however, overlaps with a specific plan recently prepared by the City of Rohnert Park. In the event that Alternative A is not implemented, the area of overlap would likely be subject to the program of development set forth in the Northwest Specific Plan Southern Area (Southern Specific Plan).

ES.3.8 ALTERNATIVE H –REDUCED INTENSITY (WILFRED SITE)

Alternative H consists of a reduced intensity version of Alternative D; however, like Alternative A the proposed development would occur on the Wilfred site. The project components would not differ from Alternative D (**Table 2-3**) whereas, unlike Alternative A, Alternative H would not contain an entertainment lounge and banquet/meeting space. The exterior design of the proposed development would not differ from Alternative A (**Figure 2-2**). While construction activities would be similar to Alternative A, the primary differences would be the absence of the spa, and some entertainment venues. In addition, the hotel would be downsized and consists of 5 stories with 100 rooms. Water for the proposed development would be provided by on-site wells, while wastewater treatment and disposal options would be similar to Alternative A. Furthermore, due to the reduced size and scope of Alternative H, the terms of the existing MOUs with the City of Rohnert Park and Sonoma County are not expected to apply; however, they may be amended to account for Alternative H development.

ES.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The EIS scoping process is an opportunity for the public and state and federal agencies to provide input on the scope of the EIS. The initial scoping report was published in August 2004. Since then, the location for the proposed casino/hotel has changed from the Stony Point site to the Wilfred Site. A supplemental scoping process was initiated to address this change and a second scoping report was published in January 2006. The Draft EIS was made available to the public in March 2007. The following is a summary of the common areas of controversy raised during the scoping process and during the Draft EIS comment period. The initial scoping report and supplemental scoping report are located in **Appendix B**.

A common area of concern was the potential effect of the casino and hotel development, as well as increased traffic, on air quality. Commenters requested that the EIS include a list of types and quantities of air pollution that might be produced and how the project would mitigate for these pollutants. Commenters requested that the EIS address the applicability of the Clean Air Act Section 176 and Environmental Protection Agency's general conformity regulations at 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93. Commenters inquired about the impact of air pollution on physical objects and the costs to local businesses and households for damage caused by increased air pollution. Commenters requested a discussion in the EIS of ambient air conditions, National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and criteria pollutant non-attainment areas. Commenters requested that the EIS analyze impacts from construction and emission estimates of all criteria pollutants and diesel particulate matter (DPM), including the Federal 8-hour ozone standard and the $PM_{2.5}$ standard. Commenters requested that the EIS air quality discussion include an impact evaluation of the construction and operation of the alternatives.

Commenters requested that the EIS address how the project would impact water supply, groundwater resources, and surface water resources in Rohnert Park and Sonoma County. Commenters requested that the EIS provide a breakdown of the water demand created by the alternatives according to proposed land uses. Commenters inquired as to what methods of flood control would be implemented. Commenters inquired whether runoff from construction and operation of the project would impact water quality of the Laguna de Santa Rosa or downstream water bodies. They requested that the EIS discuss whether fill asphalt and construction materials would impact the groundwater, whether overall groundwater quality would decline, whether any degradation of the water quality of water pumped from the lower aquifer would result and how the Proposed Action would prevent non-point source water pollution.

Another concern was whether the operation of the proposed casino would adversely impact traffic congestion on highways and back roads in the vicinity. Commenters requested that the EIS evaluate existing conditions of streets and roads in the area and identify the impacts of the alternatives.

Commenters were also concerned about impacts to biological resources, particularly wildlife. Commenters inquired whether the alternatives would result in wildlife displacement or have an adverse impact on endangered or sensitive plant and animal species. Commenters requested that the EIS consult the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to the Endangered Species Act. Commenters inquired whether the Proposed Action would encroach upon the resting and feeding area of the Pacific flyway. Commenters requested that the EIS examine whether the alternative facilities can be designed in a way to avoid environmentally sensitive areas.

Commenters inquired about the impact of current law enforcement contributions from the Tribe and requested that the EIS evaluate the effect of the project's increased funding for the police department. Commenters requested analysis of the likelihood of increased crime at the casino and how these impacts would be mitigated. Commenters inquired as to how the Tribal police force would interact with the Rohnert Park Department of Public Safety and Sheriff. Commenters inquired as to the size and training of any Tribal police force.

During the public comment period on the Draft EIS many additional concerns were raised, including issues related to land use, impacts to agriculture, and visual impacts. Comments on the Draft EIS can be found in **Appendices AA-EE**. Summaries of the comments can be found in **Appendix FF**.

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

The environmental consequences of the alternatives analyzed within the EIS are summarized in **Table ES-1**. 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 EIS. Mitigation measures have been identified where feasible to address specific effects regardless of whether they are considered "significant." These measures and significance conclusions are summarized in **Table ES-1** below. For a detailed discussion of environmental consequences and mitigation measures, please see **Sections 4.0** and **5.0** of this document.

Abbreviations for significance are identified at the bottom of the table. The following abbreviations are used in the table to identify the alternatives:

A	Alternative A, Proposed Project
B	Alternative B, Northwest Stony Point Casino
C	Alternative C, Northeast Stony Point Casino
D	Alternative D, Reduced Intensity
E	Alternative E, Business Park
F	Alternative F, Lakeville Casino
G	Alternative G, No Action
H	Alternative H, Wilfred Site Reduced Intensity

Table ES-1 also serves to provide a brief, but comprehensive comparison of the environmental impacts of each alternative. The alternatives are divided among three alternative sites (Wilfred, Stony Point, and Lakeville Sites). The alternatives that include development of the Wilfred or Stony Point Sites generally affect the same local traffic network, but the effects vary depending on the amount of traffic that the alternative is expected to draw, whether currently planned development on the Wilfred Site would be displaced and, to a lesser extent, the development's specific location on the Wilfred or Stony Point Sites. Alternatives A, B, and C are all similarly sized and would draw a similar amount of traffic to their developments through virtually the same road network. Alternative A, however, would take the place of development that would otherwise occur on the Wilfred Site. Thus, the traffic impact of Alternative A is much lower than Alternatives B and C (which would operate in addition to commercial/residential development planned for the Wilfred Site). Alternatives D and E would draw less traffic but would also not displace commercial/residential development at the Wilfred Site. As a result, Alternative D would have similar traffic impacts as Alternative A; Alternative E would have slightly lower traffic impacts than Alternative A. Alternative G (No Action) would include currently planned

commercial/residential development on the Wilfred Site and would therefore have an impact over existing conditions but the impact would be lower than the other development alternatives which either propose more intensive development in place of the planned commercial/residential development (Alternative A) or propose development in addition to the planned commercial/residential development. Alternative H will be a reduced intensity alternative (similarly sized to Alternative D), but located on the Wilfred Site. Alternative H is expected to draw a similar number of traffic trips to its developments as Alternative D, but would have a lower traffic impact because it would displace planned Wilfred Site commercial/residential development. Specifically, traffic impacts are expected to be slightly lower than Alternative E's impacts. Alternative F is located at the Lakeville Site in southern Sonoma County along the Lakeville Highway. It would draw a similar number of traffic trips to the hotel/casino as Alternatives A thru C but with impacts primarily affecting intersections and road segments near the Lakeville Site. None of the alternatives include substantial on-site direct sources of noise or air pollutant emissions. Thus, noise and air quality impacts are correlated closely with the traffic impacts summarized above.

Impacts to land resources would be similar for the alternatives. Similar mitigation measures generally related to proper design and construction practices are therefore included.

Impacts to water resources would also be similar for the alternatives except that local impacts would vary based on the location of the development (Lakeville vs. Wilfred/Stony Point sites) and only Alternatives A and G include options for connection to local, off-site wastewater treatment plants. Note that Alternative H is also expected to include an off-site wastewater treatment plant connection option. Also, only the Alternative A and H developments would be located outside of the 100-year floodplain.

The development area proposed for Alternative A, G and H is less biologically sensitive when compared to the other alternatives, thus impacts to biological resources are lessened. For instance, although the development footprint for Alternative A (on the Wilfred Site) is similar to Alternative B (on the Stony Point Site), wetland impacts are reduced by approximately 90 percent. Alternative H is expected to have a slightly reduced footprint when compared with Alternatives A and G, resulting in further reductions in impacts to biological resources.

Alternatives B, D, and E (development on the northwest corner of the Stony Point Site) would require the excavation and removal of a potentially historic residence foundation and associated unknown artifacts. The other alternatives would have no effect on known cultural resources.

Alternatives A, B, C, and F would result in the greatest economic stimulus to the region and would result in the greatest beneficial economic impact to the Tribe. The other alternatives would generate lower levels of economic activity and corresponding benefits to the Tribe. The social effects of casinos are not well known and are debated throughout the nation. More detailed information about the possible effects on crime and other social ills are contained in **Section 4.7**.

However, the non-gaming alternatives (Alternatives E and G) would not cause any of the social impacts potentially attributable to casinos (such as an increase in the incidence of problem/pathological gambling).

Impacts to land use and agriculture would be similar among the alternatives. Impacts to public services would primarily vary depending on the size of the proposed development and the location of the proposed development (Lakeville vs. Wilfred/Stony Point sites). No substantial hazardous materials contamination was found on any of the alternative sites. Thus, the alternatives would have minimal effects on known hazardous materials.

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			
Topography			
A Alternative A would entail alterations to the topographical characteristics of the Wilfred site. The Wilfred site is essentially flat, and the result of on-site grading would not alter this characteristic on site. Therefore, a less than significant impact to the topography of the site would occur. There is no sloping ground that may be subject to instability or landslides on or adjacent to the Stony Point and Wilfred sites (GEOCON, 2004). Thus, the potential for damage to development under Alternative A or its surrounding areas due to instability of slopes or landslides is low.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
B Alternative B would entail alterations to the topographical characteristics of the Stony Point site. It is estimated that 150,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required. On-site grading will be balanced based upon detention basin excavation and borrowing from other portions of the site (Robert A. Karn & Associates, Inc., 2004). Since the Stony Point site is essentially flat, a less than significant impact to the topography of the site would occur. There is no sloping ground that may be subject to instability or landslides on or adjacent to the Stony Point site (GEOCON, 2004). Thus, the potential for damage to development under	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	Alternative B or its surrounding areas due to instability of slopes or landslides is low.			
C	The topographical characteristics of the Stony Point site would be altered in order to provide a suitable building location for Alternative C. It is estimated that 350,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required. Onsite grading will be balanced based upon detention basin excavation and borrowing from other portions of the site (Robert A. Karn & Associates, Inc., 2004). Since the Stony Point site is essentially flat, a less than significant impact is identified to the topography of the site. There is no sloping ground that may be subject to instability or landslides on or adjacent to the Stony Point site (GEOCON, 2004). Thus, the potential for damage to development under Alternative C or its surrounding areas due to instability of slopes or landslides is low.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
D	Alternative D would entail similar alterations to the topographical characteristics of the Stony Point site as for Alternative B, although at a slightly smaller scale.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
E	Alternative E would entail similar alterations to the topographical characteristics of the Stony Point site as for Alternative B, although at a slightly smaller scale.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
F	Alternative F would entail alterations to the topographical characteristics of the Lakeville site. It is estimated that 404,000 cubic yards of earthwork would be required. Onsite excavation	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	would yield approximately 338,000 cubic yards. Thus, an additional 66,000 cubic yards would need to be imported to the site (Robert A. Karn & Associates, Inc., 2004). Although moderately hilly portions of the Lakeville site would be subject to grading for Alternative F, major topographic changes to the site or area would not result. Therefore, a less than significant impact is identified to the topography of the site. Existing slopes within the Lakeville site are not considered steep enough to present an unstable condition.			
G	Alternative G would lead to general alterations to the topographical characteristics of the Northwest Specific Plan Area to accommodate planned development. However, the predominant topographical profile of the Area is essentially flat and level. Therefore, a less than significant impact is identified to the topography of the site. Landslide-related impacts for Alternative G would be less than significant.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
H	Buildout of Alternative H would entail similar alterations to the topographical characteristics of the Wilfred site, as Alternative D would have to the Stony Point site. Due to the relatively flat characteristic of the Wilfred site, on-site grading would not alter the topography of the site. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result from the development of Alternative H.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
Soil			
A The development of Alternative A may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soil. The development of Alternative A may result in structural damage to overlying facilities by expansion and subsidence of soils.	S	• For light to moderately loaded structures (one to three stories) a shallow foundation system would be sufficient (see **Appendix K** for more details and optional systems) to support the developments under expansive soil conditions. However, a shallow foundation system shall be designed to reduce the potential for seasonal moisture variation under the buildings by providing continuous perimeter strip footings that extend below the depth of seasonal moisture variation (typically 18 inches or deeper). • For heavily loaded structures either a post-tensioned concrete slab or heavily reinforced structural mat slab (shallow foundation systems), or a deep foundation system such as a drilled pier system would be sufficient to support the developments under expansive soil conditions (see **Appendix K** for more detail). Shallow design systems applied to high bearing load structures will also be designed to reduce the potential for seasonal moisture variation. • To mitigate impacts to pavement caused by expansive soil, one or a combination of the following measures shall be required: a. Removal and replacement of non-expansive soils	LTS

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

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. Lime treatment of soils c. Design of pavement sections to withstand potential swelling pressures.	
B	The development of Alternative B may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils. The development of Alternative B may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	The development of Alternative C may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils. The development of Alternative C may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	The development of Alternative D may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils. The development of Alternative D may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	The development of Alternative E may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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 development of Alternative E may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.			
F	The development of Alternative F may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils. The development of Alternative F may result in structural damage to overlying facilities by expansion and subsidence of soils.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G	The development of Alternative G may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soils. The development of Alternative G may result in exposure of overlying facilities to structural damage due to expansive soils and subsidence.	S	Same as A.	LTS
H	The development of Alternative H would be similar to Alternative A, in that it may result in exposure of overlying facilities to corrosive soil. Additionally, the development of Alternative H may result in structural damage to overlying facilities by expansion and subsidence of soils.	S	Same as A.	LTS
	Seismicity			
A	Alternative A may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional faulting.	S	• Construction of facilities will adhere to the Uniform Building Code. Specifically, Chapter 16 of the 1997 UBC addresses	LTS

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

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
		structural design requirements for buildings and other structures (including hazardous materials storage facilities) that are consistent with rational analyses and well-established principles of mechanics. Division IV covers earthquake design, which has provisions to safeguard against major structural failures and loss of life. In this regard, the 1997 UBC design requirements include seismically induced characterization, and near-source attenuation effects. Use of the 1997 UBC would allow for ground shaking-related hazards to be managed from a geologic, geotechnical, and structural standpoint such that risks to the health or safety of workers or members of the public would be reduced to a less than significant level.	
B Alternative B may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional flooding.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C Alternative C may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional flooding.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D Alternative D may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional flooding.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E Alternative E may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional flooding.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
F Alternative F may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional faulting.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G Alternative G may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazard liquefaction.	S	Same as A.	LTS
H Alternative H may potentially be exposed to the seismic hazards liquefaction and regional faulting.	S	Same as A.	LTS
Mineral Resources			
A Alteration in the land use will not adversely affect known or recorded minerals and resources.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
B Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
C Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
D Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
E Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
F Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
G Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
H Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
4.3 WATER RESOURCES ***Surface Water*** A The construction of Alternative A would result in ground disturbance, which could lead to erosion and decreased water quality due to discharge of construction-related materials. Runoff from Alternative A, especially surface parking lots, could flush trash, debris, oil, sediments, and grease into area surface waters, impacting water quality. Also, operation of the outfall from the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) seasonally discharging tertiary treated wastewater could negatively impact surface water quality. Measures in a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit (required by the federal Clean Water Act) would ensure that impacts to surface water quality are minimal.	S	• During construction, surface water quality shall be protected by using Best Management Practices (BMP's) as listed in the Erosion Control recommendations in **Appendix F**. • A sampling and monitoring program shall be developed and implemented to assess the quality of surface water entering and leaving the Wilfred site. At a minimum, sampling sites shall include: a site upstream from all proposed development; and, a site downstream of all development but prior to surface waters entering the Laguna de Santa Rosa. Analyses will include total suspended solids (TSS), oils and greases. • Construction of the proposed outfall structure shall be undertaken during the dry season under permit from the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, if required. Bioengineered rip-rap and habitat restoration of the agricultural ditch is proposed to offset construction impacts to existing bank vegetation. The ditch is currently vegetated with non-native weeds and grasses. • Application of fertilizer shall be limited to the minimum	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		amount necessary and shall be adjusted for the nutrient levels in the water used for irrigation. Fertilizer shall not be applied immediately prior to anticipated rain. • The runoff from the garbage bin area shall be directed to the sewer system and treated by the WWTP. • Landscape irrigation will be adjusted based on weather conditions and will be reduced or eliminated during the wet portion of the year in order to prevent excessive runoff. • Water conservation measures including use of reclaimed water for landscape watering and toilets should be implemented. Potable water conservation measures would also be adopted including limits on drinking water served in the casino and hotel restaurants and electronic dispensing devices in faucets. • Effluent temperature shall be reduced by storing effluent in tanks and holding ponds to the extent possible without impairing the operation of the wastewater treatment facility. • The Tribe shall restrict discharge of effluent to the Laguna de Santa Rosa from May 14 to September 30 each year, or other period as specified in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. • The discharge of effluent shall not be allowed until the Russian River flow reaches 1000 cfs measured at the	

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
			Hacienda Bridge, or as otherwise specified in the NPDES permit. • Effluent shall be stored in tanks and holding ponds or discharged to land during the May 14 through September 30 prohibitory discharge period, or during any other period specified in the NPDES permit. • Effluent shall be discharged to land via sprayfields during the period when effluent may not be discharged to surface waters due to conditions of the NPDES permit. • 50 gpm of treated wastewater shall be designated for use by the casino and hotel, in order to maintain the water balance described in **Section 4.3.1**. • If the wastewater treatment option is chosen, the Tribe shall enter into an agreement with the subregional wastewater disposal system, to allow for conveyance and treatment of the project's wastewater to a system operated treatment plant. The Tribe shall also enter into an agreement to purchase 50 gpm of recycled water, in order to maintain the water balance mentioned above. The Tribe shall implement all conditions of the agreements.	
B	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
D	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
F	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G	No development plans are currently proposed for the Stony Point or Lakeville Sites. Thus, no change to surface water would occur at the Stony Point or Lakeville Sites as a result of Alternative G. The northeast corner of the Wilfred Site would be developed in accordance with the Northwest Specific Plan (South). Such development would result in ground disturbance, which could lead to erosion and decreased water quality due to discharge of construction-related materials. Once the site is developed, increased runoff would negatively impact downstream flooding.	S	• During construction, surface water quality shall be protected by using Best Management Practices (BMP's) as listed in the Erosion Control recommendations in **Appendix F**. • A stormwater sampling and monitoring program shall be developed and implemented to assess the quality of surface water entering and leaving the Wilfred site. At a minimum, sampling sites shall include: a site above all proposed development; and, a site downstream of all development but prior to surface waters entering the Laguna de Santa Rosa. Analyses will include total suspended solids (TSS), oils and greases. • Construction of the proposed outfall structure shall be undertaken during the dry season under permit from the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, if required. Bioengineered rip-rap and habitat restoration of the agricultural ditch is proposed to offset construction impacts to existing bank vegetation. The ditch is currently vegetated with non-native weeds and grasses. • A stormwater detention basin(s) shall be included on-site to	LTS

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

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
		ensure stormwater runoff is reduced to pre-project levels.	
H Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
Ground Water			
A Alternative A has the potential to impact groundwater levels in the vicinity of the Wilfred site pumping of groundwater may result in drawdown of the water table at neighboring wells.	S	• Recycled water shall be used for landscape watering and toilet flushing to the maximum extent possible. • The Tribe shall adopt water conservation measures to reduce the consumption of groundwater. • The Tribe shall cooperate with the Sonoma County Water Agency (SCWA) to locate, import, and convey additional surface water supplies to the region to offset drawdown of the aquifers and assist SCWA in the formulation and implementation of a regional groundwater management plan. • The Tribe shall work with the City and SCWA to implement a water conservation and conjunctive water use program. The program shall (1) assess existing and potential sources of reclaimed wastewater within SCWA's service area, and determine potential points of use for the reclaimed wastewater, and (2) supplement the City's and SCWA's existing water conservation programs to identify and implement additional conservation measures within City and SCWA service areas. The program shall incorporate	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		reclaimed water use and conservation to an extent that would fully offset groundwater pumping under the selected project Alternative. • The Tribe shall install and maintain a monitoring well on the site to monitor drawdown. Well logs shall be made available to the SCWA for use in implementation of the regional groundwater management plan. • If neighboring water supply wells experience a substantially lowered water table as a result of operating new water supply wells on-site compensation shall be provided to the well owners by making direct payments for water losses incurred, by reconstructing their wells to make them more efficient, by providing a connection to the City water system, or by pumping on-site extracted groundwater back to the neighbors' properties. • The proposed stormwater detention basin shall retain a portion of the stormwater runoff, allowing it to percolate into the ground. • The Tribe shall participate in or create an off-site artificial recharge project, such as purchasing a groundwater well in the sub-basin and removing the well from service in order to offset a portion of the groundwater used by implementation of the project (in lieu of recharge). • The Tribe shall implement a groundwater monitoring	

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
			program preceded by a pump test (**see Appendix G**)	
B	Alternative B has the potential to impact ground water levels in the vicinity of the Stony Point and Wilfred sites.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Alternative C has the potential to impact ground water levels in the vicinity of the Stony Point and Wilfred sites.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Alternative D has the potential to impact ground water levels in the vicinity of the Stony Point and Wilfred sites.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Alternative E has the potential to impact ground water levels in the vicinity of the Stony Point and Wilfred sites.	S	Same as A.	LTS
F	Alternative F has the potential to impact ground water levels in the vicinity of the Lakeville site. Alternative F additionally has the potential to cause seawater intrusion into the aquifer near the Lakeville site.	S	Same as A, but with additional measures to mitigate for the possibility of seawater intrusion.	LTS
G	Impacts on ground water quality in the areas of the Wilfred site, the Stony Point site or the Lakeville site are less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Alternative H has the potential to impact ground water levels in the vicinity of the Stony Point and Wilfred sites.	S	Same as A.	LTS
4.4	**AIR QUALITY**			

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

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
Construction Related Emissions			
A Construction of Alternative A would result in the generation of ozone precursors (ROG, NO_X), carbon monoxide (CO), and inhalable particulate matter less than 10 and 2.5 microns in diameter (PM_{10} & $PM_{2.5}$) emissions and $PM_{2.5}$.	LTS	Lettering system (i.e. A-b-ii, B-e) corresponds with specific mitigation measures. A. The generation of construction-related PM10 and PM2.5 emissions would cause a less than significant impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required. However, implementation of Basic Control Measures and Enhanced Control Measures from Table 2 of the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans (BAAQMD, 1999) is recommended during the construction of any of the project alternatives. a. The contractor shall designate an on-site Air Quality Construction Mitigation Manager (AQCMM) who shall be responsible for directing compliance with mitigation measures for the construction project. b. Basic Control Measures include the following: i. Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. ii. Cover all truckloads hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all truckloads to maintain at least two feet of freeboard. iii. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		toxic) soil stabilizers to all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites. iv. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites. v. Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets. c. Enhanced Control Measures include the following: i. Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more). ii. Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) iii. Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph. iii. Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways. iii. Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. vi. Use of construction entrances to reduce soil/dust	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		transport off the site. vii. Time-staged construction shall be used to avoid dust/open soils. B. The generation of ROG and NOX emissions from construction equipment would cause a less than significant impact. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required. However, implementation of some basic measures is recommended during the construction of any of the project alternatives in order to further reduce the effects from construction activities. a. To the extent that equipment and technology is available and cost effective, the contractor shall use catalyst and filtration technologies b. All diesel-fueled engines used in construction of the project shall use ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel containing no more than 15-ppm sulfur, or a suitable alternative fuel. c. All construction diesel engine, which have a rating of 50 hp or more, shall meet the tier 2 California Emission Standards for off-road compression-ignition engines, unless certified by the AQCMM that such engine is not available for a particular use. In the event that a Tier II	

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
		engine is not available, Tier I compliant or 1996 or newer engines will be used preferentially. Older engines will only be used if the AQCMM certifies that compliance is not feasible. d. All diesel fueled engines used in construction of the project will have clearly visible tags or other suitable means of identification showing that engine meets the above requirements e. Idling time shall be minimized to 5 minutes when the equipment is not in use unless safety requirements or manufacturers specifications indicate that more time is required. f. Heavy duty diesel equipment will be maintained in optimum running condition	
B Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
C Implementation of Alternative C would result in short-term construction-related generation of ROG, NO_X, CO, and PM_{10} emissions.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
D Similar to C.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
E Similar to C.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
F	Similar to C.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
G	Similar to C.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
H	Similar to C.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
	Asbestos Impacts			
A	Demolition of some existing structures on the Wilfred site could lead to airborne asbestos fibers, which pose a serious health threat. Required control techniques would result in a less than significant impact. Alternative A is not located in an area of Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA), thus Alternative A will have a less than significant impact from NOA.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
D	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
E	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
F	Alternative F would not result in demolition activity, therefore there are no impacts related to asbestos. Alternative F is not located in an area of Naturally Occurring	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
Asbestos, therefore a less than significant impact from NOA would occur.			
G Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Operational Related Emissions			
A ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions associated with operation of Alternative A could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level. Alternative A exceeds the *de minimis* conformity thresholds for NO_X and CO. Therefore a conformity determination is required. Alternative A is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.	S	C. In coordination with the regional transportation agency, such as, the Sonoma County Transit, the Golden Gate Transit, and the potential SMART rail, the Tribe shall provide the following to support regularly-scheduled community transit or shuttle service to and from the nearest mutually-acceptable major transit node: a. Transit shelter benches, b. Street lighting, c. Route signs and display, and d. Bus turnouts. D. The Tribe shall implement feasible travel demand management (TDM) measures for a project of this type. This would include but not limited to: a. Designation of an on-site TDM coordinator.	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		b. Provisions to encourage bicycle commuting. Bicycle lanes and parking areas will be provided were ever appropriate and feasible. c. Provision of transit use incentives, provision of information, printed schedules and commuter promotions. d. Carpool incentives, such as monetary or other rewards will be made available to employees.. e. Installation of secure bicycle parking facilities at commercial areas. E. Buses shall comply with the California Air Resource Board's 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 5 minutes at any location, except in the case of passenger boarding where a ten minute limit is imposed, or when passengers are onboard. Furthermore the Tribe will provide a "Drivers Lounge" for bus and truck drivers to discourage idling. F. The Tribe shall use alternative fuels, where feasible, for casino vehicles. G. The Tribe shall encourage and facilitate the use of 'carpools'	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		by construction workers and facility employees, and tour buses by casino patrons to reduce vehicular use and air pollution. H. The Tribe shall maintain all vehicles to manufactures specifications. I. The Tribe shall ensure that buildings are oriented to take advantage of solar heating and natural cooling, and use passive solar designs. J. The Tribe shall ensure use of solar, low-emission, central, or tankless water heaters and install wall insulation that shall exceed Title 24 requirements. K. The Tribe shall purchase offset credits for VOC, PM2.5, and PM10 if available, so that the total direct and indirect emissions of the project are less than or equal to the significance thresholds stated in Section 4.4. It should be noted that NOx emissions will be fully offset through emissions credits purchased and retired as required by the conformity process. The following mitigation is specific to Alternatives A, B, C, D, and H: T. A Conformity Determination shall be conducted for emissions of NOX and CO that exceed de minimis levels. A draft Conformity Determination is contained in	

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
			Appendix W. A final Conformity Determination will be issued upon evidence of conformance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for NOX and CO.	
B	ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions associated with operation of Alternative B could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level. Alternative B exceeds the *de minimis* conformity thresholds for NO_X and CO. Therefore a conformity determination is required. Alternative B is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions associated with operation of Alternative C could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level. Alternative C exceeds the *de minimis* conformity thresholds for NO_X and CO. Therefore a conformity determination is required. Alternative C is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions associated with operation of Alternative D could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level. Alternative D exceeds the *de minimis* conformity thresholds for	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	NO_X and CO. Therefore a conformity determination is required. Alternative D is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.			
E	ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions would be associated with operation of Alternative E. Alternative E is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.	LTS	Same as A, as well as: The Tribe will ensure that the project will provide multiple and/or direct pedestrian access (i.e. defined paths, "crow flies" access, etc.) to adjacent, complementary land uses and throughout the project. The Tribe will ensure that setback distance is minimized between development and existing/designated transit/pedestrian shelters	LTS
F	ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions associated with operation of Alternative F could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level. Alternative F exceeds the *de minimis* conformity thresholds for NO_X. Therefore a conformity determination is required. Alternative F is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.	S	Same as A, as well as: U. A Conformity Determination shall be conducted for emissions of NOX that exceeds de minimis levels. A draft Conformity Determination is contained in Appendix W. A final Conformity Determination will be issued upon evidence of conformance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for NOX. V. An estimation of reduced operational emissions for the Alternatives A, B, C, D, F, and G, and H were generated by the URBEMIS mitigation component and are presented in Table 5-1. Whereas, these reduced emissions do not comprehensively represent all mitigation measures presented, the results demonstrate that regional air quality impacts from Alternatives A, B, C, D, F, and G would be reduced, but not to a level that is less than significant for ROG, NOX, or PM10.	LTS

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

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
			However, with the purchase of offsets for ROG, NOx, and PM10, as stated in mitigation measure J, regional air quality impacts from Alternatives A, B, C, D, F, and G would be less than significant.	
G	ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions associated with operation of Alternative B could be reduced, but not to a less-than-significant level. Alternative B is not considered to have the potential for resulting in a significant CO air quality impact.	S	Same as A, as well as: N. The developer shall implement feasible travel demand management (TDM) measures for a project of this type. This would include but not limited to: a. Designation of an on-site TDM coordinator. b. Provisions to encourage bicycle commuting. c. Provision of transit use incentives, provision of information, printed schedules and commuter promotions. d. Carpool incentives. e. Installation of secure bicycle parking facilities at commercial areas and parks. O. The developer shall ensure that the project will provide multiple and/or direct pedestrian access (i.e. defined paths, "crow flies" access, etc.) to adjacent, complementary land uses and throughout the project. P. The developer shall ensure that setback distance is	LTS

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

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
		minimized between development and existing/designated transit/pedestrian shelters. Q. The developer shall ensure that buildings are oriented to take advantage of solar heating and natural cooling, and use passive solar designs.	
H Similar to D	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
Odor Impacts			
A Alternative A itself would not contribute odors to the region. There are no existing odor generators that might impact the sensitive receptors associated with Alternative A. However, if the on-site wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) is chosen, the WWTP, if not properly operated, could cause odors.	S	W. The wastewater treatment plant shall be constructed with comprehensive odor control facilities, including the injection of odor control oxidants at the sewage lift station and construction of a covered headworks with odor scrubber at the wastewater treatment plant. X. Spray drift from the wastewater treatment plant or spray disposal field shall be monitored daily during operation by qualified personnel. Spray drift from these two sources shall not be allowed to migrate out of the plant's property boundaries. In the event that spray drift emanating from sprayfield does migrate outside of the property boundaries, operational measures shall be taken to eliminate offsite drift of spray. Y. Spray field irrigation will cease when winds exceed 30 mph.	LTS

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

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 A	S	Same as A.	LTS
C Similar to A	S	Same as A	LTS
D Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E Since Alternative E has commercial and industrial operations, there is a potential of siting a business at this location that may produce offensive odors. Additionally, the on-site wastewater treatment plant, if not properly operated, could represent sources of odors that could potentially become a significant nuisance to the nearby residents.	S	Same as A, as well as: Z. The Tribe shall obtain a letter from the EPA confirming that the proposed use will not create an objectionable odor.	LTS
F Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G Similar to E.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
Toxic Air Contaminant Impacts			
A The gaming facility under Alternative A would not itself contribute or generate toxic air contaminants. However, bus and diesel truck travel to and from the gaming facility would result in an increased concentration of diesel emissions in those areas, resulting in a potentially significant impact of toxic air contaminants in the area.	S	AA. 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. In addition loading docks will provide refrigeration trucks with electrical outlets. Truck using the	LTS

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

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
			loading docks shall not idle for more than five minutes. BB. 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.	
B	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	The commercial development under Alternative E would not itself contribute or generate toxic air contaminants. However, bus and diesel truck travel to and from the commercial areas would result in an increased concentration of diesel emissions in those areas. Alternative E has the potential to locate dry cleaning facilities and/or gasoline stations among its proposed commercial/retail land uses. Air quality studies indicate that there is still the potential for substantial risks even near well-controlled dry cleaners (CARB 2005d). Alternative E also has the potential to locate gasoline-dispensing facilities. Refueling at gasoline dispensing facilities releases benzene into the air.	S	A. Same as A, as well as: CC. The Tribe shall provide an adequate buffer between any dry cleaning operation and any sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, households, etc.). DD. The Tribe shall provide an adequate buffer between any gasoline dispensing facility and any sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, households, etc.).	LTS
F	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
G Similar to E.	S	Same as A, as well as the developer shall implement the following measures: EE. The developer shall provide an adequate buffer between any dry cleaning operation and any sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, households, etc.). FF. The developer shall provide an adequate buffer between any gasoline dispensing facility and any sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, households, etc.).	LTS
H Similar to A	S	Same as A	LTS
Federal Class I Areas Impacts			
A Alternative A does not constitute a "major source" under PSD definitions and therefore does not trigger need for preconstruction review and assessment of impacts.	NE	None recommended.	NE
B Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE
C Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE
D Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE
E Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE
F Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE

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

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
G Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE
H Similar to A.	NE	Same as A.	NE
Indoor Air Quality Impacts			
A Environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) is an airborne toxic substance that may cause and/or contribute to death or serious illness. Since smoking will be permitted indoors at the casino, patrons of the proposed gaming facility could be exposed to toxics and carcinogens from indoor tobacco use. Other indoor pollution sources that release gases or particles into the air can be the cause of indoor air quality problems in buildings. Inadequate ventilation can increase indoor pollutant levels by not bringing in enough outdoor air to dilute emissions from indoor sources and by not carrying indoor air pollutants out of the building. High temperature and humidity levels can also increase concentrations of some pollutants.	S	GG. The Tribe shall ensure that ventilation of outdoor air is consistent with ASHRAE Standard 62-1999 under all operating conditions. HH. To limit public exposure to environmental tobacco smoke, the Tribe shall provide non-smoking areas, or "smoke-free zones" in the casino gaming area (except for alternatives that do not include a casino gaming area). II. The Tribe shall provide non-smoking rooms in the hotel (except for alternatives that do not include a hotel). JJ. The Tribe shall ensure that comfort levels are acceptable to most occupants, and consistent with ASHRAE Standard 55-1992 , under all operating conditions. KK. Signage shall be prominently displayed alerting patrons and employees of areas that permit smoking, noting that environmental tobacco smoke has been found to be deleterious to health, and noting the availability of a brochure(s) describing the health effects of exposure environmental tobacco smoke.	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		LL. A brochure(s) describing the health effects of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke shall be made available to casino patrons in common areas that permit smoking. MM. Prospective employees shall be informed, prior to their hire that indoor smoking is permitted in portions of the buildings where they may be employed. NN. Prospective employees shall be given a brochure(s) describing the health effects of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke. OO. The Tribe shall ensure that significant expected sources of pollutant emissions are isolated from occupants using physical barriers, exhausts, and pressure controls. PP. 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. QQ. The Tribe shall ensure that provisions are made for easy access to HVAC equipment requiring periodic maintenance. RR. 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. SS. The Tribe shall ensure the use of low-emitting building products pursuant to Integrated Waste Management Board's	

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
		Section 01350 where feasible. TT. The developer shall ensure that ventilation of outdoor air is consistent with ASHRAE Standard 62-1999 under all operating conditions. UU. The developer shall ensure that comfort levels are acceptable to most occupants, and consistent with ASHRAE Standard 55-1992, under all operating conditions.	
B Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
F Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G The City of Rohnert Park has an existing smoking ordinance (Smoking Ordinance of the City of Rohnert Park – Ord. 509 § I, 1989) that prohibits smoking in many enclosed spaces, several unenclosed spaces, and places of employment within the City of Rohnert Park. This regulation would render the effect of Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS) as less than significant. Ventilation is a standard engineering approach to assuring good indoor air quality and comfort. However, ventilation is not a	LTS	VV. The developer shall ensure that significant expected sources of pollutant emissions are isolated from occupants using physical barriers, exhausts, and pressure controls. WW. The developer shall ensure that outdoor air entering the building is protected from contamination from local outdoor sources and from building exhausts and sanitation vents. XX. The developer shall ensure that provisions are made for	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
complete solution to indoor pollution.		easy access to HVAC equipment requiring periodic maintenance. YY. The developer 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. ZZ. The developer shall ensure that provisions are made for easy access to HVAC equipment requiring periodic maintenance. AAA. The developer 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. BBB. The developer shall ensure the use of low-emitting building products pursuant to Integrated Waste Management Board's Section 01350 where feasible.	
H Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
4.5 BIOLOGY			
Potential Effects to Wildlife and Habitats			
A Development of Alternative A would affect habitats that are utilized by wildlife species including federally listed species, species of	S	• A detailed plan shall be developed and implemented to conserve ecological resources in the 182 acres in the	LTS

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
concern, and migratory birds.		southern portion of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites (This is not required for F and G). The plan shall address management activities to ensure maintenance of breeding, refuge, and dispersal habitats for California tiger salamander (CTS); and should provide a grazing regimen that will conserve populations of Sonoma sunshine and Burke's goldfields. • Final mitigation ratios for rare plants will be determined during the Section 7 consultation process. Final mitigation ratios are, therefore, not yet available. Mitigation ratios have been established in a programmatic Section 7 consultation for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 permitted projects that may affect four endangered plant species of the Santa Rosa Plain. Mitigation for rare plant impacts according to the Programmatic Consultation would require preservation at a 2:1 ratio for direct impacts to habitat in which presence is assumed or demonstrated through surveys. Preservation at a 1:1 ratio would be required for direct impacts to habitat in which surveys are conducted with negative results. The USFWS is expected to require similar mitigation ratios for the programmatic consultation and the proposed project. Mitigation for Alternative A Option 1 is expected to be • Mitigation for impacts to the CTS would be required and developed as part of a Section 7 consultation. All CTS mitigation would be accomplished off-site and would consist of purchase of CTS credits from an approved	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		mitigation bank or purchase of farm land providing suitable habitat for CTS (actually where CTS are known to occur) and placing the area under conservation easement. Development impacts on aestivation habitat for the CTS on the Wilfred site (Alternative A, Options 1, 2 and 3) have previously been evaluated in a Section 7 Biological Opinion for a different project on the same site. The USFWS issued a Biological Opinion on August 5, 2005 requiring mitigation for CTS aestivation habitat at a ratio of 0.5:1 Discussions with USFWS have found that USFWS would consider an amendment to the existing BO as the means to obtain the requisite "take" authorization from the agency related to the CTS. The applicant proposes mitigation for CTS aestivation habitat pursuant to the mitigation requirements of the interim agency guidance rather than the 0.5:1 ratio required in the previous BO. May 16, 2006 USFWS/CDFG interim guidance requires mitigation at a ratio of 3:1 for projects that are within 500 feet of a breeding site; 2:1 for projects that are greater than 500 feet and within 2200 feet of a known breeding site, and projects beyond 2200 feet from a known breeding site but within 500 feet of an adult occurrence; and 1:1 for projects that are greater than 2200 feet and within 1.3 miles of a known breeding site. All areas of CTS habitat impact are between 2200 feet and 1.3 miles from the nearest known breeding location. All impacted areas under Alternative A Options 1, 2, and 3 would therefore require mitigation at a	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		ratio of 1:1 according to the May 16, 2006 agency guidance. Spraying of reclaimed wastewater is proposed within the 180-acre parcel under either Alternative A Option 2 or 3, within the area east of the Bellevue–Wilfred channel. Under both options, buffers would be provided from any wetland located in this area. Biological monitors would be present during construction of the project and during excavation associated with wetland creation to remove the animals from the work area and relocate them to suitable habitat approved by the USFWS. Mitigation plans shall also include relocation of CTS from development areas (including locations of created wetlands), use of biological monitors on a daily basis during construction and or excavation activities, and fencing to exclude the CTS from entering the construction zone. Prior to construction work beginning each morning, the biological monitor will check equipment for animals and CTS under construction equipment and stored pipes. The biological monitor shall also check all steep-walled holes and trenches greater than one foot deep for any CTS. The biological monitor shall remove CTS as needed from equipment and construction-related features (i.e., trenches, holes, etc.). • A pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be	

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		conducted to ensure impacts to burrowing owls, if present in the construction area, do not occur during the nesting season. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 30 days of initiation of construction activity. If active burrows are found prior to the nesting season, passive relocation measures shall be provided for each burrow in the area of the Wilfred Site that will be rendered biologically unsuitable. Passive relocation measures shall include the creation of two natural or artificial burrows for each burrow rendered biologically unsuitable. Daily monitoring will be implemented until the owls have relocated to the new burrows. This measure will reduce potential impacts to burrowing owl species. Other mitigation measures, in lieu of the proposed mitigation, include avoidance or passive relocation by installing one-way doors at burrow entrances, as outlined in the "Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation" (CDFG, 1995). • A pre-construction survey for California horned lark and loggerhead shrike shall be conducted to ensure that the development area is not nesting habitat or, if it is likely to serve as nesting habitat, to ensure that impacts to either species do not occur during the nesting season. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted within 30 days of initiation of construction activity. • If bird nests are found, appropriate buffer zones should be established around all active nests to protect nesting adults and their young from construction disturbance. (Size of the	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		buffer zones will be determined in consultation with wildlife agency staff based on site conditions and species involved. • All grading and clearing shall be conducted after April 15 and before October 15 of any year, depending on rainfall and/or site conditions to minimize erosion. Access roads and routes will be limited, as well as the construction staging area, to the minimum size required to achieve the goals of the project. A speed limit of 15 mph on dirt roads will be maintained. These practices will limit erosion and dust borne particles. • During construction, vegetation shall only be cleared from the permitted construction footprint and necessary lay-down and assembly areas. Areas cleared of vegetation, pavement, or other substrates should be stabilized as quickly as possible and Best Management Practices (BMPs) applied (erosion fencing, straw and other material applied to soils) to prevent erosion and runoff that could affect steelhead fish in the Laguna de Santa Rosa. • Hazardous materials including fuels, oils, solvents, etc., will be stored in sealed containers in a designated location at a minimum of 200 feet from aquatic environments. All fueling and maintenance of equipment will be done at a minimum of 200 feet from aquatic environments. • All food items and food-related trash will be sealed in containers prior to leaving the construction site at the end	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		of the workday; these items shall be removed from the site once every three days. This measure will limit attraction of wildlife and eliminate trash pollution in the Laguna de Santa Rosa. • Where appropriate, vegetation removed as a result of project activities shall be replaced with native species that are of value to local wildlife. Native plants have a significant cultural value, are generally more valuable as wildlife food sources, and require less irrigation, fertilizers, and pesticides than exotic species. • Treatment of wastewater to remove phosphates and nitrates shall occur to the extent technically feasible during spring discharge from March 20 to May 15 each year. Levels of endocrine disrupting and biostimulatory substances shall be monitored biweekly during this period. If levels of endocrine disrupting and biostimulatory substances that would be harmful to Threatened and Endangered fish species are detected in wastewater discharged into surface waters during this period, additional treatment shall be implemented. The additional treatment shall be implemented during this spring discharge period, and shall reduce the concentration of endocrine disrupting and biostimulatory substances to levels that would not be harmful to Threatened and Endangered fish species. Therefore, this mitigation will reduce the effects of wastewater discharge on Threatened and Endangered Species of fish, and reduce the amounts of biostimulatory	

Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		substances in tertiary-treated wastewater to less than significant levels during the critical spring months. In addition to treatment of the wastewater, the temperature of the released wastewater shall not exceed a 5 degree (°F) variation from the receiving water body. All discharges will be consistent with the requirements of the NPDES permit. • Turn off as many exterior and interior lights as possible during the peak bird migration hours of midnight to dawn to reduce potential building collisions with migration birds. • Install downcast lights with top and side shields to reduce upward and sideways illumination. This will reduce potential disorientation affects from non-directed shine to birds and wildlife species. • Section 7 Consultation shall be initiated with NOAA Fisheries (also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service, or NMFS) regarding potential impacts to steelhead if treated wastewater is to be discharged into the Laguna de Santa Rosa.	
B Similar to A.	S	• Mitigation for impacts to the CTS would be required and developed as part of a Section 7 consultation. All CTS mitigation would be accomplished off-site and would consist of purchase of CTS credits from an approved mitigation bank or purchase of farm land providing suitable habitat for CTS (actually where CTS are known to occur)	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		and placing the area under conservation easement. No previous BO exists for the Stony Point Site. It is expected that mitigation requirements will follow recommendation in the May 16, 2006 USFWS/CDFG interim guidance related to mitigation of CTS in the Santa Rosa Plain. The May 16, 2006 USFWS/CDFG interim guidance requires mitigation at a ratio of 3:1 for projects that are within 500 feet of a breeding site; 2:1 for projects that are greater than 500 feet and within 2200 feet of a known breeding site, and projects beyond 2200 feet from a known breeding site but within 500 feet of an adult occurrence; and 1:1 for projects that are greater than 2200 feet and within 1.3 miles of a known breeding site. Spraying of reclaimed wastewater is proposed within the Stony Point Site under either Alternative B Options 1 or 2. Under both options, buffers would be provided from any wetland located in this area. Biological monitors would be present during construction of the project and during excavation associated with wetland creation to remove the animals from the work area and relocate them to suitable habitat approved by the USFWS. Mitigation plans shall also include relocation of CTS from development areas (including locations of created wetlands), use of biological monitors on a daily basis during construction and or excavation activities, and fencing to exclude the CTS from entering the construction zone. Prior to construction work beginning each morning, the biological monitor will check	

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			equipment for animals and CTS under construction equipment and stored pipes. The biological monitor shall also check all steep-walled holes and trenches greater than one foot deep for any CTS. The biological monitor shall remove CTS as needed from equipment and construction-related features (i.e., trenches, holes, etc.). All other mitigation measures are the same as A.	
C	Similar to A.	S	• Mitigation for impacts to the CTS would be required and developed as part of a Section 7 consultation. All CTS mitigation would be accomplished off-site and would consist of purchase of CTS credits from an approved mitigation bank or purchase of farm land providing suitable habitat for CTS (actually where CTS are known to occur) and placing the area under conservation easement. No previous BO exists for the Stony Point Site. It is expected that mitigation requirements will follow recommendation in the May 16, 2006 USFWS/CDFG interim guidance related to mitigation of CTS in the Santa Rosa Plain. The May 16, 2006 USFWS/CDFG interim guidance requires mitigation at a ratio of 3:1 for projects that are within 500 feet of a breeding site; 2:1 for projects that are greater than 500 feet and within 2200 feet of a known breeding site, and projects beyond 2200 feet from a known breeding site but within 500 feet of an adult occurrence; and 1:1 for projects that are greater than 2200	LTS

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
			feet and within 1.3 miles of a known breeding site. Spraying of reclaimed wastewater is proposed within the Stony Point Site under either Alternative C Options 1 or 2. Under both options, buffers would be provided from any wetland located in this area. Biological monitors would be present during construction of the project and during excavation associated with wetland creation to remove the animals from the work area and relocate them to suitable habitat approved by the USFWS. Mitigation plans shall also include relocation of CTS from development areas (including locations of created wetlands), use of biological monitors on a daily basis during construction and or excavation activities, and fencing to exclude the CTS from entering the construction zone. Prior to construction work beginning each morning, the biological monitor will check equipment for animals and CTS under construction equipment and stored pipes. The biological monitor shall also check all steep-walled holes and trenches greater than one foot deep for any CTS. The biological monitor shall remove CTS as needed from equipment and construction-related features (i.e., trenches, holes, etc.). All other mitigation measures are the same as A.	
D	Similar to A.	S	• Mitigation for impacts to the CTS would be required and developed as part of a Section 7 consultation. All CTS mitigation would be accomplished off-site and would consist of purchase of CTS credits from an approved	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		mitigation bank or purchase of farm land providing suitable habitat for CTS (actually where CTS are known to occur) and placing the area under conservation easement. No previous BO exists for the Stony Point Site. It is expected that mitigation requirements will follow recommendation in the May 16, 2006 USFWS/CDFG interim guidance related to mitigation of CTS in the Santa Rosa Plain. The May 16, 2006 USFWS/CDFG interim guidance requires mitigation at a ratio of 3:1 for projects that are within 500 feet of a breeding site; 2:1 for projects that are greater than 500 feet and within 2200 feet of a known breeding site, and projects beyond 2200 feet from a known breeding site but within 500 feet of an adult occurrence; and 1:1 for projects that are greater than 2200 feet and within 1.3 miles of a known breeding site. Spraying of reclaimed wastewater is proposed within the Stony Point Site under either Alternative D Options 1 or 2. Under both options, buffers would be provided from any wetland located in this area. Biological monitors would be present during construction of the project and during excavation associated with wetland creation to remove the animals from the work area and relocate them to suitable habitat approved by the USFWS. Mitigation plans shall also include relocation of CTS from development areas (including locations of created wetlands), use of biological monitors on a daily basis during construction and or excavation activities, and fencing to exclude the CTS from	

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
			entering the construction zone. Prior to construction work beginning each morning, the biological monitor will check equipment for animals and CTS under construction equipment and stored pipes. The biological monitor shall also check all steep-walled holes and trenches greater than one foot deep for any CTS. The biological monitor shall remove CTS as needed from equipment and construction-related features (i.e., trenches, holes, etc.). All other mitigation measures are the same as A.	
E	Similar to A.	S	• Mitigation for impacts to the CTS would be required and developed as part of a Section 7 consultation. All CTS mitigation would be accomplished off-site and would consist of purchase of CTS credits from an approved mitigation bank or purchase of farm land providing suitable habitat for CTS (actually where CTS are known to occur) and placing the area under conservation easement. No previous BO exists for the Stony Point Site. It is expected that mitigation requirements will follow recommendation in the May 16, 2006 USFWS/CDFG interim guidance related to mitigation of CTS in the Santa Rosa Plain. The May 16, 2006 USFWS/CDFG interim guidance requires mitigation at a ratio of 3:1 for projects that are within 500 feet of a breeding site; 2:1 for projects that are greater than 500 feet and within 2200 feet of a known breeding site, and projects beyond 2200 feet from a known breeding site but within 500 feet of an adult	LTS

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

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
			occurrence; and 1:1 for projects that are greater than 2200 feet and within 1.3 miles of a known breeding site. Spraying of reclaimed wastewater is proposed within the Stony Point Site under either Alternative E Options 1 or 2. Under both options, buffers would be provided from any wetland located in this area. Biological monitors would be present during construction of the project and during excavation associated with wetland creation to remove the animals from the work area and relocate them to suitable habitat approved by the USFWS. Mitigation plans shall also include relocation of CTS from development areas (including locations of created wetlands), use of biological monitors on a daily basis during construction and or excavation activities, and fencing to exclude the CTS from entering the construction zone. Prior to construction work beginning each morning, the biological monitor will check equipment for animals and CTS under construction equipment and stored pipes. The biological monitor shall also check all steep-walled holes and trenches greater than one foot deep for any CTS. The biological monitor shall remove CTS as needed from equipment and construction-related features (i.e., trenches, holes, etc.). All other mitigation measures are same as A.	
F	Similar to A.	S	• A management plan shall be developed for the north and west sections of the Lakeville site. The plan shall be developed to conserve ecological resources in that area	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		and to provide necessary mitigation for possible impacts to sensitive species resulting from development. The plan shall address management activities to ensure maintenance of breeding, refugial, and dispersal habitats for California red-legged frog; habitats for both larval and adult stages of Callipe Silverspot and Myrtle's Silverspot butterflies; breeding and foraging habitat for burrowing owl; foraging area for raptor species of concern; and should provide a grazing regimen that will conserve populations of saline clover. • Development plans for the Middle section of the Lakeville site should be designed with appropriate setbacks from California red-legged frog breeding sites, i.e., 300 feet or greater. Habitat for this species should be enhanced in the Northern portion of the site in coordination with the USFWS to compensate for any indirect effects to habitat. • Isolated populations of saline clover may be affected on the Lakeville site if development occurs in the Middle section or eastern portion. A mitigation plan will be developed to transplant the plants or collect seed, as appropriate. Transplant individuals or seed may be planted in appropriate protected habitat or open space preserves established in the project area.	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		• Appropriate setbacks from the Middle section of the Lakeville site should be implemented to prevent indirect impacts to raptors (red-tailed hawk and great-horned owl), which are known to nest in the adjacent eucalyptus groves • A pre-construction survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted to ensure impacts to burrowing owls, if present in the construction area, do not occur during the nesting season. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 30 days of initiation of construction activity. If active burrows are found prior to the nesting season, passive relocation measures shall be provided for each burrow in the area of the Wilfred Site that will be rendered biologically unsuitable. Passive relocation measures shall include the creation of two natural or artificial burrows for each burrow rendered biologically unsuitable. Daily monitoring will be implemented until the owls have relocated to the new burrows. This measure will reduce potential impacts to burrowing owl species. Other mitigation measures, in lieu of the proposed mitigation, include avoidance or passive relocation by installing one-way doors at burrow entrances, as outlined in the "Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation" (CDFG, 1995). • A pre-construction survey for the California horned lark and loggerhead shrike should be conducted to ensure that the construction area is not nesting habitat. Pre-construction surveys must be completed 30 days prior to the initiation of construction activity. The presence of nests of either	

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 would require the delay of construction until after the young have fledged. • Turn off as many exterior and interior lights as possible during the peak bird migration hours of midnight to dawn to reduce potential building collisions with migration birds. • Install downcast lights with top and side shields to reduce upward and sideways illumination. This will reduce potential disorientation affects from non-directed shine to birds and wildlife species. • Section 7 Consultation shall be initiated with the NOAA Fisheries (also known as National Marine Fisheries Service, or NMFS) regarding potential impacts to green sturgeon, tidewater goby, Delta smelt, river lamprey, Pacific lamprey, Coho salmon, steelhead, Chinook salmon, Sacramento splittail, and long-fin smelt, if treated wastewater is to be discharged into the Petaluma River.	
G Under the No Action Alternative, no development is proposed except on the northeast corner of the Wilfred Site. Impacts at this location would be similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
H Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
Potential Effects to Waters of the U.S.			
A Development of Alternative A Option 2 would impact 1.60 acres of wetlands and 0.48 acres of drainages, for a total of 2.08 acres of waters of the U.S.Development of Alternative A Option 3 would impact 1.60 acres of wetlands and 0.77 acres of drainages, for a total of 2.37 acres of waters of the U.S.	S	• For impacts to wetlands and other waters of the United States, authorization from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is required. Replacement of directly affected wetlands at a ratio approved by the USACE is required. Clean Water Act Section 401 water quality certification will also be required from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). • Wetland mitigation shall be accomplished through creation/restoration of seasonal wetlands onsite and/or within an open space preserve. This creation/restoration will provide an increase in the inventory of seasonal wetlands for the area. The proposed 1.5:1 ratio of seasonal wetland restoration/creation to impacted acreage will be sufficient to satisfy the ratio of replacement to impacted acreage required by regulatory agencies based on wetland functions and values present on the Wilfred site. A detailed mitigation plan shall be designed that includes monitoring and reporting requirements, responsibilities, performance success criteria, reporting procedures and contingency requirements.	LTS
B Development of Alternative B Option 1 would impact 21.14 acres of wetlands and 0.73 acres of drainages, for a total of 21.87 acres of waters of the U.S. Development of Alternative B Option 2 would impact 26.43 acres of	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	wetlands and 0.73 acres of drainages, for a total of 27.16 acres of waters of the U.S.			
C	Development of Alternative C Option 1 would impact 21.79 acres of wetlands and 0.49 acres of drainages, for a total of 22.28 acres of waters of the U.S. Development of Alternative C Option 2 would impact 25.70 acres of wetlands and 0.49 acres of drainages, for a total of 26.28 acres of waters of the U.S.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Development of Alternative D Option 1 would impact 19.77 acres of wetlands and 0.73 acres of drainages, for a total of 20.50 acres of waters of the U.S. Development of Alternative D Option 2 would impact 21.91 acres of wetlands and 0.76 acres of drainages, for a total of 22.67 acres of waters of the U.S.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Development of Alternative E Option 1 would impact 19.69 acres of wetlands and 0.72 acres of drainages, for a total of 20.41 acres of waters of the U.S. Development of Alternative E Option 2 would impact 20.96 acres of wetlands and 0.73 acres of drainages, for a total of 21.69 acres of waters of the U.S	S	Same as A.	LTS
F	Development of Alternative F Option 1 would impact 98.65 acres of	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	wetlands, for a total of 98.65 acres of waters of the U.S. Development of Alternative F Option 2 would impact 110.65 acres of wetlands, for a total of 110.65 acres of waters of the U.S.			
G	Under the No Action Alternative, no development is proposed except on the northeast corner of the Wilfred Site. Impacts at this location would be similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
H	Development of Alternative H Option 2 would impact 1.49 acres of wetlands and 0.48 acres of drainages, for a total of 1.97 acres of waters of the U.S. Development of Alternative H Option 3 would impact 1.48 acres of wetlands and 0.77 acres of drainages, for a total of 1.97 acres of waters of the U.S.	S	Same as A.	LTS
	4.6 CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
A	Development proposed under this alternative may adversely effect previously unknown subsurface prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	S	A. The Tribe will implement all mitigation measures concurred upon by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) during the Section 106 consultation process, including but not limited to, the following: a. The following mitigation shall be conducted and the Section 106 process concluded prior to any ground- disturbing activities: i. Alternatives A, B, C, D, E, and H: Section 106	LTS

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		concurrence of *no historic properties are affected* by SHPO is required prior to any ground disturbance if these sites are selected as the Preferred Alternative. ii. Alternative F: (CA-SON-204): Permanent fencing shall be installed to provide a buffer zone of 100 feet in width around the site to ensure there are no adverse impacts to the site during construction or project operation. Security guards shall also regularly monitor the site to ensure the fence has not been breached B. To avoid potential impacts to previously unknown cultural resources, including subsurface resources, the Tribe shall include the following requirement in construction contract specifications for the project: a. In the event that any prehistoric or historic archaeological resources or paleontological resources are discovered during construction-related earth-moving activities, all work within 50 feet of the find shall be halted until a qualified professional archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Professional Qualifications, or paleontologist as appropriate, can assess the significance of the find. If any find is determined to be significant by the archaeologist, or paleontologist, representatives of the Tribe shall meet with the archaeologist, or paleontologist, to determine the appropriate course of action, including the development of a treatment	

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
			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. b. If human remains are discovered during ground disturbing activities, pursuant to NAGPRA, Section 10.4 Inadvertent Discoveries, the County Coroner, the Tribal Official, and a representative of the BIA and NIGC shall be contacted immediately. No further disturbance shall occur until the Tribal Official, the County Coroner and the BIA and NIGC representatives have made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition. If it is determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required and if the remains are of Native American origin, the Tribal Official and BIA and NIGC representives shall make necessary arrangements regarding the disposition of the remains.	
B	Development proposed under this alternative would adversely effect historic archaeological site RPC-1 that is recommended eligible for the National Register of Historic Places for treatment purposes. Development proposed under this alternative may also adversely effect previously unknown subsurface prehistoric, historic and paleontological archaeological resources.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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 Development proposed under this alternative may adversely affect previously unknown subsurface prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D Development proposed under Alternative D would be similar to impacts described under Alternative B. This is a potentially significant impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E Development proposed under Alternative E would be similar to impacts described under Alternative B. This is a potentially significant impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
F Development proposed under this alternative may adversely affect previously unknown subsurface prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. This is a potentially significant impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
H Similar to A.	S	Same as A	LTS
4.7 SOCIOECONOMIC CONDITIONS			
Direct Economic Effects			
Construction			

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

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	Development of Alternative A is estimated to generate 750 jobs the entire construction period, and expend an estimated total construction cost of $450 million.	BE	None recommended.	BE
B	Similar to A.	BE	None recommended.	BE
C	Similar to A.	BE	None recommended.	BE
D	The number of construction employees would be the same as Alternative A, at 750 employees. However, the direct expenditures required for construction would be reduced, to approximately $433 million.	BE	None recommended.	BE
E	Approximately 90 employees would be required to construct Alternative E. Direct expenditures for construction would be approximately $52.4 million.. Note that although the economic activity physically takes place in the local economy, not all of the revenues represent a direct economic impact to the local economy. Thus, the direct economic impact to the local economy would be approximately $49 million within Sonoma County and $57 million within the San Francisco Bay Area (See Section 4.11.2 and Appendix N).	BE	None recommended.	BE
F	Similar to A.	BE	None recommended.	BE
G	The northeast corner of the Wilfred site would be developed consistent with the Northwest Specific Plan. Alternative G would generate 104 jobs during construction and construction costs would	BE	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
	be approximately $125,068,000 over a period of 24 months. During operation of its various commercial uses, Alternative G would generate 302 jobs resulting in total sales of $75,140,254. The direct economic impact to the local economy would be approximately $19 million. Alternative G would result in positive indirect and induced impacts both in jobs created and in capital flowing through the community. However, the jobs created, in particular would be much lower than the other alternatives. Negative fiscal impacts to local jurisdictions would be offset by increased property taxes and the imposition of development fees, resulting in a less than significant impact (See Appendix N).			
H	The number of construction employees would be the same as Alternative A, at 750 employees. However, the direct expenditures required for construction would be reduced, to approximately $433 million.	BE	None recommended.	LTS
Operational				
A	Alternative A is expected to result in the employment of between 2,200 and 2,600 full-time workers, with an average of 2,400 workers. The casino/hotel resort is expected to generate annual receipts between $455 million and $582 million, with an average of $533 million. Development of Alternative A would result in fiscal impacts to local jurisdictions.	BE	• The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least $181,724 to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. The County and the Tribe are free to negotiate payments greater than this amount, however the MOU must at least provide for annual payments of $181,724 in order to mitigate fiscal impacts to a less than significant level.	LTS
B	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	All indirect socioeconomic impacts of Alternative B to the region would be either beneficial or less than significant, except for indirect fiscal impacts to Sonoma County, where a potentially significant effect would occur.			
C	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Similar to A.	S	• The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least $146,777 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. The County and the Tribe are free to negotiate payments greater than this amount, however the MOU must at least provide for annual payments of $147,777 in order to mitigate fiscal impacts to a less than significant level.	LTS
E	Market data for business parks suggest that there will be one worker per 250 square feet, or 2,000 employees for Alternative E. The IMPLAN (IMpact Analysis for PLANning) model was used to estimate annual revenues of approximately $136.5 million based on this employment (Bay Area Economics, 2005). Fiscal effects to local jurisdictions would be similar but reduced when compared to Alternative A. Although the economic activity physically takes place in the local economy, not all of the revenues represent a direct economic impact to the local economy. Thus, the direct economic impact to the local economy would be approximately $49 million within Sonoma County and $57 million within the San Francisco Bay Area. (See Section 4.11.2 and Appendix N)	S	• The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least $139,788 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. The County and the Tribe are free to negotiate payments greater than this amount, however the MOU must at least provide for annual payments of $139,788 in order to mitigate fiscal impacts to a less than significant level.	LTS

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

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
F	Economic effects from job creation and revenues would not differ from Alternative A, given the similar size and scope of Alternative F. Fiscal effects would also be similar to Alternative A, except focused more on Sonoma County than the City of Rohnert Park.	S	• The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides up to $1 million towards the development of a fire station near the Lakeville Site and annual payments of at least $181,724 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County. • The tribe shall negotiate a MOU in which it agrees to provide payments to problem gambling treatment programs of at least $41,526 per year.	LTS
G	Under Alternative G, no development is proposed except on the Wilfred site, where development fees should account for fiscal impacts to local jurisdictions.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Similar to A.	S	Same as D.	LTS
	Indirect and Induced Economic Effects			
A	Alternative A would result in jobs and revenues that are induced or indirectly a result of the operation of the casino/hotel resort (indirect/induced economic impacts). Indirect employment and revenues would result from inter-industry trade, which the casino/hotel engages in with other businesses (e.g., janitorial supply services). Induced employment and revenues would result from economic activity spawned by the household trade that occurs when casino/hotel employees act as consumers. A beneficial, temporary indirect impact would occur to the region as a result of the construction and operations of the casino/hotel.	BE	None recommended.	BE

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

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 A.	BE	None recommended.	BE
C	Similar to A.	BE	None recommended.	BE
D	Alternative D would result in jobs and revenues that are induced or indirectly a result of the operation of the casino/hotel resort (indirect/induced economic impacts). These induced/indirect economic impact would be similar to, but slightly less than those occurring under Alternative A.	BE	None recommended.	BE
E	Alternative E would result in jobs and revenues that are induced or indirectly a result of the operation of the business park (indirect/induced economic impacts). These indirect/induced economic impacts would be similar, but substantially reduced when compared with Alternative B, given that Alternative E includes a much smaller project that does not include a casino/hotel component. Construction of Alternative E would result in 190 indirect and induced jobs in the Bay Area and a total indirect/induced regional output of $16,890,00. The operation of Alternative E would result in 183 indirect and induced jobs in the Bay Area and a total indirect/induced regional output of $16,890,000 causing a beneficial indirect impact to the region.	BE	None recommended.	BE
F	Alternative F would result in jobs and revenues that are induced or indirectly a result of the operation of the casino/hotel resort (indirect/induced economic impacts). These indirect/induced economic impacts would be the same as those of Alternative A, given that Alternative F is similarly sized when compared to	BE	None recommended.	BE

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

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
	Alternative A. A beneficial indirect impact to the region would result.			
G	Under the No Action Alternative the Stony Point site and Lakeville site would remain underdeveloped. The northeast corner of the Wilfred site would be developed consistent with the Northwest Specific Plan (see **Section 2.8**). The creation of jobs and increased economic activity will result in a beneficial effect for the community.	BE	None recommended.	BE
H	Alternative H would result in jobs and revenues that are induced or indirectly a result of the operation of the casino/hotel resort (indirect/induced economic impacts). These induced/indirect economic impact would be similar to, but slightly less than those occurring under Alternative A.	BE	None recommended.	BE
	Fiscal Impacts on Local Jurisdictions			
	City of Rohnert Park and Sonoma County			
A	The cost to provide fire and emergency services to the casino/hotel resort would be between $244,600 and $289,100. Under a MOU, the Tribe will donate approximately $10.9 million to fund capital improvements including an additional fire truck. Additionally, the Tribe will donate approximately $9.7 million per year to the City to mitigate any ongoing impacts (see **Section 2.2.10**). This is equal to approximately 37 percent of the City's existing General Fund Budget. Therefore, accounting for these annual contributions, the City of Rohnert Park can expect a large fiscal surplus after the	S	The Tribe shall negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least $181,724 to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County.	LTS

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

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, resulting in a beneficial impact. Alternative A would generate a negative fiscal impact to the County (approximately $181,724 per year) based on an expectation of increased County service costs coupled with a lesser anticipated increase in revenues. A potentially significant fiscal effect to the County would result should negotiations not result in offsetting contributions to the County to mitigate for the fiscal impact of Alternative A.			
B	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Fiscal impacts to the local jurisdictions would be similar, but reduced when compared to Alternative A, resulting in a net fiscal impact to Sonoma County of $146,777. Mitigation measures would ensure fiscal impacts to the County are less than significant.	S	The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least $146,777 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County.	LTS
E	Fiscal impacts to the local jurisdictions would be similar, but reduced when compared to Alternative A.	S	The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least $139,788 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County.	LTS
F	Alternative F would result in negligible fiscal impacts to the City of Rohnert Park, since the Lakeville site is not located near the City. Thus, a less than significant effect would result. Unlike Alternatives A-E, the City of Rohnert Park MOU would not	S	The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides up to $1,000,000 towards the development of a fire station near the Lakeville Site and annual payments of at least $81,724 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the	LTS

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

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
	apply to Alternative F and would not be expected to be renegotiated to apply given the distance between the City and the Lakeville site. Thus, the costs to the County would increase substantially. Mitigation measures would ensure fiscal effects to the County would be less than significant.		County.	
G	Unlike Alternatives A-F, the land would not be taken into trust under Alternative G. Instead, the portion of the Wilfred Site planned for development would be annexed by the City of Rohnert Park. Thus, most fiscal impacts would be to the City although, secondary fiscal impacts would occur to the County (similar to those expected should the development area be taken into trust). Negative fiscal impacts to local jurisdictions would be offset by increased property taxes and the imposition of development fees. Therefore, a less than significant impact would result.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Fiscal impacts to the local jurisdictions would be similar, but reduced when compared to Alternative A, resulting in a net fiscal impact to Sonoma County of $146,777. Mitigation measures would ensure fiscal impacts to the County are less than significant.	S	The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County that provides annual payments of at least $146,777 per year to mitigate for fiscal impacts to the County.	LTS
	Property Values			
A	The construction of a casino may result in changes to local property values, which could impact local tax assessor rolls and in turn, local property tax revenues. As property values and taxes can vary for a variety of reasons unrelated to the casino, it would be speculative to measure the impacts to property values.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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 A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
D	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
E	Potential impacts to property values associated with operation of a casino would not be present with the business park development proposed for Alternative E. Commercial and light industrial uses associated with a business park are not expected to result in decreased property values, although industrial uses can result in nuisances on nearby residences, which would tend to enact a negative influence on property values. Nonetheless, the level of industrial development and potential future nuisance concerns are not known. Thus, an attempt to measure impacts to property values would be speculative for this reason and for the reasons stated above.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
F	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
G	Development on the site would increase land values, thereby increasing property tax revenues to local government.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Social Effects				
A	The development of Alternative A would potentially affect County social services and crime occurrence associated with increased traffic increase crime and the incidence of problem gambling. The	S	• City MOU payments plus $125,000 should be provided for problem gambling programs. In order to maximize the effectiveness of MOU payments to treatment and prevention programs, the organization that receives the	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	development of Alternative A also may result in a local increase in problem and pathological gambling		payments for problem gambling treatment should serve the Sonoma County region, and be accessible to County residents. • The Tribe should prominently display materials describing the risk and signs of problem and pathological gambling behaviors. Materials should also be prominently displayed that provide available programs for those seeking treatment for problem and pathological gambling disorders. • The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County and neighboring cities as specified in **Section 5.2.6**.	
B	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	The social effects of Alternative D would be slightly reduced when compared to Alternative A, given that Alternative D is reduced in size and scope when compared with Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	The potential social effects that are associated with operation of a casino would not be present with the business park development proposed for Alternative E. Commercial and industrial uses associated with a business park are not expected to characteristically result in increased crime rates to the region but would likely result in increased crime due to the presence of development. An increased public presence on the Stony Point	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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
	site could lead to an increased demand in calls for law enforcement service.			
F	The social effects of Alternative F would not differ from Alternative A, given that Alternative F is similar in size and scope when compared with Alternative A. As discussed under Alternative A, the introduction of a casino could lead to increases in crime rates and problem gambling.	S	• The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU in which it agrees to provide payments to problem gambling treatment programs of at least $43,200 per year. • In order to maximize the effectiveness of MOU payments to treatment and prevention programs, the organization that receives the payments for problem gambling treatment should serve the Sonoma County region, and be accessible to County residents. • The Tribe should prominently display materials describing the risk and signs of problem and pathological gambling behaviors. Materials should also be prominently displayed that provide available programs for those seeking treatment for problem and pathological gambling disorders. • The Tribe shall negotiate a MOU with Sonoma County and neighboring cities as specified in **Section 5.2.6.**	LTS
G	The planned development would also greatly increase the number of people on the site, leading to moderately increased criminal activity. Required development fees would provide funding for local police services, reducing crime effects to a less than significant level.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	The social effects of Alternative H would be slightly reduced when compared to Alternative A, given that Alternative H is reduced in	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	size and scope when compared with Alternative A.			
	Environmental Justice			
A	No minority or low-income communities were identified in **Section 3.7.4** in the vicinity of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites.	NE	None recommended.	NE
B	Similar to A.	NE	None recommended.	NE
C	Similar to A.	NE	None recommended.	NE
D	Similar to A.	NE	None recommended.	NE
E	Similar to A	NE	None recommended.	NE
F	Four minority communities and one low-income community were identified in **Section 3.7.4**, located in Solano County, in or near the City of Vallejo. The environmental effects of Alternative F on these communities would be limited to increased traffic and possibly localized carbon monoxide (CO) effects caused by traffic congestion. Significant traffic impacts would remain even after mitigation measures in **Section 5.2.7**.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	S
G	Under the No Action Alternative, no development is proposed. Thus, no disproportionate effects to low-income or minority populations would occur.	NE	None recommended.	NE

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

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
H	Similar to A.	NE	None recommended.	NE
	Tribal Competition			
A	Alternatives A, B, C, and D all contain a casino component, which could potentially compete with the River Rock Casino and Twin Pine Casino, which are operated by the Dry Creek Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians and the Middletown Rancheria Band of Pomo Indians.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to A	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to A	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
D	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
E	No environmental justice impacts would result from Alternative E, which does not include a casino component and is located on the Stony Point site.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
F	Impacts to nearby Tribal casinos would be similar to Alternatives A, B, C, and D, as noted above. Alternative F would include the development of a casino at the Lakeville site, which is in the same region as the Wilfred and Stony Point sites. Thus, similar, less than significant impacts to nearby tribal casinos would result.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
G	Under the No Action Alternative, no development is proposed. Thus, no disproportionate effects to low-income or minority	NE	None recommended.	NE

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

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
	populations would occur.			
H	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
	4.8 RESOURCE USE PATTERNS			
	Transportation			
A	Impact to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.8.2**.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
B	Impact to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section 4.8.3.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
C	Impact to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section 4.8.4.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
D	Impact to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.8.5**.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
E	Impact to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.8.6**.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
F	Impact to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in Section 4.8.7.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
G	The No Action Alternative would result in the traffic conditions described as the baseline conditions for each target year (see **Section 4.8.1**).	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
H	Impact to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.8.9**.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
Land Use				
A	Alternative A would be inconsistent with several local land use regulations. However, conflicts with surrounding land uses (i.e., obstruction of access or the preclusion of allowable uses) would not result from the development of Alternative A. Moreover, the proposed development would occur away from the existing Rancho Verde Mobile Home Park. Therefore, impacts to land uses would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to A; however, the development of this alternative would occur on a site that was largely undeveloped, not planned for development, and in a community separator. Like Alternative A, the development would occur away from the Rancho Verde Mobile Home Park. Thus, no significant land use conflicts would occur.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to B, because the proposed development would be similar in size and scope to Alternative B and would also occur on the northern portion of the Stony Point site. In addition, the impacts to open space are similar to Alternative B and remain less than significant, whereas, Alternative C's development footprint would be slightly larger than Alternative B's.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
D	Land use effects would be similar to Alternative B, except at a somewhat reduced scale due to the reduced size of development for Alternative D. The terms of the City's MOU would not apply to Alternative D, however, a significant loss of open space would not occur given the large amount of open space that would be retained	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	under this alternative.			
E	Land use effects would be similar to Alternative B, except at a somewhat reduced scale due to the reduced size of development for Alternative E. The terms of the City's MOU would not apply to this alternative; however, a less than significant impact to open space would occur.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
F	Alternative F would be inconsistent with several local land use policies. In addition, under Alternative F only Tribal or federal land use authority would apply to the Lakeville site. Moreover, Alternative F would not result in any land use conflicts (i.e., an obstruction of access or the preclusion of allowable uses), therefore, impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
G	Under this alternative, current land uses would be retained on the Stony Point and Lakeville sites. The northeastern portion of the Wilfred site would be developed with as intended under the Northwest Specific Plan, thereby converting approximately 63 acres of undeveloped land on the Wilfred site to commercial/residential uses.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Land use effects would be similar to those of Alternative A, except at a somewhat smaller scale due to the reduced size of scope of development for Alternative H.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
	Agriculture			

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

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	Due to the inferior quality and relatively small quantity of total land available for farming purposes, impacts to agriculture from the development of Alternative A are considered less than significant. Moreover, mitigation would be implemented to reduce impacts to neighboring agricultural operations. No development would occur on the southern Williamson Act parcels; therefore, no impact would occur.	LTS	• The Tribe shall enact a "right to farm" ordinance that preserves the policy of the Tribe to respect and preserve area agricultural operations and creates a presumption that ongoing, standard farming practices are not a nuisance to development operations occurring on the Tribe's development site.	LTS
B	Due to the inferior quality and relatively small quantity of total land available for farming purposes, impacts to agriculture from the development of Alternative B are considered less than significant. No development would occur on the southern Williamson Act parcels; therefore no impact would occur.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative B.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
D	Same as A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
E	Impacts would be similar to Alternative A, but lessened somewhat due to the reduced development footprint of Alternative E.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
F	The site does not contain property under the Williamson Act, prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance. Due to the inferior quality and relatively small portion of the total County land available for farming purposes, impacts to agriculture from the development of Alternative F are considered less than	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	significant under NEPA.			
G	Land zoned for agricultural uses would not be lost and current land use would continue.	NE	None recommended.	NE
H	The development of Alternative H would be similar to Alternative A, but at a smaller scale, and would result in the direct conversion of up to 69.5 acres of rural lands to urban uses located on the northeastern portion of the Wilfred site.	LTS	Same as for Alternative A.	LTS
	4.9 PUBLIC SERVICES			
	Water Supply			
A	All on-site water demands (including fire flow) would be met by on-site wells and storage, except for recycled water, which could be supplied from the regional wastewater treatment plant if it is utilized for wastewater treatment. Alternative A would utilize recycled water from an on-site wastewater treatment plant or from existing recycled water pipelines located adjacent to the site. Should the project connect to the Subregional sewer system, the volume of sewage provided to the Laguna WWTP would exceed the required recycled water deliveries for the project and thus would be a less than significant demand on recycled water. Given that the City's water system would not be utilized and that a stable local groundwater level is expected after use of on-site wells, a less than significant impact to public water systems would	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
	occur.			
B	Water demand under Alternative B would be the same as Alternative A. As with Alternative A, all on-site water demands would be met by on-site wells and storage. Unlike Alternative A, Alternative B would not include connection to the regional wastewater treatment plant as an option, thus all recycled water would be supplied by the on-site wastewater treatment plant. Given that the City's water system would not be utilized and that a stable local groundwater level is expected after use of on-site wells, a less than significant impact to public water systems would occur.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to B.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
D	Similar to B.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
E	Similar to B.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
F	Water demand under Alternative F would be the same as Alternative A. Unlike Alternative A, all recycled water would be supplied by the on-site wastewater treatment plant. Also, Alternative F includes development on the Lakeville Site in southern Sonoma County unlike the other alternatives. The proposed water facilities are also similar to Alternative A, with two wells planned (for redundancy) for a total estimated water demand of 200 gpm. There would be no impact to groundwater levels within City of Petaluma wells. The impact to municipal water	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
	services would be less than significant.			
G	Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no additional water supply demands for the Stony Point Site or Lakeville Site, as there are no development plans for either location. Thus, the impact from these sites to water supply systems would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Similar to A; however, on-site water facilities would be of a smaller magnitude due to fewer employees and patrons.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
	Wastewater			
A	Average weekend demand for wastewater disposal would be approximately 354,000 gpd. *Off-Site Option* The Laguna WWTP has an average daily dry weather flow of 17.5 mgd (City of Santa Rosa, 2006) and an average daily dry weather capacity of 21.3 mgd (**Appendix D**). This is sufficient capacity to accept project flows of 0.35 mgd. Treatment and conveyance to the Laguna WWTP is subject to political, environmental, and other external factors, including conditions of approval from the City of Rohnert Park (conveyance) and City of Santa Rosa (treatment). As the WWTP and existing lines currently have capacity to convey flows from Alternative A, this impact is considered less than significant. *On-Site Option*	LTS	• If the Tribe disposes wastewater off-site to the Laguna Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), the Tribe would coordinate with the WWTP and the City of Rohnert Park to pay appropriate connection fees and ongoing service for wastewater treatment and recycled water. The Tribe would also pay the fair share cost of future expansion/improvements, including environmental documentation, to increase wastewater capacity of the Laguna WWTP.	LTS

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

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
	If treatment at the Laguna WWTP is infeasible, wastewater would be treated on-site with an Immersed Membrane Bioreactor System (MBR). The wastewater treatment facilities for Alternative A would be built with the recommended capacity of 400,000 gpd. Both the Tribe and the Laguna Sub-regional Wastewater Treatment Plant would be restricted by the terms of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from discharging wastewater into the Laguna when Russian River flows fall below 1,000 cfs, as measured at the Hacienda Bridge. Given the relatively minimal discharge proposed by Alternative A and the high flows, which would dilute the discharge and minimize the effect to water quality, the development of an on-site wastewater facility would result in a less than significant impact to the regional wastewater treatment system.			
B	Alternative B would utilize an on-site wastewater treatment system similar to that described under Alternative A. Alternative B would have an average weekday flow of 218,000 and an average weekend flow of 354,000 gpd. Wastewater effluent would be disposed of using seasonal storage ponds, sprayfields and/or discharge to the Laguna. As with Alternative A, discharging wastewater into the Laguna would be limited by the terms of a NPDES permit. If discharge to the Laguna were infeasible the seasonal storage and sprayfield requirements would be increased. The removal of the Stony Point Site from use as sprayfields by the Laguna WWTP would not significantly impact sprayfield discharge options for the Subregional Reclamation System. The overall	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
	impact to public wastewater services is less than significant.			
C	Similar to Alternative B, except that the location of the sprayfields, and surface water discharge would be modified.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
D	Average weekend demand would be approximately 227,000 gpd. An onsite MBR wastewater treatment plant would be constructed to service Alternative D. Effluent disposal options for Alternative D would be the same as for Alternative B, except that the size of the sprayfields would be modified as described in **Section 2.5.7** (**Figure 2-21 and Figure 2-22**). The overall impact to public wastewater services is less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
E	Average weekday demand would be approximately 78,000 gpd. An onsite MBR wastewater treatment plant would be constructed to service Alternative E. The methods for wastewater treatment would be the same as Alternative A, however, it will be designed for lower flows. An onsite MBR wastewater treatment plant would be constructed to service Alternative E. Effluent disposal options for Alternative E would be the same as for Alternative B, except that the size of the sprayfields would be modified. The overall impact to public wastewater services is less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
F	Similar to A. Wastewater effluent would be disposed of using seasonal storage ponds, sprayfields and/or discharge to surface waters (which flow to the Petaluma River). Discharge to surface waters would occur during the wet season via an existing, unnamed stream on the	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
	Lakeville Site. The overall impact to public wastewater services is less than significant.			
G	Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no additional wastewater service demands for the Stony Point Site or Lakeville Site, as there are no development plans for either location. Thus, the impact from these sites to wastewater services would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
	New gravity sewer mains and a new interceptor line to the WWTP are planned if the Wilfred Site is developed according to the Northwest Specific Plan. Given that adequate capacity is anticipated the impact would be less than significant.			
H	Similar to Alternative A; however wastewater flows and facility components would be reduced due to fewer employees and patrons.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
Solid Waste				
A	Construction of Alternative A would result in a temporary increase in waste generation. Waste that cannot be recycled would be disposed of at the Redwood Landfill or another disposal site, which accepts construction/demolition materials. This impact would be temporary and not significant.	LTS	• Construction waste will be recycled to the fullest extent practicable by diverting green waste and recyclable building materials from the solid waste stream. • Environmentally preferable materials shall be used to the extent practical for construction of facilities. • The Tribe shall install a trash compactor for cardboard and	LTS

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

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
			paper products. • The Tribe shall install recycling bins throughout the facilities for glass, cans and paper products. • Decorative trash and recycling receptacles will be placed strategically throughout the area of the Wilfred Site, Stony Point site, or the Lakeville site, as appropriate, to encourage people not to litter at the facilities. • Security guards shall be trained to discourage littering on-site. • The Tribe shall pay all standard fees for trash collection and disposal.	
B	Construction of Alternative B would result in a temporary increase in waste generation. Solid waste generation from operational uses is estimated at 12.1 tons per year.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
C	Construction of Alternative C would result in temporary increase of solid waste generation. Since the facility constructed under Alternative C would have similar components as Alternative A, the waste generated by Alternative C would be 12.1 tons per day, the same as that	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	generated by Alternative A.			
D	Construction of Alternative D would result in temporary increase of solid waste generation. Solid waste generation from operational uses is estimated at 10.6 tons per day.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
E	Construction of Alternative E would result in temporary increase of solid waste generation. Solid waste generation from operational uses is estimated at 10.4 tons per day.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
F	Construction of Alternative F would result in temporary increase of solid waste generation. Solid waste generation from operational uses is estimated at 12.1 tons per year.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
G	Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no solid waste generation for the Stony Point Site or Lakeville Site, as there are no development plans for either location. Thus, the impact from these sites to solid waste services would be less than significant. The Wilfred Site would be developed with residential and commercial uses. There would be a temporary increase in construction waste from the development, which would be taken to the Central Redwood Landfill. In order to maintain or improve the	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
City's current waste diversion rate it is anticipated that recycling and diversion programs would be implemented as for other commercial and residential areas of the City. The expected waste generation impact from the Wilfred Site under this alternative would be less than significant.			
H Construction of Alternative H would result in temporary increase of solid waste generation. Solid waste generation from operational uses is estimated at 10.6 tons per day.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications			
A Operation of Alternative A would not result in a significant demand on electricity, natural gas or telecommunications.	LTS	• The project's air conditioning and refrigeration systems shall utilize environmentally friendly refrigerants. Energy efficient chillers shall be utilized. • The air handling systems shall utilize outside air economizer cycles to take advantage of ambient cooling when the outside air temperature is below 55 degrees F. Economizer cycles may be able to reduce cooling requirements by 20 to 30 percent. • For applicable alternatives, the hotel and casino buildings shall be equipped with a direct digital energy management and control system to perform energy conservation measures such as optimum start/stop, duty cycling and demand limiting. This management system will insure that the project will not consume any more energy than is	LTS

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

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
			necessary.	
B	Operation of Alternative B would not result in a significant demand on electricity, natural gas or telecommunications.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
C	Operation of Alternative C would not result in a significant demand on electricity, natural gas or telecommunications.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
D	Operation of Alternative D would not result in a significant demand on electricity, natural gas or telecommunications.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
E	Operation of Alternative E would not result in a significant demand on electricity, natural gas or telecommunications.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
F	Operation of Alternative F would not result in a significant demand on electricity, natural gas or telecommunications.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
G	No development on the Stony Point Site or Lakeville Site would take place under this alternative. Thus, the impacts to electricity, natural gas, and telecommunications providers from these sites would be less than significant. The Wilfred Site would be developed with residential and commercial uses. Improvements to service the site would be typical of other residential and commercial developments. As	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
	stated in the Northwest Specific Plan it is anticipated that developers will fund the installation of public services. Thus, the impact to electrical, natural gas, and telecommunications service providers would be less than significant.			
H	Operation of Alternative D would not result in a significant demand on electricity, natural gas or telecommunications.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
Public Health and Safety				
A	Once land is taken into trust, State and local laws and ordinances pertaining to public health and safety would not be applicable to activities on the Wilfred Site. Given that the Tribal-State Compact (or Secretarial procedures) would require compliance with building codes, fire inspections, and food safety, impacts would not occur. Although it is not in the Tribe's economic interest to operate their pool facilities in a manner that jeopardizes public health, the absence of standards and oversight represents a potentially significant impact to public health.	S	• The Tribe shall make an agreement with the applicable City or County to address inspection, maintenance, and operation of any swimming pools available to patrons. The terms of the agreement shall include that one design inspection occur prior to operation of applicable swimming pools and at least one annual inspection occur thereafter. The agreement shall include standards for design, maintenance, and operation similar to those followed by non-tribally owned businesses in the City or County, as applicable.	LTS
B	Same as A. Alternative B includes additional public health and safety commitment in the City MOU.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Same as A. Alternative C includes additional public health and safety commitment in the City MOU.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Same as A.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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	Once land is taken into trust, State and local laws and ordinances pertaining to public health and safety would not be applicable to activities on the Stony Point Site. Issues of concern include: construction to applicable building standards, inspection of buildings to satisfy building and fire codes, and food safety at commercial facilities. Although it is not in the Tribe's economic interest to construct or operate facilities in a manner that jeopardizes public health, the absence of standards and oversight represents a potentially significant impact to public health.	S	• The Tribe shall make an agreement with the applicable City or County to address building inspection, and food safety inspections prior to public use of facilities. The terms of the agreement shall include that one design inspection occur prior to public use and that ongoing inspections occur, with similar frequency to non-tribally owned businesses. The terms of the agreement shall include that the buildings adhere to either the Uniform Fire Code or California Fire Code, depending on the agency inspecting facilities. Also see mitigation measures under Land Resources for Seismicity in **Section 5.2.1**.	LTS
F	Same as A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
G	No development on the Stony Point Site or Lakeville Site would take place under this alternative. The Wilfred Site would be developed with residential and commercial uses, which would be subject to applicable public health and safety regulations.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Same as A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
	Law Enforcement			
A	Although specific effects to crime rates are uncertain (see **Section 4.7** and **Appendix N**), an attraction of the size proposed for Alternative A would result in increased law enforcement activity on the Wilfred site due to increased visitors to the site. With the fiscal	LTS	• The Tribe shall provide on-site security to reduce and prevent criminal and civil incidents. • The Tribe shall ensure staff that serves alcohol is trained annually to identify the signs of intoxication and to cease	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
mitigation listed in **Section 5.2.6**, impacts to the County would be less than significant. As an alternative to the fiscal mitigation, the Tribe could enter into a law enforcement agreement with the County, City, or both. Mutual aid impacts would be reduced to less than significant by compensating a law enforcement agency for primary services.		serving alcohol to persons exhibiting those signs. • The Tribe shall support local law enforcement efforts in conducting DUI checkpoints and other programs known to reduce the impacts of alcohol on the community. • All parking areas shall be well lit and monitored by parking staff and/or security guards. This will aid in the prevention of auto theft and other related criminal activity. • The Tribe shall provide traffic control with appropriate signage and the presence of peak-hour traffic control staff. Peak hour traffic is between 7:30 and 8:30 am and 4:30 and 5:30 pm. This will aid in the prevention of off-site parking, which could create possible security and safety issues. • The Tribe shall pass an ordinance creating a standard policy encouraging responsible drinking and designated driver programs. As part of this policy, the employees serving alcohol shall undergo annual 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 the number of illegal alcohol sales to underage youth and intoxicated patrons through education programs. Information provided in	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		server training must at a minimum include: • The importance of checking age identification of customers who appear to be under age 30. • How to identify fake IDs and what to do once a fake ID is confiscated. • How to recognize situations in which adults are buying alcohol for underage youth. • How to refuse sales to individuals who may supply alcohol to underage youth. • How to refuse sales to individuals who may supply alcohol to underage youth. • How to identify intoxicated customers. • How to refuse service to underage youth and intoxicated customers. • To mitigate potential impacts to law enforcement resources, the Tribe shall adopt rules prohibiting anyone under 21 years of age from gambling, adopt employee training programs and policies relating to responsible beverage services with annual training conduct background checks of all gaming employees, provide a full complement of security personnel at the project at all times, and adopt programs and policies which discourage gang members	

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			from visiting the gaming facilities. • Hotel management shall work collaboratively with school and law enforcement personnel to prevent the use of hotel rooms for parties involving minors and the hotel shall have an internal monitoring program to reduce the incidence of such parties • The Tribe shall provide on-site security for casino operations to reduce and prevent criminal and civil incidents. • The Tribe shall adopt employee training programs and policies relating to responsible beverage services, which would include, but not be limited to, checking patron identification and refusing service to those who have imbibed beyond their ability to function safely. • Areas surrounding the gaming facilities shall have "No Loitering" signs in place, shall be well lit and shall be patrolled regularly. This will aid in the prevention of illegal loitering and loitering behavior that could potentially lead to other criminal acts.	
B	Similar to A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

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 A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
D	The operation of Alternative D would result in somewhat lessened law enforcement demands when compared with these alternatives. This is due to the smaller facility serving fewer patrons. With the fiscal mitigation listed in **Section 5.2.6**, impacts to the County would be less than significant. As an alternative to the fiscal mitigation, the Tribe could enter into a law enforcement agreement with the County, City, or both. Mutual aid impacts would be reduced to less than significant by compensating a law enforcement agency for primary services.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
E	The operation of Alternative E would result in somewhat lessened law enforcement demands when compared with these alternatives. This reduction is due to the fact that no alcohol would be served in association with Alternative E, fewer visitors would access the facility and the hours of operation would be reduced. With the fiscal mitigation listed in **Section 5.2.6**, impacts to the County would be less than significant. As an alternative to the fiscal mitigation, the Tribe could enter into a law enforcement agreement with the County, City, or both. Mutual aid impacts would be reduced to less than significant by compensating a law enforcement agency for primary services.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
F	The operation of the casino, hotel, and events center facilities is expected to result in law enforcement demands as described under Alternative A, except that the Lakeville Site is not located near a city. Demands would be similar to those at other tourist destinations. Increased law enforcement demands would occur	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

	ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	primarily to Sonoma County. The existing MOU with Sonoma County would require concurrence from the County to apply to the Lakeville Site. The existing MOU with the City of Rohnert Park does not apply to the Lakeville Site. With the fiscal mitigation listed in **Section 5.2.6**, impacts to the County would be less than significant. As an alternative to the fiscal mitigation, the Tribe could enter into a law enforcement agreement with the County, City, or both. Mutual aid impacts would be reduced to less than significant by compensating a law enforcement agency for primary services.			
G	No development on the Stony Point Site or Lakeville Site would take place under this alternative. Thus, the impacts to law enforcement services from these sites would be less than significant. The Wilfred Site would be developed with residential and commercial uses. Development would increase the patrol duties of the Rohnert Park Public Safety Department and increase calls for service to the Department. It is anticipated that development fees or taxes on the development would fund this increased demand. Thus, the impacts to law enforcement services would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	The operation of Alternative H would result in somewhat lessened law enforcement demands when compared with Alternative A. This is due to the smaller facility serving fewer patrons. With the fiscal mitigation listed in **Section 5.2.6**, impacts to the County would be less than significant. As an alternative to the fiscal mitigation, the Tribe could enter into a law enforcement agreement with the	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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
	County, City, or both. Mutual aid impacts would be reduced to less than significant by compensating a law enforcement agency for primary services.			
	Fire Protection			
A	Construction of Alternative A would introduce potential sources of fire to the Wilfred site. This risk, which is similar to those that are found at other construction sites, would be considered potentially significant. Operation of Alternative A would result in increased calls for service and a potential increase in response time of the City's fire services. Without an agreement for primary fire protection services there could be significant impacts to County resources, including the Rincon Valley Fire Protection District, which currently provides fire protection services to a majority of the Wilfred Site.	S	• Any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester shall be equipped with an arrester in good working order. This includes, but is not limited to, vehicles, heavy equipment, and chainsaws. During construction, staging areas, building areas, and/or areas slated for development using spark-producing equipment shall be cleared of dried vegetation or other materials that could serve as fuel for combustion. To the extent feasible, the contractor shall keep these areas clear of combustible materials to maintain a firebreak. • The Tribe shall make reasonable provisions for adequate emergency, fire, medical, and related relief and disaster services for patrons and employees. • The Tribe shall use fire resistant construction materials and equip all enclosed buildings with automatic sprinkler systems. The automatic sprinkler systems shall be designed to meet or exceed the NFPA standards governing the different occupancies associated with the project structures. • The Tribe shall employ the most modern construction and	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		fire-engineering techniques in their automatic fire containment system designs so that any fire encountered is contained to the room of origin. • Through the use of modern fire engineering technology the Tribe shall create and maintain a facility equipped with early detection systems that assures an initial response time to any fire alarm (automatic, local, or report) within three minutes. These systems would be comprised of automatic sprinkler systems in the occupied areas and smoke detection, along with automatic sprinkler systems, in the areas of the facility that are normally unoccupied, such as storerooms and mechanical areas. • If only one fire pump is provided, it will be either diesel, or provided with emergency power, thereby meeting the requirements of the CFC, UFC, and the California Building Code (CBC). • Prior to operation, the Tribe shall enter into a contract with AMR or another entity for ambulance service.	
B Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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
D	Construction of Alternative D would result in similar but reduced potential risks of fire, when compared with Alternative A, due to the reduced size of development. As there is currently no signed agreement for providing fire protection services, the impact is considered significant.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Construction of Alternative E would result in similar but reduced potential risks of fire, when compared with Alternative A, due to fewer visitors to the facility and the reduction of hours of operation. As there is currently no signed agreement for providing fire protection services, the impact is considered significant.	S	Same as A.	LTS
F	Construction and operation of the casino and hotel may introduce potential sources of fire to the Lakeville Site as described under Alternative A, except that the Lakeville Site is not located near any cities. Additionally, there would be increased calls for service to fire protection and emergency medical services in Sonoma County. Also, given that the Lakeville site is currently located in a rural setting, existing fire protection services are not equipped to adequately respond to fires at the hotel/casino on the Lakeville site. As there is currently no signed agreement for compensating fire protection and emergency medical services, the impact is considered significant.	S	Same as A, as well as: • Prior to operation, the Tribe shall ensure that a fire station is constructed near the Lakeville site and staffed with at least three firefighters.	LTS
G	Impacts to fire protection services from the Stony Point Site or Lakeville Site would be less than significant. The Wilfred Site would be developed with residential and commercial uses. Development would increase demands on the Rohnert Park Public Safety Department and AMR through increased calls for fire	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	protection services. It is anticipated that development fees or taxes on the development would fund this increased demand, thus the impact to these services would be less than significant.			
H	Construction of Alternative H would result in similar but reduced potential risks of fire, when compared with Alternative A, due to the reduced size of development. As there is currently no signed agreement for providing fire protection services, the impact is considered significant.	S	Same as A.	LTS
	Schools			
A	Construction and operation of Alternative A would have no direct impact on school services currently provided by Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District, Bellevue Union School District or Santa Rosa High School District. As discussed in **Section 4.11**, the existing labor pool would fill the jobs created. Alternative A is therefore not anticipated to increase demands on school services as it is neither creating housing nor creating a significant influx of residents. Additionally, Alternative A is not anticipated to decrease school enrollment from causing families to move out of the local area. Thus impacts to public school services would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
D	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
E	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
F	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
G	No development on the Stony Point Site or Lakeville Site would take place under this alternative. Thus, the impact to schools from these sites would be less than significant. As discussed above, the Wilfred Site would be developed with residential and commercial uses. The development of residential housing would increase demands for school services by potentially increasing the number of school age children in the Cotati-Rohnert Park Unified School District, Bellevue Union School District and/or Santa Rosa High School District. It is anticipated that the development would pay school mitigation fees (City of Rohnert Park, 2004). Thus, the impacts to schools would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
4.10 OTHER VALUES				
Noise				
A	Alternative A has the potential to temporarily increase ambient noise levels in the area of the Wilfred site due to construction. Alternative A also has the potential to increase ambient noise levels due to operational factors such as off-site traffic, on-site	S	• HVAC equipment shall be shielded to reduce noise. • To the extent feasible, HVAC equipment shall be located a significant distance from neighboring houses along Whistler	LTS

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

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
	traffic, parking lot activity, loading dock activities, wastewater treatment plant operation, and tour bus idling.		Avenue, Wilfred Avenue, and/or Labath Avenue. • The Tribe will supplement the cost of installation of dual pane windows to minimize traffic noise effects for residences adjacent to Wilfred Avenue between Redwood Drive and Stony Point Road. • The Tribe will supplement the cost for the construction of raised, landscaped berms or concrete block walls to separate sources of unwanted noise from potential noise receptors along Wilfred Avenue. • Unnecessary vehicle idling shall be prevented during loading dock operations occurring between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM. • Buses shall not be allowed to idle unnecessarily in areas adjacent to sensitive receptors. • To the extent feasible, project construction shall not occur prior to 7:00 AM or after 10:00 PM. • Pile driving, should it take place, shall not occur prior to 9:00 AM or after 5:00 PM.	
B	Similar to A.	S	Similar to A.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	S	Similar to A.	LTS
D	Similar to A.	S	Similar to A.	LTS

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

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	Similar to A.	S	Similar to A.	LTS
F	Similar to A.	S	Similar to A including the following: • The Tribe will supplement the cost installation of dual pane windows to minimize traffic noise effects for residences adjacent to Lakeville Highway between State Route 37 and State Route 116. • To the extent feasible, project construction shall not occur prior to 7:00 AM or after 10:00 PM. • Pile driving, should it take place, shall not occur prior to 9:00 AM or after 5:00 PM. • Unnecessary vehicle idling shall be prevented during loading dock operations occurring between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM.	LTS
G	Development planned by the Northwest Specific Plan and would result in construction and operation noise on and around the Wilfred Site. Development would be governed under conditions required by the CEQA process for the Rohnert Park General Plan EIR and the EIR for the Northwest Specific Plan Development. Mitigation measures in the Northwest Specific Plan EIR would reduce other noise impacts to a less than significant level.	LTS	None Recommended.	LTS
H	Same as A.	S	Similar to A.	LTS
	Hazards and Hazardous Materials			

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

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 is no reported hazardous materials contamination on the Wilfred site. Construction staff would not be affected. The unanticipated discovery of contaminated soil and/or groundwater could have a potentially significant effect. Depending on the relative hazard of the hazardous material, if a spill or leak were to occur of significant quantity, the accidental release could pose both a hazard to construction employees as well as the environment. This effect is potentially significant. The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be generated are common to commercial sites and do not pose unusual storage, handling or disposal issues.	S	• In the event that contaminated soil and/or groundwater or other hazardous materials are encountered during construction related earth-moving activities, all work shall be halted until a qualified Environmental Professional can assess the extent of contamination. If contamination is determined to be significant, representatives of the Tribe shall consult with the USEPA to determine the appropriate course of action, including the development of a sampling plan and remediation plan if necessary. • To reduce the potential for accidental releases, fuel, oil, and hydraulic fluids shall be transferred directly from a service truck to construction equipment and would not otherwise be stored on site. Paint, thinner, solvents, cleaners, sealants, and lubricants used during construction shall be stored in a locked utility building, handled per the manufacturers' directions, and replenished as needed. • Personnel shall follow written standard operating procedures (SOPs) or Best Management Practice (BMPs) for filling and servicing construction equipment and vehicles. The SOPs/BMPs, which are designed to reduce the potential for incidents involving the hazardous materials will be included within a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that will be filed with EPA or the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and shall include the following: a. Refueling shall be conducted only with approved	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		pumps, hoses, and nozzles. b. Catch-pans shall be placed under equipment to catch potential spills during servicing. c. All disconnected hoses shall be placed in containers to collect residual fuel from the hose. d. Vehicle engines shall be shut down during refueling. e. No smoking, open flames, or welding shall be allowed in refueling or service areas. f. Refueling shall be performed away from bodies of water to prevent contamination of water in the event of a leak or spill. g. Service trucks shall be provided with fire extinguishers and spill containment equipment, such as absorbents. h. Should a spill contaminate soil, the soil shall be put into containers and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. i. All containers used to store hazardous materials shall be inspected at least once per week for signs of leaking or failure. All maintenance and refueling areas shall be inspected monthly. Results of inspections shall be recorded in a logbook that will be maintained onsite.	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		j. Staging areas, welding areas, or areas slated for development using spark-producing equipment shall be cleared of dried vegetation or other materials that could serve as fuel for combustion. To the extent feasible, the contractor will keep these areas clear of combustible materials in order to maintain a firebreak. k. Any construction equipment that normally includes a spark arrester shall be equipped with an arrestor in good working order. • The amount of hazardous materials used in project construction and operation shall be kept at the lowest volumes needed. • The least toxic material capable of achieving the intended result shall be used to the extent practicable. • A hazardous materials and hazardous waste minimization program shall be developed, implemented, and reviewed annually by the Tribe to determine if additional opportunities for hazardous materials and hazardous waste minimization are feasible, for both project construction and operation. • Use of pesticides and toxic chemicals shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible in landscaping or using less toxic alternatives. The non-toxic alternative will include garden care products and organic non-toxic cleaners when	

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
		feasible. • During the groundwater monitoring and pump tests, the potential for the vertical and lateral migration of contaminants from nearby leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites should be evaluated (see Appendix Z for detailed recommendations). The pumping test conducted should include taking water level measurements in wells that are screened in the Lower Intermediate Zone, Upper Intermediate Zone and uppermost portion of the saturated zone to verify the conclusions based on historical well hydrographs, refine the drawdown model for the Site, and evaluate the potential for contaminant migration using a typical wellhead protection approach. • A Hazardous Materials Business Plan for the WWTP will be prepared to addresses emergency response and employee training in first aide, in the event a spill of citric acid and sodium hypochloride occurs that compromises the chemical storage containment vessels. • A Waste Water Contingency Plan will be prepared for the Waste Water Treatment Plant (WWTP) that will outline potential system failures and containment measures that will be made part of the WWTP design so no untreated wastewater will be released from the plant.	

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

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 A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Potentially significant effects are the same as those described under Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Potentially significant effects are the same as those described under Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Under Alternative E substantially less construction would take place, thus potential for impacts would be slightly lessened. The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative E are similar to those described under Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
F	Potentially significant effects are the same as those described under Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G	Significant effects during construction of Alternative G are similar to A. Under Alternative G, less construction would be necessary, thus potential for impacts would be slightly lessened.	S	None recommended.	LTS
H	Alternative H would be similar in size and scope to Alternative D, therefore potential impacts as a result of construction activities would be the same as Alternative D. Compared to Alternative A, groundwater pumping would be lessened as a result of the smaller development area proposed for Alternative H; nevertheless, groundwater pumping could potentially	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	cause migration of contaminated groundwater from the adjacent LUST sites.			
	Visual Resources			
A	An area of commercial development in the otherwise undeveloped agricultural lands of the Wilfred site would represent a change to the viewshed and be visible from several vantage points including travelers on Rohnert Park Expressway, Stony Point Road, Wilfred Avenue, and hikers along the Wilfred-Bellevue Channel. The visual appearance of Alternative A would be consistent with the nearby regional commercial activities just south and east of the Wilfred site, along Redwood Drive and US-101. Therefore, visual impacts in terms of the land use planning would be less than significant	LTS	• The Tribe will incorporate design elements into the project to minimize the impact of buildings and parking lots on the viewshed. These elements include: a. Incorporation of landscape amenities to complement buildings and parking areas including raised landscaped berms and plantings of trees and shrubs (see Noise Mitigation Measure). b. Use of earth tones in paints and coatings, and native building materials such as stone.	LTS
	Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact.	S	• To minimize the impacts of light and glare: a. Placement of floodlights on buildings should be set so as not to cast trespassing light offsite. b. Uplighting of structures has a high potential for offsite light spillage and should be discouraged or prohibited. c. Shielding, such as with a horizontal shroud should be used for all outdoor lighting so as to ensure it is	LTS

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

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
		downcast. d. Timers should be utilized so as to minimize lighting after a certain hour.	
B An area of urban development in the otherwise undeveloped agricultural lands of the Stony Point site would represent a significant change to the viewshed and be visible from several vantage points including travelers on Rohnert Park Expressway, Stony Point Road, Wilfred Avenue, and hikers along the Wilfred-Bellevue Channel. It would be surrounded by designated open space areas and be a visible encroachment into a community separator. This is a significant impact.	S	Since this impact cannot be mitigated, it would qualify as a significant and unavoidable impact.	S
Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C Visual resources impacts would be similar to Alternative B except that the Alternative C project facilities would be located more distant from Stony Point Road.	S	Same as B.	S

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

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
	Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	The impacts on the viewshed by Alternative D would be similar, although slightly lessened due to the reduced intensity program, when compared with Alternative B.	S	Same as B.	S
	Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Alternative E would represent development in a currently undeveloped area designated and surrounded by designated open space. However, this development would be similar to the business park development that is currently present to the east of the Stony Point site. Thus, Alternative E would blend in more effectively with the surrounding developed environment when compared with Alternative A.	S	Same as B.	S
	Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact.			
F	An area of urban development in the otherwise undeveloped agricultural lands of the Lakeville site would represent a significant change to the viewshed and be visible from several vantage points including travelers on Lakeville Highway and the scenic SR-37.	S	Same as B.	S
	Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G	Intensified urban development would block views of mountains and intensify urban form, convert rural character to urban condition and create a source of additional light and glare.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
	Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact.	S	Same as A.	
H	Impacts would be similar to Alternative A, but reduced due to the reduced intensity development under Alternative H.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Development of commercial facilities would introduce a new source of potential lighting and glare. If escaping light were to trespass upon adjacent properties, this would be considered a significant impact.	S	Same as A.	
4.11 INDIRECT AND GROWTH INDUCING EFFECTS			
4.11.3 Indirect Effects From Off-Site Traffic Mitigation			
Land Resources			
The construction of roadway improvements would require grading and the introduction of fill material to extend the existing shoulders and road bed. The increase of impervious surfaces and additional earthwork could result in erosion of soils. Local jurisdictions would require the use of stable fill material, engineered embankments, and erosion control features to reduce the potential for slope instability, subsidence and erosion. In accordance with the federal Clean Water Act, construction of roadway improvements over one acre in area would be required to comply with NPDES General Construction Permit Program. To comply with the program, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (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	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
practices and specifications required by the NPDES permit program, the roadway improvements identified under the project alternatives are expected to result in less than significant indirect effects to land resources. The roadway improvements would not significantly affect the ability to extract minerals.			
Water Resources			
The development of roadway improvements at the locations identified could affect water resources due to grading and construction activities and an increase in impervious surfaces. Potential effects include an increase of surface runoff and increased erosion that could adversely affect surface water quality due to increases in sediment and roadway pollutants such as grease and oil.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
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 are expected to 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 demolished 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, effects to			

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

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
water resources would be less than significant.			
Air Quality			
Development of the roadway improvements would result in short-term construction-related air pollution emissions. The construction phase would produce exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generated as a result of demolition and soil movement. Exhaust emissions from construction activities include those associated with the transport of workers and machinery to the site, as well as those produced onsite as the 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 are typically required by local jurisdictions to reduce construction emissions.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Long-term effects from roadway improvements could result if the roadway improvements resulted in localized increases in CO 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, it is expected that the improvements would reduce congestion and improve traffic flow, reducing emissions from idling vehicles. Long-term effects would therefore be less than significant.			
Biological Resources			

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Construction of the roadway improvements would result in the loss of some existing vegetation and modification of drainage channels. Removal of sensitive native vegetation and vegetation that provides habitat for special-status species or supports migratory birds could result in potentially significant effects. The modification of intermittent drainages and the direct loss or harm to sensitive animal species are also considered potentially significant effects. Most of the habitat that exists in the areas of roadway improvements is highly disturbed roadsides. Due to the degraded condition of the roadside areas, habitat quality is generally low and it is unlikely that expansion of the existing facilities would result in a significant effect to sensitive species. Environmental documentation for each roadway improvement project must be completed by the lead agency for the particular improvement project, prior to implementation of the project. For example, a project with the California Department of Transportation as the lead agency must complete environmental documentation under CEQA. The lead agency for the particular improvement project 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. Due to the limited nature of the improvements along existing roadways, the degraded condition of existing habitat, and the requirements of CEQA/NEPA to address impacts to biological resources, the effects of the roadway improvements would be less than significant. G Residential and commercial development occurring on the northeast corner of the Wilfred site under Alternative G	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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
would bring additional indirect and induced jobs and economic activity to the region, a beneficial effect. Negative fiscal impacts to local jurisdictions would be offset by increased property taxes and the imposition of development fees.			
Cultural Resources			
The construction of the roadway improvements has the potential to disturb or destroy historical features and archaeological resources. Grading roadsides to add traffic lanes 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.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
To address potential impacts to cultural resources, cultural resource surveys may be required to comply with the 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. Therefore, a less than significant indirect effect to cultural resources would result.			

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

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
Socioeconomic Conditions			
Construction of roadway improvements would result in short-term inconveniences and minor delays due to constricted traffic movements and possible temporary detouring of traffic. The intersection improvements are not expected to result in long-term disruption of access to surrounding land uses or to minority or low-income populations.	S	The Tribe would pay the fair-share cost of traffic mitigation, including the cost of any required land acquisition and right-of-way.	LTS
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 – 1263.330 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.			
Public Services			
Construction of the roadway improvements may require the relocation of utilities located within and near the existing roadways. These utilities include overhead electricity and telecommunication lines and underground water, stormwater, wastewater and other utility lines. Relocation of these lines could result in a temporary	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
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 would be less than significant. No effects to fire or emergency medical services are expected as access to adjacent homes and businesses would be maintained during construction of the improvements.			
Other Values			
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.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
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 Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would be contained within a SWPPP. Such BMPs could include refueling in designated areas, storing hazardous materials in approved containers, and clearing dried vegetation. With adherance to these BMPs, potential hazards are considered to be less than significant.			

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Visual effects would occur as the result of modification and expansion of existing roadways. However, because the intersections are expected to conform to modern design standards and are expected to be landscaped to suit the settings, a less than significant effect would occur.			
4.11.3 Indirect Effects From Off-Site Pipeline Construction			
Land Resources			
The construction of off-site pipelines would occur primarily along existing roadways and would require trenching and backfilling/re-paving in order to install the pipelines within the roadway. Installing pipelines within existing roadways would require an encroachment permit prior to construction. Effects to land resources would be similar to those discussed above under off-site roadway improvements, except the effects would be somewhat lessened because the roadways/intersections would not be extended. Instead, disturbances would occur largely within currently disturbed roadways. A less than significant indirect effect to land resources would result.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Water Resources			
Effects to water resources would be similar to those discussed above under off-site roadway improvements, except the effects would be lessened because the roadways/intersections would not be extended. Instead, disturbances would occur largely within	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
currently disturbed roadways. New impervious surfaces and therefore additional pollutant runoff would not occur. Thus, a less than significant indirect effect to water resources would result.			
Air Quality			
Installation of water and wastewater pipelines would result in short-term construction-related air pollution emissions. The construction phase would produce two types of air contaminants: exhaust emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust generated as a result of demolition and soil movement. 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 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 are typically required by local jurisdictions to reduce construction emissions, often in conjunction with required CEQA review. These include watering the exposed soil to reduce dust, reducing speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour, and maintaining equipment properly.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Biological Resources			
Construction of the pipelines has the potential to impact vegetation communities and unidentified waters of the U.S. Removal of sensitive native vegetation and vegetation that provides habitat for special-status species or supports migratory birds could result in	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
potentially significant effects. The modifications of potential waters of the U.S. and the direct loss or harm to sensitive animal species are also considered potentially significant effects. Most of the habitat that exists in the areas of the pipeline alignment is highly disturbed roadsides or totally disturbed roadways. Due to the degraded condition of the roadway/roadside areas, habitat quality is generally low and it is unlikely that extending the existing pipeline facilities would result in a significant effect to sensitive species. However, to address effects to sensitive habitat and species, biological surveys would 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. Due to the limited nature of the pipeline alignment along existing roadways, the degraded condition of existing habitat, and the requirements of CEQA to address impacts to biological resources, the effects of extending existing pipelines would be less than significant.			
Cultural Resources			
The construction pipelines have the potential to disturb or destroy historical features and archaeological resources. Grading roadways/roadsides and trenching to add pipeline may disturb previously unknown sites. Due to prior grading of the existing roadways and occasional traffic on roadsides, it is likely that resources remaining in these areas are highly disturbed and lack integrity, thus diminishing the significance of the remaining	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
resources. To address potential impacts to cultural resources, cultural resource 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. Therefore, a less than significant indirect effect to cultural resources would result.			
Socioeconomic Conditions			
Effects to socioeconomic conditions from construction of pipelines would be very similar to the effects noted above to construction of roadway improvements. These effects are primarily limited to temporary inconvenience due to construction and would not result in a significant indirect effect to socioeconomic conditions.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Land Use			
Construction of the pipelines would require utility easements, which would limit future construction. An easement is a right, privilege or interest limited to a specific purpose which one party has in the land of another. Underground utility easements are typically laid out as corridors of sufficient width to give some latitude in locating the actual utility line, and to permit sufficient room for periodic	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
inspection, repair and maintenance. Underground utility easements typically prohibit the construction of building improvements, but may permit the construction of non-structural improvements, such as paved surface parking or landscaping. The pipelines would be constructed to follow public roads and would not be in an area where a building would normally be built or where an agricultural field would be plowed. Therefore, less than significant indirect impacts to land uses would occur.			
Agriculture			
As discussed under Land Use, the pipelines would be placed within or in close proximity to public roads. Agricultural fields usually include a buffer between the crops and public throughways. The pipelines are not expected to extend past this buffer area, and would therefore not affect agricultural practices. Therefore, no significant indirect impact to agriculture would occur.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Public Services			
As with traffic improvements, the extension of water and wastewater lines could result in a temporary break in public services to some homes and businesses in the area. However, because these effects are common when upgrading and maintaining utility services, and because potential service breaks would be temporary, these effects are considered to be less than significant. No significant effects to police, fire, or emergency medical services are expected as access to homes and businesses	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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
would be maintained during the construction period.			
Other Values			
As with off-site traffic improvements, construction of the proposed pipelines could potentially result in noise and hazardous materials 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 would occur. The accidental release of hazardous materials used during construction activities could pose a hazard to construction employees and the environment. Additionally, equipment used during construction activities could ignite dry grasses and weeds in construction areas. However, these hazards, which are common to construction activities, would be minimized with adherence to standard operating procedures, such as refueling in designated areas, storing hazardous materials in approved containers, and clearing dried vegetation. These potential hazards are therefore considered to be less than significant. Because the proposed water and wastewater lines would be constructed below ground, visual indirect effects would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
4.12 CUMULATIVE			

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

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
	Land Resources			
A	The geographic area for the analysis of cumulative impacts to land resources is the Santa Rosa Plain in Sonoma County. The principal effects to Land Resources associated with Countywide development would be localized topographical changes and soil attrition, both of which are evaluated in terms of runoff characteristics, sedimentation and flow under permitting authorities and criteria relevant to Water Resources. Local permitting requirements for construction would address regional stormwater, geotechnical, seismic and mining hazards; therefore, no cumulative impacts related to Land Resources would occur as a result of Alternative A. Effects to socioeconomic conditions from construction of pipelines would be very similar to the effects noted above to construction of roadway improvements. These effects are primarily limited to temporary inconvenience due to construction and would not result in a significant indirect effect to socioeconomic conditions.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
B	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
E	Similar to Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
F	The geographic area for the analysis of cumulative impacts to land resources is southern Sonoma County. Cumulative impacts are similar to Alternative A. As with off-site traffic improvements, construction of the proposed pipelines could potentially result in noise and hazardous materials 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	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
G	The geographic area for the analysis of cumulative impacts to land resources is the Santa Rosa Plain in Sonoma County. The principal effects to Land Resources associated with Countywide development would be localized topographical changes and soil attrition, both of which are evaluated in terms of runoff characteristics, sedimentation and flow under permitting authorities and criteria relevant to Water Resources, below. Local permitting requirements for construction would address regional stormwater, geotechnical, seismic and mining hazards; therefore, no cumulative impacts related to Land Resources would occur as a result of Alternative G.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
	Water Resources			
A	For the purposes of analyzing cumulative impacts to water resources, the proposed project and known planned development in the vicinity are considered. For Treated Effluent Discharge, projects within the Laguna de Santa Rosa are considered. For groundwater, projects within the Santa Rosa groundwater sub-	LTS	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.3**, Water Resources.	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	basin are considered. If the proposed project is hooked up to the City of Santa Rosa's sub-regional water reclamation system, impacts would be addressed through that sub-regional system's program, and would be less than significant. The water quality impact of Alternative A's potential on-site wastewater treatment was addressed in the City of Santa Rosa's IRWP Addendum to the EIR. The cumulative impact analysis of the IRWP stated the cumulative impact on established Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) would be less than significant. The implementation of Alternative A would result in a relatively modest increase in regional groundwater pumping. Basin-wide groundwater pumping is expected to remain relatively stable over the next several decades. However, given the relatively modest level of pumping proposed and the stable projected future groundwater levels, the project would not contribute to a further decline in regional groundwater levels, resulting in a less than significant cumulative impact to basin-wide groundwater levels.			
B	As with Alternative A, cumulative impacts are considered to be those from the proposed project and known planned development in the vicinity. Impacts of Alternative B from treated effluent discharge would be slightly greater than those for Alternative A, since the Stony Point site does not overlap the Northwest Specific Plan (South). Implementation of mitigation measures, including the Tribe working with Sonoma County Water Agency to increase surface water use, would further reduce potential impacts to	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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
	groundwater.			
C	Similar to Alternative B.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
D	Similar to Alternative A, cumulative impacts to groundwater would be similar but slightly reduced when compared to Alternative A, given the smaller water demands of Alternative D. As with Alternative A, cumulative impacts to groundwater would be less than significant.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
E	Similar to Alternative A, cumulative impacts to groundwater would be similar but reduced when compared to Alternative A, given that the groundwater demand is much lower for Alternative E.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS
F	No planned development is known in the vicinity of the Lakeville Site. Cumulative impacts would be similar to impacts discussed in Alternative F in **Section 4.3**. When mitigation is fully implemented, impacts would be rendered less than significant.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G	The treated effluent generated by the development of the City of Rohnert Park's Northwest Specific Plan (South) would be treated using currently unused allotments held by the Cities of Rohnert Park and Santa Rosa. Treated wastewater would presumably be discharged under an existing NPDES permit held by the wastewater disposal system. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H	Similar, but reduced when compared to Alternative A.	LTS	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	Air Quality			
	Ozone, $PM_{10,}$ and $PM_{2.5}$ Emissions			
A	Alternative A would generate 2.37% of the southern portion of Sonoma County's total NOx in near term and only 1.27% in 2020. For ROG, Alternative A would generate 0.73% in the near term and 0.287% in 2020. The PM_{10} contribution for Alternative A is a little more with 3.41% in the near term and 3.30% in 2020. The $PM_{2.5}$ contribution to southern Sonoma County is similar to PM_{10} with 3.30% for the near term and 3.30% for the year 2020. The incremental effect of Alternative A is a relatively large portion of the countywide total for one project. This is especially true regarding PM_{10} emissions, where percentages are almost 4%. Alternative A would exacerbate the regional trend towards higher PM_{10} emissions. In 2020, ROG emissions generated by casino traffic would exceed the 80 pounds per day (ppd) and 15 tons per year (tpy) significance thresholds, NOx emissions would exceed the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds, and PM_{10} emissions would exceed the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds; significant effects would result. ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} emissions associated with operation of Alternative A would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of mitigation measures contained in **Executive Summary Section 4.4** above.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.4**, Air Quality. Mitigation would reduce the cumulative effects of Alternative A to a less than significant level.	LTS
B	Operation of Alternative B is estimated to result in the same	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	emissions as Alternative A. Thus, a significant cumulative effect would result for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions. ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} emissions associated with the operation of Alternative B would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of mitigation measures contained in **Section 4.4** above.			
C	Operation of Alternative C is estimated to result in the same emissions as Alternative B. Thus, a significant cumulative effect would result for ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions. ROG, NOx, and PM_{10} emissions associated with the operation of Alternative C would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of mitigation measures contained in **Section 5.2.3**.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Alternative D generated 1.6% of the southern portion of Sonoma County total NOx in near term and only 0.88% in 2020. For ROG, Alternative D only generated 0.5% in the near term and 0.2% in 2020. The PM10 contribution for Alternative D is a little more with 2.7% in the near term and 2.6% in 2020. The incremental effect of Alternative D is a relatively large portion of the countywide total for one project. This is especially true regarding PM10 emissions, where percentages are over 2.5%. Alternative D would exacerbate the regional trend towards higher PM10 emissions.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Alternative E generated 0.23% of the southern portion of Sonoma County total NOx in near term and only 0.13% in 2020. For ROG, Alternative E only generated 0.74% in the near term and 0.004% in 2020. The PM10 contribution for Alternative E is a little more with	LTS	Same as A	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	0.31% in the near term and 0.29% in 2020. In 2020, ROG emissions generated by Alternative E traffic would be less than the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds, NO_x emissions would be less than the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds, and PM_{10} emissions would be less than the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance threshold. Alternative E would result in a less than significant cumulative effect to ozone precursor and PM_{10} emissions because the incremental effect of this alternative is a small portion of the countywide total and the BAAQMD emissions thresholds would not be exceeded.			
F	Alternative F generated 2.37% of the southern portion of Sonoma County total NOx in near term and only 1.27% in 2020. For ROG, Alternative F only generated 0.51% in the near term and 0.293% in 2020. The PM10 contribution for Alternative F is a little more with 3.41% in the near term and 3.30% in 2020. The incremental effect of Alternative F is a relatively large portion of the countywide total for one project. In 2020, ROG emissions generated by casino traffic would exceed the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds, NO_x emissions would exceed the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds, and PM_{10} emissions would exceed the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds; significant effects would result. ROG, NO_x, and PM_{10} emissions associated with operation of Alternative F would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of the mitigation measures contained in **Section 4.4** above.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G	Alternative G would generate 0.43% of the southern portion of	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	Sonoma County total NOx in near term and only 0.3% in 2020. For ROG, Alternative G only would generate 0.11% in the near term and 0.1% in 2020. The PM_{10} contribution for Alternative G is a little more but only 0.6% in the near term and 0.5% also in 2020. The incremental effect of Alternative G is a relatively small portion of the countywide total for one project. In 2020, ROG emissions generated by Alternative G traffic would be less than the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds for ROG and NOx emissions but PM_{10} emissions would be more than the 80 ppd and 15 tpy significance thresholds. Alternative G would result in a less than significant cumulative effect to ozone precursors and PM_{10} emissions because the incremental effect of this alternative is a small portion of the countywide total but the BAAQMD emissions thresholds would be exceeded for PM_{10}.			
H	Alternative H generated 1.6% of the southern portion of Sonoma County total NOx in near term and only 1.0% in 2020. For ROG, Alternative H only generated 0.5% in the near term and 0.2% in 2020. The PM10 contribution for Alternative H is a little more with 2.7% in the near term and 2.6% in 2020. The incremental effect of Alternative H is a relatively large portion of the countywide total for one project. This is especially true regarding PM10 emissions, where percentages are over 2.5%. Alternative H would exacerbate the regional trend towards higher PM10 emissions. ROG, NOx, and PM10 emissions associated with operation of Alternative H would be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of the mitigation measures contained in **Section**	S	Same as A.	LTS

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
	4.4 above.			
	Carbon Monoxide Concentrations			
A	Traffic operations at signalized study intersections would be LOS D or better with Alternative A under 2020 long-term future cumulative background conditions and traffic mitigation measures. Intersections operating at LOS D or better typically do not result in CO concentrations that exceed State or Federal standards. This impact is significant and with traffic mitigation would be reduced to less than significant.	S	See traffic mitigation measures listed in **Section 4.8,** Resource Use Patterns**.**	LTS
B	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
F	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G	As described in the traffic study of the project alternatives, traffic operations at signalized study intersections would be LOS D or better with Alternative G under 2020 long-term future 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*	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
	Carbon Monoxide Protocol (Garza, et al., 1997), intersections operating at LOS D or better typically do not result in CO concentrations that exceed State or Federal standards. Therefore, Alternative G with traffic mitigation measures is considered to have a less-than-significant impact on CO air quality.			
H	Similar to A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
	Odor Effects			
A	Alternative A and other reasonable foreseeable projects in the area, when considered cumulatively, could result in potentially significant odor impacts. Several commercial centers are planned in the area around the intersection of Wilfred Avenue and US Highway 101. The common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors occur mostly in manufacturing/industrial zones and no manufacturing/industrial areas are projected for the area, however significant commercial development is planned. However, the BAAQMD permit process, city/county permitting processes, and future environmental review processes will combine to ensure that Alternative A in combination with cumulative development would have a less than significant effect from odors.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
B	Cumulative impacts from odors and toxic air contaminants are similar to Alternative A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
D Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
E Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
F Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
G Alternative G and other reasonable foreseeable projects in the area, when considered cumulatively, could result in potentially significant odor impacts. Several commercial centers are planned in the area around the intersection of Wilfred Avenue and US Highway 101. The common types of facilities that have been known to produce odors occur mostly in manufacturing/industrial zones and no manufacturing/industrial areas are projected for the area, however significant commercial development is planned. However, BAAQMD permit process, city/county permitting processes, and future environmental review processes will combine to ensure that Alternative G in combination with cumulative development would have a less than significant effect from odors.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
H Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
Toxic Air Contaminants			
A. Alternative A and other reasonable foreseeable projects in the area, when considered cumulatively, could result in potentially significant impacts from toxic air contaminants. Several commercial centers are planned in the area around the intersection	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	of Wilfred Avenue and US Highway 101. Potential toxic air contaminant sources such as gasoline dispensing facilities and dry cleaners could site in these commercial areas. However, BAAQMD permit process, city/county permitting processes, and future environmental review processes will combine to ensure that Alternative A in combination with cumulative development would have a less than significant effect from toxic air contaminants.			
B	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
C	Similar to A.	LTS	None recommended.	LTS
D	Similar to A.	S	None recommended.	LTS
E	Similar to A.	S	None recommended.	LTS
F	Alternative F and other reasonable foreseeable projects in the area, when considered cumulatively, could result in potentially significant impacts from toxic air contaminants. No manufacturing/industrial or commercial areas projected for the area, therefore Alternative F in combination with cumulative development would have a less than significant effect from toxic air contaminants.	S	None recommended.	LTS
G	Alternative G and other reasonable foreseeable projects in the area, when considered cumulatively, could result in potentially significant impacts from toxic air contaminants. Several commercial centers are planned in the area around the intersection of Wilfred Avenue and US Highway 101. Potential toxic air contaminant sources could site in these	S	None recommended.	LTS

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

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
	commercial/industrial areas. However, BAAQMD permit process, city/county permitting processes, and future environmental review processes will combine to ensure that Alternative G in combination with cumulative development would have a less than significant effect from toxic air contaminants.			
H	Similar to A.	S	None recommended.	LTS
	Climate Change			
A	Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with construction and operation of Alternative A could be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Alternative A would emit GHG and has the potential to have a significant impact on climate change; however, with the implementation of mitigation the impact would be less than significant.	S	5.2.3 B.e. Idle time shall be minimized to five minutes when the equipment is not in use, unless safety requirements or manufacturers specifications indicate that more time is required. The above mitigation measure would reduce climate change impacts to less than significant. Other mitigation measures provided in **Section 5.2.3** would further reduce the project's greenhouse gas emissions.	LTS
B	Similar to A	S	Same as A	LTS
C	Similar to A	S	Same as A	LTS
D	Similar to A	S	Same as A	LTS
E	Similar to A	S	Same as A	LTS

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

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
F Similar to A	S	Same as A	LTS
G Similar to A	S	Same as A	LTS
H Similar to A	S	Same as A	LTS
Biological Resources			

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

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 *Wildlife and Habitats*			
After mitigation is implemented, Alternative A is not anticipated to result in significant direct or indirect effects to wildlife and habitats. However, disturbance to habitats and increases in human activity from the casino in combination with other proposed projects in the Rohnert Park area such as the Santa Rosa Sub-regional IRWP, the Route 101 High Occupancy Vehicle and Lane Widening Project, and local planned development projects could incrementally contribute to past, present, and future effects to wildlife and habitats. Given the level of disturbance currently existing within the area and the planned preservation of the southern portions of the Wilfred Site under Alternative A for open space and habitat preservation, Alternative A would not result in significant cumulative effects to wildlife and habitats.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.5**, Biological Resources.	LTS
Federally Listed Species			
Disturbance to seasonal wetlands, California tiger salamander habitat, and increases in human activity resulting from Alternative A and other proposed projects in the Rohnert Park area could cumulatively and adversely affect federally listed species. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact to Threatened and/or Endangered Species.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for Section 4.5, Biological Resources.	LTS
Migratory Birds			
Alternative A is not anticipated to result in significant direct or indirect effects to nesting migratory birds. However, disturbance to	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.5**, Biological	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	migratory bird habitats and increases in human activity from other proposed projects in the Rohnert Park area could incrementally contribute to past, present, and future effects to migratory birds. Given the level of disturbance currently existing within the area and the planned preservation of the northern and southwestern portions of the Stony Point site under Alternative A for open space and habitat preservation, Alternative A would not result in significant cumulative effects to migratory birds.		Resources.	
	Waters of the U.S.			
	Alternative A would directly affect approximately 2 acres of "waters of the U.S." This loss of "waters of the U.S." is anticipated to be permitted under a USACE Individual Permit and would require compensatory mitigation and a written plan on how such mitigation would be implemented. Adverse indirect effects to "waters of the U.S." would be avoided by the implementation of project features designed to prevent increased erosion and sedimentation and increase flood storage on the site. After complying with permit conditions, Alternative A would not result in any net loss of on-site waters of the U.S. or wetlands. Thus, significant cumulative effects to "waters of the U.S." would not occur.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.5**, Biological Resources.	LTS
B	*Wildlife and Habitats*			
	After mitigation is implemented, Alternative B is not anticipated to result in significant direct or indirect effects to wildlife and habitats. However, disturbance to habitats and increases in human activity from the casino in combination with other proposed projects in the	S	Same as A	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Rohnert Park area such as the Santa Rosa Sub-regional IRWP, the Route 101 High Occupancy Vehicle and Lane Widening Project, and local planned development projects could incrementally contribute to past, present and future effects to wildlife and habitats. Given the level of disturbance currently existing within the area and the planned preservation of the southern and northeastern portions of the Stony Point site under Alternative B for open space and habitat preservation, Alternative B would not result in significant cumulative effects to wildlife and habitats.			
Federally Listed Species			
Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
Migratory Birds			
Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
Waters of the U.S.			
Alternative B would directly affect greater than approximately 21 acres of "waters of the U.S." This loss of "waters of the U.S." is anticipated to be permitted under a USACE Individual Permit and would require compensatory mitigation and a written plan on how such mitigation would be implemented. Adverse indirect effects to "waters of the U.S." would be avoided by the implementation of project features designed to prevent increased erosion and sedimentation and increase flood storage on the site. After	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	complying with permit conditions, Alternative B would not result in any loss of on-site waters of the U.S. or wetlands. Thus, significant cumulative effects to "waters of the U.S." would not occur.			
C	The impacts of Alternative C to biological resources are similar, but lessened due to the smaller scope of Alternative C facilities, when compared with those of Alternative A.	S	Same as A. Mitigation is discussed in **Section 5.2.4**.	LTS
D	The cumulative impacts of Alternative D to biological resources are similar, but reduced in intensity, to those of Alternative B, given that Alternative D is reduced in size and scope when compared with Alternative B.	S	Same as A. Mitigation is discussed in **Section 5.2.4**.	LTS
E	The cumulative impacts of Alternative E to biological resources are similar, but reduced in intensity, to those of Alternative B, given that Alternative E is reduced in size and scope when compared with Alternative B.	S	Same as A. Mitigation is discussed in **Section 5.2.4**.	LTS
F	Development of the Lakeville site is expected to have significant cumulative impact due to the loss of Sonoma sunshine, Myrtle's silverspot, Callippe silverspot, and California red-legged frog habitat. The footprint of development for Alternative F will impact over 20 acres of wetland habitat on the Lakeville site. The area surrounding the proposed development is largely wetland. Impacts to wetlands will be minimized with preservation of existing wetlands or the creation of new wetlands. Cumulative impacts are projected to be significant if other development scheduled for the area also reduces habitat for special status species. This is a potentially	S	Same as A.	S

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
significant cumulative impact. The impacts of Alternative F to biological resources would be similar to those of the Rohnert Park alternatives but the species and habitats to be affected differ owing to the location of the site and adjoining developable land adjacent to San Pablo Bay. Mitigation measures are discussed in **Section 5.2.4**, though the measures will not reduce the cumulative impact to less than significant.			
G Wildlife and Habitats After mitigation is implemented, Alternative G is not anticipated to result in significant direct or indirect effects to wildlife and habitats. However, disturbance to habitats and increases in human activity from development associated with the Northwest Specific Plan in combination with other proposed projects in the Rohnert Park area such as the Santa Rosa Sub-regional IRWP, the Route 101 High Occupancy Vehicle and Lane Widening Project, and local planned development projects could incrementally contribute to past, present, and future effects to wildlife and habitats. Given the level of disturbance currently existing within the area, and the disturbance associated with development under the Northwest Specific Plan, Alternative G would potentially result in significant cumulative effects to wildlife and habitats. *Federally Listed Species* Disturbance to seasonal wetlands, California tiger salamander	S	Same as A.	LTS

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	habitat, and increases in human activity resulting from Alternative G and other proposed projects in the Rohnert Park area could cumulatively and adversely effect federally listed species. This is a potentially significant cumulative impact to Threatened and/or Endangered Species. *Migratory Birds* Alternative G is not anticipated to result in significant direct or indirect effects to nesting migratory birds. However, disturbance to migratory bird habitats and increases in human activity from other proposed projects in the Rohnert Park area could incrementally contribute to past, present, and future effects to migratory birds. Alternative G would not result in significant cumulative effects to migratory birds. *Waters of the U.S.* Alternative G would directly affect "waters of the U.S." associated with the development of projects appropriate under the Northwest Specific Plan. This loss of "waters of the U.S." would require an Individual Permit from USACE and would require compensatory mitigation and a written plan on how such mitigation would be implemented. Thus, significant cumulative effects to "waters of the U.S." would not occur.			
H	*Wildlife and Habitats* Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	Federally Listed Species			
	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
	Migratory Birds			
	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
	Waters of the U.S.			
	Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
	Cultural Resources			
A	Based on the extensive presence of cultural resources in Sonoma County, it is expected that future development may result in significant losses of cultural resources. Development proposed under this alternative would not affect any known historic properties. However, there is always the possibility that unknown archaeological resources exist buried with no surface manifestation. Mitigation measures are presented in **Section 4.6** for the protection and preservation of known archaeological and historical sites, and for the treatment of unanticipated discoveries. Therefore, the development of Alternative A is expected to result in a less than significant incremental effect to the cumulative loss of important cultural resources in Sonoma County.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.6**, Cultural Resources.	LTS
B	Based on the extensive presence of cultural resources in Sonoma County, it is expected that future development may result in	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	significant losses of cultural resources. Development proposed under this alternative would affect two historic archaeological sites (RPC-1 and -5) that are potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.			
C	Based on the extensive presence of cultural resources in Sonoma County, it is expected that future development may result in significant losses of cultural resources. Development proposed under this alternative would affect one historic archaeological site (RPC-5) that is potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Cumulative effects to cultural resources would be similar to those of Alternative B, given that the development footprint would be similar.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Cumulative effects to cultural resources would be similar to those of Alternative B, given that the development would affect the same potentially eligible cultural resources as Alternative B.	S	Same as A.	LTS
F	Based on the extensive presence of cultural resources in Sonoma County, it is expected that future development may result in significant losses of cultural resources. Development proposed under this alternative may affect one prehistoric archaeological site (CA-SON-204) that is potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.	S	Same as A.	LTS
G	The Rohnert Park General Plan EIR identified potentially	S	Same as mitigation measures in the Rohnert Park General Plan	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	significant cultural resource impacts within the Northwest Specific Plan area. Alternative G and other reasonable foreseeable projects in the area, when considered cumulatively, could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources just as in Alternative A. However, implementation of mitigation measures in the General Plan EIR would reduce the cumulative impact to a level below significance.		EIR.	
H	Cumulative effects to cultural resources would be similar to those of Alternative A, given that the project would be developed on the Wilfred site. Mitigation measures for Alternative H are presented in **Section 5.2.5** for the protection and preservation of known archaeological and historical sites, and for the treatment of unanticipated discoveries.	LTS	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.6**, Cultural Resources.	LTS
	Socioeconomic Conditions			
A	Cumulative socioeconomic effects could occur in the vicinity of the Wilfred site as the 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. Alternative A would introduce a substantial new source of economic activity to Sonoma County. Once operational,	LTS	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.7**, Socioeconomic Conditions.	LTS

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Alternative A's casino/hotel resort would become Sonoma County's largest employer (assumes 2,400 jobs created). As the growth in jobs and housing occurs in the region, fiscal demands on local governments will increase for necessary services to new and existing developments, as described within **Section 4.7**. The local governments in the region address increased service demand from new developments by requiring various development fees and assessments. Alternative A would not be subject to development fees. However, the Tribe would pay fees equivalent to development fees to Rohnert Park and Sonoma County (MOU terms assumed to apply), ensuring that Alternative A's impact to the cumulative fiscal demands on local government is less than significant. Social impacts, including their potential to increase over time are also analyzed in **Section 4.7**. Substantial research has been conducted on the potential social costs associated with gambling. A review of this research does not reveal a link between casinos and regional crime. Thus, Alternative A would not affect regional trends in crime rates. Regarding problem gambling, the National Gambling Impact Study Commission (NGISC) has concluded that as "the opportunities for gambling become more commonplace, it appears likely that the number of people who will develop gambling problems also will increase" (NGISC, 1999). The development of Alternative A would introduce a new casino venue within Sonoma County. However, because Sonoma County already has a casino, several other casinos and card rooms exist in the region, and internet gambling is prevalent, the introduction of an additional			

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	casino is not likely to significantly increase local residents' access to casino gambling. The incremental increase in access provided by the proposed casino would be offset by an expected annual contribution of $125,000 to a local organization dedicated to the treatment and prevention of problem or pathological gambling disorders.			
B	Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative B would be similar to those of Alternative A, since Alternative B is similar in size and scope to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative C would be similar to those of Alternative A, since Alternative B is similar in size and scope to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
D	Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative D would be similar, but reduced in intensity, to those of Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
E	Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative E would be similar, but reduced in intensity, to those of Alternative A. Impacts would not include the gaming-related impacts described under Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
F	Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative F would be similar to those of Alternative A, but the effects would be centered more on southern Sonoma County. The Rohnert Park MOU would not apply to Alternative F, although effects to Rohnert Park would be minimal.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
G Under Alternative G, residential and commercial development would occur on the Wilfred site. This development would contribute to the regional trend of increased housing developments and would add jobs to the regional economy. The number of jobs added would be less than Alternative A, however. Thus unemployment rates may be marginally higher than under Alternative A. Criminal activity is expected to be increased somewhat due to the congregation of people at residential and commercial developments. However, this activity would not be enough to result in worsening regional crime rates. A less than significant cumulative socioeconomic effect would result.	LTS	None recommended	LTS
H Cumulative socioeconomic effects of Alternative H would be similar, but reduced in intensity, to those of Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
Resource Use Patterns			
A *Transportation/Circulation*			
Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.12.3**, Alternative A.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
Agriculture			
As growth occurs within the region, cumulative effects to agriculture may occur as the result of the transformation of agricultural lands to other land uses. However, according to the NRCS, the land proposed for development under Alternative A			

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	does not contain prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance. Four parcels in the southern portion of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites are partially irrigated pasturelands currently under Williamson Act contracts. Under Option 2 and Option 3 for wastewater disposal, these parcels would be used as spray fields, which would aide in irrigation. This is an allowable use under the Williamson Act contract as it would be compatible and incidental to the agricultural use of the land. Under each option for wastewater disposal, the primary use of the southern parcels would remain agricultural as required by the Williamson Act contracts. Because no net loss of important or protected farmland would occur, the effects of Alternative A on agricultural resources are not considered to significantly contribute to past, present and future effects of other projects to agriculture within the project vicinity.			
B	*Transportation/Circulation* Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.12.3**, Alternative B. *Agriculture* According to the NRCS, up to 48.7 acres of the land proposed for development under Alternative B is considered prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance. However the agricultural capability of these lands is considered marginal. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41,	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	S

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	which indicates that the land is suited to a few crops or to special crops and would require special management. The land proposed for development is approximately 0.0078% of the farmland in the County. Given the inferior quality, which is evidenced by the Storie Index Rating, and the relatively small contribution to the total loss of farmlands in the County, this is not considered to be an adverse impact to agricultural resources. As with Alternative A, the four parcels in the southern portion of the Wilfred site are currently under Williamson Act Contracts. No development is proposed to occur on these parcels. Under Alternative B, the primary use of these lands would remain agricultural. This is consistent with the protections and requirements of the Williamson Act Contracts. Overall, the effects of Alternative B on agricultural resources are not considered to significantly contribute to past, present and future effects of other projects to agriculture within the project vicinity.			
C	*Transportation/Circulation* Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.12.3**, Alternative C. *Agriculture* According to the NRCS, up to 75.7 acres of the land proposed for development under Alternative C is considered prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance. However the	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	S

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	agricultural capability of these lands is considered marginal. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41, which indicates that the land is suited to a few crops or to special crops and would require special management. The land proposed for development is approximately 0.012% of the farmland in the County. Given the inferior quality and relatively small area of available farmland to be converted, this is not considered to be an adverse impact to agricultural resources. As with Alternatives A and B, the four southern parcels are currently under Williamson Act Contracts. Under Alternative C, the primary use of these lands would remain agricultural. Overall, the effects of Alternative C on agricultural resources are not considered to significantly contribute to past, present and future effects of other projects to agriculture within the project vicinity.			
D	*Transportation/Circulation*			
	Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.12.3**, Alternative D.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS
	Agriculture			
	According to the NRCS, up to 43.6 acres of the land proposed for development under Alternative D is considered prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance. However the agricultural capability of these lands is considered marginal. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41, which indicates that the land is suited to a few crops or to special			

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	crops and would require special management. The land proposed for development is approximately 0.007% of the farmland in the County. Given the inferior quality and relatively small area of available farmland to be converted, this is not considered to be an adverse impact to agricultural resources. As with Alternatives A, B, and C, the four southern parcels are currently under Williamson Act Contracts. Under Alternative D, the primary use of these lands would remain agricultural. Overall, the effects of Alternative D on agricultural resources are not considered to significantly contribute to past, present and future effects of other projects to agriculture within the project vicinity.			
E	*Transportation/Circulation* Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.12.3**, Alternative E. *Agriculture* According to the NRCS, up to 38.1 acres of the land proposed for development under Alternative E is considered prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance. However the agricultural capability of these lands is considered marginal. The NRCS evaluated the land at a California Storie Index rating of 41, which indicates that the land is suited to a few crops or to special crops and would require special management. The land proposed for development is approximately 0.0061% of the farmland in the County. Given the inferior quality and relatively small area of	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS

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
	available farmland to be converted, this is not considered to be an adverse impact to agricultural resources. As with Alternatives A, B, C, and D, the four southern parcels are currently under Williamson Act Contracts. Under Alternative E, the primary use of these lands would remain agricultural. Overall, the effects of Alternative E on agricultural resources are not considered to significantly contribute to past, present and future effects of other projects to agriculture within the project vicinity.			
F	*Transportation/Circulation* Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.12.3**, Alternative F. Two freeway/ramp segments, identified as; Wilson Avenue EB Off-Ramp and Wilson Avenue WB On-Ramp under Alternative F, would continue to have significant impacts in 2020 after implementation of mitigation measures.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	S
	Agriculture Under Alternative F, approximately 103.9 acres of rural lands would be directly converted to urban uses. According to the NRCS, the land proposed for development under Alternative F does not contain prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance. Additionally, none of the parcels on the Lakeville site are currently protected under Williamson Act contracts. Due to the inferior quality and relatively small portion of the total County land available for farming purposes, the effects of Alternative F on agricultural resources are not considered to			

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

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
	significantly contribute to past, present and future effects of other projects to agriculture within the project vicinity.			
G	*Transportation/Circulation* It is assumed that future development of the Wilfred Site, Stony Point Site, and Lakeville Site would be guided by existing land use plans. For the Stony Point Site and Lakeville Site there are currently no known development plans. According to Northwest Specific Plan- South the northeastern corner of the Wilfred Site would be developed with residential and commercial uses. (City of Rohnert Park, 2004). The Northwest Specific Plan area east of the Wilfred site proposes high-density residential, industrial, business park, and regional commercial development. The northeastern portion of the Wilfred site would be developed with residential land uses as intended under the Northwest Specific Plan. The No Action Alternative would result in the traffic conditions described as the 2020 baseline conditions. Five freeway segments and three intersections will not meet adequate LOS standards in 2020 under the No Action Alternative.	LTS	See **Section 5.2.7** for a listing of recommended traffic mitigation measures.	LTS
H	*Transportation/Circulation* Incremental cumulative impacts to regional intersections and freeway segments/ramps would occur, as detailed in **Section 4.12.3**, Alternative H.	S	See **Section 5.2.7**.	LTS

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

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
Agriculture As growth occurs within the region, cumulative effects to agriculture may occur as the result of the transformation of agricultural lands to other land uses. However, according to the NRCS, the land proposed for development under Alternative A does not contain prime or unique farmlands or farmlands of statewide importance. Four parcels in the southern portion of the Wilfred and Stony Point sites are partially irrigated pasturelands currently under Williamson Act contracts. Under Option 2 and Option 3 for wastewater disposal, these parcels would be used as spray fields, which would aide in irrigation. This is an allowable use under the Williamson Act contract as it would be compatible and incidental to the agricultural use of the land. Under each option for wastewater disposal, the primary use of the southern parcels would remain agricultural as required by the Williamson Act contracts. Because no net loss of important or protected farmland would occur, the effects of Alternative A on agricultural resources are not considered to significantly contribute to past, present and future effects of other projects to agriculture within the project vicinity.			
Public Services			
A Water Supply Alternative A would draw its water supply from on-site wells rather than a municipal system. Affected municipal systems include the City of Rohnert Park and regional resources, which draw water	S	Same as mitigation listed in **Section 4.9,** Public Services.	LTS

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
from the same groundwater basin. The overall cumulative effect on the regional groundwater basin from the Tribe's production wells is less than significant. The City of Rohnert Park currently obtains water from several sources including groundwater wells, the SCWA, and recycled water. The City of Rohnert Park conducted a WSA to assess future water demand and supply. The WSA reported that there were adequate water resources through the year 2025 for buildout of the City, expansion of Sonoma State University, and the Graton Rancheria's casino and hotel project (City of Rohnert Park, 2005, **Appendix H**). The City plans on decreasing reliance on groundwater. SCWA has determined in their Urban Water Management Plan that their supplies will exceed projected demand through the year 2020. Due to the City's decreasing reliance on groundwater, and the availability of water supplies through 2025 with planned development and the Proposed Project, the cumulative effect to public water service providers is less than significant. *Wastewater Service* Alternative A would obtain wastewater service through an independent treatment system or through connection to the Laguna Subregional Treatment Plant (Laguna WWTP). If Alternative A utilized an independent wastewater treatment plant it would not affect the ability of any wastewater service providers to treat wastewater and dispose of effluent. If Alternative A utilized the Laguna WWTP, there could potentially be cumulative impacts			

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
when combined with foreseeable development projects through 2025. Alternative A would exceed the City of Rohnert Park's projections for wastewater capacity by approximately 100,000 mgd on weekdays and 239,000 mgd on weekends (HydroScience, 2006). *Solid Waste* Under Alternative A, collection and hauling services would be provided by Rohnert Park Disposal, Sonoma County, or an independent collection company. The project and planned growth would not affect the County's long-term plans for solid waste management. *Electricity, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications* For Alternative A and the list of cumulative projects the electric and natural gas supplier is PG&E. AT&T is the main telecommunications provider in Sonoma County and has connections near Alternative A and the cumulative projects. PG&E has confirmed that it can provide electrical and natural gas services for Alternative A. The electrical and natural gas demands of the anticipated cumulative projects are unknown. PG&E planning departments work with city and county planners to ensure that adequate capacity is available for future development. Individual projects would be responsible for paying development or user fees to receive electrical, natural gas, cable, and telephone services.			

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Thus, the cumulative effects would be less than significant. *Law Enforcement* Cumulative effects related to law enforcement could occur in the region as the result of inadequate law enforcement resources and/or increased response times. The local governments in the region address increased service demand from new developments, such as law enforcement services, by requiring various development fees and assessments, and through increased property tax increments related to increases in assessed values. Alternative A would generate a need for additional law enforcement resources. With the fiscal mitigation listed in **Section 5.2.6**, impacts to the County would be less than significant. As an alternative to the fiscal mitigation, the Tribe could enter into a law enforcement agreement with the County, City, or both. Mutual aid impacts would be reduced to less than significant by compensating a law enforcement agency for primary services and contributions in the MOU. *Fire Protection/Emergency Medical* Cumulative effects related to fire protection and emergency medical services could occur in the region as a result of inadequate resources and/or increased response times to existing and planned development. The incorporated areas of Sonoma County address increased			

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
service demand from new developments, by requiring various development fees and assessments, and through increased property tax increments related to increases in assessed values. Emergency medical services are provided throughout the County by American Medical Response and are primarily funded by individuals receiving service. Alternative A would generate a need for additional fire protection and emergency medical services, and through the anticipated MOU with the City of Rohnert Park, the Tribe would provide funding for impacts to these services. This funding would be beneficial in providing additional resources for expected growth. As there is currently no signed agreement for fire protection or emergency medical services, this impact is considered significant. An agreement for primary services would prevent a reliance on mutual aid services. With mitigation measures listed in **Section 5**, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. *Schools* Planning for schools is left largely to the school districts, which forecast new schools based on projected residential growth. While enrollment is anticipated to decrease in the unincorporated areas, student enrollment is project to increase through 2020 in the Rohnert Park-Cotati area by 18% (Nichols Berman, 2006). The existing labor pool would fill the jobs created by Alternative A. Alternative A is not anticipated to increase demands on school services as it is neither creating housing nor creating a significant influx of residents.			

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	The cumulative impact of Alternative B on public services is substantially similar to Alternative A, given the identical facilities and proximity in location. For water supply, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, law enforcement and schools the cumulative impact is the same as Alternative A and less than significant. For wastewater service the Tribe would not utilize the Laguna WWTP. The Tribe would utilize an independent, on-site WWTP. Therefore impacts to wastewater service are considered less than significant. Cumulative impacts would be similar to Alternative A. Given that there is currently no signed agreement for fire protection services, a potentially significant impact would result.	S	Same as A.	LTS
C	Effects to public services would not differ from Alternative B. There is currently no signed agreement for fire protection services, thus this impact is considered significant. For water supply, wastewater service, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, law enforcement, and schools the impact would be less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed in **Section 4.9,** Public Services.	LTS
D	Effects to public services would not differ from those of Alternative B, except that impacts would be slightly lessened due to the reduced intensity of development. There is currently no signed agreement for fire protection services, thus this impact is considered significant,. For water supply, wastewater service, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, law enforcement, and schools the impact would be less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed in **Section 4.9,** Public Services.	LTS

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

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	Effects to public services would not differ from Alternative B, except that impacts would be substantially lessened due to the reduced intensity of development and because the development is not likely to be open to the public 24 hours a day, like the proposed casino/hotel resort. There is currently no signed agreement for fire protection services, thus this impact is considered significant. For water supply, wastewater service, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, law enforcement, and schools the impact would be less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed in **Section 4.9,** Public Services.	LTS
F	Effects to public services would not differ from Alternative A, except that impacts would be centered in southern Sonoma County and the existing MOUs with Sonoma County and Rohnert Park would not apply. The existing MOU with Sonoma County would require concurrence from the County to apply to the Lakeville Site. There is currently no signed agreement for law enforcement or fire protection services, thus this impact is considered significant. For water supply, wastewater service, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, law enforcement, and schools the impact would be less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed in **Section 4.9,** Public Services.	LTS
G	As there are no plans for development on the Stony Point Site or Lakeville Site, there would be no cumulative impacts to public services. The Wilfred Site would be developed according to the Northwest Specific Plan (Southern Area), which identifies the site as being developed for residential and commercial uses. Development of	LTS	None recommended.	LTS

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

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 site would increase demands on public services. As stated in the Northwest Specific Plan it is anticipated that developers of the Southern Area will fund the installation of public services and will contribute through City fees to the funding of off-site services. These fees would include but not be limited to school mitigation fees and sewer and water connection fees.			
H	Effects to public services would not differ from those of Alternative A, except that impacts would be slightly lessened due to the reduced intensity of development and the Rohnert Park MOU would not apply. There is currently no signed agreement for fire protection services, thus this impact is considered significant. For water supply, wastewater service, solid waste, electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, law enforcement, and schools the impact would be less than significant.	S	Same as mitigation listed in **Section 4.9,** Public Services.	LTS
	Other Values			
A	*Noise*			
	Alternative A would contribute to the cumulative increase in traffic in the area. This would also result in a contribution to cumulative traffic noise effects.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.10**, Other Values.	LTS
	Noise associated with cumulative 2020 traffic at the Wilfred site would exceed the 65 dB Ldn land use compatibility criterion at all study road segments and intersections. Noise-sensitive development is present along Rohnert Park Expressway in the form of the mobile home park. This condition would occur with or			

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
without the project. The mobile home park has been designed with a large buffer zone and a sound barrier between the park and Rohnert Park Expressway. Thus traffic noise from Rohnert Park Expressway is not expected to significantly affect any sensitive receptors.			
Hazardous Materials There are no existing known hazardous materials on the Wilfred site. Alternative A would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been identified to decrease any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.			
Visual Resources Growth is planned within Rohnert Park and Sonoma County. However, cumulative development that takes place would be consistent with local land use regulations, including associated design guidelines. Development of Alternative A would be consistent with the visual goals of local land use regulations. The construction portion of the Wilfred site is not located in a scenic corridor or an area of high aesthetic value, commercial attraction notwithstanding. Substantial development is present to the east of the Wilfred site, with open space to the west. This development includes regional commercial and service centers. The proposed project would be attractively designed as a resort facility and, in combination with other nearby development, would not constitute a significant cumulative visual effect to an already semi-developed environment.			

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

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 *Noise*			
Similar to Alternative A.	S	Same as A.	LTS
Hazardous Materials			
There are no existing known hazardous materials on the Stony Point site. Alternative B would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been identified to decrease any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.			
Visual Resources			
As growth occurs within the City of Rohnert Park and Sonoma County, cumulative effects to visual resources may take place as the result of increased development. However, cumulative development that takes place within the area would be consistent with local land use regulations. The construction portion of the Stony Point site is not located in a scenic corridor or an area of high aesthetic value, commercial attraction notwithstanding. Substantial development is present to the east of the Stony Point site, with open space to the west. This development includes regional commercial and service centers. The Alternative B facilities would be attractively designed as a resort facility and, in combination with other nearby development, would not constitute a significant cumulative visual effect to an already semi-developed			

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

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
environment.			
C *Noise*			
Noise effects would be similar to those of Alternative B, given that Alternative C is similar in size and scope to Alternative B. However, noise effects to residences along Wilfred Avenue would be reduced since less traffic would be traveling between the project driveway and Stony Point Road.	S	Same as A.	LTS
Hazardous Materials			
There are no existing known hazardous materials on the Stony Point site. This alternative would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been identified to decrease any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.			
Visual Resources			
Cumulative impacts to visual resources would be similar to those of Alternative B, given that Alternative C is similar in size and scope to Alternative B.			
D *Noise*			
Noise effects would be similar to Alternative B, however reduced in intensity, given that Alternative D is reduced in size and scope to	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
	Alternative B. It is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the segments that would be above this level. Therefore, this is considered a significant impact.			
	Hazardous Materials			
	There are no existing known hazardous materials on the Stony Point site. This alternative would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been identified to decrease any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.			
	Visual Resources			
	Cumulative impacts to visual resources would be similar but reduced when compared with those of Alternative B, given that Alternative D is reduced in size and scope to Alternative B.			
E	*Noise*	S	Same as A.	LTS
	Noise effects would be similar to those of Alternative B, however reduced in intensity, given that Alternative E proposes the development of a business park that is reduced in size when compared with Alternative B. Note that noise-sensitive development is present along Rohnert Park Expressway in the form of the mobile home park. The mobile home park has been designed with a large buffer zone and a sound barrier between the park and Rohnert Park Expressway. Thus traffic noise from Rohnert Park Expressway is not expected to significantly affect any			

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

ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE BEFORE MITIGATION	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
sensitive receptors within the mobile home park. *Hazardous Materials* There are no existing known hazardous materials on the Stony Point site. This alternative would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been identified to decrease any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative. *Visual Resources* As growth occurs within the City of Rohnert Park and Sonoma County, cumulative effects to visual resources may take place as the result of increased development. However, cumulative development that takes place within the area would be consistent with local land use regulations. The construction portion of the Stony Point site is not located in a scenic corridor or an area of high aesthetic value, commercial attraction notwithstanding. Substantial development is present to the east of the Stony Point site, with open space to the west. This development includes regional commercial and service centers. The Alternative E facilities would be attractively designed as a resort facility and, in combination with other nearby development, would not constitute a significant cumulative visual effect to an already semi-developed environment.			

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
F *Noise* Alternative F would contribute to the cumulative increase in traffic in the area. This would also result in a contribution to cumulative traffic noise effects. *Visual Resources* As growth occurs within Sonoma County, cumulative effects to visual resources may take place as the result of increased development. However, cumulative development that takes place within the area would be consistent with local land use regulations. Little cumulative development is expected in the vicinity of the Lakeville site, which is primarily an agricultural area. Development of Alternative F would not be consistent with local land use regulations and would not be consistent with the agricultural character of the area, however, no additive visual impacts would result since little surrounding development is planned. Thus, cumulative visual impacts would be less than significant. *Hazardous Materials* There are no existing hazardous materials on the Lakeville site. Alternative F would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been identified to decrease any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.	S	Same as A.	LTS

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

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
G *Noise* The City of Rohnert Park identified the potential for the generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards. Development in conjunction with cumulative traffic could result in potentially significant traffic noise impacts on the existing land uses in the area. Since certification of the City of Rohnert Park General Plan EIR, existing traffic volumes may have increased and will necessitate an updated traffic study. Alternative G is expected to result in cumulative noise impacts resulting from the increased traffic volumes. The City of Rohnert Park identified the potential for the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The General Plan EIR analyzed potentially significant impacts related to temporary construction noise that may include excessive ground vibration. Alternative G would be developed under the authority of the Rohnert Park General Plan EIR, which specifies locally required mitigation measures to reduce the impacts above to less than significant. *Visual Resources* Growth is planned within Rohnert Park and Sonoma County. However, cumulative development that takes place would be	S	Same as mitigation measures outlined in the Rohnert Park General Plan EIR.	LTS

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

	Environmental Effect	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	consistent with local land use regulations, including associated design guidelines. Development of Alternative G would be governed by and consistent with the visual goals of local land use regulations. The Northwest Specific Plan, Southern Area, is not located in a scenic corridor or an area of high aesthetic value, commercial attraction notwithstanding. Substantial development is present to the east of the Plan Area, with open space to the west. This development includes regional commercial and service centers. Planned commercial and residential development under Alternative G would not constitute a significant cumulative visual effect to an already semi-developed environment.			
	Hazardous Materials			
	Under Alternative G it is likely the City of Rohnert Park's Northwest Specific Plan (South) will progress. As a result high-density residential and commercial facilities would be developed on the Wilfred site. There are no expected cumulative effects with this alternative.			
H	Noise effects would be identical to alternative D due to similarity of the construction footprint. Under Alternative H it is assumed that noise sensitive development is present or proposed immediately adjacent to all of the segments that would be above this level. Therefore, this is considered a significant impact.	S	Same as D.	LTS

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

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
Visual Resources Impacts would be similar to Alternative A, but slightly reduced due to the reduced intensity of development under Alternative H.	LTS		LTS
Hazardous Materials There are no existing known hazardous materials on the Wilfred site. Alternative H would not use significant quantities of hazardous materials and mitigation has been identified to decrease any incidental spills to a less than significant level. There are no significant cumulative hazardous materials issues associated with this alternative.	S	Same as mitigation listed above for **Section 4.10**, Other Values.	LTS

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